Practical Implications of Generative AI on Assessment: Snapshot of Early Reactions to Assessment Redesign in an HRM and a Psychology Course

Timos Almpanis[1], Dom Conroy[2] and Paul Joseph-Richard[3]
[1]London Metropolitan University, UK
[2]Open University, UK
[3]Ulster University, UK

t.almpanis@londonmet.ac.uk
dom.conroy@open.ac.uk
p.joseph-richard@ulster.ac.uk

https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.23.3.3971

Abstract: The advent of Generative AI (GAI) tools such as ChatGPT, Google Gemini, and Microsoft Copilot has significantly impacted higher education. This exploratory study investigates the current perspectives of lecturers in Human Resource Management (HRM) and Psychology on adapting assessment strategies in response to GAI developments. Through an online survey, qualitative data was collected from 12 academics, revealing a shift towards more authentic and process-oriented assessments. The findings highlight the dual role of GAI: while it poses risks to academic integrity, contrary to the common perception, it also offers opportunities to enhance assessment authenticity and student engagement. Participating educators reported various adaptations, including the integration of GAI into assessment tasks, increased use of group-based projects, and the implementation of time-limited and context-specific assignments. The study emphasises the need for continuous evolution in assessment practices to maintain academic integrity and effectively measure student learning outcomes in the GAI era. Further research should focus on longitudinal studies to track the impact of these changes over time, to identify the merits and any shortcomings of these new assessment approaches.

Keywords: Generative AI, Assessment design

1. Introduction

The proliferation of Generative AI (GAI) tools such as ChatGPT, Google Gemini and Microsoft Bing chat (Copilot), have presented many opportunities and challenges for Learning, Teaching and Assessment in HE (Russell group principles on use of AI in HE, 2023). A lot has been written on the need for assessment strategies to become more 'authentic' i.e., equipping students with the necessary real-world skills to succeed in the job market upon graduation (Advance HE Authentic Assessment in the era of AI, 2023; McArthur, 2022). GAI tools can become the catalyst and speed up the adoption of authentic assessment tasks in two ways: a) if universities aim to produce employment-ready graduates, then GAI literacies and skills should be embedded in the curriculum and b) assessment tasks need to be reconsidered so that they embed the critical adoption of GAI tools and minimise the possibilities for academic misconduct. The underlying motivation of the paper is to explore how the advent of GAI is influencing assessment strategies in Higher Education. This research aims to uncover the current thinking of lecturers in Human Resource Management (HRM) and Psychology around the ways they have adapted or intend to adapt their assessment strategies in response to the recent GAI developments. While there is a growing body of literature sources regarding the impact of GAI on assessment, there is a gap in the literature about actual changes made in assessment practices as a result of GAI advancements in specific subject areas such as HRM and Psychology. This study addresses this gap.

The paper is structured in the following order: the background literature section reviews existing research on GAI's implications on assessment, emphasising the challenges to academic integrity and identifying ways these can be addressed. The current study section outlines the research purpose, and methodology followed, detailing how lecturers in HRM and Psychology have adapted, or planning to adapt, their assessment strategies in response to GAI developments. The results section is divided in two analyses: the first examines educator approaches to assessment pre and post GAI, while the second explores future-focused textual data, highlighting educators' hopes and doubts about GAI's impact. The discussion emphasises the need for balanced and thoughtful integration of GAI tools and the adoption of innovative assessment strategies taking into account equitable access to the tools used and the digital literacy skills required to use these ethically and productively.

Cite this article: Almpanis, T., Conroy, D. and Joseph-Richard, P. 2025. "Practical Implications of Generative AI on Assessment: Snapshot of Early Reactions to Assessment Redesign in an HRM and a Psychology Course", *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 23(3), pp 19-29, https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.23.3.3971

The study strengths and limitations are then discussed alongside future research directions and the paper is concluded emphasising the importance of re-evaluating traditional assessment approaches for the new GAI-infused era.

2. Background Literature on the Implications of GAI on Assessment

Researchers and professional organizations have been concentrating on the potential impact of GAI tools on assessment, exploring how assessment practices need to evolve due to the widespread use of these tools (AdvanceHE, 2023; Bower *et al*., 2024; QAA, 2023). A scoping review on how GAI transforms assessment in HE (Xia *et al.*, 2024) found that over half of the 32 reviewed articles in this area highlighted that the emergence of GAI presented a significant challenge to academic integrity as GAI tools can potentially encourage cheating and academic dishonesty. A systematic literature review on AI and academic integrity that included 25 studies, also highlighted the new challenges posed by GAI tools and emphasised the need for a balanced approach to using the benefits of AI in education while upholding ethical standards (Ballale & Pannilage, 2025). Weng *et al*., (2024) in their scoping review of assessment and learning outcomes for GAI in higher education have emphasised the need for traditional assessments to be reviewed and call for the design of innovative assessments and career-driven competencies and lifelong learning skills as new focused learning outcomes. Humble *et al*., (2024) suggests that GAI tools will bring new teaching and learning practices and that lecturers need to adapt to this technology to successfully assess students' knowledge and skills. The need for assessment redesign has been highlighted by other authors too. Firat (2024) argues that some of the traditional assessment methods may soon become obsolete and emphasises the importance of critical thinking skills, digital and AI literacies to be integrated in the curricula.

As GAI tools continue to advance and become more widespread, the UK Quality Assurance Agency (QAA, 2023), a quality assurance service for higher education providers in the UK offering advice, guidance and support to help UK universities and colleges to provide the best possible student experience, warns that certain types of assessments may no longer effectively demonstrate that students have achieved the necessary learning outcomes. This concern arises because students might utilize GAI tools unethically to produce and submit essay-type assignments, which could easily go undetected. Research on detection tools for AI-generated text shows that these tools are inaccurate and unreliable (Elkhatat, Elsaid & Almeer, 2023; Weber-Wolff *et al*., 2023). Consequently, generic essay-type questions are particularly susceptible to misuse, as they provide an opportunity for students to use these tools inappropriately. This highlights the need for educators and educational institutions to rethink and adapt their assessment strategies to ensure academic integrity and accurately measure student learning (Klyshbekova & Abbott, 2024). To this end, the QAA (2023) recommends three key outcomes when reviewing assessment strategies in light of the recent GAI developments: reducing the summative assessment volume and adding more formative checkpoints, shifting towards synoptic assessments, and developing authentic assessments.

Authentic assessment focuses on learners using and applying knowledge and skills in real-life situations and can assist towards the development of work-ready graduates. The call for authentic assessments is not new, however it has been amplified by the recent GAI developments and there is extensive literature on the necessity for assessment strategies to become more 'authentic,' equipping students with essential real-world skills for success in the job market upon graduation (Advance HE, 2023; AdvanceHE, 2024; Brownlie, Burke and van der Laan, 2024; McArthur, 2023). The need for a shift to more authentic assessment tasks and to focus more on the process of assessment providing increased supervision were among the findings of a large-scale international survey with teachers and academics aiming to identify their perceptions regarding the changes needed in teaching and assessment in response to the proliferation of GAI tools (Bower *et al.,* 2024).

3. The Current Study

Generative AI is leading to a re-evaluation of the purpose of higher education and learning as it has significant implications directly impacting existing teaching methods and assessment practices (Malik *et al*., 2023). As discussed in the previous section, the use of GAI tools can potentially pose risks to assessment, such as false evidence of learning and amplify academic integrity issues. Despite these challenges, the use of GAI can open avenues for assessing a wider spectrum of professional and subject-specific competencies, offering students more choices in showcasing their learning. This research aims to investigate the impact of GAI on assessment in HE and in particular on HRM and Psychology courses by asking lecturers in these subjects to explain any modifications they have implemented, or are planning to implement, on their assessment approaches to either counter the risks posed by inappropriate student use of GAI, or to integrate GAI aiming to build their students

GAI literacies and critical thinking. Additionally, we asked participants to speculate on how assessments will look in five years' time.

3.1 Researchers' Professional Background and Research Participants

One of the authors' expertise lies on educational development and digital education, while the other two authors of this study are engaged in teaching Human Resource Management (HRM) and Psychology. Collectively, they hold over 30 years of experience in designing, delivering, and assessing modules at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. Their professional expertise includes curriculum development, assessment design, and digital pedagogies, with a shared research interest in the educational implications of emerging technologies such as GAI. The study was conducted within the context of two post-1992 UK institutions, one in England and one in Northern Ireland, with a strong focus on teaching and learning enhancement. The participants included academic staff involved in assessment design, quality assurance, and pedagogical innovation in HRM and Psychology courses.

3.2 Method

We used an online survey to gather qualitative data. Participants were asked to describe their current assessment approaches. They were then invited to consider how recent developments in GAI might challenge these approaches. Next, they explained how they had redesigned—or were planning to redesign—assessments in a module they teach. Finally, participants reflected on the perceived strengths and weaknesses of these new approaches and shared their thoughts on what assessment in their subject area might look like in five years.

3.3 Research Procedure

Following ethical approval by both participating universities, the survey took place in the summer of 2024. We collected data through a bespoke questionnaire tool, specifically designed for the purposes of this exploratory study. The questions were formulated based on a focused review of the emerging literature on GAI in higher education, particularly in relation to assessment practices. To enhance clarity and relevance, we peer-reviewed the questionnaire internally among the author team, drawing on our combined disciplinary expertise. Following that, the questionnaire was piloted with two colleagues, one from HRM and one from Psychology, before it was finalised. The online questionnaire that was sent to academics can be found below:

- What course(s)/modules do you teach?
- Please describe an example of an assessment method or task you used in a module you taught last year (in the pre-ChatGPT era). Include specific details such as the type of assessment, its objectives, the exact wordings of the tasks, and how it was conducted.
- Reflecting on the assessment method you described, and in light of the recent advancements in Generative AI tools (ChatGPT, Google Gemini, Microsoft Bing Chat etc.), what do you consider to be the significant weaknesses or limitations of this approach, if any, in effectively evaluating student learning?
- Considering the advent of advanced AI tools like ChatGPT (post-November 2022), how have you changed, or how do you intend to change, your assessment methods? Please provide an example of a new form of assessment you have adopted, or plan to adopt.
- What is one key strength or advantage of the new assessment method you have implemented or are planning to implement in the era of advanced AI tools like ChatGPT?
- What is one key limitation or difficulty of the new assessment method?
- In your opinion and based on what you know about Generative AI, what will assessments look like in your subject/discipline in 5 years' time?

The questionnaire was distributed to the entire HRM course team at one university—eight academics in total—of whom six responded. It was also sent to ten lectures of psychology at the other participating university, with six responses received. This resulted in an equal split of participants across the two disciplines.

3.4 Analytic Approach

As a result of our pre-planned questionnaire design, we were able to identify two distinct sets of textual data in the first round of reading the text responses. The first category—derived from responses to questions 1 to 6—comprised a clearly sequenced set of accounts reflecting educators' experiences and viewpoints on responding to GAI through reactive assessment changes, within specific modules. The second category—which includes responses to question 7—was broader and more speculative in nature, capturing general reflections and

concerns about the longer-term impact and implications of GAI on assessment in higher education. Given the differing focus and character of these two data sets, we analysed them separately, each using methods appropriate to their structure and content.

The first set of data, i.e., the viewpoints of how lecturers responded to GAI, contained a coherent sequential narrative of pre-existing assessment, educator assessment-related actions (where apparent) in response to the post-GAI era, and educator evaluations concerning the efficacy of action taken. The focus of our analysis was identifying the details of each educator account. Hence, we used a summative content analysis process (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005) which involves counting and comparisons, usually of keywords or content, followed by the interpretation of the underlying context. We began our analysis by identifying frequently occurring terms (e.g. essays, research report) across responses, manually. We calculated word frequencies and noted the source of each instance to better understand how particular terms were used to describe the assessment types. This allowed us to explore the context in which specific words or phrases appeared. Through this process, we were able to interpret the range of assessments participants applied, and relate these practices to broader themes in the data. This process provided basic insights into how assessment forms were used within the subject areas (See Table 1).

The second set of data, i.e., concerning speculative general viewpoints about GAI-related assessment, was subjected to a reflective thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2019). Using the steps prescribed in Braun & Clarke (2019), initially, two of the authors read the text responses independently and generated preliminary codes. They followed an inductive approach to coding, grouping similar codes into broader categories through iterative discussions. To enhance the reliability of our analysis, the third author reviewed our coded data and provided critical feedback on the refinement of themes. Any disagreements were resolved through collaborative discussion until we reached a consensus. We derived the themes presented in this paper, through repeated comparison across responses, paying close attention to recurring patterns in experiences, concerns, and pedagogical responses to the use of GAI in assessment contexts.

4. Results

We present two distinctive analyses in this section. We first present educator survey responses to assessment pre/post GAI emergence. We then consider a discrete corpus of textual data concerning speculations about future assessment approaches, in light of the GAI developments.

4.1 Analysis 1: Educator Approaches to Assessment Pre/Post GAI Emergence

Given the narrative form of this data we present these findings, educator by educator, as Table 1. Table 1 includes educator extracts in summarised form to permit a standard, clear account of textual data. Assessment types at the pre-GAI timepoint were somewhat heterogenous, reflecting the range of assessment approaches undertaken within that disciplinary area. Pre-GAI, participating educators mostly used traditional essay-type submissions (e.g., 3000-word essays, 2500-word research proposals). Most modules had one clearly identified assessment component (9 of 12) while three modules included two components (3 of 12).

Table 1: Pre and post GAI assessments

	Assessment pre-GAI		**Assessment post-GAI**		
ID	**Assessment description (pre-GAI)**	**Evidence of how GAI impacted on the assessment**	**Was assessment changed, post-GAI?**	**Details of changed assessment post-GAI (where applicable).**	**Evaluation of new assessment post GAI.**
P1 PSY	Research report	GAI eases research methods assessment anxiety but is difficult to detect.	No.	n/a	Students may cheat and it is hard to detect.
P2 PSY	Assessment 001: 15-minute motivational interviewing session with a client. Assessment 002: critical reflection.	Students mentioned the use of ChatGPT as an Academic tool. It led to many well written reflections which did not actually relate to what was covered on the module.	No.	n/a	It is very easy for ChatGPT to be utilised, resulting in well written but often inaccurate reflections.

	Assessment pre-GAI		**Assessment post-GAI**		
ID	**Assessment description (pre-GAI)**	**Evidence of how GAI impacted on the assessment**	**Was assessment changed, post-GAI?**	**Details of changed assessment post-GAI (where applicable).**	**Evaluation of new assessment post GAI.**
P3 PSY	A 1,500-word essay submitted on Turnitin	Turnitin can identify GAI use as text appears different to surrounding text e.g. it is boxed or grey. We have ensured that all exams are on campus with several invigilators and are developing other approaches to written work.	No.	n/a	All exams are on campus with several invigilators, and we are developing other approaches to written work.
R4 PSY	Research Report Writing.	The reflective statement part was identified as the one element more prone to AI misuse.	Yes.	Students were asked to gather and analyse their own data. They also had the opportunity to create their own research question.	Engaging students further and adding specificity in the reflective statement might also make the assessment less prone to the use of AI.
P5 PSY	10 min Screencast Presentation.	Assessment submissions all now have to be checked to ensure that the content is not entirely drawn from GAI tools.	No.	n/a	Checking the authenticity of the content. Checking that the student has embedded their learning points.
R6 HRM	3000-word essay	Students tend to write AI-tool-generated ideas on talent attraction and retention, as if those ideas have been used in their local organisations. What the students actually learned in the class were not identified in this assessment.	Yes.	The essay task was changed to students writing six, short, online journal postings (200 words each) every week, and a shorter critical response essay (1400 words) that evaluates a post published by their peers.	Writing blog posts on a topic discussed in the class, and the posts are published for other peers to view. In the second task, students write a critical essay based on one of their peers' posts. The arguments are generated based on what is taught in the class.
R7 HRM	A 2500-word research proposal.	The literature review section is poorly written. It lacked cohesion, criticality and comprehension. Students tend to use AI tools to generate proposals that are too descriptive.	Yes.	The task was changed to two tasks of writing a Literature Review-based Academic Essay (1250 words - 30%) and producing a research Proposal (2000 words - 70%) that uses the output of the first task as a component in the proposal.	The literature-review based essay prepares the students on writing literature review sections and helps them get feedback. Students then use the feedback to develop the literature review section as part of their proposal. By dividing the assessment into two pieces of coursework, lecturers are able to see students' work in Stage 1. If any unusual patterns are found in Stage 2, then this gives a chance for lecturers to identify if the submitted work is the students' or not.

	Assessment pre-GAI		**Assessment post-GAI**		
ID	**Assessment description (pre-GAI)**	**Evidence of how GAI impacted on the assessment**	**Was assessment changed, post-GAI?**	**Details of changed assessment post-GAI (where applicable).**	**Evaluation of new assessment post GAI.**
R8 PSY	Short answer essay; answer 2 questions (out of 4) with a 500-word essay for each question.	Potential AI misuse as students can use AI to answer the essay and ultimately adapt or polish their answers into better-finished work.	Yes.	Change made for this year - gave students the ChatGPT answers to all the short questions, so that they could not just use the basic answer that ChatGPT would produce.	Incorporating ChatGPT responses as learning materials can improve the learning experience and might act as a deterrent. Inherent limitation of the essay as an assessment method as essays can always be polished or adapted by AI tools.
R9 HRM	1500-word Essay. 3000-word Research Proposal	The biggest weakness of these assessment types is that students can use GenAI tools to generate answers. Students' original ideas are not that visible in their works.	Yes.	Introduced two time-limited tasks, releasing both tasks only 24 hours before the deadline and specified that local context must be used as reference in their answers.	The emphasis on the local Northern Irish context restricts students to focus more on their own thinking and contextual reflections. The limited time allowed for them further restricts their ability to use AI-generated contents extensively.
R10 HRM	1500-word Essay. 3000-word Case Study.	Students began to use AI tools to brainstorm ideas and presented them as their own. Although it was obvious that they are not their own ideas, I was not able to prove this.	Yes.	The traditional essay assessments were changed to a Lab-based task of HR analytics Simulation and a group presentation of their Analytics Dashboards.	The key strength now is the whole class is in the lab. Everyone is sitting in front of computers. They use the data and the software which I supplied. It is a monitored exercise. The group presentation and the Q&A session that follows gives ample opportunities to test learning gains.
R11 HRM	Analysis of their own company organisational structure using the company's annual report and suggest improvements.	No limitations identified, although students could use AI tools to analyse the company's documents.	Yes.	Change from individual to group project (In groups of 5 create an organisational structure for a specific company).	Authentic task researching a local company, proposing a structure and get it evaluated by a member of that company. No perceived limitations.
R12 PSY	To write a STEEPLE analysis report. Second task to write an essay.	AI tools give STEEPLE analysis of several companies. Students' answers resemble ChatGPT generated scripts.	Yes.	Changed the submission format types to include two modes of submissions: Live, in-class presentation or video recorded, narrated presentation.	Demonstrating the understanding of the content. AI use still possible, but the risk of copying directly is minimised.

Educators identified a range of evidence relating to the impact of GAI on assessment. An educator thought that GAI could be misused to develop a higher standard assessment response than would otherwise have been possible (R8). However, other educators mentioned that GAI tools tended to reduce the overall assessment quality by producing overly descriptive and relatively less coherent work (R7, R2). Other educators emphasised that a main challenge was the impossibility of demonstrating that GAI had been used to generate content (R1,

R9, R10). In some responses it was apparent that educators did not identify a major impact of GAI on assessment (R11, R4) and an educator claimed that current processes and resources in place successfully identified inappropriate GAI use linked to assessment (P3). Notably, two thirds of participating educators (n=8) formally changed their assessment approach in some way following the widespread availability of GAI tools and the associated awareness of how these might be used in educational environments among educators and learners, while the remaining educators either made no change or made changes to the process surrounding submissions rather than the assessment specification itself (n=4).

Responses indicated varied methods for changing the assessment approach post-GAI, where change had occurred. Some changes were very minor including retaining the same overall assessment approach but shifting one element (R4), students required to generate their own datasets or, more substantially, retaining the approach but creating a choice of different submission formats that mitigated inappropriate use of GAI (evident in R12's live or video-recorded submission formats). Other changes involved amendments which foregrounded GAI in some way by introducing it into the assessment approach (R7, R8). For example, R7 reported changes that involved using GAI to create a literature review which learners then needed to provide a critical response to. Some educator responses indicated change involving movement toward group-based assessments (R10, R11). Group-based assessments had the benefit of being able to see learners engaging in their assessment in real time, with peers, on campus (R10), while other responses showed inventive ways of involving online peer engagement in an assessment change requiring learners to produce a critique of assessment-mandated peer produced journal posts concerning module topics (R6). Another example of inventive responses included localising the assessment focus (R4, R9) so that learners needed to focus on (e.g.) their own business/local context, and learners being granted limited time (e.g., 24 hours) to produce their response (R9).

Several responses suggested that there had already been evidence of improvements to submitted work, in terms of reduced AI-generated work, following GAI-related assessment changes. For example, time-limited approaches to deadlines seemed to reduce inappropriate GAI usage (R9), and incorporating GAI transparently into assessment appeared to serve as a deterrent to inappropriate adoption of GAI tools among learners in the experience of some educators (R7, R8). Other data indicated how students' work became more familiar to educators following changes whether by having more oral/presentation type assessments (R10) or by providing an opportunity for a formative/ early warning mechanism for identifying inappropriate GAI use at an early stage and subsequently addressing this via feedback to relevant learners.

4.2 Analysis 2: Future-Focused Textual Data

Material in this section concerns a thematic study of textual responses generated in response to the speculative question: "what will assessment look like in your discipline in 5 years' time?". As reported below, we identified two simple themes – 'Hopes' and 'Doubts' – from this analysis.

4.2.1 Educators' hopes: priority emphasis on process, groupwork and authentic assessment

Notably, most responses were optimistic about GAI's anticipated impact on assessment and learning experiences and approaches within HE more widely. Optimism was grounded in how "*GAI technologies will be incorporated as learning tools in teaching*" (R8); and in a movement towards "*students being able to demonstrate their learning in various ways, including in-class, routine, bite-size tasks*" (R11). Grounds for optimism were particularly strongly expressed in terms of more emphasis placed on process and groupwork and away from product in learning experiences: "*shifted focus from product to process and relationships, co-created assessments, peer marking, self-assessment and emphasis on developmental feedback... but these changes may take more than 5 years*" (R12); "*we will focus more on 'HOW' students learn A, B and C and APPLY them in real world, than on 'WHAT' they learn in formal settings*" (R7). One educator went further still, suggesting that the growth of GAI in the context of HE assessment might have positive implications for learner mental health, "*future assessment be more enjoyable, personalised and engaging because of the possibilities of gamification... if teachers are creative and skilful, it is possible to help students enjoy the assessments and thus reducing their anxiety and promote wellbeing in universities... assessments times may be less stressful in the future*" (R10).

One final reason for optimism concerned the possibility for more transparent and relationally sophisticated relationship between educators and learners because of the emergence and growth of GAI in the context of assessment. This was apparent in an extended and eloquent response from one educator, "*I directly acknowledge GAI's appeal when speaking to learners and talk about how I would have used it myself had it been available as an undergraduate... I explain why using it would have been massively inhibitive to my personal and academic growth, and why I am so glad that I was forced to write my own assessments... this leads to talking*

about foundational reasons for attending university (personal growth, confidence, career progression), and how using ChatGPT could undermine these things... students may still go on to use ChatGPT, but having this helpful discussion always strikes a chord with students" (R1).

4.2.2 Educators' doubts: unassured quality and expanded inequity.

Despite a mainly optimistic forecast, there were clear issues of concern voiced by some educators. Clear risks were identified including the risk to the reputation and quality assurance of higher education as an institution for providing a skilled workforce and delivering on raising individual aspiration: "*there are costs of GAI in the learning experience: the more automated tech is relied on, the less learners get to exercise social communication skills... GAI assessment methods cut out essential interpersonal, relational and experiential components of learning*" (P5). Another clear area of risk concerning the growth in GAI technology was how it may contribute to unfairness. This might involve inequity in access to, or familiarity with, GAI technology among learners and educators alike, "*the (inevitable) use of AI by some students should not mean other students should have their academic growth stunted*" (R1). Similarly, another educator suggested that GAI might serve to exacerbate the divide between access to higher quality, more technologically sophisticated higher education experiences between relatively more and less wealthy countries, "*in advanced countries, and particularly in postgraduate and professional courses, more immersive, dialogue-based and interactive experiences may be used in assessments, possibly by using AI-enabled, wearable tools. In developing countries, however, more emphasis might be given to the traditional pen and paper, closely proctored, campus-based assessments to combat students' use of AI-generated answers*" (R9).

5. Discussion

Generative AI (GAI) tools such as ChatGPT have presented considerable challenges and possibilities for how educators approach assessment design within higher education delivery. This research aimed to uncover the current thinking of lecturers in Psychology and HRM on the ways they have adapted or plan to adapt their assessments in light of the recent GAI developments. Based on the views of 12 UK-based academics, we show four significant threads in their responses to GAI integration and their vision for future assessment practices.

First, our findings reveal that two-thirds of participating educators have made meaningful changes to their assessment practices, highlighting the substantial impact of GAI. Notably, some of these changes were not just minor adjustments; academics actively developed innovative approaches to enhance learning. For example, some academics are integrating GAI directly into the learning process, alongside a shift toward group-based and time-limited assessments that reflect a broader movement in higher education; additionally, there is a notable trend toward using localised, context-specific tasks that require students to connect theoretical knowledge with real-life or professional contexts, in line with authentic assessment principles. This shift shows that educators are rethinking assessment—moving beyond traditional integrity concerns to what we might call 'post-GAI assessment trend.' These new assessment trends do not challenge GAI usage simply by making the questions more complex; they demand authentic human engagement and contextual insight. Such a shift signals a promising move in how we evaluate student learning, from simply recalling information to truly applying knowledge in real-world contexts. Our findings confirm and extend the recent shifts in assessment approaches highlighted by Weng *et al*. (2024) and Lang (2024) and align with various sources that highlight the need for assessment redesign in light of the recent GAI developments (Firat, 2023; Naidu & Sevnarayan, 2023; QAA, 2023; Yeadon *et al*., 2023). As Humble *et al.* (2024) have highlighted, the assessment of basic skills and knowledge will need to be reconsidered. The trend toward authentic assessments that emphasise context-based skills and lifelong learning outcomes represents a promising shift toward innovative approaches, that support more holistic student development. We see that this trend will benefit students by equipping them with transferable skills that align more closely with industry demands, allowing them to build capabilities essential for lifelong learning in professional environments.

Second, the study also revealed academics' evaluation of GAI's impact on students' submissions. While some educators expressed concerns that GAI allows for enhanced performance, others noted a different trend. Often, AI-generated content resulted in work that was less rigorous, relying heavily on descriptive elements while lacking depth, coherence, or critical analysis. This variation in educators' experiences underscores the complex nature of GAI's influence on learning. On one hand, GAI can help students organise and articulate ideas more fluently; this support may be particularly beneficial for international students, who often face additional language and structural challenges. On the other, it may inadvertently encourage an overreliance on AI-generated content over synthesis and insight. These mixed results underscore the need for continued

exploration into how GAI impacts both the form and substance of student submissions, raising important questions about how we construct learning outcomes, design assessment criteria, and evaluate student performance. This complexity calls into question current grading practices and the basis on which judgments about learning gains are made, suggesting a need to rethink traditional approaches to assessing student understanding and skill development in a GAI-influenced environment. Contributions such as the AI Assessment Scale by Perkins *et al.,* (2024) hold promise for the ethical integration of GAI in educational assessment.

Third, our study brings forward several concerns and challenges surrounding the integration of GAI in assessment, calling for a broader perspective that considers the varied global uptake of GAI tools. Our findings highlight that unequal access to GAI could lead to inconsistent learning outcomes and variable academic support across student groups, thereby increasing educational inequities. The absence of access to GAI tools may not only widen achievement gaps but also limit opportunities for students to practice and refine their interpersonal and communication skills through authentic, real-world tasks. Additionally, this lack of access highlights a risk of growing disparities in assessment approaches, particularly between developed and developing countries, where access to GAI technology may vary significantly. Such disparities call for a critical examination of how GAI is integrated into education, emphasising the importance of equitable access and a careful consideration of its broader effects on skills development and international assessment standards. We also observe that none of the participants referenced scenarios in which GAI could be utilised in assessment contexts as a co-intelligence model, as suggested by Mollick & Mollick (2024), where GAI works collaboratively with students to enhance learning quality. This reveals an underexplored potential of GAI as a transformative educational tool. By fostering an interactive, co-intelligence-based approach, GAI could support a more dynamic learning process, augmenting students' creative and analytical abilities. Such a model could enable students to produce richer, more comprehensive outputs, highlighting the value of harnessing GAI not merely as a functional tool but as an integrated partner in diverse learning contexts.

Fourth, differences in disciplinary priorities appear to shape how GAI is being interpreted and addressed in assessment practices. HRM academics often referenced the importance of preparing students for the world of work and focused on adapting assessment tasks to reflect practical, applied, and authentic formats that GAI cannot easily replicate. In contrast, psychology academics were more likely to raise questions about students' cognitive development, critical reflection, and conceptual understanding. These distinctions suggest that subject-specific traditions—such as HRM's emphasis on employability and applied skills, and psychology's attention to cognitive and developmental learning—may influence how academic staff perceive the risks and opportunities of GAI in higher education assessment. This highlights the need for institutions to consider the disciplinary context when supporting staff to respond to GAI in teaching and assessment.

Taken together, these findings contribute to our understanding of how GAI is reshaping assessment in higher education, suggesting that successful adaptation requires three key approaches to assessment design and implementation: balanced integration of GAI tools while preserving core educational values, designing assessment strategies that leverage GAI's potential while mitigating its risks, and ensuring equitable access to prevent disparities in learning achievement. We suggest that there is an urgent need for discipline-specific educator development programmes in universities that empower them to stay ahead of both GAI advancements and student adaptations, equipping educators to anticipate changes, refine assessment strategies, and continue to genuinely care about their students of all abilities. To this end, our findings serve to provide a source of qualitative evidence to guide understanding by highlighting educators' experiences and guiding future efforts in adapting assessments.

6. Study Strengths, Limitations and Future Research Priorities

Strengths and limitations of our study are considered alongside implied areas for future research in this area. First, we acknowledge that the small sample size (n=12), selected from two UK universities, with a focus on HRM and Psychology departments limit the generalisability of these findings. While the sample size is small, it enabled a more in-depth, qualitative exploration of educators' views and decision-making activities, generating richer insights into how GAI is shaping assessment design. Although the data were drawn from only two disciplines, this narrower focus allowed us to examine specific practices more closely and to capture discipline-informed responses. We believe the experiences and concerns raised by our participants may resonate with educators in other subject areas, offering relevance beyond the immediate sample.

Second, we also acknowledge that using a free-text survey tool to capture educator responses worked well as a convenient way of generating a substantial but manageable volume of textual data to address our research aims. However, we point out that educator narratives around previous module assessment, design responses post GAI

and general apprehensions about the impact of GAI on higher education assessment were mixed in terms of detail and focus, partly as a function of the survey tool approach. Future research can now address this by interviewing a subset of educator survey respondents to generate fuller, spontaneous insights into individuals' views, experiences and feelings.

Third, while our decision to approach educator viewpoints at a module specific level meant we could rapidly survey colleagues simply and efficiently, we acknowledge that this meant we were unable to consider prior and reactive educator responses at the level of an entire curriculum for particular courses or disciplines. Taking this broader approach was beyond the scope of our study. We recommend that future research builds on the scope and scale of our study by a more comprehensive mapping exercise - e.g. of GAI-related assessment changes for a whole course or a set of courses in an entire disciplinary area. In addition, exploring assessment approaches in response to GAI developments across a wider range of disciplines is now required.

Fourth, our research study design was appropriate given the novelty of the phenomenon under exploration. Our data has provided a snapshot insight into how educators have responded to a pressing demand on the integrity of their assessment approaches in the context of an unprecedented technological upheaval. However, we were unable to explore a wider range of questions concerning change over time and viewpoints/ experiences among different stakeholders recorded in time series. We suggest that a longitudinal expansion of the current study could follow the 'journey' of a new, GAI-informed, set of course assessment across multiple modules, drawing on the perspectives of both educator and learner stakeholders, to identify the relative merits and shortcomings of approaches taken.

Future research could address these limitations in several ways. Investigating student perspectives on these modified assessments would add valuable depth, helping educators understand how GAI integration impacts students' learning and engagement. Research across varied disciplines could also uncover discipline-specific effects, clarifying whether certain fields benefit more from GAI-based approaches. Finally, exploring methods to maintain assessment integrity in a GAI-enabled environment remains essential, especially as technology continues to advance. Additionally, the rapidly evolving nature of GAI technology means that the findings may require regular updating. These efforts would collectively enhance our understanding of GAI's impact and guide best practices in assessment.

7. Conclusion

The integration of Generative AI (GAI) tools in higher education is prompting a re-evaluation of traditional assessment methods. There has been sector speculation that future assessments in HE will emphasize process over product, with less summative and more continuous, formative assessments providing ongoing feedback and support. GAI has the potential to enhance personalized learning experiences, provided educators and students have the necessary skills and resources. We sought to understand experiences and viewpoints of using GAI for assessment purposes among lecturers in HRM and Psychology. Our findings highlight the need for educational institutions to adapt their strategies to maintain academic integrity while leveraging GAI benefits. While GAI presents significant challenges to traditional assessment methods, it also offers opportunities for more authentic, engaging, and effective assessment practices. By addressing the associated risks, higher education institutions can better prepare students for the modern workforce and promote ethical GAI use.

AI statement: AI tools have not been used in any phase of this research including the writing of the paper.

Ethics statement: Ethical approval was granted by both participating universities' research ethics committees.

Conflict of interest statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

References

Advance HE, 2023. *Authentic Assessment in the era of AI*, available at: https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/membership/all-member-benefit-projects/Authentic-Assessment-in-the-era-of-AI (accessed 02 October 2024).

AdvanceHE, 2024. *Embedding Employability in Higher Education Framework*, available at: https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/news-and-views/advance-he-publishes-new-framework-embedding-employability-higher-education (accessed 02 October 2024).

Ballale, H. and Pannilage, S., 2025. Reassessing academic integrity in the age of AI: a systematic literature review on AI and academic integrity. *Social Sciences and Humanities Open*, 11, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2025.101299

Bower, M., Torrington, J., Lai, J.W.M., Petocz, P. and Alfano, M., 2024. How should we change teaching and assessment in response to increasingly powerful generative Artificial Intelligence? Outcomes of the ChatGPT teacher survey. *Education and Information Technologies,* 29, pp 15403-15439 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12405-0

Braun, V. and Clarke, V., 2012. Thematic analysis. In H. Cooper, P. M. Camic, D. L. Long, A. T. Panter, D. Rindskopf, & K. J. Sher (Eds.), *APA handbook of research methods in psychology, Vol. 2. Research designs: Quantitative, qualitative, neuropsychological, and biological* (pp. 57–71). American Psychological Association, https://doi.org/10.1037/13620-004

Braun, V. and Clarke, V., 2019. Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative research in sport, exercise and health,* 11 (4), pp 589-597, https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

Brownlie, N., Burke, K. and van der Laan, L., 2024. Quality indicators of effective teacher-created summative assessment. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 32 (1), pp 30-45, https://doi.org/10.1108/QAE-04-2023-0062

Elkhatat, A.M., Elsaid, K. and Almeer, S., 2023. Evaluating the efficacy of AI content detection tools in differentiating between human and AI-generated text. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 19 (17), https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00140-5

Firat, M., 2023. What ChatGPT means for universities: Perceptions of scholars and students. *Journal of Applied Learning and Teaching*, 6 (1), pp 57–63, https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2023.6.1.22

Hsieh, H. F. and Shannon, S. E., 2005. Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative health research*, 15 (9), pp 1277-1288, https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687

Humble, N., Boustedt, J., Holmgren, H., Milutinovic, G., Seipel, S. and Ostberg, A., 2024. Cheaters or AI-Enhanced Learners: Consequences of ChatGPT for Programming Education. *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 22 (2), pp 16-29, https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.21.5.3154

Klyshbekova, M. and Abbott, P., 2024. ChatGPT and Assessment in Higher Education: A Magic Wand or a Disruptor? *Electronic Journal of e-Learning*, 22 (2), pp 30-45, https://doi.org/10.34190/ejel.21.5.3114

Lang, J. C., 2024. Embracing Generative AI for Authentic Learning. *Creative Education*, 15, pp 1-20, https://doi.org/10.4236/ce.2024.151001

Malik, T., Hughes, L., Dwivedi, Y.K. and Dettmer, S., 2023. Exploring the Transformative Impact of Generative AI on Higher Education. In: Janssen, M., *et al. New Sustainable Horizons in Artificial Intelligence and Digital Solutions. I3E 2023. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, vol 14316. Springer, Cham, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-50040-4_6

Mollick, E. and Mollick, E., 2024. *Co-Intelligence*. Penguin Random House UK.

McArthur, J., 2023. Rethinking authentic assessment: work, well-being, and society. *Higher Education,* 85, pp 85–101, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-022-00822-y

Naidu, K. and Sevnarayan, K., 2023. ChatGPT: An ever-increasing encroachment of artificial intelligence in online assessment in distance education. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies*, 13 (3), https://doi.org/10.30935/ojcmt/13291

Perkins, M., Furze, L., Roe, J. and MacVaugh, J., 2024. The Artificial Intelligence Assessment Scale (AIAS): A Framework for Ethical Integration of Generative AI in Educational Assessment. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 21 (6), https://doi.org/10.53761/q3azde36

Quality Assurance Agency, 2023. *Reconsidering assessment for the ChatGPT era: QAA advice on developing sustainable assessment strategies*, available at: https://www.qaa.ac.uk/membership/membership-areas-of-work/generative-artificial-intelligence/qaa-advice-and-resources (accessed 28 October 2024).

Russell group principles on use of AI in HE, 2023, https://russellgroup.ac.uk/news/new-principles-on-use-of-ai-in-education/

Weber-Wulff, D., Anohina-Naumeca, A., Bjelobata, S., Foltynek, T., Guerrero-Dib, J., Popoola, O., Sigut, P. and Waddington, L., 2023. Testing of detection tools for AI-generated text. International Journal for Educational Integrity, 19 (26), https://doi.org/10.1007/s40979-023-00146-z

Weng, X., Xia, Q., Gu, M., Rajaram, K. and Chiu, T. K., 2024. Assessment and learning outcomes for generative AI in higher education: A scoping review on current research status and trends. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology,* 40 (6), pp 37-55, https://doi.org/10.14742/ajet.9540

Xia, Q., Weng, X., Ouyang, F., Jin Lin, T. and Chiu, T.K.F., 2024. A scoping review on how generative artificial intelligence transforms assessment in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education,* 21 (40), https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00468-z

Yeadon, W., Inyang, O. O., Mizouri, A., Peach, A. and Testrow, C. P., 2023. The death of the short-form physics essay in the coming AI revolution. *Physics Education*, 58 (3), https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6552/acc5cf