



ETHICS OF USING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Sardorbek Baxodirovich Yusupov

Head of the Department of Administrative and Financial Law
Tashkent State University of Law, Uzbekistan

E-mail: s.yusupov022@mail.ru

Edvardas Juchnevicius

Professor, DSc

University of Gdansk, Poland

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20490189>

ARTICLE INFO

Qabul qilindi: 26-may 2026 yil

Ma'qullandi: 28-may 2026 yil

Nashr qilindi: 30-may 2026 yil

KEYWORDS

artificial intelligence; legal education; ethics; academic integrity; digitalization; higher education; Uzbekistan; AI policy.

ABSTRACT

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into higher education — and in particular into legal training — raises a set of profound ethical questions that academic and legal communities can no longer defer. This article examines the ethical dimensions of AI use in higher educational institutions, with particular emphasis on legal education in Uzbekistan and at the Tashkent State University of Law. Drawing on international frameworks — including the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence (2021) and comparative institutional experience from the United States, the European Union, and Australia — the article analyzes four core ethical challenges: threats to academic integrity, erosion of critical legal thinking, algorithmic bias and reliability of AI-generated legal analysis, and questions of data privacy. The article further examines the legal and policy context of Uzbekistan's AI integration, including the Strategy for the Development of Artificial Intelligence Technologies until 2030. The authors argue that responsible and ethically governed AI adoption, guided by transparent institutional frameworks, is not merely advisable but indispensable to preserving the quality, integrity, and humanistic foundations of legal education.

1. Introduction

The question of how artificial intelligence ought to be used — not merely how it can be used — has moved from the margins of academic debate to its center. As AI-powered systems become embedded in research, teaching, assessment, and student services at universities worldwide, the ethical frameworks governing their use have lagged behind the pace of their adoption. Nowhere is this tension more acute than in legal education, where the integrity of professional formation, the cultivation of independent legal reasoning, and strict standards of academic honesty are foundational values.

According to UNESCO, approximately 254 million students are currently enrolled in universities worldwide, while the

global gross enrollment ratio in higher education stands at just 42 percent.¹ There are approximately 50,000 universities globally, with the highest concentrations in India (around 8,410), the United States (around 5,762), and China (approximately 3,013).² The scale of global higher education makes it both a fertile ground for AI deployment and a domain in which the consequences of poorly governed AI use are correspondingly vast.

The ethical dimensions of AI in education are not hypothetical. They are already materializing in plagiarism incidents, unreliable legal analyses generated by language models, and debates over whether AI is enhancing or displacing students' intellectual capabilities. These are not simply questions of compliance or policy — they go to the heart of what higher education, and legal education in particular, is for.

This article proceeds as follows. Section 2 surveys the international normative framework for AI ethics in education, including the pivotal UNESCO Recommendation of 2021. Section 3 examines the specific ethical risks AI poses in higher education. Section 4 analyzes the context of Uzbekistan, including its national AI strategy and the experience of the Tashkent State University of Law. Section 5 addresses the distinctively heightened ethical stakes of AI in legal education. Section 6 proposes a framework of principles for responsible AI integration. Section 7 concludes.

2. The International Normative Framework for AI Ethics in Education

The most authoritative global instrument governing the ethics of artificial intelligence is the UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, adopted unanimously by all 193 UNESCO Member States at the General Conference in November 2021.³ This landmark framework — the product of three years of multidisciplinary consultation involving experts from 155 countries — establishes four foundational values: respect for human rights and dignity; the promotion of peaceful, just, and interconnected societies; inclusiveness and diversity; and environmental sustainability. From these values, it derives ten actionable principles, including transparency, accountability, proportionality, safety, fairness, and the preservation of human oversight of AI systems.

In the specific domain of education, UNESCO's Recommendation calls upon states to ensure that AI systems used in educational settings are subject to appropriate ethical review, that students and educators are equipped with AI literacy, and that the human relational and developmental dimensions of education are not subordinated to algorithmic efficiency. These principles provide the normative foundation for evaluating institutional and national AI policies in education worldwide.

At the institutional level, EDUCAUSE — one of the foremost higher education technology associations — published its AI Ethical Guidelines in June 2025, calling upon universities to establish comprehensive ethical frameworks that uphold the core academic values of fairness,

¹UNESCO Institute for Statistics. Global Education Data. Available at: <https://www.unesco.org/en/higher-education> [Accessed 1 June 2026].

²Uhomes. How Many Universities Are There Worldwide? Available at: <https://en.uhomes.com/blog/how-many-universities-are-there-worldwide> [Accessed 1 June 2026].

³UNESCO. Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. Paris: UNESCO, November 2021. Available at: <https://www.unesco.org/en/artificial-intelligence/recommendation-ethics>

privacy, transparency, and accountability, while actively mitigating risks such as bias, privacy violations, and the potential for misuse.⁴ Similarly, the California State University system's ETHICAL Principles AI Framework (2025) sets out a structured approach emphasizing responsible use, proper attribution of AI-generated content, and curriculum design that promotes genuine learning rather than algorithmic substitution.⁵

The European Union's AI Act — proposed in 2021 and progressively entering into force — represents the most comprehensive binding regulatory framework for AI. Its risk-based categorization of AI systems, and its stricter requirements for high-risk applications (including those affecting education and access to educational services), directly operationalizes UNESCO's ethical principles as enforceable law. This trajectory from ethical recommendation to binding regulation underscores the urgency with which institutions must develop internal governance frameworks rather than await external mandates.

Chan (2023) proposes a comprehensive AI policy education framework for universities, building on UNESCO's recommendations and emphasizing that effective AI governance requires not merely the promulgation of rules, but the cultivation of an institutional culture in which ethical reasoning about AI is embedded in everyday academic practice.⁶

3. Ethical Risks of Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education

3.1. Academic Integrity and the Challenge of AI-Assisted Misconduct

The most widely discussed ethical risk of AI in higher education concerns academic integrity. According to a 2024 survey by the International Center for Academic Integrity, 43% of students admitted to using AI tools for academic work, with 18% acknowledging they submitted AI-generated content as their own without disclosure.⁷ A separate study found that as many as 58% of students admitted to using AI tools to complete assignments dishonestly.⁸

These figures reflect a structural challenge: generative AI systems can produce fluent, plausible academic text at scale and at speed, making traditional plagiarism detection methods increasingly inadequate. Student discipline rates for AI-related plagiarism rose from 48% in the 2022–2023 academic year to 64% in 2023–2024, while 68% of educators now rely on AI detection tools — a 30 percentage point increase in usage.⁹ Tools such as Turnitin have

⁴EDUCAUSE. AI Ethical Guidelines. June 2025. Available at: <https://library.educause.edu/resources/2025/6/ai-ethical-guidelines>

⁵Wynants, S. et al. ETHICAL Principles AI Framework for Higher Education. California State University, Fullerton, 2025. CC BY-NC 4.0. Available at: <https://genai.calstate.edu/communities/faculty/ethical-and-responsible-use-ai/ethical-principles-ai-framework-higher-education>

⁶Chan, C.K.Y. A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 2023, Vol. 20, Art. 38.

⁷International Center for Academic Integrity. Survey on Student Use of AI Tools in Academic Work. 2024. Available at: <https://academicintegrity.org>

⁸Tan, S.C., Maravilla, J. Shaping integrity: why generative artificial intelligence does not have to undermine education. *Frontiers in Education*, 2024. DOI: 10.3389/educ.2024.1381056

⁹Gustilo, L., Ong, E., Lapinid, M.R. Algorithmically-driven writing and academic integrity: exploring educators' practices, perceptions, and policies in AI era. *International Journal of Educational Integrity*, 2024, Vol. 20, Art. 3. DOI: 10.1007/s40979-024-00153-8

expanded their AI detection capabilities, but researchers and practitioners acknowledge that detection remains imperfect, with significant rates of both false positives and false negatives.¹⁰

A qualitative study drawing on interviews with 58 undergraduate and graduate students and 12 teachers at a research-intensive university in Hong Kong (conducted in early 2025) identified not only conventional integrity concerns but also more subtle phenomena: the "invisible labour" of navigating ambiguous AI policies, the uneven enforcement of institutional rules across departments, and the ways in which AI has reconfigured students' and teachers' attitudes toward authorship and originality.

3.2. Erosion of Critical Thinking

A second and in some respects more insidious ethical risk concerns the potential erosion of students' capacity for independent intellectual work. Azevedo et al. (2025) emphasize that institutions risk undermining the core mission of higher education when AI adoption is not accompanied by thoughtful governance frameworks.¹¹ A faculty survey conducted across Spain found that the top three AI-related risks identified by educators were deterioration of essential student skills, excessive dependence on technology, and plagiarism, with 75% of faculty members reporting encounters with AI-generated plagiarism in their institutions.

The concern is not that students use AI as a tool — any more than one would object to the use of a calculator in mathematics — but that they use it as a substitute for the intellectual processes that higher education is designed to develop. In legal education, this risk is particularly acute: the analytical reasoning, textual interpretation, and ethical judgment that define legal competence cannot be outsourced to an algorithm without fundamentally compromising the formation of the legal professional.

3.3. Reliability and Algorithmic Bias in AI-Generated Legal Analysis

AI-generated information is not always accurate or reliable. Contemporary large language models may produce confident-sounding but factually incorrect or legally outdated responses — a phenomenon researchers have termed "hallucination." In legal education, a student relying on an AI-generated summary of legislation may unknowingly work from an obsolete version of a statute, fundamentally compromising the validity of their analysis.¹²

Beyond accuracy, AI systems trained on existing legal corpora may reproduce and amplify the biases embedded in historical legal practice. This is an ethical concern of profound significance for legal education: it raises the possibility that students will internalize not only the substantive outputs of AI analysis but its embedded assumptions, thereby perpetuating patterns of bias into the next generation of legal professionals.

3.4. Data Privacy and Surveillance Risks

The integration of AI in educational settings necessarily involves the collection and processing of substantial quantities of personal data — from student performance records to

¹⁰Sciencedirect. Reassessing academic integrity in the age of AI: A systematic literature review. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 2025. DOI: 10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100290

¹¹Azevedo, P. et al. Institutional Policies on Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: Frameworks and Best Practices for Faculty. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 2025. DOI: 10.1002/ace.70013

¹²Woerner, J.H.R. et al. Transformative potentials and ethical considerations of AI tools in higher education: case studies and reflections. *SoutheastCon 2024*, pp. 510–516. DOI: 10.1109/SOUTHEASTCON52093.2024.10500042

behavioral analytics and online interaction logs. This creates significant data privacy risks, particularly where AI systems are provided by commercial third parties whose data practices may not be aligned with academic or national data protection norms. Cruvinel Júnior et al. (2026) identify data privacy and algorithmic transparency as among the most pressing ethical concerns in AI-integrated higher education globally.¹³

4. The National Context: AI Integration in Uzbekistan's Legal Education

Uzbekistan's engagement with artificial intelligence is embedded within an ambitious national digital transformation agenda. The presidential strategy "Digital Uzbekistan — 2030," adopted by Decree No. UP-6079 on 5 October 2020, established a comprehensive framework for the development of the digital economy, with explicit attention to the transformation of education, healthcare, and public administration.¹⁴

Building on this foundation, Presidential Resolution No. PQ-4996, issued on 17 February 2021, introduced concrete measures for the accelerated implementation of AI technologies, including the introduction of AI-focused courses in 15 higher education institutions from the 2021/2022 academic year and the admission of 572 students (510 undergraduates and 62 master's students) to AI specializations from the 2023/2024 academic year.¹⁵

Most significantly, the Strategy for the Development of Artificial Intelligence Technologies until 2030, approved by Presidential Resolution No. RP-358 on 14 October 2024, allocates \$50 million for infrastructure development, establishes the objective of training 1 million AI specialists, and sets as a national target the placement of Uzbekistan among the top 50 countries globally in the Government AI Readiness Index.¹⁶ This ambition is already partially realized: according to the Oxford Insights Government AI Readiness Index 2024, Uzbekistan ranked 70th globally — having risen 17 positions — reflecting the measurable progress of state-led AI integration across sectors.¹⁷

The Tashkent State University of Law occupies a central position in this landscape. Ranked in the Top 200 of the Round University Ranking by subject area and holding "Reporter" status in the Times Higher Education Young University Rankings, TSUL enrolls approximately 10,000 students and operates more than 20 academic departments, including a dedicated

¹³Cruvinel Júnior, L., Héctor Ascama, O., Marques da Silva, M. AI Ethics in Higher Education: A Review of Ethical Challenges. In: ETHICOMP 2025. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, vol. 15939. Springer, Cham, 2026. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-032-01429-0_17

¹⁴Presidential Decree of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. UP-6079, dated 5 October 2020 "On Approval of the Strategy 'Digital Uzbekistan — 2030' and Measures for Its Effective Implementation."

¹⁵Resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PQ-4996, dated 17 February 2021 "On measures to create conditions for the accelerated implementation of artificial intelligence technologies." Available at: <https://www.lex.uz>

¹⁶Resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. RP-358, dated 14 October 2024 "On the approval of the Strategy for the Development of Artificial Intelligence Technologies until 2030." Available at: <https://www.lex.uz/docs/7159258>

¹⁷Oxford Insights. Government AI Readiness Index 2024. Oxford: Oxford Insights, 2024. Available at: <https://oxfordinsights.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/2024-Government-AI-Readiness-Index-2.pdf>

Department of Cyber Law.¹⁸ Over the past three years, TSUL has implemented a series of digital reform initiatives: the complete digitalization of final assessment examinations; the introduction of AI-powered administrative platforms (including Marketing.tsul.uz, Degree.tsul.uz, Online.tsul.uz, Kadr.tsul.uz, NewTopic.tsul.uz, and E-Researcher.tsul.uz); and the integration of AI tools into pedagogical practice.

A development of particular significance for legal education is the introduction of the LexAI platform — an AI-powered legal information system built upon the Lex.uz national legal database, which contains over 48,000 legal documents (of which more than 34,000 are currently in force). LexAI provides students and practitioners with AI-assisted legal inquiry, a document construction module enabling independent drafting of legal instruments, and tools for the analysis of legal cases based on existing jurisprudence.¹⁹ While this represents a substantive advance in legal research accessibility, it simultaneously intensifies the ethical obligations of educators: students equipped with powerful AI research tools must be trained not only in their use, but in their critical evaluation and the ethical limits of their application.

Uzbekistan's emerging digital legal ecosystem also confronts a specific challenge: the rise of digitally-enabled crime. The development of cyber corruption, cyber fraud, and AI-assisted criminal activity creates an urgent professional imperative for legal education to engage with artificial intelligence — not merely as a pedagogical tool, but as a subject of legal and ethical analysis in its own right.²⁰

5. The Heightened Ethical Stakes of AI in Legal Education

Legal education occupies a distinctive position in the ethical landscape of AI adoption in higher education. According to a survey conducted by the American Bar Association Task Force on Law and Artificial Intelligence among 29 law schools, 55% of institutions currently offer specialized courses on artificial intelligence, while 83% provide additional educational opportunities — such as legal clinics — that teach students how to use AI effectively in legal practice.²¹ Leading law schools including UC Berkeley School of Law, the University of Michigan Law School, and George Washington University Law School have taken active steps to integrate AI technologies into their legal education programs. This momentum reflects the profession's recognition that future legal practitioners must be conversant with AI as both a tool and a subject of legal regulation.²²

¹⁸Official website of the Tashkent State University of Law. Available at: <https://tsul.uz> [Accessed 1 June 2026].

¹⁹Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Presentation of the LexAI Platform. Available at: <https://adliya.uz/en/posts/lexai-platformatasi-taqdimoti-o%CA%BBtkazildi> [Accessed 1 June 2026].

²⁰Uzreport.news. Cyber Corruption Prevention through Artificial Intelligence. UZA, 2023. Available at: https://uza.uz/uz/posts/kiberkorruptsiyaga-suniy-intellekt-orqali-tosiq-qoyish-mumkinmi_696824

²¹American Bar Association. ABA Task Force on Law and Artificial Intelligence releases survey on AI and legal education. ABA News, 24 June 2024. Available at: <https://www.americanbar.org/news/abanews/aba-news-archives/2024/06/aba-task-force-law-and-ai-survey/>

²²University of Richmond Journal of Law and Technology. Artificial Intelligence in the Law Classroom: Good, Bad, or Maybe Both? 30 January 2025. Available at: <https://jolt.richmond.edu/2025/01/30/artificial-intelligence-in-the-law-classroom-good-bad-or-maybe-both/>

However, the integration of AI into legal education is subject to ethical tensions that do not arise with the same intensity in other disciplines. First, the legal profession imposes upon its members duties of accuracy, candor, and competence that are codified in rules of professional conduct. An attorney who submits a brief containing AI-generated case citations that do not exist — a well-documented phenomenon — may face disciplinary consequences. The ethical formation of future lawyers therefore demands that AI literacy includes not only facility in use but rigorous habits of verification and professional judgment.

Second, the humanistic core of legal education — the development of students' capacity to reason from principle, to interpret ambiguous texts, to understand the human stakes of legal disputes, and to exercise ethical judgment under conditions of uncertainty — is precisely the kind of cognitive and moral formation that cannot be replicated or replaced by AI. As one law professor observed: "To be in a position to know whether the output of a generative AI tool is right or wrong, helpful or harmful, you first need to have the knowledge and skills that would have enabled you to generate such an output yourself."²³

Third, AI systems used in legal research may reflect historical biases in legal reasoning and outcomes. Where legal education relies uncritically on AI-generated analysis, it risks producing graduates whose sense of what the law is, and what it ought to be, has been shaped by these embedded biases. The ethical obligations of legal educators in an AI environment therefore extend to actively cultivating in students a critical awareness of AI's limitations and propensities, alongside its capabilities.

The world's top universities have begun to develop explicit policies addressing these stakes. Oxford University's research and assessment policies permit generative AI only where explicitly authorized, require disclosure declarations for any permitted AI use, and treat unauthorized use as academic misconduct. MIT advises that AI may assist with non-confidential tasks, but that users must verify outputs to avoid plagiarism or hallucinations.²⁴ These emerging norms provide a benchmark against which Uzbekistan's legal education institutions can calibrate their own frameworks.

6. A Framework for Ethically Responsible AI Integration in Legal Education

On the basis of the foregoing analysis, the authors propose the following framework of principles for the ethically responsible integration of artificial intelligence in higher legal education. This framework draws upon international normative standards — in particular the UNESCO Recommendation (2021) and the EDUCAUSE AI Ethical Guidelines (2025) — and is tailored to the specific context of legal education in Uzbekistan and comparable jurisdictions.

Principle 1 — Human Primacy and Oversight. AI tools must function as instruments that augment and support the intellectual work of students and educators, not as substitutes for it. Institutional policies must establish clear parameters regarding which tasks may appropriately involve AI assistance and which require unaided human judgment. In legal

²⁴Thesify. Generative AI Policies at the World's Top Universities: October 2025 Update. Available at: <https://www.thesify.ai/blog/gen-ai-policies-update-2025>

education, AI must never substitute for the student's own legal reasoning on assessed work, without explicit disclosure and faculty authorization.

Principle 2 — Transparency and Attribution. All use of AI-generated content in academic work must be transparently disclosed. Institutions should develop clear and consistently enforced attribution requirements adapted to the forms of AI use prevalent in legal education. Silence about AI use is not a neutral act — it is an act of concealment with ethical and, in some contexts, legal consequences.

Principle 3 — Critical Evaluation and Verification. Students and educators must be equipped with the analytical skills to critically evaluate AI-generated outputs, verify their accuracy, and identify their limitations. This is especially important in legal education, where AI-generated case summaries, statutory interpretations, or legal analyses may be plausible in form but incorrect or outdated in substance. AI literacy must include the habit of verification.

Principle 4 — Preservation and Development of Critical Legal Reasoning. Curricula and assessment methodologies must be designed to ensure that AI use does not displace the development of core legal competencies, including textual interpretation, analogical reasoning, ethical judgment, and the capacity to argue from principle. Where AI tools are integrated into legal education, they should be deployed in ways that build these competencies rather than circumvent them.

Principle 5 — Fairness, Non-Discrimination, and Bias Awareness. Institutions must actively address the risks of algorithmic bias in AI systems used in legal education. This requires both technical due diligence in the selection of AI tools and pedagogical attention to educating students about the ways in which AI systems may reproduce and amplify biases embedded in legal data and historical legal practice.

Principle 6 — Data Privacy and Security. The use of AI systems in educational settings must comply with applicable data protection law and institutional privacy policies. Students' personal data must not be shared with AI platforms without informed consent, and institutions must conduct appropriate due diligence regarding the data practices of third-party AI providers.

Principle 7 — Institutional Governance and Continuous Adaptation. Given the rapid pace of AI development, institutional AI governance frameworks must be treated as living instruments subject to regular review and adaptation. Cross-functional governance bodies — including faculty, students, legal experts, and technical specialists — should be established to monitor developments, update policies, and embed ethical AI practice into institutional culture.

7. Conclusion

Artificial intelligence is not a passing phenomenon in higher education. It is a structural transformation — one that is already reshaping how students learn, how educators teach, and how knowledge is produced and evaluated. In legal education, its implications are especially profound, because the values at stake — academic integrity, professional formation, critical reasoning, and the ethical disposition of future lawyers and jurists — are foundational to the functioning of the rule of law itself.

Uzbekistan's trajectory — from the "Digital Uzbekistan 2030" strategy through the AI Development Strategy until 2030 and the concrete innovations at TSUL — represents a genuine commitment to AI integration in legal education. This commitment is to be welcomed. However,

the speed of technological change and the ambition of national AI targets must not outrun the development of the ethical frameworks necessary to govern AI use responsibly.

The UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence provides the authoritative global baseline. The emerging institutional frameworks of leading universities worldwide offer comparative models. The task for legal educators, university administrators, and policymakers in Uzbekistan — and more broadly — is to translate these global norms and comparative insights into contextually appropriate, enforceable, and pedagogically coherent institutional frameworks.

The authors conclude that the ethical integration of AI in legal education is not simply a matter of managing risks — though it is certainly that. It is an affirmative commitment to the idea that artificial intelligence, deployed with wisdom and governed by principle, can genuinely enrich the formation of the next generation of legal professionals, rather than impoverishing it.

References:

1. UNESCO. Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence. Paris: UNESCO, November 2021. Available at: <https://www.unesco.org/en/artificial-intelligence/recommendation-ethics>
2. UNESCO Institute for Statistics. Global Education Data. Available at: <https://www.unesco.org/en/higher-education>
3. Uhomes. How Many Universities Are There Worldwide? Available at: <https://en.uhomes.com/blog/how-many-universities-are-there-worldwide>
4. EDUCAUSE. AI Ethical Guidelines. June 2025. Available at: <https://library.educause.edu/resources/2025/6/ai-ethical-guidelines>
5. Oxford Insights. Government AI Readiness Index 2024. Oxford: Oxford Insights, 2024.
6. Resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PQ-4996, dated 17 February 2021 "On measures to create conditions for the accelerated implementation of artificial intelligence technologies." Available at: <https://www.lex.uz>
7. Resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. RP-358, dated 14 October 2024 "On the approval of the Strategy for the Development of Artificial Intelligence Technologies until 2030." Available at: <https://www.lex.uz/docs/7159258>
8. Presidential Decree of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. UP-6079, dated 5 October 2020 "On Approval of the Strategy 'Digital Uzbekistan — 2030' and Measures for Its Effective Implementation."
9. American Bar Association. ABA Task Force on Law and Artificial Intelligence: Survey on AI and Legal Education. ABA News, 24 June 2024. Available at: <https://www.americanbar.org/news/abanews/aba-news-archives/2024/06/aba-task-force-law-and-ai-survey/>
10. University of Richmond Journal of Law and Technology. Artificial Intelligence in the Law Classroom: Good, Bad, or Maybe Both? 30 January 2025. Available at: <https://jolt.richmond.edu/2025/01/30/artificial-intelligence-in-the-law-classroom-good-bad-or-maybe-both/>
11. Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Uzbekistan. Presentation of the LexAI Platform. Available at: <https://adliya.uz/en/posts/lexai-platformasi-taqdimoti-o%CA%BBtkazildi>

12. Chan, C.K.Y. A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 2023, Vol. 20, Art. 38.
13. International Center for Academic Integrity. Survey on Student Use of AI Tools in Academic Work. 2024.
14. Tan, S.C., Maravilla, J. Shaping integrity: why generative artificial intelligence does not have to undermine education. *Frontiers in Education*, 2024. DOI: 10.3389/feduc.2024.1381056
15. Cruvinel Júnior, L., Héctor Ascama, O., Marques da Silva, M. AI Ethics in Higher Education: A Review of Ethical Challenges. *ETHICOMP 2025. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol. 15939. Springer, Cham, 2026.
16. Azevedo, P. et al. Institutional Policies on Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 2025. DOI: 10.1002/ace.70013
17. Gustilo, L., Ong, E., Lapinid, M.R. Algorithmically-driven writing and academic integrity. *International Journal of Educational Integrity*, 2024, Vol. 20, Art. 3.
18. Woerner, J.H.R. et al. Transformative potentials and ethical considerations of AI tools in higher education. *SoutheastCon 2024*, pp. 510–516.
19. Wargo, K., Anderson, B. Striking a Balance: Navigating the Ethical Dilemmas of AI in Higher Education. *EDUCAUSE Review*, December 2024.
20. Wynants, S. et al. ETHICAL Principles AI Framework for Higher Education. California State University, Fullerton, 2025.
21. UZA News Portal. Cyber Corruption Prevention through Artificial Intelligence. 2023. Available at: https://uza.uz/uz/posts/kiberkorrupciyaga-suniy-intellekt-orqali-tosiq-qoyish-mumkinmi_696824
22. Official website of the Tashkent State University of Law. Available at: <https://tsul.uz>
23. Thesify. Generative AI Policies at the World's Top Universities: October 2025 Update. Available at: <https://www.thesify.ai/blog/gen-ai-policies-update-2025>
24. *Frontiers in Education*. Addressing student use of generative AI in schools and universities through academic integrity reporting. 2025. DOI: 10.3389/feduc.2025.1610836
25. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*. Reassessing academic integrity in the age of AI: A systematic literature review. 2025. DOI: 10.1016/j.caeai.2025.100290