Joint Instructions No. 1/2026 (10 January 2026)
of the Rector and the President of Dennis Gabor University
on the University Use of Artificial Intelligence

Having regard to section 114/P of Act CCIV of 2011 on National Higher Education, the Rector and the President of Dennis Gabor University hereby issue the following Regulation on the use of artificial intelligence at the University

Section 1
The Purpose of the Regulation

(1) The purpose of this Instructions is to define the framework for the use of artificial intelligence (hereinafter referred to as "AI") for the students, teaching staff and researchers of Dennis Gabor University (hereinafter referred to as the "University"), as well as for employees participating in teaching and research activities.

(2) The purpose of this Instructions is also to establish an institutional system with a supportive and developmental approach that promotes the responsible, ethical and transparent use of AI in education and research, while ensuring the primacy of academic integrity and independent intellectual work.

Section 2
The Scope of the Regulation

(1) The personal scope of this Instructions extends to all students of the University, as well as to all persons and organisational units employed by the University, or engaged under any other legal relationship for the performance of work, who carry out teaching, research, or tasks directly related to these.

(2) The subject-matter scope of this Instructions covers the use of AI technologies – in particular text-generation, translation, data-processing, image-processing and image-generation tools, as well as other AI-based applications – in the course of teaching and research activities.

Section 3
General Principles Governing the Use of AI

(1) The University supports the responsible and ethical use of AI technologies – in particular text-generation, translation, data-processing, image-processing and image-generation tools, as well as other AI-based applications – in education and research.

(2) AI may be used solely as a supplement to, and as an aid for, the student's independent intellectual activity, in such a manner that it supports independent thinking, creative problem-solving and the preservation of academic integrity; however, it may not replace the student's genuine knowledge, competence and performance.

(3) When using AI tools, students are required to preserve the independent nature and academic credibility of their work, and may submit only such academic and research outputs – including, in particular, assignments, essays, examination tasks, dissertations or diploma theses – as reflect their own knowledge and competence.

(4) The use of AI does not exempt the student from completing academic requirements independently and through their own work.

Section 4
Obligation to Disclose the Use of AI

(1) In fulfilling their academic obligations (written work, assignments, portfolios, dissertations, diploma theses, etc.), the student shall clearly disclose if they have used an AI-based tool in producing their work.

(2) The disclosure shall include the following:
(a) the precise name and version of the AI-based tool used (e.g. ChatGPT-5, Copilot, DALL·E 3);
(b) the purpose of use (e.g. drafting an outline, checking writing style, image editing, data analysis);
(c) the extent and manner of use (e.g. collecting suggestions, linguistic refinement, graphical enhancement);
(d) a brief description of the prompt(s) or query(ies) used, and – where the nature of the task justifies it – a summary of the substantive part of the conversation or interaction;
(e) the student's declaration that the submitted work is their own independent intellectual output and that the AI tool was used solely as an aid.

(3) The student shall make the disclosure in writing to the relevant instructor, or, in the case of a dissertation or diploma thesis, to the supervisor, in accordance with Annex 1, at the same time as submitting the work.

Section 5
Oral Assessment

(1) Oral assessments – including examinations, presentations, and dissertation and diploma thesis defences – are of particular importance for identifying any potential misunderstandings, gaps in knowledge or competence deficiencies arising from the use of AI tools.

(2) The instructor is entitled to examine the student orally on the basis of a written essay, assignment or other academic output submitted in writing, in order to satisfy themselves that the student understands, can interpret, and can independently apply the knowledge and conclusions set out in the submitted work.

(3) Where, during an oral assessment, the student cannot credibly demonstrate their own intellectual contribution to the submitted work, the grade may be reduced. If, on the basis of the oral assessment, it may reasonably be presumed that the predominant part of the submitted work is not based on the student's independent intellectual performance, the performance may be graded as Fail.

Section 6
The AI Scale

(1) The table set out in Annex 2 describes in detail the expectations, roles and typical usage characteristics applicable to teaching staff and students at each level. This three-level framework is hereinafter referred to as the AI Scale.

(2) The three levels of the AI Scale – Think, Decide, Understand – offer a gradual approach to using AI tools in teaching and learning processes. The purpose of the Scale is not to restrict the use of tools, but to embed them consciously, responsibly and reflectively into teaching and learning. The levels do not exclude one another; rather, they build upon and complement each other, enabling increasingly deliberate use of AI tools.

Section 7
Principles of the AI Scale

(1) The principles of the AI Scale serve to ensure transparency, progression, awareness and ethical use. The University's aim is for the use of AI tools to support the work of students and teaching staff, while preserving the principles of independent thinking, academic integrity, and personal and professional responsibility.

(2) **Planning:** the selection of an AI tool should always align with learning objectives and the chosen learning format. An important consideration is knowing the tool's functions and using them deliberately – whether as a source of inspiration, a means of feedback, or a content-analysis function.

(3) **Content development:** the aim of AI-supported content development is to create high-quality learning materials that match students' level and needs. A critical approach is essential, in particular with regard to recognising possible bias, erroneous conclusions or unreliable information.

(4) **Organisation of learning:** AI tools offer opportunities to support learning in class and outside the classroom. In organising learning, it is worth leveraging the flexibility and adaptivity offered by AI, including learning formats not bound to a specific place or time.

(5) **Assessment:** in assessment processes, AI may play a role from providing automated feedback to preliminary analysis of student performance. However, maintaining human feedback and professional judgement remains important, and formative assessment should be prioritised as a means of supporting learning.

(6) **Didactic challenges:** the use of AI tools creates new types of challenges, such as difficulties in managing attention or the need to filter AI-generated content. Students should be supported in becoming reflective, independent users who do not merely consume, but understand and critically evaluate, content produced by AI.

Section 8
Guidelines for Teaching Staff

(1) Integrating AI-based tools into pedagogical practice is not only a technological challenge but also a didactic and attitudinal one. The guidelines in paragraphs (2)–(6) are intended to support teaching staff in using AI consciously, purposefully and reflectively across different areas of teaching.

(2) **Continuous professional development:** the rapid evolution of AI applications requires teaching staff to develop their knowledge regularly, both methodologically and digitally. It is recommended to follow relevant literature and national and international good practice, and to participate in internal or external training. It is particularly important to become familiar with tools that have been tested, are pedagogically grounded, and fit the specific course context.

(3) **Reflective use of AI:** AI tools should not be used merely as technological novelties. Their use must always be aligned with learning objectives, content, and pedagogical intent.

(4) **Developing critical thinking:** AI tools can be used not only as sources of information, but also to develop critical thinking and evaluative judgement. Teaching staff have a key role in helping students recognise potential shortcomings, bias and lack of substantiation in AI-generated content. This requires reinforcing the conscious use of reliable sources and developing students' ability to evaluate, compare and contextualise information.

(5) **Role-modelling and shaping attitudes:** through their own habits of AI use, questioning techniques and decisions, teaching staff set an example for students. It is recommended that decisions relating to AI – especially regarding its purpose, scope of application and limitations – are shared openly and transparently. In this way, students learn not only tool use, but also a conscious and ethical approach.

(6) **Collaboration and community learning:** successful implementation of AI pedagogy requires institutional and staff collaboration. It is recommended to establish knowledge-sharing forums and professional workshops among teaching staff, to conduct joint testing and evaluation, and to incorporate experiences and feedback regularly into teaching practice.

Section 9
Guidelines for Students

(1) **Understanding how AI works and mastering effective prompting:** AI-based tools can be used effectively when students understand their basic operating principles, possibilities and limitations. It is recommended to practise question- and instruction-formulation (prompting) consciously – i.e. learning how to frame clear, targeted and context-appropriate prompts so that AI provides relevant, accurate and evaluable outputs.

(2) **Critical thinking and evaluation of AI-generated outputs:** AI-generated content (e.g. texts, suggestions, summaries or analyses) should not automatically be considered a reliable source. Students must be able to critically evaluate, verify and compare such outputs with other sources, and to recognise possible errors, bias or superficial answers. Interaction with AI should be treated not as a substitute, but as a complementary and supportive tool.

(3) **Conscious data handling and ethical responsibility:** responsible handling of data and content is especially important when working with AI. Students must be aware of what types of personal, academic or research data they provide to AI tools, and how such data may be stored, processed or used. Particular attention must be paid to ethical and legal considerations, especially respect for copyright, avoidance of plagiarism, and ensuring that AI use does not become a substitute for the learning process.

(4) **Purposeful tool use in support of learning objectives:** AI tools should be employed to serve learning objectives, for example for outlining, source discovery, refining questions or self-checking. Students should recognise when AI supports deeper understanding and when it risks making learning superficial. Conscious and responsible use contributes to more reflective and active learning processes.

Section 10
Research and Academic Writing

(1) **Literature searches and processing of publications:** AI can rapidly review, organise and thematically summarise large volumes of academic text, highlight key terms and identify gaps in the literature. This may be particularly useful at the initial stage of literature review, when the researcher needs to orient themselves to the main directions and results within a field. However, AI-generated summaries may be superficial and may not always reflect methodological depth, context or argumentative structure. Accordingly, the student's own critical reading and primary processing of sources is indispensable.

(2) **Bibliographic systems and reference management:** many AI-integrated tools can facilitate the organisation of references through automated style formatting (e.g. APA, MLA, Chicago) or by generating bibliographies. Such tools can effectively support tracking

publications, organising citations and using reference-management systems (e.g. Zotero, Mendeley, EndNote). Nevertheless, automatically generated data and references must be verified, as inaccuracies, omissions or fictitious references are common.

(3) **Exploring relationships and research questions:** AI tools can identify thematic clusters, create conceptual maps and uncover links between different studies. They may provide inspiration for formulating new hypotheses, research questions or theoretical frameworks. However, AI-suggested relationships cannot substitute for scholarly rigour, logical coherence and support from the literature. Any identified relationship must be subject to human evaluation and scholarly validation.

(4) **Academic integrity and ethical responsibility:** the use of AI does not exempt students or researchers from compliance with academic ethics. Respect for copyright, adherence to citation rules and avoidance of plagiarism remain fundamental requirements. AI-generated content may be incorporated only where it is clearly indicated as a source and where interpretation, verification and integration form part of the researcher's own work. In academic writing, the fact, nature and extent of AI use must always be stated clearly, including – where relevant – the name of the tool used, the essence of the prompts and the nature of the interaction. AI may not be a co-author of scholarly work and is not considered an author/creator in the copyright sense.

(5) **Conscious tool selection and competence development:** students and early-career researchers are encouraged to familiarise themselves with different types of AI tools – for example, solutions specialised for text analysis, data visualisation, source discovery or text production. Tool selection must always be aligned with the research objective and the stage of research, rather than driven by technological possibilities for their own sake. In parallel, information literacy and data-analysis and text-interpretation skills should be developed deliberately.

Section 11
Institutional Framework and Sustainability

(1) **Establishing a stable technological and organisational framework:** the educational use of AI tools requires reliable digital infrastructure and institutional support. AI use can be sustainable only if the University builds not solely on individual initiatives by teaching staff, but on gradually developed, supported elements that can be operated in the long term. Subject to available financial and organisational conditions, this includes:

(a) ensuring access to secure, legally compliant and data-protection-compliant AI-based tools and applications;

(b) the gradual establishment of records necessary for regular updates, maintenance and user support;

(c) designating the Legal Centre to provide ethical oversight of AI use.

(2) **Developing a sustainable strategy for introducing AI tools:** the integration of AI must be preceded by strategic planning that is comprehensive, phased and cost-effective, taking into account the University's financial, infrastructural and human-resource conditions, aligning with the University's digital and educational strategies and with the expectations of the ESG framework. Within this, particular attention shall be paid to:

(a) the implementation timetable and delivery of pilot programmes;

(b) establishing institutional regulation and guidelines, including ethical and transparency rules;

(c) taking sustainability considerations into account (energy-efficient cloud services, low data-footprint solutions);

(d) identifying and managing risks, particularly preventing error potential and bias in AI systems.

(3) **Supporting teaching communities, mentoring and knowledge sharing:** introducing AI is also a community-development and mindset-shaping task. To that end, subject to its capacities, the University supports:
(a) the regular organisation of knowledge-sharing forums and professional workshops;
(b) mentoring systems in which more experienced teaching staff support colleagues with less experience in the educational application of AI tools;
(c) encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration in areas where AI use is particularly relevant;
(d) involving students in development processes, testing and evaluation of AI tools, and in the development of learning materials.

(4) **Transparency, accountability and monitoring:** a key aim in institutional introduction of AI tools is transparent decision-making, accountability and regular impact assessment. The University endeavours to:
(a) monitor which organisational units, programmes and modules use AI, and for what purposes;
(b) carry out regular evaluations of educational AI use, student satisfaction, and ethical and data-protection compliance;
(c) provide feedback opportunities for teaching staff and students;
(d) periodically review and, where necessary, amend internal regulation on AI.

Section 12
Final Provisions

(1) Module leaders and module coordinators shall, in line with the introduction of the AI Scale, continuously monitor how the AI tools used in teaching serve learning objectives, fit the characteristics of the module, and support the diversity of student communities.

(2) The Vice-Rector for Education shall ensure, through regular review, that familiarisation with AI becomes part of the programme curriculum in a manner appropriate to the objectives of the relevant programme.

(3) The provisions of this Regulation supplement the provisions set out in the University's Student Requirements System, with particular regard to Section 50 thereof on the legal compliance of work carried out by students.

(4) This Regulation shall enter into force on the date of signature.

Budapest, 10 January 2026

Dr Krisztina Zimányi
Rector

Dr Ferenc Dietz
President

DECLARATION ON THE USE OF AI

I, the undersigned [name],
[Neptun code],
[programme, year],
hereby declare that in preparing **[course name / title of assignment]** I used the following AI-based tool(s):

- tool name and version: [e.g. ChatGPT-5, Copilot, DALL·E 3]
- purpose of use: [e.g. drafting an outline, checking writing style, data analysis]
- manner and extent of use: [e.g. collecting suggestions, linguistic refinement, image generation]
- brief description of prompts or interaction used: [if relevant].

I declare that the submitted work is **my own independent intellectual output**; I used the AI tool **solely as an aid**, and the content reflects my own understanding and work.

Date: _____

Student signature:

THE THREE LEVELS OF THE AI SCALE

LEVEL	MEANING	ROLE OF TEACHER	ROLE OF STUDENT	NATURE OF USE
T –Think	Familiarisation with AI tools	Trying out, brainstorming, information gathering	Introduction, experimentation, critical evaluation	Support tool, background information
D – Decide	Conscious, purpose-driven use	Selecting tools aligned with learning objectives	Conscious use within tasks	Planned, reflective integration
U – Understand	Reflective, pedagogically interpreted AI use	Application embedded in methodology	Supporting deep learning processes	Creative, differentiated and ethical use