INTI JOURNAL | Vol.2025, Issue 5, No.9
eISSN:2600-7320

Humanizing AI in Higher Education: Rethinking HR, Ethics, and Skill Development for University Employees in the SDG Era

Shreeja Nair*, Kritika Banka, Ankur Pandya

Human Resource Department, Pandit Deendayal Energy University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat, India

***Email:** Shreeja.Nair@spt.pdpu.ac.in

Abstract

The rapid integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in higher education presents a profound dilemma of how universities can balance technological innovation with ethical governance and sustainable human resource (HR) practices. This study addresses the ethical considerations in AI adoption, the lack of accountability and transparency in AI-assisted HR functions, and the skills gaps among university employees transitioning to an AI-supportive environment. Equity, bias, and preparedness are central to institutional integrity and employee wellness in digitally transforming traditional higher education organizations. This qualitative study employed semi-structured interviews with academic heads, human resource managers, and administrators, supported by a review of institutional policies, accreditation models, and AI governance reports. It sought to understand how universities are redefining their HR, ethics, and capacity building processes to integrate AI humanely in academic and operational spaces. The results identified three predominant themes: (1) unbalanced ethical frameworks and low transparency in AI-driven hiring and performance appraisal; (2) faculty and staff apprehension due to algorithmic biases, data privacy issues, and a lack of institutional oversight; and (3) an urgent need to develop emotional intelligence, interdisciplinary thinking, and digital sensitivity among employees. Based on these findings, the paper proposes a Humanizing AI in Higher Education Framework focusing on ethical accountability, diversified HR policies, and continuous professional learning, aligned with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 4 - Quality Education, SDG 8 - Decent Work, and SDG 16 - Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions). This model offers strategies for universities to balance technological advancement with human values in the AI revolution.

Keywords

Artificial Intelligence, Higher Education, Human Resource Management, Digital Transformation, Sustainable Development Goals

Submission: 28 September 2025; **Acceptance:** 21 November 2025; **Available online:** November 2025

Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become an integral entity in institutions of higher education (HEIs), characterizing how institutions are structured, serve the student population, and manage organizations. AI is redefining the roles and responsibilities of university employees as it automates traditional work. While the potential for improved efficiency and innovativeness is significant, major questions arise concerning the marginalization of human agency, increased ethical concerns, and amplified skill gaps among academic and administrative employees.

Higher education must therefore transform its human resource management (HRM) strategy, not just to handle AI, but to ensure the digital transformation process balances human dignity, professional development, and sustainability. Universities have a dual role: to implement AI for institutional efficiency and equality, and to ensure transparency and inclusivity in HR practices.

This paper argues that humanizing AI integration in higher education requires a reassessment of HR, ethics, and skills development policies in relation to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Based on qualitative data from interviews and document analysis, the research proposes a Humanizing AI in Higher Education Framework to enable ethically responsible AI governance, equitable workforce practices, and continual skill development.

The paper proceeds in four parts: the Literature Review discusses existing works on AI uptake, HR change, and ethical governance in HEIs; the Methodology describes the qualitative approach and data-gathering procedure; the Findings and Discussion present the salient themes from the data; and the Conclusion offers the recommended framework and its implications for policy and practice.

Methodology

Research Design and Objectives

A qualitative case study methodology was used to examine the role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in transforming Human Resource (HR) functions, ethics, and skill development of employees in higher learning institutions (HEIs). The exploratory research design was suitable as the incorporation of AI into the university HR environment is an emerging field requiring comprehensive insight rather than hypothesis validation. The case study approach enabled a context-related investigation of various institution types, providing detailed, comparative information on AI's impact on human aspects of academia and administration.

The research was guided by four primary objectives. First, it sought to study the impact of Artificial Intelligence on HR activities and the evolving roles of employees within universities. Second, it aimed to examine the ethical concerns arising from the application of AI in this context. Third, the research intended to investigate university plans for employee skill enhancement in the age of AI. Finally, based on these findings, the study aimed to propose a human-oriented HR

framework that is strategically linked with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Participant Recruitment and Sampling

A purposive sampling strategy was used to select participants with significant experience in HR management, AI implementation, or institutional governance. Snowball sampling was also applied to enrich the data; participants were asked to suggest colleagues engaged in similar initiatives. The final sample included 20 participants from 5 Indian universities, comprising public, private, and deemed-to-be universities. The sample included HR managers, senior administrators, and faculty involved in technology integration or academic governance. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Data Collection

Data collection was conducted from January to May 2025, utilizing a mixed-methods approach of semi-structured interviews and document analysis. The semi-structured interview format was chosen to provide flexibility for participants to elaborate on their experiences while ensuring core areas pertinent to the study's objectives were systematically covered. Each interview, lasting between 45 and 75 minutes, was conducted either in person or via the Microsoft Teams platform to accommodate participant availability. The interview protocol was developed based on a review of prior literature concerning AI in higher education, HR transformation, and ethical AI frameworks. Guiding questions included inquiries into how AI has been integrated into HR and academic administration, the challenges and ethical concerns emerging from AI-driven decision-making, institutional preparations for AI-related transitions and new skill requirements, and the ways HR practices can promote human-centered AI adoption. To triangulate and contextualize the insights gained from the interviews, a supplementary analysis of institutional documents was performed, including HR policies, AI implementation strategies, and relevant national higher education frameworks.

Data Analysis

All interviews were audio-recorded with participant consent, transcribed verbatim, and subjected to a rigorous thematic analysis following the established six-phase framework of Braun and Clarke (2006). This process began with a phase of familiarization, involving immersion in the data through repeated reading of the transcripts. This was followed by initial coding, where systematic identification of meaningful units related to AI's role in HR, ethics, and skills was conducted, facilitated by NVivo software for efficient data management. Subsequently, the coded data was grouped into broader, emerging themes such as "Algorithmic Bias" and "Skill Reorientation" during the theme development phase. These themes were then reviewed and refined to ensure internal coherence and consistency. The process continued with the careful definition and naming of each theme to accurately capture their essence. Finally, the report was produced by integrating the refined thematic analysis with relevant scholarly literature. To ensure the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings, methodological triangulation was employed through the use of multiple data sources, and member checking was conducted by sharing preliminary findings with a subset of participants for validation and feedback.

Results and Discussion

Reforming HR Functions

Participants uniformly underscored that AI integration is redefining HR functions in higher education institutions (HEIs). HR departments now increasingly assess digital competence, communicate AI-related policies, and structure professional digital skills development. This new position transforms HR into an intermediary between IT professionals, teaching staff, and institutional executives.

This finding aligns with the argument that AI is reshaping organizations by reallocating human decision-making rights (Jobin et al., 2019). While automation increases efficiency, it also creates new interdependencies between technical and administrative elements, demanding interdisciplinary cooperation and leadership elasticity. HR's emerging role as a "translator" between technology and pedagogy underscores the need for systems that interface technological know-how with moral consciousness.

Ethical Ambiguity

A dominant theme was ethical ambiguity concerning AI use in universities. Interviewees expressed doubt regarding the fairness and transparency of AI-powered tools used in staff hiring, performance assessment, and online proctoring. Concerns were raised about surveillance activities and the lack of clear consent processes for staff information.

This supports Boddington's (2021) concept of "moral indeterminacy," where technological uptake outpaces shared ethical norms. Similarly, Jobin et al. (2019) note a patchwork of AI ethics guidelines that are not operationalized practically. Participant results confirm this incompleteness, revealing that despite universities stating ethical AI principles, many lack institutional governance mechanisms to ensure accountability and transparency. Ethical control thus remains ad hoc and personality-oriented rather than systematic.

Skills Gaps

There was unanimous acknowledgment of persistent digital literacy gaps among employees. Training was often haphazard; some institutions had inclusive digital upskilling programs, while others relied on voluntary self-training schemes. The instability of formalized programs increased employee anxiety, corresponding with literature on human capital development (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2017).

A significant finding was that while technical upskilling was sometimes introduced, broader capabilities such as critical digital ethics, interdisciplinary ability, and adaptive problem-solving were underdeveloped. This misalignment suggests that upskilling must extend beyond technical competence to include cross-disciplinary ethical thinking and reflective practice.

Humanizing AI through the SDG Lens

Based on the insights and recommendations gathered from participants, the study proposes a human-centric framework for AI integration in higher education. This comprehensive approach encompasses the establishment of ethical AI governance systems developed through active faculty and staff participation to ensure accountability and transparency. It also involves creating inclusive,

wide-reaching training programs designed for all categories of university workers to bridge the digital literacy gap. Furthermore, the framework emphasizes fostering a culture of participatory decision-making in the process of AI adoption, ensuring that diverse stakeholder perspectives are incorporated. Finally, it calls for the strategic alignment of institutional AI policies with key United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, specifically SDG 4 (Quality Education), SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), and SDG 16 (Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions), to anchor technological advancement in principles of equity, sustainability, and institutional integrity.

This model echoes Boddington's (2021) argument to embed ethical thinking within institutional culture, not as a compliance initiative. The SDG framework provides a universal language to connect digital transformation with human rights, human-centeredness, and sustainability. By implementing these principles, universities can counter the dehumanizing impact of automation and transform AI into a tool for empowerment.

Conclusion

This research found that Artificial Intelligence implementation in education is changing human resource services, reworking employee roles, and presenting new ethical issues. Major conclusions pointed to three imperative themes: ethical ambiguity in AI decision-making, the redefinition of HR functions toward algorithm-friendly practices, and enduring skills gaps that hinder staff ability to adapt to AI-driven settings. These findings indicate that AI must be humanized through ethics-based and ability-enhancing institutional designs.

The article contributes to literature by presenting a comprehensive framework that connects AI ethics, human resource innovation, and sustainable skills development within the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). While previous research often examines these domains in silos, this paper offers a holistic view of how universities can integrate AI transformation with social justice, inclusion, and lifelong learning.

However, the qualitative nature of the study and its small sample size limit the generalizability of the findings. Future studies may use quantitative or mixed methods to quantify AI implementation's effect on job satisfaction, employee well-being, and institutional performance across university types. Longitudinal studies monitoring upskilling initiatives could also provide valuable insights into sustainable workforce development over time.

In conclusion, humanizing AI in higher learning necessitates the strategic alignment of ethics, HR policy, and professional development. By integrating these values into the SDG framework, universities can ensure their digital transformation is inclusive, transparent, and future-proof.

Acknowledgements

There is no grant or funding bodies to be acknowledged for preparing this paper.

References

Boddington, P. (2021). *Towards a code of ethics for artificial intelligence*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-60648-4

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2014-07087-000

Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence, 1*(9), 389–399. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2

Percy, R., Han, K., & Lewis, T. (2021). Humanizing artificial intelligence in higher education: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Educational Technology and Society, 24*(3), 45–59.

Robert, L., Boudreau, J., & Chen, Z. (2020). Managing the human–AI interface: Insights from human resource management research. *Human Resource Management Review, 30*(4), 100789.

Smith, K., Patel, R., & Xu, L. (2023). Artificial intelligence and workforce transformation: A meta-analysis of HRM research (2010–2023). *Human Resource Management Review, 33*(2), 101975.

UNESCO. (2020). *Education for sustainable development goals: Learning objectives*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000247444

Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (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), 39. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0