



## 1/2026. (I. 30.) Dean's Directive

### on supplementary rules for the use of artificial intelligence in education at the Faculty of Education and Psychology

In accordance with ELTE Rector's Instruction No. 4/2025. (X. 28.) on the use of artificial intelligence for educational purposes (hereinafter: Rector's Instruction), and taking into account the specific characteristics and scientific values of the Faculty, I hereby issue the following instruction.

#### 1. General provisions and purpose of the regulation

- 1. § (1) Nature of the regulation:** This instruction sets out special and supplementary rules applicable to the Faculty of Education and Psychology (hereinafter: Faculty). The provisions of this instruction shall be applied and interpreted within the framework of and in accordance with the Rector's Instruction, taking into account the disciplinary characteristics of the Faculty.
- (2) **Material scope:** This instruction applies to all generative artificial intelligence-based systems and tools (hereinafter: generative AI) that are capable of creating new content, in particular text, images (e.g. DALL-E, Midjourney), computer code, audio material, presentation slides or complex data visualisations. The scope of this instruction does not extend to spell checkers and grammar checkers used for their intended purpose and not enhanced with generative functions, simple translation programmes, or reference management software.
- (3) **Personal scope:** This instruction applies to lecturers, researchers and students who have a legal relationship with the Faculty.
- (4) **Pedagogical objective:** The primary objective of the regulation is to promote a change in pedagogical culture, shifting the emphasis from the exclusive evaluation of the product to the evaluation of the learning process. The Faculty is committed to the development of human competencies. Accordingly, the focus of education should be on enduring, uniquely human (e.g. critical and analytical thinking, human creativity and ethical decision-making, the ability to adapt flexibly to technological change, etc.) and metacognitive skills (e.g. planning, monitoring, evaluation).
- (5) **Limits of regulation and shared responsibility:** The pace of technological development exceeds the effectiveness of traditional regulatory and control tools. Simply declaring rules does not guarantee compliance. Therefore, the Faculty considers compliance with the rules to

be not only a matter of control, but also a community and cultural issue. Maintaining the quality of education and the value of degrees is a shared responsibility of the university community, based on integrity.

## 2. Common principles for members of the Faculty

**2. § (1) Responsibility and academic integrity:** All members of the Faculty have exclusive ethical, legal and professional responsibility for the content of the intellectual products they publish, regardless of the tools used in their production. Since AI tools do not possess understanding, intent or moral accountability, it is the author's responsibility to verify the factual content of the generated content, statements and references. The communication of false information, the uncritical acceptance of distortions, or the unchecked use of sources (whether the result of intentional or negligent use of technology) constitutes a violation of academic integrity.

**(2) Decision-making responsibility and intellectual work:** The use of generative AI must not lead to the abandonment of human decision-making, critical thinking and intellectual autonomy. The purpose of these tools is to expand the learning, teaching and research capacities of the Faculty's members, not to replace human intellectual effort and cognitive processes. In all cases, the user must retain control over the work process and the final result.

**(3) Informed use and competence:** The professional and responsible use of AI tools requires basic AI literacy. It is the shared responsibility of the Faculty's members to inform themselves about the operating principles, limitations and possible biases of the technologies they use, thereby ensuring the appropriate, safe and ethical use of the tools. To this end, the Faculty provides additional support and development opportunities and encourages knowledge sharing and the collection of good practices.

**(4) Human-centredness:** The integration of AI cannot replace, but only support, human interactions within the university community. Technology cannot replace the professional discourse between teachers and students or colleagues, personal mentoring and community knowledge sharing, which form the basis of university life.

**(5) Cultural and linguistic sensitivity:** It is the shared task and responsibility of the Faculty's members to pay critical attention to filtering out cultural, linguistic and other biases when using AI tools. Users must check that the output of AI does not contain unintended biases that are alien to the educational or research objectives of the task or the cultural background of the target group. The Faculty supports the culturally conscious use of technology based on local knowledge bases and taking into account the specificities of the international educational environment and cultural diversity.

**(6) Environmental sustainability:** The Faculty is committed to responsible resource management and environmental awareness. The regulations encourage Faculty members to

use AI purposefully and sparingly, considering the necessity of using energy-intensive models for trivial tasks, given the significant ecological footprint of the technology.

(7) **Data protection and research ethics:** It is prohibited to upload personal data, sensitive research data or participant responses to public AI tools that do not have a data processing agreement with the University. Exceptions to this rule may only be made if the research participants have given their express, informed consent, or if the data has been completely anonymised and is processed in a closed system that guarantees, either technologically or contractually, that the input data will not be used by the service provider for model training.

### 3. Provisions for teaching and research staff

#### 3.1. Review of assessment and communication of requirements

**3. § (1) Mandatory information:** The syllabus of every course advertised by the Faculty must include a separate section entitled "Rules on the use of artificial intelligence", which sets out the specific requirements for the course in question based on the Framework set out in paragraph (2) and links to the relevant rector's and dean's instructions, and indicates the declaration and documentation obligations in accordance with paragraph (3) in line with the learning outcomes of the course.

(2) **Framework:** Based on the considerations set out in Section 4, the instructor must specify the expectations regarding the use of AI in the syllabus at the beginning of the semester. For the sake of clarity and to help students navigate the system, instructors must define and communicate their decisions regarding the use of generative AI according to the categories in the framework below, for which templates and additional aids are available in Appendix 1 and on the Artificial Intelligence page of the faculty website:

- **a) Green (Supported/Integrated Use):** The use of AI is an integral part of the task solution, and the application of the technology is not only permitted but actively encouraged. Strict critical control and transparent documentation are prerequisites for use. This mode of use is usually closely linked to objectives aimed at developing critical AI literacy.
- **b) Yellow (Restricted/Conditional Use):** Hybrid mode of application. The use of AI is only permitted in predefined cases, e.g. in the preparatory and supporting phases of the work (e.g. brainstorming, language editing, structure planning, error checking). It is strictly forbidden to use the tool to generate the substantive text content of the assignment or to replace the logical arc that forms the essential part of the task.
- **c) Red (Prohibited use):** Any form of generative AI is prohibited. This category applies to courses or assignment types where the aim is to assess basic skills, which would be circumvented by the use of AI.

(3) **Mandatory documentation requirement:** When defining the requirements for a course, instructors may compile the mandatory documentation requirements for students for each task related to the course from the elements of the "Mandatory Documentation Requirement" available on the Artificial Intelligence interface of the faculty website, as specified in Appendix 2.

(4) **Right to change and legal certainty:** The AI usage rules specified for the course at the beginning of the semester may be modified during the semester in the event of changes in the technological environment. However, any restrictions imposed during the semester shall not apply retroactively to work that has already been started or submitted. Students who have acted in good faith based on the previous rules shall not be disadvantaged.

**4. § (1) Basic principle of assessment planning:** It is the professional responsibility of the instructor to adapt the course requirements so that the grade credibly reflects the student's actual knowledge and the achievement of the course learning outcomes. In view of the possibilities offered by generative AI, this requires particular attention in the case of tasks performed in an unsupervised (asynchronous, e.g. at home) environment (e.g. online tests completed at home, papers to be submitted).

(2) **Limitations of prohibition in asynchronous environments:** A complete prohibition on the use of artificial intelligence can be ensured with sufficient certainty in controlled environments (e.g. closed-book exams, oral exams, supervised computer lab tests). In unsupervised environments, compliance with the ban is difficult to verify, so the ban alone cannot be considered a sufficient quality assurance guarantee for such tasks.

(3) **Decentralised control:** At the beginning of the semester, it is the responsibility of the programme coordinators (with particular regard to external lecturers) to review, with the help of the lecturers concerned, whether the assessment system for the advertised courses is in line with these regulations. To support this, guides are available on the Artificial Intelligence section of the faculty website.

(4) **Guiding principle:** If a significant portion of the final grade for a course (guiding principle: approximately 30% or more) is based on assignments that:

- a) are completed in an unsupervised, asynchronous manner, and
- b) the instructor wishes to apply the "Prohibited" (Red) label to them, the assessment system must be reviewed in consultation with the programme coordinator when planning the semester.

(5) **Review options:** In the cases referred to in paragraph (3), the instructor must consider modifying the assessment to ensure its validity:

**a) Change of environment:** Moving the assessment to a controlled space (e.g. oral exam, written exam in class).

**b) Methodological adaptation:** Modifying the task so that the use of AI is permitted (Yellow or Green signal), supplemented by the documentation and process monitoring requirements detailed in these regulations.

(6) **Exception procedure and approval:** If the instructor considers it professionally justified to maintain unsupervised, prohibited tool use (Red) assessment, and the modifications specified in paragraph (5) cannot be implemented, the course is subject to approval, the procedure for which is as follows:

a) The instructors concerned shall consult with the programme coordinator. The programme coordinator shall summarise the professionally justified exceptions arising in the course (where, for example, the unique nature of the task in itself guarantees authenticity). In the application, the lecturer must justify why the elements of paragraph (5) cannot be applied and demonstrate how valid assessment of learning outcomes can be ensured in the given asynchronous, unsupervised form.

b) The subject coordinator shall compile the applications by the end of the first week of the semester and submit them jointly to the dean's commissioner responsible for artificial intelligence and the deputy dean of education for approval.

c) The programme coordinator shall receive feedback on the applications received by the end of the second week of the semester.

(7) **Knowledge sharing and experience gathering:** The programme coordinator's report shall be supplemented by a summary of the experiences of the changes set out in this instruction. In this context, the programme coordinator shall summarise how the courses have been transformed, what the experiences of the transformation have been, highlighting good practices and difficulties. This part of the subject coordinator's report is key to the review process of these regulations.

### **3.2. Transformation of the assessment and examination system**

**5. § (1) Process-based assessment:** In order to preserve the integrity and quality of learning, it is recommended that teachers transform their assessment methods to take into account evidence of the learning process, thereby reducing the exclusive weight of the product. We recommend that the prescribed documentation requirement should not be merely an administrative appendix but should form part of the student's grade (e.g. with weighted assessment), thereby recognising the student's work invested in the transparent and reflective use of tools.

(2) **Validity stress test:** Before assigning tasks, instructors are advised to check (stress test) whether the task can be solved solely with the help of generative AI, without significant human added value, at an acceptable level. If AI alone is capable of completing the task, it is recommended to restructure the assessment or incorporate oral validation. Additional resources are available on the Artificial Intelligence section of the faculty website to support this check.

(3) **Use of AI in assessment and feedback:** The use of generative AI cannot replace, but only complement, the pedagogical relationship between teacher and student. Although AI can be

used to generate preliminary, formative feedback, summative assessment and decision-making (grades) as well as final, personalised feedback must always be provided by the teacher.

(4) **High-risk application:** Given that Annex III of the European Union's Regulation on Artificial Intelligence<sup>1</sup> classifies as high-risk AI systems those applications that are used to assess the learning outcomes of natural persons (including the management of the learning process), assessing the appropriate level of education, and observing and detecting prohibited student behaviour during tests and examinations, The Faculty strictly prohibits the use of these systems without substantive human review to determine student grades or to make decisions that have a legal impact on students' academic progress (e.g., access, classification, advancement).

(5) **Inclusive approach:** When planning assessments and assignments, teachers should be mindful of student diversity (e.g. linguistic background, disability, socio-economic status).

- a) Making the use of AI mandatory should not disadvantage students with special needs.
- b) The use of AI as an assistive technology for students with special needs is expressly supported and encouraged, provided that it does not compromise the fundamental learning outcomes of the course.

(6) **Tool fairness:** In order to ensure equal opportunities, it is strictly prohibited to make the use of AI tools that are only available through a paid subscription mandatory. All mandatory tasks must be achievable at a high level using free versions or licensed tools provided by the University.

### 3.3. Transparency and data protection for teachers

**6. § (1) Transparency:** In order to create transparency and mutual trust, teachers are required to indicate in the course material or during the lecture if they have relied significantly on generative AI in the creation of the educational content (e.g. slides, notes, exam questions).

(2) **Data protection:** Teachers may not upload students' intellectual property (assignments, exam papers) or personal data to public AI tools that do not have a data processing agreement with the University.

## 4. Provisions for students

---

<sup>1</sup> Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence and repealing Regulations (EC) No 300/2008, (EU) No 167/2013, (EU) No 168/2013, (EU) 2018/858, (EU) 2018/1139 and (EU) 2019/2144, and amending Directives 2014/90/EU, (EU) 2016/797 and (EU) 2020/1828 (Regulation on artificial intelligence) (Text with EEA relevance) - <http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj>

**7. § (1) Declaration obligation:** If the use of AI is permitted in the course (yellow or green mark), students must record their use in writing using the modular template available on the Artificial Intelligence section of the faculty website, as specified in Annex 3. The purpose of the declaration is to provide a transparent summary of the technology used and the methodology of the work. The declaration must include the following three elements:

- **a) Use of tools:** The exact name of the model used (e.g. ChatGPT 5.2) and the purpose of use (e.g. writing an outline).
- **b) Output management:** The student must declare whether they used the generated content indirectly (for planning, brainstorming, without directly using the content), in an integrated manner (as content generation, after verification) or in a mixed manner.
- **c) Ethical and professional responsibility:** The student certifies with their statement that they have reviewed the final content, checked the sources, and that the attached documentation reflects the actual work process.

(2) **Documentation:** The student is required to substantiate the authenticity of the statement referred to in paragraph (1) with the specific attachments specified by the instructor in the course description.

(3) **Protection of the authenticity of student work:** In order to protect the authenticity and authorship of student work (even if not required by the instructor), students are strongly encouraged to record the work process and document the use of AI tools (e.g., cloud-based editing, where the version history is retained). In the event of a dispute or suspicion, the lack of this data may limit the student's ability to prove their case.

(4) **Thesis declaration:** When submitting theses, dissertations and portfolios, students are required to sign the Faculty's updated declaration of originality, which also includes a detailed statement on the use (or non-use) of artificial intelligence (Annex 4).

(5) **Legal consequences:** Making a false declaration by the student will result in disciplinary proceedings.

(6) **Conscientious exemption:** Students may request that the instructor provide an AI-free alternative for completing the assignment if they reject the use of generative AI on ethical, data protection or sustainability grounds, or for reasons of conscience. This right cannot be exercised in courses where the declared learning outcome specified in the syllabus is explicitly the acquisition of AI competence.

## 5. Rules of procedure in cases of abuse and enforcement

**8. § (1) Standards of proof:** Alerts from AI detection software (e.g. Turnitin AI detection, GPTZero) cannot be used on their own as exclusive evidence of student misuse. This prohibition is based on the scientific fact that the reliability of these tools is currently limited, they often produce false positive results, and they have been shown to exhibit systemic bias against the writing of non-native speakers.

(2) **Conclusive evidence:** In all cases, the determination of plagiarism must be based on conclusive evidence from multiple sources. This includes, in particular:

- a) The absence or manipulation of mandatory declarations and documentation;
- b) Lack of logical or substantive connection between documented prompts and the final result;
- c) Fundamental, irreconcilable inconsistencies between the student's oral validation, performance, and the content or language of the written assignment.

(3) **Scalability and spot checks:** In order to protect the integrity of the assessment, instructors reserve the right to conduct random oral checks and audit process documentation on a random sample of submitted work. Spot checks or auditing of process documentation are standard elements of pedagogical assessment and quality assurance, so we recommend incorporating them into the course as part of the learning process. The purpose of this is to verify that the student has the knowledge and competencies reflected in the submitted work.

(4) **Pedagogical feedback and professional correction:** As part of their autonomy and commitment to quality education, instructors are entitled to provide professional feedback without resorting to formal verification procedures if the style, quality or coherence of the submitted work raises suspicions of inappropriate use of AI tools or inadequate student performance. In such cases, while maintaining a partnership with the student, the teacher may initiate:

- a) a discussion of the professional shortcomings of the work (e.g. excessive generalisation, lack of sources, stylistic inconsistencies);
- b) revising or supplementing the assignment in order to reinforce the student's own voice and ideas;
- c) drawing the student's attention to the importance of conscious and ethical use of tools.

The aim of this pedagogical intervention is not to punish, but to correct the learning process and develop academic culture.

(5) **Encouraging transparency:** In order to support the learning process, the Faculty distinguishes between pedagogical errors and ethical misconduct.

- **a) Pedagogical error:** If a student violates the rules for using AI in a course (e.g., relies excessively on the tool, or the work does not meet the expected level of independence), but honestly indicates this in their statement and documentation, their action is not considered an ethical violation or academic fraud. In this case, the instructor will evaluate the work according to professional criteria (even as unsatisfactory) due to the lack of independent performance.
- **b) Ethical misconduct:** If the student uses a prohibited tool and conceals this in the declaration, or makes a false declaration, their actions constitute a violation of academic

integrity and will result in disciplinary proceedings in accordance with the rector's instructions.

(6) In the event of a violation of these regulations, the disciplinary and ethical procedures specified in the rector's instructions shall apply.

## **6. Final provisions**

**9. §** (1) This instruction shall enter into force on 1 February 2026. Its provisions shall apply to courses and procedures starting after its entry into force.

(2) The instruction shall be reviewed annually, in accordance with the review cycle of the rector's instruction.

- 1. Appendix:** Indication of expectations regarding the use of artificial intelligence in the syllabi
- 2. Appendix:** Prescribed student documentation requirements
- 3. Appendix:** Student AI statement
- 4. Appendix:** Declaration of originality

Budapest, 30 January 2026

Dr Andrea Dúll