The Enthusiasm-Anxiety Paradox

Building a human-centered architecture of trust for AI in higher education

Huy Nghiem

Director, Institute for Digital Education and Testing (VNU-IDT)
Vietnam National University, Hanoi

Education 2026 - Policy & Ethics: The Architecture of Trust

Vietnamese higher education faces an AI paradox

High adoption vs. Deep anxiety (n=196 faculty)

HIGH ENTHUSIASM

79% of faculty are active AI users in teaching

78% believe AI improves teaching efficiency

DEEP ANXIETY

82% fear student over-reliance on AI

86% feel unconfident in their AI competence

45% have received NO formal AI training

Rapid bottom-up adoption is outpacing top-down policy, creating an "architecture of risk."

Three critical risks of inaction

Academic integrity collapse

76.5%

of faculty struggle to detect AI-generated work

- Traditional assessment methods becoming obsolete
- Erosion of degree value

Faculty burnout & inequality

52.5%

of untrained faculty feel left behind

- Widening digital divide between adopters and laggards
- Loss of professional agency

Student passivity & over-reliance

82.1%

fear students becoming passive consumers

- Erosion of critical thinking skills
- Loss of authentic learning engagement

The cost of inaction is not just inefficiency—it's the erosion of core educational values.

The choice

Do we police AI use or empower faculty as ethical architects?

Policing

- **Restrictive:** Ban AI tools in classrooms
- **Surveillance:** Focus on AI detection tools
- **Punitive:** Penalties for violations

RESULT: Drives AI use underground, stifles innovation, creates adversarial culture.

Empowering

- **Enabling:** Train faculty to use AI responsibly
- **Collaborative:** Co-create ethical guidelines
- **Transformative:** Redesign assessment to be AI-resilient

RESULT: Builds trust, fosters innovation, and develops critical competence.

VNU's architecture of trust

A three-pillar framework for responsible AI integration

Policy & governance

The foundation

- Co-created AI ethics guidelines (faculty & students)
- Academic integrity framework for AI era
- Data privacy and security protocols

Faculty development

The engine

- **3-Tier System:** Acquire, Deepen, Create
- Based on UNESCO AI Competency Framework
- From literacy to innovation leadership

Pedagogical transformation

The goal

- Assessment redesign (AI-resilient methods)
- Shift from content delivery to competency
- Teacher role: "Architect & Guide"

> **Trust is built through transparency, competence, and shared ownership—not control.**

Pillar 1: Policy as dialogue

Co-creating guidelines with faculty, not imposing rules

1

Evidence-based research

Large-scale surveys (196 faculty, 2,550 students) to identify real challenges, not assumed problems.

2

Stakeholder engagement

Faculty workshops on ethical dilemmas and student focus groups on AI use in learning.

3

Iterative guideline development

Draft guidelines shared for feedback, pilot testing in selected courses, and continuous revision.

4

Recognition & support

AI integration recognized in workload policies; awards for innovative, ethical AI use.

"Policies are living documents, not static rules."

Pillar 2: From anxiety to agency

A research-based, tiered training system (UNESCO framework)

Why Tiered?

44.9%
have NO formal training

34.6%
demand advanced training

ACQUIRE
Foundational

Target	Duration	Focus
100% Faculty	20h / 2 Years	Basics, ethics, tools

Outcome: confident AI users

DEEPEN
Pedagogical

Target	Duration	Focus
60-70% Faculty	40h / 3 Years	Pedagogy, assessment

Outcome: integrated practice

CREATE
Innovation

Target	Duration	Focus
10-15% Faculty	Ongoing	Research, leadership

Outcome: innovation champions

✓ Progressive ✓ Flexible ✓ Measurable ✓ Supportive

Pillar 3: Pedagogical transformation

Redesigning assessment: from "policing cheating" to "developing competence"

Traditional Assessment

Multiple-Choice Tests

Easily AI-solvable; tests recall, not understanding.

Take-Home Essays

Impossible to verify authorship; high plagiarism risk.

Summative Exams

Snapshot only; doesn't reflect learning process.

AI-Resilient Strategies

Authentic Tasks

Real-world problems, oral defenses, collaborative projects.

Formative Assessment

Learning portfolios, reflective journals, process focus.

Competency-Based

Focus on "human-only" skills: critical thinking, creativity.

The goal is not to prevent AI use, but to ensure students develop genuine competence.

The most effective AI policy is a "human firewall"

Not a technical barrier, but a human capacity of Empowered, Competent Faculty

Critical competence

Ability to evaluate AI outputs for accuracy, bias, and appropriateness. Understanding limitations.

86% currently lack this confidence

Pedagogical creativity

Designing learning experiences that leverage AI while developing human skills.

78.5% see teacher role transforming

Ethical confidence

Ability to navigate ethical dilemmas (plagiarism, privacy) and model responsible use.

97.5% call for ethical guidelines

"Technology can be bypassed, but a well-trained, ethically grounded faculty cannot."

The architecture of trust is not built overnight—but we must start now

From policing tools → **To empowering people**

From faculty anxiety → **To professional agency**

From artificial intelligence → **To augmented humanity**

Thank you for your attention