SKHID (СХІД) (E-ISSN 2411-3093)
2026, Vol.8, Issue 1, 44-52
https://doi.org/10.21847/2411-3093.2026.816

Institutional Strategies for Regulating Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: A Comparative Analysis of Ukrainian Experience

Olga Sarajeva (ORCID 0000-0001-5305-6751)
O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv (Ukraine)

Larysa Kokhan (ORCID 0000-0003-0519-3406)
O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv (Ukraine)

This article examines the process of integrating generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) into Ukraine's educational ecosystem during 2025–2026. Drawing on a comparative analysis of regulatory frameworks and academic integrity codes at leading universities – including Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute, Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University, and O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv, the study identifies four key institutional strategies for AI regulation: from strict control and ethical barriers to practical utility and full academic freedom.

The analysis reveals a sociological phenomenon of "dual reality," characterised by a gap between the latent mass use of technology by over 80% of students and the official discourse of higher education institutions, where only 26% of respondents are willing to openly declare their use of AI. At the same time, the study presents the GAIDeT methodological model (Generative AI, Author, Input, Declaration, Ethics, Transparency) as a validated instrument for ensuring academic integrity and legitimising the use of AI in the research process.

The study establishes that shifting from a paradigm of "strict oversight" to a model of transparent partnership ensures the sustainable development of Ukrainian higher education in the context of global digital competition and the renewal of the educational environment. The research concludes that this approach becomes a catalyst for transforming the role of the teacher – from a transmitter of knowledge to a moderator of intellectual inquiry, while preserving the uniqueness and inviolability of human creative agency.

KEYWORDS
generative artificial intelligence, academic integrity, GAIDeT model, Ukrainian higher education, digital inequality, Human-in-the-loop, regulatory framework, human-centred approach, authorial agency, ethics of artificial intelligence.

Introduction

As of 2026, generative artificial intelligence has definitively transformed the classical structure of the educational process in Ukrainian universities, rendering traditional teaching methods obsolete. What in 2023 was considered a futuristic experiment or a threat to academic integrity has today become a foundational tool without which modern higher education cannot function. We are witnessing the emergence of a digital "assistant" – an external neural network that significantly expands human capabilities: from memory capacity to the speed of analysis and the creation of complex projects. Contemporary academic activity is virtually impossible without the use of large language models (LLMs), signalling a shift from simple information retrieval to a model of digital knowledge construction (*Kasneci E. et al., 2023*). In this new reality, the student's primary skill is no longer the ability to reproduce what has been learned, but the capacity to verify and critically evaluate outputs generated by intelligent systems.

The conflict within higher education intensified after 2025 with the emergence of autonomous AI agents capable of independently planning and executing sequential tasks. While technologies evolve at an extraordinary pace, university regulations often remain static. Sociological data capture the phenomenon of "dual reality": over 80% of students regularly use AI for their studies, yet only 26% are willing to acknowledge this openly, driven by fear of punishment and the prevailing stigmatisation of digital tools (*Paniotto, 2025*). This state of regulatory ambiguity impedes honest dialogue and creates conditions for educational degradation. In the context of war and the imperative of national recovery, restricting students' access to modern AI tools renders them uncompetitive in the global labour market.

Review of Recent Research and Context. Questions of digital literacy and ethics are actively discussed within the European Higher Education Area (*European Commission, 2022*). While leading European institutions are developing frameworks for the open use of technologies, Ukrainian universities have become arenas for their own regulatory experiments. An analysis of the policies of various higher education institutions reveals a diversity of approaches:

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv is introducing an "AI-Safe" certification system to preserve classical scientific standards and rigorous digital hygiene.

The National Defence University of Ukraine focuses on data security and the protection of strategic information from leakage through public cloud services.

saraeva.ov84@gmail.com
lara.kokhan@gmail.com

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University functions as an innovation hub, where proficiency in working with AI is considered part of the professional culture of a modern specialist in a major city.

O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv implements a strategy of practical and safe technology use. For future engineers and architects, AI serves as a vital assistant in handling large datasets, however, the university enforces a mandatory manual verification rule for all outputs (the Verification Wall), given that the cost of errors in engineering calculations is critically high.

Despite these efforts, Ukraine still lacks a unified standard of "digital integrity," which heightens the risks of losing independent thinking skills and deepens the digital divide among students.

An analysis of the academic literature indicates a transition from discussions of artificial intelligence's technical potential to its systemic institutionalisation in education. Palamar S. and Naumenko M. were among the first in Ukrainian academic discourse to propose a systematic approach to the ethical legitimisation of GenAI, emphasising that the technology should serve as a tool of support rather than a replacement for human intellect (*Palamar, Naumenko, 2024*). A significant contribution to the theoretical understanding of the role of algorithmic systems during their active implementation was made by O. Kabatska, O. Shamshyk, and N. Podkovyroff, who conducted a systematic review of AI's instrumental potential, treating it as a factor driving the fundamental modernisation of didactic methods (*Kabatska et al., 2023*). The role of AI as a fundamental instrument of "future learning" within the framework of mobile education was substantiated by O. Vlasiuk, O. Stepanenko, and N. Prykhodkina (*Vlasiuk et al., 2023*). The authors regard AI not merely as a technological supplement, but as a key factor in designing "future learning," which aligns with the contemporary vision of AI as a foundational cognitive toolkit.

An important milestone in synthesising domestic experience was the International Conference "Artificial Intelligence: Sustainable Development of Education, Science, and Industry" (*Shtuchnyi intelekt: stalyi rozvytok osvity..., 2025*). The conference proceedings allow for the identification of three research directions:

Legal: analysis of global regulatory models and the introduction of *sui generis* rights for AI-generated objects (N. Prykhodkina);

Ethical-social: risks of the dehumanisation of education and the necessity of preserving critical thinking (B. Boltianskyi, O. Boltianskyi, V. Butakov, S. Palamar);

Strategic-didactic: transformation of educational goals, adaptability, and the personalisation of learning trajectories (N. Boreiko, L. Azarenkova, O. Zhyhlo, I. Biletskyi).

Despite considerable attention to theoretical aspects, the actual strategies of leading Ukrainian universities remain understudied. This research proposes classifying the approaches of academic institutions along four vectors: ethical, practical, security-oriented, and liberal, enabling a shift from general descriptions to an analysis of specific governance models in contemporary higher education.

Research methods

The methodological foundation of the study is an interdisciplinary approach that combines methods from pedagogy, law, and systems analysis for a comprehensive examination of strategies for regulating generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in the university environment. To achieve the research objectives, a set of scholarly methods was employed, including content analysis, comparative analysis, and typological classification.

The primary instrument of the empirical stage was content analysis, applied to regulatory frameworks, academic integrity codes, and internal regulations of Ukrainian higher education institutions (HEIs) concerning the use of AI. This method enabled the identification of key control mechanisms and restrictions implemented in universities, such as mandatory disclosure of AI use and the prohibition of substituting authorial thinking with algorithms.

To ensure representativeness, the study included institutions of classical, technical, humanities, pedagogical, and specialised (security-oriented) profiles. **Table 1** details the specific documents subjected to content analysis for each institution.

Table 1. – Ukrainian HEIs and Regulatory Documents on AI Use

Full name of the higher education institution	Subject of the content analysis (title of the document or regulatory framework)
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv	"Regulation on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Educational Programmes" https://senate.knu.ua/?p=3466
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University	"Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence" https://kubg.edu.ua/images/stories/Departaments/vdd/documenty_grinchenko_university/rozdil_7/Polityka_AI.pdf
O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv	"Policy on the Use of AI and AI Technologies" https://khges.kname.edu.ua/index.php/khges/uk/ai/index
National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy	"Policy on the Responsible Use of Generative AI Applications" https://www.ukma.edu.ua/index.php/about-us/sogodennya/vakansii/doc_download/4259-polityka-vidpovidalnoho-vykorystannia-zastosunkiv-heneratyv-noho-shtuchnoho-intelektu-v-naukma
Ivan Cherniakhovskyi National Defense University of Ukraine	"Regulation on the Use of Artificial Intelligence" https://nuou.org.ua/assets/documents/polozhennia-ai-25.pdf
National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute"	"Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence for Academic Activities" https://osvita.kpi.ua/node/1225
Oles Honchar Dnipro National University	"Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence" https://www.dnu.dp.ua/docs/osvitnya/N106_14_04_25_Polityka_Shtuchnyi_intelekt.pdf

V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University	"Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence" https://surl.li/ntvrck
H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University	"Regulation on the Use of Generative AI Tools in the Educational and Research Process" http://hnpu.edu.ua/sites/default/files/files/Normat_dokum/Pol/Pol_vykorystannia_shi.pdf
Lviv Polytechnic National University	"Declaration on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Scientific Publications" https://science.lpnu.ua/uk/sisn/polityka-vykorystannya-shi

Following the content analysis, the comparative analysis method was applied to compare data across different HEIs. On this basis, the typological classification method enabled the categorisation of strategies at leading universities into four principal directions:

1. Humanistic barrier, grounded in the priority of the human factor.
2. Technological pragmatism, based on instrumental expediency.
3. Security imperative, entailing strict risk regulation.
4. Academic liberalism, founded on professional trust and community self-regulation.

The study's source base included UNESCO (*2023*) guidelines, according to which the fundamental vectors for integrating generative AI into education are: preserving a human-centred approach (preventing the usurpation of human intellect by algorithms) and establishing a reliable regulatory framework to protect privacy and intellectual property. The document also emphasises the need for mandatory ethical-pedagogical validation of AI tools by educational institutions themselves, targeted enhancement of teachers' digital competencies, and systemic counteraction against deepening digital inequality among students. A significant milestone in the national institutionalisation of technologies was the "Recommendations on the Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education Institutions" (*Ministry of Digital Transformation of Ukraine, 2024*), which consolidate the rejection of ineffective policies of blanket prohibition on generative AI. The document directs universities toward transforming assessment systems in favour of practical case studies with personal defence, legitimising digital tools through prompt engineering instruction, and ensuring academic integrity whereby AI functions exclusively as a transparent assistant rather than a substitute for the student's independent authorial work. A separate group of sources comprises local regulatory acts from a representative sample of Ukrainian higher education institutions, including academic integrity regulations, specialised AI use policies, ethical codes, and internal guidelines from universities of various profiles – classical, technical, pedagogical, and specialised security-oriented. Analysis of this body of material made it possible to reveal the practical dimension of generative model regulation and to identify current institutional strategies.

Research Objective is to conduct a content analysis of local regulatory documents of Ukrainian higher education institutions concerning the ethical and practical regulation of artificial intelligence use, and, on the basis of the findings, to substantiate the rationale for introducing the GAIDeT methodological model (Generative AI, Author, Input, Declaration, Ethics, Transparency) as an instrument for legitimising AI and ensuring academic integrity through a clear delineation of the roles of human and machine.

Results and Discussion

Socio-Cultural Factors and the Diversity of Regulatory Approaches

An analysis of how Ukrainian universities implemented AI regulations in 2025–2026 reveals significant decentralisation. Thanks to the autonomy system, each institution was able to respond independently to the emergence of new technologies. Simultaneously, a gap arose between the pace of technological development and the updating of regulatory frameworks. Under these conditions, higher education institutions are compelled to act proactively, independently forming local norms and ethical codes for AI use.

Most leading institutions have already adopted the principle of mandatory disclosure, according to which students must honestly indicate how they used AI. However, the approaches to implementing this principle differ considerably depending on the profile and traditions of the university:

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv has chosen the classical path. The primary emphasis here is placed on rigorous "digital hygiene" and the preservation of traditional scientific quality. Artificial intelligence is treated solely as a technical tool for correcting errors or processing statistics, while the creation of meaning and conclusions remains the exclusive prerogative of the human author. A significant step was the introduction of AI-Safe labelling for academic disciplines – a system that designates courses in which the use of algorithms is restricted, in order to foster student independence and preserve the originality of scholarly outputs (*Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, n.d*).

The National Defence University of Ukraine places security first. The integration of AI here is viewed through the lens of data protection in wartime. To prevent information leakage, the institution prioritises closed local systems. Additionally, training in identifying algorithmic errors and disinformation has become an essential component of education, a critical skill for the modern military officer (*Ivan Cherniakhovskyi National Defense University of Ukraine [NUOU], 2025*).

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University functions as an innovation hub for the metropolis. Here, proficiency in working with AI is regarded as a mandatory element of professional culture (Professional AI Literacy) (*Palamar, Naumenko, 2024*). Students apply algorithms to analyse large datasets and develop innovative projects in the humanities. The university's central principle is that technologies should enhance the analytical capabilities of the individual, not replace them (*NUOU*, 2025).

O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv adheres to the principle of responsible technology use. AI is integrated into the training of future engineers as a means for data analysis, however, any output must undergo manual verification. This approach prevents critical errors in projects and ensures that the human remains the primary decision-making subject, rather than a mere user of algorithms (*O. M. Beketov National University*

of Urban Economy in Kharkiv [O. M. Beketov NUUE], 2025).

The Kyiv-Mohyla Academy model is grounded in protecting its own scholarly space from the undue influence of global technological standards. The primary emphasis here shifts from administrative regulation to a culture of trust, with responsibility for the use of innovations resting on the researcher themselves and their obligations to the scholarly community (*National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy [NaUKMA], n.d.*).

Thus, the regulation of AI in Ukrainian universities today is multifaceted. Each institution independently determines the boundary between embracing innovation and upholding the ethical standards of education.

To analyse the situation, a monitoring of academic integrity policies was conducted across a sample of universities encompassing classical, technical, humanities, and specialised security-oriented profiles

Table 2. – Comparative Analysis of Regulatory Policies on Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education Institutions of Ukraine

Higher Education Institution	Strategic Approach	Control Mechanism	Key Restrictions
Classical and Humanities			
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University	Humanistic and innovation-oriented	Disclosure and ethical self-regulation	Prohibition of delegating critical thinking to AI
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv	Flexible, integrative	Mandatory disclosure	Prohibition of substituting original (authorial) thinking
Lviv Polytechnic National University	Liberal	Mandatory disclosure	Prohibition of authorship imitation
Oles Honchar Dnipro National University	Cautious, humanistic	Mandatory disclosure	Prohibition of replacing human intelligence
V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University	Restrained, regulated	Mandatory disclosure	Instructor's right to impose a complete ban
National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy	Liberal, research-oriented	Disclosure in the form of source citation	Prohibition of presenting AI-generated content as one's own
H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University	Pedagogically balanced	Mandatory disclosure	Possibility of lecturer-imposed restrictions
Technical			
National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute"	Pragmatic, technically oriented	Full disclosure in written assignments	Unacceptability of any decline in the quality of work
O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv	Cautious, instrumental	Mandatory disclosure	AI must not generate the core content
Security-Oriented			
Ivan Cherniakhovskyi National Defense University of Ukraine	Strict, security-oriented	Mandatory disclosure	Prohibition in thesis works; data protection requirements

Based on an analysis of regulatory documents and ethical codes of Ukrainian universities, four fundamental strategies for the governance of artificial intelligence (AI) have been identified. These approaches reflect a broad spectrum of perspectives on the role of technology in the educational process – from strict regulatory control to full academic autonomy.

1. The strategy of the humanistic barrier is grounded in the idea of the irreplaceability of human experience in the process of cognition and the priority of protecting creative agency. Education is viewed as an act of personal formation that cannot be delegated to algorithms without losing its essential meaning. AI is perceived exclusively as an auxiliary service tool, while legal and academic authorship remains an inalienable human right. Any theses generated by neural networks are considered "raw material" that requires mandatory reinterpretation by the author. This strategy emphasises the development of skills that are difficult to replicate digitally, such as empathy, deep contextual understanding, and creative intuition.

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv and Oles Honchar Dnipro National University implement mechanisms of strict "digital hygiene," where the creation of meaning and conclusions remains the exclusive prerogative of the human author.

H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University applies a pedagogically balanced approach, in which the use of AI is limited by criteria of pedagogical appropriateness.

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University pursues a humanistic-innovative pathway through the concept of "Professional AI Literacy." Technologies are intended to enhance the analytical capacities of specialists without replacing their ethical self-regulation.

2. The strategy of technological efficiency and pragmatism is prioritised by technical and engineering universities, where the primary quality criteria are performance and the speed of executing complex computations. The ability to work with AI systems is directly integrated into curricula as a mandatory professional competence. This strategy establishes the norm of full student responsibility for the final outcome: algorithmic errors are not considered a valid justification, and the uncritical use of erroneous data is regarded as a sign of incompetence.

The National Technical University of Ukraine "Ihor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute," the National Aerospace University "Kharkiv Aviation Institute," and Lviv Polytechnic National University orient students toward the use of language models for code optimisation and the simulation of physical processes, in line with contemporary industry requirements.

O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv complements pragmatism with cautious instrumentalism. Given the high cost of technological error in engineering practice, a system of mandatory manual verification ("Verification Wall") has been introduced, where any generated result must undergo thorough validation against primary sources.

3. The strategy of the security imperative is the most highly regulated and is characteristic of specialised educational institutions. It emerged as a response to threats of intellectual property leakage, breaches of confidential state information, and violations of privacy. Universities prioritise their own technical infrastructure and closed local systems for working with algorithms.

The National Defense University of Ukraine focuses on the protection of strategic data in wartime conditions. A strict prohibition on the use of public cloud services for processing sensitive information has been implemented, and training in the identification of disinformation constitutes an essential component of the curriculum.

The strategy of academic trust and liberalism is grounded in the idea of decentralisation and respect for the professional autonomy of lecturers and the ethical maturity of students. Universities reject uniform administrative prohibitions in favor of internal academic integrity. The educational process is viewed as a collaborative search for truth, where the use of AI is acceptable provided there is transparent disclosure and critical evaluation of results by the student.

The Ukrainian Catholic University and the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy are based on a culture of trust, in which each lecturer independently determines the boundaries for integrating algorithms into course structures.

V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University implements a liberal approach in which the key requirement is mandatory disclosure of AI usage methods and the prevention of authorship imitation.

Implementation of the Model of Responsible AI Use

The experience of leading Ukrainian universities, in particular Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University and O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv, has made it possible to formulate a model of responsible technology use. This approach is considered the most effective for the training of teachers, engineers, and managers.

At the core of the model lies a three-tier filtering system known as the "traffic light model." It enables the transformation of AI usage from an uncontrolled process into a clearly managed educational technology. This system includes the classification of tasks according to the level of permissible algorithmic intervention:

Red zone: complete prohibition of AI use for assessing foundational knowledge and critical skills.

Yellow zone: limited use of AI as an assistant for structuring information or generating ideas.

Green zone: full integration of technologies for performing complex calculations or project modeling.

This adaptive governance mechanism helps maintain the quality of education while simultaneously preparing specialists for real market demands, where the ability to work with new tools is essential.

Limitations and Areas of Personal Responsibility

The boundaries have been defined within which the involvement of algorithms poses a threat to the quality of education and professional ethics. The domains in which the use of AI is deemed unacceptable include:

Formulation of original conclusions: research outcomes must be the result of the author's own analysis and personal reflection.

Value-based and ethical analysis: the provision of moral evaluations of events, pedagogical situations, or managerial processes. Since AI lacks empathy, its outputs in such matters constitute mere simulation and cannot substitute for the position of a qualified professional.

Strategic decision-making: the development of final plans and educational strategies. This activity remains a domain of personal responsibility that cannot be delegated to a programme.

Such limitations help preserve the conditions for independent thinking, where responsibility for results and the consequences of decisions is always borne by the individual.

Verification Protocols and Rigorous Data Validation

This level of interaction with artificial intelligence presupposes strict control over output data. Any information (numbers, quotations, references to normative acts) generated by an algorithm is treated as requiring mandatory manual verification.

Students are required to provide evidence of verification for each fact through references to authentic primary sources, including archives, library registries, official statistics, or scholarly publications. In the case of O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv, the identification of fabricated references or non-existent statistical data in a final paper is equated with deliberate falsification of academic research. Given that in engineering and life-support sectors the cost of error is critically high, such strict control constitutes an indispensable norm.

This approach fosters a culture of professional responsibility. The student becomes not a passive consumer of

content, but a rigorous editor and critic of algorithmic systems. The requirement of mandatory disclosure of AI usage methods places Ukrainian universities on par with leading European institutions, legitimising AI as a tool while simultaneously preventing academic misconduct.

The GAIDeT Methodological Model as an Algorithm of Legitimisation and Transparency

To address ambiguity in the use of technologies, the implementation of the GAIDeT protocol (Generative AI Disclosure Tool) is proposed (*Shtuchnyi intelekt…, 2025: 146–149*). This instrument serves as a methodological foundation for integrating generative models into the structure of academic research as a standard and justified component. Its application ensures adherence to high educational standards, as it enables the evaluation not only of the final text but also of the student's actual participation in the research process.

The model is based on six principles that ensure the ethical integrity and transparency of the workflow:

G – Generative AI (Tool Selection). The student specifies the name and version of the model used, for example, Claude 3.5 or GPT-4o. This is necessary for research accuracy, as different systems possess distinct characteristics and limitations. Such an approach aligns with contemporary transparency requirements and constitutes a foundation of academic integrity.

I – Input (Prompts). Complex and significant prompts are appended to the work as separate annexes. A well-constructed prompt is regarded as a product of intellectual effort, demonstrating the student's capacity for systematic thinking. This allows the instructor to assess the author's ability to independently structure knowledge rather than merely retrieve ready-made information.

A – Author (Personal Responsibility). The student signs a declaration confirming that they have personally verified and edited the generated content. Errors produced by the system cannot serve as justification for inaccuracies or fabricated references. The author bears full responsibility for every statement in the work, regardless of how it was produced.

D – Declaration (Scope of Intervention). The student specifies not only the fact of using the technology but also its precise functional role, such as text structuring or source translation. This helps clearly distinguish between technical assistance and the researcher's intellectual contribution. Such differentiation is essential for the fair assessment of the student's individual work.

E – Ethics (Ethics and Bias Verification). A mandatory stage involves the critical analysis of outputs for potential stereotypes or distortions, which are often present in global datasets. This component also entails adherence to digital hygiene, prohibiting the upload of personal or confidential data to cloud services, which is critically important for security.

T – Transparency (Levels of Interaction). The system includes five levels of technological engagement, ranging from minimal correction at the first level to the collaborative development of complex hypotheses at the fourth level. The fifth level of deep interaction is permitted only in exceptional experimental projects. This scale enables institutions such as Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University and O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv to flexibly calibrate requirements across different disciplines.

Fundamental Ethical Dilemmas and Future Challenges

Despite the active development of regulatory mechanisms, the academic community in Ukraine faces a number of "grey areas" that will remain subjects of debate and shape the educational discourse up to 2030.

Risks of Intellectual Dependency

There is a tangible risk that students may lose the capacity for critical thinking due to the constant assistance of algorithms. Traditionally, writing is regarded not only as a means of transmitting information but also as a process through which thought itself is formed. If the task of composing texts is consistently delegated to artificial intelligence, this may lead to the gradual erosion of skills in logical argumentation and in-depth analysis.

The principal danger lies in the emergence of a generation of professionals who are capable only of formulating tasks for machines but are unable to independently produce complex, logically coherent texts. This poses the threat of complete intellectual dependence on technology, whereby an individual becomes incapable of performing cognitive work without digital assistance.

The Problem of Digital Inequality and Access to Technology

Within Ukrainian universities, a divide is evident among students due to unequal access to technological resources. Students who can afford premium subscriptions to advanced models gain a significant advantage over those relying on free versions. This creates an inequitable situation in which learning outcomes are directly dependent on an individual's financial capacity. Universities should consider paid AI tools as part of the modern library infrastructure and ensure equitable access for all categories of students.

To address this inequality, a range of systemic measures at both the national and institutional levels is proposed:

State programmes may provide subsidies for access to premium services for students from vulnerable groups, including internally displaced persons and low-income families.

The Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine may initiate negotiations with global technology companies to establish a preferential national academic licensing framework.

Universities may establish specialised laboratories or centres within libraries, where students would have free access to advanced models through corporate accounts.

Cooperation with IT companies within the framework of corporate social responsibility programmes would enable the engagement of the business sector in funding access to cutting-edge educational tools.

Such measures would help transform artificial intelligence into an instrument of inclusion and ensure equal starting opportunities for every researcher, regardless of their economic background.

Issues of Trust and Risks Associated with AI Detection Tools

The use of artificial intelligence detection software often creates an atmosphere of suspicion within universities due to the high likelihood of erroneous results. Algorithms frequently classify high-quality, well-structured work as machine-generated, which demotivates talented students. This leads to the emergence of defensive writing, whereby authors deliberately simplify their style or introduce inaccuracies in order to pass technical checks. Such a situation

suppresses creative boldness and undermines trust between lecturer and student.

Technical inaccuracies in detection tools compel students to question their own abilities, as the programme's assessment may be perceived as more authoritative than the author's own account. Persistent false accusations devalue students' efforts and create an environment of psychological pressure. To address this issue, universities are advised to implement ethical guidelines for responding to detector signals:

The results produced by detection software should be regarded solely as an auxiliary indicator for the lecturer, rather than definitive evidence of misconduct.

In cases of suspicion, the lecturer should conduct a confidential meeting during which the student explains the logic of their work and provides a record of prompts in accordance with the GAIDeT protocol.

Text evaluation should be conducted in comparison with the author's previous work, as a sudden stylistic shift constitutes a more reliable basis for analysis than algorithmic judgement.

Students should have the right to an oral defence of their work without grade reduction, provided they can substantiate each claim presented in their text.

Any doubt regarding detector results should be interpreted in favour of the student in order to preserve academic integrity and mutual respect.

Issues of Copyright and Responsibility for Outcomes

In contemporary conditions, the classical understanding of authorship is undergoing transformation due to the active involvement of artificial intelligence in academic work. This raises the question of ownership of intellectual output when a significant portion of ideas has been proposed or refined by an algorithm. As of 2026, Ukrainian legislation continues to seek a balance between protecting human authorship and recognising the role of new technologies. The absence of clear regulations in this domain may hinder the international recognition of Ukrainian degrees and academic research.

The Law of Ukraine "On Copyright and Related Rights" (*Pro avtorske pravo i sumizhni prava, 2022*) establishes a specific legal status for outputs generated by software without direct human authorship. Such outputs are not regarded as works in the traditional sense; however, the right to the result is granted to the individual who lawfully uses the software to generate the content. This effectively permits the legitimate use of AI-generated outputs within academic and educational environments.

The issue of responsibility remains one of the most vulnerable aspects of this process. If a system reproduces fragments of other authors' works during text generation, liability for copyright infringement rests with the user rather than the developer of the algorithm. The researcher is obliged to act as the guarantor of the legality of the resulting work. This further underscore the necessity of implementing strict verification procedures and mandatory disclosure of technology use in every academic submission.

Conclusions

The conducted analysis substantiates the necessity for Ukrainian higher education to transition from an ineffective model of prohibition towards a strategy of transparent intellectual partnership with artificial intelligence.

The integration of artificial intelligence into Ukrainian higher education is not merely a technical upgrade but a fundamental shift in worldview that requires a comprehensive restructuring of educational strategies. The experience of recent years demonstrates that attempts at total prohibition or reliance solely on administrative sanctions are strategically ineffective. As text-generation algorithms develop significantly faster than detection methods, the only viable path is the full integration of artificial intelligence into the educational process as a legitimate instrument of academic research.

A crucial condition for such integration is the implementation of transparent disclosure protocols, particularly the GAIDeT model. This represents the only means of preserving the societal value of academic qualifications and restoring trust within the university environment. In the contemporary world, transparency regarding the tools employed becomes more significant than the mere fact of their use. This approach enables lecturers to assess not only the final outcome but also the student's actual effort and their capacity for critical engagement with generated information.

At the same time, higher education institutions must adopt flexible regulations that take into account disciplinary specificity. The model of technology usage for a philologist, where text itself is the object of analysis, must differ from that for an engineer, where text functions merely as a medium for calculations. The practice of technical universities, including O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv and Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute, confirms the necessity of rigorous data verification due to the high cost of technological risks in these fields.

Such transformation fundamentally alters the role of the lecturer, who ceases to function solely as a source of information. Their new mission lies in mentorship and the critical analysis of algorithmically generated data. The primary task of the contemporary educator is to cultivate the student's ability to think in conjunction with technology while preserving independence of judgement.

The future of higher education in Ukraine depends on our capacity to transform artificial intelligence from a threat to academic integrity into a powerful catalyst for development. At the same time, it remains essential to preserve the uniqueness of human creative agency, which must confidently guide technological advancement and determine the directions of its application.

REFERENCES

Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University (n.d.). Polityka vykorystannia shtuchnoho intelektu. Retrieved from https://kubg.edu.ua/images/stories/Departaments/vdd/documenty_grinchenko_university/rozdil_7/Polityka_AI.pdf (In Ukrainian).

Chowdhury, A., Chowdhury, A., Hoque, N., Moriwam, & Jahan, M. (2025). A deep learning approach for multiclass classification of air quality from image data. *Computer Science and Engineering Research*, 2(1), 19-31. https://doi.org/10.69517/cser.2025.02.01.0004

European Commission (2022). Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture. Ethical guidelines on the use of artificial intelligence (AI) and data in teaching and learning for educators. Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved from https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2766/153756

H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University (n.d.). Polozhennia pro vykorystannia instrumentiv heneratyvnoho shtuchnoho intelektu v osvitno-naukovomu protsesi. Retrieved from http://hnpu.edu.ua/-sites/default/files/files/Normat_dokum/Pol/Pol_vykorystannia_shi.pdf (In Ukrainian).

Ivan Cherniakhovskyi National Defense University of Ukraine (2025). Polozhennia pro vykorystannia shtuchnoho intelektu. Retrieved from https://nuou.org.ua/assets/documents/polozhennia-ai-25.pdf (In Ukrainian).

Kabatska, O. V., Shamshyk, O. P., & Podkovyroff, N. T. S. (2023). Vykorystannia tekhnolohii shtuchnoho intelektu v protsesi navchannia i vykladannia u vyshchii osviti. Visnyk nauky ta osvity, 11(17), 719-735 https://doi.org/10.52058/2786-6165-2023-11(17)-719-735 (In Ukrainian).

Kasneci, E. et al. (2023). ChatGPT for good? On opportunities and challenges of large language models for education. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 103, 102274. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2023.102274

Lviv Polytechnic National University (n.d.). Deklaratsiia shchodo vykorystannia shtuchnoho intelektu v naukovykh publikatsiiakh. Retrieved from https://science.lpnu.ua/uk/sisn/polityka-vykorystannya-shi (In Ukrainian).

Ministry of Digital Transformation of Ukraine (2024). Rekomendatsii shchodo vidpovidalnoho vykorystannia shtuchnoho intelektu v zakladakh vyshchoi osvity. Retrieved from https://storage.thedigital.gov.ua/files/5/b5/1de422b38985d037d9ba8f9f6cb2ab58.pdf (In Ukrainian).

National Technical University of Ukraine “Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute” (n.d.). Polityka vykorystannia shtuchnoho intelektu dlia akademichnoi diialnosti. Retrieved from https://osvita.kpi.ua/node/1225 (In Ukrainian).

National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (n.d.). Polityka vidpovidalnoho vykorystannia zastosunkiv heneratyvnoho shtuchnoho intelektu. Retrieved from https://www.ukma.edu.ua/index.php/about-us/sogodennya/vakansii/doc_ download/4259-polityka-vidpovidalnoho-vykorystannia-zastosunkiv-heneratyvnoho-shtuchnoho-intelektu-v-naukma (In Ukrainian).

O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv. (n.d.). Polityka vykorystannia ShI ta tekhnolohii ShI. Retrieved from https://khges.kname.edu.ua/index.php/khges/uk/ai/index (In Ukrainian).

Oles’ Honchar Dnipro National University (2025). Polityka vykorystannia shtuchnoho intelektu. Retrieved from https://www.dnu.dp.ua/docs/osvitnya/N106_14_04_25_Polityka_Shtuchnyi_intelekt.pdf (In Ukrainian).

Palamar, S., & Naumenko, M. (2024). Shtuchnyi intelekt v osviti: vykorystannia bez porushennia pryntsypiv akademichnoi chesnosti. *Osvitolohichnyi dyskurs*, 1(44). https://doi.org/10.28925/2312-5829.2024.15 (In Ukrainian).

Paniotto, V. (2025). Use of artificial intelligence by the population of Ukraine *Kyiv International Institute of Sociology*. Retrieved from https://kiis.com.ua/?lang=eng&cat=reports&id=1528&page=1 .

Pro avtorske pravo i sumizhni prava [On copyright and related rights], Pub. L. No. 2811-IX (2022). https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/2811-20 (In Ukrainian).

Shtuchnyi intelekt: stalyi rozvytok osvity, nauky, industrii [Artificial intelligence: Sustainable development of education, science, industry] (2025). Proceedings of the International Scientific and Practical Conference (Kharkiv, December 11–12, 2025). O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv. (In Ukrainian).

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. (n.d.). Polozhennia pro vykorystannia shtuchnoho intelektu pry realizatsii osvitnikh prohram. Retrieved from https://senate.knu.ua/?p=3466 (In Ukrainian).

UNESCO. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. Retrieved from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000386693

V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University (2026). Polityka shchodo vykorystannia shtuchnoho intelektu. Retrieved from http://rada.karazin.ua/public/uploads/2026/01/6.pdf (In Ukrainian).

Vlasiuk, O. P., Stepanenko, O. K., & Prykhodkina, N. O. (2023). Impact of artificial intelligence and information technologies on mobile education and learning of the future. *Academic Visions*, (26). Retrieved from https://www.academy-vision.org/index.php/av/article/view/789 (In Ukrainian).

Інституційні стратегії регулювання штучного інтелекту у вищій освіті: порівняльний аналіз українського досвіду

Ольга Сараєва (ORCID 0000-0001-5305-6751)
Харківський національний університет міського господарства імені О. М. Бекетова (Україна)

Лариса Кохан (ORCID 0000-0003-0519-3406)
Харківський національний університет міського господарства імені О. М. Бекетова (Україна)

У статті розглядається процес інтеграції генеративного штучного інтелекту (GenAI) в освітню екосистему України протягом 2025–2026 років. Спираючись на порівняльний аналіз нормативно-правової бази та кодексів академічної доброчесності провідних університетів – зокрема Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка, Київського політехнічного інституту імені Ігоря Сікорського, Київського столичного університету імені Бориса Грінченка та Харківського національного університету міського господарства імені О. М. Бекетова – у дослідженні виокремлено чотири ключові інституційні стратегії регулювання ШІ: від суворого контролю та етичних бар’єрів до практичної корисності та повної академічної свободи. Аналіз розкриває соціологічний феномен «подвійної реальності», що характеризується розривом між латентним масовим використанням технологій (понад 80% студентів) та офіційним дискурсом закладів вищої освіти, де лише 26% респондентів готові відкрито заявляти про застосування ШІ. Водночас у дослідженні представлено методологічну модель GAIDeT (Generative AI, Author, Input,

Declaration, Ethics, Transparency – Генеративний ШІ, Автор, Запит, Декларування, Етика, Прозорість) як валідований інструмент забезпечення академічної доброчесності та легітимізації використання ШІ в дослідницькому процесі. Установлено, що перехід від парадигми «суворого нагляду» до моделі прозорого партнерства забезпечує сталий розвиток української вищої освіти в умовах глобальної цифрової конкуренції та оновлення освітнього середовища. Дослідження підсумовує, що такий підхід стає каталізатором трансформації ролі викладача — від транслятора знань до модератора інтелектуального пошуку при збереженні унікальності та недоторканності людської творчої суб'єктності.

Ключові слова: генеративний штучний інтелект, академічна доброчесність, модель GAIDeT, вища освіта України, цифрова нерівність, Human-in-the-loop (людина в контурі управління), нормативна база, людиноцентристський підхід, авторська суб’єктність, етика штучного інтелекту.

Received (Надійшла до редакції): 20.02.2026,
Accepted (Прийнята до друку): 10.03.2026
Available online (Опубліковано онлайн) 26.03.2026