



APPLICATION OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE (AI) IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES: CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

DR. OKHUOYA OJEKHATA PETER

Ojekhata.okhuoya@uniben.edu

Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education,
University of Benin

DR. OBIWELUOZOR NKECHI

Nkechi.obiweluozeor@uniben.edu

Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education,
University of Benin

ABSTRACT

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly shaping how universities organise information, deliver services, allocate resources and support decision-making. In Nigerian universities, the potential of AI is especially relevant because administrators operate within systems characterised by rising enrolment, complex records, resource constraints, infrastructure deficits and growing expectations for timely, transparent and data-informed services. This conceptual paper examines the application of AI in the administration of Nigerian universities, with emphasis on administrative opportunities, implementation challenges and strategies for responsible integration. A focused narrative review of peer-reviewed studies and policy documents on AI in higher education and educational management was undertaken, with particular attention to recent Nigerian evidence and international guidance. The review shows that AI can support admissions and enrolment, student records, human-resource management, timetabling, finance, student support, predictive analytics, quality assurance, research administration, library services and institutional planning. However, meaningful adoption is constrained by inadequate digital infrastructure, unstable electricity and connectivity, limited staff competence, high implementation costs, fragmented data systems, privacy and cyber-security risks, algorithmic bias, weak governance arrangements and concerns about job displacement and overreliance on automated systems. The paper argues that Nigerian universities should treat AI as a governed institutional capability rather than as a stand-alone technology. It recommends phased implementation, robust data governance, staff capacity development, human oversight, ethical and legal safeguards, interoperability of institutional systems, sustainable financing and continuous evaluation. Responsible adoption can improve administrative efficiency and service quality, but AI should augment rather than replace professional judgement and human accountability in university administration.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, university administration, educational management, Nigerian universities, digital transformation, AI governance

Introduction

Universities are knowledge-intensive organisations whose effectiveness depends not only on teaching and research but also on the quality of their administrative systems. Admissions, registration, records, staff management, finance, procurement, scheduling, student services, quality assurance, research support and institutional planning generate large volumes of data and require timely decisions. In Nigeria, these functions are carried out within a higher education environment marked by rapid enrolment growth, pressure on public funding, uneven digital infrastructure and



increasing expectations for transparent and responsive services. These conditions make digital transformation an administrative necessity rather than a peripheral innovation.

Artificial intelligence has become one of the most significant technologies within this transformation. AI broadly refers to computer systems that perform tasks associated with human intelligence, including pattern recognition, language processing, prediction, classification, recommendation and automated decision support. In higher education, AI applications now include machine learning, natural-language processing, chatbots, predictive analytics, recommender systems, generative AI, robotic process automation and intelligent decision-support tools. Systematic reviews show that AI in higher education is used for profiling and prediction, assessment, personalisation, intelligent support and institutional or administrative services (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019; Crompton & Burke, 2023; Bond et al., 2024). More recent evidence also points to expanding applications in educational management, data analysis and administrative decision-making (Wang et al., 2024; Castillo-Martínez et al., 2024; Fadlelmula & Qadhi, 2024).

The Nigerian context gives these developments particular importance. Igboke (2023) observed that AI can support educational management through automation, student support, data analysis and administrative decision-making. Similarly, Obiweleozor and Eshemogie (2022) identified the importance of information and communication technologies to university administration while drawing attention to financial, infrastructural and staff-related constraints. Recent Nigerian research has further shown that the potential of AI-driven digital transformation is accompanied by limited digital skills, institutional readiness problems, infrastructure deficits and governance concerns (Nnaji et al., 2026). These issues suggest that AI adoption in Nigerian universities cannot be approached merely as the purchase of software; it requires organisational redesign, staff competence, reliable data, governance safeguards and sustainable institutional commitment.

Nigeria's policy environment is also evolving. The National Artificial Intelligence Strategy emphasises responsible data use, data security, transparency, public trust and alignment with the Nigeria Data Protection Act, while recognising that broadband and digital infrastructure are prerequisites for meaningful AI adoption (National Centre for Artificial Intelligence and Robotics [NCAIR] & National Information Technology Development Agency [NITDA], 2025). The National Universities Commission has likewise placed digital transformation, artificial intelligence and technology-enabled institutional reform within current efforts to reposition the Nigerian university system (National Universities Commission [NUC], 2026). Against this background, university administrators need a balanced understanding of where AI can add value, the risks it creates and the institutional conditions required for responsible deployment.

This paper therefore examines the application of AI in the administration of Nigerian universities. Specifically, it discusses the concept of AI in university administration, identifies major areas of application and administrative benefits, analyses implementation challenges, and proposes strategies for responsible and sustainable integration. The central argument is that AI should augment professional judgement and institutional capacity rather than replace human responsibility in university governance.

Method of Review

The paper adopts a focused narrative review approach. The review was designed to synthesise conceptual, empirical and policy literature relevant to AI in higher education administration rather than to estimate an intervention effect. Priority was given to peer-reviewed studies and



authoritative policy documents published mainly from 2019 to 2026, together with a small number of earlier sources retained only where they provided useful background. Search terms included combinations of 'artificial intelligence', 'higher education', 'university administration', 'educational management', 'academic administration', 'predictive analytics', 'AI governance', 'Nigeria' and 'digital transformation'.

Sources were considered relevant when they addressed one or more of the following: institutional or administrative applications of AI in higher education; benefits and risks of AI adoption; ethical, privacy or governance issues; digital transformation in Nigerian universities; or implementation conditions such as infrastructure and staff capacity. Greater evidential weight was given to systematic reviews, peer-reviewed empirical studies, UNESCO guidance, Nigeria's national AI policy framework and National Universities Commission materials. The resulting literature was organised thematically around administrative applications, benefits, challenges and implementation strategies. Because this is a narrative review, the paper does not claim the exhaustive coverage or statistical synthesis associated with a systematic review or meta-analysis.

Conceptualising Artificial Intelligence in University Administration

Artificial intelligence should be distinguished from ordinary digitisation. Digitisation converts paper-based or manual processes into electronic form; automation uses predefined rules to execute routine tasks; AI goes further by enabling systems to infer patterns, generate content, make predictions, classify information or recommend actions from data. In university administration, these capabilities can be embedded in existing management information systems rather than deployed as isolated applications. For example, an electronic admissions portal is primarily a digital system, but it becomes AI-enabled when it predicts enrolment yield, flags anomalous applications, recommends applicant communication or provides an intelligent conversational assistant.

University administration refers to the coordinated planning, organisation, staffing, direction, monitoring and control of institutional resources and processes required to achieve university goals. It includes both academic administration and general administration. Academic administration covers admissions, registration, examinations, records, timetabling, curriculum coordination, quality assurance and research support, while general administration includes human resources, finance, procurement, facilities, communication and strategic planning. AI is therefore relevant wherever administrative activity involves large data sets, repeated decisions, pattern recognition, forecasting, communication or workflow coordination.

The value of AI lies less in replacing administrators than in extending their analytical and operational capacity. Bond et al. (2024) found that institutional and administrative applications remain less studied than teaching and learning applications, despite their importance to admissions, examinations, library services and quality assurance. This gap is significant for Nigerian universities because administrative inefficiencies often produce long queues, delayed results, fragmented records, duplicated work and poor service experience. Carefully designed AI systems can reduce some of these pressures, but the quality of the outcome depends on the quality of data, institutional processes and human oversight.

Applications of AI in the Administration of Nigerian Universities

1. Admissions, recruitment and enrolment management: AI can support the screening and organisation of large volumes of application data, identify incomplete applications, automate routine communication and forecast enrolment patterns. Predictive models can assist admissions



offices in estimating likely acceptance and enrolment rates, thereby supporting planning for accommodation, staffing and course demand. Chatbots can provide applicants with round-the-clock responses to frequently asked questions about programmes, deadlines, fees and admission requirements. However, automated admissions decisions should remain subject to human review because historical data may reproduce socioeconomic, gender, regional or other biases.

2. Student records and information management: Universities generate extensive student data from admission to graduation. AI-assisted records systems can classify documents, detect duplicate or inconsistent entries, automate routine verification and support rapid retrieval of academic information. Natural-language interfaces can allow authorised staff to query institutional databases more efficiently. These capabilities are particularly useful where legacy systems have produced fragmented data repositories. Their successful use requires strong identity management, audit trails and clearly defined access privileges.

3. Student support and service delivery: AI-powered chatbots and virtual assistants can respond to routine enquiries on registration, fees, course schedules, transcripts, hostel procedures and university regulations. By handling repetitive requests, these tools can reduce pressure on administrative staff and allow personnel to focus on cases requiring judgement or empathy. AI can also identify patterns of repeated student complaints and help administrators detect service bottlenecks. Evidence from higher education research shows that conversational and recommender systems can improve access to timely support when they are accurate, transparent and appropriately supervised (Crompton & Burke, 2023; Wang et al., 2024).

4. Human-resource administration: AI can support workforce planning, leave administration, training needs analysis, performance data management and recruitment workflows. It can assist human-resource units in identifying skills gaps, matching staff competencies with institutional needs and forecasting retirement or staffing pressures (Ukoima and Udukeke, 2025). Generative AI can also support drafting of routine correspondence and summarisation of policy documents. Because employment decisions affect rights and livelihoods, AI-generated recommendations should never become unreviewed final decisions. Transparent criteria and appeal mechanisms are essential.

5. Timetabling, scheduling and facilities utilisation: Course timetabling in large universities is a complex optimisation problem involving rooms, staff availability, student combinations, programme requirements and equipment constraints. AI-assisted optimisation can generate feasible schedules more efficiently than manual processes and can adapt to changes such as room closures or staff unavailability. Similar tools can support examination scheduling, vehicle allocation, meeting coordination and facilities utilisation, thereby reducing clashes and improving resource use.

6. Finance, procurement and resource allocation: AI can enhance budgeting and financial administration through expenditure classification, anomaly detection, cash-flow forecasting and analysis of historical spending. It can help identify unusual transactions for further review and support procurement planning by analysing consumption patterns and inventory levels. These applications are particularly relevant in resource-constrained institutions, but they require strong financial controls, segregation of duties and human authorisation to prevent automated errors from becoming institutional losses.

7. Predictive analytics and strategic decision support: Predictive analytics can help administrators identify students at risk of withdrawal, forecast enrolment, estimate demand for



courses, analyse space utilisation and evaluate trends in institutional performance. Zawacki-Richter et al. (2019) identified profiling and prediction as major areas of AI application in higher education, while more recent reviews confirm the continuing expansion of data-driven decision support (Bond et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2024). In Nigeria, predictive systems could support earlier intervention in retention and planning, provided that administrators understand model limitations and avoid treating predictions as certainties.

8. Examinations, results and quality assurance: AI can assist with examination administration by checking data consistency, supporting optical or digital marking processes, detecting anomalous patterns and accelerating result collation. It can also help quality-assurance units organise evidence for programme review, accreditation and institutional monitoring. The National Universities Commission's current digital-transformation agenda increases the relevance of interoperable institutional data and technology-supported quality processes (NUC, 2026). Nevertheless, high-stakes academic decisions should retain human validation and clear procedures for correction or appeal.

9. Research administration and library services: AI can support research offices in grant opportunity matching, proposal administration, research-output classification and institutional research analytics. Libraries can use AI for discovery, recommendation, metadata enhancement and user support. These applications can improve access to knowledge and reduce routine workload, but universities should guard against fabricated citations, inaccurate summaries and copyright or licensing problems associated with generative systems.

10. Security, compliance and institutional risk management: AI can assist in detecting unusual network activity, supporting access control, monitoring system performance and identifying patterns that may indicate fraud or cyber-security threats. It can also help compliance units track deadlines and policy obligations. Such uses are sensitive because surveillance technologies can threaten privacy and academic freedom. Security applications must therefore be proportionate, legally compliant and subject to institutional oversight.

Administrative Benefits of AI Integration

Improved efficiency and reduced routine workload

A central benefit of AI is the automation or acceleration of repetitive administrative work. Tasks such as sorting documents, answering routine enquiries, reconciling records, generating standard reports and scheduling can consume significant staff time. AI-assisted workflows can reduce turnaround time and enable administrators to devote more attention to complex cases, stakeholder engagement and strategic planning. Igbokwe (2023) similarly identified administrative efficiency and support for decision-making as important benefits of AI in educational management.

Better use of institutional data

Many universities possess large volumes of data but limited capacity to transform them into actionable information. AI can detect patterns across enrolment, finance, staffing, facilities and student progression data. When integrated with reliable management information systems, these insights can support evidence-based planning and resource allocation. Nnaji et al. (2026) found that Nigerian higher-education stakeholders recognised the potential of AI-enabled tools to strengthen governance, institutional effectiveness and decision-making, even while identifying readiness and governance gaps.

Faster and more responsive services



Students and staff increasingly expect university services to be accessible beyond traditional office hours. Chatbots, automated notifications and intelligent self-service systems can provide immediate responses to routine enquiries and guide users through standard processes. This can reduce queues and improve service experience, especially in universities with large student populations. However, escalation to a human officer must remain available for unusual, sensitive or contested cases.

More consistent administrative processes

Rule-based and AI-assisted systems can improve consistency by applying standard procedures and reducing avoidable clerical variation. Consistency is valuable in admissions processing, records validation, fee administration and routine compliance. Nevertheless, standardisation should not become inflexibility. Universities must preserve discretion for exceptional circumstances and ensure that system rules are periodically reviewed for fairness and relevance.

Support for institutional planning and competitiveness

AI can strengthen long-term planning through forecasting, scenario analysis and institutional research. Nigeria's National AI Strategy identifies AI as a national development capability, while current NUC reforms emphasise digital transformation and the role of emerging technologies in repositioning universities (NCAIR & NITDA, 2025; NUC, 2026). Universities that build responsible AI capability may therefore improve not only internal efficiency but also their capacity for innovation, partnerships, research administration and global engagement.

Challenges to AI Adoption in Nigerian University Administration

1. Inadequate digital infrastructure: AI depends on reliable computing infrastructure, secure networks, cloud or local processing capacity and interoperable information systems. Many Nigerian universities continue to face bandwidth limitations, ageing hardware and fragmented databases. Where basic digital systems are weak, AI adoption can merely automate existing disorder. Infrastructure investment should therefore precede or accompany AI deployment.

2. Unstable electricity and connectivity: Continuous access to electricity and broadband is necessary for dependable digital administration. The National AI Strategy explicitly links meaningful AI adoption to broadband availability and digital infrastructure (NCAIR & NITDA, 2025). Power interruptions and unreliable connectivity can undermine service continuity, data synchronisation and user trust, particularly where universities depend heavily on cloud-based systems.

3. Limited AI and data literacy among staff: Administrators need more than basic computer literacy. They must understand what AI systems can and cannot do, how to interpret outputs, when to question automated recommendations and how to protect confidential information. Recent Nigerian evidence identifies inadequate digital literacy and staff readiness as major constraints to AI-driven transformation (Nnaji et al., 2026). Without sustained professional development, sophisticated systems may be underused, misused or resisted.

4. Financial constraints and sustainability: AI implementation involves software, infrastructure, integration, cyber-security, staff training, maintenance and vendor support. Pilot projects may appear affordable but become difficult to sustain when licensing, storage, model access and maintenance costs accumulate. Universities should therefore evaluate total cost of ownership and avoid dependence on technologies for which recurrent funding is uncertain.



5. Poor data quality and fragmented systems: AI systems learn from and act on data. Incomplete, inconsistent or duplicated records can produce unreliable outputs. Many universities maintain separate systems for admissions, finance, examinations, human resources and libraries, often without shared standards. Before introducing advanced analytics, institutions need data-cleaning programmes, common identifiers, metadata standards and integration architecture.

6. Privacy, cyber-security and confidentiality: University records contain sensitive personal, academic, employment and financial information. AI systems may require access to large data sets, increasing the consequences of unauthorised access or data leakage. UNESCO (2023) emphasises data protection and human-centred governance in the use of generative AI, while Nigeria's National AI Strategy similarly stresses data minimisation, security, transparency and alignment with data-protection obligations (NCAIR & NITDA, 2025). Universities must therefore conduct privacy and security assessments before deployment.

7. Algorithmic bias and unfair decisions: AI models can reproduce biases contained in historical data or system design. In admissions, recruitment, scholarships, staff appraisal or student-risk prediction, biased models can disadvantage particular groups. International reviews repeatedly identify ethics, fairness and insufficient critical scrutiny as major weaknesses in AI adoption in higher education (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019; Bond et al., 2024). High-stakes decisions should therefore remain explainable, auditable and reviewable by humans.

8. Lack of transparency and explainability: Some AI systems produce recommendations without making their reasoning understandable to users. This creates accountability problems when a decision affects admission, employment, progression or access to services. Administrators must be able to explain the basis on which institutional decisions are made. Procurement decisions should therefore favour systems that support documentation, traceability and meaningful human review.

9. Job-displacement anxiety and resistance to change: Staff may interpret AI as a threat to employment or professional relevance. Such fears can generate resistance even when the technology is intended to support rather than replace staff. Responsible implementation requires early consultation, role redesign and assurance that automation will be accompanied by reskilling. The objective should be to remove avoidable routine workload while strengthening human-centred functions that require judgement, empathy, negotiation and accountability.

10. Overreliance, errors and generative-AI hallucinations: Generative AI can produce fluent but inaccurate information, fabricated references or misleading summaries. Administrators who treat generated outputs as authoritative may introduce serious errors into policy, correspondence or decision-making. AI outputs should therefore be verified against authoritative institutional records and regulations. Automated tools should assist professional work rather than become substitutes for evidence and judgement.

11. Weak institutional governance and policy: Technology can spread informally through staff use before institutions have rules for procurement, approved data, acceptable use, audit and accountability. UNESCO (2023) recommends coherent institutional governance for generative AI, and Bond et al. (2024) call for greater attention to ethical and contextual issues in higher education. Nigerian universities need institution-specific AI policies that clarify permitted uses, prohibited uses, oversight responsibilities and procedures for incident reporting (Ali et al., 2024).

Strategies for Improving AI Integration in Nigerian University Administration



1. Develop an institutional AI governance framework: Each university should establish a formal AI governance framework approved by its governing structures. The framework should define acceptable administrative uses, data-access rules, human-oversight requirements, procurement standards, accountability, record keeping, audit procedures and sanctions for misuse. A multidisciplinary AI governance committee should include administrators, ICT professionals, legal/data-protection officers, academics, students and relevant external expertise.

2. Adopt a phased, problem-driven implementation approach: Universities should begin with clearly defined administrative problems rather than purchasing AI because it is fashionable. Suitable early projects include enquiry management, document classification, scheduling, records validation or analytics dashboards. Pilot projects should have measurable objectives, limited data exposure and clear evaluation criteria. Successful pilots can then be scaled after technical, ethical and financial review.

3. Strengthen digital and data infrastructure: AI requires a reliable foundation. Universities should prioritise broadband, resilient power, secure data centres or cloud arrangements, integrated management information systems, backup procedures and cyber-security controls. Current NUC initiatives aimed at strengthening ICT capacity in the university system provide a policy environment that institutions can align with (NUC, 2026).

4. Build staff capacity and AI literacy: Training should be continuous and role-specific. Senior administrators need strategic and governance literacy; ICT staff need technical, integration and security skills; records, finance and human-resource officers need skills relevant to their workflows. Training should include prompt use where generative AI is permitted, data protection, bias, verification, cyber-security and interpretation of AI-assisted analytics. Capacity building is essential because recent Nigerian research shows that institutional support and staff readiness strongly influence meaningful adoption (Nnaji et al., 2026).

5. Improve data governance and interoperability: Universities should create data dictionaries, common identifiers, retention schedules and access-control standards across administrative systems. Legacy records should be cleaned and validated before they are used for predictive models. Interoperability between admissions, student records, finance, human resources and learning systems will reduce duplication and improve the quality of institutional analytics.

6. Embed privacy, security and ethics by design: Privacy and cyber-security should be built into projects from the beginning rather than added after deployment. Universities should minimise data collection, restrict access, encrypt sensitive information, document model and vendor data flows, and establish breach-response procedures. Any AI application affecting rights or opportunities should undergo an ethical and impact assessment. These safeguards align with UNESCO's human-centred guidance and Nigeria's national AI policy direction (UNESCO, 2023; NCAIR & NITDA, 2025).

7. Maintain meaningful human oversight: AI should recommend, flag or assist, while authorised officers retain responsibility for consequential decisions. Human review is particularly necessary for admissions, discipline, staff recruitment, appraisal, scholarships and student progression. Universities should also provide channels through which affected persons can challenge or correct AI-assisted decisions.

8. Use transparent procurement and vendor management: Universities should evaluate vendors for data-location practices, security, model transparency, uptime, interoperability, exit arrangements, cost escalation and compliance with Nigerian law. Contracts should clarify



ownership of institutional data and generated outputs, prohibit unauthorised secondary use of confidential data and require timely notification of security incidents.

9. Provide sustainable funding and shared services: AI adoption should be included in medium-term institutional planning rather than financed only as one-off projects. Universities may reduce costs through consortia, shared infrastructure, open standards and partnerships with government, research networks and technology providers. Funding should cover maintenance and staff development as well as acquisition.

10. Evaluate outcomes continuously: Every AI initiative should be assessed for accuracy, service improvement, user satisfaction, fairness, cost, privacy impact and unintended consequences. Performance should be compared with the previous process, and systems that do not produce demonstrable value should be modified or discontinued. Continuous evaluation prevents technology adoption from becoming symbolic rather than functional.

Implications for University Administrators

The growing availability of AI changes the role of the university administrator. Administrative competence will increasingly include the ability to work with data, evaluate automated recommendations, manage digital risk and lead organisational change. Administrators do not need to become machine-learning engineers, but they do need enough AI literacy to ask informed questions about accuracy, fairness, privacy, costs and institutional fit. This is especially important because vendors may present AI tools as neutral or universally applicable when their performance depends on data, context and design assumptions.

AI adoption also requires stronger collaboration between administrative and academic units. Admissions, examinations, student affairs, ICT, legal services, planning, libraries and quality-assurance units often operate in silos. AI projects that cut across these units can fail if data ownership and responsibilities are unclear. Cross-functional governance can improve both system design and institutional accountability.

Finally, universities should avoid equating innovation with full automation. Some administrative activities benefit from speed and standardisation; others depend on discretion, trust and human relationships. A responsible Nigerian model should therefore pursue 'human-in-the-loop' administration in which AI handles appropriate routine or analytical tasks while people retain authority for judgement, explanation and accountability. This approach is consistent with UNESCO's human-centred position and with the emphasis on responsible, trustworthy AI in Nigeria's national strategy (UNESCO, 2023; NCAIR & NITDA, 2025).

Conclusion

Artificial intelligence has significant potential to improve the administration of Nigerian universities by strengthening data use, automating routine processes, accelerating service delivery and supporting planning and decision-making. Applications are relevant to admissions, records, student support, human resources, scheduling, finance, quality assurance, research administration, library services and institutional risk management. These possibilities are increasingly supported by the broader development of AI in higher education and by Nigeria's current policy emphasis on digital transformation.

The benefits, however, are not automatic. AI introduced into weak processes, unreliable databases or poorly governed institutions can magnify existing problems. Infrastructure deficits, unstable power and connectivity, limited staff capability, financial constraints, cyber-security risks,



privacy concerns, algorithmic bias, opaque decision-making and resistance to organisational change remain substantial barriers. For this reason, AI should be treated as an institutional capability that combines technology with data governance, human expertise, ethical safeguards and accountability.

The most appropriate path for Nigerian universities is therefore responsible augmentation rather than indiscriminate automation. Universities should use AI to extend the capacity of administrators, not to remove human responsibility from consequential decisions. Phased implementation, transparent governance, continuous staff development, secure and interoperable data systems, sustainable financing and ongoing evaluation can enable institutions to capture administrative benefits while protecting fairness, privacy and trust. If these conditions are established, AI can become a practical instrument for more efficient, responsive and evidence-informed university administration in Nigeria.

Recommendations

1. University governing councils and management should develop institution-wide AI policies that define approved uses, human-oversight requirements, privacy standards, accountability and audit procedures.
2. Universities should prioritise reliable electricity, broadband connectivity, cyber-security and interoperable management information systems before scaling high-dependence AI applications.
3. Continuous AI and data-literacy training should be provided for administrators, ICT personnel and other staff according to their roles and responsibilities.
4. AI adoption should begin with limited, problem-driven pilot projects whose effectiveness, fairness, cost and security can be evaluated before wider deployment.
5. High-stakes administrative decisions involving admissions, employment, discipline, scholarships or academic progression should remain subject to meaningful human review and appeal procedures.
6. Universities should strengthen data governance through data-quality standards, access controls, retention policies, common identifiers and clear responsibility for institutional data.
7. Procurement of AI systems should include due diligence on vendor security, data ownership, interoperability, model transparency, ongoing costs and compliance with Nigerian data-protection obligations.
8. Universities should establish multidisciplinary AI governance or ethics committees to monitor implementation, review risks and coordinate responses to emerging issues.
9. Government, the National Universities Commission, TETFund and development partners should support shared AI infrastructure, staff development and context-relevant research on AI-enabled university administration.
10. AI systems should be reviewed periodically against measurable administrative outcomes, and ineffective or unsafe applications should be modified, suspended or discontinued.

References

Ali, O., Murray, P. A., Momin, M., Dwivedi, Y. K., & Malik, T. (2024). The effects of artificial intelligence applications in educational settings: Challenges and strategies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 199, 123076.



Bond, M., Khosravi, H., De Laat, M., Bergdahl, N., Negrea, V., Oxley, E., Pham, P., Chong, S. W., & Siemens, G. (2024). A meta systematic review of artificial intelligence in higher education: A call for increased ethics, collaboration, and rigour. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21, 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00436-z>

Castillo-Martínez, I. M., Flores-Bueno, D., Gómez-Puente, S. M., & Vite-León, V. O. (2024). AI in higher education: A systematic literature review. *Frontiers in Education*, 9, 1391485. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2024.1391485>

Crompton, H., & Burke, D. (2023). Artificial intelligence in higher education: The state of the field. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, 22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00392-8>

Fadlelmula, F. K., & Qadhi, S. M. (2024). A systematic review of research on artificial intelligence in higher education: Practice, gaps, and future directions in the GCC. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 21(6).

Igbokwe, I. C. (2023). Application of artificial intelligence (AI) in educational management. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 13(3), 300-307.

National Centre for Artificial Intelligence and Robotics (NCAIR) & National Information Technology Development Agency (NITDA). (2025). National Artificial Intelligence Strategy.

National Universities Commission. (2026). NUC says Blueprint ICT-Dev Project could be expanded as implementation committee meets.

Nnaji, I. L., Ayanwale, M. A., Ukeje, I. O., Ekwunife, R. A., Igwe, C. M., Okwor, E. O., & Nwuzor, C. I. (2026). Enhancing governance and performance in Nigerian higher education through AI-driven digital transformation: Insights from stakeholder perspectives. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 13, 102348.

Obiweluozor, N., & Eshemogie, K. (2022). Factors affecting the use of information and communication technology among universities' administrators in Nigeria. *Studies in Education*, 20(1), 31-37.

Ukoima, E. F. and Udukeke, O. F. (2015). Human Resource Management: An Issue in Business Education. *Journal of Sustainable Education*, 6 (1): 225 – 231.

UNESCO. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO.

Wang, S., Wang, F., Zhu, Z., Wang, J., Tran, T., & Du, Z. (2024). Artificial intelligence in education: A systematic literature review. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 252, 124167.

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, 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0171-0>