THE UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG
HKU SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

Guidelines for Revising Programme Curricula to Integrate Generative AI (GenAI)

1. Purpose

The rapid emergence of Generative AI (GenAI) requires programme-level updates to curricula, teaching and learning activities, assessment tasks etc., so that graduates are future-ready, ethical, and competitive.

These guidelines operationalise School-wide directions on GenAI by:

- embedding AI literacy and ethics in programme and course learning outcomes where appropriate;
- promoting authentic, AI-enabled learning and assessments; and
- instituting safeguards against AI-related risks, including hallucinations, privacy, copyright and licensing issues, and breaches of academic integrity.

2. Scope and Applicability

These guidelines apply to all award-bearing programmes and, where appropriate, to non-award-bearing and new programmes.

They are intended for Programme Teams to use during programme validation, review, modification, and ongoing delivery.

3. Guiding Principles

Programme Teams revising curricula to integrate GenAI should be guided by the following principles:

- **Integration of AI Literacy and Ethics**
  Embed AI literacy, ethical reasoning, and critical evaluation of AI outputs within Programme Intended Learning Outcomes (PILOs) and Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs) where appropriate, ensuring constructive alignment with teaching and learning activities and assessment tasks.
- **Transparency of AI Use**
  Promote transparency by requiring students to declare their use of GenAI tools (e.g. tool names/versions, prompts, parameters, verification steps) in relevant assessments.
- **Authentic, AI-enabled Learning**
  Design learning tasks that make constructive, discipline-relevant use of GenAI (e.g. drafting, editing, analysis, simulations, scenario-based learning etc.) while ensuring that critical thinking and original work remain central.
- **Equity of Access**
  Advance equity by leveraging institution-supported tools and providing guidance for students who may lack access to premium GenAI services.

4. Curriculum Revision Requirements

4.1 Learning Outcomes (PILOs/CILOs)

When revising programmes or courses, Programme Teams should:

- embed measurable outcomes related to AI literacy, ethical and responsible AI use, and critical evaluation of AI-generated outputs, where appropriate to the discipline and level;
- ensure vertical alignment of AI-related outcomes across levels and horizontal alignment across courses within a programme; and
- make explicit expectations regarding transparent AI use and student accountability in coursework and assessments.

5. Teaching and Learning Activities

Teachers are encouraged to:

- use GenAI as a cognitive tool to support drafting, editing, summarising, analysis, data exploration, and problem solving etc.;
- adopt domain-specific simulations, role plays, scenario-based activities etc. where GenAI can generate realistic cases or data to enhance learning; and
- design activities that require students to compare AI-generated outputs with authoritative sources, reflect on limitations, and refine their own work accordingly.

6. Assessment Redesign

To ensure assessments remain authentic, robust, and AI-aware, revised assessment tasks where appropriate should incorporate the following components where appropriate:

6.1 Process Evidence

Students should be required to submit documentation demonstrating how GenAI was used, for example through an **AI Use Log** *(see Appendix I for reference)* that records:

- tool name and version (e.g. Microsoft Copilot, HKU SPACE AI Chat etc.);
- prompts entered (with date and time);
- relevant parameters or settings, if applicable; and
- screenshots or exported outputs from the AI tool.

Students should also provide drafts showing their own contributions and how they integrated and modified AI outputs.

6.2 Verification of AI Outputs

Students must verify key AI-generated claims against credible sources (e.g. official reports, peer-reviewed publications, reputable professional resources etc.) and document:

- which elements were checked;
- sources consulted; and
- any errors, hallucinations, or biases identified and how these were corrected.

This requirement helps manage the risk of AI hallucinations and reinforces information literacy.

6.3 In-class Validation / Oral Defence

Where feasible, teachers should incorporate in-class validation or oral components (e.g. presentations, Q&A, reflective interviews, viva-style defences etc.) to:

- confirm individual understanding of submitted work;
- deter over-reliance on AI; and
- provide opportunities for personalised feedback.

6.4 AI-aware Rubrics

Assessment rubrics should explicitly include descriptors for responsible AI use where appropriate. Typical criteria may cover:

- transparency and documentation of AI use;
- critical evaluation and verification of AI outputs;
- ethical and responsible use (including privacy, copyright, and attribution);
- originality and higher-order thinking beyond AI-generated content; and
- contextualisation and professional relevance.

Sample AI-aware rubrics for written assignments and group projects are provided in Appendix II for reference.

7. Student Communications

Teachers must clearly communicate acceptable GenAI use to students via:

- course syllabi;
- assessment briefs and marking rubrics; and
- relevant student handbooks or online platforms.

Such communications should specify:

- which AI tools are approved;
- declaration and documentation requirements (e.g. AI Use Declaration Form, logs, drafts);
- expectations for verification of AI-generated content;
- the necessity of maintaining critical thinking, originality, and personal reflection; and
- that misuse of AI (e.g. plagiarism, undisclosed AI use, inappropriate outsourcing) will be treated as academic misconduct under School policy.

8. Exemplary Programmes

Exemplary programme documents integrating GenAI, collected from different Colleges, are available for colleagues' reference, including examples (click links below) from:

- HKU SPACE Community College (CC)
- College of Life Sciences and Technology (CLST)
- College of Business and Finance (CBF)
- College of Humanities and Law (CHL)

These exemplars illustrate different ways of incorporating AI literacy outcomes, AI-enabled teaching and learning activities and assessment tasks.

Note: Colleagues may refer to the HKU Policy on Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence for Teaching and Learning (HKU portal login required) for reference.

Appendices *(for internal reference)*

Appendix I: Sample AI Use Documentation Requirement
Appendix II: Sample AI-Aware Assessment Rubrics
Appendix III: Sample Guideline for AI Use in Course Syllabus

Approved by SAMB in March 2026

Appendix I: Sample AI Use Documentation Requirement *(for reference only)*

Purpose:

To ensure transparency and verify authentic student engagement when using Generative AI tools.

Sample Instructions for Students:

AI Use Log:
- Maintain a record of all AI interactions, including:
  • Tool name and version (e.g., Microsoft Copilot, HKU SPACE AI Chat).
  • Prompts entered (with date/time).
  • Parameters or settings used (if applicable).

Example:
Tool: Copilot (Version X.X)
Prompt: 'Generate a summary of Hong Kong's AI policy implications'
Date: 10 Jan 2026

Outputs and Verification:
- Attach screenshots or exported outputs from the AI tool.
- Highlight any modifications or corrections you made.
- Provide evidence of verification against credible sources (e.g., citing official reports, academic references).

Drafts and Personal Contribution:
- Submit draft versions showing how you integrated AI outputs with your own analysis.
- Include annotations or comments explaining your reasoning and edits.

Example:
Original AI output → Annotated with notes on bias or hallucinations.
Revised draft → Shows added local context and original insights.

Declaration Form:
- Complete the AI Use Declaration Form confirming compliance with ethical and academic integrity standards.

Assessment Rubric Linkage:

Students will be graded on:

- Transparency of AI Use (completeness of log and evidence).
- Critical Evaluation of AI Outputs (identifying errors, bias, and verifying facts).
- Original Contribution (extent of personal synthesis and contextualisation).

Appendix II: Sample AI-Aware Assessment Rubrics *(for reference only)*

(1) Rubric for Written Assignments

Criterion	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Pass	Fail
Transparency & Documentation of AI Use	Comprehensive AI log (tools, versions, prompts, parameters, screenshots) with clear justification and full verification evidence.	Detailed AI log with minor omissions; verification evident for most outputs.	Basic AI disclosure; limited prompt or verification detail.	Mentions AI use only; little or no process evidence.	No AI disclosure or deceptive presentation of AI output.
Critical Evaluation of AI Outputs	Systematic identification and correction of hallucinations, bias, and gaps with credible sources.	Identifies most inaccuracies and performs thorough fact-checking.	Recognises some limitations; partial checking.	Minimal critique; obvious errors only.	Accepts AI output uncritically.
Ethical & Responsible AI Use	Full ethical declaration addressing privacy, copyright, licensing, and attribution.	Clear ethical declaration with minor gaps.	General awareness of ethics; limited detail.	Vague ethical statements; no attribution clarity.	Ethical breaches or no declaration.
Original Contribution & Higher-Order Thinking	Substantial original synthesis, argumentation, and reflection beyond AI output.	Strong personal analysis and synthesis.	Some original input with reliance on AI structure.	Minimal personal contribution.	Over-reliance on AI; no independent thinking.
Contextualisation & Professional Relevance	Insightfully applies concepts to local, disciplinary, or professional contexts.	Clear contextualisation with relevant examples.	Basic contextual references.	Weak or generic context.	No contextual relevance.

(2) Rubric for Group Projects

Criterion	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Pass	Fail
Transparency & Documentation of AI Use	Shared AI log showing transparent, coordinated use across team with version control.	Most AI use documented; generally consistent across members.	Partial documentation; uneven detail among members.	Minimal group-level documentation.	No documentation or undisclosed AI use.
Critical Evaluation of AI Outputs	Team critically evaluates AI outputs, triangulates sources, and agrees on corrections.	Most outputs reviewed and validated by team.	Some review evident; gaps remain.	Superficial review by limited members.	No critical evaluation.
Ethical & Responsible AI Use	Collective ethical compliance clearly addressed and documented.	Ethics discussed with minor gaps.	General ethical awareness at group level.	Limited or implicit ethics consideration.	Ethical non-compliance.
Original Contribution & Higher-Order Thinking	Strong collective synthesis and innovation beyond AI suggestions.	Clear group-level original insights.	Some original contribution; AI heavily guides structure.	Limited synthesis beyond AI output.	Project largely AI-generated.
Contextualisation & Professional Relevance	Convincing application to real-world/professional context with impact analysis.	Relevant contextual application with examples.	Basic professional context.	Weak or generic application.	No real-world relevance.

Appendix III: Sample Guideline for AI-Use in Course Syllabus *(for reference only)*

Insert the following section into course syllabi to clarify acceptable AI use:

> *"Students may use approved AI tools (e.g., Copilot, HKU SPACE AI Chat) for learning support under the following conditions:*
>
> - *All AI use must be declared in submissions using the AI Use Declaration Form.*
> - *Students must verify AI-generated content against credible sources and document verification steps.*
> - *AI tools must not replace critical thinking or original analysis; assessments requiring personal judgment must reflect student's own work.*
> - *Misuse of AI (e.g., plagiarism, undisclosed use) will be treated as academic misconduct under School policy."*