

Co-Designing AI Literacy: Recognising Students as Experts in Shaping Responsible Artificial Intelligence Use in Higher Education

Nurun Nahar, David Howard, Kater Akeren, Emmanuel Ngele, Graeme Prescott

University of Greater Manchester

Abstract

This case study examines how students were positioned as experts in shaping artificial intelligence (AI) literacy curricula at a United Kingdom university. Academic staff, students and professional services collaborated to co-create an AI literacy framework with a focus on generative AI, addressing institutional and learner needs. Guided by partnership principles of reciprocity, respect and shared responsibility, the project responded to the opportunities and challenges of AI in higher education (HE).

Following a cross-disciplinary survey which captured student perceptions of generative AI use, two student partners were appointed; their roles evolved from research interns to co-designers and co-evaluators during this funded project. They have co-led focus groups with students, conducted data analysis and synthesis and undertaken peer consultation and evaluation to co-develop guidance resources on ethics, integrity, bias and responsible AI use.

Two key outputs resulted from this collaboration: a four-step AI literacy framework and an online tutorial which are now embedded in central pre-enrolment and academic skills programmes. Framing students as co-designers helped both 1) to enrich staff understanding of student perceptions of generative AI use for learning and 2) to enable the students to enhance their research, collaboration, communication and leadership skills. The study contributes to the current discourse on fostering critical, responsible AI literacies in HE through the lens of students as partners.

Keywords: students as partners, cross-disciplinary problem-solving, ethical AI

Introduction

The accelerating integration of AI into HE has prompted a critical re-examination of how universities prepare students to engage with emerging technologies. In this article, integration of AI refers to generative AI. While AI offers transformative potential for learning, research and professional development, it simultaneously raises complex questions regarding academic integrity, ethical use and digital equity (Luckin et al., 2016; Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019). Within this evolving landscape, the University of Greater Manchester identified a growing need to articulate a coherent, institution-wide approach to AI literacy – one that would equip learners not only with technical proficiency, but also with critical awareness and ethical responsibility (UNESCO, 2023).

As AI tools become ubiquitous and increasingly integrated into everyday digital applications and university learning management systems (LMS), their influence on teaching, learning,

assessment and feedback is becoming more pervasive. The public availability since November 2022 of free AI tools like ChatGPT prompted the HE sector to recognise a pressing pedagogical challenge: ensuring that both staff and students could navigate the educational implications of AI with confidence and integrity (Cotton *et al.*, 2023; Mhlanga, 2023). The need extended beyond technological competence to include reflective engagement, critical evaluation and responsible use (Holmes *et al.*, 2019; Ng *et al.*, 2021). Following the publication of the Russell Group's '*Principles on the Use of Generative AI in Education*' (Russell Group, 2023), most universities acknowledged the need to address AI's pedagogical and ethical implications. However, studies indicate that many institutions were strategically aware but operationally underprepared, lacking the infrastructure, expertise and policies to guide implementation (Newton, 2023; Advance HE, 2024). Early adopters – typically research-intensive universities – moved swiftly to integrate AI guidance, whereas smaller or teaching-focused institutions progressed more cautiously (Jack, 2025). AI readiness across the sector was further constrained by uneven staff digital confidence and varying levels of understanding of AI literacy across disciplines (Cotton *et al.*, 2023; Jisc, 2025). In many HE institutions, the lack of either a locally developed institutional framework for AI literacy or adaptation of a readily accessible one led to inconsistencies in how staff and students were navigating AI tools.

As these tools continue to reshape assessment design, academic practice and student learning behaviours (Cotton *et al.*, 2023), there is a growing imperative for universities to cultivate reflective judgement and ethical discernment among learners alongside the mere functional competence of working with the tools (UNESCO, 2023). The rationale for this study emerged from the recognition that AI literacy cannot be achieved through generic training or policy statements alone; rather, it requires pedagogical frameworks that are contextually grounded, participatory and responsive to institutional values and learner diversity (Selwyn *et al.*, 2023; Holmes *et al.*, 2019).

Recognising the importance of the matter, and that effective curriculum design must be informed by the experiences, perspectives and needs of students, the present study examines how a student-staff partnership approach may put co-creation principles into practice. This project aims to address the matter through the co-creation of an AI literacy framework tailored to the university's diverse academic community and aligned with its infrastructure needs. This institutionally funded research study captures the co-creation process in participatory curriculum design, highlighting the stages, outcomes and institutional enablers that supported its development and implementation.

Grounded in Healey, Flint, and Harrington's (2014) '*Students as Partners*' (SaP) model, the initiative moved beyond traditional consultation by positioning students as co-researchers, co-designers and co-evaluators. This approach reflected a deliberate institutional commitment to reciprocity, respect and shared responsibility, fostering collaboration between academic staff, professional services and students (Mercer-Mapstone *et al.*, 2017). In so doing, the project met the demand of establishing an AI literacy curriculum that is scalable and embedded within academic skills programmes contributing to emerging scholarship on SaP, digital literacy and the pedagogical integration of AI in HE.

Literature review

AI literacy in HE: opportunities and challenges

AI literacy is increasingly recognised as a key dimension of digital literacy. Laupichler *et al.* (2022) define it as the skills and understanding needed to handle AI technologies and their implications. It encompasses understanding of how AI tools work, their benefits, limitations and ethical considerations. In the context of AI (e.g., large-language models like ChatGPT), this includes skills such as prompt crafting, verifying outputs, recognising bias, safeguarding data privacy and knowing when and how to use AI appropriately in academic work (Chinta *et al.*, 2024).

Research suggests that AI can enhance learning and teaching by tailoring instruction to individual needs and automating routine tasks, thereby freeing staff for more creative pedagogical activities (Chinta *et al.*, 2024). Informed use of AI tools has been shown to improve efficiency in immediate feedback generation, thus enhancing engagement through personalised learning experience (Lintner, 2024; Galdames, 2025). However, these benefits are tempered by concerns about bias, inequity and opacity and about the tendency of AI systems to reinforce user assumptions rather than critically challenge them. AI systems trained on historical data may reproduce existing biases, leading to unfair outcomes in areas such as grading or admissions (Chinta *et al.*, 2024). Slimi (2023) also highlights issues of accountability and transparency: many AI models function as 'black boxes', making it difficult to understand how outputs – such as plagiarism flags or content recommendations – are generated. This lack of transparency undermines trust and complicates ethical accountability in education.

Academic integrity and institutional readiness present further challenges. With some AI tools capable of producing essays like those written by humans, universities face dilemmas in distinguishing original work from AI-assisted content. Essien *et al.* (2024) found that, though AI supports lower-order cognitive tasks, it raises concerns about reliability and ethics when applied to higher-order thinking. Over-reliance may erode critical thinking and promote plagiarism (Garcia-Lopez and Trujillo-Linan, 2025; Balalle and Pannilage, 2025). Nonetheless, scholars argue that AI offers opportunities to rethink assessment by prioritising authenticity, creativity and critical engagement over reproduction of knowledge (Cotton *et al.*, 2023). Maintaining integrity in this context requires clear institutional guidelines and effective education on ethical use.

However, institutional capacity limitations and the underlying digital divide between students and staff complicate implementation. Sutedjo *et al.* (2025) and Becker *et al.* (2023) note that many universities lack formal AI strategies and rely on reactive staff training, leading to disparities in readiness and access. This digital inequity risks excluding learners from the benefits of emerging tools. As Chinta *et al.* (2024) argue, achieving fairness in AI-enhanced education demands inclusive stakeholder engagement to ensure equitable access and capability building. A balanced approach is therefore essential: Maximising AI's potential while proactively addressing bias, ethics and digital competence (Ng *et al.*, 2021; UNESCO, 2023). Central to this is cultivating AI literacy among students and staff: enabling learners to evaluate outputs critically, recognise limitations and use AI as a complement to their own thinking. The University of Greater Manchester's partnership project was conceived precisely to build this capacity through a collaborative, educative framework that embeds ethical AI engagement within student learning.

Students as partners: a framework for co-design and engagement

To address this complex challenge, the University of Greater Manchester adopted a SaP approach, framing students and staff as collaborators in shaping AI literacy curricula. SaP recognises learners as co-creators and agents of change rather than passive consumers. As Healey, Flint and Harrington (2014) emphasise, partnership is “*a way of doing things*”, grounded in reciprocity and mutual learning. Genuine partnership moves beyond tokenistic consultation, granting students meaningful agency in curriculum design and fostering transformative educational change. Involving students in co-design ensured the project’s relevance and authenticity. As end-users of AI literacy resources, students contributed first-hand insight into the opportunities and challenges of using AI in academic work. Chan and Hu (2023) highlight that students often hold nuanced, under-represented perspectives on AI’s role in pedagogy. Students’ involvement in this case ensured the AI literacy framework reflected actual learner needs and resonated across disciplines.

The project drew on the adaptation by Holen *et al.* (2020) of Olsen’s (2007) model of student participation, which situated students as “*democratic participants*”, engaged through institutional commitment and constructive dissent, and allowed them to shape guidelines and practice from within, while constructively challenging assumptions. The approach described here reflects Dunne and Zandstra’s (2011) argument that listening to student voice without true partnership risks reinforcing consumerism, whereas treating students as active collaborators and co-producers yields more meaningful, change-oriented outcomes. The strategy avoided tokenism and promoted genuine co-ownership. Consistent with Bovill, Felten and Cook-Sather’s (2014) principles of trust, reciprocity and shared responsibility as well as with Matthews’ (2017) advocacy for inclusive, power-sharing partnership, the project embedded equality in practice. Prior research shows that student-staff partnerships enhance engagement, confidence and a sense of belonging, while offering staff fresh perspectives and renewed pedagogical motivation (Healey *et al.*, 2014; Matthews, 2017).

Methodology and Embedding Partnership

The project adopted a convergent parallel mixed-methods design to capture a comprehensive understanding of how students and staff engage with AI within HE. This methodological approach incorporated quantitative and qualitative elements, allowing for the triangulation of findings and the development of a pedagogically grounded framework. The design was particularly suited to the study’s aims, providing 1) triangulation, through the combination of survey data, focus-group findings and insights from a systematic literature review; 2) depth and breadth, by capturing both measurable trends and the nuanced perspectives of participants; and 3) practical relevance, ensuring that the framework was both theoretically robust and operationally feasible (Creswell and Plano Clark, 2018). Collectively, this approach yielded a rigorous, multidimensional understanding of AI literacy in HE and facilitated the development of an empirically informed, contextually situated and pedagogically applicable framework.

The next sections describe how these ideas were put into practice through the project’s co-design approach.

Research design and process

This project received full ethical approval following institutional policy. All procedures were conducted in accordance with the University’s research ethics policy and the British

Educational Research Association's '*Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*' (BERA, 2024). Prior to participation, all participants received an information sheet outlining the project's aims, the voluntary nature of their involvement and their right to withdraw at any point without consequence. Informed consent was obtained from all participants before the start of data collection. All data were anonymised at the point of collection, stored securely on institutionally approved systems and accessible only to the research team. Participants were informed in advance of how their data would be used, including their role in informing the development of the AI literacy framework and its potential use in academic publications and conference presentations.

The research comprised sequential interdependent phases. First, an inter-disciplinary team of academic staff, library professionals and e-learning specialists conducted a university-wide survey consisting of open-ended and closed questions exploring students' engagement with AI tools. It examined patterns of use, perceived benefits, ethical concerns and level of confidence in dealing with AI-assisted learning. From $n = 101$ valid responses, findings revealed significant variability in student awareness and confidence, alongside an institutional gap in guidance on ethical and effective AI use. These results established the empirical foundation for structured educational interventions.

In the second phase, the project embedded SaP principles (Healey, Flint and Harrington, 2014) by recruiting student research interns as co-researchers – a deliberate shift from consultation to collaboration. Following a competitive recruitment process, two postgraduate students were purposively recruited on the basis of their disciplinary expertise and experience with AI to support the co-design of the framework and its associated learning resources. These students were involved as active partners across iterative co-design workshops, working collaboratively with academic and professional services staff. Their contributions as co-facilitators extended beyond data collection to: undertaking a systematic review of literature; participation in the analysis and evaluation of qualitative data; and the co-development of content across the framework. This approach reflects a co-creation model in which students act as partners rather than passive participants, shaping both the conceptual and practical dimensions of the output. However, limitations were the small number of student contributors and consequently the potential for partial representation, given their disciplinary backgrounds. To address these constraints, drawing on their experiences as learners using AI, the student partners contributed to analysing the results from the university-wide survey to identify themes that resulted in a co-designed semi-structured focus-group questionnaire and protocols for data collection and analysis to elicit richer insights into students' practices, motivations and concerns.

Two focus groups were conducted with Business Management and Nursing and Midwifery students, representing the University's largest cohorts and the highest rates of AI-related misconduct referrals. Sessions explored learner experiences and pedagogical implications of AI use. The focus groups were co-facilitated by a student and staff researcher to minimise power imbalances and promote open dialogic exchange.

Analysis

The qualitative data from focus groups complemented quantitative data from the survey, deepening understanding of behavioural patterns and perceptions of use of AI in academic settings. Student partners helped in analysing the focus group data, synthesising themes and

triangulating them to survey findings. The integrated analysis identified three overarching themes: (1) variability in AI confidence and understanding across disciplines; (2) uncertainty about ethical and appropriate use; and (3) strong demand for institutionally supported research-informed guidance. These findings directly informed the co-design of the 'AI Literacy Framework', addressing both practical skill gaps and values-driven learning needs.

Framework co-design and implementation

The overarching themes were further interrogated by means of six iterative co-design workshops, in accordance with the reflective cycles of participatory action research (Kemmis, McTaggart and Nixon, 2014). At this stage, data were continually interpreted and translated into design principles, ensuring that the analytical process remained dynamic and responsive to emerging insights. The evaluative process was similarly iterative and dialogic, embedded throughout the project as a form of collective learning rather than a post-hoc review – consistent with Bovill, Felten and Cook-Sather's (2014) view of partnership as a continuing cycle of co-inquiry and mutual growth. Following these co-design workshops, the team co-developed the four-stage AI literacy framework—*Prepare, Understand, Apply, and Responsible Use*—representing progressive AI literacy and application competences in response to the findings. In parallel, a self-paced online tutorial was created within the University's 'Learning Excellence Achievement Pathway' (LEAP) online platform, enabling students to participate in guided interactive learning and acquire a digital AI literacy badge upon completion.

Embedding, evaluation, and institutional integration

Following development of the literacy framework and online self-paced AI literacy tutorial, student partners co-presented project outcomes at three international conferences on student engagement, partnership and '*Generative AI in Education*'. Peer feedback informed further refinement of content and structure of the online tutorial. The finalised framework and online tutorial were embedded within LEAP (Learning Excellence Achievement Pathway) Online which is designed to support students' academic and personal development through online self-paced tutorials, integrated into academic skills provision and adopted within *PREPARE* (a seven-week pre-enrolment programme for new students), supporting widening participation and transition to HE. Following the institutional launch of the AI literacy framework in May 2025, 492 students completed the tutorial by May 2026 and approximately fifty students participated in a series of AI literacy workshops co-designed by the student partners and delivered as part of academic skills support, extending the framework's reach into classroom practice. Staff feedback on the framework and its accessible online tutorial, indicated that it has been widely welcomed by academic and professional services colleagues as a comprehensive guide and valuable resource for facilitating consistent discussions on the responsible use of AI in learning and assessment.

This approach combined analytical rigour with participatory authenticity. In having students as co-researchers and co-designers, the project embodied democratic partnership principles, ensuring the AI literacy framework was both empirically validated and co-owned by the community it continues to serve.

Evaluation

The effectiveness of the AI literacy tutorial and framework was evaluated by means of pre- and post-engagement questionnaires co-designed by the student partners and completed by participating students (n=50) as part of the 'PREPARE and LEAP' online academic skills programme. Analysis revealed learners reported increased confidence in using AI responsibly, with many reporting greater awareness of ethical boundaries and institutional expectations. Students confirmed that the tutorial reinforced their understanding of academic integrity by clarifying acceptable uses of AI in academic settings. Moreover, the framework's practical examples provided clear guidance on how to engage with AI creatively and critically, supporting contextualised learning and enabling students to apply AI tools as aids to reflective thinking and academic development.

Evaluation of the partnership aspect of the project was grounded in reflective inquiry, drawing on student and staff perspectives to assess both process and impact. The evaluative process was iterative and dialogic, embedded throughout the project as a form of collective learning rather than a post-hoc review – consistent with Bovill, Felten and Cook-Sather's (2014) view of partnership as a continuing cycle of co-inquiry and mutual growth.

From the student partners' perspective, participation was a transformative learning experience. Acting as co-researchers and co-designers strengthened their research literacy, inter-disciplinary collaboration and communication skills, in keeping with Matthews' (2017) findings that partnership enhances agency and belonging. One student noted that this project developed personal understanding of the technological, human and structural dimensions of AI integration in education. For student partners, translating technical content for non-technical learners proved challenging yet rewarding, reinforcing Bovill and Woolmer's (2019) argument that dialogic co-design develops metacognitive and communication capabilities. Iterative feedback cycles enhanced their confidence in articulating complex ideas and contributing to a student-centred design process.

For staff partners, the project validated partnership as a driver of institutional innovation and coherence. The academic skills team leader reflected that embedding the AI literacy tutorial within 'PREPARE and LEAP' provided "*a proactive foundation for digital academic integrity and critical engagement with emerging technologies.*" This collaboration fostered alignment across academic skills, library and e-learning departments, promoting consistent messaging about responsible AI use and critical digital literacy – outcomes supported by Healey *et al.* (2014), who highlight partnership's capacity to connect strategic and pedagogic aims. Early analytics showed students increasingly viewing AI as a tool for inquiry and ethical engagement, reflecting the call by Ng *et al.* (2021) for reflective, values-driven AI education.

Institutionally, integrating the AI literacy tutorial into student induction and the University's academic integrity policy had significant effects: the framework clarified acceptable and responsible AI use, embedding ethical engagement into both curriculum and policy. Incorporating AI literacy within integrity education, the project moved beyond compliance toward a culture of dialogue about honesty, authorship and critical engagement with technology, as advocated by UNESCO (2023). Following its institutional launch, student partners co-designed AI literacy workshops within the 'Academic Skills Support Programme', extending the framework into classroom practice. Staff feedback indicated that the framework and its accessible LEAP Online tutorial were welcomed across academic and professional

services teams as a comprehensive clear guide for fostering responsible AI use in learning and assessment.

Conclusion and practical implications

This case study illustrates that fostering AI literacy in HE requires shared responsibility and collective problem-solving. In the context of continuing debates about the promises and risks of AI, the project demonstrated how a SaP approach may transform institutional challenges into collaborative learning opportunities. Through co-designing the four-stage AI literacy framework, students shaped a pedagogical model grounded in reciprocity, authenticity and inclusivity. Embedding the framework within academic skills provision established a coherent institutional language for ethical AI engagement and fostered a cultural shift toward reflective and responsible use.

While context-specific to the University of Greater Manchester and for learners transitioning to HE, the principles underpinning this initiative and the resulting AI literacy framework are transferable across disciplines and HE institutions. The steps promote transferable critical AI literacy – encouraging students to interrogate AI model designs and capabilities, evaluate outputs and reflect on ethical, environmental, academic and professional implications – and thereby support adaptable use beyond the original context. Although disciplinary differences may influence implementation, the framework offers a flexible structure that may be locally contextualized. Further cross-disciplinary application is needed to test and refine its generalisability.

Future research should extend the disciplinary reach of the project and explore the longitudinal effects of this co-designed framework on students' AI literacy. Nonetheless, the scalability and adaptability of this partnership-based approach offer clear potential for sector-wide integration within HE.

Reference list

- Advance HE (2024) 'Member Project 23-24 -Generative AI: Beyond Assessment.' Available at: <https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/membership/all-member-benefit-projects/Generative-AI-Beyond-Assessment> (Accessed: 9 October 2025).
- Brew, M., Taylor, S., Lam, R., Havemann, L. and Nerantzi, C. (2023) 'Towards developing AI literacy: Three student provocations on AI in higher education.' *Asian Journal of Distance Education*, 18(2), 1-11. Available at: <https://asianjde.com/ojs/index.php/AsianJDE/article/view/726> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).
- Balalle, H. and Pannilage, S. (2025) 'Reassessing academic integrity in the age of AI: A systematic literature review on AI and academic integrity.' *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 11. Available at: <https://doi:10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101299> (Accessed: 2 October 2025).
- Bovill, C., Felten, P. and Cook-Sather, A. (2014) 'Engaging Students as Partners in Learning and Teaching (2): Practical guidance for academic staff and academic developers.' *Conference Proceedings of the International Consortium on Educational Development*, Stockholm, 16-18 June 2014. Available at: <https://www.research.ed.ac.uk/en/publications/engaging-students-as-partners-in-learning-and-teaching-2-practical/> (Accessed: 3 October 2025).
- Bovill, C. and Woolmer, C. (2019) 'How conceptualisations of curriculum in higher education influence student-staff co-creation in and of the curriculum.' *Higher Education*, 78(3), 407-422. Available at: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10734-018-0349-8> (Accessed: 5 October 2025).
- British Educational Research Association (BERA). (2024) *Ethical guidelines for educational research* (5th ed.). Available at: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-fifth-edition-2024> (Accessed: 29 May 2026).
- Chan, C.K.Y. and Hu, W. (2023) 'Students' voices on Generative AI: perceptions, benefits, and challenges in higher education.' *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20(1). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00411-8> (Accessed: 1 October 2025).
- Chinta, S.V., Wang, Z., Yin, Z., Hoang, N., Gonzalez, M., Quy, T.L. and Zhang, W. (2024) 'FairAIED: Navigating fairness, bias, and ethics in educational AI applications.' *arXiv*. Available at: <https://doi:10.48550/arXiv.2407.18745> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).
- Cotton, D.R.E., Cotton, P.A. and Shipway, J.R. (2023) 'Chatting and cheating: Ensuring academic integrity in the era of ChatGPT.' *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 61(2). Available at: <https://doi:10.1080/14703297.2023.2190148> (Accessed: 5 October 2025).
- Creswell, J.W. and Plano Clark, V.L., (2018) *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. ISBN: 9781483344379
- Dunne, E. and Zandstra, R. (2011) *Students as Change Agents: New ways of engaging with learning and teaching in higher education*. University of Exeter/HEA. Available at:

<https://www.spargs.ac.uk/ch/E3%20Students%20as%20Change%20Agents%20-%20University%20of%20Cumbria.pdf> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).

Essien, A., Bukoye, O.T., O'Dea, X. and Kremantzis, M. (2024) 'The influence of AI text generators on critical thinking skills in UK business schools.' *Studies in Higher Education*, 49(5), 865-882. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2316881> (Accessed: 3 October 2025).

García-López, I.M. and Trujillo-Liñán, L. (2025) 'Ethical and regulatory challenges of Generative AI in education: a systematic review.' *Frontiers in Education*, 10. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1565938> (Accessed: 3 October 2025).

Holmes, W., Bialik, M. and Fadel, C. (2019) *Artificial Intelligence in Education: Promises and Implications for Teaching and Learning*. Center for Curriculum Redesign. ISBN: 978-1-794-29370-0. Available at: <https://curriculumredesign.org/wp-content/uploads/AIED-Book-Excerpt-CCR.pdf> (Accessed: 3 October 2025).

Holen, R., Ashwin, P., Maassen, P. and Stensaker, B. (2020) 'Student partnership: exploring the dynamics in and between different conceptualizations.' *Studies in Higher Education*, 46(12), 2726-2737. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1770717> (Accessed: 3 October 2025).

Healey, M., Flint, A. and Harrington, K. (2014) *Engagement through partnership: students as partners in learning and teaching in higher education*. Advance HE. Available at: <https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/knowledge-hub/engagement-through-partnership-students-partners-learning-and-teaching-higher> (Accessed: 3 October 2025).

Jack, P. (2025) 'Funding challenges mean UK "risks falling behind" on AI education.' *Times Higher Education*, 10 June. Available at: <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/funding-challenges-mean-uk-risks-falling-behind-ai-education> (Accessed: 5 October 2025).

Jisc (2025) '2024/25 UK higher education students digital experience insights survey findings.' *Jisc Digital Insights*. Available at: <https://digitalinsights.jisc.ac.uk/reports-and-briefings/our-reports/2024-25-uk-higher-education-students-digital-experience-insights-survey-findings/> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).

Laupichler, M.C., Aster, A., Schirch, J. and Raupach, T. (2022) 'Artificial intelligence literacy in higher and adult education: a scoping literature review.' *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 3(4). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100101> (Accessed: 5 October 2025).

Lintner, T. (2024) 'A systematic review of AI literacy scales.' *npj Science of Learning*, 9(50). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41539-024-00264-4> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).

Luckin, R., Holmes, W., Griffiths, M. and Forcier, L.B. (2016) *Intelligence unleashed: An argument for AI in education*. London: Pearson Education. ISBN: 9780992424886

Mhlanga, D. (2023) 'Open AI in education: The responsible and ethical use of ChatGPT towards lifelong learning.' *SSRN Electronic Journal*. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4354422> (Accessed: 3 October 2025).

Mercer-Mapstone, L., Dvorakova, S.L., Matthews, K.E., Abbot, S., Cheng, B., Felten, P., Knorr, K., Marquis, E., Shammas, R. and Swaim, K. (2017) 'A systematic literature review of students as partners in higher education.' *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 1(1), 1-23. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.15173/ij sap.v1i1.3119> (Accessed: 9 October 2025).

Matthews, K.E. (2017) 'Five Propositions for Genuine Students as Partners Practice.' *International Journal for Students as Partners*, 1(2), 1-9. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.15173/ij sap.v1i2.3315> (Accessed: 3 October 2025).

Ng, D.T.K., Leung, J.K.L., Chu, K.W.S. and Qiao, M.S. (2021) 'AI literacy: Definition, teaching, evaluation and ethical issues.' *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 58(1), 504-509. Available at: <https://doi:10.1002/pra2.487> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).

Newton, O. (2024) 'The future of assessment: embracing AI and EdTech.' *Jisc Blog*, 15 August. Available at: <https://www.jisc.ac.uk/blog/the-future-of-assessment-embracing-ai-and-edtech> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).

Russell Group (2023) *Russell Group principles on the use of Generative AI tools in education*. Available at: <https://www.russellgroup.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2025-01/Russell%20Group%20principles%20on%20Generative%20AI%20in%20education.pdf> (Accessed: 2 October 2025).

Selwyn, N., Hillman, T., Bergviken-Rensfeldt, A. and Perrotta, C. (2023) 'Making sense of the digital automation of education.' *Postdigital Science and Education*, 5(1), 1-14. Available at: <https://doi:10.1007/s42438-022-00362-9> (Accessed: 9 October 2025).

Suazo Galdames, I. (2025) 'Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Higher Education: A Literature Review.' In: Abreu, A., Carvalho, J.V., Mesquita, A., Sousa Pinto, A. and Mendonça Teixeira, M. (eds.) *Perspectives and Trends in Education and Technology*. Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems, vol. 859. Cham: Springer. Available at: https://doi:10.1007/978-3-031-78155-1_35 (Accessed: 4 October 2025).

Slimi, Z. (2023) 'The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Higher Education: An Empirical Study.' *European Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10(1), pp. 17–33. Available at: <https://doi:10.19044/ejes.v10no1a17> . (Accessed: 3 October 2025).

Sutedjo, A., Liu, S.P. and Chowdhury, M. (2025) 'Generative AI in higher education: A cross-institutional study on faculty preparation and resources.' *Studies in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 4(1). Available at: <https://doi:10.21428/8c225f6e.955a547e> (Accessed: 5 October 2025).

UNESCO (2023) *Guidance for Generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. Available at: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693> (Accessed: 1 October 2025).

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V.I., Bond, M. and Gouverneur, F. (2019) 'Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education – where are the educators?' *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 16(39). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0> (Accessed: 9 October 2025).