

# Criteria related to the pedagogical and responsible use of artificial intelligence in university teaching

Crterios relacionados con un uso pedagógico y responsable de la inteligencia artificial en la enseñanza universitaria

Alfonso Infante-Moro<sup>1</sup>, Juan Carlos Infante-Moro<sup>1</sup>,  
Julia Gallardo-Pérez<sup>1</sup>, Basheer Al-haimi<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Huelva, Spain

<sup>2</sup> Azman Hashim International Business School, University Technology Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia

alfonso.infante@decd.uhu.es , juancarlos.infante@decd.uhu.es ,  
julia.gallardo@decd.uhu.es , mabasheer@utm.my

**ABSTRACT.** Artificial intelligence (AI) has been progressively incorporated into university teaching, offering opportunities to improve learning, but also risks related to dependency, uncritical use, and knowledge obsolescence. This study aims to identify criteria that enable a pedagogical and responsible use of AI in university teaching, so that it acts as a learning support and as a key digital competence for future employability. To this end, the Delphi methodology was applied to a panel of 15 university professors, developing three rounds of consultations that led to consensus on the essential criteria. The results reveal nine categories of recommendations, highlighting ethics, training in critical use, integration into real-life contexts, and the prevention of dishonest practices. And it is concluded that a planned, ethical, and strategic implementation of AI can enhance the development of advanced cognitive skills and better prepare students for digitalized professional environments.

**RESUMEN.** La inteligencia artificial (IA) se ha incorporado progresivamente a la enseñanza universitaria, ofreciendo oportunidades para mejorar el aprendizaje, pero también riesgos relacionados con la dependencia, el uso acrítico y la obsolescencia de conocimientos. Este estudio tiene como objetivo identificar criterios que permitan un uso pedagógico y responsable de la IA en la docencia universitaria, de manera que actúe como apoyo al aprendizaje y como competencia digital clave para la empleabilidad futura. Para ello, se aplicó la metodología Delphi a un panel de 15 docentes universitarios, desarrollando tres rondas de consulta que permitieron alcanzar consenso sobre los criterios esenciales. Los resultados revelan nueve categorías de recomendaciones, destacando la ética, la formación en uso crítico, la integración en contextos reales y la prevención de prácticas deshonestas. Y se concluye que una implementación planificada, ética y estratégica de la IA puede potenciar el desarrollo de competencias cognitivas avanzadas y preparar mejor al alumnado para entornos profesionales digitalizados.

**KEYWORDS:** Artificial intelligence, University teaching, Delphi methodology, Digital skills, Pedagogical use.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Inteligencia artificial, Enseñanza universitaria, Metodología Delphi, Competencias digitales, Uso pedagógico.

## 1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence has become a tool to support teaching and the training process in many degree programs and universities, but this tool can have the opposite effect if its knowledge is not updated or properly applied to each subject (causing technological obsolescence in students) and if excessive dependence is created, limiting critical skills and encouraging plagiarism and superficial learning (negatively affecting students' independent academic development).

Faced with this scenario, this study aims to identify criteria related to the pedagogical and responsible use of artificial intelligence in university teaching, with the aim of ensuring that this technology acts as a support for student learning and as a key digital competence for their future employability.

Based on the Delphi methodology and through consultation with a panel of university professors, the aim is to reach an expert consensus around these criteria. This identification will allow teachers to make informed decisions about how to integrate artificial intelligence into their teaching practices, avoiding its indiscriminate use and ensuring that its implementation is aligned with clear, relevant, and sustainable educational objectives. This is intended to promote a critical and deliberate incorporation of this technology, which contributes to the development of advanced cognitive skills and prepares students for highly digitalized professional environments.

Along these lines, it is essential that teachers clearly define the role that artificial intelligence should play in the classroom, considering both the specific pedagogical objectives and the intensity and frequency of its use. This study, therefore, not only seeks to identify good practices but also to prevent risks arising from excessive or decontextualized use, ensuring that its incorporation responds to the real needs of the educational process.

The following section presents a literature review that contextualizes the implementation of artificial intelligence in educational institutions as a tool to support student learning and as a key digital competence for future employability. The methodology used in this study is presented below, followed by the results obtained from the application of the Delphi method with a panel of university professors. Finally, the criteria that faculty should consider to achieve appropriate pedagogical use of artificial intelligence are identified, ensuring that this technology is coherently integrated into the teaching-learning process and fulfills its function as a training resource and tool.

## 2. Literature review

Artificial intelligence (AI) is reshaping expectations about the competencies university graduates should possess and how learning takes place in higher education contexts. In education, it is increasingly understood that AI should not be seen solely as an automation tool, but as an intelligent support tool capable of personalizing learning trajectories, offering timely feedback, and expanding access to knowledge, provided its integration is critically managed. Recent systematic reviews and meta-analyses on AI in higher education show that, when articulated with pedagogical intent, AI can improve motivation, adaptation to individual styles, and the efficiency of the learning process, without replacing fundamental cognitive skills (Martín-Ramallal et al., 2025; Castillo-Martínez et al., 2024; Bond et al., 2024; Bearman et al., 2023; Falla-Falcón et al., 2022).

At the same time, the concept of AI literacy has emerged as a current requirement. It is not enough for students to know how to use tools: they must understand their capabilities, limitations, biases, and ethical implications, and acquire the confidence to interact with them critically and effectively. Recent frameworks proposed by Kassorla et al. (2024) and Milberg (2025) emphasize that AI literacy involves both technical knowledge and ethical judgment and metacognition about its use, and present it as a transversal competence that enhances the development of human intelligence in digitalized environments. Studies on competency frameworks have sought to systematize this knowledge, identifying dimensions such as conceptual understanding, critical evaluation skills, effective prompting, and ethical use (Chee et al., 2024; Biagini, 2025).



Future employability is closely linked to this combination: graduates capable of using AI as a strategic tool and adapting to workflows that incorporate intelligent assistance are more highly valued by employers. Recent research shows that developing AI skills—both through self-directed learning and institutional programs—increases the perception of job readiness and effectively improves job placement, especially when articulated with real-life professional use scenarios (Portocarrero Ramos et al., 2025; Luján-Salamanca et al., 2024, 2025a, 2025b; Mowreader, 2024). This is reinforced by findings on gaps and equity: the unequal adoption of AI tools and skills can widen gaps between student groups if inclusive interventions are not designed; therefore, equitable access and differentiated training are critical elements for AI to contribute to closing, rather than widening, inequalities (Hadar Shoval, 2025).

Educational institutions face a dual imperative: on the one hand, integrating AI into educational processes as a genuine learning support—for example, through adaptive feedback, intelligent tutoring, or content co-creation—and on the other, structuring this incorporation as part of training in advanced digital skills that translate into sustainable employability. The lack of clear institutional strategies leaves many universities at risk of obsolescence, as graduates without AI literacy may lose competitive advantage, while those with only superficial training in its use run the risk of dependence or inappropriate use (Telfer, 2025; OECD, 2024).

In short, the literature agrees that AI in higher education should be implemented as a support that enhances personalization and critical thinking, and as training content that equips students with key digital skills to navigate and contribute to AI-mediated labor markets. This requires institutional policies that collaborate in this acquisition, hence the need to identify criteria related to the pedagogical and responsible use of artificial intelligence in university teaching, so that this technology acts as a support for student learning and as a key digital skill for their future employability.

### 3. Methodology

This study was conducted using the Delphi methodology, a widely used technique for obtaining consensus among experts and particularly effective for identifying and validating criteria in complex contexts. In this research, it was applied to define guidelines for the pedagogical and responsible use of artificial intelligence in university teaching, aimed at both supporting student learning and developing key digital skills for their future employability.

The Delphi methodology is based on structured consultation with a panel of experts and has proven useful for defining and validating constructs in various systems (Cabero Almenara & Infante Moro, 2014). In this case, it was used to delimit the key elements related to the problem addressed.

The process consisted of administering successive rounds of surveys to a group of previously selected experts—specifically, university professors. In each round, the experts reviewed the results obtained in the previous round to confirm or adjust their assessments, thus promoting convergence toward a consensus.

Three rounds were conducted in total. The first consisted of an open-ended questionnaire, in which experts freely identified the criteria they considered relevant. Responses were subsequently grouped to avoid conceptual duplication, a common procedure in similar studies such as that of Feret and Marcinek (1999), which ensures clarity and terminological consistency.

In the second round, a closed-ended questionnaire was presented that included the previously identified elements. Each expert was asked to rate, on a scale of 0 to 10, the relevance of each criterion to the problem being studied.

The third round also consisted of a closed-ended questionnaire, which included both the individual scores given by each expert in the previous round and the overall average obtained for each item. With this information, participants were asked to confirm or modify their responses in order to refine consensus.

Based on the average scores achieved in this final phase, it was possible to establish a set of criteria considered key for the pedagogical and responsible use of artificial intelligence in university teaching. Specifically, the criteria to be considered for this tool to act as a support for student learning and as a key digital competence for their future employability were sought.

The panel consisted of 15 experts, a number that falls within the range recommended by various authors for the application of the Delphi method: Malla and Zabala (1978) proposed between 15 and 20 experts; León and Montero (2004) proposed between 10 and 30; Gordon (1994) proposed between 15 and 35; Landeta (2002) proposed between 7 and 30; and Skulmoski, Hartman, and Krahn (2007) proposed between 10 and 15.

## 4. Results

The use of this methodology began with Round 1, which consisted of an open questionnaire in which experts were able to indicate the relevant criteria (see Table 1):

**Identifies the criteria related to the pedagogical and responsible use of artificial intelligence in university teaching, so that this technology acts as a support for student learning and as a key digital competence for their future employability.**

Table 1. Round 1 Questionnaire. Source: Self-made.

Based on the results obtained in Round 1, and after unifying those criteria that, although expressed in different terms by the experts, shared the same meaning, Round 2 was conducted (see Table 2). In this phase, the experts were required to rate, on a scale of 0 to 10, the relevance of each criterion to the problem being analyzed. The criteria were organized into nine sections, the structure of which was developed with the support of ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2025).

It rates, on a scale of 0 to 10, each of the criteria related to the pedagogical and responsible use of artificial intelligence in university teaching, so that this technology acts as a support for student learning and as a key digital competence for their future employability	
<b>SECTION 1. General Principles</b>	<b>RATING (0-10)</b>
<i><b>Ethics and Responsibility:</b> Promote the ethical, legal, and transparent use of AI tools, respecting privacy and copyright.</i>	
<i><b>Complementarity:</b> AI does not replace teaching or critical thinking, but rather acts as a supporting tool.</i>	
<i><b>Accessibility and Equity:</b> Promote equitable access to AI tools, avoiding creating digital divides between students.</i>	
<b>SECTION 2. Role of the Teacher</b>	<b>RATING (0-10)</b>
<i><b>AI Trainer:</b> Introduce students to the responsible and critical use of tools such as ChatGPT, Copilot, Grammarly, etc.</i>	
<i><b>Learning Guide:</b> Teach when and how to use AI to enhance learning without becoming dependent.</i>	
<i><b>Modeling Good Practices:</b> Demonstrate in class how AI can be used to research, organize ideas, improve writing, or program, without replacing individual effort.</i>	
<b>SECTION 3. Recommended Teaching Applications</b>	<b>RATING (0-10)</b>
<i>In lesson planning and design:</i>	
<i><b>Use AI to generate activity ideas, text summaries, or lesson plans.</b></i>	
<i><b>Request support for creating question banks (after review and validation).</b></i>	
<i>In assessment:</i>	
<i><b>Introduce AI tools to aid in formative feedback.</b> For example, checking for style or consistency.</i>	
<i><b>Assess tasks that explore critical interaction with AI.</b> For example, comparing an AI-generated response with one written by the student.</i>	
<i>In the classroom:</i>	
<i><b>Encourage the use of AI in debates on current issues, text analysis, argument creation, etc.</b> For example, checking for style or consistency.</i>	
<i><b>Stimulate teacher-student-AI co-creation.</b> Stimulate teacher-student-AI co-creation.</i>	

<b>SECTION 4. Student Training</b>	<b>RATING (0-10)</b>
<i>Raise awareness about the limits of AI: biases, misinformation, hallucinations (errors).</i>	
<i>Provide training in effective prompting techniques and critical analysis of responses.</i>	
<i>Promote personal authorship: reinforce the importance of personal thinking, proper citation, and individual reflection.</i>	
<b>SECTION 5. Aspects to Avoid</b>	<b>RATING (0-10)</b>
<i>Blind or automated use of AI-generated responses without review.</i>	
<i>Promoting dishonest practices: such as using AI to write essays, take exams, or generate unsupervised assignments.</i>	
<i>Overreliance on AI in teacher training without verifying the quality of the content.</i>	
<b>SECTION 6. Recommendations for Assessing with AI</b>	<b>RATING (0-10)</b>
<i>Include tasks that require personal reflection on AI responses.</i>	
<i>Use rubrics that assess the thought process, justification, and critical review.</i>	
<i>Design activities that integrate AI as a resource, not a solution.</i>	
<b>SECTION 7. AI as a Professional Competency</b>	<b>RATING (0-10)</b>
<i>Integrate the use of AI in real-life contexts: report generation, email writing, presentation design, data analysis, etc.</i>	
<i>Expose students to tools used in the workplace: Copilot, Notion AI, or assistants in office suites (Google, Microsoft).</i>	
<i>Develop activities that simulate work environments using AI as part of the workflow.</i>	
<b>SECTION 8. Suggested Resources and Tools</b>	<b>RATING (0-10)</b>
<i>Suggest appropriate AI resources and tools based on the task at hand.</i>	
<b>SECTION 9. Final Considerations</b>	<b>RATING (0-10)</b>
<i>Establish a clear policy on the use of AI from the beginning of the course: what is allowed and what is not.</i>	
<i>Include a section on AI in the teaching guides and assessment rubrics.</i>	
<i>Promote a culture of responsible innovation: where students and teachers learn together about the challenges and opportunities of AI.</i>	

Table 2. Round 2 Questionnaire. Source: Self-made.

Once the results of Round 2 were obtained and the average scores for each criterion were calculated, Round 3 was conducted (see Table 3). In this phase, all the criteria were presented again, this time accompanied by both the rating previously given by the expert and the average obtained for each criterion in the previous round. During this third round, the experts had the opportunity to confirm or modify their responses, again evaluating, on a scale of 0 to 10, the importance of each criterion in relation to the problem addressed.

It rates, on a scale of 0 to 10, each of the criteria related to the pedagogical and responsible use of artificial intelligence in university teaching, so that this technology acts as a support for student learning and as a key digital competence for their future employability			
SECTION 1. General Principles	RATING (0-10)		
	Old Rating	Average Group Rating	New Rating
<i>Ethics and Responsibility: Promote the ethical, legal, and transparent use of AI tools, respecting privacy and copyright.</i>		9.27	
<i>Complementarity: AI does not replace teaching or critical thinking, but rather acts as a supporting tool.</i>		9.13	
<i>Accessibility and Equity: Promote equitable access to AI tools, avoiding creating digital divides between students.</i>		8.67	
SECTION 2. Role of the Teacher	RATING (0-10)		
	Old Rating	Average Group Rating	New Rating
<i>AI Trainer: Introduce students to the responsible and critical use of tools such as ChatGPT, Copilot, Grammarly, etc.</i>		8.67	
<i>Learning Guide: Teach when and how to use AI to enhance learning without becoming dependent.</i>		8.27	
<i>Modeling Good Practices: Demonstrate in class how AI can be used to research, organize ideas, improve writing, or program, without replacing individual effort.</i>		8.33	



SECTION 3. Recommended Teaching Applications	RATING (0-10)		
	Old Rating	Average Group Rating	New Rating
<i>In lesson planning and design:</i>			
<b>Use AI to generate activity ideas, text summaries, or lesson plans.</b>		8.67	
<b>Request support for creating question banks (after review and validation).</b>		8.80	
<i>In assessment:</i>	Old Rating	Average Group Rating	New Rating
<b>Introduce AI tools to aid in formative feedback.</b> For example, checking for style or consistency.		8.40	
<b>Assess tasks that explore critical interaction with AI.</b> For example, comparing an AI-generated response with one written by the student.		8.73	
<i>In the classroom:</i>	Old Rating	Average Group Rating	New Rating
<b>Encourage the use of AI in debates on current issues, text analysis, argument creation, etc.</b> For example, checking for style or consistency.		8.53	
<b>Stimulate teacher-student-AI co-creation.</b> Stimulate teacher-student-AI co-creation.		8.67	
SECTION 4. Student Training	RATING (0-10)		
	Old Rating	Average Group Rating	New Rating
<b>Raise awareness about the limits of AI:</b> biases, misinformation, hallucinations (errors).		8.40	
<b>Provide training in effective prompting techniques and critical analysis of responses.</b>		8.80	
<b>Promote personal authorship:</b> reinforce the importance of personal thinking, proper citation, and individual reflection.		8.13	
SECTION 5. Aspects to Avoid	RATING (0-10)		
	Old Rating	Average Group Rating	New Rating
<b>Blind or automated use of AI-generated responses without review.</b>		8.07	
<b>Promoting dishonest practices:</b> such as using AI to write essays, take exams, or generate unsupervised assignments.		8.53	
<b>Overreliance on AI in teacher training without verifying the quality of the content.</b>		8.93	
SECTION 6. Recommendations for Assessing with AI	RATING (0-10)		
	Old Rating	Average Group Rating	New Rating
<b>Include tasks that require personal reflection on AI responses.</b>		8.53	
<b>Use rubrics that assess the thought process, justification, and critical review.</b>		9.13	
<b>Design activities that integrate AI as a resource, not a solution.</b>		8.33	
SECTION 7. AI as a Professional Competency	RATING (0-10)		
	Old Rating	Average Group Rating	New Rating
<b>Integrate the use of AI in real-life contexts:</b> report generation, email writing, presentation design, data analysis, etc.		9.07	
<b>Expose students to tools used in the workplace:</b> Copilot, Notion AI, or assistants in office suites (Google, Microsoft).		8.67	
<b>Develop activities that simulate work environments using AI as part of the workflow.</b>		9.00	
SECTION 8. Suggested Resources and Tools	RATING (0-10)		
	Old Rating	Average Group Rating	New Rating
<b>Suggest appropriate AI resources and tools based on the task at hand.</b>		8.27	
SECTION 9. Final Considerations	RATING (0-10)		
	Old Rating	Average Group Rating	New Rating
<b>Establish a clear policy on the use of AI from the beginning of the course: what is allowed and what is not.</b>		8.80	
<b>Include a section on AI in the teaching guides and assessment rubrics.</b>		8.60	
<b>Promote a culture of responsible innovation:</b> where students and teachers learn together about the challenges and opportunities of AI.		8.40	

Table 3. Round 3 Questionnaire. Source: Self-made.



And in this Round 3, the experts recorded changes in their ratings for only four criteria (see Table 4):

Ratings increased for the criteria "Train in effective prompting techniques and critical analysis of responses" and "Design activities that integrate AI as a resource, not a solution" (from 8.80 to 9.00 and from 8.33 to 8.93, respectively), as these were considered essential for fostering a more reflective and conscious pedagogical use of AI, favoring the development of critical thinking and student autonomy in the face of the responses generated by these tools. A student with good prompting skills is more independent, analytical, and problem-solving, and designing activities that integrate AI as a resource makes the difference between superficial and strategic use.

And the ratings for the criteria "Request support for the creation of question banks (after review and validation)" and "Include a section on AI in teaching guides and assessment rubrics" decreased (from 8.80 to 8.60 and from 8.60 to 8.40, respectively), as some experts pointed out that these actions, although useful, can be seen as secondary, require extra effort without results (the quality of AI-generated questions can be inconsistent, implying an equally costly manual review), or depend on external factors, such as institutional policies or resource availability, which limits their immediate applicability in all teaching contexts.

SECTION 1. General Principles	RATING (0-10)
<i>Ethics and Responsibility: Promote the ethical, legal, and transparent use of AI tools, respecting privacy and copyright.</i>	9.27
<i>Complementarity: AI does not replace teaching or critical thinking, but rather acts as a supporting tool.</i>	9.13
<i>Accessibility and Equity: Promote equitable access to AI tools, avoiding creating digital divides between students.</i>	8.67
SECTION 2. Role of the Teacher	RATING (0-10)
<i>AI Trainer: Introduce students to the responsible and critical use of tools such as ChatGPT, Copilot, Grammarly, etc.</i>	8.67
<i>Learning Guide: Teach when and how to use AI to enhance learning without becoming dependent.</i>	8.27
<i>Modeling Good Practices: Demonstrate in class how AI can be used to research, organize ideas, improve writing, or program, without replacing individual effort.</i>	8.33
SECTION 3. Recommended Teaching Applications	RATING (0-10)
<i>In lesson planning and design:</i>	
<i>Use AI to generate activity ideas, text summaries, or lesson plans.</i>	8.67
<i>Request support for creating question banks (after review and validation).</i>	8.60
<i>In assessment:</i>	
<i>Introduce AI tools to aid in formative feedback. For example, checking for style or consistency.</i>	8.40
<i>Assess tasks that explore critical interaction with AI. For example, comparing an AI-generated response with one written by the student.</i>	8.73
<i>In the classroom:</i>	
<i>Encourage the use of AI in debates on current issues, text analysis, argument creation, etc. For example, checking for style or consistency.</i>	8.53
<i>Stimulate teacher-student-AI co-creation. Stimulate teacher-student-AI co-creation.</i>	8.67
SECTION 4. Student Training	RATING (0-10)
<i>Raise awareness about the limits of AI: biases, misinformation, hallucinations (errors).</i>	8.40
<i>Provide training in effective prompting techniques and critical analysis of responses.</i>	9.00
<i>Promote personal authorship: reinforce the importance of personal thinking, proper citation, and individual reflection.</i>	8.13
SECTION 5. Aspects to Avoid	RATING (0-10)
<i>Blind or automated use of AI-generated responses without review.</i>	8.07
<i>Promoting dishonest practices: such as using AI to write essays, take exams, or generate unsupervised assignments.</i>	8.53
<i>Overreliance on AI in teacher training without verifying the quality of the content.</i>	8.93
SECTION 6. Recommendations for Assessing with AI	RATING (0-10)
<i>Include tasks that require personal reflection on AI responses.</i>	8.53
<i>Use rubrics that assess the thought process, justification, and critical review.</i>	9.13
<i>Design activities that integrate AI as a resource, not a solution.</i>	8.93

SECTION 7. AI as a Professional Competency	RATING (0-10)
<i>Integrate the use of AI in real-life contexts: report generation, email writing, presentation design, data analysis, etc.</i>	9.07
<i>Expose students to tools used in the workplace: Copilot, Notion AI, or assistants in office suites (Google, Microsoft).</i>	8.67
<i>Develop activities that simulate work environments using AI as part of the workflow.</i>	9.00
SECTION 8. Suggested Resources and Tools	RATING (0-10)
<i>Suggest appropriate AI resources and tools based on the task at hand.</i>	8.27
SECTION 9. Final Considerations	RATING (0-10)
<i>Establish a clear policy on the use of AI from the beginning of the course: what is allowed and what is not.</i>	8.80
<i>Include a section on AI in the teaching guides and assessment rubrics.</i>	8.40
<i>Promote a culture of responsible innovation: where students and teachers learn together about the challenges and opportunities of AI.</i>	8.40

Table 4. Criteria related to the pedagogical and responsible use of artificial intelligence in university teaching, and their scores from 0 to 10. Source: Self-made.

## 5. Conclusions

This study, using the Delphi methodology, has identified a set of key criteria to ensure the pedagogical and responsible use of artificial intelligence in university teaching. These criteria, agreed upon by a panel of expert educators, offer a practical guide for integrating artificial intelligence as a complementary resource, fostering critical thinking, autonomy, and preparing students for highly digitalized work environments.

These criteria can be seen below:

### SECTION 1. General Principles

1. Ethics and Responsibility: Promote the ethical, legal, and transparent use of AI tools, respecting privacy and copyright.
2. Complementarity: AI does not replace teaching or critical thinking, but rather acts as a supporting tool.
3. Accessibility and Equity: Promote equitable access to AI tools, avoiding creating digital divides between students.

### SECTION 2. Role of the Teacher

4. AI Trainer: Introduce students to the responsible and critical use of tools such as ChatGPT, Copilot, Grammarly, etc.
5. Learning Guide: Teach when and how to use AI to enhance learning without becoming dependent.
6. Modeling Good Practices: Demonstrate in class how AI can be used to research, organize ideas, improve writing, or program, without replacing individual effort.

### SECTION 3. Recommended Teaching Applications

In lesson planning and design:

7. Use AI to generate activity ideas, text summaries, or lesson plans.
8. Request support for creating question banks (after review and validation).

In assessment:

9. Introduce AI tools to aid in formative feedback. For example, checking for style or consistency.
10. Assess tasks that explore critical interaction with AI. For example, comparing an AI-generated response with one written by the student.

In the classroom:



11. Encourage the use of AI in debates on current issues, text analysis, argument creation, etc. For example, checking for style or consistency.
12. Stimulate teacher-student-AI co-creation. Stimulate teacher-student-AI co-creation.

#### SECTION 4. Student Training

13. Raise awareness about the limits of AI: biases, misinformation, hallucinations (errors).
14. Provide training in effective prompting techniques and critical analysis of responses.
15. Promote personal authorship: reinforce the importance of personal thinking, proper citation, and individual reflection.

#### SECTION 5. Aspects to Avoid

16. Blind or automated use of AI-generated responses without review.
17. Promoting dishonest practices: such as using AI to write essays, take exams, or generate unsupervised assignments.
18. Overreliance on AI in teacher training without verifying the quality of the content.

#### SECTION 6. Recommendations for Assessing with AI

19. Include tasks that require personal reflection on AI responses.
20. Use rubrics that assess the thought process, justification, and critical review.
21. Design activities that integrate AI as a resource, not a solution.

#### SECTION 7. AI as a Professional Competency

22. Integrate the use of AI in real-life contexts: report generation, email writing, presentation design, data analysis, etc.
23. Expose students to tools used in the workplace: Copilot, Notion AI, or assistants in office suites (Google, Microsoft).
24. Develop activities that simulate work environments using AI as part of the workflow.

#### SECTION 8. Suggested Resources and Tools

25. Suggest appropriate AI resources and tools based on the task at hand.

#### SECTION 9. Final Considerations

26. Establish a clear policy on the use of AI from the beginning of the course: what is allowed and what is not.
27. Include a section on AI in the teaching guides and assessment rubrics.
28. Promote a culture of responsible innovation: where students and teachers learn together about the challenges and opportunities of AI.

These results demonstrate that teachers must take an active role as trainers and guides in the use of artificial intelligence, promoting ethical and responsible practices aligned with pedagogical objectives. Likewise, they highlight the importance of training students in prompting techniques and critical analysis of responses, as fundamental skills for a reflective and strategic use of these tools.

Among the most valued principles are ethics and responsibility, complementarity with traditional teaching, accessibility and equity, and the integration of artificial intelligence in real-life professional contexts. They also emphasize the need to avoid excessive dependence, uncritical use, and dishonest practices by establishing clear

usage policies from the beginning of the course.

The application of these criteria will allow institutions and teachers not only to prevent risks associated with the indiscriminate use of artificial intelligence, but also to enhance its value as an innovative resource for learning and as a differentiating skill for the future employability of graduates. In this sense, artificial intelligence should be understood not as an end in itself, but as a means that, when properly implemented, contributes to the development of advanced cognitive skills, creativity, and problem-solving abilities in the university context.

## Funding

This research is part of the teaching innovation project “Aspects to be taken into account by the teaching staff of the Master's Degree in Tourism at the University of Huelva for the correct use of artificial intelligence” and is financed by the Vice-rector's Office for Innovation and Employability of the University of Huelva (Spain), within the call for Teaching Innovation and Educational Research Projects 2024/2025.

Cómo citar este artículo / How to cite this paper

Infante-Moro, A.; Infante-Moro, J. C.; Gallardo-Pérez, J.; Al-haimi, B. (2025). Criteria related to the pedagogical and responsible use of artificial intelligence in university teaching. *Campus Virtuales*, 14(2), 209-219. <https://doi.org/10.54988/cv.2025.2.1743>

## References

- Bearman, M.; Ryan, J.; Ajjawi, R. (2023). Discourses of artificial intelligence in higher education: A critical literature review. *Higher Education*, 86(2), 369-385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00937-2>.
- Biagini, G. (2025). Towards an AI-Literate Future: A systematic literature review exploring education, ethics, and applications. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*, 1-51. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40593-025-00466-w>.
- Bond, M.; Khosravi, H.; De Laat, M.; Bergdahl, N.; Negrea, V.; Oxley, E.; ...; Siemens, G. (2024). A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour. *International journal of educational technology in higher education*, 21(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00436-z>.
- Cabero Almenara, J.; Infante Moro, A. (2014). Empleo del método Delphi y su empleo en la investigación en comunicación y educación. *Educat*, 48, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.21556/edutec.2014.48.187>
- Castillo-Martínez, I. M.; Flores-Bueno, D.; Gómez-Puente, S. M.; Vite-León, V. O. (2024). AI in higher education: A systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1391485. <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2024.1391485>.
- Chee, H.; Ahn, S.; Lee, J. (2024). A competency framework for AI literacy: Variations by different learner groups and an implied learning pathway. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 0, 1-37. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13556>.
- Falla-Falcón, N.; López-Meneses, E.; Aubry, A. C.; García-Ordaz, M. (2022). La supervisión de la enseñanza no presencial en centros educativos no universitarios. *Campus Virtuales*, 11(2), 161-177. <https://doi.org/10.54988/cv.2022.2.1198>.
- Feret, B.; Marcinek, M. (1999). The future of the academic library and the academic librarian: a Delphi study. *Librarian Career Development*, 7(10), 91-107. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09680819910301898>
- Gordon, T. J. (1994). The Delphi Method. *Futures Research Methodology AC/UNU Millennium Project*.
- Hadar Shoval, D. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: Bridging or Widening the Gap for Diverse Student Populations?. *Education Sciences*, 15(5), 637. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15050637>.
- Kassorla, M.; Georgieva, M.; Papini, A. (2024). AI literacy in teaching and learning: A durable framework for higher education. *Educause*. (<https://www.educause.edu/content/2024/ai-literacy-in-teaching-and-learning/executive-summary>).
- Landeta, J. (2002). *El método Delphi: una técnica de previsión para la incertidumbre*. Barcelona: Ariel.
- León, G.; Montero, I. (2004). *Métodos de investigación en Psicología y Educación*. Madrid: McGraw-Hill.
- Luján-Salamanca, A.; Infante-Moro, A.; Infante-Moro, J. C.; Gallardo-Pérez, J. (2024). La ciberseguridad en la empresas: estudio bibliométrico. *Revista de pensamiento estratégico y seguridad CISDE*, 9(2), 61-73. <https://doi.org/10.54988/cisde.2024.2.1551>.
- Luján-Salamanca, A.; Infante-Moro, A.; Infante-Moro, J. C.; Gallardo-Pérez, J. (2025a). Factors That Influence the Use of the Online Channel for the Purchase of Food Products in Spain. *Journal of Theoretical and Applied Electronic Commerce Research*, 20(2), 74. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jtaer20020074>.
- Luján-Salamanca, A.; Infante-Moro, A.; Infante-Moro, J. C.; Gallardo-Pérez, J. (2025b). The Use of the Online Channel for the Purchase of Food Products: A Bibliometric Study. In *Sustainable Data Management: Navigating Big Data, Communication Technology, and Business Digital Leadership*. Volume 1 (pp. 437-447). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-83911-5\\_38](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-83911-5_38).

Infante-Moro, A.; Infante-Moro, J. C.; Gallardo-Pérez, J.; Al-haimi, B. (2025). Criteria related to the pedagogical and responsible use of artificial intelligence in university teaching. *Campus Virtuales*, 14(2), 209-219. <https://doi.org/10.54988/cv.2025.2.1743>



- Martín-Ramallal, P.; Polo-Serrano, D.; Bertola-Garbellini, A. (2025). AI-Learning. Aceptación de la inteligencia artificial en estudiantes de Comunicación. *Campus Virtuales*, 14(2), 101-114. <https://doi.org/10.54988/cv.2025.2.1596>.
- Malla, F. G.; Zabala, I. (1978). La previsión del futuro en la empresa (III): El método Delphi. *Estudios Empresariales*, 39, 13-24.
- Milberg, T. (2025). Why AI literacy is now a core competency in education. *World Economic Forum*. ([https://www.weforum.org/stories/2025/05/why-ai-literacy-is-now-a-core-competency-in-education/?gad\\_source=1&gad\\_campaignid=22234048793&gbraid=0AAAAAoVy5F6zTBaccQ\\_Miiii768i4pf70&gclid=CjwKCAjwk bzEBhAVEiwA4V-yqnimsASB3DcQ1HwN\\_N4xVsD8DbTI\\_xc9Xe-rP2IU-moOo8wGkAoURBoC0wcQAvD\\_BwE](https://www.weforum.org/stories/2025/05/why-ai-literacy-is-now-a-core-competency-in-education/?gad_source=1&gad_campaignid=22234048793&gbraid=0AAAAAoVy5F6zTBaccQ_Miiii768i4pf70&gclid=CjwKCAjwk bzEBhAVEiwA4V-yqnimsASB3DcQ1HwN_N4xVsD8DbTI_xc9Xe-rP2IU-moOo8wGkAoURBoC0wcQAvD_BwE)).
- Mowreader, A. (2024). Employers Say Students Need AI Skills. What If Students Don't Want Them?. *Inside Higher Ed*. (<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/student-success/life-after-college/2024/10/03/are-ai-skills-key-part-career-preparation>).
- OECD (2024). Artificial intelligence and education and skills. (<https://www.oecd.org/en/topics/sub-issues/artificial-intelligence-and-education-and-skills.html>).
- OpenAI (2025). ChatGPT [Manual de buenas prácticas con los aspectos a tener en cuenta por los profesores de su titulación para un correcto uso de la inteligencia artificial, que sirva para que esta herramienta se convierta en una herramienta de acompañamiento en los estudios para los estudiantes y una competencia digital diferenciadora a la hora de buscar empleo en el futuro]. (<https://chat.openai.com/>).
- Portocarrero Ramos, H. C.; Cruz Caro, O.; Sanchez Bardales, E.; Quiñones Huatangari, L.; Campos Trigoso, J. A.; Maicelo Guevara, J. L.; Chávez Santos, R. (2025). Artificial intelligence skills and their impact on the employability of university graduates. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 8, 1629320. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2025.1629320>.
- Skulmoski, G. J.; Hartman, F. T.; Krahn, J. (2007). The Delphi method for graduate research. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research*, 6(1), 1-21.
- Telfer, R. (2025). Universities risk falling behind without a clear AI strategy. *TechRadar Pro*. (<https://www.techradar.com/pro/universities-risk-falling-behind-without-a-clear-ai-strategy>).