CHAI - Contextual Honor Codes for AI Literacy and Academic Integrity

Implementation toolkit for teachers



Research Group Learning Technology & Analytics

2026

let's change
YOU. US. THE WORLD.

THE HAGUE
UNIVERSITY OF
APPLIED SCIENCES

CHAI - Contextual Honor Codes for AI Literacy and Academic Integrity

Implementation toolkit for teachers

Authors
Manika Garg, Sunčica Bruck, Theo Bakker

Department
Research Group Learning Technology & Analytics, Centre of Expertise Global & Inclusive Learning

Date
July 2026

Type project
Study research

Version
1.0

Table of Contents

Purpose of this document..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
1 Introduction..... 6
1.1 About CHAI..... 6
1.2 When to use CHAI..... 6
1.3 The methodology at a glance..... 7
2 Preparing for the session..... 8
2.1 Review the preparatory materials..... 8
2.2 Prepare the list of course activities..... 8
2.3 Inform your students..... 8
3 Running the session..... 9
3.1 Set up the presentation..... 9
3.2 Introduce the project and guide the voting..... 9
3.3 Discussion and closing..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
4 After the session..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
4.1 Draft and share the final Honor Code..... 9
5 Reaching agreement when opinions differ..... 10
5.1 A structured decision process..... 10
5.1.1 Route 1: Full consensus..... 10
5.1.2 Route 2: Majority - Compromise..... 10
5.1.3 Closing a contested discussion..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**
5.2 Students who miss the session..... 11
6 Revisiting the Honor Code..... 11
6.1 Planned moments..... 11
6.2 Event-driven moments..... 11
Appendix: Honor Code template..... 12

Foreword

Teachers and students meet the technology every day, in assignments, projects, and preparation, yet often without a shared understanding of what is acceptable and what is not. Institutional policies offer direction but leave many practical questions open at the level of the individual course.

CHAI (Contextual Honor Codes for AI Literacy and Academic Integrity) was set up to close that gap. Rather than imposing rules from above, it invites teachers and students to decide together how GenAI should be used in their own learning context, and to record those agreements in a shared Honor Code. This toolkit is the practical result of that work. It guides teachers step by step through preparing, running, and following up on a CHAI session.

We thank the teachers and students who took part in the project for their openness and their honest discussions. We also thank the AI Hub for funding the project, and our colleagues from the research groups Learning Technology & Analytics, Multilevel Regulation, and Sustainable Talent Development for their expertise. We hope this toolkit helps you start the conversation in your own classroom. Feedback and ideas are always welcome at M.Garg@hhs.nl.

The project team

Introduction

1.1 About CHAI

The rapid growth of generative AI (GenAI) is reshaping how students learn and how teachers design and assess learning. Policies such as the EU AI Act and the institutional guidelines at THUAS offer valuable direction, but they remain intentionally broad so that they stay flexible for different programmes and teaching practices. As a result, many concrete questions about GenAI use are left to individual courses and programmes to interpret. At the same time, students and educators often enter these discussions with very different levels of experience, confidence, and expectations regarding GenAI. Most existing initiatives address them separately, which limits the opportunities for shared understanding and collaborative decision-making.

CHAI (Contextual Honor Codes for AI Literacy and Academic Integrity) responds to this gap. The objective of the project is to promote responsible use of GenAI in higher education by facilitating the co-creation of AI honor codes: agreements jointly developed by students and teachers to formalize a shared understanding of GenAI use within their learning contexts. The project is grounded in the principle of informed choice, which brings together its two core pillars: AI regulation and shared AI literacy. The AI regulation pillar translates broad institutional and legal guidelines into practical, context-relevant agreements. Through structured dialogue, students and teachers collaboratively determine when, how, and why GenAI should or should not be used in their own course. These agreements are formalized in an Honor Code, in which educational activities are organized across increasing levels of AI involvement, from No AI to Full AI.

Equally important is the development of shared AI literacy. Because students and educators come to GenAI with different levels of familiarity and needs, CHAI brings them together to build a common understanding of what GenAI tools can and cannot do. In addition to the customizable Honor Code template, students and teachers therefore receive a supplementary information package about the capabilities, limitations, risks, and potential of GenAI. The project is funded by the AI Hub and is carried out by a multidisciplinary team at THUAS that combines expertise in AI and AI literacy (Learning Technology & Analytics), ethics and law (Multilevel Regulation), and co-creation (Sustainable Talent Development). The methodology has been piloted in two THUAS programmes, Public Administration and Applied Computer Science, and is being refined for broader use within the university.

1.2 When to use CHAI

CHAI is flexible in scope: it can be applied to a single assignment, a module, or an entire course. You decide the context in which the agreements apply, and this context is recorded in the Honor Code itself.

Use CHAI when there is genuine room for choice about GenAI use in that context:

- The assignment, module, or course contains activities where GenAI could realistically play a role, such as written assignments, projects, or presentations, and the appropriate level of AI use is open for discussion.
- Institutional and legal guidelines leave concrete questions about GenAI use open to interpretation, and you want clear, shared agreements instead of case-by-case decisions.
- You expect (or already notice) that students hold different views and levels of experience with GenAI, and unspoken assumptions could lead to unfair advantages or integrity issues.
- You are introducing a new assignment or teaching format and want to settle expectations about AI use from the start.

The best moment for a CHAI session is early on, before the first graded activity, so that agreements are in place when they matter. A session can also be run mid-course when a conflict or a new AI tool changes the situation (see Chapter 5).

CHAI is less suitable for activities where no negotiation is possible, such as formal examinations governed by assessment regulations. These belong on your non-negotiable list, which you communicate to students but do not put up for a vote.

1.3 The methodology at a glance

The CHAI methodology consists of:

- **Three levels of AI use:** every activity is assigned one of three levels: No AI (completed entirely without GenAI), GenAI-assisted (GenAI may be used to plan or edit individually produced content), or Full GenAI (GenAI may be used to complete any elements of the task).
- **A voting session:** in a one-hour in-class session, the teacher and students vote anonymously on the level of AI use for each activity through Mentimeter or Wooclap, and discuss the results until a majority is reached.
- **The Honor Code template:** the agreements are recorded in a customizable template (see appendix), which organizes the activities per AI level and captures how AI use is acknowledged, for example by sharing prompts or citing GenAI content. Teacher and students sign it as a shared commitment.

2 Preparing for the session

2.1 Review the preparatory materials

Read through the following materials before the session:

- **Information package:** covers the basics of AI and the AI policies within THUAS and Europe.
- **Honor Code format:** the template that will be used to record the agreements (see appendix).

2.2 Prepare the list of course activities

Make a list of the course activities during which GenAI could potentially be used, such as graded assignments and in-class activities. Indicate which activities are negotiable and which are non-negotiable, and communicate this to your students. Ask students to add any other activities where they believe GenAI could be used in the course. The combined final list of activities is used during the in-class session, where the teacher and students vote on each activity using a tool such as Mentimeter or Wooclap.

2.3 Inform your students

Inform your students about the session as early as possible and share the information package with them, for example on Brightspace.

3 Running the session

The session takes approximately one hour and consists of three parts.

3.1 Set up the presentation

Set up the presentation on the projector in the classroom. The main activity uses Mentimeter or Wooclap, so log in to the chosen tool before the session starts and check that the voting screen is clearly visible to all students.

3.2 Introduce the project and guide the voting

Start by briefly introducing the CHAI project and the purpose of the session: to reach shared agreements on the use of GenAI in this course and to record those agreements in an Honor Code. Explain the three levels of AI use that the class will vote on (No AI, AI-assisted, and Full AI) and remind students which activities are non-negotiable and therefore not up for a vote. Make clear that this is a joint decision: you vote along with the students.

Then go through each course activity on the list and guide the voting:

1. **Present the activity.** State what the activity involves and what its learning objective is, so that students vote with the purpose of the activity in mind.

2. **Open the vote.** The whole class votes on the level of AI use through Mentimeter or Wooclap. The teacher votes too, as an equal participant in the agreement. Anonymous voting encourages everyone to answer honestly.

3. **Show and discuss the results.** Display the outcome and invite students from both the majority and the minority to explain the reasoning behind their vote.

4. **Revote if needed.** If there is no majority, discuss further and revote until a majority is reached. Chapter 4 describes how to handle persistent disagreement.

5. **Agree on acknowledgment of AI use.** For activities agreed at GenAI-assisted or Full GenAI, also discuss how AI use will be acknowledged: whether prompts or chat logs need to be shared, and whether GenAI content has to be cited. These agreements fill the ‘Acknowledgment of AI use’ column of the Honor Code template.

6. **Discussion and closing.** Once all voting and discussion is completed, summarise the outcomes and explain the next steps: how the Honor Code will be compiled, shared, and revisited.

Keep an eye on the time: with a one-hour session, the voting and discussion time available per activity depends on the length of the activity list, so prioritise the activities where opinions are most likely to differ.

3.3 Draft and share the final Honor Code

Draft the final Honor Code based on the agreements reached during the session. Use the template in the appendix and share the draft with your students. To adopt the final Honor Code, students can either sign it, or it can be made available to all students on Brightspace.

4 Reaching agreement when opinions differ

Voting will not always produce full consensus. Some students may want to discuss the use of AI in a certain activity further. This chapter provides a structured process for those situations, illustrated with two examples.

4.1 A structured decision process

For each contested activity, first define the intended AI use alongside the learning objective of that activity: how much AI use fits this activity, given what students are meant to learn from it? Then follow these steps:

1. **Vote.** The teacher and students vote on one of three levels: No AI, AI-assisted, or Full AI.
2. **Surface the underlying values.** Understand what is driving each position. Common values are: academic integrity, workload pressure, privacy and data protection, learning and development, climate impact, and unfair advantage.
3. **Resolve.** Depending on the outcome, one of the two routes below applies.

4.1.1 Route 1: Full consensus

The class reaches 100% agreement. Record the agreed level in the Honor Code and move on to the next activity.

4.1.2 Route 2: Majority - Compromise

The class is divided and a middle ground needs to be found. The guiding question is: does this affect assessment integrity?

- **If yes:** the teacher safeguards the decision. The teacher's judgment on the appropriate AI level stands.

Example. For an individual essay, most of the class (including the teacher) votes AI-assisted, but a group of students votes Full AI because generating draft text would save them time. The guiding question is whether Full AI affects assessment integrity. It does: the learning objective of the essay is independent argumentation, which cannot be assessed if the text is AI-generated. The teacher therefore safeguards the decision and sets the level at AI-assisted: GenAI may be used to clarify concepts and improve language, but not to generate text. As part of the compromise, the class agrees on disclosure: students share the prompts they used, so the teacher can see how AI contributed to the work.

- **If no:** the class votes again, or an example case scenario is discussed first to clarify the issue. Discussion and dialogue are central here. Disclosure helps in reaching a compromise. For example, students can share the prompts they used, so the teacher can see how AI contributed to the work.

Example. For a group presentation, the class is split between No AI and AI-assisted for designing the slides. The guiding question is whether AI-assisted slide design affects assessment integrity. It does not: the assessed skills are oral presentation and reasoning, not slide making. The class discusses an example scenario, a group using GenAI to generate the layout and visuals of their

slides, and then votes again. After the discussion, a majority settles on AI-assisted: GenAI may be used for formatting and visuals, while the content of the presentation is created by the students themselves.

4.2 Students who miss the session

A student who is not present during the in-class session cannot vote with the rest of the group. Share the information package and the draft Honor Code with absent students afterwards, and give them the opportunity to raise concerns before the Honor Code is adopted. They then commit to the code in the same way as the rest of the class.

5 Revisiting the Honor Code

The Honor Code is a living agreement. Plan two reflection moments in advance and be prepared to reopen the discussion when circumstances change.

5.1 Planned moments

- **Mid-semester checkpoint:** a reflection moment typically halfway through the module.
- **End of the module:** collectively reflect on what worked and what did not.

5.2 Event-driven moments

Revisit the Honor Code when:

- the university's AI policy changes;
- a student or teacher requests it;
- the code is not abided by a student or a group of students;
- many students ask for exceptions afterwards, for example when a large share of the class emails to opt out or request exceptions;
- AI tools significantly evolve mid-semester;
- a conflict takes place, either between teacher and student or between students.

Appendix: Honor Code template

Date: _____

Course ID: _____

Teacher: _____

Context (e.g. the entire course / individual assignment / module): _____

The goal of this Honor Code is to formalize the agreements reached during the CHAI session on the responsible use of GenAI in the specific learning context. The following rubric outlines the agreements made in this discussion:

GenAI Involvement Rubric

Level of AI use	Description of levels	Educational activities	Acknowledgment of AI use	Reasoning behind this choice (optional)
1. No AI	These tasks will be completed entirely without GenAI.	...	N/A	
2. GenAI-assisted	GenAI may be used to plan or edit individually produced content.	...	Do prompts or chat logs need to be provided? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Only upon request from the instructor	
3. Full GenAI	GenAI may be used to complete any elements of the task*.	...	Does GenAI content have to be cited? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Only upon request from the instructor	

* Please note that all external guidelines and limitations (e.g. the EU AI Act, GDPR, THUAS-wide AI policies) still apply.

☐ I have read and understand the above agreements.
☐ The above rubric accurately reflects my own intentions with GenAI in this course.
☐ I agree to adopt this Honor Code as an affirmation of my commitment to upholding the values, principles and ethics of academic integrity in this course and THUAS as a whole.

Signature: _____ **Name:** _____