



DUNAÚJVÁROSI EGYETEM
UNIVERSITY OF DUNAÚJVÁROS

Alkalmazott Tudományok Egyeteme
University of Applied Sciences



UNIVERSITY OF DUNAÚJVÁROS

**REGULATION ON THE ETHICAL USE OF
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE**

Effective from: 1 July 2026

	Regulation on the ethical use of artificial intelligence		
1. edition	0. modification	2 (4). page	

1st edition adopted by the Senate of University of Dunaújváros by Resolution No. 44-2025/2026 (23 June 2026)

Effective from: 1 July 2026

University of Dunaújváros considering that the use of artificial intelligence (hereinafter: AI) is gaining ground in both education and research, has established the following regulation on the ethical use of AI based on Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 on harmonized rules for artificial intelligence (AI Regulation):

I. Ethical use of AI in teaching and research work

1. § UOD teaching and research staff may ethically use AI for the preparation of teaching materials and for the collection and analysis of data in the course of their research. In doing so, they shall take into account the recommendations of the document entitled *Institutional recommendation and application framework for the responsible use of artificial intelligence in educational, research, assessment and related administrative environments* (Annex).
2. § Teaching and research staff are responsible for ensuring that the application of AI in their work is in all cases transparent, appropriately indicated and ethically justified.
3. § Content generated with the use of AI must be clearly marked in a manner similar to the literature sources used.
4. § The use of content generated with the use of AI without clear indication constitutes plagiarism and carries the same legal consequences.

II. Ethical use of AI by students

1. § UOD students may use artificial intelligence as a supporting tool in their research, projects and studies, but exclusively for the purpose of promoting independent thinking, critical analysis and their own original work. In doing so, they shall take into account the recommendations of the document entitled *Institutional recommendation and application framework for the responsible use of artificial intelligence in educational, research, assessment and related administrative environments*.
2. § AI may only be part of the research process, it may not replace independent work.
3. § Content generated with the use of AI must be clearly marked in a manner similar to the literature sources used.

	Regulation on the ethical use of artificial intelligence		
	1. edition	0. modification	3 (4). page

4. § The use of content generated with the use of AI without clear indication constitutes plagiarism and carries the same legal consequences.
5. § In the case of theses/portfolios and Student Research Conference papers, completion of a declaration specified in a separate regulation on the lawful use of AI is mandatory.

III. Procedure in the event of unethical use of AI

1. § Taking into account that artificial intelligence may err, the user of the content is responsible for all content generated by artificial intelligence. Verification of the appropriateness of all content generated with the assistance of AI is the obligation of the user. This responsibility is non-transferable.
2. § In the event of conduct causing damage by AI or unethical use of AI, the provisions of Chapter III (ETHICAL REGULATION) of the UOD Regulation on the handling of events violating organisational integrity and ethical expectations and complaints, as well as the rules of disciplinary proceedings shall apply.
3. § The Ethics Committee of the Scientific Council is entitled to take a position on the question of the ethicality of the use of AI.

IV. FINAL PROVISIONS

1. § This regulation was adopted by the Senate with Resolution No. 44-2025/2026 (23 June 2026).
2. § The University shall ensure the publication of this regulation in the customary local manner, making it public on its internal network and website.
3. § Access path of this regulation:

N:\1 - Szabályzatok\ÉRVÉNYES SZABÁLYZATOK.

	Regulation on the ethical use of artificial intelligence		
1. edition	0. modification	4 (4). page	

Annex:

- Annex No. 1: Institutional recommendation and application framework for the responsible use of artificial intelligence in educational, research, assessment and related administrative environments

Dunaújváros, 30 June 2026



Dr. István András

Rector



 Dr. Rago Pál István



ANNEX No. 1

Institutional recommendation and application framework for the responsible use of artificial intelligence in educational, research, assessment and related administrative environments

This document is an institutional recommendation to be applied in accordance with the mandatory regulations of University of Dunaújváros, which provides a common interpretive framework for local educational, research and assessment practices.



Table of Contents

1. Purpose and scope of the document	8
1.1. The five minimum principles	8
2. Conceptual framework and typical modes of use	9
3. Institutional principles for responsible use	9
3.1. Human control	9
3.2. Transparency.....	9
3.3.1. Introduction of protected and confidential content into AI systems	10
3.4. Equity	10
3.5. Integrity.....	10
4. Rethinking educational and assessment practices with the application of artificial intelligence	10
4.1. Task planning based on learning outcomes.....	11
4.2. Preferring tasks that are more difficult to automate	11
4.3. Modernising assessment.....	11
4.4. Instructor pre-testing	11
5. Indication and documentation of AI use.....	12
5.1. When is indication required?	12
5.2. What information should be included in the documentation?	12
5.3. Brief examples	15
6. Research, publication and professional review environment	16
6.1. Authorship and contribution	16
6.2. Source management and verification	16
6.3. Confidentiality of manuscripts and reviews	16
6.4. Reproducibility and verification.....	16
7. Violations and possible consequences.....	16
8. Detection tools, training and institutional support	17
9. In the case of development of own AI systems	17



9.1. AI governance framework	18
9.2. Data processing and GDPR.....	18
9.3. Risk management	18
9.4. Information security	18
9.5. Human oversight	19
9.6. Transparency and documentation	19
9.7. Model lifecycle and MLOps controls.....	19
9.8. Ethical and HR rules.....	19
10. Literature used	20
11. Appendices	21
11.1. Examples of brief descriptions of use	21
Literature review	21
Linguistic correction	21
Illustration.....	21
11.2. Available AI applications for different tasks	22
11.3. Appearance in course descriptions	22

1. Purpose and scope of the document

At the University of Dunaújváros artificial intelligence-based tools are becoming increasingly frequent elements of educational, research, assessment and administrative processes. The task of institutional regulation is therefore not primarily to formulate prohibitions but to define clear, verifiable and pedagogically justified frameworks for use.

In student academic and examination matters, this recommendation shall be interpreted and applied in accordance with Section 44 of the Student Requirements Framework of the University of Dunaújváros, as well as the provisions specified in the course syllabus and course requirements. This document establishes an institutional framework of principles that complements these mandatory provisions.

The purpose of this recommendation is to provide a common set of criteria for students, teaching staff, researchers and other staff of the University of Dunaújváros for the responsible, pedagogically justified and transparent application of artificial intelligence-based tools on the basis of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (AI Act).

The document applies to all situations in which an artificial intelligence-based tool is used for writing, source searching, analysis, translation, coding, generating visual content, administrative support or preparing educational tasks.

The fundamental principle is the following: AI may be a useful complementary tool, but it must not replace professional judgement, independent work or human responsibility.

1.1. The five minimum principles

The recommendation is based on five minimum principles (Table 1) that are binding for all those concerned in the use of AI in the educational, research and administrative environment of UOD.

Table 1: The five minimum principles of responsible AI use

Transparency	In every submitted, published or institutionally used document, it must be indicated if an AI tool has made a substantive contribution to the final product.
Human control	The output created with the use of AI must in all cases be verified; correction, finalisation and assumption of responsibility are human tasks.
Data protection	During the use of an AI tool, personal, sensitive, business or institutional data may be processed exclusively in accordance with the relevant legislation and the requirements applicable to systems approved by the University.
Equity	Task specifications must ensure that the assessment of performance does not depend unjustifiably on access to more expensive or more advanced AI tools.
Integrity	Support provided by AI may not be presented as one's own independent human performance.



The University continuously monitors changes in the technological, legal and ethical environment of AI-based systems and reviews institutional regulation as necessary.

2. Conceptual framework and typical modes of use

In this document, an AI system means a machine-based system that, on the basis of explicit or implicit objectives, produces predictions, content, recommendations or other outputs affecting the physical or virtual environment from the input data received. Generative AI within this is an AI system that is capable of creating text, image, sound, video, code or a combination thereof on the basis of a user instruction (Ali et al., 2024; Lim et al., 2023). When assessing AI use, the document distinguishes between purely technical assistance and substantive contribution.

Substantive contribution is considered to exist in particular if AI plays a content role in the formation of the final text, the analysis, the code, the visual content, reference searching, the structure or the interpretation. Spelling correction, character recognition, translation or other purely technical auxiliary functions do not by themselves constitute substantive contribution, provided that they do not modify the content statements.

AI tools may provide useful support in certain partial tasks; at the same time, limitations such as the appearance of erroneous statements, inaccurate handling of sources, built-in biases, copyright risks, as well as dangers related to personal data must also be taken into account (Bjelobaba et al., 2025).

Therefore, at every stage of AI use it is justified to distinguish technical assistance from professionally acceptable performance.

3. Institutional principles for responsible use

The following principles elaborate in more detail the five minimum principles defined in point 1.1. Their purpose is to clarify what behavioural expectations the requirements of transparency, human control, data protection, equity and integrity mean in practice.

3.1. Human control

The content produced by AI is never the responsibility of the application itself, but of the user. This applies to content accuracy, the correctness of citation, any errors and copyright compliance as well.

3.2. Transparency

If an AI tool has made a substantive contribution to the completed work as defined in Chapter 2, its use must be indicated. For the purposes of this regulation, a technical auxiliary function is AI support that exclusively assists the formal, linguistic or technical handling of content already created by the user and does not change its content statements, professional conclusions, argumentation, structure or interpretation. Such a technical auxiliary function may be in particular spelling and grammar correction, fixing of typing errors, character recognition, formatting assistance, checking of citation format, as well as linguistic translation, provided that it is directed exclusively at accurately rendering the meaning of the existing text.

It is not considered a purely technical auxiliary function, and is therefore to be indicated as AI use, if AI creates a new content element, in particular: argumentation, conclusion, analysis, source suggestion, text structure, code or visual content, or if during translation or linguistic correction it substantially rephrases,



shortens, expands, interprets or professionally modifies the content of the text. In case of doubt, the user is advised to briefly indicate the nature of the use of the AI tool.

3.3. Data protection

Data that is personal, sensitive, business or institutionally protected may not be uploaded to public or external cloud services. If the processing of such data is nevertheless necessary, exclusively approved systems providing appropriate contractual and technical guarantees may be used.

Personal data, student work, questionnaire responses, research raw data, data originating from institutional databases or other protected content may be processed with an AI system exclusively in an environment approved by the University that provides appropriate data protection and information security guarantees.

3.3.1. Introduction of protected and confidential content into AI systems

The introduction of protected and confidential content into AI systems is a particularly sensitive area of data protection, confidentiality and institutional integrity; therefore the following detailed rules apply. In particular, the following may not be uploaded to an external AI service not under institutional control:

- personal or special data,
- exam assignments, midterm tests, test banks or answer keys not yet posted,
- non-public thesis, diploma work or article manuscripts,
- application materials, expert reviews, referee opinions or research plans,
- documents that are confidential from a contractual, business or institutional perspective

Such data or documents may be processed exclusively with a system approved by the University that provides appropriate data protection and information security guarantees, involving the data protection officer if necessary.

3.4. Equity

Assignment instructions need to take into account that students might have different access to tools. A set of requirements should clearly define the permitted tools and should not make performance dependent on paid services.

3.5. Integrity

Text, analysis or code produced entirely by artificial intelligence but submitted as one's own independent work violates the requirements of independent work, transparent AI use and academic and scientific integrity.

4. Rethinking educational and assessment practices with the application of artificial intelligence

The spread of artificial intelligence is not merely a technological but also a pedagogical challenge. The question is not whether it is present in education but how it transforms learning outcomes, assignments and methods of assessment.



4.1. Task planning based on learning outcomes

In the case of tasks whose primary purpose is the assessment of the student's independent understanding, analytical skills, decision-making or creative work, AI tools can only be used in a supportive way. A solution in which the substantive content, conclusions, decisions or creative part of the task is created by AI instead of the student is not acceptable. Therefore, in courses and assignment instructions it must be clearly determined which tasks may be carried out with AI support and which require exclusively independent work.

4.2. Preferring tasks that are more difficult to automate

When planning assignments, preference should be given to task types that are based on complex thinking processes, personal interpretation, critical thinking and verifiable student input, making them harder to automate with generative AI tools:

- problems linked to personal or local context;
- analyses based on real databases or own data collection;
- multi-s project work with intermediate submissions;
- essays and portfolios containing a reflective part;
- written work complemented with an oral defence, presentation or demonstration;
- tasks in which source criticism, methodological decision and interpretation of results are emphasised.

4.3. Modernising assessment

If an essential part of a task can reliably be performed by a single generative system, the form of assessment requires review. It is advisable to give greater weight to process monitoring, intermediate versions, oral explanation and self-reflection.

AI-based pre-assessment, scoring or textual feedback may not be the exclusive basis of a decision on student performance. In every case, there should be a human review, justification and feedback that the students can understand.

4.4. Instructor pre-testing

It is recommended practice that the lecturer tries out the assigned task in advance using one or more AI tools. If the desired result can be reproduced with minimal effort, the task should be revised.

Reconsidering educational tasks to fit the AI era can be supported by the following (Table 2) checklist points when planning assignments and assessment practices.

In the course syllabus and course requirements, in accordance with Section 28(5) of the Student Requirements Framework, it must be clearly stated whether the use of AI is completely prohibited, partially permitted or fully permitted in the given course or type of assessment.



Table 2: Checklist for the review of task specifications and assessment practice

Checklist question	Why is it important?
Is it clear what is permitted?	Reduces uncertainty and unintentional rule violation.
Does the task distinguish support from independent performance?	Thus the student knows which part must be solved with their own competence.
Does the task require brief documentation of AI use?	Increases transparency and assists assessment.
Does it contain reflection or an oral element?	Makes pure machine substitution more difficult.
Does the assessment measure thinking as well, not only the end product?	Genuine learning outcomes thus become more visible.

Taking into account institutional and course-specific characteristics, the educational units responsible for programmes/courses may establish supplementary, discipline- or profession-specific requirements. The permitted, restricted or prohibited cases of AI use must be stated in advance and clearly in the course syllabus, course requirements and task specification.

5. Indication and documentation of AI use

The principle of indication is that the same transparency must be expected of AI support as would be expected of any other external professional or technical assistance.

5.1. When is indication required?

In the case of a student academic task, AI use must be indicated in every case, in accordance with Section 44(2) of the Student Requirements Framework, if the tool participated in the preparation of the task. In the case of teaching, research and staff use, documentation is at least required when AI has substantively influenced the content, structure, analysis, visualisation or assessment of the end product.

5.2. What information should be included in the documentation?

The documentation should include at least the following information: the name and provider of the tool used, if known the model or version designation, the date of access, the purpose and phase of work, a brief description of the given instruction, the manner of use of the output, and a record of the manner in which the user verified the output, possibly modified or discarded it.

Recommended uniform form: "Tool used: ... ; date of access: ... ; work phase: ... ; type of task or prompt: ... ; use of the output: ... ; own verification: ... ; own modification:"

In a publication it is necessary to indicate the version of the AI used if it was involved in creating the publication:

- text writing
- abstract preparation
- literature summary



- data interpretation
- preparation of statistical code
- preparation of software code
- generation of figures or images
- generation of test data
- formulation of professional review or referee opinion
- AI API call occurred.

If the author made use of AI assistance it is recommended to indicate the version of the AI:

- in the case of spelling correction,
- grammatical stylisation,
- use of translation.

The recording of the above data may also take the form of a brief, uniform entry; the example below provides this.

Tool used: ChatGPT, OpenAI; date of access: 12 March 2026; work phase: linguistic check; type of task: request for spelling and stylistic suggestions; use of the output: only linguistic suggestions that do not modify the content were adopted; own verification: the corrected text was compared with the original version; own modification: the professional terminology and the final wording were verified independently.

Table 3 presents typical user scenarios in which the application of AI tools is advisable to document and also gives an example of what mode of indication may be considered appropriate for the individual activities.

Table 3: Examples of documentable cases of AI use and modes of indication

Activity	Non-AI tool	Possible AI tool	Recommended indication	Mode of verification of the full output
Source exploration	library databases,, Google Scholar	Elicit, Research Rabbit, etc.	It may be briefly stated that the tool assisted in refining keywords or expanding relevant articles.	It must be recorded in what manner the user verified the suggested sources, for example in databases, by reviewing full texts, comparing abstracts or examining citation data.
Data analysis	Excel, SPSS, R	ChatGPT, Copilot, etc.	It must be indicated if AI assisted in coding, interpretation or the production of tables, as well as how the output was verified and validated.	It must be precisely indicated in what manner the results were verified, for example by manual recalculation, repeated running with statistical software, manual back-checking of the data and comparison with the literature.
Linguistic correction	Human proofreader	DeepL, ChatGPT, Copilot etc.	It is advisable to indicate that linguistic editing or translation support took place.	It must be stated in what manner the verification of the full final text took place, for example by author reading, terminological coordination, professional proofreading or comparison with the original text.
Illustration aid	own editing,image database	DALL-E or other image generator etc.	In the caption it may be recorded that the visual material was prepared with AI assistance, but AI may appear at most as a preparatory, exploratory, visualisation auxiliary tool, while the substantive results must be produced and validated with a reproducible, verifiable analytical procedure.	It must be indicated according to what criteria the content of the image was verified, for example professional accuracy, freedom from bias, faithfulness to reality, copyright compliance or suitability for the illustrative purpose.
Simulation of professional dialogue	interviewee or role play	ChatGPT, Character.AI, etc.	It must be clearly indicated if the text is not a real interview but a generated example.	It must be precisely described in what manner the full generated content was validated, for example with the literature, instructor verification, examination according to professional criteria or comparison with real situations.



5.3. Brief examples

The following samples illustrate how the use of AI tools may be indicated briefly, clearly and in accordance with the requirement of scientific transparency:

- Source searching: “In the course of literature orientation, in addition to institutional databases, an AI-based literature search or recommendation system was also used, for example Elicit or Research Rabbit, for the identification of further relevant studies; the hits were subsequently filtered manually, verified on the basis of the original sources, and only the verified items were used.”
- Data analysis: “For the preparation of the first version of the figures, the assistance of [name of the AI tool used, for example ChatGPT, Copilot or another system supporting data analysis] was used, for example for code suggestion, diagram sketch or display suggestion. The results, the correctness of the data and the final display of the figures were subsequently finalised on the basis of own verification.
- Translation or proofreading: “For the linguistic correction of the manuscript and/or the first version of its translation, the support of [name of the tool used, for example DeepL, ChatGPT, Copilot] was used. The final text was recorded after human review, terminological check and professional reading.”
- Image generation: “The illustrative image was created with the assistance of [name of the tool used, for example DALL-E, ChatGPT image generation feature or another image generator]. The image serves exclusively an illustrative purpose; the selection of the final version, its professional verification and use took place on the basis of the author’s decision.”

The above brief examples are general samples. If the given work requires more detailed documentation, the detailed samples in Appendix 11.1 shall be applied.



6. Research, publication and professional review environment

6.1. Authorship and contribution

An AI system cannot be indicated as the author or co-author. The natural person author or submitter is in all cases responsible for the content, accuracy, originality, references and lawfulness of the research manuscript, application, report or other professional material.

6.2. Source management and verification

Literature items recommended by AI must be verified on the basis of the original source. The output of AI in itself may not be regarded as a reliable literature source. The original, verified publication must be given as the reference.

6.3. Confidentiality of manuscripts and reviews

A non-public manuscript, expert review, application material or editorial communication may be entered into an external AI system only if this is expressly permitted by the rules of the given procedure and the technical and contractual conditions of confidentiality are demonstrably ensured.

6.4. Reproducibility and verification

If AI played a role in a substantive part of the research method, the code, data cleaning, analysis or visualisation, the use must be documented in a reproducible manner in the methodological description or a separate declaration and must always be fully verified.

7. Violations and possible consequences

A violation of the provisions recorded in this recommendation, as well as in the relevant regulations of the University and the given course, research or procedural requirements, may be considered in particular if a student, instructor, researcher or staff member:

- submits content created by AI as their own independent work;
- conceals the use where its indication is prescribed;
- incorporates fictitious or unverified references into the work;
- applies a prohibited tool or AI in a prohibited work phase;
- processes personal, sensitive or confidential data in a non-permitted system;
- incorporates references recommended by AI into the work without verification;
- uploads a non-public manuscript, review, examination task or institutional document into a non-permitted AI system.



The specific legal consequences are in all cases determined by the Student Requirements Framework, Ethical Regulation, Disciplinary Regulations as well as the Data Processing and Data Protection Regulation of the University of Dunaújváros in force at the time.

The aim, however, is not primarily punishment, but prevention: clear communication, well-structured set of tasks, and transparent expectations noticeably reduce the chance of abuses.

8. Detection tools, training and institutional support

The results of AI detection solutions must be treated with increased caution. These tools may indicate informative patterns, but in themselves do not serve as certain evidence.

Similarity reports and indications of machine writing always require human interpretation. The instructor or assessor must check the textual context, the regular citation, the bibliographic elements and also whether the indication truly shows a problem.

The result of an AI detector or similarity report may not in itself form the basis of an unfavourable decision or sanction. Such an indication may at most justify further human investigation, which must extend to the course requirements, the student documentation, the internal consistency of the text, the verification of sources and, if necessary, oral clarification.

Institutional preparedness does not end with detection. Support for students and staff with training, consultation and sample documents is equally important.

Recommended topics include, for example:

- course design based on learning outcomes;
- conscious application of AI tools in an educational environment;
- redesign of assessment systems in the AI era;
- prompting and verification techniques;
- source criticism, data protection and copyright;
- support for thesis and essay writing with responsible AI use.

In an educational environment, an AI system that serves the recognition or inference of the emotions of students or instructors may not be applied, except if the application is expressly linked to a medical or security purpose.

9. In the case of development of own AI systems

If the University plans, develops, introduces or operates its own developed or customised artificial intelligence system for its own purposes, the requirements of responsible use may not be limited merely to the regulation of the user side. In such cases the institution must pay particular attention to the governance framework, lawful data processing, prior identification of risks, information security, appropriate human



oversight, as well as documentation and control covering the entire lifecycle. Before the introduction of an own AI system, the purpose of the system, the circle of those concerned, the type of data processed, any decision-support or decision-preparation functions, and the extent to which the system may affect students, staff or other persons concerned must in all cases be clearly determined.

9.1. AI governance framework

For every own developed or customised AI system, a clear responsibility and decision-making framework must be established. Within this framework it must be determined who is entitled to initiate and approve the development or introduction of a new system, who is to be regarded as the business owner of the given system, who is responsible for technical operation, and who supervises legal, ethical, data protection and information security compliance.

The governance framework must also cover which body or leader is entitled to take a decision in the event of an extraordinary event, incident, malfunction or complaint. The purpose of the governance framework is to ensure that the spheres of responsibility connected with the operation of the AI system are clearly determined, and that decision-making, control and intervention responsibility is identifiable throughout the entire lifecycle.

9.2. Data processing and GDPR

In the development and operation of an own AI system, the lawfulness of data processing must already be examined at the design stage. In every case the legal basis of data processing, purpose limitation, the principle of data minimisation, the conditions of data transfer, retention periods, as well as the order of deletion and archiving must be clarified. Only data that is truly necessary for the achievement of the given purpose may be processed.

If the system processes personal data, or if, as a result of its operation, an elevated risk is probable for the persons concerned, a data protection impact assessment (DPIA) must be carried out. Particular attention must be paid to whether the use of student data, student performance data, research raw data, employee data or other sensitive information complies with the relevant data protection provisions. Access to the data should be controlled based on roles, in a way that can be logged and checked.

9.3. Risk management

The introduction of own AI systems must in all cases be preceded by a prior risk assessment. Risks should be classified at least into low, medium and high categories according to the effect the system may have on the rights, opportunities, academic or employment situation of the persons concerned, or on the operation of the institution.

Functions that are purely administrative or advisory and do not involve substantive consequences for the persons concerned may be regarded as low risk. Any system that supports professional decision preparation or uses personal data may be of medium risk. High risk may be constituted by any application that influences assessment, selection, ranking, disciplinary, access or other processes with significant effect on the persons concerned. In the case of a higher risk level, stricter approval, testing, documentation and supervision requirements must be applied.

9.4. Information security

Own AI systems must be designed and operated in accordance with the University's information security regulations. This includes the protection of the confidentiality, integrity and availability of data, the regulation of access, logging, rights management, backup and recovery procedures, as well as the establishment of an incident management process.



Particular attention must be paid to what external components, APIs, cloud services or open-source models the system uses. Their application is permissible only if the information security and data protection conditions are appropriately clarified. The operation of the system must be supported by regular vulnerability testing, an update schedule and up-to-date access management.

9.5. Human oversight

An own AI system may not replace human decision-making in matters that affect student rights, assessment, employment law situation, research compliance or other decisions with significant consequences. In such cases the output of AI may at most provide a suggestion, pre-filtering, summary or decision support, but the final decision must always be taken by an authorised natural person.

It must be ensured that the output of the system is reviewable, if necessary overridable, and that an appropriate complaint or appeal possibility is accessible to the persons concerned. Human oversight may be regarded as genuine only if the reviewing person exercises substantive professional control and does not merely formally approve the system's suggestion.

9.6. Transparency and documentation

Documentation must be prepared for every own AI system that enables understanding of the purpose, operation, data sources, limitations and conditions of use of the system. One part of the documentation may be public or accessible to internal users, particularly with regard to information on the purpose of the system, its general operation, its responsible persons and limitations of use.

In addition, non-public, detailed technical and compliance documentation is also necessary, which may extend to model selection, the source of training data, testing results, risk assessment, access rights, incidents, as well as the tracking of updates and modifications. The purpose of transparency is not merely verifiability, but also that users are aware of the limitations of the system and do not attribute unjustified reliability to it.

9.7. Model lifecycle and MLOps controls

The full lifecycle of an own AI system must be managed in a controlled manner from development to decommissioning. This includes version management, separation of development and production environments, testing, validation, continuous monitoring of performance, as well as documented change management. Before the system goes live it must be checked whether it performs the expected functions with appropriate accuracy, without biases and in a manner suited to the purpose.

During operation, model drift must be monitored, that is, whether the input data or output performance deteriorates over time. If necessary, the schedule for retraining, the approval process for model updates, and the possibility of rollback, that is, that in the event of a faulty update the system can be restored to a previous stable version, must be determined. As good practice AI governance and management system standards may be taken into account, particularly the approach represented by ISO/IEC 42001.

9.8. Ethical and HR rules

In the development and use of own AI systems it is advisable to record in a separate internal regulation who, under what conditions and what type of data may be uploaded into the system. This is particularly important if the data contain client data, student data, employee information, research material or source code. It must also be clearly determined in what cases those participating in development or business users may make use of an external AI service, and when they are obliged to work exclusively in an approved institutional environment.

From an ethical point of view it is an expectation that the system does not reinforce unjustified biases, does not result in discriminatory effects, and does not diminish the human dignity, autonomy or right to fair procedure of the persons concerned. Staff must receive appropriate training on how AI outputs must be



verified, what errors and biases may occur, and in what cases the use of the system must be suspended or an expert examination initiated. The internal HR and ethical regulation must therefore also cover the questions of responsible use, verification obligation and reporting channels.

10. Literature used

Ali, O., Murray, P. A., Momin, M., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Malik, T. (2024). *The effects of artificial intelligence applications in educational settings: Challenges and strategies*. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 199, Article 123076. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.123076>

Bjelobaba, S., Waddington, L., Perkins, M., Foltýnek, T., Bhattacharyya, S., & Weber-Wulff, D. (2025). *Maintaining research integrity in the age of GenAI: An analysis of ethical challenges and recommendations to researchers*. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 21, Article 18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-025-00191-w>

COPE. Authorship and AI tools.

University of Dunaújváros. Student Requirements Framework, Chapter 2, Studies and Examination Regulations, 2026.

University of Dunaújváros, Ethical regulation. 2022.

University of Dunaújváros, Data processing and data protection regulation. 2022.

ICMJE. Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly Work in Medical Journals. Sections on AI use.

Lim, W. M., Gunasekara, A., Pallant, J. L., Pallant, J. I., & Pechenkina, E. (2023). *Generative AI and the future of education: Ragnarök or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management educators*. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21(2), Article 100790. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100790>

OECD. OECD AI Principles.

Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence.

UNESCO. Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence.



11. Appendices

The purpose of the appendices is to provide briefly applicable, uniform samples for students, teaching staff, researchers and other staff for the appropriate indication and documentation of the use of artificial intelligence. The samples do not replace the own requirements of the given course, procedure or organisational unit, but assist the establishment of uniform institutional practice.

11.1. Examples of brief descriptions of use

Literature review

Keyword searching was carried out in databases, then an AI-based recommendation system was also used for the identification of related studies. The final selection took place after full manual verification of the identified studies.

Brief example

In the course of literature exploration I used Google Scholar searching and a ChatGPT-based recommendation system for the identification of related studies. The role of the AI tool was limited to the refinement of search terms and the suggestion of further possible sources. Only items that I fully verified on the basis of the original publication were included in the final bibliography.

More detailed example

AI tool used: ChatGPT; date of access: [date]; work phase: literature orientation; type of task: refinement of keywords and searching for relevant studies; use of the output: of the suggested sources only publications found in the original database and content-verified were used; own verification: verification of DOI, authors, journal, volume, page numbers, abstract and full text; own modification: several suggested items were discarded on the basis of relevance.

Linguistic correction

The linguistic refinement of the manuscript was partly assisted by a machine tool, but every statement and wording of the final text underwent author verification.

Brief example

For the linguistic refinement of the manuscript I used the ChatGPT linguistic auxiliary tool. The tool gave spelling, language correctness and stylistic suggestions, but did not modify the content statements, the argumentation and the professional conclusions. The full final text and all its statements underwent author verification.

More detailed example

Tool used: ChatGPT; date of access: [date]; work phase: linguistic check; type of task: request for spelling and stylistic correction suggestions; use of the output: only those suggestions were adopted that did not change the professional content; own verification: comparison of the corrected text with the original version; own modification: finalisation of the terminology and professional wording took place by human decision.

Illustration

The attached image is AI-generated visual material that has been verified and serves exclusively an illustrative purpose.



Brief example

The attached illustration is visual material generated with ChatGPT that serves exclusively an illustrative purpose. The image may not be regarded as empirical data, measurement result or scientific evidence. The final version was verified on the basis of professional accuracy, freedom from bias and suitability for the purpose of use.

More detailed example

Tool used: ChatGPT; date of access: [date]; work phase: preparation of educational illustration; type of task: generation of a visual illustrative figure; use of the output: the completed image was used as presentation auxiliary material; own verification: professional verification of the concepts, objects, proportions and captions appearing in the image; own modification: inaccurate or misleading versions were discarded.

11.2. Available AI applications for different tasks

There are several websites available on the internet that even provide searchable recommendations for AI applications, for example:

<https://www.edtechinsiders.ai/ai-tool-directory>

<https://engaged-learning.com/ai-tools-for-education-directory/>

<https://ditchthattextbook.com/ai-tools/>

<https://aitoolsdirectory.com/education>

<https://ai-hed.eu/resources/ai-tools-list/>

11.3. Appearance in course descriptions

Depending on the nature of the courses and tasks, the use of AI tools may be regulated in different ways. Table 4 contains sample formulations that provide assistance in formulating clear expectations suited to the individual situations.

In the preparation of assignments, the use of generative artificial intelligence is permitted provided that its application takes place in accordance with institutional requirements, with appropriate indication and reference.

Use may be particularly supported in the course of source exploration, data analysis preparation, linguistic correction, proofreading, outline preparation, as well as the creation of visual elements.



Table 4: Recommended formulations for the regulation of AI use in course descriptions

Situation	Recommended formulation
AI used not permitted	The purpose of the task is the measurement of basic competences that can only be assessed by independent work; therefore, an artificial intelligence-based tool may not be used.
AI use permitted with limitations	AI may be used for brainstorming, source searching or linguistic correction, but the adoption of generated content without change is not permitted, and the use must be briefly documented.
AI use explicitly supported	Part of the task is the conscious trying out of AI tools; therefore, the student may use generative systems if they clearly indicate the tool used, the work phase, the mode of verification of the full output and their own contribution.