INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY RESEARCH SYMPOSIUM- 2026

"Intelligent, Sustainable, and Inclusive Libraries: Shaping the Future of Knowledge"

Organized by the Library, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka

10th December 2026

Guidelines for Submission of Abstracts

The Library, University of Colombo, invites researchers, academics, undergraduate and postgraduate students, and industry professionals to submit abstracts for the **International Library Research Symposium 2026 (ILRS 2026)**. Selected abstracts will be considered for oral presentations at the technical sessions of ILRS 2026, which will be held on **10th December 2026**.

Deadline for the submission of Abstracts: 30th June 2026

To be considered for evaluation, each submission should include the following documents:

1. **Abstract** - Should not exceed **300 words** (excluding the title and author affiliations, acknowledgements, and key words) and formatted according to the attached template.
2. **Extended Abstract** –Should include the background, objectives, research design/materials and methods, results/findings, and discussion and/or conclusions. The total word count should not exceed **1,000 words**.
3. **Author Declaration Form** – Must be signed and submitted before the final selection is made.

Please follow the instructions carefully. Abstracts that do not adhere to the provided guidelines or are submitted after the deadline will not be considered for review. The Editorial Committee reserves the right to make minor changes to the text to enhance clarity and quality of the abstract.

Authors must submit their abstracts and extended abstracts as **Word** documents, along with the completed declaration form (as PDF), via email to the editor by **30th June 2026**. The submission email is provided below.

Email: lrseditor@lib.cmb.ac.lk

Guidelines for Preparation of Abstracts

i. The abstract must report original research not previously published elsewhere.

ii. An author may submit a maximum of **one** abstract as a single author and up to three abstracts as a co-author. No author shall submit more than **four** abstracts in total.

iii. At least one of the authors should be affiliated to the **Library, University of Colombo**.

iv. The author(s)' names and addresses

   a. Capital letters should be used only for the initials and the first letters of the surnames of authors.

   b. The address of the Institution where the work was carried out should be included under the author's name.

   c. If the collaborators are from different institutions, the addresses of the institutions should be included in brief. In this case, the addresses of the co-authors should be indicated by a number in superscript after the authors' names and before the respective addresses as shown below.

   Example (Multiple authors):

   P. Menikpurage[1], D. T. U. Abeytunga[1], R. L. C. Wijesundara[2]

   [1]Department of Chemistry, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka.

   [2]Department of Plant Sciences, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka.

v. The title should be brief and reflect the study reported. Capital letters should be used only for the first letter in the first word of the title and proper nouns.

vi. The text of the abstract should not exceed 300 words excluding title, author affiliations, acknowledgments, and keywords.

vii. Acknowledgment should be restricted to the names of funding agencies providing sponsorship.

viii. Standard abbreviations of SI units should be used.

ix. A maximum of five keywords should be provided.

x. The abstract should be coherent and free of language errors.

xi. Before you submit your abstract, ensure that the entire contents of the final abstract will fit into a single A4 page with 1-inch margins all round, font Times New Roman, size 11, and 1.5 spacing.

xii. Two versions of the abstract should be submitted electronically as separate pages within a single Word document. The first version should contain name(s) of author(s) and institutional affiliations. The second version should contain only the title and the main text, excluding any author names or institutional details.

Guidelines for Preparation of Extended Abstracts

i. The text should not exceed 1,000 words, including references.

ii. The extended abstract must clearly address the following aspects: Background, Objectives, Research Design/Materials and Methods, Results/Findings, and Discussion and/or Conclusions.

iii. The abstract should be coherent, well-structured, and free of grammatical and language errors.

iv. Submit two versions of the extended abstract electronically as separate pages within a single Word document:

– The first version should include the title, author name(s), and institutional affiliations.

– The second version should contain only the title and the main text, excluding any author names or institutional details.

v. Tables and figures may be included and must be referred to in the text as Table 1, Figure 1, etc.

vi. References should be kept to a minimum and limited to essential sources.

vii. Use Times New Roman, font size 11, with 1.5 line spacing on A4-sized paper.

Please note:

i. The declaration form must be signed, scanned, and returned by the Corresponding Author via email along with each abstract submitted.

ii. All correspondence will be addressed to the Corresponding Author. If the Corresponding Author is a student, it is mandatory that the declaration form should be signed by the supervising author/s.

iii. If the presenting author indicated in the Author Declaration Form is unable to present the paper, it is the responsibility of the corresponding author to either withdraw the paper in advance or arrange for a co-author to present it.

iv. The Editorial Committee reserves the right to reject any abstracts that do not comply with these requirements.

Academic Integrity, Similarity Assessment, and Responsible Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

* All submitted abstracts and extended abstracts must adhere to the highest standards of academic integrity. Plagiarism, including self-plagiarism, is strictly prohibited. Authors are expected to submit original work and ensure that all sources are appropriately acknowledged.

* All submitted documents will be screened using Turnitin Similarity Detection and AI Detection tools before review and publication decisions.

* The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in the preparation of manuscripts is permitted only in accordance with the University of Colombo's "Policy on the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Academic and Administrative Activities" (Annexure I). Authors remain fully responsible for the accuracy, originality, integrity, and ethical compliance of all submitted content, irrespective of whether AI tools have been utilised.

* The acceptable similarity threshold for abstracts is 5%, while the acceptable similarity threshold for extended abstracts is 15 %.

* Similarity reports will be evaluated after excluding: Reference lists; In-text citations (citation elements only, not the associated text); and Matched text segments consisting of eight (8) words or fewer.

* All identified similarities must be appropriately attributed and cited. Whether similarities arise from direct quotations, paraphrased content, adopted ideas, or previously published scholarly work, proper citation and acknowledgement are mandatory. Commonly used technical terms, standard methodological descriptions, and widely accepted academic expressions may not require citation where appropriate.

* Submissions exceeding the prescribed similarity thresholds, containing uncited material, or violating the University's academic integrity **requirements may be rejected without further notification.**

Policy on the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Academic and Administrative Activities

University of Colombo

Introduction

University of Colombo is committed to upholding the highest standards of academic rigour, ethical conduct, and professional integrity in higher education. The university recognises the transformative potential of Artificial Intelligence (AI) to enhance teaching, learning, assessment, research, administration efficiency and to create an accessible platform for all students and staff. The university is committed to responsible and ethical integration of AI, ensuring its use strengthens academic rigour, fosters innovation, promotes accessibility for all students and upholds the highest professional and ethical standards. In addition, AI offers assistance in enhancing the efficiency in managing administrative functions of the university. However, AI needs to be used in a way that promotes integrity, and preserves human judgement rather than replacing critical thinking and independent effort which hinders the teaching, learning, assessment, research and administrative activities.

This document sets out a broad set of policy guidelines on ethical, transparent and effective use of AI, and these shall be further elucidated and adapted given a particular situation without violating the core principles and values behind each guideline below. These guidelines are grounded on internationally accepted principles and best practices for ethical and trustworthy use of AI in education, including human-centred learning, transparency, accountability, fairness and equity, privacy and data protection, and safety and reliability.

Scope

This policy applies to the use of generative AI (GenAI) tools in academic and administrative activities. GenAI is broadly defined as "systems that possess the ability to process data in a way that resembles human intelligence" such as resembling human reasoning, learning, or creativity. For the purpose of this policy, GenAI tools include but are not limited to the following categories and examples.

- Conversational and text-generating tools: *e.g.,* ChatGPT, Microsoft Copilot, Google Gemini, DeepSeek, AlphaProof, AI Claude, AI co-scientist, *etc.*
- Image, audio or video generation tools: *e.g.,* Sora, Runway, Leonardo, Veo 3.1 AI, SunoAI, Grok AI *etc.*
- Automated writing and editing assistants: *e.g.,* Grammarly with AI features, *etc.*
- Research support tools: *e.g.,* Perplexity AI, ResearchRabbit, Scite LLC, Inciteful, Jenni AI, SciSpace AI, Thesis AI, *etc.*
- Paraphrasing and content humanizer tools: *e.g.,* WriteHuman, Ai Rephraser (Grammarly), Sider AI, Humanize AI, *etc.*
- Code generation and programming assistant tools: *e.g.,* GitHub Copilot, *etc.*
- AI tools that enhance accessibility for students with disabilities: visually impaired students in reading documents, accessing audio descriptions e.g., Envision AI, Saathi, Insta Reader

etc.; notetaking e.g., Google Notebook; text to speech apps for students with learning difficulties; visual and hearing impairments e.g., Voice AI, Murf AI, Speechify, Google Text to Speech, JAWS, NVDA, Balabolka *etc.;* accessing audio description of images, graphs and charts

Overarching principles for the use of GenAI

1. Accountability:
   Students and staff remain fully responsible for the accuracy, originality, quality and integrity of all completed works, regardless of whether AI tools were used or not. AI can assist their works, but it cannot replace their own critical analysis and intellectual contribution.

2. Essential verification:
   Students and staff are required to review, fact-check, and edit any AI-generated content before incorporating it into academic or administrative works. They should ensure that the final submission accurately represents their own understanding and intention.

3. Awareness of the limitations and risks of GenAI tools:
   There are many inherent limitations in GenAI, and understanding how these systems work is essential for their effective and responsible use. These limitations include but are not limited to:
   - Plagiarism and copyright risks: AI may reproduce or rephrase material from its training data, leading to potential plagiarism or copyright infringement.
   - Hallucinations: AI tools can fabricate facts, data, or references that appear credible but are false or unverifiable.
   - Bias and offensive content: Outputs may reflect social, cultural, or gender bias present in training data.
   - Lack of originality: Predictive text generation can produce work that lacks the novelty, analytical depth, or originality required for academic or research standards.
   - Technical errors: AI-generated code, calculations, or structured data may contain syntax errors or yield unintended or unsafe results.

4. Respect for assessment and teaching-specific restrictions:
   - If the use of AI tools is explicitly prohibited for a particular assignment, assessment, or teaching–learning activity, students must strictly adhere to those instructions.
   - Such restrictions take precedence over the general permissions outlined in this policy.
   - Using AI in violation of explicit instructions will be considered a serious breach of academic integrity and may constitute academic misconduct.

Guidelines of this policy are organised in Three Parts: Part I - Use of AI for Students, Part II - Use of AI in Teaching and Research by Staff, and Part III – Use of AI in Administrative Works

Part I - Use of AI for Students

Permitted use of AI (with no declaration/acknowledgement)

1. Generating in-text citations and reference list: Using AI tools to generate in-text citations and reference lists based on the readings that students have actually undertaken is permitted. However, AI tools should not be used to generate references that have not been personally accessed and read. The inclusion of fabricated, unverifiable, or AI-hallucinated references constitutes an academic misconduct.
2. Improving accessibility for students with disabilities (visually impaired/ hearing impaired): Using AI to convert text to speech and speech to text, text to Braille and Braille to text, text to image and image to text, to create video or music, presentations, to engage in notetaking during classes.

Permitted use of AI (with declaration/acknowledgement)

If students use AI for the purposes beyond those specified in 1 – 2 above, they must explicitly acknowledge such use of AI in their work. The declaration should include a short description as to how the tool was used, name and version of the AI system used, the scope or purpose of use, preferably with the AI prompt or type of input provided. This disclosure could be included in the acknowledgement section of the report or as a standalone disclaimer statement. In all instances, the original intellectual work, analysis, interpretation, and synthesis must be carried out by the student.

Examples of such permitted uses of generative AI with acknowledgement include:

- Statistical analyses or data computations: Statistical analysis or data computation required for assessments/research may be conducted using AI tools. Such usage of AI tools should be acknowledged in the research report, thesis or dissertation. However, the AI should not use for the interpretation of statistical outputs.
- Language corrections: Using AI for non-substantive language refinement (e.g., spell check, grammar, etc.).
- Substantive language editing: Substantive language editing includes more advanced stylistic editing, paraphrasing, or improving the flow or tone of writing beyond basic grammar correction. The student must verify that meaning, nuance, and scientific accuracy are maintained and that the edit does not introduce new ideas or alter interpretation.
- Information gathering and fact clarification: Use of AI tools to find and gather factual information or get a clarification on facts unclear. Since, GenAI systems can produce inaccurate or fabricated content, it is necessary that all information found is verified through an established source (e.g., textbooks, clinical guidelines, peer reviewed literature).
- Summarisation for documents already read: Using AI tools to summarise or simplify a long document. Summaries generated by AI should not replace the student's own synthesis or critical discussion.

- Developing outlines or structures: AI tools may use to plan the organisation or logical flow of a report, essay, or dissertation. AI-suggested structures may serve as a starting framework, but the final outline and content must be student-created.
- Brainstorming and idea generation: All concepts and arguments presented must originate from the student's own reasoning. Initial generation of ideas, concepts and framework must be carried out by the student independently. The student may use GenAI tools to organise or refine these further. The student must critically evaluate any generated content and independently decide what to include.
- Translation: AI tools may be used to translate short academic passages or other documents. However, translation must be reviewed and corrected by the student to ensure accuracy and contextual fidelity.
- Editing or improving visual materials: AI tools may be used to enhance clarity, layout, or visual quality of student-created figures, graphs, or diagrams. AI tools may be used for labelling, resizing, improving resolution, or aesthetic enhancement but not for generating new data or altering data representation.

Permitted use with conditions and limitations

The following conditions apply for any learning task requiring critical thinking, problem solving or creativity, and directly linked to a learning outcome in the curriculum. Use of AI in these tasks must be consistent with other sections of the Part I.

- Students must first attempt the task on their own or have a workable idea regarding producing their own draft or solution, before obtaining assistance from AI.
- Once the first draft is developed independently, the students may consult a GenAI tool to get feedback or suggestions, to compare their solution, or refine the draft.
- At all times, the students remain responsible for the work and must ensure that AI output is critically reviewed, edited and matched to their own thinking.

Permitted use of AI tools by students with disabilities (e.g., visually impaired, hearing impaired, neurodivergent, *etc.*)

Terminology, which refers to 'students with disabilities' or 'persons with disabilities' is used in this context based on the United Nations Inclusion Strategy launched in 2019, reflecting a person first and rights-based approach.

- Use of AI tools by students with disabilities shall be allowed with supervision or legitimate instructions from the relevant lecturer/supervisor/instructor and in alignment with guidelines provided by the Centre for Disability Research Education and Practice, University of Colombo.

- AI tools for students with disabilities are varied but are essential as these enable them to fully participate and engage in active and independent learning (without reliance on sighted guides or instant interpretation) within a classroom, to receive the same learner experience as other students, and inculcates essential values of equity, justice, dignity, empathy, equality, diversity and inclusivity within a higher education setting.

- Permitted use of AI tools for students with disabilities can differ from that of other students as specified above in Part I of this policy, as their needs could be more diverse and varied. Therefore, it is permitted that the requirements and usage of AI tools of diverse learners to be identified, assessed and absorbed into the preparation of teaching, learning and assessment materials with regard to disable students.

Non-permitted/prohibited use of AI and punitive consequences

1. Using AI tools in all assessments (summative, formative, self-assessment, continuous assessments, in-class assessments, final assessments, etc.) is not permitted, unless instructions explicitly authorise such use in a particular academic activity/question/assignment. In the absence of such permission to use AI tools, it should be considered that the use of AI is not permitted.
2. Using AI tools in summative assessment without authorisation is considered cheating and tantamount to an examination offence similar to the use of unauthorized material at an examination. The use of AI tools within examinations may be permitted as a reasonable accommodation for students with documented disabilities in accordance with the UGC regulations, regulations of the Centre for Disability Research Education and Practice, University of Colombo, or any other applicable university policy.
3. Students should refrain from fabricating data, evidence, citations or results in academic reports. In such cases the students may be requested to submit evidence of data collection – field reports, transcribed interviews, printed or google data collection sheets in case of a suspicion. Hence, it is important not to destroy the paper-based evidence prior to the release of the examination results.
4. Producing an AI-developed first draft for assignments or project report (even with due acknowledgement) and/or paraphrasing (see Section 5 below) is considered plagiarism and is not permitted. Such actions may entail punitive consequences of cancelling the marks of the assignment. All written works must originate from the student's own intellectual effort, with AI used only for permitted refinement, clarification, or feedback as outlined in the Sections of "permitted use of AI" in this policy. Permission could be granted to use AI tools for students with disabilities to use text to speech, text to image, text to audio / video format for the use of assessments.
5. Paraphrasing AI generated contents manually or with the use of Humaniser tools to 'humanise' them, in order to prevent identification of AI generated content or disguise its origin constitutes intentional academic deception and may entail punitive consequences. In a suspected case, authorities may use the submitted assignment of the student to put through suitable AI detectors for idiolect and lexicon analysis without the prior permission of the student.
6. Cyberbullying and impersonation: AI tools must not be used for cyberbullying in any circumstance. Creating deepfakes, manipulated media, or misleading representations of individuals is strictly prohibited. Image, audio and video generation of tools to impersonate a person or to edit audio/video/voice of a current or past member of academic or non-academic staff of the university, past or current student or a patient/cadaver, or any other person shall not be attempted with or without permission under any circumstance.
7. Data protection, privacy, and confidentiality: Sharing with/uploading of sensitive or confidential information to an AI tool or any online sharing platform is strictly prohibited.

Students must never input, upload, or share sensitive, confidential, or personally identifiable information (PII) into any AI tool or online platform. This includes patient information, student or staff records, or any data protected by ethical or legal obligations* Such conduct may violate the ethical principle of confidentiality, personal data protection laws, and institutional ethics policies, and may be treated as a serious professional misconduct issue. Uploading, sharing, or distributing lecture notes, examination papers, or any other material containing university or lecturer information to any external platform or service, for any purpose, is strictly prohibited.

8. In an incident of any non-permitted/prohibited use of AI, academic staff members shall report it to the Deputy Registrar/Examinations of the University through the Head of the Department and Rector/Dean/Director of the Campus/Faculty/Institute. The Deputy Registrar/Examinations shall submit the reported incident to the Examinations Committee of the University to determine the punishment, if any.

Note: If a student is uncertain whether the use of AI for an academic activity is permitted or not, they are advised to discuss this matter with the teacher responsible for the said activity and use only if permitted.

Part II - Use of AI in Teaching and Research by Staff

Permitted use of AI in teaching

1. Course design and content delivery

   AI could be used in developing adaptive learning materials tailored to individual student needs. For example, using AI-based platforms to recommend additional readings or exercises based on a student's performance.

2. Classroom engagement

   AI-driven simulations, virtual labs, and chatbots could be used to enhance student engagement in lessons. For example, chatbot answers for frequently asked questions about coursework or laboratory protocols.

Note: Although teachers are permitted to use AI in the above activities, the sole responsibility of these activities and their products lie entirely with the teacher(s). In other words, using AI for the above activities must not be used as an excuse for any deficiencies and shortcomings of these activities or their products.

Non-permitted use of AI in teaching

1. Assessment and feedback

   AI tools must not be used to mark or grade student works, generate evaluative feedback, or contribute to summative assessment decisions. AI systems/tools may only be used in assessment processes where the tool has undergone institutional review, rigorous validation and quality assurance, and where meaningful human oversight is maintained. Assessment decisions must remain fully human-led unless these checks are in place.

Use of AI in research

1. Staff of the University of Colombo are advised to adhere to the guidelines provided by publishers if using AI, and to use AI in a responsible manner to ensure academic integrity in publishing their research. Unethical or misuses of AI in publications would tarnish the credibility of the staff member himself/herself and the name of the University indirectly.
2. If Editorial Boards of journals / research conferences/ symposia affiliated to the University of Colombo find a misuse of AI in research papers submitted, the paper will be rejected or referred back to the authors to revise as per the comments of the editorial board.
3. Staff should not prepare research/project proposals for competitive grants of the University without acknowledging the extent of using AI. If the panel of evaluators observe that AI has been used without acknowledgement or the level of AI usage is unacceptable, the proposal will be rejected.
4. If a selection committee finds a publication enclosed in a promotion application of a staff member has used AI in an unethical manner, the selection committee will disallow the marks claimed for the particular publication.

Instructions for teachers

1. Teachers should be prepared for students to be interested in these technologies and to want to know whether they are allowed to use them for class assignments. As a result, the university encourages open dialogue among students and teachers concerning AI applications and how they relate to academic integrity. Where AI use is prohibited for pedagogical reasons, key components of class assignments may be conducted in person under the instructor's supervision to ensure compliance.
2. Inform students of the institution's expectations that "academic integrity is violated whenever AI tools are used in examinations without authorization".
3. Remind students of the importance of upholding of academic honesty and provide examples of how unauthorized use of such technologies may constitute academic misconduct. Where AI use is prohibited, its use constitutes cheating. For example, if they use images created through the use of ChatGPT or another AI tool when not authorized by a particular learning task or assessment, or use an AI tool to gain an unfair advantage on an academic evaluation when the objective of the task/assessment is to assess hands-on creation of such materials.
4. When giving assignment directions, be very detailed and clear about your expectations. Ensure these standards are communicated in various ways, such as by including them in LMS, course syllabi, and instruction guidelines and repeating them in class to assist in preventing confusion.
5. Different pedagogical requirements in different learning tasks may adopt varying expectations of using AI tools.
6. While appreciating the transformative potential of AI, it is important that the university community is also adequately informed of the below challenges that the current usage of AI as well as its ongoing unregulated development represents:
    - AI datacenters necessary for the processing and training of large language models require an environmentally unsustainable concentration of resources ignoring other pressing global problems (UN Environment Program, 2025).

- Recent research on AI use in education suggests that the negative impact of current AI use on students' cognitive skill development requires substantive pedagogical strategizing against such impact (Gerlich, 2025; Tian & Zhang, 2025).
- Threats from malicious use, dangers of too speedy AI development, risks of catastrophic accidents at the organizational level, and the problem of rogue AI have been identified as serious safety concerns in the sphere of AI development (Hendryks, Mantas & Woodside, 2023).
- Insufficient research on AI safety, minimal commitment by companies working on the technology to ensure safeguards, and the absence of adequate regulatory frameworks for the development and usage of the technology pose considerable risks. While the 2021 UNESCO framework on the Ethics of AI that the member countries signed on to represents a foundational document, that too has limitations in that it does not cover the military use of AI (Ganbaatar, 2025).
- Considerable resistance to the use of AI (Şimşek & Yasar, 2025) and many digital democracy activists refuse to accept the future arc of AI inevitability that is currently being propagated (Paris, 2026). Such positions argue that it is essential that the public literacy regarding AI be greatly improved, and that the public be made aware of current problems with AI use as well as the risks that it poses to human life in the future.

Suggestions for enhancing AI competencies of graduates

While this policy governs current expectations, the university recognises that AI will increasingly influence how knowledge is created, disseminated, applied, and evaluated. Therefore, it is encouraged to cultivate the following AI competencies in graduates even by incorporating relevant AI lessons into existing courses or offering separate course(s) for AI:

- In-depth fundamental theoretical knowledge and deep understanding of subject area to guide and critically evaluate AI outputs and systems
- Sound foundational skills capable of AI-augmentation
- Reflective attitudes, ensuring ethical and responsible use of AI technologies to augment human judgement, empathy, and professional integrity

Part III – Use of AI in Administrative Works

Permitted use of AI in administrative works

1. Summarisation of documents: Using AI tools to summarise or simplify a long document as an aid to quick reading and making decision. However, summaries generated by AI should not replace the staff member's own synthesis or critical evaluation.
2. Preparing databases or data computations: Database preparation or data computation required for decision making may be conducted using AI tools. Such usage of AI tools should be acknowledged in the relevant output. However, the AI should not use for the interpretation of computations.
3. Developing outlines or structures: AI tools may use to plan the organisation or logical flow of a report, policy, guideline, model or framework. AI-suggested outlines and structures

may serve as a starting point, but the final outline and content must be incorporated with own ideas.

4. Brainstorming and idea generation: GenAI tools could be used to organise or refine initial ideas, concepts and framework generated related to an administrative task. However, the staff must critically evaluate any generated content and independently decide what to include in the outcome document.
5. Language editing: Using AI for non-substantive language refinement (e.g., spell check, grammar, etc.) is permitted without any caution. Substantive language editing includes more advanced stylistic editing, paraphrasing, or improving the flow or tone of writing beyond basic grammar correction of documents prepared. Therefore, in substantive language editing, the staff must make sure that meaning, nuance, and scientific accuracy are maintained and that the edit does not introduce new ideas or alter interpretation.
6. Translation: Staff may use AI tools to translate documents. However, translation must be reviewed and corrected to ensure accuracy and contextual fidelity.
7. Editing or improving visual materials: AI tools may be used to enhance clarity, layout, or visual quality of figures, graphs, or diagrams included in documents. AI tools may be used for labelling, resizing, improving resolution, or aesthetic enhancement.

Conditions and limitations of using AI in administrative works

1. At all times, the staff remain responsible for the work and must ensure that AI output is critically reviewed, edited and matched to their own thinking.
2. Cyberbullying and impersonation: AI tools must not be used for cyberbullying in any circumstance. Creating deepfakes, manipulated media, or misleading representations of individuals is strictly prohibited. Image, audio and video generation of tools to impersonate a person or to edit audio/video/voice of a current or past member of academic or non-academic staff of the university, past or current student or a patient/cadaver, or any other person shall not be attempted under any circumstance.
3. Data protection, privacy, and confidentiality: Sharing with/uploading of sensitive or confidential information to an AI tool or any online sharing platform is strictly prohibited. Staff must never input, upload, or share sensitive, confidential, or personally identifiable information (PII) into any AI tool or online platform. This includes patient information, student or staff records, or any data protected by ethical or legal obligations*
   Such conduct may violate the ethical principle of confidentiality, personal data protection laws, and institutional ethics policies, and may be treated as a serious professional misconduct issue. Uploading, sharing, or distributing any material containing university, staff or student information to any external platform or service, for any purpose, is strictly prohibited.

---

* Personal data, such as personally identifiable medical diagnosis including photographs, videos, etc., authentication data such as PIN numbers, passwords and login credentials, ID and passport numbers, any socio-culturally sensitive information, intimate or nude photographs, scanned documents, signatures, financial details such as bank accounts and credit card details and biometrics or identity proof, photographs of exam result sheets, etc., irrespective of belonging to others or self.

References

Ganbaatar, U. (2025). Do Ethics in AI Still Matter? A Review of the 2021 UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of AI. *The Review of Faith & International Affairs, 23* (3), 26-33, https://doi.org/10.1080/15570274.2025.2531638

Gerlich, M. (2025). AI Tools in Society: Impacts on Cognitive Offloading and the Future of Critical Thinking. *Societies*, *15*(1), 6. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15010006

Mantas, H. D. M, & Woodside, T. (2023). An Overview of Catastrophic AI Risks. Center for AI Safety. https://arxiv.org/pdf/2306.12001.

Paris, B. (2026). *People Have the Right to Refuse AI.* https://www.techpolicy.press/people-have-the-right-to-refuse-ai/

Şimşek, C, & Yasar, A. G. (2025). *From Rejection to Regulation: Mapping the Landscape of AI Resistance*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5287068

Tian, J, & Zhang, R. (2025). Learners' AI Dependence and Critical Thinking: The Psychological Mechanism of Fatigue and the Social Buffering Role of AI Literacy, *Acta Psychologica, 260*, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2025.105725.

UN Environment Program. (2025). AI has an environmental problem. Here's what the world can do about it. https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/ai-has-environmental-problem-heres-what-world-can-do-about.

-End-

Contribution of the following staff members is acknowledged in developing this policy:

Prof. Indika Mahesh Karunathilake	Dr. Chiranthi Liyanage
Snr Prof. Vajira Dissanayake	Dr. Darshi Thoradeniya
Prof. Upul Sonnadara	Dr. Avanka Fernando
Prof. Gominda Ponnamperuma	Dr. Thushani Weerasinghe
Prof. Pandula Siribaddana	Dr. Kaushalya Perera
Prof. N.M. Kaumal	Dr. Neluka Karannagoda
Prof. I.M. Lakshman	Dr. Asitha De Silva
Prof. Farzana Haniffa	Ms. Vajira Hapuhinna
Prof. Dushyanthi Mendis	Prof. Sampath Kehelwalatenna

ILRS 2026
The Library, University of Colombo

Author Declaration Form

1. Title of the abstract:

2. Names of authors:

	Name	Affiliation	Signature
1			
2			
3			

3. Name of the author who will present the Abstract:

……..

(Note: The permanent academic staff member of the Main Library, University of Colombo, must sign this)

Name:		**Department:**
Contact No.	**Email:**	**Signature:**

I declare that this abstract reports results of original research and that the work reported in the abstract has not been published or presented earlier, and is not being considered for publication elsewhere, including the University of Colombo International Conference 2026 (UCIC 2026). (Note: The same abstract cannot be sent elsewhere for consideration for publication until the Submitting Author is notified of the decision on the Abstract).

I am aware that if this Abstract is accepted but not presented at the ILRS 2026 of the Library, University of Colombo, the authors will not be allowed to present an Abstract at the subsequent Annual Sessions of the University of Colombo, for the **next 3 years.**

Signature of the Permanent Academic Staff Member: ……

Date: …….