

Institutional Guidelines on AI in Latin American Higher Education: A Comparative Analysis

Jenny Marcela Sánchez-Torres

Universidad Nacional de Colombia,
Colombia
jmsanchezt@unal.edu.co
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5284-836X>

Lorena Chaparro-Díaz

Universidad Nacional de Colombia,
Colombia
olchapparod@unal.edu.co
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8241-8694>

Sonia Carreño-Moreno

Universidad Nacional de Colombia,
Colombia
spcarrenom@unal.edu.co
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4386-6053>

Yuly Edith Sánchez-Mendoza

Universidad Nacional de Colombia,
Colombia
yesanchezm@unal.edu.co
<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-0030-6822>

Liz Karen Herrera-Quintero

Universidad Nacional de Colombia,
Colombia
lkherreraq@unal.edu.co
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2002-4336>

Abstract

The emergence of generative artificial intelligence (AI) has significantly transformed education, compelling higher education institutions (HEIs) to develop ethical, pedagogical, and regulatory guidelines for its use. This study aimed to identify similarities and differences in institutional guidelines on AI use in teaching and research within Latin American HEIs. A comparative analysis was conducted of 22 institutional guidelines from nearly 85 HEIs across six Latin American countries. The review scrutinised issuance dates, target audiences, intended purposes, thematic areas, evaluation strategies, academic integrity strategies, norms, and recommendations for AI integration into core institutional functions, following a systematic search and analysis. The guidelines emphasised ethical principles and academic integrity, as well as adjustments to assessment strategies. Operational and methodological recommendations

Received: 11/09/2025 | Submitted to peers: 03/11/2025 | Accepted by peers: 29/11/2025 | Approved: 24/03/2026

DOI: 10.5294/edu.2026.29.2.1

Para citar este artículo / To reference this article / Para citar este artigo

Sánchez-Torres, J. M., Chaparro-Díaz, L., Carreño-Moreno, S., Sánchez-Mendoza, Y. E., & Herrera-Quintero, L. K. (2026). Institutional guidelines on AI in Latin American Higher Education: A comparative analysis. *Educación y Educadores*, 29(2), e2921. <https://doi.org/10.5294/edu.2026.29.2.1>

were scarce. Research-related guidelines emphasised transparency, authorship, and data protection. There were no guidelines for the third mission. Comparative analysis with international studies revealed thematic convergence but highlighted gaps in Latin American systematisation, institutional policy, and curricular integration. The study confirmed progress in recognising AI-related challenges yet underscores the need for structured frameworks to support responsible pedagogical adoption. Findings offered actionable insights for institutional policy and best practices, enriching global debates on AI governance from underrepresented Latin American contexts.

Keywords

Artificial intelligence; educational policy; guides; higher education; Latin America.

Directrices institucionales sobre IA en la educación superior latinoamericana: análisis comparativo

Resumen

El surgimiento de la inteligencia artificial (IA) generativa ha transformado significativamente la educación, impulsando a las instituciones de educación superior (IES) a desarrollar directrices éticas, pedagógicas y normativas para su uso. Este estudio tuvo como objetivo identificar similitudes y diferencias en las directrices institucionales relativas al uso de la IA en la docencia y la investigación de las IES latinoamericanas. Se realizó un análisis comparativo de 22 directrices institucionales de casi 85 IES en seis países latinoamericanos. La revisión tuvo en cuenta las fechas de publicación, el público objetivo, los propósitos previstos, las áreas temáticas, las estrategias de evaluación, las estrategias de integridad académica, las normas y las recomendaciones para la integración de la IA en las funciones institucionales centrales, tras una búsqueda y un análisis sistemáticos. Las directrices enfatizaron los principios éticos y la integridad académica, así como los ajustes en las estrategias de evaluación. Las recomendaciones operativas y metodológicas fueron escasas. Las directrices de investigación enfatizaron la transparencia, la autoría y la protección de los datos. No se encontraron directrices para la tercera misión. El análisis comparativo con estudios internacionales reveló convergencia temática, pero también puso de manifiesto brechas en la sistematización, la política institucional y la integración curricular en Latinoamérica. El estudio confirma los avances en el reconocimiento de los desafíos relacionados con la IA, pero subraya la necesidad de marcos estructurados que respalden una adopción pedagógica responsable. Los hallazgos ofrecieron perspectivas prácticas para la formulación de políticas institucionales y de mejores prácticas al enriquecer los debates globales sobre el gobierno de la IA desde la perspectiva de contextos latinoamericanos poco representados..

Palabras clave

Inteligencia artificial; política educacional; guía; educación superior; América Latina.

Diretrizes institucionais sobre IA no ensino superior latino-americano: uma análise comparativa

Resumo

O surgimento da inteligência artificial (IA) generativa tem transformado significativamente a educação, levando as instituições de ensino superior (IES) a desenvolverem diretrizes éticas, pedagógicas e regulatórias para seu uso. Este estudo teve como objetivo identificar semelhanças e diferenças nas diretrizes institucionais sobre o uso da IA no ensino e na pesquisa acadêmica em IES latino-americanas. Foi realizada uma análise comparativa de 22 diretrizes institucionais de quase 85 IES em seis países da América Latina. A revisão considerou datas de publicação, público-alvo, propósitos, áreas temáticas, estratégias de avaliação, integridade acadêmica, parâmetros e recomendações para a integração da IA nas funções institucionais centrais, por meio de busca e análise sistemáticas. As diretrizes enfatizaram os princípios éticos e a integridade acadêmica, além de ajustes nas estratégias de avaliação. As recomendações operacionais e metodológicas foram limitadas. As diretrizes de pesquisa enfatizaram transparência, autoria e proteção de dados. Nenhuma diretriz relacionada à terceira missão universitária foi identificada. A análise comparativa com estudos internacionais revelou convergências temáticas, mas também lacunas na sistematização, nas políticas institucionais e na integração curricular na América Latina. O estudo confirma progressos no reconhecimento dos desafios relacionados à IA, mas ressalta a necessidade de estruturas institucionais que apoiem a adoção pedagógica responsável. Os resultados oferecem perspectivas práticas para a formulação de políticas institucionais e de boas práticas, enriquecendo os debates globais sobre governança da IA, considerando os contextos latino-americanos ainda sub-representados.

Palavras-chave

Inteligência artificial; política educacional; guia; ensino superior; América Latina.

Introduction

The rapid emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) tools—particularly those that experts classify as generative AI—has profoundly transformed academic environments worldwide. This transformation has introduced ethical, pedagogical, and regulatory challenges for higher education institutions (HEIs), compelling them to revise and redesign their academic and assessment practices and governance structures.

In response, multilateral organisations and HEIs have developed frameworks and guidelines to support the ethical, effective integration of AI in education. UNESCO has published foundational documents such as *ChatGPT and artificial intelligence in higher education* (Sabzalieva & Valentini, 2023), *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research* (Miao & Holmes, 2023), and the *AI Competency Framework for Students to promote human-centred thinking, ethics, technical application, and system design* (Miao et al., 2024). UNESCO's guidelines emphasise data privacy, human-centred design, ethical challenges, and teacher training. Similarly, the European Union has promoted ethical best practices for AI in education and research via guidelines and reports that highlight transparency, accountability, and research ethics (European Commission, 2022, 2023; European Research Area Forum, 2024; High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence, 2022). The OECD (2023) has also contributed by publishing its *Guidelines on the Use of GenAI in Education*.

Recent empirical research has examined institutional responses to AI adoption. Studies have highlighted the need to develop institutional policies that support the effective and ethical adoption of generative AI in HEIs (Jin et al., 2024; Moorhouse et al., 2023). The lack of clear guidelines creates additional challenges for both students and faculty, who seek institutional direction for responsible action (Kohnke et al., 2023; Moorhouse et al., 2023), and early AI policies often failed to address the challenges of generative models (Nguyen et al., 2023). Other em-

pirical studies report gaps in areas such as data privacy, academic integrity, and perceptions of originality in the context of generative AI use in top-ranked institutions (Ghimire & Edwards, 2024; Luo, 2024).

Despite these challenges, researchers have observed progress. Xiao et al. (2023) showed that institutional responses to generative AI are influenced by variables such as academic reputation, language (English), and public attitudes. Other studies have emphasised the importance of fostering students' responsibility in AI use (Dabis & Csáki, 2024) and the need to redesign assessments and strengthen institutional communication (Moorhouse et al., 2023).

In a previous study conducted by the authors (Sánchez-Torres et al., 2025), a systematic review of comparative analyses of institutional AI guidelines in HEIs identified key contributions from (An et al., 2025; Dai et al., 2024; McDonald et al., 2025; Moorhouse et al., 2023; Ruiz-Lázaro et al., 2025). Moorhouse et al. (2023) identified that the top 50 universities globally have updated guidelines on academic integrity. Dai et al. (2024), in their review of 60 top Asian HEIs, confirmed that integrity and academic writing were key concerns. However, they identified persistent gaps in stakeholder engagement and continued reliance on traditional educational paradigms. In the United States, McDonald et al. (2025) examined AI policies in 116 R1-classified HEIs and found that over 60% promote the use of generative AI in educational contexts, with approximately 40% offering detailed guidance. Notably, 56% of institutions provide sample syllabi, and 50% suggest classroom activities. Nevertheless, the study also warned that these frameworks may impose additional burdens on faculty due to their need for frequent updates. An et al. (2025) analysed generative AI guidelines in the 50 top-ranked U.S. institutions, concluding that the most robust policies incorporate technical, ethical, organisational, and communication elements to promote equitable, transparent use. Ruiz-Lázaro et al. (2025) found significant heterogeneity in the structure, scope, and quality of AI policies, reinforcing the need for

cohesive national strategies to ensure consistency across Spanish HEIs.

While these works provide valuable insights into North American, Asian, and European contexts, the review also revealed a notable absence of comparative studies focusing on Latin American HEIs.

Beyond their normative function, these institutional AI guidelines can also be understood as emerging instruments of educational governance. They shape pedagogical practices, organisational cultures, regulatory alignment, accountability and institutional strategy (Ghimire & Edwards, 2024; Li et al., 2025). From this perspective, AI ethics extends beyond technical regulation, constituting a pedagogical and political issue embedded in broader debates on university autonomy, quality assurance, and public responsibility.

In this context, systematic knowledge of how Latin American HEIs are responding to generative AI remains limited. This study aims to fill that gap by conducting a comparative analysis of institutional guidelines in Latin American HEIs and identifying best practices, thematic priorities, and policy gaps. By doing so, this work seeks to support the development of context-sensitive and responsible AI strategies for HEIs across the region.

This paper is structured into four sections. Following this introduction, the second section details the methodological framework and criteria that we applied in the analysis. The third section presents the findings in response to the research questions. The last section presents a comparative discussion of the Latin American HEIs' findings, considers global studies, and provides a synthesis of the main conclusions.

Method

This work carried out a systematic comparative documentary review with an exploratory approach, based on the method proposed by Sánchez-Torres

and Miles (2017), which in turn adapts the protocol developed by Kitchenham et al. (2009). There are two components to this method: the search strategy and the framework for analysing the institutional guidelines regarding the use of AI within Latin American HEIs.

Search Strategy

This study is guided by the following questions:

- When were the guidelines released, by which types of institutions, and whom do they target?
- What purposes do the guidelines state, and which institutional missions do they cover (teaching, research, third mission, administration)?
- Which thematic areas, assessment strategies, academic integrity issues, and AI risk types are addressed?
- What recommendations are provided for the use of AI in teaching?
- What recommendations are provided for the use of AI in research?

We conducted a systematic online search in April and May 2025, examining publications from 2020 to the present. Searches were performed using Google and targeted institutional webpages, combining Spanish keywords (*guía, lineamientos, pautas, protocolos, directrices, inteligencia artificial*) and English equivalents (guide, guidelines, protocol, directives, artificial intelligence), together with country names (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Mexico, and Peru) and selected HEI names.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria: Only those guidelines issued by Latin American HEIs (or HEI consortia/associations) that explicitly focus on the use of AI or generative AI in teaching and/or research contexts and were publicly available online were included. Documents were excluded if they lacked institutional authorship.

This phase enabled the identification of 22 institutional guidelines, which constitute the study's primary corpus. These guidelines were published by 19 HEIs along with two collective entities (associations or consortia) as shown in Table 1.

Analytical Framework

Each of the 22 guidelines identified was examined and classified using the following criteria:

- Country of origin
- Name of the institution which published the guideline
- Year of publication
- Type of issuing institution: public, private or both
- Target audience: faculty, students, and/or administrative staff
- Institutional mission covered: teaching, research, third mission, and administrative tasks
- AI scope: AI, generative AI or both
- Stated goals of the guideline
- Main and secondary categories of goal, defined by the authors based on prior findings (Sánchez-Torres et al., 2025):
 - Administrative/operational: recommendations for AI in management and support processes (student services, Human Resources, finance, Quality Assessment)
 - Data/privacy: safeguards around data protection, security, and compliance (privacy laws, consent, retention, access control)
 - Research: standards for using AI in research workflows (data management, reproducibility, authorship, methodological transparency)
 - Regulatory-ethical: policies, principles, and rules that ensure responsible, fair, and legal-
- ly compliant AI use (codes of conduct, regulations, institutional norms)
- Pedagogical-evaluative: guidance on teaching/learning practices and assessment redesign with AI (didactics, feedback tools, rubrics, learning activities)
- Strategic-transformational: long-term institutional strategy to leverage AI (governance models, roadmaps, culture change, capacity building)
- Thematic areas: using the categories proposed by Ruiz-Lázaro et al. (2025):
 - Ethical considerations: principles and dilemmas about responsible, fair, and transparent AI use
 - Uses and applications: concrete ways AI/GenAI can support teaching, learning, or research tasks
 - Tools: specific AI platforms, apps, or services recommended or allowed
 - Prompts: example instructions/questions to interact effectively with AI systems
 - Glossary: definitions of key AI terms to ensure shared understanding
- Assessment strategy: following Ruiz-Lázaro et al. (2025):
 - AI-based vs traditional assessment: whether evaluation methods rely on AI tools or conventional techniques
 - Scenarios: contexts or cases illustrating how to assess with/without AI
 - Assessment criteria: rubrics or standards rethought considering AI's capabilities/limits
 - Prompts & tools: suggested activities, prompts, and digital resources for evaluation

- Instruments: concrete artefacts (rubrics, checklists, forms) for grading or feedback
- Norms: institutional rules/standards governing grading and assessment with AI
- Academic integrity issues: categorised by Ruiz-Lázaro et al. (2025):
 - Referencing AI: how to cite or acknowledge AI contributions
 - Plagiarism & detection tools: policies and tools to detect misuse or unauthorised AI-generated work
 - Ethical/responsible use: expectations for honest, transparent engagement with AI
 - Not included: the guideline does not address integrity issues
- Type of risks: per Ruiz-Lázaro et al. (2025):
 - Biases: discrimination or unfair outputs (e.g., gender, race)
 - Data (privacy & protection): risks to personal or sensitive data
 - Veracity: inaccurate or hallucinated information produced by AI
 - Sustainability: environmental and energy impacts of AI technologies
- Recommendations for AI use in teaching
- Recommendations for AI use in research

We conducted a systematic content review of each guideline, distinguishing recommendations for AI use in teaching from those for AI use in research. The extracted statements were subsequently processed with ChatGPT (o3 model) exclusively as heuristic support for clustering and organising text, guided by the prompt: “Based on the following recommendations for the use of AI in education/research, group them into categories and provide an explanation

for each category.” The research team—comprising one physicist educator, two engineers, and two nurses—ensured disciplinary diversity and analytical breadth, with all decisions reached through iterative discussion and consensus. Categories proposed by ChatGPT were critically reviewed and refined to ensure conceptual coherence and methodological rigour, while analytical decisions, category definitions, and interpretative judgements remained under full researcher control.

Epistemological triangulation was achieved by contrasting emergent categories with findings from global comparative studies of institutional AI guidelines in HEIs, complemented by a think-aloud technique applied during AI literacy workshops with university faculty. Although these workshops were not designed as a formal empirical study, structured reflective discussions provided contextual insights that strengthened analytical robustness. AI-generated outputs were validated through researcher review at every stage of coding and classification, positioning AI as an assistive instrument rather than an autonomous analytical agent and minimising potential algorithmic bias.

Results

Overview of the Guidelines

We analysed 22 institutional guidelines on the use of AI in Latin American HEIs originating from six countries (see Table 1). These are strikingly few guidelines, compared to the number of HEIs in the region.

Brazil leads with five guidelines, followed by Mexico, Colombia, and Chile with four each, Peru with three, and Argentina with two. Nineteen individual HEIs issued these documents. Additionally, the Brazilian Political Science Association (ABCP) and the National Association of Graduate Studies and Research in Social Sciences jointly produced one guideline. At the same time, another was issued by the STHEM consortium, which brings together 65 public and

private HEIs across Brazil. In total, these guidelines reach approximately 85 HEIs across the region, illustrating the growing institutional awareness

and collaborative efforts to regulate the responsible and educational use of AI in Latin American higher education.

Table 1. Distribution of Guidelines of AI Use in Latin American HEIs

Country/Institution	# of guidelines	
	per institution	per country
Argentina		2
Universidad de Ciencias Empresariales y Sociales (UCES)	1	
Universidad Tecnológica Nacional (UTN)	1	
Brazil		5
Associação Brasileira de Ciência Política (ABCP) e da Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa em Ciências Sociais (Anpocs) ¹	1	
Universidade Federal da Bahia (UFBA)	1	
Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG)	1	
Centro Universitário SENAI CIMATEC (SENAI)	1	
Consortio STHM – 65 HEIs ²	1	
Chile		4
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile (PUCCh)	1	
Universidad Andrés Bello (UAB)	1	
Universidad Autónoma de Chile (UACH)	1	
Universidad Católica de Temuco (UCT)	1	
Colombia		4
Universidad de Ibagué (UI)	1	
Universidad Antonio Nariño (UAN)	1	
Universidad de Los Andes (UA)	1	
Universidad Externado de Colombia (UEC)	1	
México		4
Tecnológico de Monterrey (TecM)	2	
Universidad de Guadalajara (UG)	1	
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM)	1	

(continued)

¹ They are non-profit associations that bring together professionals and students of social and political sciences.

² Appendix 1 shows the public-private Consortium STHM HEIs.

(continued)

Country/Institution	# of guidelines	
	per institution	per country
Perú		3
Universidad del Pacífico (UP)	1	
Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas (UPC)	1	
Universidad San Ignacio de Loyola (USIL)	1	
Total number of guidelines		22

Source: Own elaboration

In terms of chronology, as shown in Table 2, eight of the analysed guidelines were published in 2023, 13 in 2024, and one in 2025. The year 2024 represents a clear turning point in the region. On the one hand, it reflects a rapid surge in institutional interest in regulating, guiding, or promoting the responsible use of AI in academic settings—an interest that aligns with trends observed in other global HEIs. On the other hand, this trend may be partly driven by the global consolidation of generative AI tools such as ChatGPT, along with mounting pressure to adapt to new technological and ethical dynamics. Fifteen guidelines offer recommendations for both AI and generative AI; the remaining seven focus solely on generative AI.

Despite quantitative differences in guidelines from public and private institutions, both types of HEIs express similar concerns about ethics, learning, and assessment. As shown in Table 3, twenty guidelines are aimed at faculty. Two guidelines are directed exclusively at students. Eight guidelines include recommendations for administrative staff. Thus, nine guidelines address all three target audiences, indicating a systemic vision of the university environment. This broader scope reveals an institutional effort to establish a cross-cutting culture of ethical and pedagogical AI use, fostering awareness and engagement beyond the classroom setting.

Table 2. Target Audience and Institutional Mission Covered per Guideline

Guideline	Reference	AI type covered	Type of HEI covered
ABCP	Sampaio et al. (2024)	Both	N/A
PUCCh	Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile Vicerrectoría Académica (2024)	Both	Private
SENAI	de A. Ferraz et al. (2024)	Generative AI	Private
STHEM	STHEM Brasil (2024)	Generative AI	Both
TecM (1)	Tecnológico de Monterrey (2024a)	Both	Private
TecM (2)	Tecnológico de Monterrey (2024b)	Both	Private
UA	Equipo proyecto IA UniAndes (2024)	Both	Private
UAB	Universidad Andrés Bello (2024)	Both	Private
UACH	Universidad Autónoma de Chile - Rectoría (2023)	Both	Private

(continued)

(continued)

Guideline	Reference	AI type covered	Type of HEI covered
UAN	Universidad Antonio Nariño (2024)	Generative AI	Private
UCES	O'Donnell and Pérsico (2024)	Both	Private
UCT	Universidad Católica de Temuco (2023)	Generative AI	Private
UEC	Universidad Externado de Colombia (2024)	Both	Private
UFBA	Alves Peixoto et al. (2025)	Generative AI	Public
UFMG	Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG) - Gabinete da Reitora (2023)	Both	Public
UG	Universidad de Guadalajara (2023)	Generative AI	Public
UI	Universidad de Ibagué (2023)	Both	Private
UNAM	Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México and Grupo de trabajo IA generativa (2023)	Both	Public
UP	Universidad del Pacífico (2024)	Both	Private
UPC	Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas (2024)	Generative AI	Private
USIL	Universidad San Ignacio de Loyola (2023)	Both	Private
UTN	Universidad Tecnológica Nacional Rectorado (2024)	Both	Public

Source: Own elaboration

Table 3. Target Audience and Institutional Mission Covered per Guideline

Guideline	Target audience			Institutional mission covered		
	Faculty	Students	Administrative staff	Teaching	Research	Third mission
ABCP	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
PUCCh	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
SENAI	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
STHEM	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
TecM(1)	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N
TecM(2)	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
UA	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
UAB	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
UACH	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
UAN	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
UCES	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
UCT	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N

(continued)

(continued)

Guideline	Target audience			Institutional mission covered		
	Faculty	Students	Administrative staff	Teaching	Research	Third mission
UEC	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
UFBA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
UFMG	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
UG	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
UI	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
UNAM	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
UP	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
UPC	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N
USIL	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N
UTN	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

Note. Y: yes; N: no.

Source: Own elaboration

Stated Goals of the Guidelines

Another aspect analysed was whether the guidelines stated an objective. We found that 100 % of them do; each objective is synthesised in Table 4 and assigned to a category.

Table 4. Categories of Goals

Guideline	Synthesised objective	Main category	Secondary categories
ABCP	To provide general principles of ethics and responsibility in AI-based scientific research	Research	Regulatory-ethical
PUCCh	To offer principles for AI use in teaching	Pedagogical-evaluative	Regulatory-ethical
SENAI	To guide responsible and ethical GenAI use in education, research and tech development, complying with the LGPD and principles of transparency, equity and responsibility	Regulatory-ethical	Research; data/privacy
STHEM	To stimulate reflection on AI integration in higher education, with practical guidelines and integrity	Pedagogical-evaluative	Strategic-transformational
TecM(1)	To establish ethical principles and guidelines for responsible AI use by students	Regulatory-ethical	Pedagogical-evaluative

(continued)

(continued)

Guideline	Synthesised objective	Main category	Secondary categories
TecM (2)	To guide faculty in ethical, responsible AI use, fostering conscious authorship and critical thinking	Pedagogical-evaluative	Regulatory-ethical
UA	To provide guidance for students, faculty and staff on responsible GenAI use, strengthening cross-cutting competencies	Strategic-transformational	Pedagogical-evaluative; administrative
UAB	To promote responsible AI use in education, research and management, grounded in ethical principles and institutional transparency	Strategic-transformational	Regulatory-ethical; research; administrative
UACH	To regulate the use of AI tools at Universidad Autónoma de Chile	Regulatory-ethical	Administrative
UAN	To facilitate and promote effective, ethical GenAI use within Universidad Antonio Nariño's academic community	Pedagogical-evaluative	Regulatory-ethical
UCES	To provide ethical guidance for students on appropriate and safe AI use, promoting authentic authorship and digital responsibility	Pedagogical-evaluative	Regulatory-ethical
UCT	To give recommendations for using AI (ChatGPT) in higher education at Universidad Católica de Temuco	Pedagogical-evaluative	Regulatory-ethical
UEC	To ensure human intellectual control and the ethical and critical use of AI without compromising autonomy, privacy, or integrity	Regulatory-ethical	Strategic-transformational
UFBA	To guide the UFBA community in ethical, responsible use of GenAI across academic and administrative activities	Strategic-transformational	Administrative; pedagogical-evaluative
UFMG	To formulate institutional strategies for responsible AI—ethical values, transparency, justice, and data protection—that transform teaching, research, outreach, and administration	Strategic-transformational	Regulatory-ethical; data/privacy
UG	To familiarise the University of Guanajuato community with GenAI through practical tips, suggested apps and ethical criteria	Pedagogical-evaluative	Regulatory-ethical
UI	To integrate AI as support for teaching, research, and outreach, maintaining human guidance and continuous institutional reflection	Strategic-transformational	Pedagogical-evaluative; research

(continued)

(continued)

Guideline	Synthesised objective	Main category	Secondary categories
UNAM	To give practical recommendations to ethically incorporate generative AI into teaching, learning and assessment, anticipating challenges to integrity, equity, and data privacy	Pedagogical-evaluative	Regulatory-ethical; data/privacy
UP	To establish policy guidelines for using digital technologies/AI in teaching and research. Proper, ethical use is each user's responsibility	Regulatory-ethical	Research; pedagogical-evaluative
UPC	To establish rules for the ethical and appropriate use of generative AI in university teaching, learning, and assessment	Regulatory-ethical	Pedagogical-evaluative
USIL	To provide guidelines for the responsible and ethical use of AI in academic activities (USIL)	Regulatory-ethical	Pedagogical-evaluative
UTN	To promote ethical, reflective and safe AI use across university life, reinforcing critical thinking and academic authorship	Pedagogical-evaluative	Regulatory-ethical

Source: Own elaboration

As shown in Table 4, all guidelines converge on ensuring ethical, responsible and human-centred use of AI/generative AI—academic integrity, conscious authorship, critical thinking, privacy protection and regulatory compliance. Their primary focus is teaching—and especially assessment—by redefining criteria, instruments, and scenarios, while research and administrative management receive less attention. AI is a support tool, never a substitute for human judgment, thereby preserving autonomy, intimacy, and integrity.

Although several guidelines operate as institutional policies, the normative framework remains emergent and seldom specifies implementation, monitoring, or evaluation mechanisms (e.g., KPIs, accountability, timelines). The guidelines also promote a digital culture built on critical, ethical, socio-emotional, and technical competencies that go beyond mere rule compliance. Concerns about data privacy and bias are frequent, yet environmental

sustainability and broader systemic impacts are rarely addressed.

Thematic Areas from the Guidelines

All the analysed guidelines explicitly address generative AI. This demonstrates an institutional understanding of the multifaceted role AI plays in academic environments—ranging from recommendation systems to text generation and simulation tools. At the same time, it reflects a growing awareness of the emerging risks associated with generative AI, such as hallucination, misinformation, and the uncritical replacement of intellectual work.

Table 5 illustrates that the thematic analysis of the 22 guidelines reveals that ethical considerations represent the most prominent area of focus, addressed in 21 of the documents. This underscores a strong institutional commitment to ensuring the fair and responsible use of AI in academic contexts.

The uses and applications of AI rank second, with 19 mentions, suggesting a clear interest in contextualising AI technologies within concrete institutional functions such as teaching, research, and academic management.

Technological tools are discussed in 13 guidelines, indicating a practical inclination to equip users with the necessary digital skills. The topic of prompts—crucial for interacting effectively with generative AI systems—is addressed in eight documents, reflecting growing institutional atten-

tion to prompt literacy. In addition, glossaries are included in six guidelines, supporting digital literacy by defining key technical terms.

Despite these encouraging developments, the findings suggest that many institutions are still in the early stages of integrating AI methodologically and terminologically into their academic frameworks. While critical adoption is underway, HEIs need to develop greater maturity in incorporating AI-related competencies into their strategies and curricula.

Table 5. Presence of Thematic Areas of the Analysed Guidelines

Guideline	Ethical considerations	Uses and applications	Tools	Prompts	Glossary
ABCP	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
PUCCh	Y	Y	N	N	N
SENAI	Y	Y	N	N	N
STHEM	Y	N	N	N	N
TecM(1)	Y	Y	N	N	Y
TecM(2)	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
UA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
UAB	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
UACH	Y	Y	N	N	N
UAN	Y	N	N	N	N
UCES	Y	Y	Y	N	N
UCT	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
UEC	Y	Y	Y	N	N
UFBA	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
UFMG	Y	Y	Y	N	N
UG	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
UI	Y	Y	Y	N	N
UNAM	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
UP	Y	N	N	N	N
UPC	N	Y	N	N	N
USIL	Y	Y	N	N	Y
UTN	Y	Y	Y	Y	N

Note. Y: The thematic area is mentioned; N: The thematic area is not mentioned.

Source: Own elaboration

Assessment and Feedback Strategies

The analysis of the 22 institutional guidelines, as illustrated in Table 6, reveals that the most frequently recommended assessment and feedback strategy is reformulating evaluation criteria in response to AI, which appears in 15 documents. This is followed by comparisons between traditional assessment methods and AI-assisted approaches, as presented in 12 guidelines.

However, more operational elements—such as prompts, digital tools, assessment instruments, and specific learning scenarios—are far less common. This indicates a clear gap between conceptu-

al approaches and practical implementation. Only two guidelines address all six evaluated strategies, thereby demonstrating a comprehensive and integrated perspective. By contrast, several guidelines contain solely normative references without providing actionable or applied pedagogical resources.

These findings suggest that while HEIs are increasingly acknowledging the need to adapt assessment practices to the challenges posed by AI, there remains a lack of consolidated institutional frameworks and pedagogical tools to support effective and meaningful adoption in practice.

Table 6. Assessment and Feedback Strategies in the Analysed Guidelines

Guideline	AI-based vs. traditional assessment	New scenarios	Assessment criteria	Prompts & tools	Instruments	Norms
ABCP	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
PUCCh	Y	Y	N	N	N	N
SENAI	Y	N	N	N	N	Y
STHEM	N	N	Y	N	N	N
TecM (1)	N	N	N	N	N	Y
TecM (2)	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
UA	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
UAB	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
UACH	Y	N	N	N	N	N
UAN	N	Y	Y	N	N	N
UCES	N	N	Y	N	N	N
UCT	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y
UEC	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
UFBA	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
UFMG	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
UG	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
UI	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
UNAM	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N

(continued)

(continued)

Guideline	AI-based vs. traditional assessment	New scenarios	Assessment criteria	Prompts & tools	Instruments	Norms
UP	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
UPC	Y	N	Y	N	N	N
USIL	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
UTN	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N

Note. Y: Assessment and feedback strategy is mentioned; N: Assessment and feedback strategy is not mentioned.

Source: Own elaboration

Academic Integrity and AI Use

The analysis reveals that all 22 guidelines address issues of academic integrity related to AI use (see Table 7). The majority (22) explicitly promote the ethical and responsible use of AI, and 17 documents highlight the need to reference AI use and the asso-

ciated risks of plagiarism, including the use of detection tools.

Notably, none of the guidelines omits these topics entirely, reflecting a widespread institutional concern about the academic and ethical implications of AI integration in higher education.

Table 7. Academic Integrity and AI Use

Guideline	Referencing AI	Plagiarism & detection tools	Ethical/responsible use
ABCP	Y	Y	Y
PUCCh	N	N	Y
SENAI	Y	Y	Y
STHEM	Y	Y	Y
TecM (1)	N	Y	Y
TecM (2)	Y	Y	Y
UA	Y	Y	Y
UAB	Y	Y	Y
UACH	Y	Y	Y
UAN	Y	Y	Y
UCES	Y	Y	Y
UCT	N	N	Y
UEC	Y	Y	Y
UFBA	Y	Y	Y

(continued)

(continued)

Guideline	Referencing AI	Plagiarism & detection tools	Ethical/responsible use
UFMG	Y	N	Y
UG	Y	N	Y
UI	Y	N	Y
UNAM	N	Y	Y
UP	N	Y	Y
UPC	Y	Y	Y
USIL	Y	Y	Y
UTN	Y	Y	Y

Note. Y: Academic integrity issue is mentioned. N: Academic integrity issue is not mentioned.

Source: Own elaboration

Identified Risks Associated with AI

The analysis of AI-related risks across the 22 institutional guidelines indicates that algorithmic bias—such as inequalities based on race or gender—is the most frequently cited concern, appearing in documents from 19 institutions. This highlights a strong institutional awareness of the need for algorithmic fairness and inclusivity. Following this, data privacy and protection risks are

mentioned in 15 guidelines, while concerns regarding the accuracy and reliability of information—including AI-generated errors or hallucinations—are discussed in 14 guidelines. In contrast, only five guidelines address environmental sustainability, referencing the environmental footprint of AI technologies. This suggests that sustainability remains a marginal consideration in most current institutional recommendations (see Table 8).

Table 8. Risk Associated with AI Use in the Analysed Guidelines

Guideline	Biases	Data (privacy & protection)	Veracity	Sustainability
ABCP	Y	Y	Y	N
PUCCh	Y	N	Y	N
SENAI	Y	Y	Y	N
STHEM	Y	Y	N	N
TecM (1)	Y	Y	N	N
TecM (2)	Y	Y	N	N
UA	Y	N	Y	Y
UAB	Y	Y	Y	N
UACH	N	Y	N	N
UAN	Y	Y	N	N
UCES	Y	Y	Y	N
UCT	Y	Y	N	N
UEC	Y	N	Y	N

(continued)

(continued)

Guideline	Biases	Data (privacy & protection)	Veracity	Sustainability
UFBA	Y	Y	Y	Y
UFMG	Y	Y	Y	N
UG	Y	Y	N	N
UI	Y	N	Y	Y
UNAM	Y	N	Y	N
UP	N	N	Y	N
UPC	Y	Y	N	Y
USIL	Y	Y	Y	Y
UTN	Y	Y	Y	N

Note. Y: Risk associated with AI is mentioned; N: Risk associated with AI is not mentioned.

Source: Own elaboration

Recommendations for AI Use in Teaching

The comparative analysis of the 22 institutional guidelines on AI use in teaching reveals a thematic convergence, as shown in Table 9. Only one guideline refrains from offering recommendations because it focuses exclusively on AI in research.

All guidelines emphatically advocate transparency and disclosure, requiring explicit statements of AI tools, prompts, and outputs in assignments, projects, and assessments, together with records of usage limits and criteria. They likewise unanimously call for safeguarding ethics and

academic integrity—respecting human authorship, protecting data, and ensuring traceability of AI interactions. Twenty guidelines further emphasise human supervision and validation of AI-generated results, underscoring the need for critical review to ensure accuracy and mitigate bias. Training and capacity-building initiatives appear in 18 guidelines, reflecting recognition that digital literacy is a prerequisite for responsible adoption. In contrast, only 14 guidelines recommend redesigning and adapting assessment practices, suggesting that authentic examination mechanisms remain a challenge.

Table 9. Categories of Recommendations for the Use of AI in Teaching

Category	Description of the category	Guidelines
Training and capacity building	Provide ongoing training for faculty and students, build digital literacy, and support the pedagogical integration of AI	PUCCh, STHM, TecM (1) & (2), UA, UAB, UACH, UAN, UCES, UCT, UEC, UFBA, UFMG, UG, UI, UP, UPC, USIL, UTN
Transparency and disclosure of use	Require explicit disclosure of AI tools, prompts, and outputs in assignments, projects, and assessments, and record usage limits and criteria	PUCCh, SENAI, STHM, TecM (1) & (2), UA, UAB, UACH, UAN, UCES, UCT, UEC, UFBA, UFMG, UG, UI, UNAM, UP, UPC, USIL, UTN

(continued)

(continued)

Category	Description of the category	Guidelines
Ethics and academic integrity	Ensure responsible use that respects human authorship, academic integrity, intellectual property rights, and personal data protection	PUCCh, SENAI, STHM, TecM (1) & (2), UA, UAB, UACH, UAN, UCES, UCT, UEC, UFBA, UFMG, UG, UI, UNAM, UP, UPC, USIL, UTN
Assessment design and adaptation	Redesign assessment instruments and criteria to foster authenticity, creativity, and competency-based learning while minimising inappropriate AI use	PUCCh, SENAI, TecM (1) & (2), UA, UAB, UACH, UEC, UFMG, UG, UNAM, UP, USIL, UTN
Supervision and validation of outputs	Implement human verification, critical thinking, and continuous review of AI-generated outputs to ensure quality, accuracy, and absence of bias	PUCCh, SENAI, TecM (1) & (2), UA, UAB, UACH, UAN, UCES, UCT, UEC, UFBA, UFMG, UG, UI, UNAM, UP, UPC, USIL, UTN
No explicit recommendations	The reviewed document contains no guidance on the use of AI in teaching	ABCP

Source: Own elaboration

Recommendations for AI Use in Research

As shown in Table 10, the comparative analysis of 22 institutional guidelines for AI use in research reveals a shared normative core alongside several thematic gaps. Recommendations clustered into three categories—ethics/responsibility, transparency/documentation, and human oversight/validation—are addressed by every guideline, demonstrating unanimous consensus on the need for honest AI use, public disclosure of the tools used, and human verification of results.

A secondary convergence emerges around intellectual property and authorship (20 guidelines), underscoring persistent concern to prevent improper attribution to automated systems and to ensure appropriate citation. The absence of this category suggests that some institutions rely on general legal frameworks rather than articulating their own guidelines.

More operational categories display wider variation. Only 12 guidelines explicitly regulate data protection and privacy, and 14 mandate continuous training, indicating that technical–organisational aspects have not yet reached the same priority as ethical principles. Likewise, 16 guidelines recommend bias, risk, and impact assessments—an important advance, but still not universal.

Recommendations on institutional governance and ethics committees are scarce: only eight guidelines establish formal oversight mechanisms, suggesting that governance infrastructure remains nascent and presents an opportunity for regional improvement. And 14 guidelines emphasise that AI should serve as a complement rather than a substitute for human judgment, reflecting a prudent—though uneven—stance on the extent of automation in academic research.

Table 10. Categories of Recommendations for the Use of AI in Research

Category	Category description	Institutions addressing the category
AI ethics and responsible use	General principles to ensure AI is employed honestly, fairly, and in line with academic and social values	ABCP, PUCCh, SENAI, STHEM, TecM (2), UA, UAB, UACH, UAN, UCES, UCT, UEC, UFBA, UFMG, UG, UI, UNAM, UP, UPC, USIL, UTN
Transparency and documentation of AI use	Requirement to explicitly disclose tools, prompts, results, and processes related to AI (including citing AI as a source)	ABCP, PUCCh, SENAI, STHEM, TecM (2), UA, UAB, UACH, UAN, UCES, UCT, UEC, UFBA, UFMG, UG, UI, UNAM, UP, UPC, USIL, UTN
Human oversight and validation of results	Mandate for critical review and human verification of AI-generated content to ensure accuracy and relevance	ABCP, PUCCh, SENAI, STHEM, TecM (2), UA, UAB, UACH, UAN, UCES, UCT, UEC, UFBA, UFMG, UG, UI, UNAM, UP, UPC, USIL, UTN
Intellectual property and authorship	Respect for copyright, prohibition on attributing authorship to AI, and guidance on how to cite or reference AI tools	ABCP, SENAI, STHEM, TecM (2), UA, UAB, UACH, UAN, UCES, UCT, UEC, UFBA, UFMG, UG, UI, UP, UPC, USIL, UTN
Data protection and privacy	Safeguarding of personal and sensitive data; compliance with confidentiality and information-security regulations	SENAI, STHEM, UAB, UACH, UCES, UEC, UG, UI, UPC, USIL, UTN
Training and competency development in AI	Ongoing education programmes for researchers and students covering technical, ethical, and critical use of AI	ABCP, PUCCh, TecM (2), UA, UAB, UACH, UCES, UCT, UFMG, UG, UI, USIL, UTN
Bias, risk, and impact assessment	Guidelines for identifying biases and evaluating the risks, effects, and limitations of AI in knowledge production	ABCP, PUCCh, TecM (2), UA, UAB, UACH, UAN, UEC, UFBA, UFMG, UG, UI, UNAM, UP, UPC, UTN
Institutional governance and ethics committees	Establishment of policies, committees, and mechanisms that oversee ethical compliance in AI use	SENAI, STHEM, UACH, UCT, UFBA, UFMG, UI, USIL
Complementary, not substitutive, use	Recognition of AI as a support tool that does not replace human judgement, authorship, or creativity	ABCP, PUCCh, TecM (2), UA, UAN, UCES, UCT, UEC, UG, UNAM, UP, UPC, UTN

Source: Own elaboration

Discussion and Conclusions

To the best of our knowledge, this study represents the first comparative analysis of institutional guidelines on AI in higher education with a specific focus on Latin America. The examination of 22 guidelines issued by Latin American HEIs reveals a consistent and region-wide commitment to ethical principles and academic integrity in the adoption and use of generative AI. Most guidelines emphasise the responsible use of AI, the prevention of plagiarism, and the explicit acknowledgement of AI and generative AI tools. This ethical orientation

aligns with international trends identified by Li et al. (2025) and McDonald et al. (2025), which hold that ethics serves as the cornerstone of AI governance in higher education. In the Latin American context, this convergence suggests an early but important consensus on safeguarding transparency, authorship, and data protection.

Faculty development is a recurring concern across the guidelines. Several Latin American HEIs highlight the importance of equipping educators with the skills to use AI critically, creatively, and re-

flectively, echoing findings from North American institutions (An et al., 2025) and Spanish HEIs (Ruiz-Lázaro et al., 2025). However, the Latin American HEIs' recommendations still lack operational depth, as few guidelines articulate structured training programmes, pedagogical methodologies, or implementation timelines. Although faculty development is widely recognised as essential, it remains largely an aspiration rather than a consolidated strategic institutional priority. Similarly, while the importance of human oversight and the educator's role is acknowledged, concrete mechanisms for pedagogical supervision and institutional support are seldom articulated. Within the guidelines, few recommendations address redesigning assessment or integrating AI literacy into curricula. Without comprehensive pedagogical strategies, these guidelines risk being perceived as static policy statements rather than dynamic tools for instructional innovation. Embedding faculty training, curricular integration, and cross-institutional collaboration would ensure that AI adoption strengthens both learning outcomes and academic integrity in a sustainable, context-sensitive way.

Academic integrity is addressed in 21 of the 22 Latin American guidelines, with a strong focus on ethical conduct, authorship recognition, and plagiarism detection. This reflects a shared awareness of how academic honesty frameworks are being reshaped, a concern also noted by An et al. (2025) and Ruiz-Lázaro et al. (2025). Nevertheless, integrity-related measures tend to be framed normatively, with limited guidance on pedagogical implementation.

Assessment practices emerge as a particularly uneven area. Although most guidelines (15 of 22) recommend reformulating evaluation criteria and considering new scenarios, only a minority provide concrete instruments or examples, such as rubrics, authentic tasks, and using prompts to assess higher-order cognitive skills. Nevertheless, these proposals remain isolated and are not articulated within broader institutional policy, in contrast

to the more structured and regulatory approach identified in the guidelines analysed by Ruiz-Lázaro et al. (2025). This lack of applied pedagogical resources in Latin American guidelines highlights the need to move beyond normative statements toward actionable frameworks that support faculty in redesigning assessment for AI-integrated learning environments.

In relation to the research process, all analysed guidelines address ethics, transparency, and human oversight. These recommendations reflect a growing awareness of the importance of scientific integrity in AI-mediated research. However, fewer documents provide operational detail on data protection (12 guidelines) or structured capacity-building for researchers (14 guidelines). Compared with U.S. HEIs, where governance mechanisms and ethics committees are more frequently institutionalised (An et al., 2025). Latin American HEIs appear in an early stage of formalising oversight structures. Without dedicated governance bodies, the enforcement of ethical standards risks remaining inconsistent. Strengthening institutional capacity through ethics committees, clear protocols, and monitoring mechanisms could help bridge the gap between principle and practice.

Risk management priorities further illustrate this pattern. Algorithmic bias and data privacy are the most frequently cited concerns, with 19 and 15 guidelines respectively, aligning with global policy discussions that emphasise fairness and privacy (European Commission, 2023). In contrast, environmental sustainability was mentioned in only five, despite its growing prominence in international guidance, such as the OECD (2023). Integrating sustainability into AI governance could help Latin American HEIs to anticipate future regulatory and societal demands.

The findings of this study also carry methodological implications for research processes that incorporate AI-assisted analysis. While tools such as ChatGPT can facilitate the organisation, clustering, and pre-

liminary interpretation of large qualitative datasets, the institutional guidelines analysed generally require interpretive judgement that cannot be fully delegated to AI systems. These results reinforce the importance of positioning AI as an analytical instrument rather than as an autonomous decision-making agent within research workflows. Human oversight in coding and classification remains essential to preserve epistemic responsibility and methodological transparency. This suggests that hybrid approaches, combining AI-assisted processing with rigorous human review, may enhance efficiency without compromising research integrity.

Overall, the analysis reveals a promising yet fragmented landscape in the responses of Latin American HEIs to generative AI. Ethical considerations and academic integrity are consistently prioritised, but pedagogical, operational, and governance strategies remain unevenly developed. This fragmentation complicates the emergence of shared good practices across the region.

From a policy and institutional development perspective, the results highlight the importance of regional reference frameworks that establish baseline ethical, pedagogical, and operational standards for AI use in higher education, while preserving flexibility for national and institutional adaptation. Embedding AI literacy as a cross-cutting competence, linked not only to technical proficiency but also to digital ethics, academic integrity, and critical thinking, would support more coherent curricular integration. Equally, faculty development initiatives need to progress beyond general awareness-raising and provide educators with concrete guidance on assessment design, supervision, and the critical evaluation of AI-generated outputs.

From a governance and quality assurance perspective, the findings indicate that although AI is recognised as a cross-cutting institutional issue, oversight monitoring processes and implementation indicators remain limited. In Latin American

HEIs, AI guidelines are mostly normative instruments focused on ethics and academic integrity. These results also show that operational, curricular, and accountability mechanisms are less developed; that is, educational policies on the adoption of AI are in an early stage, and institutional intention precedes the capacity for implementation (Ghimire & Edwards, 2024). Consequently, the HEIs must integrate AI governance into existing frameworks for academic integrity, quality assurance, and digital transformation. In this sense, institutional AI guidelines could operate as soft regulation, which, combined with faculty training, can raise awareness, internalise ethical principles, and implement AI governance in the classroom (Li et al., 2025). Taken together, these patterns confirm that AI ethics is a pedagogical, technological, and political concern, which involves coordinating different governance frameworks to implement guidelines for sustainable educational practice. The above suggests that accreditation agencies should incorporate explicit criteria for ethical AI use, evaluation practices, data protection, and faculty and student competencies, which would encourage institutional responses to move away from reactive compliance towards more reflective, strategic, coherent, and sustainable models of AI adoption in Latin American HEIs.

From a future research perspective, there is a need to generate empirical evidence on the implementation of institutional AI guidelines and to explore how these policies are perceived, adopted, or resisted by faculty, students, and administrative staff. Future studies should investigate the impact of these guidelines on teaching and learning practices, the transformation of academic integrity frameworks, and the evolution of assessment methods in different disciplinary contexts. Additionally, it is relevant to examine the discursive and regulatory shifts emerging from national agencies and accreditation bodies, and how these influence institutional policy alignment. Understanding these dynamics will help ensure that AI adoption in higher education is

not only technologically informed but also socially grounded, inclusive, and educationally meaningful.

This study is not without limitations. First, only published guidelines available online were analysed. Second, the heterogeneity in the structure and comprehensiveness of the guidelines hindered uniform comparison. Third, the analysis focused exclusively on the guidelines' documentary content, without assessing implementation processes or the policy's effects on teaching, research, or learning practices. Consequently, the findings reflect patterns of emphasis, emerging trends, and normative gaps across Latin American HEIs rather than behavioural or organisational outcomes. Therefore, this study, as policy analysis, through document reviews, allows us to understand institutional intent, but it cannot replace empirical evaluation of practice (McDonald et al., 2025).

In conclusion, Latin American HEIs have begun to address the ethical and pedagogical challenges posed by AI. However, gaps remain in curriculum integration, institutional policy development, and structured pedagogical design. Although the outlook is promising yet still fragmented and under construction. Accordingly, this study should be interpreted as exploratory, which provides a baseline for future research examining how such guidelines are enacted, negotiated, and operationalised within HEI contexts.

CRedit Categories Statement

Each author listed has made a substantial, direct, and intellectual contribution to the work in all the phases of the project: conceptualisation, data curation, formal analysis, methodology, drafting and writing. Each author has approved it for publication.

Acknowledgements

This article originates from the work of the ViejIAs collective, an interdisciplinary group of female

professors at the Universidad Nacional de Colombia, committed to examining the pedagogical, ethical, and institutional implications of AI in education.

Funding

The researchers emphasise that this work was entirely funded by them.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this research.

Ethics Statement

The authors declare that this research was conducted with integrity and responsibility, in full compliance with ethical standards. The data presented are original, accurate, and have not been fabricated, manipulated, or previously published. Methods are described clearly to ensure reproducibility. Authorship accurately reflects individual contributions, and all authors assume collective responsibility for the work.

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting the findings of this study are derived from publicly available institutional documents, which can be accessed through the official websites of the respective higher education institutions. Additional materials are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Consent for Publication

All authors have reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript and consent to its publication. As this study is based exclusively on publicly available documentary sources and does not involve human participants, informed consent was not required.

Artificial Intelligence Disclosure

Artificial intelligence tools (ChatGPT, o3 model) were used solely as heuristic support to assist in clustering and organising qualitative data. All outputs were critically reviewed and validated by the

authors, and all analytical decisions remained under their full control. AI did not contribute to conceptualisation or conclusions. Further details on the use of AI have been explained in the Analytical Framework subsection of the Method section.

References

- Alves Peixoto, A. de L., Coelho Neves, B., Rebouças Rangel, M. T., de Castro Júnior, M. A., Barreto Leblanc, P., Nogueira Rios, T., & Vieira dos Santos, V. (2025). *Guia para uso ético e responsável da inteligência artificial generativa na Universidade Federal da Bahia*.
- An, Y., Yu, J. H., & James, S. (2025). Investigating the higher education institutions' guidelines and policies regarding the use of generative AI in teaching, learning, research, and administration. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 22(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00507-3>
- Dabis, A., & Csáki, C. (2024). AI and ethics: Investigating the first policy responses of higher education institutions to the challenge of GAI. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11, 1006. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03526-z>
- Dai, Y., Lai, S., Lim, C. P., & Liu, A. (2024). University policies on generative AI in Asia: promising practices, gaps, and future directions. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*, 18(2), 260–281. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17516234.2024.2379070>
- de A. Ferraz, T. G., da Silva Alves, A., Vieira Albuquerque, R., & Barros Murai, T. (2024). *Guia para uso de IA Generativa no Centro Universitário SENAI CIMATEC*. Centro Universitário SENAI CIMATEC.
- Equipo proyecto IA UniAndes. (2024). *Recomendaciones para el uso de inteligencia artificial generativa en la docencia*. Universidad de los Andes.
- European Commission. (2022). *Ethical guidelines on the use of artificial intelligence (AI) and data in teaching and learning for educators*. Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission. (2023). *AI report – By the European Digital Education Hub's squad on artificial intelligence in education*. Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Research Area Forum. (2024). *Living guidelines on the responsible use of generative AI in research*. European Commission Directorate-General for Research and Innovation.
- Ghimire, A., & Edwards, J. (2024). From guidelines to governance: A study of AI policies in education. *ArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2403.15601>
- High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence. (2022). *Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI*.

- Jin, Y., Yan, L., Echeverría, V., Gašević, D., & Martínez-Maldonado, R. (2024). Generative AI in higher education: A global perspective of institutional adoption policies and guidelines. *ArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2405.11800>
- Kitchenham, B., Pearl Brereton, O., Budgen, D., Turner, M., Bailey, J., & Linkman, S. (2009). Systematic literature reviews in software engineering — A systematic literature review. *Information and Software Technology*, 51, 7-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infsof.2008.09.009>
- Kohnke, L., Moorhouse, B. L., & Zou, D. (2023). ChatGPT for language teaching and learning. *RELC Journal*, 54(2), 537–550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00336882231162868>
- Li, M., Xie, Q., Enkhtur, A., Meng, S., Chen, L., Yamamoto, B. A., Cheng, F., & Murakami, M. (2025). A framework for developing university policies on generative AI governance: A cross-national comparative study. *ArXiv*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2504.02636>
- Luo, J. (2024). A critical review of GenAI policies in higher education assessment: A call to reconsider the “originality” of students’ work. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 49(5), 651–664. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2024.2309963>
- McDonald, N., Johri, A., Ali, A., & Hingle, A. (2025). Generative artificial intelligence in higher education: evidence from an analysis of institutional policies and guidelines. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans*, 3(10121), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2025.100121>
- Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9335>
- Miao, F., Shiohira, K., & Lao, N. (2024). *AI competency framework for students*. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/JKJB9835>
- Moorhouse, B. L., Yeo, M. A., & Wan, Y. (2023). Generative AI tools and assessment: Guidelines of the world’s top-ranking universities. *Computers and Education Open*, 5(100151). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeo.2023.100151>
- Nguyen, A., Ngo, H. N., Hong, Y., Dang, B., & Nguyen, B. P. T. (2023). Ethical principles for artificial intelligence in education. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28, 4221–4241. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-022-11316-w>
- O’Donnell, G., & Pérsico, M. L. (2024). *Guía para estudiantes sobre cómo desenvolverse en la universidad en la era de la inteligencia artificial*. Universidad de Ciencias Empresariales y Sociales (UCES).
- OECD. (2023). *Opportunities, guidelines and guardrails for effective and equitable use of AI in Education*. OECD Publishing.
- Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile Vicerrectoría Académica. (2024). *Marco para el uso de inteligencia artificial en docencia*.

- Ruiz-Lázaro, J., Redondo-Duarte, S., Jiménez-García, E., Martínez-Requejo, S., & Galán-iñigo, A. (2025). Analysis of guidelines for the use of artificial intelligence in higher education: a comparison between Spanish universities. *Bordón. Revista de Pedagogía*, 77(1), 121–153. <https://doi.org/10.13042/Bordon.2025.110638>
- Sabzalieva, E., & Valentini, A. (2023). *ChatGPT and artificial intelligence in higher education: Quick start guide*. UNESCO International Institute for Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean.
- Sampaio, R. C., Sabbatini, M., & Limoni, R. (2024). *Diretrizes para o uso ético e responsável da inteligência artificial generativa um guia prático para pesquisadores*. Editora Intercom.
- Sánchez-Torres, J. M., Chaparro-Díaz, L., Herrera-Quintero, L. K., Carreño-Moreno, S., & Sánchez-Mendoza, Y. E. (2025). *Recomendaciones para el uso de la Inteligencia Artificial en actividades de docencia e investigación. Memoria Justificativa*. Bogotá.
- Sánchez-Torres, J. M., & Miles, I. (2017). The role of future-oriented technology analysis in e-Government: a systematic review. *European Journal of Futures Research*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/S40309-017-0131-7>
- STHEM Brasil. (2024). *Ética no uso da inteligência artificial nas instituições de ensino superior*.
- Tecnológico de Monterrey. (2024a). *Lineamientos para el uso ético de inteligencia artificial. Dirigido a estudiantes del Tecnológico de Monterrey*.
- Tecnológico de Monterrey. (2024b). *Lineamientos para el uso ético de inteligencia artificial. Dirigido al profesorado del Tecnológico de Monterrey*.
- Universidad Andrés Bello. (2024). *Lineamiento para el uso responsable de inteligencia artificial en la Universidad Andrés Bello*.
- Universidad Antonio Nariño. (2024). *Acuerdo12-2024: Manual uso de herramientas de inteligencia artificial generativa*.
- Universidad Autónoma de Chile - Rectoría. (2023). *Resolución Rectoría No. 220/2023: Reglamento sobre el uso de herramientas de inteligencia artificial de la Universidad Autónoma de Chile*.
- Universidad Católica de Temuco. (2023). *Lineamientos para el uso de inteligencia artificial y el ChatGPT en la UCT*.
- Universidad de Guadalajara. (2023). *Orientaciones y definiciones sobre el uso de la inteligencia artificial generativa en los procesos académicos: Guía práctica*.
- Universidad de Ibagué. (2023). *Lineamientos institucionales para el uso de herramientas de Inteligencia Artificial en los procesos académicos*.
- Universidad del Pacífico. (2024). *Política para el uso de tecnologías digitales e inteligencia artificial en la Universidad del Pacífico*.
- Universidad Externado de Colombia. (2024). *Lineamientos para el uso de inteligencia artificial*.

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, & Grupo de trabajo IA generativa. (2023). *Recomendaciones para el uso de la inteligencia artificial generativa en la docencia*.

Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas. (2024). *Lineamientos para el uso de herramientas de inteligencia artificial generativa en el proceso de enseñanza–aprendizaje. (Versión 0.2)*.

Universidad San Ignacio de Loyola. (2023). *Lineamientos para el uso de la inteligencia artificial*.

Universidad Tecnológica Nacional Rectorado. (2024). *Ética y responsabilidad para la UTN en el uso de la inteligencia artificial*.

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG) - Gabinete da Reitora. (2023). *Recomendações para o uso de ferramentas de inteligência artificial nas atividades acadêmicas na UFMG*.

Xiao, P., Chen, Y., & Bao, W. (2023). *Waiting, banning, and embracing: An empirical analysis of adapting policies for GAI in higher education*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4458269>

Appendix 1

The annex lists the universities that belong to the STHEM Consortium, categorised by province.

São Paulo SP	Minas Gerais MG	Rio Grande do Sul RS	Paraná PR	Rio de Janeiro RJ
Centro Universitário Santo Antônio	Faculdade ALIS	IMED	UNIFATEB	UEJ
UNISO	UNIFAGOC	Faculdade Dom Bosco	Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná	AEDB
UNILINS	UNIFEI	Universidade La Salle	UNIPAR	UNIFAVA
UnISALESIANO	UNIS	UNIVATES	Centro Universitário Integrado	UNISUAM
Facens	UNA	UFRGS	UNIOPET	UniFOA
ENIAC	Newton	FACCAT	UNIDEP	UFRJ
ESPM	UNIFENAS	FASA	UniCesumar	
FAAP	UNIBH		UniFCV	
UNIFEO	UNILAVRAS		UFPR	
Cruzeiro do Sul				
São Judas				
Toledo Prudente				
Belas Artes				
Ítalo				
UNICAMP				
Mauá				
UniFECAF				
FATEC Cruzeiro				
FATEC Itaquera				
UNISAL				
USF				
ESEG				

Distrito Federal DF	Bahia BA	Ceará CE	Tocantins TO	Piauí PI
UnB	Faculdade Santo Agostinho	UniFAP	ITPAC	UNINOVAFAP
UDF				
Pará PA	Maranhão MA	Espírito Santo ES	Goiás GO	Santa Catarina SC
CESUPA	UNDB	FAESA	UniEVANGÉLICA	UNISOCIESC
Sergipe SE				
UNIT				