Lecture Notes in Education, Arts, Management and Social Science,
2026, Volume 4, Issue 7
https://bbwpublisher.com/journal/LNE
Online ISSN: 2705-053X
Print ISSN: 3083-1091

Construction of AI Teaching Ethical Norms for Business Faculty in Private Undergraduate Institutions

Pan Wang, Zhizhong Jing, Yangjian Hu

Sichuan Technology and Business University, Meishan 620000, Sichuan, China

Copyright: © 2026 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

Abstract: The integration of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) into business classrooms has brought efficiency gains, but it has also introduced four types of ethical risks: student data security, algorithmic bias, academic integrity, and pedagogical responsibility. Existing norms are formulated for general scenarios and fail to cover the unique structure of the intersection of student data and corporate data in business classrooms of private undergraduate institutions. This paper reveals the generative logic of these risks from four dimensions: dual data overlap, algorithmic evaluation labeling, homogenization of assignment generation, and dilution of human-machine responsibility. On this basis, it constructs an ethical norm system led by values, supported by four-dimensional pillars, and implemented through execution. It designs distinctive clauses such as corporate data authorization and case desensitization, and builds a closed-loop of warning and evaluation, providing a reference for similar institutions.

Keywords: Private undergraduate institutions; Business faculty; Artificial intelligence (AI); Teaching ethics; Norm construction

Online publication: July 26, 2026

1. Introduction

In recent years, generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools have rapidly entered business classrooms. Drafting marketing plans, interpreting financial data, and rehearsing business negotiations can all be accomplished with the assistance of intelligent tools, while the efficiency of lesson preparation, learning analytics, and assignment grading for teachers has also been improved. Against this backdrop, the state has incorporated AI into the overall deployment of educational digitalization. The *Master Plan for Building a Strong Educational Nation (2024–2035)* explicitly calls for promoting AI to facilitate educational reform [1]. The industry standard *Digital Competence for Teachers* lists digital social responsibility as a fundamental dimension [2]. Meanwhile, the *Interim Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services* issued by seven departments established baseline requirements such as personal information

protection, prevention of discrimination, and content labeling [3]. The General Office of the Ministry of Education has arranged for the development of guidelines for teachers' application of GenAI [4]. In November 2025, the Expert Steering Committee for Teacher Development of the Ministry of Education released the *Guidelines for Teachers' Application of Generative Artificial Intelligence (First Edition)* [5], marking the entry of teachers' application of intelligent tools into a stage governed by established regulations.

In contrast to the accelerated development of normative frameworks, the formulation of school-specific guidelines remains relatively lagging. Although some universities have begun to formulate in-school guidelines for teachers' application of AI, these are mostly drafted for general teaching scenarios, with few studies making specific provisions for the data structure, assignment patterns, and faculty characteristics of business classrooms in private undergraduate institutions. Existing research either discusses the construction of professional ethics in the context of AI for general teacher populations [6] or comparatively analyzes teachers' AI ethical frameworks based on international documents targeting higher vocational colleges [7]. The unique risk structure of private undergraduate business education scenarios has yet to enter the purview of existing normative research.

Business classroom teaching by business faculty in private undergraduate institutions simultaneously invokes student data and corporate operating data. Young teachers account for a relatively high proportion, and their training in data ethics is relatively weak, making it difficult to directly apply general norms. Based on this, the core argument is proposed: the AI teaching ethical norms for such teachers is essentially a system that translates the unique risk structure of the classroom into an enforceable system of behavioral provisions.

2. The generative logic of risks

2.1. The risk of dual data overlap

The data structure of business classrooms possesses a dual nature. In the process of teachers guiding students to use intelligent tools to complete coursework, student assignment data and behavioral records constitute the first category of data, while the operational data and customer information of partner enterprises invoked in marketing, finance, and logistics courses constitute the second category. These two types of data intersect within the processing flow of intelligent tools, thereby increasing the channels for risk spillover. In application-oriented undergraduate classrooms, professional courses with close university-enterprise linkages are highly synchronized with business operations on-site. Consequently, the frequency of intersection between student data and corporate data is higher, making the risk of data loss more prominent.

2.2. The risk of algorithmic evaluation labeling

Learning analytics tools generate individual profiles based on students' historical performance. Once generated, these profiles may detach from their original context and subsequently solidify into low expectations for specific students, thereby forming a self-fulfilling cycle. Intelligent grouping and personalized recommendations arrange learning tasks based on algorithmic outputs, which may lock students into predetermined ability tracks, depriving them of opportunities to break through these established tracks. Existing research has indicated that the stance of educators has long been overlooked in artificial intelligence application studies in higher education [8], and subsequent systematic reviews have further called for increased attention to ethical issues [9]. When algorithmic suggestions are packaged as objective data and presented to teachers, the fulfillment of review obligations faces cognitive barriers, making it easy for

teachers to unconsciously treat algorithmic outputs as their own judgments.

2.3. The risk of homogenization of assignment generation

Common assignment formats in business courses, including case analysis reports, market research reports, and business plans, highly overlap with the output formats of generative tools, making ghostwriting and excessive assistance difficult to distinguish visually. Some teachers attempt to use detection tools to maintain academic integrity; however, the misjudgment rate of such tools is relatively high, and over-reliance on detection may inadvertently penalize honest students. This structural homogenization between assignment formats and generated content implies that integrity constraints cannot be maintained solely through prohibitive regulations, but must instead rebuild the basis for judging learning authenticity through task design and evaluation methods.

2.4. The risk of dilution of human-machine responsibility

In human-AI collaborative teaching, there is a tendency for teachers' primary responsibilities to be diluted by technological mediation. Learning analytics and grade suggestions generated by intelligent tools are often directly applied to students without review, and matters such as academic early warning also tend to be left to algorithmic judgment alone, resulting in a lack of clear responsible entities in the tool selection process. Responsibility dilution is not caused by teachers' subjective negligence, but rather by the structural consequences of technological convenience. Once teaching responsibility is abdicated, educational judgment loses the gatekeeping of professional subjects. UNESCO lists AI ethics as an independent dimension of the AI Competency Framework for Teachers, precisely to prevent technology from replacing teachers' educational duties [10].

3. Architecture of the normative system

3.1. Establishment of value-leading principles

The highest level of the normative system is the value layer, which governs all provisions. Among them, the principle of student rights protection requires that all uses of intelligent tools must not come at the expense of student data security and developmental fairness. The principle of teacher's primary responsibility confirms that technology can share information processing but cannot share educational judgment, and that all teaching decisions in the classroom are ultimately the responsibility of the teacher. The operational principle that "boundaries precede convenience" requires teachers to complete a data flow review before selecting tools and assigning tasks. The AI Competency Framework for Teachers of UNESCO lists the human-centered AI concept as the first competency [10], and this formulation provides an international reference for the value layer. The above three principles constitute a progressive relationship from value to action. When tensions arise between provisions, adjudication shall be based on the order of the value hierarchy.

3.2. Design of four-dimensional pillar clauses

The normative layer consists of four pillars, each addressing a specific risk. The data ethics pillar stipulates the collection authorization, scope of use, and desensitization requirements for student data and corporate data, establishes a pre-review system for data flows with traceability for inspection, and requires that review records be kept for no less than one complete teaching cycle. The algorithmic ethics pillar stipulates

the teacher's obligation to review the output of intelligent tools; algorithmic labels shall not be directly converted into assessment conclusions. Teachers must also pay attention to the differential impact of tools on different student groups and promptly discontinue relevant functions if bias tendencies are detected. The academic integrity pillar stipulates the disclosure obligations for generated content and the boundaries of assistance, requiring students to explain the scope and method of using intelligent tools in a fixed format when submitting assignments, supplemented by evaluation links that are difficult to outsource, such as process materials and oral defenses. The teaching responsibility pillar stipulates the teacher's principal position in human-machine division of labor, listing non-delegable decision-making items such as academic early warning, assessment evaluation, and tool selection. Among these, the European Commission's Ethics Guidelines emphasize data minimization and human oversight [11], while the U.S. Department of Education report insists on the human-in-the-loop principle [12]. Data minimization is integrated into the data ethics pillar, and human oversight is integrated into the teaching responsibility pillar.

3.3. Internal logic of the normative system

The internal logic of the normative system is first reflected in the one-to-one correspondence between risks and pillars: the risk of dual data overlap is addressed by the data ethics pillar, the risk of algorithmic evaluation labeling is addressed by the algorithmic ethics pillar, the risk of homogenization of assignment generation is addressed by the academic integrity pillar, and the risk of dilution of human-machine responsibility is addressed by the teaching responsibility pillar. The system is divided into three layers from top to bottom: the value layer, the normative layer, and the execution layer. The value layer provides the fundamental basis for the provisions, and the execution layer transforms the norms into operable processes and requirements. The operational experience then flows back from bottom to top, serving as the basis for revising the provisions of the normative layer, thereby maintaining the openness of the system to adjust with technological evolution and policy updates.

4. Implementation mechanisms of the norms

4.1. Institutional embedding and training integration

Institutional embedding is the primary link for the implementation of norms. Within the institutional framework of teacher ethics and conduct construction, universities should formulate ethical norms for teachers' AI teaching applications, transform the four pillars into clause-based university-level documents, and link them with relevant clauses in teacher employment contracts and teaching work regulations, thereby granting the norms contractual effect and an assessment basis. University-level documents should not copy the original text of national guidelines, but should translate guiding principles into operational requirements executable in the university's own business classrooms.

Training integration is the capacity guarantee for the understanding and application of norms. AI ethics modules should be set up in pre-service training and in-service training, with content not limited to tool operation, but focusing on judgmental content such as data review, bias identification, disclosure rules, and responsibility boundaries. Research on Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK) suggests that teachers' understanding of technology can only be transformed into real competence when embedded in specific subject teaching contexts. Studies on the evolution of teacher knowledge frameworks also show that technological knowledge is being reintegrated with PCK. Accordingly, ethical training for business teachers

should use real teaching tasks rather than abstract cases, and training assessments should examine teachers' practical judgment on corporate data authorization chains and case desensitization processes.

4.2. Implementation of business-specific normative clauses

The particularity of business scenarios requires the normative system to set up two distinctive clauses. Among them, the corporate data use authorization clause requires teachers to confirm the authorization chain before using real operational data of partner enterprises, clarifying whether the authorization scope covers classroom teaching purposes, whether it allows entry into intelligent tool processing, and whether data needs to be destroyed or returned after class. Without explicit corporate authorization, relevant data shall not enter the classroom, let alone be uploaded to third-party intelligent platforms. When teachers lead students to undertake real enterprise projects, the collection, storage of project data, and ownership of results shall be agreed upon in writing before the project starts.

The business case desensitization clause requires that real cases be anonymized before entering the classroom. Enterprise names, identifiable business data, and personal information must be technically processed. Cases that may still be identifiable after processing require written consent from the enterprise. Teachers' self-built case libraries should indicate data sources and desensitization status. For student assignments and competition entries based on real cases, if they involve non-desensitized information, they must undergo dual review by teachers and enterprises before external release. Practical narrative studies of university teachers suggest that the real use of intelligent tools in teaching is far more complex than institutional assumptions. Therefore, the two special clauses must be continuously refined with practical feedback, and shareable operational examples should be formed through teaching and research activities.

4.3. Closed-loop of early warning, evaluation, and revision

After the norms take effect, regular warning and evaluation arrangements are still needed. The university should regularly collect typical instances of non-compliance inside and outside the university, such as student data uploaded directly to public tools without processing, algorithmic evaluations used for assessment without review, and tacitly allowing generated content to pass off as original assignments. After anonymization, they should be analyzed in teaching and research activities, so that abstract clauses can obtain contextualized interpretation. The purpose of case analysis is prevention rather than accountability. Case sources include problems found in school inspections and lessons from other schools reported publicly.

Violation handling adheres to a gradient design with education as the main focus and punishment as a supplement. For general negligence, reminders and rectification within a time limit are the main measures. For situations causing damage to student rights, the procedures for handling teacher ethics violations shall be followed. The handling results shall be recorded in the teacher ethics file, forming a closed loop with the assessment and promotion links. Before a handling decision is made, the teacher's statement should be heard. Procedural legitimacy is as important as the handling result.

Execution evaluation and dynamic revision constitute the end of the closed loop. The university should establish an annual evaluation arrangement to track the actual implementation of the four-pillar clauses in the classroom. The Reference Framework for AI Education Ethics released by the World Digital Education Alliance establishes the concepts of subject accountability and classified governance, defining three types of behaviors: prohibited, limited use, and encouraged use. The university can reclassify existing clauses according to risk levels and dynamically adjust the applicable boundaries of the clauses. Research

on AI ethics education points out that the cultivation of ethical literacy requires long-term progression. Empirical analysis of how teachers' AI literacy affects teaching innovation behaviors also shows that literacy construction is the capacity foundation for norm implementation. Therefore, the revision of normative clauses should be synchronized with teacher training, and the revision results should feed back into the case library.

5. Conclusion

The AI teaching ethical norms for business teachers in private undergraduate universities represents a systematic arrangement that translates the special risk structure of such classrooms into an enforceable system of behavioral provisions. This paper constructs a normative system led by values, supported by four-dimensional pillars, and implemented through execution, sets up distinctive clauses such as corporate data authorization and case desensitization, and builds a closed-loop of warning and evaluation, so as to ensure a one-to-one correspondence between risks and pillars, and the mutual connection between clauses and obligations. Looking forward to the "15th Five-Year Plan" period, educational digitalization is advancing in depth, and the supply of norms at the national level is increasingly improving. Accordingly, the focus of norm construction at the university level is shifting from general requirements to contextual adaptation, and from text formulation to classroom execution. The value of norms ultimately does not depend on the completeness of the clauses, but on the real execution in the classroom. Only with proper execution can an ethical foundation be laid for the intelligent transformation of business classrooms.

Funding

Planning Project of the Research Center for Integrated Development of Digital Economy and Cultural Creativity, Chengdu Research Center for Philosophy and Social Sciences, "Research on the Reconstruction of Business Teachers' Competency Model in Private Undergraduate Institutions under the Background of Empowerment and Symbiosis of Digital Economy and Artificial Intelligence" (2025), (Project No. SJWC2025ZC011); Sichuan Technology and Business University 2024 University-Level Teaching Quality and Teaching Reform Project, "Exploration and Practice of Professional Development of Business Major Teachers in Private Undergraduate Universities under the Background of Digital Economy" (2024), (Project No. JYJXGG2024005).

Disclosure statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

[1] Communist Party of China Central Committee, State Council, 2025, Master Plan for Building a Strong Educational Nation (2024–2035), viewed July 13, 2026, http://www.moe.gov.cn/jyb_xxgk/moe_1777/moe_1778/202501/t20250119_1176193.html

[2] Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China, 2022, Digital Competence for Teachers: JY/T 0646—2022, viewed July 13, 2026, http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A16/s3342/202302/t20230214_1044634.html.

[3] Cyberspace Administration of China, National Development and Reform Commission, Ministry of Education, et al., 2023, Interim Measures for the Management of Generative Artificial Intelligence Services, viewed July 13, 2026, https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/2023-07/content_6891998.htm

[4] General Office of the Ministry of Education, 2025, Notice on Organizing and Implementing the Action for Digitally Empowering Teacher Development, viewed July 13, 2026, http://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A10/s7034/202507/t20250704_1196586.html

[5] Expert Steering Committee for Teacher Development, Ministry of Education, 2025, Guidelines for Teachers' Application of Generative Artificial Intelligence (First Edition), viewed July 13, 2026, https://www.cse.edu.cn/index/detail.html?category=31&id=4743

[6] Du S, Cai G, 2025, Professional Ethics of Teachers in the Intelligent Age and Its Transformation. Educational Science Research, (6): 27-35.

[7] Han Y, 2025, The Logic of the Times, Element Framework, and Cultivation Path of Artificial Intelligence Ethics for Higher Vocational Teachers—A Comparative Analysis Based on 5 International Documents. Vocational and Technical Education, 46(28): 48–54.

[8] Zawacki-Richter O, Marín IV, Bond M, et al., 2019, Systematic Review of Research on Artificial Intelligence Applications in Higher Education–Where Are the Educators? International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16(1): 1-27.

[9] Bond M, Khosravi H, Laat DM, et al., 2024, A Meta Systematic Review of Artificial Intelligence in Higher Education: A Call for Increased Ethics, Collaboration, and Rigour. International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 21(1): 4.

[10] UNESCO, 2024, AI Competency Framework for Teachers, viewed July 13, 2026, https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-competency-framework-teachers

[11] European Commission, Directorate-General for Education, Youth, Sport and Culture, 2022, Ethical Guidelines on the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Data in Teaching and Learning for Educators, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, viewed July 13, 2026, https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/d81a0d54-5348-11ed-92ed-01aa75ed71a1/language-en

[12] U.S. Department of Education, 2023, Office of Educational Technology. Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning: Insights and Recommendations, viewed July 13, 2026, https://www2.ed.gov/documents/ai-report/ai-report.pdf

Publisher's note

Bio-Byword Scientific Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.