



AI Text Generators and Academic Integrity: Adjusting Assessment Design in Response to Emerging Challenges

AI text generators, such as [ChatGPT](#), can pose challenges in relation to the academic integrity of assessments.

In this resource we provide an introduction to AI text generators, identify potential challenges for educators, and outline initial suggestions for mitigating these challenges through assessment design.

What are AI Text Generators?

Technically called large language models or LLMs, AI text generators produce mostly original writing in response to a user's prompt. Putting it simply, you tell it what you want and it generates a text response.

An example is [ChatGPT](#). Released by the company OpenAI (which is largely funded by Microsoft) in November 2022, it has caused considerable discussion and debate in education about potential impacts on assessment and academic integrity.

Potential challenges for educators

ChatGPT is capable of generating a solid piece of writing which is:

- grammatically correct,
- academic in writing style
- highly relevant to the stimulus prompt/question

As such, it has the potential to generate academic prose which meets the requirement of particular assessment types (e.g. essays, reports etc.)

Suggestions for Immediate Adjustments to Assessments

To mitigate the risk of academic integrity breaches, using AI text generators, you may consider adapting assessment as follows:

- Review current assessment formats to gauge the level of 'risk'. (For example, is there a significant reliance on formats that are most vulnerable to AI supports, such as essays?)



- Highlight/make explicit in teaching where you see value in students writing/coding themselves. Focus on the 'process' as learning.
- Require disclosure where ChatGPT or similar is used in support of an assignment, and adjust marking to reflect this.
- Problematised use of ChatGPT or other AI text generators in the context of ethical/plagiaristic behaviours and issues around data privacy/ownership of output.
- Link assessment to class learning/discussion. For example, 'localise' assessment activity.
- Reduce the temptation to rely on ChatGPT by evaluating assessment deadlines and encouraging students to avail of opportunities to improve their academic skills. (See [Student Learning Development](#) for more information.)
- Change assessment mode (though not weighting) of individual assessment components, including opting for invigilated/in-person assessment.

Examples:

1. Introduce 'showcase' events that align to assignment deadlines, e.g., presentations on text-based work to a peer and/or expert audience to coincide with submission windows.
2. Introduce a rotational/random sample of additional vivas to confirm thought ownership.
3. Incorporate in-class tests, for which the module coordinator is fully responsible.
4. Schedule exams in the centrally timetabled examination session.

Suggestions for Medium-Term Adjustments to Assessment

Medium-term adjustments will require ongoing review of assessment, which may involve some of the above and/or the following:

- Articulate where/how assessment links to learning:
 - What is being assessed?
 - Why is it best assessed in its current format (for example, essay, lab report etc.)?
- Articulate/review where and how a particular form of assessment links to modular/programme learning outcomes.
- Consider greater transition to/support of oral exams to confirm thought ownership. For example, by integrating preparation for greater oracy into curricula.
- 'Unbundle' assessment at 'multistages' across the semester. For example, move to more frequent supervised lower-stakes assignments which could be invigilated locally or take place during teaching contact time.

Last updated on: 2 February 2023