

Human Intelligence Labs in the Age of Generative AI: Rethinking Learning and Integrity

Khandakar Kamrul Hasan^a, Md. Abu Hasnat^b, Hissan Khandakar^c

^a Chairman, HHH Research Consultancy & Development, Dhaka, Bangladesh

^b Managing Partner, HHH Research Consultancy & Development, Dhaka, Bangladesh

^c Technical Partner, HHH Research Consultancy & Development, Dhaka, Bangladesh

Abstract

Generative artificial intelligence is changing how students read, write, think, and complete academic work. This change has created a difficult question for higher education. How can universities prepare students to use AI well, while also helping them practice human skills without AI support? This blog reflects on the idea of Human Intelligence Labs as AI-free learning spaces on campus. These spaces would not reject technology. Rather, they would protect time for deep reading, writing, reasoning, problem-solving, and focused study. Drawing on recent research and policy discussions, the blog argues that academic integrity cannot be managed only through detection tools or stricter rules. Students also need supportive spaces where they can struggle, practice, and build confidence. Human Intelligence Labs may offer one practical response. They can help universities balance AI literacy with the human work that remains central to higher education.

Keywords: Generative AI; higher education; Human Intelligence Labs; academic integrity; cognitive engagement

To cite this article:

Hasan, K. K., Hasnat, M. A. & Khandakar, H. (2026). Human Intelligence Labs in the Age of Generative AI: Rethinking Learning and Integrity. HHH Research Blog, 1(2).





Rationale

Generative AI has quickly become part of student life. Many students now use AI tools to summarize readings, draft essays, solve problems, and prepare assignments. Some use these tools responsibly. Others use them in ways that hide their own learning process. This creates a real challenge for teachers.

The issue is not only cheating. It is also about practice. Students learn by reading slowly, writing rough drafts, making mistakes, and trying again. These steps are not always easy. They take time and effort. But they are part of learning.

Spira (2026) raises this concern through the idea of Human Intelligence Labs. These would be welcoming campus spaces where students can work without generative AI. In these spaces, students could read, write, solve problems, and think through ideas on their own. The aim is not to punish students. The aim is to protect the human side of learning (Hasan et al., 2026b; Hasan et al., 2026c; Hasan et al., 2026d).

This is a strong rationale for a research blog because it speaks to a current and shared problem. As Hasan et al. (2026a) explain, a research blog should show why a topic matters now. Human Intelligence Labs matter because higher education is at a turning point. Faculty are being asked to teach in an AI-rich world. Students are being asked to learn in that same world. Universities need a better response than fear, confusion, or detection alone.

Research also supports this concern. Lee et al. (2024) found that educators see both benefits and risks in generative AI. Many are still unsure how to redesign teaching and assessment (Hasan et al., 2026e; Hasan et al., 2026f). Robert and McCormack (2025) also shows that AI is now an institutional issue. It affects strategy, policy, equity, and support systems. So, the question is no longer whether AI belongs in higher education. The better question is where, when, and how AI should be used.

Research Gap

Most conversations about generative AI focus on academic integrity. This is understandable. AI can make it harder to know whether students completed their own work. Bittle and El-Gayar (2025) show that generative AI has raised serious concerns about plagiarism, authorship, and assessment fairness. Kofinas et al. (2025) also argue that authentic assessment is under pressure because AI can help students produce strong work without fully showing their own thinking.

Policy reports have also responded to this concern. TEQSA (2024) calls for action to protect academic integrity. TEQSA (2023) also stresses the need to redesign assessment for the age of AI. These are important steps.

Still, something is missing. Many discussions focus on rules, detection, and assignment design. Less attention is given to the spaces where students practice learning before they are assessed. This is the research gap.

As Hasnat et al. (2026a) note, a research gap should show what current discussions have not yet addressed. In this case, the missing part is learning infrastructure. Universities already have libraries, writing centers, tutoring centers, language labs, and testing centers. But they have not yet fully developed AI-free learning spaces as supportive environments for human practice (Hasnat et al., 2025; Hasnat et al., 2026b).



Human Intelligence Labs could fill this gap. They would not be testing centers. They would not be surveillance rooms. They would be places where students can build skill, attention, and confidence. This distinction is important. Students do not only need rules about AI. They also need spaces that help them learn without always reaching for AI.

Future Implications

Human Intelligence Labs should not be seen as anti-AI. That would be too simple. Students still need AI literacy. They need to know how AI works, where it helps, and where it can mislead them. UNESCO's AI competency framework makes this clear (Miao et al., 2024). Students should learn to use AI responsibly and critically.

At the same time, students also need AI-free practice. Some learning tasks should be done without automated support. This may include close reading, early writing, mathematical reasoning, language practice, and argument building. These tasks help students develop their own thinking.

The future implication is clear. Universities may need both AI-rich and AI-free learning environments. Some spaces can help students experiment with AI. Other spaces can help students practice without it. The key is purpose. AI should be used where it supports learning. It should be limited where it replaces learning.

This idea also has policy implications. Academic integrity should not be left only to individual faculty. Institutions need shared planning. They need to think about space, staffing, access, student trust, disability support, and course design. Teaching and learning centers could lead small pilot projects. Writing-intensive courses and reading-heavy courses may be good starting points.

Khandakar et al. (2026) argue that research blogs should connect evidence to future practice, policy, and innovation. Human Intelligence Labs do that well. They offer a practical way to move beyond panic. They ask universities to design learning spaces with care.

The real goal is not to protect higher education from AI. The goal is to protect learning itself. Students deserve time and space to think without shortcuts. Faculty deserve support in teaching human skills. Universities deserve a response that is thoughtful, balanced, and humane.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgements

This Research Blog post was written by the founding members of HHH Research Consultancy & Development

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- Bittle, K., & El-Gayar, O. (2025). Generative AI and academic integrity in higher education: A systematic review and research agenda. *Information*, 16(4), Article 296. <https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/16/4/296>
- Robert, J., & McCormack, M. (2025). 2025 EDUCAUSE AI landscape study: Into the digital AI divide. EDUCAUSE. <https://library.educause.edu/resources/2025/2/2025-educause-ai-landscape-study>
- Hasan, K. K., Hasnat, M. A., & Khandakar, H. (2026a). Framing the Rationale in Research Blogging: Establishing Relevance and Context Across Disciplines. *HHH Research Blog*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.66246/9acv8522>
- Hasan, K. K., Akhtar, M. M., Hasnat, M. A., & Khandakar, H. (2026b). Ethical AI innovation in healthcare and sustainable development in Bangladesh. *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JHOM-12-2025-0862>
- Hasan, K. K., Hasnat, M. A., & Khandakar, H. (2026c). Technical and vocational education and training (TVET) in Bangladesh: educator perspectives on innovative curriculum design. *Education+ Training*, 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-08-2025-0631>
- Hasan, K. K., Hasnat, M. A., & Khandakar, H. (2026d). From Scholar to Autocrat: When Academic Authority Turns into Ego. *HHH Research Blog*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.66246/x2v9p161>
- Hasan, K. K., Hasnat, M. A., & Khandakar, H. (2026e). Knowledge management as a catalyst for digital financial literacy in Bangladesh: Integrating AI and metaverse technologies for sustainable development. *Journal of Strategy & Innovation*, 37(2), 200577. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsinno.2026.200577>
- Hasan, K. K., Khandakar, H., & Hasnat, M. A. (2026f). Sustainability for the modern campus: curriculum, governance and community impact through systemic change in higher education. *International Journal of Organization Theory & Behavior*, 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOTB-10-2025-0310>
- Hasnat, M. A., Hasan, K. K., & Khandakar, H. (2025). Intelligent Machines and Organizational Knowledge Transformation in Bangladesh's Islamic Banking Sector: Navigating Innovation and Shariah Compliance. *Journal of Integrated Islamic Finance and Socio-Economic Systems*, 1, 11-28. <https://doi.org/10.65638/2978-8196.2025.01.02>



- Hasnat, M. A., Hasan, K. K., & Khandakar, H. (2026a). Identifying the Research Gap: A Guide to Articulating Scholarly Contribution in Blog Format. *HHH Research Blog*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.66246/2yfmj747>
- Hasnat, M. A., Hasan, K. K., & Khandakar, H. (2026b). A Shariah-Aligned Framework for Social Well-Being: Reducing Ego, Jealousy, Greed, and Hate-Driven Humiliation. *HHH Research Blog*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.66246/5b9m2h37>
- Khandakar, H., Hasan, K. K., & Hasnat, M. A. (2026). Projecting Future Implications in Research Blogs: Connecting Evidence to Policy, Practice, and Innovation. *HHH Research Blog*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.66246/rzq8tq72>
- Kofinas, A. K., Tsay, C. H.-H., & Pike, D. (2025). The impact of generative AI on academic integrity of authentic assessments within a higher education context. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 56(6), 2522–2549. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjet.13585>
- Lee, D., Arnold, M., Srivastava, A., Plastow, K., Strelan, P., Ploeckl, F., Lekkas, D., & Palmer, E. (2024). The impact of generative AI on higher education learning and teaching: A study of educators' perspectives. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 6, Article 100221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100221>
- Miao, F., Shiohira, K., & Lao, N. (2024). AI competency framework for students. UNESCO. <https://www.unesco.org/en/articles/ai-competency-framework-students>
- Spira, K. (2026, July 2). Human intelligence labs: New infrastructure for learning in the age of AI. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/opinion/views/2026/07/02/ai-colleges-need-human-intelligence-labs-opinion>
- Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency. (2023). Assessment reform for the age of artificial intelligence. <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/guides-resources/resources/corporate-publications/assessment-reform-age-artificial-intelligence>
- Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency. (2024). The evolving risk to academic integrity posed by generative artificial intelligence: Options for immediate action. <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/guides-resources/resources/corporate-publications/evolving-risk-academic-integrity-posed-generative-artificial-intelligence-options-immediate-action>