



## Guide for Academic Staff

### Integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) into Assessment Design

The rapid evolution of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has significantly transformed traditional higher education teaching, learning, assessment, and credentialing. Academic institutions must prepare students for an AI-enabled workforce while preserving the integrity, validity and trustworthiness of academic awards.

#### Purpose

This guide provides academic staff at STI Myanmar University with an actionable framework to design robust, authentic assessments that validly measure intended learning outcomes, foster ethical AI literacy, and maintain rigorous standards of academic integrity.

#### Scope

This guide applies to:

- All Faculties
- All Programs at Level 2, 3, 4 and 5
- Validated Programs at Level 6 and 7
- All assessment types
- All academic staff

### Core Principles for AI-Enabled Assessment Design

#### 1. Design Assessments Around Learning Outcomes

- **Outcome Mapping:** Ensure every assessment explicitly aligns with intended module learning outcomes.
- **Determine the Appropriate Role of AI:** For each learning outcome, explicitly classify AI's role: whether it may support, enhance, or must be excluded from the assessment task.
- **Prioritize Higher-Order Cognitive and Professional Skills:** Focus grading rubrics on higher-order cognitive skills, including critical evaluation, synthesis, ethical judgement, contextual application, and personal reflection.

## 2. Establish Clear AI Expectations and Standardized Citation

- Assessment designers should consider accessibility and reasonable adjustments when establishing AI restrictions.
- AI tools must not be used to process confidential, personal, sensitive, proprietary, or otherwise restricted information unless expressly authorized and permitted under STIMU AI policy.
- Every assessment brief must explicitly state the level of permissible AI usage, approved AI tools and permitted use cases, and mandatory disclosure methods.
- AI permissions must be determined at assessment-task level, not assumed to apply uniformly across an entire module.
- The use of AI must not be permitted where it would prevent the assessment from validly measuring the intended learning outcome.

### Assessment AI Categories

- **AI Permitted** – Students may use approved AI tools throughout the assessment, subject to specified conditions, documentation, verification, and citation requirements. In this case, students remain responsible for the accuracy, integrity, originality, and appropriate attribution of submitted work.
- **AI Restricted** – AI use is permitted only for explicitly identified stages (e.g., initial brainstorming, code debugging, or language proofreading). All other task components must be completed independently by the student without unauthorized AI assistance.
- **AI Prohibited** – Students must not use Generative AI tools for any part of the assessment unless an explicit institutional exception applies. (e.g., in-class invigilated examinations, controlled practical demonstrations, or assessments specifically designed to verify unaided performance).

### AI Use Disclosure and Citation Guidelines

A generic declaration alone is insufficient to document substantive AI use. When AI-generated content, code, ideas, analysis, or other substantive outputs are incorporated, adapted, or relied upon, students must disclose and, where applicable, cite the AI tool in accordance with institutional requirements.

#### In-Text Citation:

Use the citation and disclosure format prescribed by the institution's adopted referencing standard.

#### Reference/Disclosure List Format:

Developer. (Year or access date, as required by the adopted style). Tool or model name and version. [Generative AI tool/model]. URL or other persistent identifier, where applicable.

*Example:* OpenAI. (2026). ChatGPT [Generative AI tool]. <https://chatgpt.com>, Access Date.

### 3. Assess Human Learning, Reasoning and Judgment

To prevent passive copy-pasting and ensure genuine mastery, design authentic tasks that require students to:

- **Defend Decision-Making:** Explain the rationale behind choices, strategies, and methodologies.
- **Audit AI Content:** Critically evaluate AI outputs for factual accuracy, hallucinated references, logical fallacies, and inherent socio-cultural biases.
- **Localize & Contextualize:** Apply theoretical frameworks to real-world, local, or highly specific scenarios requiring evidence, contextual judgement, and student-specific reasoning.

### 4. Require Proportionate AI Use Documentation

To reduce the risk of superficial AI declarations that do not provide sufficient evidence of the student's process or contribution—where students submit copy-pasted text alongside generic disclaimers—a declaration alone is insufficient where the assessment required evidence of AI use and student contribution.

Where AI use is **Permitted** or **Restricted**, students must attach a brief AI Process Appendix to their submission containing:

1. **Tool Log:** Specific tools/models used, relevant versions or model identifiers, date of use, and purpose of use.
2. **Prompt Record:** Relevant prompts and, where material to the assessment, significant iterative refinements.
3. **Relevant AI Outputs:** Material AI-generated outputs that informed or contributed to the submitted work, where required by the assessment brief.
4. **Verification Record:** Evidence of fact-checking, critical evaluation, revisions, and the student's independent analytical contribution.

### 5. Incorporate Authentic Evidence of Learning and Iterative Orals

Where appropriate, supplement or replace traditional viva voce examinations with scalable Interactive Oral Assessments (IOs) and authentic process-based evidence.

- **Interactive Oral (IO) Assessment Model**

Interactive Orals are structured, authentic, scenario-based dialogues designed to verify the student's understanding, reasoning, and ability to apply knowledge efficiently and consistently across cohorts.

| Assessment Stage        | Recommended Duration | Focus/Action                                                                                                      |
|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Scenario Setup       | 1-2 minutes          | Assessor sets a realistic professional/workplace context based on the student's submission.                       |
| 2. Interactive Dialogue | 8-10 minutes         | Unscripted conversation where the student defends choices, critiques alternatives, and answers probing questions. |
| 3. Rubric Evaluation    | 3-5 minutes          | Assessor completes a standardized rubric evaluating real-time reasoning, depth of knowledge, and communication.   |

Additional Authentic Evidence Types may include:

- Stage-based drafts and milestone submissions.
- Live practical demonstrations and design logs/portfolios.
- Evaluative reflective commentaries linking process to final outputs.

## 6. Policy on the use of Automated AI Detection Tools and Misconduct Resolution

### Institutional Integrity Directive: Use of AI Detection Software

Automated AI detection indicators (e.g., AI-detection indicators or scores generated by tools such as Turnitin or Copyleaks) **must not** be treated as definitive proof of AI use or as the sole basis for a finding of academic misconduct.

### Rationale and Bias Mitigation

Research by Liang et al., (2023), involving researchers affiliated with Stanford University, found substantial false-positive rates when GPT detectors were applied to writing by non-native English speakers. Automated AI-generated-text detection systems exhibit unreliability and systemic linguistic bias. Research has demonstrated that some AI detectors can disproportionately misclassify human-written text by non-native English writers, with linguistic predictability such as lower perplexity identified as one contributing factor.

### Misconduct Investigation Procedure

1. **No Automated Penalties:** An AI-detection score or indicator must not, by itself, trigger an academic penalty or constitute sufficient evidence for a formal finding of academic misconduct.
2. **Academic Integrity Review and Dialogue:** If an assessor suspects uncredited AI usage or lack of authorship based on inconsistencies across drafts, language style, or process mapping, the student must be given an opportunity to participate in an academic integrity review, including a structured dialogue where appropriate.

3. **Verification of Understanding:** During this dialogue, the student will be asked to explain their research process, clarify complex concepts present in the paper, and provide relevant drafts, notes, process documentation, or AI-use records to demonstrate their understanding and contribution.

## 7. AI Assessment Brief Checklist

Before releasing any assessment brief to students, module leaders must verify the following:

- **Learning Outcomes:** The task rigorously assesses intended learning outcomes regardless of AI involvement.
- **Classification:** The AI usage tier (**Permitted**, **Restricted**, or **Prohibited**) is explicitly stated.
- **Clear Instructions:** Acceptable/unacceptable AI tools and specific use cases are clearly defined.
- **AI Disclosure and Citation:** Clear instructions are provided on how to disclose AI use and reference AI-generated content in accordance with the adopted referencing standard.
- **Student AI Declaration Form:** Proportionate documentation requirements are specified for Permitted and Restricted assessments.
- **Authentic Verification:** The assessment incorporates appropriate mechanisms (e.g., Interactive Oral, draft milestones, or contextual analysis) to verify student learning and individual contribution.
- **Rubric Alignment:** Grading criteria explicitly assess critical evaluation, synthesis, contextual application, reasoning, and ethical judgement rather than rewarding the production of information alone.

Assessment briefs should be reviewed at least annually, and sooner where significant changes occur in institutional AI policy, professional accreditation requirements, assessment practice, or relevant technology, evolving educational, professional, technological, and industry practice, and quality assurance standards.