Co-funded by the European Union

EHEAII
AI IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Erasmus+ Cooperation Partnership project
„Empowering Higher Education through Artificial Intelligence Integration – EHEAII"
Project nr. 2025-1-LV01-KA220-HED-000359026

REPORT

SPAIN

Within the EHEAII project, a series of round table discussions was organised in all project partner countries during February and March 2026. These discussions aimed to bring together higher education stakeholders to explore the impact of Artificial Intelligence on teaching, learning and institutional practices.

This report summarises the round table discussion held in Spain on 4 March 2026 at the Campus of the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. The event was organised by the School of Prevention and Integral Safety and Security (FUAB Formació – Prevenció i Seguretat Integral, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona) and brought together representatives from academia, quality assurance, and industry to discuss the role of artificial intelligence in higher education teaching, learning, and assessment. The discussion was led by Montserrat Iglesias Lucía and Javier Dorado Ferrer and involved eight participants from universities, public agencies, and the technology sector.

COUNTRY:	Spain
ORGANIZERS:	School of Prevention and Integral Safety and Security. FUAB Formació – Prevenció I Seguretat Integral (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)
DISCUSSION WAS LED BY:	Montserrat Iglesias Lucia, Director Javier Dorado Ferrer, Coordinator
DATE AND TIME:	4 March 2026, 12:30h
PLACE:	Campus de la UAB · 08193 Bellaterra (Cerdanyola del Vallès) · Barcelona · Spain
TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS	8
PARTICIPANTS:	Juan Águila Martínez, Director AI Industrial Software Solutions HP; Anna Prades Nebot, Head of Internationalization, AQU (Catalan Agency for Higher Education Quality); Ian Blanes García, Director School of Engineering, UAB; Santiago Robert Guillén, Professor Faculty of Law; Montserrat Iglesias Lucía, Director, School of Prevention and Integral Safety and Security, UAB; Adán Tomé Raja, Head of Quality, FUAB; Carles Botia Villarreal, professor Faculty of Political Sciences and Sociology; César Torrero Fernández, Professor School of Prevention and Integral Safety and Security.

1. How is AI currently being used in teaching process in higher education, and what patterns or gaps you can identify?

A practical use case discussed was simulation and role-play, where AI can embody different "characters" in a case (e.g., a client, an advisor, or another stakeholder). This allows students to interact with each role, ask questions, and receive varied responses.

Overall, AI adoption among teaching staff is advancing, but it is often introduced through pilots in selected sessions rather than implemented systematically across entire programmes. At the same time, AI is increasingly being used by students as an immediate problem-solving shortcut: when they do not know how to solve a task, or when it requires sustained effort, they tend to rely on AI repeatedly instead of engaging with the learning process.

Participants also pointed to key gaps, notably the need to redesign competence frameworks, since AI can automate many cognitive tasks that previously served as evidence of learning. More broadly, they noted that current university learning models and classroom formats are not yet fully aligned with the new behaviours and challenges introduced by generative AI, and that each discipline will need updated competence profiles adapted to today's technological reality.

2. To what extent can AI tools truly enhance learning outcomes without compromising academic integrity or critical thinking?

AI can enhance learning and productivity significantly, especially when used by competent users who can validate results. However, the discussion stressed that AI must not replace core understanding. Universities need to protect foundational skills such as reading, writing, comprehension, and critical thinking, as well as technical solvency: students must still demonstrate that they can perform the underlying reasoning and not only produce polished outputs.

A key proposal was to "humanise" AI-assisted work in assessment: students should make their contribution visible and accountable by explaining their method, what tools were used, how outputs were verified, and what final reasoning and judgement they added. The goal is to allow AI use while ensuring that learning outcomes are genuinely achieved and demonstrable.

3. What are the most pressing risks - academic, ethical, or social - associated with the growing use of AI in universities, and how should they be addressed institutionally?

Academic integrity risks were among the most pressing issues discussed, including AI-assisted cheating in exams and difficulties in reliably detecting AI use. Participants also linked misconduct to external pressures (time constraints, economic pressure, social expectations), which can drive opportunistic shortcuts. Another key risk is the loss of authenticity in student work, where students may submit high-quality content that they cannot understand, explain, defend, or apply.

Institutional responses should be systemic and quality-oriented, combining clear policies with responsible structures and procedures, monitoring mechanisms, and continuous improvement. Importantly, measures must be discipline-sensitive because competence needs and evaluation models differ significantly across fields.

4. Are current national and institutional policies and guidelines sufficient to ensure responsible and transparent AI use by both staff and students?

The discussion suggested that current policies and guidelines are not yet sufficient or clear enough. There is a need for clearer institutional frameworks on what AI use is allowed or prohibited, what expectations apply to students and staff, how transparency should be ensured, and what consequences follow from misconduct. A systemic approach was highlighted as essential: policies, governance responsibilities, procedures, and consistent communication must work together to protect trust and fairness.

5. How can universities better prepare educators and students to use AI critically and ethically- through training, curriculum integration, or support mechanisms?

Preparation should be practical and discipline grounded. Suggested actions included seminars and case-based learning to raise awareness of typical AI failures (biases, hallucinations, and discipline-inconsistent reasoning), along with prompting and verification strategies to review AI outputs critically. Training should focus on using AI as support without replacing student reasoning.

Curriculum integration should make AI use explicit, defining when it is acceptable and what students must still demonstrate. Participants also proposed institutionalising guidance by discipline, including identifying suitable AI tools for specific learning objectives and embedding this information into course documentation (e.g., course guides). Classroom design and teaching strategies should also promote motivation and preserve the human relationship in the learning process as a key educational asset.

6. What good practical examples you can name using AI in higher education?

Examples discussed included AI-supported role-play and simulated stakeholders in case-based learning (AI acting as different characters such as a client or advisor). Another example is AI-assisted productivity in structured tasks such as drafting materials or preparing presentations, freeing time for higher-value technical work, provided users have sufficient competence to validate results. Programming support was also mentioned as a practical case where AI can accelerate coding tasks while the human remains responsible for structure, intent, and verification.

7. How do you see AI transforming teaching roles and assessment methods in future, and what competences will become essential for educators?

Teaching roles are expected to shift towards designing learning experiences that ensure understanding, accountability, and methodological transparency, not just output generation. Educators will increasingly act as guides for validation, reasoning quality, and responsible AI use, while preserving the motivational and relational dimension of teaching.

Assessment will need redesign because AI changes what counts as evidence of skill. Participants noted that the efficiency gains introduced by AI may require redistributing the weight of certain tasks in credit allocation and evaluation, since some outputs can no longer be assumed to reflect student competence. A recurring priority is ensuring students can explain and defend what they submit, especially in traditional coursework formats.

8. Should AI tools used for student assessment and exam monitoring – classified as high-risk technologies under the EU AI Act – be treated as such in practice, and what level of human

oversight should universities ensure to guarantee fairness, transparency and the protection of students' rights?

Although the discussion focused more on integrity and assessment credibility than on legal classification, it strongly supported robust oversight in assessment contexts. Universities should establish clear rules on which tools are allowed, define limits and boundaries, and implement monitoring mechanisms aligned with AI's evolving capabilities. A central principle repeated in the discussion is that ultimate responsibility remains human, particularly where assessment certifies competence and professional readiness.

Oversight should ensure fairness, transparency, and the protection of students' rights, while recognising that different assessment contexts may require different levels of control and different expectations regarding acceptable AI support.

9. How do you see AI use in higher education in 10 years? Your vision?

Participants anticipated that some current limitations (errors and hallucinations) may diminish over time. There was also discussion of a possible convergence towards fewer tools or more unified AI systems. However, the central long-term challenge will remain competence-based: universities must preserve trust by ensuring that graduates genuinely acquire learning outcomes and can demonstrate both technical rigour and responsible AI use. The future model should balance "knowing how to work with AI" with "knowing how to work with people" and sustain the human dimension of learning.

Any additional questions discussed? Additional feedback.

A strong message throughout the meeting was that university credibility depends on its ability to certify real competence acquisition. As AI becomes embedded in learning, programmes should revisit learning outcomes, competence frameworks, and assessment design to remain coherent and defensible. Participants also highlighted the importance of communication and shared responsibility: students should clearly understand expectations, permitted uses, and consequences, and they should be engaged as partners in defining integrity standards, since they also value fairness and professional preparedness.