Pedagogy of Integrity: Evidence-Based Instructional Design and Ethical Frameworks for Minimizing Generative AI Misuse in Asynchronous Online Higher Education

Abstract

The advent of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has precipitated a paradigm shift in higher education, challenging traditional notions of authorship, assessment validity, and academic integrity. This report provides an exhaustive analysis of instructional design strategies aimed at mitigating unauthorized AI usage in asynchronous online courses—environments uniquely vulnerable due to the structural absence of real-time supervision. Drawing upon a multidisciplinary synthesis of cognitive science, educational technology, and digital ethics, the analysis moves beyond the limitations of surveillance-based detection toward a proactive, "pedagogy-first" model. Central to this strategy is the integration of the Comprehensive Authentic Assessment Model (CAAM), the application of Self-Determination Theory (SDT) to foster intrinsic motivation, and the implementation of a multi-dimensional AI literacy curriculum. Evidence suggests that by reducing "busy work," scaffolding iterative learning processes, and utilizing multimodal, context-specific tasks, educators can substantially reduce the incentive and ease of AI-based cheating. The report further critiques the ethical implications of AI surveillance, highlighting how "technosolutionist" approaches may exacerbate inequalities and erode institutional trust. Actionable blueprints for assessment redesign and ethical-use continuums are provided to guide faculty and instructional designers in fostering a culture of integrity in a technologically saturated academic landscape.

The Asynchronous Imperative: Contextualizing the AI Disruption

The rapid integration of Large Language Models (LLMs) such as GPT-4, Claude, and Gemini into the academic workflow has created a dual-edged reality for higher education. In asynchronous online learning—a domain defined by flexibility and self-directed study—the "asynchronous gap" (the temporal and social distance between instructor and student) has historically been managed through high-stakes summative assessments and automated proctoring. However, post-2022 research indicates that these legacy methods are increasingly insufficient. Traditional plagiarism detection tools, which rely on text-matching, frequently fail to identify unique AI-generated content, while AI detection algorithms themselves are prone to false positives and can be easily bypassed by "humanizer" tools.

Recent institutional surveys highlight the scale of this challenge. For instance, data from 2025 indicates that approximately 18% of undergraduate students in the United Kingdom admit to

submitting AI-generated text as their own work, while 95% of the broader academic community believes AI is being misused across their institutions. This widespread polarization among faculty—split between those advocating for total bans and those seeking integration—underscores a lack of unified pedagogical guidance. The consequence is an environment where students may unknowingly violate fluctuating integrity standards, driven by a combination of academic pressure, low self-efficacy, and the sheer accessibility of these tools. The response from higher education institutions must therefore move from a reactive, punitive posture to a proactive instructional design framework. This involves rethinking the "hidden curriculum" of syllabus statements, where fear-based framing may actually trigger the very behaviors it intends to prevent. Instead, a robust strategy for the asynchronous environment must leverage the Six Domains of Academic Integrity Reporting (AIR): Limitations, Policy Parameters, Literacy Education, Intent, Issue-Based Coaching, and Remediation. By addressing the structural and psychological drivers of misconduct, educators can restore the credibility of academic credentials in the age of generative agents.

Theoretical Foundations of AI-Resilient Pedagogy

Effective instructional design for academic integrity must be grounded in robust learning theories that explain student behavior and cognitive engagement. Three primary frameworks—Constructivism, Self-Determination Theory (SDT), and the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB)—provide the theoretical scaffolding for AI-resilient instruction.

Constructivism and the Community of Inquiry

Constructivist epistemology suggests that knowledge is not a commodity to be transferred but a meaning-making process constructed through experience and reflection. In the asynchronous environment, the Community of Inquiry (CoI) framework identifies "cognitive presence" and "social presence" as critical for this construction. Cognitive presence involves four phases: the triggering event, exploration, integration, and resolution. AI misuse often occurs when students view the "resolution" (the final assignment) as the only goal, bypassing the exploration and integration phases.

Instructional strategies that enhance cognitive presence—such as using generative AI agents to act as "Co-Learners" or "Simulated Peers"—can transform asynchronous learning into an interactive experience that requires sustained reflection. When students engage in a dialogue-based process to construct meaning, the act of "outsourcing" the final product becomes cognitively inconsistent with their perceived learning journey.

Self-Determination Theory and Motivational Resilience

Cognitive science identifies student motivation as a primary predictor of academic integrity. Self-Determination Theory (SDT) posits that when students' basic psychological needs—autonomy, competence, and relatedness—are satisfied, they engage in deeper, more ethical learning.

SDT Component	Application to AI Integrity	Instructional Design Implication
Autonomy	Students feel they have a choice in how they use technology to reach goals.	Provide options for assessment modality and "ethical use" levels.

SDT Component	Application to AI Integrity	Instructional Design Implication
Competence	Students believe they can succeed through their own intellectual effort.	Implement low-stakes "quests" and scaffolding to build mastery.
Relatedness	Students feel connected to the instructor and the academic community.	Increase social awareness through personalized feedback and video communication.

Empirical evidence suggests that "busy work"—assignments perceived as having no real-world value or requiring only rote summarization—severely undermines these needs. In such contexts, students may rationalize AI use as a legitimate tool for time-saving efficiency. Thus, the removal of repetitive, low-value tasks is a fundamental requirement for maintaining integrity in an AI-saturated environment.

The Theory of Planned Behavior and Perceived Control

The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) provides a mechanism for understanding the decision to cheat. It suggests that intention is shaped by attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. The "perceived ease" of using GenAI is currently high, while the "perceived risk" of detection is decreasing. An effective instructional design must therefore alter this calculus by:

1. **Reframing Attitudes:** Using ethics education to demonstrate the value of original thought.
2. **Influencing Norms:** Establishing clear, transparent course policies that emphasize collective responsibility.
3. **Adjusting Control:** Designing assessments that are difficult for AI to replicate, thereby reducing the "ease" of outsourcing.

Learner Personas: Understanding Motivations for AI Usage

To design effective interventions, instructional designers must recognize that "the student" is not a monolith. Different learner profiles utilize AI for distinct reasons, requiring tailored pedagogical responses.

Persona A: The Efficiency-Driven Professional

- **Profile:** Often a graduate student or adult learner working full-time.
- **Motivation:** Values time-saving and pragmatism. Uses AI to summarize articles, generate templates, or "get past" assignments that seem tangential to their professional goals.
- **Risk:** Rationalizes "outsourcing" as a time-management strategy rather than a violation of integrity.
- **Strategy:** Utilize authentic assessments that directly relate to their career, making the work inherently valuable to them.

Persona B: The Anxious High-Achiever

- **Profile:** Undergraduate student under intense pressure to maintain a high GPA.
- **Motivation:** Uses AI to "polish" their work, correct grammar, or ensure their tone sounds "academic".
- **Risk:** Over-reliance on AI leads to a loss of original voice and critical thinking.
- **Strategy:** Provide frequent, low-stakes feedback loops and "parallel quests" that allow for failure and revision without high grade-penalties.

Persona C: The Under-Resourced Navigator

- **Profile:** First-generation student or non-native English speaker.
- **Motivation:** Uses AI as a primary tutor or translation bridge to overcome language barriers or lack of foundational support.
- **Risk:** Vulnerable to algorithmic bias and may unknowingly submit AI-hallucinated facts.
- **Strategy:** Integrate "AI as Tutor" modules and scaffolding that teaches them to verify and cite AI assistance properly.

The Comprehensive Authentic Assessment Model (CAAM)

The most robust defense against AI misuse is the transition from "disposable" assignments to "authentic" assessments. Authentic assessment requires learners to apply knowledge in real-world contexts, focusing on higher-order cognitive skills like evaluation, synthesis, and creative problem-solving.

Design Principles for Authentic Redesign

The Multimodal Interactive Framework classifies assessments by their degree of modality (using diverse media) and interactivity (outcomes shaped by student actions). Tasks high in both dimensions are the most resistant to AI outsourcing.

Assessment Type	Redesign Strategy	Disciplinary Example
Contextualized Monomodal Static	Integrate highly specific, local variables that an LLM would not have in its training data.	**Biology:** "Explain varying plant growth rates in our specific campus greenhouse 'Zone B' based on this morning's light readings".
Problem-Solution Narrative	Focus on the reasoning process and multi-step logical connections.	**Business:** "Propose a marketing solution for considering the Northern Irish context and current local supply chain disruptions".
Reflective Metacognition	Require students to articulate *how* their thinking evolved through the assignment.	**Psychology:** "Submit a 500-word reflection explaining why you chose your specific primary sources over the alternatives provided in the course library".

Assessment Type	Redesign Strategy	Disciplinary Example
Live Verification / Oral Defenses	Use recorded or synchronous presentations with Q&A to verify mastery.	**Computer Science:** "Demonstrate your code in a 3-minute screen recording, explaining the logic of your specific recursive function".

The "Digital Matrix" of Vulnerability

Institutional designers should utilize a "Digital Matrix" to evaluate which assessment tasks are most vulnerable to AI. Tasks relying on "describe," "summarize," or "identify" are high-risk. Tasks requiring "critique," "synthesize for a specific audience," or "apply to personal experience" are more resilient.

Process-Oriented Pedagogy: The Scaffolding Blueprint

In the asynchronous environment, the absence of real-time supervision necessitates making the learning process *visible*. This is achieved through scaffolding—breaking down a large project into iterative, interdependent stages.

Iterative Feedback and Scaffolding Cycles

A 15-week asynchronous course should replace one or two "high-stakes" papers with a continuous assessment cycle. This design not only deters cheating by creating a "paper trail" of intellectual growth but also reduces the anxiety that drives misconduct.

1. **Phase 1: The Triggering Event (Weeks 1-3).** Students submit a "Problem Statement" or "Thesis Proposal." The focus is on finding a personally relevant topic.
2. **Phase 2: Exploration & Sourcing (Weeks 4-6).** Submission of an annotated bibliography or a prompt log showing initial research. Students must identify and justify the reliability of their sources.
3. **Phase 3: Integration & Feedback (Weeks 7-10).** Peer review of rough drafts. Students must document how they integrated peer feedback into their revision.
4. **Phase 4: Resolution & Reflection (Weeks 11-15).** Final submission accompanied by a "Process Memo" or "Ethical Use Statement" outlining any AI involvement.

Table: Scaffolded Assessment Plan for an Online Writing Course

Week	Deliverable	Integrity Safeguard	Weight
2	Topic Pitch (Video)	Voice/Identity Verification	5%
4	Search History Screenshot	Verifies research process	5%
6	Annotated Bibliography	Context-specific source analysis	10%
9	Rough Draft & AI Log	Transparency of tool usage	20%

Week	Deliverable	Integrity Safeguard	Weight
12	Peer Review Reflections	Evidence of social co-construction	10%
15	Final Portfolio	Cumulative "visible" thinking trail	50%

AI Literacy as a Core Competency: Curriculum Sequencing

Misuse of AI is frequently a symptom of low AI literacy. Students may not understand the limitations of LLMs, the ethical implications of their data usage, or the professional standards for attribution. Integrating AI literacy into the curriculum involves four intersecting domains: Functional, Ethical, Rhetorical, and Pedagogical.

Functional and Ethical Literacy: The Novice Layer

The first layer of instruction should demystify the technology. Students must understand that LLMs are "predictive text generators," not knowledge bases.

- **Key Concept:** AI Hallucinations. Show examples where AI confidently generates fake citations or nonsensical data.
- **Key Concept:** Algorithmic Bias. Discuss how training data can replicate societal prejudices, impacting fairness and equity.
- **Activity:** "Bias Audit." Students use an AI tool to generate a professional biography for a "typical doctor" and a "typical nurse," then analyze the results for gender or racial stereotypes.

Rhetorical and Pedagogical Literacy: The Advanced Layer

As students progress, the focus shifts to using AI as a "Partner" rather than a substitute.

- **Rhetorical Training:** Prompt Engineering. Teaching students to craft clear, precise, and iterative prompts to achieve specific rhetorical goals.
- **Pedagogical Training:** "AI as Tutor." Showing students how to use AI to generate practice questions, summarize complex concepts for better understanding, or act as a debate partner.
- **Activity:** "Critique the Bot." Students prompt an AI to answer a core course question, then spend 1000 words critiquing the AI's response for depth, accuracy, and nuance compared to peer-reviewed sources.

The GenAI Use and Ethics Framework

A central component of this report is the recommendation of a five-level framework to guide ethical implementation across different assignment types.

Level 1: Independent Demonstration (No AI)

This level is critical for ensuring students have mastered foundational concepts. It requires "unaided work" and is often best assessed through timed, "locked-down," or in-person elements.

- **Instructional Focus:** Teaching source review and foundational memory skills.
- **Guardrail:** Proctored or high-stakes contexts.

Level 2: AI-Enhanced Research and Planning

Students are permitted to use AI for "Dreaming" (brainstorming) and "Drudgery" (organizing data).

- **Instructional Focus:** Evaluating AI-suggested outlines and verifying sources.
- **Guardrail:** Submission of prompt logs and search history.

Level 3: AI-Assisted Refinement

AI is used to improve the clarity and grammar of student-authored drafts.

- **Instructional Focus:** Coaching revision cycles and maintaining "Authentic Voice."
- **Guardrail:** Comparison of "Pre-AI" and "Post-AI" drafts with a justification memo.

Level 4: Collaborative AI

The assignment is designed for a human-AI team. AI acts as a "Teammate" or "Co-Writer" in real-time.

- **Instructional Focus:** Guiding teamwork and ethical delegation.
- **Guardrail:** Students must keep a diary of how they "managed" the AI's contributions.

Level 5: AI as Creative Partner

Used for high-level synthesis where the student acts as a "Director" or "Curator" of AI-generated artifacts.

- **Instructional Focus:** Advanced ethical reflection and artifact curation.
- **Guardrail:** Submission of an "Ethics Memo" documenting the entire design lifecycle.

Ethical Dilemmas: The "Snake-Oil" of Surveillance

While many institutions look to AI surveillance—such as automated proctoring and behavioral analytics—as a solution for academic dishonesty, research warns of significant unintended consequences.

The Erosion of Trust and Social Presence

Surveillance tools often reduce multifaceted students and faculty to "data points." This "Ghost in the Machine" approach judges behavior without understanding context, leading to an "eerie notion" of a digital overseer that erodes the social presence necessary for learning. Teachers report that constant monitoring infringes on student autonomy and creates an environment characterized more by control than by collaboration.

Bias and Inequity in Surveillance

Studies have shown that automated proctoring software disproportionately targets marginalized

learners. For example, AI algorithms may misread neurodivergent behaviors (like averting eyes) as signs of cheating or fail to function correctly for students with darker skin tones. Furthermore, reliance on expensive AI detection tools can exacerbate the "digital divide," as students with lower socioeconomic status may lack the high-speed internet or hardware required for these intensive platforms.

The Policy-Pedagogy Conflict

Surveillance often emphasizes "compliance" over "competence". The report highlights that "technosolutionist" rhetoric promises easy fixes that may actually stifle teacher creativity and narrow the curriculum to only that which is "measurable" by an algorithm. Educators are urged to resist "snake-oil" promises and instead foster environments that amplify human potential.

Institutional Policy and Implementation Strategies

For instructional strategies to be effective, they must be supported by transparent and equitable institutional governance.

Syllabus Design and Policy Clarity

Policies should move from "Prohibitive" to "Productive." A clear syllabus statement should answer:

1. **Scope:** Which tools are allowed? (e.g., ChatGPT, Grammarly, Scopus AI).
2. **Context:** When can they be used? (e.g., brainstorming only vs. full drafting).
3. **Conditions:** How must they be cited? (e.g., APA style for ChatGPT).
4. **Consequences:** What is the process for suspected misuse? (e.g., consultation with the instructor before formal reporting).

Situational Crime Prevention in Higher Ed

Drawing on the Baird and Clare (2017) case study, institutions can reduce misconduct by structurally embedding deterrents within a supportive environment.

Goal	SCP Technique	Implementation in Online Learning
Increase Effort	Make the task "bespoke" and time-limited.	Releasing specific datasets or case studies only 24-48 hours before the deadline.
Increase Risks	Implement a "Red-Flag System."	Using LMS analytics to monitor "unusual" submission patterns or drastic changes in student voice.
Reduce Rewards	Remove the "commercial" value of cheating.	Issuing takedown notices for course materials posted on external "homework help" sites.
Remove Excuses	Prime the student's conscience.	Requiring students to sign an Integrity Pledge specifically for AI use before each assignment.

Goal	SCP Technique	Implementation in Online Learning
Reduce Provocations	Decrease academic pressure.	Providing "easily digestible" rules and extending deadlines for students under significant stress.

Uncertainty and the Future Outlook

As of 2026, research into AI and academic integrity remains emergent, with several critical gaps:

1. **Longitudinal Impact:** Limited data exists on how AI usage affects the development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills over a 4-year degree.
2. **Cultural Sensitivity:** Most current models (like SDT and TPB) are applied through a Western lens; emerging research suggests that the correlation between AI use and performance varies significantly across different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.
3. **Accuracy of "Process" Tracking:** While scaffolding is highly recommended, the administrative burden on instructors to track multiple iterative drafts for large classes remains an operational challenge.

The future of instructional design in higher education will likely involve "Adaptive Intelligence"—systems that not only help students learn but also help instructors design assignments that evolve as AI capabilities grow.

Actionable Conclusions

To minimize AI misuse while fostering ethical engagement, the following strategy map is proposed for asynchronous online courses:

- **Priority 1: Assessment Transformation.** Eliminate "summarize" tasks and generic essays. Implement the CAAM framework, focusing on contextualized, multimodal, and locally-situated problem-solving.
- **Priority 2: Process Scaffolding.** Break all summative assessments into iterative drafts with "visible" thinking logs and required metacognitive reflections.
- **Priority 3: Multi-Level AI Literacy.** Embed AI ethics and functional literacy modules into the curriculum, transitioning from "No AI" foundations to "Collaborative Partner" projects.
- **Priority 4: Human-Centered Trust.** Move from surveillance-based deterrence to "Gentle Inquiry" and issue-based coaching. Address the "busy work" that drives students toward shortcuts.
- **Priority 5: Policy Transparency.** Replace punitive, general syllabus language with specific, assignment-level "Ethical Use Statements" that align with institutional values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage.

By aligning instructional design with the psychological needs of learners and the technological reality of the modern era, higher education can ensure that academic credentials represent genuine student effort and intellectual growth, even in an AI-saturated future.

Works cited

1. Generative Artificial Intelligence and Education: A Brief Ethical Reflection on Autonomy, https://er.educause.edu/articles/2025/1/generative-artificial-intelligence-and-education-a-brief-et

hical-reflection-on-autonomy 2. AI-assisted academic cheating: a conceptual model based on postgraduate student voices, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/computer-science/articles/10.3389/fcomp.2025.1682190/full 3. Enhancing Cognitive and Social Presence of Students in Asynchronous Learning with Generative AI - arXiv, https://arxiv.org/html/2410.04365v1 4. Generative Co-Learners: Enhancing Cognitive and Social Presence of Students in Asynchronous Learning with Generative AI - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/387919780_Generative_Co-Learners_Enhancing_Cognitive_and_Social_Presence_of_Students_in_Asynchronous_Learning_with_Generative_AI 5. Practical Implications of Generative AI on Assessment: Snapshot of ..., https://academic-publishing.org/index.php/ejel/article/download/3971/2396/12680 6. New and emerging trends in academic misconduct | Turnitin, https://www.turnitin.com/blog/what-are-the-new-and-emerging-trends-in-academic-misconduct 7. Academic Integrity & Generative AI, https://academicintegrity.usc.edu/faculty-resources/addressing-generative-ai/ 8. AI-Based Digital Cheating At University, and the ... - UCL Discovery, https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10208163/9/Leaton_AI-Based%20Digital%20Cheating%20At%20University,%20and%20the%20Case%20for%20New%20Ethical%20Pedagogies_VoR.pdf 9. Empowering Students and Faculty in the AI Loop - EDUCAUSE Review, https://er.educause.edu/podcasts/educause-shop-talk/2025/empowering-students-and-faculty-in-the-ai-loop 10. Academic Integrity and Teaching With(out) AI, https://oaisc.fas.harvard.edu/academic-integrity-and-teaching-without-ai/ 11. Why AI Literacy is the Key to Ethical AI Use in Higher Education - Kritik, https://www.kritik.io/blog-post/why-ai-literacy-is-the-key-to-ethical-ai-use-in-higher-education 12. Does AI Knowledge Encourage Cheating? Investigating Student Perceptions, Ethical Engagement, and Academic Integrity in the Digit, https://ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/viewFile/12896/pdf 13. The college students' engagement motivations in hot topics on social media: a study based on Q-method from China - PubMed Central, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12577062/ 14. The Impact of AI Assistants On Students' Academic Performance and Learning Behavior - International Journal on Science and Technology, https://www.ijsat.org/papers/2025/4/9222.pdf 15. Aligning AI with ICAI's Fundamental Values - Academic Integrity, https://academicintegrity.org/aws/ICAI/pt/sd/news_article/607630/_PARENT/layout_details/false 16. Addressing student use of generative AI in schools and ... - Frontiers, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/education/articles/10.3389/feduc.2025.1610836/full 17. A Self-determination Theory (SDT) Design Approach for inclusive and diverse Artificial Intelligence (AI) Education - selfdeterminationtheory.org, https://selfdeterminationtheory.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/Manuscript_XiaChiuEtAl_SDTDesignApproach.pdf 18. Artificial intelligence as a mentor in the graduate online classroom: opportunities and challenges - Emerald Publishing, https://www.emerald.com/aiie/article/1/1/56/1297472/Artificial-intelligence-as-a-mentor-in-the 19. Academic Cheating with Generative AI in Higher Education: An Extended Model of the Theory of Planned Behavior with Motivational Antecedents | Taslim - Jurnal Universitas Gadjah Mada, https://jurnal.ugm.ac.id/jpsi/article/view/107932 20. AI Teaching Resources | TLPDC Home - Texas Tech University Departments, https://www.depts.ttu.edu/tlpdc/ai-resources/teaching-with-ai.php 21. AI and Academic Integrity: Exploring Student Perceptions and Implications for Higher Education - the College of Information - University of North Texas,

https://ci.unt.edu/computational-humanities-information-literacy-lab/aiandai.pdf 22. Academic Cheating with Generative AI in Higher Education: An Extended Model of the Theory of Planned Behavior with Motivational Antecedents - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/399227567_Academic_Cheating_with_Generative_AI_in_Higher_Education_An_Extended_Model_of_the_Theory_of_Planned_Behavior_with_Motivational_Antecedents 23. Understanding AI Literacy | Teaching Commons, https://teachingcommons.stanford.edu/teaching-guides/artificial-intelligence-teaching-guide/understanding-ai-literacy 24. Generative AI Literacy Modules - AI for Teaching and Learning - The Citadel, https://www.citadel.edu/ai-education/generative-ai-literacy-modules/ 25. Setting Expectations and AI Policy | FIU Center for the Advancement of Teaching, https://cat.fiu.edu/resources/teaching-with-ai/setting-expectations-and-ai-policy/ 26. Assessment and Generative AI | Center for Educational Innovation - University of Minnesota Twin Cities, https://cei.umn.edu/teaching-resources/assessments/assessment-and-generative-ai 27. Reframing Assessments: Designing Authentic Assessments in the ..., https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378190915_Reframing_Assessments_Designing_Authentic_Assessments_in_the_Age_of_Generative_AI 28. Why You Need to Use Learner Personas for Your eLearning - Neovation Learning Solutions, https://www.neovation.com/learn/learner-personas-what-they-are-and-why-you-need-them 29. Learning Personas: Designing eLearning for Real People, Not Just Roles - Mindsmith, https://www.mindsmith.ai/blog/learning-personas-designing-elearning-for-real-people-not-just-roles 30. 5 reasons why Learner Persona should be used developing online courses - Gerta.eu, https://gerta.eu/what-is-a-learner-persona-and-why-should-you-use-it-when-creating-online-courses-and-training-2/ 31. Assessment Design using Generative AI | AI In Teaching and Learning, https://ai.ctlt.ubc.ca/assessment-design-using-generative-ai/ 32. Discourage academically dishonest use of AI in online courses - University at Albany, https://www.albany.edu/teaching-and-learning/teaching-resources/discourage-academically-dishonest-use-ai-online-courses 33. Ethical Problems in the Use of Artificial Intelligence by University Educators - MDPI, https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/10/1322 34. A Review of Generative AI in Computer Science Education: Challenges and Opportunities in Accuracy, Authenticity, and Assessment - arXiv, https://arxiv.org/html/2507.11543v1 35. Ethics of Using AI in Higher Education and Its Impact on Academic Integrity - EdTech Books, https://edtechbooks.org/introduction_to_ai_and_ethics_in_higher_education/ai-academic-integrity 36. The impact of AI on privacy, data protection and ethics in education - 9ine, https://www.9ine.com/newsblog/ai-in-education-the-impact-of-ai-on-privacy-data-protection-and-ethics-in-education 37. Integrating AI into your curriculum and assignments - University of Nevada, Reno, https://www.unr.edu/ai/teaching-with-ai/curriculum 38. Structured Development of Learning and Assessment Tasks to ..., https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12441287/ 39. GenAI Use and Ethics Framework: A Pedagogical Model for ..., https://onlinelearningconsortium.org/olc-insights/2025/11/genai-use-and-ethics-framework/ 40. GenAI & Assessment Design - University College Dublin, https://www.ucd.ie/teaching/resources/generativeai/genaiassessmentdesign/ 41. AI in Instructional Design: Use Cases, Best Tools & More, https://onlinedegrees.sandiego.edu/ai-instructional-design/ 42. 2. Some Ethical Considerations for Teaching and Generative AI in Higher Education - DigitalCommons@USU, https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=teachingai 43. The Influence of Privacy, Bias, and Surveillance Concerns on Teachers' Willingness to Use Artificial Intelligence in Education - International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science, https://rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/articles/the-influence-of-privacy-bias-and-surveillance-c

oncerns-on-teachers-willingness-to-use-artificial-intelligence-in-education/ 44. Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: How ACE Prepares Students For an AI-Driven Future, https://ace.edu/blog/artificial-intelligence-in-higher-education-how-ace-prepares-students-for-an-ai-driven-future/ 45. AI Surveillance in Education: Unpacking Ethical Dilemmas and the Snake-Oil Promises of AI-Infused Technosolutionism - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/397381486_AI_Surveillance_in_Education_Unpacking_Ethical_Dilemmas_and_the_Snake-Oil_Promises_of_AI-Infused_Technosolutionism 46. The Unintended Consequences of Artificial Intelligence and Education Executive summary, https://www.ei-ie.org/file/747 47. Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: Addressing Academic Misconduct through AI-Driven Approaches - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/397926850_Artificial_Intelligence_in_Higher_Education_Addressing_Academic_Misconduct_through_AI-Driven_Approaches 48. How Instructional Designers Use AI to Optimize Workflow and the Learning Experience | University of Cincinnati, https://www.online.uc.edu/blog/how-instructional-designers-use-ai 49. International Center for Academic Integrity, https://www.academicintegrity.org/