**UNE L&T Symposium 2025 – Presentation Synopsis**

**1. Title of Presentation:**

[*Assessment design and the ethical and responsible use of GenAI: implications for equitable pedagogy*]

**2. Presenter(s) Name(s) and Affiliation(s):**

[*Dr Saugat Neupane, UNE Business School, Sydney; A/Prof Subas Dhakal, UNE Business School, Armidale*]

**3. Main Takeaways:**

***Takeaway 1:***

[*Student-centered responsible GenAI usage guidelines needed to inform assessment design*]

***Takeaway 2:***

[*Designing marking rubric for equitable evaluation of assessments with or without GenAI usage*]

**4. Application in Educational Contexts:**

***Teaching Methods:*** *The presentation content could inform unit design in a way to prepare students for ethical and responsible GenAI usage*

**Assessment:** - *The presentation content could influence the development of assessment tasks for ensuring the disclosure of GenAI usage when such use is either optional or self-reported. Further, it can be applied in revamping marking rubrics to ensure assessments are fairly assessed irrespective of their usage of GenAI.*

**Student Engagement:** *The presentation content could inform to design unit level activities e.g. forum discussions that engage students with instructors, other peers and content. The innovative nature of the assessment design, the dedicated effort to ensure fairness, and the structured activities prepared for GenAI readiness are collectively expected to enhance student engagement and experiences.*

**Curriculum Development:** *The approaches to ethical and responsible GenAI usage highlighted in the presentation has the potential to inform equitable and inclusive curriculum related policies and practices. Such approaches need to ensure a balanced integration of human and GenAI components in achieving learning outcomes. Student-centric assessment design that fosters a learning environment where GenAI's capabilities can foster equitable pedagogy.*
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**6. Weakness and Area for Future Research:**

**Weakness:** [*Based on secondary sources and researcher’s experiences*]

**Future Research:** *[Innovative alternatives to Bloom’s Taxonomy-based assessment of the pre-GenAI era]*

Abstract:

UNE is one of the leading universities in adapting policies allowing responsible use of GenAI under the condition that students self-report such applications. However, although responsible usage sounds right in principle, it raises some crucial dilemmas. Not all students prefer to use GenAI, and if that‚Äôs the case, in assessments where the use of Generative AI (GenAI) is permitted, we can anticipate two distinct types of submissions: those that utilise GenAI and those that do not. This variation presents a significant challenge: How do we accurately detect and validate whether GenAI was used in the preparation of submissions?

Furthermore, given the presence of these two submission types, it's crucial to consider how we can ensure a fair and equitable evaluation process. How can we consistently measure and assess the quality of work in a manner that accounts for both AI-assisted and traditional approaches without inadvertently disadvantaging or advantaging one or the other? This study proposes a guideline for designing assessments for optional GenAI usage and a marking rubric that could potentially ensure fair evaluation of all assessments (with or without AI use) and proposes teaching practices on how students could be prepared for such assessment designs to ensure truthfulness in their self-reporting of AI usage.