

USING AI IN YOUR TEACHING

The rule of thumb: AI executes, drafts and advises. It never decides. You are the author of whatever carries your name, so if you could not defend the output as your own work, you have delegated too far.

Faculty use of AI in teaching runs on five levels of delegation, adapted for teaching from Hyatt's (2019) Five Levels of Delegation. EBS operates at levels 1 to 3. At those levels you keep full authority over every pedagogically consequential act: what goes into a lecture, how an assessment is designed, how a student's work is judged.

The three levels you may use

1	AI executes. A task you have fully specified, needing no judgement from the tool: reformatting materials, translating a reading, building a glossary, converting a technical text to a more accessible reading level.
2	AI researches and drafts, you decide. AI gathers, summarises or drafts; you review, edit, accept or reject before anything reaches students. Ten discussion questions from which you pick four; a first-draft case scenario you adapt; slides you revise and enrich.
3	AI analyses and recommends, you decide. AI reasons about patterns and puts a recommendation to you: common misconceptions across past answers, a comparison of two assessment designs. Judging a recommendation means understanding its basis and its limits, so this level asks more of you.

Levels 4 and 5 are not appropriate in any teaching context. At level 4, the system decides and then informs you. At level 5, it decides and acts autonomously, with no reporting at all.

Assessment stays with you

AI must not be used to grade individual assignments, examinations or any summative assessment. It may help you design a rubric, draft a model answer, assist in giving feedback or recommend a grade; but the evaluative act is yours. Where you use it in either of those last two ways, say so in the assessment instructions. A grade or a piece of feedback that AI helped shape is declared on the same terms as any other substantive use, and the student is entitled to know the judgement behind it was yours.

- Assessment is formative as well as summative. It depends on a feedback relationship that responds to one student's particular work, which a model cannot supply.
- Grading models carry the linguistic, cultural and pedagogical biases of their training data. Delegating grading lets those biases set student outcomes.
- A student who receives a grade is entitled to know a qualified person judged the work and stands behind it.

Every assessment falls into one of three AI categories, stated in the syllabus or the assessment instructions. The descriptions below are written for students and can be copied as they stand into a syllabus or an assessment brief.

A	AI prohibited. No AI assistance, apart from approved accessibility adjustments or tools you have been explicitly authorised to use.
B	AI limited. Only the uses your instructor names, such as ideation, spelling, translation or coding support. The core intellectual work must be unassisted.
C	AI permitted. You may use AI for the parts the assessment instructions specify. You must declare it and evaluate its contribution critically.

What counts as AI

This guide covers generative AI: tools that produce text, code, images, data or analysis on request. That includes chatbots and assistants, AI features built into search engines, office software and the learning platform, and translation tools that rewrite as well as translate. It does not include spellcheckers, reference managers, calculators or statistical software. If you are unsure whether a tool counts, declare it and say what it did. Use is substantive where it shaped the content, structure or conclusions of the work, or where removing it would leave the result materially different. Correcting spelling or reformatting a table is not substantive. Drafting a case, restructuring an argument, generating analysis, or producing material that reaches students is. Where the line is unclear, treat the use as substantive and declare it.

Choosing a tool

EBS provides faculty with approved enterprise licences. The current list of approved tools, what each one is licensed for, and how to get access is published at staff intranet. Always log in with your institutional account. Check the list before using a tool for the first time, because licences change and a tool approved last semester may not be approved now.

Choose the least capable tool that does the job and prefer one EBS already licenses over a new sign-up. If your teaching needs something not on the list, raise it with IT rather than working around the list.

EBS must not mandate that you use AI in your teaching. At any stage you may decline a tool on ethical, privacy or environmental grounds without giving a reason.

Data: what may go where

Approved enterprise platforms only	The platform does not do the thinking for you
• Student data and institutional data may be shared with AI only inside an EBS-approved enterprise platform, logged in with your institutional account. This is the same approved list as in Choosing a tool above. If a tool is not on it, ask IT before putting any student or institutional data into it. • Never in a personal account, a free tier, or a tool outside the approved list, whatever its settings appear to promise. • Special-category data, in the sense of Article 9 of the GDPR, needs a data protection impact assessment (GDPR Article 35) and DPO approval first. Contact the EBS data protection officer before you start, not once the work is under way.	• Decide before you paste: which data is safe to share with an AI system, and which is not. Decide the same way before you switch on an AI note-taker or transcription tool in a class or a supervision meeting: the students must know it is running, and the transcript is student data from the moment it exists. • An approved platform is not a reason to put in more than the task needs: data minimisation and retention limits apply inside it as much as outside. The same restraint applies to material you did not write: a licensed case, a textbook chapter or a colleague's unpublished work is not yours to upload unless the licence or the author permits it. • Passwords, API keys and security details go into no AI system, ever.

What you should provide for your students

- State the AI category in every assessment. Stating a category is not optional. Where none has been stated, 'AI permitted' applies by default: the student may use AI provided they note how, and no student may be penalised for relying on that default. The default exists to protect the student, not to stand in for a decision you have not made. A missing category is a defect in the assessment, to be corrected for the current cohort as soon as it comes to light and before the course runs again.
- An approved accommodation overrides the category. A student entitled to assistive technology, such as speech-to-text, reading support or translation tools, may use it in any assessment, including category A. If you are unsure how far the accommodation reaches, ask the office that approved it rather than the student.

- Where you require students to use AI, require only tools that are free to them and usable without creating an account. Never require a named product, a paid subscription, or a sign-up with a personal email address. A course whose subject is AI tools themselves is exempt, provided the requirement is stated in the course description before registration.
- Offer a non-AI route of equal academic validity wherever an assessment expects students to use AI, unless AI use is a stated individual learning outcome of the course. A student may take that route without giving reasons. Where the tool itself is the object of study, no equivalent route can exist, so the same exemption applies.
- Verify AI-generated teaching material yourself before it reaches a class.
- Where AI has materially shaped a course, in its structure, its assessment design or the substance of its materials, add an 'AI-assisted course design' declaration to the course's Canvas home page.
- Add a copyright statement to your course's Canvas home page.

Course materials are protected by copyright and are for your personal educational use only.

Do not upload course materials to public or non-approved AI tools without the instructor's permission. Doing so may expose copyrighted or confidential content to third parties and may breach university policies.

- As a course assessor you maintain the right to use AI detectors and conduct further examinations, including an oral examination, if (1) substantive AI use is suspected and not declared, or if (2) individual learning outcomes have not been achieved due to the use of AI. Tell students so in advance. State on your course's Canvas home page, alongside the 'AI-assisted course design' declaration where you have one, that AI detection may be used in assessment and that an oral examination may follow where learning outcomes appear unmet. A right the students did not know about should not be exercised against them for the first time after the fact.
- Never treat an AI-detector score as the sole or decisive evidence of misconduct. Weigh drafts, version history and oral explanation. Tell the student what prompted the concern and give them a real chance to answer, in person where possible, before you conclude anything.
- Treat an honest slip in declaring AI use as a chance to teach citation, not as immediate misconduct.

You are the demonstration

Students learn what responsible AI use looks like mostly by watching you. Formulating a prompt in front of a class, showing the output, and saying aloud what is useful and what is wrong teaches AI literacy better than any rule. Working within levels 1 to 3 models exactly what the policy asks of them: purposeful use, critical evaluation, transparent acknowledgement, and human authorship of the result.

Your own declaration

Substantive AI use in your own written outputs is declared on the same terms as students': tool and version, dates, purpose, parts affected, how you treated the output. Where AI materially contributes to feedback, student support, admissions or learning analytics, EBS must disclose that to those affected. Grading appears on that list only in the narrow form this guide permits: where AI has assisted in drafting feedback or putting a recommended grade to you, that assistance is disclosed to the student. What is disclosed is the assistance, never a decision, because AI does not determine grades at EBS.

If you did not use AI for the task, you do not need to include a declaration.

AI system(s) used	tool, provider and version
Date or period of use	start and end of the period
Purpose	the specific task
Affected parts	section, chapter, code, image, data or process
Treatment of output	whether you edited, verified or rejected what it produced

Questions and support

The Vice-Rector for Studies holds overall responsibility for this guide, and the Methods Lab maintains it and issues new versions. Your programme director is the first point of contact for applying the levels to a particular course. The data protection officer handles anything involving personal data, and IT answers questions about tools and platforms. The rules that apply to students, on permitted use, declaration and academic integrity, are set out in “Using AI in your studies” guide at Student Intranet. When you tell students what applies to them, cite that document rather than this one. This guide applies alongside the EU Artificial Intelligence Act (Regulation (EU) 2024/1689), the GDPR (Regulation (EU) 2016/679) and EBS’s own study and academic-integrity rules. Where any of those requires more than this guide, it prevails.

Sources

Estonian Business School. (2026). *Using AI in your studies*.

European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2016). *Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation)*. Official Journal of the European Union, L 119, 1–88. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj/eng>

European Parliament and Council of the European Union. (2024). *Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 (Artificial Intelligence Act)*. Official Journal of the European Union, L 2024/1689. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng>

Hyatt, M. (2019). *5 levels of delegation*. Michael Hyatt & Company. <https://fullfocus.co/the-five-levels-of-delegation/>