ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.03 No.04 (2025)

Institutional Inertia vs. Ethical Innovation: A Comparative Analysis of AI Governance at The Islamia University of Bahawalpur and Cambridge University Press

***Asif Ali*[1]**
[1]M.Phil. Education, Govt. High School Bair Wala, School Education Department, Bahawalnagar, Punjab, Pakistan, geoasifali@gmail.com
***Dr. Muhammad Rafiq-uz-Zaman*[2]**
Doctor of Education, Department of Education, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan, mrzmuslah@gmail.com,
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0009-0002-4853-045X
***Corresponding Author Email**: mrzmuslah@gmail.com*

Abstract
The article compares the responses of The Islamia University of Bahawalpur (IUB) in Pakistan and Cambridge University Press to the rise of generative AI in research in the period 2023-2025. While Cambridge embraced an early formal AI ethics policy that addressed authorship, disclosure, and research integrity, IUB revised its thesis regulations without so much as a mention of AI tools. This oversight stands out all the more in the context of IUB's subsequent announcement of an "AI-backed" bachelor's program, offered sans any underlying ethical framework. Through a comparative case study, the article demonstrates how Cambridge's early move, in keeping with international best practices by the likes of Oxford, Toronto, and Hong Kong, stands in sharp contrast to IUB's seeming symbolic ad-hoc response. The study is supported by a scoring matrix and timeline that identify major differences in the responsiveness of policies, ethical clarity, and institutional consistency. The article concludes by making practical recommendations to South Asian universities, urging them to revise procedures, invest in faculty and student training, and embrace clear AI governance that is transparent. By bridging the gap between innovation and integrity, universities can create a research culture that looks to the future while being ethically strong.

Keywords: *AI policy in education, Academic integrity, Generative AI governance, University research ethics, South Asian higher education.*

1. Introduction

The wide spread adaption of AI tools from advanced reference managers (e.g., Zotero, to EndNote) to more sophisticated LLMs (e.g., ChatGPT, Microsoft Copilot etc) have transformed the academic research environment at a global scale within a very short span of time (Brown et al., 2020). For campuses, the technological transformation brings a twofold challenge: making not only good but most effective use of AI while rigorously protecting ethical standards and academic integrity. Institutions must develop explicit policies, models and ethical guidelines; this is no longer an optional requirement, but rather a necessary condition for ensuring academic quality and preparing students to become employable (European Commission, 2024).

Global institutions have generally recognized this urgency. An initial framework of ethics for trustworthy AI was offered in the Ethics Guidelines of the European Commission (2019), which placed human autonomy, fairness, and accountability at the center of AI system use. The Living Guidelines on the Responsible Use of Generative AI in Research (2025) expand on this by proposing the active involvement of universities not only to comply with the policies but also to actively promote a culture of integrity, transparency, and human supervision in AI-implemented research settings (European Commission, 2025). UNESCO, too, has provided its Guidance on Generative AI in Education and Research (2023), encouraging institutions to implement human-

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.03 No.04 (2025)

centered policies and to emphasize privacy, inclusiveness, and ethics in deploying generative tools in education and research (UNESCO, 2023). At the regional scale, the Asian Development Bank (ADB) launched its AI Readiness Guide (2023) and emphasized the significance of benchmarking institutions, boards of ethics, and capacity building in the developing member states (Asian Development Bank, 2023).

Pakistan has retaliated with its own strategic plan: The National AI Policy 2025, announced by the Ministry of IT & Telecom, has far-reaching ambitions of training one million people in AI by 2030, establishing Centers of Excellence, and integrating AI literacy within government agencies (Ministry of IT & Telecom, Government of Pakistan, 2025). To supplement this, in the same month (April 2025), the Higher Education Commission (HEC) published its Draft Framework of Ethical Use of Generative AI in Institutions of Higher Education (HEIs), requiring universities to establish internal policies, mitigate against abuse, and encourage responsible use of AI (Higher Education Commission Pakistan, 2025).

Nonetheless, with this national movement, there has been a phenomenal lack of connection at the institutional level. On March 17, 2023, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur (IUB) committee passed a revised copy of its Guidelines to Synopsis/Thesis Writing, reasserting manual formatting and procedural inflexibility. The most disturbing fact is that this amendment was made only three days following the publication of UNESCO's global guidance on AI in education, but IUB, in its document, did not mention AI tools at all (Islamia University of Bahawalpur, 2024). This omission hints at a bigger problem: faculty and administrators either did not know or were not interested in participating in global and national events that have a direct influence on academic governance. It may be a sign of institutional irresponsibility, this kind of detachment in a fast-changing world technologically.

It was even more paradoxical in August and October 2025 where the Vice Chancellor of IUB declared in public that AI had overtaken all university disciplines (UrduPoint, 2025; IUB, 2025). As much as the words sounded forward-leaning and innovative, the truth was that it was an extraordinary gap: no policy, not even an ethics construct or a written plan to underpin this statement. Without rules in place, the university will be taken over by AI tools out of its control, potentially compromising research integrity, with old fashioned manual procedures being continued (Daily The Occasion, 2025).

This is not a matter of late adoption; it is a failure in governance. We cannot have responsible AI deployment only by good will, intent or ethics, we need organization and responsibility. The issue of IUB is illustrative to show how institutional inertia could be covered under the disguise of innovation and how it may become a threat to apprehending the distinction between what we pronounce and what we practice. A description of the key international, national and institutional developments may also be helpful in illustrating this disconnect between countries' efforts and what impact not adhering to best practice is likely to have.

Table 1. Timeline of AI Integration and Policy Developments

Date	Event	Institution/Source
April 8, 2019	Publication of Ethics Guidelines for Trustworthy AI	European Commission (2019)
March 14, 2023	UNESCO releases Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research	UNESCO (2023)

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.03 No.04 (2025)

Date	Event	Institution/Source
March 17, 2023	IUB committee approves revised Guidelines for Synopsis/Thesis Writing (no AI mention)	Islamia University of Bahawalpur (2024)
March 20, 2023	Cambridge University Press launches AI Research Ethics Policy	Cambridge University Press & Assessment (2023)
June 2023	Revised European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity published	European Commission / ALLEA (2023)
August 7, 2025	IUB Vice Chancellor publicly declares all programs are "AI-backed"	UrduPoint (2025); IUB (2025)
April 2025	European Commission publishes Living Guidelines on the Responsible Use of Generative AI	European Commission (2025)
April 2025	HEC Pakistan releases Draft Framework for Ethical Use of Generative AI in HEIs	Higher Education Commission Pakistan (2025)
July 2025	Pakistan's National AI Policy 2025 approved by federal cabinet	Ministry of IT & Telecom, Government of Pakistan (2025)
June 2023	ADB publishes AI Readiness Guide for Developing Member Countries	Asian Development Bank (2023)

2. Conceptual Framework

The paper is based on a governmentalized paradigm that analyses the reaction of institutional level to the disruptive technological change, namely the emergence of generative AI in scholarly research and publication. The framework is supported by three linked dimensions that include policy responsiveness, ethical clarity, and institutional coherence based on global and national standards, including the AI ethics guidelines of UNESCO, the AI Readiness Guide of the Asian Development Bank, and the AI national policy of 2025 of Pakistan.

2.1. Policy Responsiveness

This dimension measures the rate and effectiveness of reaction of the institutions on emerging technologies. It takes into account the latency of updating policies, with reference to international standards, and keeping up with technological uptake. Cambridge University Press and other organizations were highly responsive and even instituted their own policy on AI ethics within days following the global recommendations by UNESCO (Cambridge University Press and Assessment, 2023). In the same manner, the Higher Education Commission (HIC) in Pakistan also published its Framework of Ethical Use of Generative AI in HEIs in April 2025 (Higher Education Commission Pakistan, 2025), and the Ministry of IT & Telecom issued the National AI Policy 2025 with specific requirements of AI literacy, ethics boards, and institutional readiness (Ministry of IT & Telecom, Government of Pakistan, 2025). Conversely, the AI did not feature in the revision of thesis guidelines at IUB, which was developed on the basis of a 2014 framework and adopted in March 2023, at the same time as the world (and the country in particular) was seeing an escalation in the discussion about artificial intelligence (Islamia University of Bahawalpur, 2024).

2.2. Ethical Clarity:

The concept of ethical clarity can be described as the transparency and particularity of institutional directives in relation to the use of AI. It contains disclosure required provisions, authorship limits, data confidentiality, and scholarly honesty. The policy of Cambridge specifically bans AI

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.03 No.04 (2025)

authorship and the use of AI in submissions must be disclosed (Cambridge University Press and Assessment, 2023). The European Commission (2025) and UNESCO (2023) attach importance to human control, transparency and responsible implementation. Institutional ethics boards and public registers of AI systems are suggested by the ADB (2023). The National AI Policy of Pakistan is no different and suggests regulatory sandboxes and AI governance frameworks (Ministry of IT & Telecom, Government of Pakistan, 2025). The absence of any ethical standards regarding the use of AI in IUB, even though it is publicly claimed that the institution is run as a scientific entity, is a very critical indicator in this aspect and is an issue of concern when it comes to academic practices that are not controlled.

2.3. Institutional Coherence:

This dimension assesses the level of conformity between the institutional rhetoric and the policy recorded. There is coherence whereby the statements of the people, the change in curriculum and the government documents support each other. The contrast between the statements of the Vice Chancellor at IUB where all the programs were declared to be supported by AI (UrduPoint, 2025; IUB, 2025), and the procedural guidelines that remain unchanged at the university and the lack of an explicit policy on AI is staggering. This detachment implies conformity and not actual reform. Conversely, the National AI Policy 2025 proposes a systematic framework of AI adoption, such as capacity building, ethics management, and curriculum revision factors, which IUB has not put into practice (Ministry of IT & Telecom, Government of Pakistan, 2025).

These dimensions combined make up the analysis lens of this comparative case study. With the help of this framework, the research will evaluate not only what the institutions say about AI but also how they organize, introduce, and manage its use. It aims to shed light on the impacts of ethical innovation and institutional inertia and to promote a single, responsible AI policy model to institute of higher learning in the developing world.

3. Comparative Case Analysis: IUB vs. Cambridge University Press

3.1. Contradiction and Institutional Lag at IUB

On the one hand, the gap in the governance at The Islamia University of Bahawalpur (IUB) is apparent in the presence of a radical discrepancy between its official statements and what it has documented. The Vice Chancellor publicly declared that it was now an IUB offering that was AI-supported in August 2025, a new BS Climate Change program was the flagship offering (UrduPoint, 2025; IUB, 2025). Although such an announcement indicates the interest of institutions in the implementation of AI, it is not backed by supportive ethical principles, working policies, or guiding policies that regulate the use of AI in academic writing or research.

Rather, IUB still implements the manual formatting processes and out-of-date thesis guidelines, as stipulated in its 2024 Guidelines to Synopsis/Thesis Writing a document also updated in March 2023, only several days after the publication of landmark AI ethics guidance by UNESCO and Cambridge University Press (Islamia University of Bahawalpur, 2024). This revision does not even indicate the existence of AI tools or ethical considerations, which is also worrying as a sign of institutional inertia. This implies that faculty and administrators did not consult global developments or simply failed to pay attention to them, though they are directly related to academic governance.

This disconnection is not at all a procedural one, but is structural. Having no written policies, the implementation of AI in IUB is rhetorical, with the lack of accountability, transparency, and supervision to make implementation responsible. The result is an uncoordinated adoption of AI tools: students and faculty are using these tools informally, but without proper guidance,

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.03 No.04 (2025)

safeguards, or institutional support, they risk compromising research integrity and creating inconsistencies in academic quality. Conversely, Cambridge University Press and Assessment (2023), UNESCO (2023), HEC (2025), and the National AI Policy 2025 of Pakistan all state that it is necessary to have ethical clarity, institutional coherence, and policy responsiveness criteria, which IUB has not fulfilled to date (Cambridge University Press and Assessment, 2023; UNESCO, 2023; Higher Education Commission Pakistan, 2025; Ministry of IT and Telecom, Government of Pakistan, 2025).

3.2. Comparison: Cambridge's Ethical Leadership vs. IUB's Governance Gap

Unlike the institutional-weight that The Islamia University of Bahawalpur (IUB) itself seems to be facing, Cambridge University Press & Assessment has shown themselves to be an ethically-driven and policy responsive organization with their AI Research Ethics Policy being released on 14 March 2023—only three days before the revised guidelines from IUB were circulated for adoption at faculty level—(Cambridge University Press & Assessment, 2023). The Cambridge policy includes plain language applications as to how generative AI systems such as ChatGPT might be employed. It advances transparency, mandates the reporting of AI applied in academic manuscripts; prohibits indicating AI as an author and reinforces responsibility for maintaining the accuracy of research findings (Cambridge University Press and Assessment, 2023).

This is a systematic practice of an institutional policy consistent with it: the pronouncements and editorial policies dovetail, not to mention the ethics policies. The response from the University of Cambridge is an example of how institutions can get ahead to govern developing technologies in a way that innovation does not lead without integrity. Being silent about AI in the last revision of IUB thesis guidelines that was issued in March 2023 under the model of 2014 and appeared in the same week when this UNESCO world leading guideline regarding policy for AI and a policy by Cambridge were published (Islamia University of Bahawalpur, 2024). Failing to do so betrays a serious lack of policy imagination and institutional movement in the face of challenging global events.

Table 2 presents the comparison between IUB and Cambridge, which is combined with national policy context and framework of HEC to offer an overview of governance environment.

Table 2. Institutional Approaches to AI Integration in Academic Research (2023–2025)

Institution	AI Integration Status	Policy/Framework	Key Features	Source
IUB (Pakistan)	Minimal / Unregulated	IUB Guidelines for Synopsis/Thesis Writing (2024)	No mention of AI tools; manual procedures emphasized; no ethical framework despite AI-backed claims	Islamia University of Bahawalpur (2024); UrduPoint (2025)
Cambridge University Press	Structured & Ethical	AI Research Ethics Policy (2023)	Requires disclosure of AI use; prohibits AI authorship; enforces originality and transparency	Cambridge University Press & Assessment (2023)

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.03 No.04 (2025)

Institution	AI Integration Status	Policy/Framework	Key Features	Source
HEC Pakistan	Emerging / Regulatory	Framework for Ethical Use of Generative AI in HEIs (2025)	Mandates internal AI policies; outlines misuse categories; promotes responsible GenAI integration	Higher Education Commission Pakistan (2025)
Government of Pakistan	Strategic / National	National AI Policy 2025	AI literacy goals; ethics board; regulatory sandboxes; public register of AI systems	Ministry of IT & Telecom, Government of Pakistan (2025)

The comparison brings forth both the consequences of institutional inertia and those of ethical creativity. While Cambridge has embraced a transparency and accountability based governance concept, IUB has not had same. Despite national frameworks arising, IUB has not yet applied its own internal governance structures to either the GenAI framework developed by HEC nor to the now National AI Policy. Here we have argued the importance to come together and push AI as a wise policy in higher education institutions, even more so in developing contexts.

3.3. Comparison Evaluation Matrix

To operationalize the above developed conceptual framework, this article employs a qualitative grading model in assessing institutional responses to the latter with respect to three dimensions: policy responsiveness, ethical clarity and institutional coherence. Each organization receives a rating (on a scale of 1 to 5), according to the review process and documents, public statements and others relating to worldwide or domestic benchmarks.

Table 3. Comparative Scoring of Institutional AI Governance Across Three Dimensions

Dimension	IUB (Pakistan)	Cambridge University Press	HEC Pakistan	National AI Policy 2025	Source
Policy Responsiveness	1	5	4	5	IUB (2024); Cambridge (2023); HEC (2025); MoITT (2025)
Ethical Clarity	1	5	4	5	UNESCO (2023); HEC (2025); Cambridge (2023); MoITT (2025)
Institutional Coherence	2	5	3	4	UrduPoint (2025); HEC (2025); MoITT (2025); Cambridge (2023)

A qualitative assessment of IUB, Cambridge University Press, HEC Pakistan and National AI Policy 2025 in the light of three core government domains is offered here through Table 3. The benchmark ranks each institution according to their alignment with global and national norms, and

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.03 No.04 (2025)

the action in AI governance. This table demonstrates that the governance gap at IUB is in fact reinforced, and that structured, transparent, and ethically-informed policies are crucial for responsible AI implementation in higher education.

4.Case Studies: Institutional Response to the Integration of AI

In this section, the governance framework, policy responsiveness, ethical clarity, and institutional coherence are applied to two contrasting institutions, i.e., The Islamia University of Bahawalpur (IUB) and Cambridge University Press. These case studies demonstrate the difference between applying AI to academic research and publishing, as they illustrate the outcomes of the symbolic and substantive governance approaches.

4.1. Case Study 1: IUB's Conventional Revision and Policy Gap

On 17 March 2023, the Advanced Studies and Research Board (ASRB) at IUB endorsed revisions to its guidelines for writing a synopsis/thesis, focusing on manual formatting, structural clarity, and procedural uniformity (The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, 2024). This revision was initiated by a committee constituted on 2 March 2023 and notably lacked any mention of AI-assisted tools or Large Language Models (LLMs), although they are increasingly becoming academically relevant. Global guidance on the subject, such as the Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research, was released in the days before (UNESCO, 2023).

This exclusion was further intensified in August 2025 when the Vice Chancellor of IUB publicly claimed that all university courses were now AI-supported, citing the recently established BS Climate Change course as a model (UrduPoint, 2025; IUB, 2025). Nevertheless, no ethical frameworks, regulations of action, or institutional policies were brought up to regulate the use of AI in academic writing or research. This is especially worrying in light of the fact that the Higher Education Commission (HEC) of Pakistan had already published its Framework of Ethical Use of Generative AI in HEIs in April 2025 (Higher Education Commission Pakistan, 2025) and that the federal government had published its National AI Policy 2025 in July, which also establishes institutional alignment, internal policy formulation, and ethical control (Ministry of IT & Telecom, Government of Pakistan, 2025).

In spite of such national guidelines, IUB still uses rather slow manual processes, ignoring the possibilities of AI technologies to improve research opportunities, minimize repetition, and save precious time. This paradox of innovation in rhetoric and stagnation in procedures signifies a more fundamental governance failure. In the absence of documented policies, the integration of AI at IUB is merely symbolic, lacking the format, responsibility, and supervision that can make implementation responsible. This completely goes against the requirements of the Ethical and Policy Framework that you have described, as there are no definite and publicized rules regarding AI usage, intellectual property, or data privacy. It also compromises structural and curricular integrity, as it does not offer specialized infrastructure (policies as infrastructure to be used ethically) or proper faculty training on AI ethics.

4.2. Case Study 2: Cambridge's Proactive AI Ethics Policy

By comparison, Cambridge University Press and Assessment published its first policy on AI Research Ethics on March 14, 2023, only three days before IUB updated its guidelines (Cambridge University Press and Assessment, 2023). The policy provides proper direction regarding the application of generative AI applications like ChatGPT, as it focuses on transparency, prevention of plagiarism, accuracy, and originality. It forbids listing AI as an author, requires the disclosure of AI applications in scholarly work, and strengthens accountability in terms of the integrity of research products (Cambridge University Press and Assessment, 2023).

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.03 No.04 (2025)

Mandy Hill, the Managing Director of Academic Publishing at Cambridge, has said, "Generative AI can open up new research and experimentation possibilities. The focus on transparency, accountability, accuracy, and originality depicts more continuity than change in the application of generative AI to research" (Cambridge University Press and Assessment, 2023).

This is an institutional framing that can be interpreted as an intonation of critical engagement, but not avoidance, making Cambridge a frontrunner in applying ethical AI integration. Its policy meets international standards such as those set by UNESCO (2023), the European Commission (2025), and the ADB (2023) and is coherent in the presentation of its statements, editorial decisions, and governance policies. Such a strategy meets the Ethical and Policy Framework requirement directly, providing clear instructions on the use of AI, IP, and transparency. It also promotes Structural and Curricular Integrity by establishing implicit academic norms for AI-assisted work, and as such, faculty and researchers must be skilled in using AI in an ethical manner.

The latter two case studies are the foundation of the Comparative Evaluation Matrix provided above (Table 3) and are further contextualized within the updated timeline and policy comparison provided below.

Table 4. Comparative Timeline and Policy Features of AI Integration (2023–2025)

Feature / Milestone	**IUB (Pakistan)**	**Cambridge University Press**	**Global Benchmarks (Oxford, Toronto, Hong Kong)**	**Source**
AI Policy Launch Date	No formal policy as of October 2025	March 14, 2023	Oxford (2024); Toronto (2025); Hong Kong UGC (2023)	Cambridge University Press (2023); Rughiniș et al. (2025)
Thesis Guidelines Revision	March 17, 2023 (no AI mention)	Not applicable	Not applicable	The Islamia University of Bahawalpur (2024)
AI Program Announcement	August 2025 (BS Climate Change program)	Not applicable	Not applicable	UrduPoint (2025)
Disclosure Requirement for AI Use	Not implemented	Mandatory disclosure in all scholarly works	Required by Oxford, Toronto, Hong Kong	Cambridge University Press (2023); Chan (2023)
AI Authorship Policy	Not defined	AI cannot be listed as author	Human authorship enforced	Cambridge University Press (2023); Frontiers (2025)
Ethical Oversight Framework	Absent	Embedded in editorial and research ethics policy	Supervisor oversight emphasized	Cambridge University Press (2023); Chan (2023); UNESCO (2023)

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.03 No.04 (2025)

Feature / Milestone	IUB (Pakistan)	Cambridge University Press	Global Benchmarks (Oxford, Toronto, Hong Kong)	Source
Student AI Usage (2025)	Informal, undocumented	Guided by policy	78% adoption rate globally	AnaraAI (2025)
Faculty AI Usage (2025)	Informal, undocumented	Guided by policy	62% adoption rate globally	AnaraAI (2025)
National/HEC Policy Alignment	Not implemented	Not applicable	Required by HEC and National AI Policy 2025	HEC (2025); Ministry of IT & Telecom (2025)

5. Discussion

Islamia University of Bahawalpur (IUB) and Cambridge University Press differ not just in procedure but also in philosophy. The policy of Cambridge has a proactive and ethically based solution grounded in global best practices, which are supported by the University of Oxford (2024), the University of Toronto (2025), and the University Grants Committee in Hong Kong (Chan, 2023; Rughiniș et al., 2025). These entities have provided official recommendations regarding the application of generative AI in academic research based on transparency, integrity of authorship, supervisor control, and institutional responsibility. This is a clear response to the Ethical and Policy Framework and the Pedagogical and Assessment Strategy, as it offers a clear strategy in both areas.

On the other hand, the additional reliance on aged clerical models by IUB can be seen as a sign that it threatens to marginalize academics and stall much needed reforms. AI tools are more feverishly and less formally being picked up by users, for they are not endorsed by institutions nor held back ethically (AnaraAI 2025). Such divisiveness threatens to lead the research culture to inconsistency, inequality and academic malpractice. The absence of any official AI governance policy not only questions the credibility of research with such data but also points at a broader disjuncture between institutional rhetoric and actual operation that is part and parcel of this larger turn in policy making being pursued by Pakistan. This, therefore, impacts Structural and Curricular Integrity (it provides no skilled academics or a curriculum that teaches AI ethically) and disempowers the Pedagogical and Assessment Strategy (it does not adapt methods of assessment nor develops AI literacy responsibly).

The Higher Education Commission (HEC) of Pakistan released the Framework of Ethical Uses of Generative AI in HEIs in April 2025, calling on universities to develop policies for enhancing internal coordination, discouraging abuses and promoting responsible use (Higher Education Commission Pakistan, 2025). Similarly, the National AI Policy 2025 approved by federal cabinet in July has strategic goals for AI literacies, ethics boards and regulatory sandboxes (Ministry of IT & Telecom, Government of Pakistan, 2025). That IUB has failed to adopt nationwide standardization, in spite of saying publicly that it's already doing AI-driven initiatives, is indicative of a broad failure in governance and implementation from policy. Here there is a massive contravention of all three fundamental preconditions - the lack of Structural and Curricular Integrity (no accreditation, no curriculum integration), the lack of an Ethical and Policy Framework (the absence thereof), a Pedagogical and Assessment Strategy not adjusted to meet such individual challenges).

ISSN E: 3006-1466
ISSN P: 3006-1458
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
CJSSR
CONTEMPORARY JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE REVIEW
Vol.03 No.04 (2025)

The gap is supported by the comparative evaluation matrix (Table 3), which reveals that Cambridge has high scores in all dimensions of governance, whereas IUB does not develop any points and remains within the symbolic compliance level. Subsequent institutional timeline and policy feature comparisons (Table 4) suggest the disconnect: Cambridge University adopted its AI ethics policy in early 2023 with explicit authorship and disclosure policies, whereas IUB, although it began an AI-supported degree program in 2025, still has not developed any guidelines on ethical oversight and integration (Cambridge University Press, 2023; UrduPoint, 2025; The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, 2024). In comparison to global standards and domestic models, the lack of policy infrastructure within IUB becomes even more significant (Rughiniș et al., 2025; Chan, 2023; AnaraAI, 2025; HEC, 2025; MoITT, 2025).

Otherwise, the university runs the risk of being left behind in academic standards worldwide, as well as losing its credibility in the field of research innovation. The example of IUB serves as a warning about the inability to integrate transformative technologies ethically when the institution remains inert.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

The case study highlights the pressing necessity of South Asian universities and in particular IUB to come up with AI policies that are context-sensitive, ethically-based and globally-oriented. Since generative AI tools are starting to be integrated into the academic processes, universities should also step out of the transcription and start to consider the systematic governance framework that provides national requirements and the global best practices.

7. Bridging the Divide Between Research and Ethics

To close the divide between the research and the ethical, the following suggestions are offered, and they explicitly consider the prerequisites of AI-supported programs:

1. Structural and Curricular Integrity

- **Policy Change:** Policy change to incorporate AI tools in thesis and research policies should be promptly done to make it clear how they can be used and within what limits. This should be regularly checked and accredited.
- **Faculty Development:** A large amount of investment in faculty development and training programs so that they are adept in AI tools and methods and their ethical implications.
- **Curriculum Integration:** AI principles should be incorporated into the curriculum, and the practical uses of AI should be shown, not AI as an optional addition.
- **Ethical and Policy Frameworks:**
    - To address ethical and policy frameworks, it is necessary to discuss the line of authority.
    - To deal with the ethical and policy frameworks, the line of authority should be mentioned.
- **AI Ethics Policy:** The creation of an all-encompassing AI ethics policy in the line of UNESCO, Cambridge, HEC Pakistan, and other international standards, with specifications of disclosure, authorship, data protection, and ethical control.
- **Intellectual Property:** Evident Intellectual Property (IP) standards on the AI-generated content.
- **Transparency:** Transparency and explainability regarding the use of AI in the educational and administrative processes.

2. Pedagogical and Assessment Strategies

- **Pedagogical:** This approach involves employing methods to engage as many stakeholders as possible within the project and extend the benefits of the project to all participants.
- **Assessment Strategy:** This strategy requires the use of techniques to attract as many stakeholders as possible in the project and spread the project benefits to everyone.
- **AI Literacy:** Institutional workshops and digital materials to promote AI literacy through faculty training and student orientation on responsible AI use, boundaries of authorship, and norms of disclosure.
- **Evaluation Strategies:** New evaluation strategies based on critical thinking, synthesis, and ethical reasoning capabilities AI is not capable of (e.g., project-based education, oral tests).
- **Continuous Improvement:** Enactment of a continuous improvement mechanism, including an AI Steering Committee to revise and update the AI curriculum and policies with the changing technology.

By taking these steps, institutions could develop a progressive and principled research culture one that has heeded the siren call of technological advance without destroying the value basis of academics. In this regard, the universities like IUB will be able to get rebranded creating their respective niche in the global stage of academics and well-prepared to face the ethical questions concerning AI with greater anticipation and responsibility.

References

AnaraAI. (2025). *AI in higher education statistics: The complete 2025 report*. https://anara.com/blog/ai-in-education-statistics

Brown, T. B., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Selsam, D., Amodei, D., Zhu, X., Zoph, B., Askell, A., Chen, M., Child, R., Gray, A., Radford, A., Wu, J., & Amodei, D. (2020). Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, *33*, 1877–1901.

Cambridge University Press. (2023, March 14). *Cambridge launches AI research ethics policy*. Cambridge University Press & Assessment. https://www.cambridge.org/news-and-insights/cambridge-launches-ai-research-ethics-policy

Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International journal of educational technology in higher education*, *20*(1), 38. https://educationaltechnologyjournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3

Daily The Occasion. (2025, October 11). IUB Vice Chancellor announces AI integration in all academic programs for national and international job markets. *Daily The Occasion*, p. 1.

European Commission. (2019). *Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI*. High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai

European Commission. (2023). *European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity* (Revised ed.). All European Academies (ALLEA). https://allea.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/06/European-Code-of-Conduct-Revised-Edition-2023.pdf

European Commission. (2025). *Living guidelines on the responsible use of generative AI in research* (2nd ed.). Directorate-General for Research and Innovation. https://research-

and-innovation.ec.europa.eu/document/download/1e2a4c9c-d3f1-43e9-9488-c8152aabf25f_en

Islamia University of Bahawalpur. (2025, August 7). BOS meeting led by VC Prof. Dr. Muhammad Kamran approved the BS Artificial Intelligence and Climate Change program. https://www.iub.edu.pk/bos-meeting-led-by-vc-prof-dr-muhammad-kamran-approved-the-bs-artificial-intelligence-and-climate-change-program

Rughiniș, C., Vulpe, S. N., Țurcanu, D., & Rughiniș, R. (2025). AI at the Knowledge Gates: Institutional Policies and Hybrid Configurations in Universities and Publishers. Frontiers in Computer Science, 7, 1608276. https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/computer-science/articles/10.3389/fcomp.2025.1608276/full

The Islamia University of Bahawalpur. (2024). *Guidelines for Synopsis/Thesis Writing*. Directorate of Advanced Studies and Research. (Revised during the 84th ASRB meeting on March 2, 2023). https://www.iub.edu.pk/uploads/2340/1718381659-iub-guidelines-for-thesis-writing.pdf

UNESCO. (2023). *Guidance for generative AI in education and research*. https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/guidance-generative-ai-education-and-research

University of Oxford. (2024, November 13). *New ethical framework to help navigate use of AI in academic research*. https://www.ox.ac.uk/news/2024-11-13-new-ethical-framework-help-navigate-use-ai-academic-research

University of Toronto. (2025, September 5). *Guidance on the appropriate use of generative artificial intelligence for graduate academic milestones*. School of Graduate Studies. https://www.sgs.utoronto.ca/about/guidance-on-the-use-of-generative-artificial-intelligence

UrduPoint. (2025, August 7). *IUB approves AI-integrated BS degree program*. https://www.urdupoint.com/en/pakistan/iub-approves-ai-integrated-bs-degree-program-2027524.html