



Case Study 13: University of Brighton

An Institution-Wide Course Risk Level Approach to Generative AI Misuse in Assessment

What issue were we trying to address and why?

Like many Higher Education Institutions when ChatGPT was first launched the University of Brighton considered and added generative AI into the Examination and Assessment regulations and provided workshops and training to staff on its use and the challenges it brought to assessment practice. Most work was undertaken at a modular level looking at individual assessments and ensuring they were “AI-ready”, meaning it was unlikely a student could pass an assessment using solely generative AI tools. Any changes were undertaken within normal module change processes meaning they were not necessarily highlighted as being “AI-ready”. The university has taken the approach of placing the emphasis on promoting academic integrity and ethical practice and ensuring that assessment design reduces opportunities for misuse. Alongside this, staff have been encouraged to begin to develop student skills in the use of these technologies where they have been approved under data protection risk assessments.

This approach has led to some challenges as technology progresses quickly. Adaptation at an individual module level can lead to:

- unbalance of assessment type across a course,
- some assessments being missed or purposefully left due to a lack of awareness or skills in the technology,
- Reduced student and employer confidence in the degree if they still think it is possible to obtain a pass using Generative AI technology.
- Increase in staff workload as they adapt all of their assessments in a limited time period on top of standard workload.

What we did

We have developed a course level risk-based approach, Course Learning Evaluation and Analysis of Risk (CLEAR), to evaluate and analyse assessment. It has two stages:

- Completion of Artificial Intelligence Risk (AIR) tool to identify key ‘at-risk’ assessments.
- Rethink ‘at risk’ assessments using a staged process, “RAISE”.

Assessments on a course are ranked by risk using the AIR tool and interventions are prioritised. The risk level is calculated using module information drawn from the curriculum management system (CMS) and a series of questions about the assessment answered by module leaders. Key components are:

- the assessment’s percentage of the final awarding algorithm.

- whether the module is mandatory, compulsory or optional in the course.
- the level of the module.
- the assessment type.

The tool is designed to allow semi-automated completion of the module information using a specially designed report from the CMS and a simple yes/no input for 9 questions from the module lead.

The ranked assessments are then prioritised by the course team for intervention using the RAISE process. This process analyses the assessment and supports staff to design out the potential for misuse of generative AI. The five steps are:

- Requirement - Identify what you want the student to demonstrate.
- Action - How is that achieved in the assessment as it is?
- Integrity - Are there ways a student can show this without doing it themselves? (e.g. by generative AI)
- Shift - How can you change the assessment if it isn't clear that the student is achieving the learning outcome(s)? Is it constructively aligned?
- Evaluate - Does it still enable the student to achieve the learning outcome(s) whilst ensuring integrity and inclusivity?

Seven courses are currently piloting the CLEAR approach. Course teams have an initial meeting to discuss the process and any factors that impact on their courses (such as PSRB requirements). At this meeting they are provided with a pre-filled AIR tool spreadsheet which contains all of the assessments on the course and the module information from the CMS. The course teams then liaise with the module leads to complete the remaining questions. The course team then reconvenes to prioritise the assessments to move forward to the RAISE process. The approach is supported by the university's Learning and Teaching Hub and the Learning and Teaching lead in the relevant School with workshops and resources.

Once the course has gone through the process the course team can reassure students and employers that a student passing the degree has to have met the learning outcomes themselves and any use of generative AI has not compromised this. This can also assure staff that use of generative AI could be allowed as an aid as it will not compromise the validity of the assessment, encouraging development of student skills in the area. This approach is taking on more importance with the university's current policy to remove exams from assessment where possible (certain PSRB courses excepted) requiring staff to ensure integrity and inclusivity are at the heart of their assessment design.

Who was involved

- Learning and Teaching Hub led by Dr Alison Willows.
- Learning and Teaching Leads in Schools.
- Course leads and key course team members.

Measures of success

- More consistent intervention to assessment protecting variety and timing across a course.
- Reduced workload to staff as intervention is prioritised to high-risk assessment only.
- Improved confidence in integrity and validity of assessment across a course.
- Raised staff awareness of the potential of generative AI and encourage inclusion of its use.

How do you plan to develop the intervention/activity?

The pilot is set to roll out to further courses across the university with the aim of covering all courses. Initial pilot course teams will be able to help other courses in their Schools to go through the process allowing the Schools to take ownership and integrate it into any course redevelopments in the future.