Chapter 1
Rethinking Educational Assessment in the Age of Generative AI:
Actionable Strategies to Mitigate Academic Dishonesty

Manuel B. Garcia
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2615-422X
FEU Institute of Technology, Philippines

Joanna Rosak-Szyrocka
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5548-6787
Czestochowa University of Technology, Poland

Ramazan Yılmaz
Bartın University, Turkey

Ahmed Hosny Saleh Metwally
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9545-5870
Helwan University, Egypt

Dharel P. Acut
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9608-1292
Cebu Technological University, Philippines

Kingsley Ofosu-Ampong
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0561-6376
Heritage Christian University, Ghana

Fatih Erdoğdu
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1022-8570
Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University, Turkey

Chorng Yuan Fung
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2007-6286
Swinburne University of Technology, Sarawak, Malaysia

Aras Bozkurt
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4520-642X
Anadolu University, Turkey

ABSTRACT

As artificial intelligence (AI) becomes increasingly integrated into educational contexts, they present new challenges to traditional assessment methods. A particularly pressing issue is academic dishonesty, which undermines learning authenticity and the credibility of educational institutions. With generative AI tools like ChatGPT making it easier for students to produce automated answers, educational assessments are at risk of measuring AI capabilities rather than students' actual knowledge. Thus, this chapter explores a range of strategies designed to adapt assessment practices in response to the influence of AI in education. These strategies offer actionable frameworks to support authentic learning and uphold academic

DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0122-8.ch001

Copyright ©2025, IGI Global Scientific Publishing. Copying or distributing in print or electronic forms without written permission of IGI Global Scientific Publishing is prohibited.

integrity. Additionally, the chapter highlights future research directions to guide further adaptation of educational policies and practices. Given the rapid integration of AI in the education sector, this chapter provides sensible insights that reinforce the importance of integrity-focused reforms in sustaining meaningful educational outcomes in an AI-driven world.

INTRODUCTION

Educational assessment is fundamental to the learning process. It provides essential insights into both student progress and institutional effectiveness. Over time, assessment practices have evolved alongside shifts in educational theories and societal expectations. This evolution underscores the ongoing need to align them with the demands of higher education and professional fields. Traditionally, assessments have relied on structured, standardized methods such as written exams, essays, and graded assignments. These approaches often emphasize the retention of knowledge, critical thinking, and the ability to apply learned concepts in specific contexts. In classroom settings, educators have used techniques like oral questioning, quizzes, and written feedback to gauge student comprehension and progress. Final exams and cumulative projects serve as benchmarks to summarize students' overall performance. These culminating assessments prove a snapshot of their achievements at the end of a course or program. While these conventional methods have shaped the foundation of educational assessment, evolving educational landscapes and emerging challenges signal a need to explore more dynamic and flexible ways of measuring and fostering learning outcomes (e.g., Swiecki et al., 2022).

In the 21st century, advancements in information and communication technologies have significantly transformed assessment methods (See et al., 2022). Recent trends pave the way for technology-enhanced assessments like computer-based testing and online evaluations. Particularly, e-assessment has emerged as a powerful tool for aiding teachers in monitoring student progress and evaluating complex cognitive skills (Azevedo & Azevedo, 2019). Prior works underscored the benefits of e-assessment in higher education, highlighting its potential to boost student motivation, satisfaction, skill development, autonomy, and flexibility (Montenegro-Rueda et al., 2021). E-assessments are often facilitated through learning management systems, which provide a variety of assessment options, including calculation questions, essays, matching exercises, and true/false queries. In addition, online tools like self-test quizzes, discussion forums, and e-portfolios have been increasingly adopted for educational assessments (Gikandi et al., 2011). The importance of these resources was further amplified during the COVID-19 pandemic (Ofosu-Ampong et al., 2024) when platforms such as Moodle and Zoom became essential for conducting online assessments to maintain the continuity of student evaluation amidst unprecedented challenges (Montenegro-Rueda et al., 2021; Slack & Priestley, 2023).

While e-assessments offer numerous benefits (Heil & Ifenthaler, 2023), the rise of emerging technologies like artificial intelligence (AI) introduces new challenges in educational assessment (Swiecki et al., 2022). One of the most pressing concerns is the increasing use of generative AI tools, which can produce sophisticated written responses, solve complex problems, and simulate human-like interactions. These AI-powered tools, such as ChatGPT, have made it easier for students to generate content that may not accurately reflect their individual understanding or learning progress. This ease of access has heightened concerns around academic dishonesty (Gruenhagen et al., 2024), which refers to any form of cheating or misrepresentation of one's own work in an academic setting. Students may rely on AI tools to complete assessments, which undermines the authenticity of their work (Lee et al., 2024).

Educational assessment methods now face the risk of becoming avenues for misuse rather than accurate measures of student knowledge. Consequently, educators are confronted with the challenge of designing assessments that not only measure genuine skills but also discourage reliance on AI-generated content. Addressing these concerns requires a rethinking of assessment strategies to uphold academic integrity in this evolving technological landscape.

MAIN FOCUS OF THE CHAPTER

The rapid advancements in generative AI have underscored the inadequacy of conventional assessment paradigms in addressing the multifaceted demands of modern education. As AI tools become increasingly sophisticated and ubiquitous, educators are compelled to reconceptualize and reengineer assessment frameworks to ensure they remain pedagogically sound, equitable, and authentically reflective of learner competencies. This chapter argues that simply modifying existing assessment methods is not enough; instead, a fundamental rethinking is imperative to align evaluative methodologies with the transformative capabilities and ethical implications of generative AI. There is an urgent need for actionable frameworks that can be operationalized across diverse educational ecosystems—including K–12 education, tertiary institutions, and professional development environments. These frameworks must account for evolving patterns of learner engagement, emergent modalities of knowledge representation, and heightened vulnerabilities to academic misconduct enabled by AI technologies.

Consequently, the objective of this chapter is to furnish a praxis-oriented analysis of how assessment systems can be recalibrated in response to the generative AI landscape. It endeavors to offer empirically grounded insights and pedagogical strategies that educators and institutions can adopt to construct assessments that not only yield valid measures of student learning but also uphold academic integrity and cultivate higher-order cognitive skills. To ensure epistemic rigor and contextual relevance, this chapter employs a collaborative expert synthesis coupled with an integrative review of contemporary scholarship. This methodological orientation reflects both the cross-disciplinary expertise of the contributing authors and a critical engagement with current empirical and theoretical discourse. The resulting strategies are thus both theoretically robust and pedagogically responsive. Determining and proposing these actionable strategies seeks to empower institutions, educational leaders, and teachers to navigate the challenges posed by AI advancements (Acut, Gamusa, et al., 2025; Gantalao et al., 2025; Mangubat et al., 2025).

STRATEGIES IN DESIGNING ASSESSMENTS

Implement Multimodal Assessment Techniques for Holistic Learning

In the era of generative AI, diversifying assessment types is crucial to ensure the authenticity of student work and minimize opportunities for academic dishonesty. Multimodal assessments go beyond traditional written tasks by incorporating oral presentations, practical demonstrations, and portfolios. Utilizing various forms of evaluation allows educators to capture a more comprehensive picture of students' abilities and learning processes (Grapin, 2023). More importantly, it reduces the likelihood of AI-generated content misrepresenting a student's actual skills. For example, in science education, students may be required to explain the steps of a scientific experiment through oral presentations. They can also

perform practical demonstrations (e.g., conducting a chemistry experiment) to showcase hands-on skills that cannot be easily fabricated by AI. Asking students to create portfolios is another example, as it allows them to compile a curated collection of their work throughout the course, demonstrating their progress, critical thinking, and reflective learning. By adopting a more varied assessment strategy, educators not only foster a more equitable learning environment but also create a system that emphasizes authentic student engagement and the application of knowledge.

Ironically, teachers can use AI to counter the challenges posed by AI-generated content in student work (Hasanah et al., 2025). Integrating AI tools into the assessment process can add a layer of objectivity and tailored feedback to multimodal assessments. These AI capabilities in areas such as speech analysis, real-time feedback, and content evaluation can help ensure the authenticity of student work while supporting more diverse and holistic assessment methods. Table 1 presents different ways AI can be effectively integrated into multimodal assessments, highlighting practical strategies that educators can employ to maintain academic integrity while adapting to the ever-evolving technological landscape in education. This comprehensive approach not only counters the misuse of AI tools by students but also enriches the learning experience, making assessments more meaningful and aligned with 21st-century skills.

Table 1. Various multimodal assessments and how to integrate AI

Assessment Type	Description	Benefits	Challenges	Examples of AI Integration
Oral Presentations	Students articulate their understanding verbally, often in front of peers or through recorded video.	Develops communication skills and real-time articulation of ideas.	Requires evaluation of subjective aspects like speaking style and confidence.	AI can analyze speech clarity and tone and provide feedback on content and presentation style.
Practical Demonstrations	Hands-on demonstration of skills, often in labs or simulations, showing the application of theoretical knowledge.	Validates real-world skills and problem-solving abilities.	It may require specific equipment or environments; evaluation criteria can be complex.	AI-based simulations can provide virtual environments for practice and give immediate feedback on performance.
Portfolios	A curated collection of a student's work over time, reflecting progress and learning.	Encourages reflection and self-assessment and showcases a range of skills.	Time-consuming to compile and evaluate; requires clear criteria.	AI can analyze portfolio content, track progress, and suggest areas for improvement.
Visual Presentations	Use of graphics, slideshows, infographics, and videos to present information.	Enhances creativity and visual communication skills.	Difficult to assess the quality of visual elements objectively.	AI can assess design aspects, clarity, and the effectiveness of visual elements used.
Interactive Activities	Engaging in tasks like quizzes, simulations, or role-playing scenarios that involve active participation.	Fosters engagement, collaboration, and practical application of knowledge.	Requires proper setup; monitoring and feedback may be challenging.	AI-based platforms can provide interactive simulations, track performance, and give real-time feedback.
Peer Evaluations	Students assess each other's work, providing feedback and constructive criticism.	Promotes critical thinking and self-reflection; develops evaluation skills.	It can be biased or inconsistent and requires guidance on effective feedback.	AI can guide students on how to give constructive feedback and assess the quality of peer evaluations.
Self-Evaluations	Students reflect on their own work and learning processes, often using rubrics or guided questions.	Enhances self-awareness and encourages lifelong learning skills.	Requires a high level of student honesty and self-assessment skills.	AI tools can provide prompts for reflection and track self-assessment trends over time.

Promote Higher-Order Thinking Skills Through Critical Analysis

Higher-order thinking skills are fundamental for developing modern competencies (Huang et al., 2024). Key components of these skills include critical thinking, problem-solving, creative thinking, and decision-making. However, the advent of generative AI in educational settings poses a significant risk: *students may become overly dependent on these tools*. This dependency bypasses the development and application of their higher-order thinking abilities. When students rely on AI to generate content, solve problems, or provide answers, they often neglect the deep cognitive processes involved in analyzing information, synthesizing ideas, and making complex decisions. This dependency can lead to a superficial understanding of the material and an increase in academic dishonesty, as students might submit AI-generated work that does not truly reflect their knowledge or skills (Miranda et al., 2025). Excessive reliance on AI tools can contribute to mental health issues, including what some researchers refer to as "*ChatGPT Dependency Disorder*" (Garcia, 2024a). This condition arises when students become so reliant on AI that they experience anxiety or difficulty when faced with tasks that require independent thought and problem-solving. Such dependency can ultimately undermine self-confidence, critical thinking, and creativity, which then affects both academic performance and overall mental well-being.

To counter the risk of overreliance on AI tools, it is crucial to design assessments that focus on promoting higher-order thinking. Tasks that require students to critically analyze a case study, synthesize information from multiple sources, or develop an original argument challenge them to go beyond simple knowledge recall or basic problem-solving that AI can easily replicate. For instance, instead of assigning a traditional essay, teachers can implement project-based assessments where students must address real-world problems. One practical strategy is to use a "*Design Thinking Challenge*," where students are tasked with identifying a community issue, researching possible solutions, and creating a proposal or prototype that addresses the problem (Revano & Garcia, 2020). In this scenario, students might be asked to investigate local environmental concerns, such as plastic waste, and then propose an innovative recycling program tailored to their community's needs. This process requires them to conduct interviews, analyze data, think creatively, and present their findings through a combination of written reports, visual presentations, and oral pitches. By doing so, students are encouraged to use skills that AI cannot replicate—such as original problem-solving, empathy gained through interviews, and real-time adaptation during the presentation. Moreover, teachers can integrate reflective components where students must discuss their thought processes, challenges faced, and lessons learned.

Incorporate Human-Centered Interaction to Assess Real-Time Understanding

Assessment methods that prioritize direct human interaction have become more crucial than ever with the rise of generative AI. These methods offer students opportunities to demonstrate their knowledge and skills in real-time, without the crutch of AI tools. By integrating elements such as interviews, oral examinations, collaborative projects, role-playing activities, and Socratic seminars into the assessment process, educators can better assess students' spontaneous understanding while fostering essential communication skills that are critical in the professional world. The Media Richness Theory (Daft & Lengel, 1986) provides a relevant lens through which to view these interactions. This theory posits that communication media vary in their capacity to convey nuanced information and facilitate understanding. Richer mediums (e.g., face-to-face interactions) allow for immediate feedback, nonverbal cues, and personal engagement, making them more effective for complex communication tasks. In the context of

educational assessments, interviews, oral exams, and discussions serve as 'rich' media. They facilitate a level of depth, spontaneity, and adaptability in evaluating students' skills that AI-driven assessments, which typically operate through 'leaner' media like text-based platforms, cannot easily replicate.

Generative AI tools, while capable of evaluating factual knowledge through structured methods (e.g., multiple-choice questions), struggle to assess soft skills like communication, collaboration, and critical thinking effectively (Yilmaz & Karaoglan Yilmaz, 2023). Incorporating methods like oral exams and group work into assessments not only provides real-time insight into students' abilities but also creates an environment where they must adapt their thinking dynamically in response to questions and dialogue. Interviews and oral examinations can be structured in various ways. For example, structured interviews with predetermined questions ensure consistency and fairness, while unstructured or semi-structured interviews allow for a more adaptive, conversational approach. Both formats facilitate an interactive environment where students articulate their thoughts, defend their ideas, and engage in intellectual discourse. Unlike traditional written exams, these oral formats require students to think on their feet, respond to inquiries, and explain their reasoning processes. These approaches are more effective in terms of uncovering deeper levels of understanding and critical thinking that written responses may not fully capture. Teachers can further enhance these skills by providing opportunities for students to practice and receive constructive feedback (Garcia et al., 2024). This interaction supports the development of communication skills and ensures that assessments reflect a more comprehensive evaluation of student learning, counteracting the limitations of AI-driven methods.

Prioritize Process-Oriented Learning Over End-Product Evaluation

The emergence of generative AI in education necessitates a paradigm shift in how we assess students' learning processes and outcomes. Traditional assessment methods, which often focus solely on the final product, may be insufficient in the context of generative AI, as they fail to capture the full scope of student development. Therefore, educators must adopt a process-oriented approach that emphasizes the learning journey rather than just the result (Garcia, 2024b). By shifting the focus to the steps, students take toward achieving their outcomes, teachers can reduce the risk of academic dishonesty facilitated by AI tools while fostering deeper engagement, critical thinking, and continuous improvement (Yilmaz & Karaoglan Yilmaz, 2023). Process-oriented assessment recognizes that learning is a dynamic and iterative process, and evaluating students' progress over time provides a more comprehensive understanding of their intellectual growth and problem-solving abilities. This approach becomes particularly crucial in the age of AI, where polished end products generated by tools like ChatGPT can obscure the learner's true depth of understanding and effort (Salinas-Navarro et al., 2024). By emphasizing research logs, draft submissions, and reflective papers, educators can create assessments that value the entire learning process, not just the final product (Preiksaitis & Rose, 2023).

Incorporating process-oriented assessments into the curriculum requires setting clear criteria for evaluating research logs, drafts, and reflective writings, along with guidelines for how these components will be weighted in the overall assessment framework (Cacho, 2024). Providing students with templates, examples, and training in metacognitive strategies and reflective writing can further enhance their ability to document their learning processes effectively. Timely feedback on research logs, drafts, and reflections is essential, as it helps guide students toward a deeper understanding rather than simply correcting errors. Organizing peer review sessions also fosters a collaborative learning environment where students give and receive feedback on their drafts and reflections, learning from one another's approaches. Generative

AI can support this process by offering automated feedback on draft submissions, which helps students identify areas for improvement before receiving instructor input. However, educators must use AI tools judiciously to enhance rather than replace authentic learning experiences. By emphasizing the learning process over the final product, process-oriented assessments not only promote academic integrity but also prepare students for lifelong learning (Salinas-Navarro et al., 2024).

Utilize Performance-Based Tasks to Demonstrate Practical Knowledge

Performance-based tasks offer an authentic approach to assessing students' real-time demonstration of skills, emphasizing the application of practical knowledge over mere theoretical understanding. In the age of generative AI, traditional assessments such as written exams are increasingly vulnerable to compromise, as students can leverage AI tools to generate content. Performance-based tasks serve as a valuable alternative, requiring active, hands-on participation that is difficult to replicate using AI. Rooted in constructivist theories, these assessments align with the principle that students learn more effectively through doing rather than passively receiving information (Anderson & Johnston, 2016). By integrating tasks like lab activities, simulations, or practical demonstrations, educators can better measure a student's ability to apply theoretical knowledge in real-world scenarios. One of the key advantages of performance-based tasks is their ability to capture a student's problem-solving process in dynamic environments (see Table 2). For instance, in lab-based assessments, students are required to apply scientific principles, conduct experiments, interpret data, and make real-time decisions based on their observations. This approach not only evaluates content knowledge but also critical thinking and adaptive learning skills (Aladini et al., 2024). Similarly, simulations in fields such as medicine or engineering place students in complex scenarios that mirror real-world challenges, demanding thoughtful navigation and decision-making (Kong et al., 2024). These tasks go beyond simply testing knowledge; they provide a window into the students' analytical and reflective abilities, which AI-generated responses cannot easily mimic (Hasanah et al., 2025).

Table 2. Types of performance-based tasks and their educational impact

Performance Task	Description	Key Skills Assessed	Example Fields of Application	Supporting Studies
Lab Activities	Hands-on experiments or tasks requiring students to apply scientific methods in real-time.	Critical thinking, problem-solving, data analysis	Science, Engineering	Gomez-del Rio and Rodriguez (2022); Kovaleva et al. (2024)
Simulations	Virtual or physical scenarios that mimic real-world processes require decision-making and adaptive learning.	Decision-making, adaptability, collaboration	Medicine, Nursing, Law	Slavinska et al. (2024); Miller et al. (2024); Petil et al. (2025)
Collaborative Group Work	Group-based tasks that require joint problem-solving and teamwork in dynamic environments.	Collaboration, communication, leadership	Business, Social Sciences, ICT	Riebe et al. (2016); Garcia (2023)

continued on following page

Table 2. Continued

Performance Task	Description	Key Skills Assessed	Example Fields of Application	Supporting Studies
Creative Problem-solving Challenges	Open-ended tasks that require innovation and creative application of knowledge.	Creativity, innovation, reflective thinking	STEM Education, Design Thinking	Valderama et al. (2022); Acut, Lobo, et al. (2025)
Portfolio Development	Compilation and presentation of students' work over time to showcase growth and achievements.	Self-assessment, reflective thinking, organizational skills	Arts, Education, Business	Ryan (2011); Doğan et al. (2024)

In the context of generative AI's increasing capabilities and features, performance-based tasks serve as a critical safeguard against academic dishonesty. While generative AI can assist students in generating written responses or solving complex problems (Acut et al., 2024), it cannot physically perform tasks or replicate real-time decision-making processes. By requiring students to actively demonstrate their skills in real time, educators ensure that assessments reflect each student's true abilities rather than the output of an AI model. The integration of performance-based assessments is, therefore, increasingly recognized as a best practice in educational settings. In science education, for example, performance assessments have been shown to enhance scientific inquiry skills and deepen students' understanding of content (Acut, 2022). Similarly, in professional fields such as nursing and law, performance-based tasks (e.g., simulations and practical exercises) effectively mirror the complexities of real-world practice and decision-making (Slavinska et al., 2024). As educators rethink assessment strategies in the age of generative AI, performance-based tasks emerge as a reliable approach to measure authentic student skills. These assessments offer a more holistic evaluation of student capabilities, better preparing them for the demands of professional environments in an AI-driven world.

Initiate Capstone Projects for Real-World Problem Solving

Capstone projects offer a comprehensive and multifaceted approach to assessing student learning (Tenhunen et al., 2023). This academic experience requires extensive research, planning, and execution over an extended period (Table 3). These projects culminate in a final presentation or defense, where students synthesize the knowledge and skills acquired throughout their academic journey (Acut, 2022). In the era of generative AI, capstone projects stand out as one of the most rigorous forms of assessment because they demand creativity, critical thinking, problem-solving, and deep subject matter expertise—skills that are not easily automated or replicated by AI systems. Unlike traditional assessments focused on memorization or short-term knowledge retention, capstone projects span several months, offering students the opportunity to explore a topic in great depth (Kim et al., 2019). This process inherently fosters higher-order thinking as students identify real-world problems, design research methodologies, collect and analyze data, and propose evidence-based solutions (Stephenson et al., 2020). The reflective nature of these projects ensures that students not only gain a deeper understanding of the subject matter but also develop the ability to apply their learning in meaningful ways.

Table 3. Comparison of capstone project types, key components, and skills assessed

Capstone Project Type	Key Components	Skills Assessed	Assessment Method	Example Fields
Research-based Project	Literature review, data collection, analysis	Critical thinking, research skills	Written reports, defense	Social Sciences, STEM
Design/Engineering Project	Prototype development, testing	Problem-solving, technical skills	Prototype, presentation	Engineering, ICT
Service-Learning Project	Community engagement, solution implementation	Collaboration, leadership	Project report, oral defense	Education, Public Health
Entrepreneurship Project	Business plan, market analysis, product development	Innovation, strategic thinking	Business proposal, pitch	Business, Economics
Artistic/Creative Project	Concept creation, artifact production	Creativity, technical expertise	Portfolio, exhibition	Fine Arts, Media Studies
Interdisciplinary Project	Integration of multiple fields, comprehensive analysis	Systems thinking, adaptability	Multi-format deliverables	Sustainability, Policy Studies
Technology Integration Project	Software/hardware development, user testing	Programming, usability design	Software demo, documentation	ICT, Education Technology

A key benefit of capstone projects is the promotion of student autonomy and self-directed learning. Since students typically choose their topics based on personal or professional interests, they are more motivated to engage deeply with the material. Landfried et al. (2023) found that capstone projects can enhance student engagement and ownership of learning, resulting in improved academic outcomes and higher satisfaction. Additionally, these projects often require collaboration with industry professionals, community partners, or interdisciplinary teams, providing students with valuable real-world experience (Badir et al., 2023). Capstone projects also help students develop key skills that are highly sought after in today's job market, including project management, research, communication, and teamwork. By guiding students through the process of project conception, development, and execution, educators help them refine these transferable skills, which are essential for success in diverse professional contexts (Darling-Hammond et al., 2019). Finally, the formal presentation or defense at the project's culmination further enhances students' ability to articulate their ideas persuasively.

From an assessment perspective, capstone projects provide educators with the opportunity to evaluate a broad range of competencies, from research proficiency to practical application. They often require the integration of multiple forms of assessment, including written reports, oral presentations, and project artifacts, offering a holistic view of student learning (Acut, 2022). The defense component adds an additional layer of rigor, as students must not only present their findings but also respond to questions and critiques, demonstrating their ability to defend their work and think critically on their feet. Previous studies have highlighted the effectiveness of capstone projects in fostering critical skills. For instance, Cheng et al. (2019) found that these projects facilitate deeper learning and the development of essential competencies such as problem-solving and independent work. Similarly, Stephenson et al. (2020) emphasized how capstone experiences integrate theoretical knowledge with practical application, preparing students for professional life. In the age of AI, where skills like creativity, adaptability, and problem-solving are increasingly valuable and less susceptible to automation, capstone projects stand out as a robust method of ensuring students are well-equipped for the future.

Facilitate Value-Based Discussions to Foster Reflective Thinking

Value-based discussions are a dialogic approach that emphasizes active listening, respect, empathy, and the exploration of the ethical, cultural, and social implications of a subject. In the context of generative AI, incorporating value-based discussions into assessments can serve as a powerful tool for preventing academic dishonesty. These discussions require students to engage with the subject matter, critically reflect on their values, and consider the broader implications of their actions, making it difficult for them to rely solely on AI-generated responses. When students are asked to reflect on ethical considerations or societal impacts, they are compelled to express their individual perspectives and reasoning. Generative AI can enhance value-based discussions by providing a starting point for exploration. For example, AI can generate prompts that urge students to analyze various ethical scenarios or cultural biases embedded in AI's outputs (Ofosu-Ampong et al., 2023; Walter, 2024). However, educators must be cautious in how they use AI in this context. The questions posed by AI should not simply reflect dominant viewpoints or specific agendas; instead, they should provoke genuine thought and debate. Teachers play a crucial role in scrutinizing these AI-generated prompts to ensure they are free of bias and encourage students to examine underlying beliefs critically (Adams, 2021). By actively engaging in these reflective discussions, students learn to articulate their thoughts, question the narratives presented to them, and make informed decisions—skills that reduce their dependence on AI for answers.

Additionally, value-based discussions can highlight the limitations of AI and the importance of human judgment. When students discuss ethical dilemmas, cultural norms, or social justice issues, they are not just responding to information; they are interpreting and negotiating meaning based on their values and experiences (Martínez-Requejo et al., 2025). This level of critical engagement is something that AI cannot authentically reproduce. As a moderator, AI can facilitate a more inclusive environment by filtering out hate speech and fostering respectful exchanges (Kiritchenko et al., 2021). However, educators must define the parameters of discourse (Bozkurt et al., 2024), ensuring that diverse perspectives are included without overly aggressive content filtering that might incorrectly categorize unconventional viewpoints as negative. By promoting transparency about AI's role in discussions and guiding students in balancing free speech with constructive communication (Xiao et al., 2025), educators can create a learning environment where students develop critical thinking skills, ethical reasoning, and a deeper understanding of complex issues—all of which make academic dishonesty less likely.

Conduct Continuous Assessments for Ongoing Learning and Feedback

Continuous assessment is an ongoing process of evaluating students' learning progress throughout a program or course. This approach employs a variety of assessment methods—such as gamified quizzes, project work, peer reviews, presentations, and assignments—rather than relying solely on final exams. By providing regular and timely feedback, continuous assessments help students improve their learning performance and outcomes while also serving as a valuable tool for combating academic dishonesty, especially in the context of AI's growing influence.

Table 4. Practical example of continuous assessment for sociology

Activity	Description
After each lecture	Short online quizzes featuring a mix of multiple-choice and open-ended questions to test students' analysis and interpretation of sociological events.
Weekly	One-page reflection essay analyzing sociological facts, motivations, and outcomes in society.
Mid-term project	Research proposal outlining a sociological effect and its significance, incorporating an appropriate methodological approach to explain or unravel new knowledge.
Class participation	Deploying robust and engaging gamification mechanisms to reward students for asking thoughtful questions and engaging in meaningful discussions.
Final project work	Research paper on a specific sociological problem in a context that requires critical analysis and synthesis of evidence to examine students' thought processes and original arguments.

The introduction of AI in education has raised concerns regarding its potential impact on the integrity of continuous assessments. However, adopting a diversified and dynamic approach can significantly reduce the likelihood of AI-generated submissions compromising academic integrity (Gruenhagen et al., 2024; Taneja et al., 2025). Teachers can combat dishonesty by incorporating creative tasks, essays, and open-ended questions that demand originality and critical thinking—tasks that AI tools cannot easily replicate. Moving beyond multiple-choice questions to assessments that emphasize application over memorization (see Table 4) helps ensure that students are evaluated on their ability to analyze, synthesize, and apply knowledge. This variety in assessment types makes it harder for students to rely solely on AI to produce responses, as the tasks require a demonstration of personal insight, reasoning, and problem-solving.

Table 5. Practical example of continuous assessment for information systems

Activity	Description
Daily coding challenge	Conduct short coding exercises to practice specific programming concepts learned in each class session.
Weekly programming assignment	Crafting code through problem-solving, focusing on the thought process behind the code, and understanding how to adapt solutions to new scenarios.
Mid-term project	Task students with designing and developing a simple mobile app that addresses societal challenges, such as waste management or climate change.
Peer code review	Facilitate collaborative learning sessions where students review each other's work, identify errors, and suggest improvements for efficiency and code readability.
Final project work	Combine multiple-choice questions on specific concepts with open-ended coding problems to assess understanding comprehensively.

The proposed continuous assessment framework for Information Systems (see Table 5) illustrates how incorporating real-world scenarios and project-based learning can diminish the impact of AI-generated content. By engaging students in problem-solving that reflects real-world complexities, educators encourage critical analysis and the application of knowledge, both of which are difficult for AI to replicate. Additionally, continuous assessments foster an environment where students receive feedback at regular intervals, allowing them to identify and address weaknesses in their understanding before being tempted to resort to dishonest means. By prioritizing ongoing engagement and the development of higher-order thinking skills, continuous assessments serve as a robust strategy to maintain academic integrity in an AI-enhanced educational landscape (Ofosu-Ampong et al., 2023; Xiao et al., 2025).

Customize Assessment Criteria to Encourage the Synthesis of Knowledge

Recalibrating assessment frameworks to prioritize epistemic synthesis and the pragmatic application of disciplinary knowledge is pivotal for cultivating higher-order cognitive engagement and robust critical thinking among learners. Conventional evaluative mechanisms tend to focus on surface-level learning—primarily rote memorization and basic factual recall (Diaz et al., 2025)—which insufficiently capture a learner's conceptual depth or capacity for transference to authentic contexts. By refocusing assessment criteria toward indicators that demand interdisciplinary reasoning, intellectual engagement, and applied problem-solving, educators can more effectively equip students with the competencies required for navigating complexity in academic inquiry.

Application-Based Assessments: These challenge students to operationalize theoretical constructs within novel and contextually relevant scenarios. In computing education, for instance, such assessments may entail the end-to-end development of functional software artifacts (see Garcia, 2025 for detailed examples). To foreground applied cognition, instructors can recalibrate their grading rubrics to include the following evaluative dimensions:

- **Operational Validity**: Does the artifact meet all functional specifications and demonstrate reliability across use cases?
- **Code Robustness and Elegance**: Is the source code optimized, syntactically coherent, and aligned with industry-standard conventions for maintainability?
- **Algorithmic Reasoning**: How effectively does the student diagnose edge cases and deploy debugging methodologies?
- **Innovative Problem Formulation**: Does the project exhibit originality in conceptualization or deploy non-traditional heuristics?

Synthesis-Based Assessments: These tasks involve the convergence of disparate conceptual frameworks to produce integrated, innovative outcomes—fostering meta-cognitive reasoning and design thinking. Within an AI-driven programming curriculum (Garcia, 2025), a synthesis-centric task might involve the architectural design and implementation of a multi-component web platform. Expert-level criteria for such assessments include:

- **Technological Integration**: To what extent does the student fluently orchestrate multiple programming paradigms, libraries, or third-party APIs?
- **Systemic Cohesion**: Is the final deliverable an architecturally coherent system with seamless interaction between components?
- **Cognitive Complexity**: Does the project incorporate advanced functionalities, such as asynchronous data flows, machine learning modules, or secure authentication systems?
- **Creative Fluency**: How distinctive is the student's approach in terms of user experience, design aesthetics, and conceptual novelty?

Implementing Customized Assessment Criteria: For rigorous implementation of these advanced assessment modalities, pedagogical strategies such as Project-Based Learning (PBL) and scenario-based case studies should be deployed. These should be scaffolded by analytically robust rubrics, which articulate clear evaluative benchmarks:

- **Conceptual Transference**: How adeptly does the learner transpose theoretical insights to resolve real-world, ill-structured problems?
- **Cross-Platform Synergy**: Does the student demonstrate sophistication in synthesizing diverse technologies to create functional and aesthetically cohesive systems?
- **Metacognitive Reflexivity**: Is the learner able to critically evaluate their development process, articulating challenges encountered and strategies for adaptive learning?
- **Collaborative Dynamics**: In team-based contexts, how does the student engage in distributed cognition, co-construction of knowledge, and equitable task allocation?

By providing well-defined criteria through rubrics, educators guide students toward deeper learning and create an environment that values originality, critical thinking, and practical application—key factors in reducing academic dishonesty.

Facilitate Peer Review Activities to Enhance Scrutiny and Understanding

Organizing peer assessment activities where students evaluate each other's work introduces an additional layer of scrutiny, contributing to a more comprehensive and equitable evaluation process. In this approach, students not only receive feedback from their instructors but also engage with their peers' perspectives, often accounting for a small portion of the overall assessment marks. This added layer enhances the credibility of the assessment, as students actively participate in the evaluation process, fostering a deeper understanding of academic standards and criteria. One of the primary benefits of peer assessment lies in its ability to develop critical thinking skills (Topping et al., 2025). By evaluating their classmates' work, students are required to thoughtfully and objectively apply evaluative criteria, analyzing and judging the quality based on established standards. This process not only cultivates an analytical mindset but also helps students identify strengths and weaknesses in their own work. The practice of scrutinizing peers' submissions allows them to gain insight into different approaches and solutions, which, in turn, enhances their own learning and ability to produce quality work. Additionally, peer assessment fosters a sense of responsibility and accountability. Knowing that their work will be reviewed by classmates often motivates students to invest more effort into producing higher-quality submissions. This sense of accountability extends to the role of evaluator, where students learn to provide fair, constructive, and respectful feedback, grasping the ethical and professional standards expected in both academic and professional settings.

To implement effective peer assessment activities, it is crucial to provide students with clear guidelines and criteria for evaluation. Utilizing rubrics and checklists ensures that the peer assessments are consistent, objective, and focused on key learning outcomes. Training sessions or workshops on how to give and receive constructive feedback can further prepare students to participate effectively in the peer review process. By organizing structured peer assessment activities, educators create a learning environment where students engage actively with the material, develop critical thinking skills, and gain a deeper understanding of the standards that underpin academic evaluation. This approach not only adds a layer of scrutiny to the assessment process but also enhances students' ability to self-assess and reflect on their learning.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND RESEARCH NEEDS

As generative AI continues to evolve, so too must our strategies for educational assessment. The rapid advancements in AI capabilities present both opportunities and challenges, particularly concerning academic integrity. To effectively address these challenges, future research must focus on developing innovative assessment methods, ethical guidelines, and policies that adapt to this changing technological landscape. This section outlines key areas for future research to ensure that assessments remain effective, fair, and authentic.

Exploring the Impact of Generative AI on Learning Outcomes

As generative AI becomes increasingly integrated into educational environments (Hulus, 2025; Olugbade, 2025), its influence on pedagogical processes and cognitive development warrants sustained, critical inquiry. Although preliminary investigations have documented short-term gains—such as increased accessibility and adaptive feedback—there remains a paucity of longitudinal evidence regarding its impact on core educational constructs, including epistemic engagement, durable knowledge retention, and the cultivation of higher-order cognitive faculties (Garcia et al., 2025). Moreover, the continuous interplay between learners and AI systems introduces new dynamics in metacognitive regulation and problem representation. To address these complexities, future research should pursue the following trajectories:

- Conduct studies comparing traditional and AI-integrated assessment frameworks to evaluate their efficacy in fostering deep learning and transferable competencies.
- Investigate the extent to which AI-mediated evaluations influence students' capacity for integrative thinking, adaptive reasoning, and creative problem-solving.
- Analyze shifts in students' epistemological beliefs and self-regulated learning behaviors in response to sustained interactions with generative AI tools.

Development of Ethical Guidelines for AI Use in Assessments

The integration of AI into assessment ecosystems introduces a spectrum of ethical and sociotechnical challenges that extend beyond algorithmic functionality. Critical issues such as algorithmic opacity, surveillance risk, data sovereignty, and the erosion of authorship authenticity must be addressed through normative frameworks that prioritize justice, accountability, and inclusivity. The lack of cohesive institutional protocols leaves educational stakeholders vulnerable to unintended harm and systemic inequities. Therefore, establishing a comprehensive set of ethical parameters is essential for ensuring responsible AI deployment in evaluative contexts. Future research should be oriented toward the following imperatives:

- Develop and evaluate transparent governance models to ensure responsible AI use in assessment, emphasizing student data protection and informed consent.
- Design audit mechanisms for identifying and mitigating algorithmic bias, particularly across diverse sociocultural and linguistic student populations.
- Examine the role of ethics-based policy frameworks in shaping institutional practices that promote fairness, trust, and transparency in AI-supported evaluation systems.

AI as an Assessment Tool

Despite presenting epistemological and logistical challenges, generative AI holds substantial promise as an augmentative mechanism within the assessment continuum. When integrated judiciously, AI can facilitate scalable feedback systems, automate routine evaluation tasks, and support differentiated instruction across diverse learning profiles. However, uncritical reliance on algorithmic assessment risks undermining the interpretive and relational dimensions of human evaluation. To optimize AI's role in assessment, it is essential to interrogate its pedagogical affordances while preserving the educator's epistemic authority. The following research directions are essential for realizing AI's constructive potential:

- Evaluate the pedagogical value of AI-generated feedback in supporting formative assessment and enhancing students' metacognitive awareness.
- Determine best practices for calibrating AI-human hybrid assessment models to ensure reliability, validity, and student engagement.
- Explore subject-specific implementations of AI-driven assessments that allow for personalization without compromising academic rigor or learner autonomy.

Development of Anti-Cheating Technologies

The advent of generative AI has introduced novel vectors for academic misconduct, significantly complicating the verification of student-authored work. Existing academic integrity frameworks and detection mechanisms are often ill-equipped to distinguish between authentic and algorithmically generated submissions. As such, the development of intelligent, adaptive countermeasures is imperative for sustaining trust in assessment validity. These mechanisms must be rooted in both technical rigor and ethical defensibility, capable of evolving alongside adversarial AI capabilities. Future research must address the following critical areas:

- Advance the design of AI-enabled forensics capable of identifying linguistic, syntactic, and semantic markers indicative of non-human authorship.
- Conduct empirical evaluative studies on the efficacy and limitations of existing academic integrity tools in detecting generative AI outputs.
- Facilitate interdisciplinary collaboration to co-develop context-aware anti-cheating frameworks that integrate machine learning, educational theory, and ethical oversight.

Policy and Institutional Adaptation

The increasing ubiquity of AI in pedagogical and assessment practices necessitates a systemic reconfiguration of institutional policies and governance models. Static, pre-digital frameworks are ill-suited to address the evolving nature of algorithmically mediated learning environments. Institutional stakeholders must, therefore, engage in anticipatory policymaking that foregrounds educational equity, assessment fidelity, and technological accountability. To ensure that assessment practices remain aligned with educational goals and ethical standards in an AI-augmented context, the following research avenues are proposed:

- Formulate institution-wide AI governance policies that codify principles of academic integrity, transparency, and responsible innovation in assessment.
- Investigate adaptive models of assessment that integrate AI while centering on learning outcomes, disciplinary standards, and student well-being.
- Develop strategic frameworks that align institutional assessment policies with national and international standards for ethical AI deployment in education.

CONCLUSION

In confronting the complexities introduced by advanced AI technologies, educational assessment must undergo a thoughtful transformation. The strategies outlined in this chapter offer actionable frameworks to support authentic learning and uphold academic integrity. Each of these approaches offers unique ways to assess students' deeper cognitive and practical skills, reducing the reliance on outputs that may be artificially generated. The implications of these evolving strategies reach beyond the academic world. By incorporating integrity-centered assessment practices, educators influence the cultivation of critical thinking and ethical awareness in students—skills essential for navigating an AI-driven society. Implementing these methods prepares students not only for academic success but also for responsible participation in a technology-infused world. Looking forward, commitment to these integrity-based reforms will shape the resilience of educational institutions in preserving the values of genuine scholarship. Through adaptable, ethics-focused assessment models, educators can nurture learning environments that emphasize personal accountability and true intellectual development.

REFERENCES

Acut, D. (2022). Developing SIPCaR projects utilizing modern technologies: Its impact to students' engagement, R&D skills, and learning outcomes. *LUMAT: International Journal on Math. Science and Technology Education*, *10*(1), 294–318. DOI: 10.31129/LUMAT.10.1.1667

Acut, D. P., Gamusa, E. V., Pernaa, J., Yuenyong, C., Pantaleon, A. T., Espina, R. C., Sim, M. J. C., & Garcia, M. B. (2025). AI Shaming Among Teacher Education Students: A Reflection on Acceptance and Identity in the Age of Generative Tools. In *Pitfalls of AI Integration in Education: Skill Obsolescence, Misuse, and Bias*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0122-8.ch005

Acut, D. P., Lobo, J. T., & Garcia, M. B. (2025). Determinants of Teachers' Intentions to Integrate Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) Into Physical Education and Health Curricula. In Garcia, M. B. (Ed.), *Global Innovations in Physical Education and Health* (pp. 439–472). IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-3952-7.ch016

Acut, D. P., Malabago, N. K., Malicoban, E. V., Galamiton, N. S., & Garcia, M. B. (2024). "ChatGPT 4.0 Ghosted Us While Conducting Literature Search:" Modeling the Chatbot's Generated Non-Existent References Using Regression Analysis. *Internet Reference Services Quarterly*, ●●●, 1–26. DOI: 10.1080/10875301.2024.2426793

Adams, R. (2021). Can Artificial Intelligence be Decolonized? *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, *46*(1-2), 176–197. DOI: 10.1080/03080188.2020.1840225

Aladini, A., Bayat, S., & Abdellatif, M. S. (2024). Performance-Based Assessment in Virtual Versus Non-Virtual Classes: Impacts on Academic Resilience, Motivation, Teacher Support, and Personal Best Goals. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, *9*(1), 1–27. DOI: 10.1186/s40862-023-00230-4

Anderson, A., & Johnston, B. (2016). Student Learning and Information Literacy. In A. Anderson & B. Johnston (Eds.), *From Information Literacy to Social Epistemology* (pp. 67-79). Chandos Publishing. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-08-100545-3.00005-3

Azevedo, A., & Azevedo, J. (Eds.). (2019). *Handbook of Research on E-Assessment in Higher Education*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-5936-8

Badir, A., O'Neill, R., Kinzli, K.-D., Komisar, S., & Kim, J.-Y. (2023). Fostering Project-Based Learning through Industry Engagement in Capstone Design Projects. *Education Sciences*, *13*(4), 1–14. DOI: 10.3390/educsci13040361

Bozkurt, A., Xiao, J., Farrow, R., Bai, J. Y. H., Nerantzi, C., Moore, S., Dron, J., Stracke, C. M., Singh, L., Crompton, H., Koutropoulos, A., Terentev, E., Pazurek, A., Nichols, M., Sidorkin, A. M., Costello, E., Watson, S., Mulligan, D., Honeychurch, S., & Asino, T. I. (2024). The Manifesto for Teaching and Learning in a Time of Generative AI: A Critical Collective Stance to Better Navigate the Future. *Open Praxis*, *16*(4), 487–513. DOI: 10.55982/openpraxis.16.4.777

Cacho, R. (2024). Integrating Generative AI in University Teaching and Learning: A Model for Balanced Guidelines. *Online Learning : the Official Journal of the Online Learning Consortium*, *28*(3), 1–28. DOI: 10.24059/olj.v28i3.4508

Cheng, L. T. W., Armatas, C. A., & Wang, J. W. (2019). The Impact of Diversity, Prior Academic Achievement and Goal Orientation on Learning Performance in Group Capstone Projects. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *39*(5), 913–925. DOI: 10.1080/07294360.2019.1699028

Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational Information Requirements, Media Richness and Structural Design. *Management Science*, *32*(5), 554–571. DOI: 10.1287/mnsc.32.5.554

Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2019). Implications for Educational Practice of the Science of Learning and Development. *Applied Developmental Science*, *24*(2), 97–140. DOI: 10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791

Diaz, F. C. B., Trinidad, I., Agustin, M. J., Panganiban, T. P., & Garcia, M. B. (2025). Mindfulness For Health and Well-Being: An Innovative Physical Education Course in the University of the Philippines Diliman. In *Global Innovations in Physical Education and Health*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-3952-7.ch006

Doğan, Y., Yıldırım, N. T., & Batdı, V. (2024). Effectiveness of Portfolio Assessment in Primary Education: A Multi-Complementary Research Approach. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, *106*, 1–12. DOI: 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2024.102461 PMID: 38925046

Gantalao, L. C., Calzada, J. G. D., Capuyan, D. L., Lumantas, B. C., Acut, D. P., & Garcia, M. B. (2025). Equipping the Next Generation of Technicians: Navigating School Infrastructure and Technical Knowledge in the Age of AI Integration. In *Pitfalls of AI Integration in Education: Skill Obsolescence, Misuse, and Bias*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0122-8.ch009

Garcia, M. B. (2023). Facilitating Group Learning Using an Apprenticeship Model: Which Master is More Effective in Programming Instruction? *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *61*(6), 1207–1231. DOI: 10.1177/07356331231170382

Garcia, M. B. (2024a). Addressing the Mental Health Implications of ChatGPT Dependency: The Need for Comprehensive Policy Development. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry*, *98*, 104140. Advance online publication. DOI: 10.1016/j.ajp.2024.104140 PMID: 38943840

Garcia, M. B. (2024b). The Paradox of Artificial Creativity: Challenges and Opportunities of Generative AI Artistry. *Creativity Research Journal*, ●●●, 1–14. DOI: 10.1080/10400419.2024.2354622

Garcia, M. B. (2025). Teaching and Learning Computer Programming Using ChatGPT: A Rapid Review of Literature Amid the Rise of Generative AI Technologies. *Education and Information Technologies*, ●●●, 1–25. DOI: 10.1007/s10639-025-13452-5

Garcia, M. B., Arif, Y. M., Khlaif, Z. N., Zhu, M., de Almeida, R. P. P., de Almeida, R. S., & Masters, K. (2024). Effective Integration of Artificial Intelligence in Medical Education: Practical Tips and Actionable Insights. In *Transformative Approaches to Patient Literacy and Healthcare Innovation* (pp. 1-19). IGI Global. DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-3661-8.ch001

Garcia, M. B., Goi, C. L., Shively, K., Maher, D., Rosak-Szyrocka, J., Happonen, A., Bozkurt, A., & Damaševičius, R. (2025). Understanding Student Engagement in AI-Powered Online Learning Platforms: A Narrative Review of Key Theories and Models. In Gierhart, A. R. (Ed.), *Cases on Enhancing P-16 Student Engagement With Digital Technologies* (pp. 1–30). IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-5633-3.ch001

Gikandi, J. W., Morrow, D., & Davis, N. E. (2011). Online Formative Assessment in Higher Education: A Review of the Literature. *Computers & Education*, *57*(4), 2333–2351. DOI: 10.1016/j.compedu.2011.06.004

Gomez-del Rio, T., & Rodriguez, J. (2022). Design and Assessment of a Project-Based Learning in a Laboratory for Integrating Knowledge and Improving Engineering Design Skills. *Education for Chemical Engineers*, *40*, 17–28. DOI: 10.1016/j.ece.2022.04.002

Grapin, S. E. (2023). Assessment of English Learners and Their Peers in the Content Areas: Expanding What "Counts" as Evidence of Content Learning. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *20*(2), 215–234. DOI: 10.1080/15434303.2022.2147072

Gruenhagen, J. H., Sinclair, P. M., Carroll, J.-A., Baker, P. R. A., Wilson, A., & Demant, D. (2024). The Rapid Rise of Generative AI and Its Implications for Academic Integrity: Students' Perceptions and Use of Chatbots for Assistance With Assessments. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *7*, 1–10. DOI: 10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100273

Hasanah, N. A., Aziza, M. R., Junikhah, A., Arif, Y. M., & Garcia, M. B. (2025). Navigating the Use of AI in Engineering Education Through a Systematic Review of Technology, Regulations, and Challenges. In *Pitfalls of AI Integration in Education: Skill Obsolescence, Misuse, and Bias*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0122-8.ch016

Heil, J., & Ifenthaler, D. (2023). Online Assessment in Higher Education: A Systematic Review. *Online Learning : the Official Journal of the Online Learning Consortium*, *27*(1), 187–218. DOI: 10.24059/olj.v27i1.3398

Huang, K.-L., Liu, Y., & Dong, M.-Q. (2024). Incorporating AIGC Into Design Ideation: A Study on Self-Efficacy and Learning Experience Acceptance Under Higher-Order Thinking. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, *52*, 1–16. DOI: 10.1016/j.tsc.2024.101508

Hulus, A. (2025). A Systematic Review of Educators' Overreliance and Misuse of AI in Student Feedback: Introducing the ETHICAL-FEED Framework. In *Pitfalls of AI Integration in Education: Skill Obsolescence, Misuse, and Bias*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0122-8.ch015

Kim, S. C., Covington, B., Benavente, V., & Willson, P. (2019). Capstone Projects As Experiential Evidence-Based Practice Education. *The Journal for Nurse Practitioners*, *15*(3), 51–56. DOI: 10.1016/j.nurpra.2018.12.011

Kiritchenko, S., Nejadgholi, I., & Fraser, K. C. (2021). Confronting Abusive Language Online: A Survey from the Ethical and Human Rights Perspective. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, *71*, 431–478. DOI: 10.1613/jair.1.12590

Kong, Z. Y., Omar, A. A., Lau, S. L., & Sunarso, J. (2024). Introducing Process Simulation as an Alternative to Laboratory Session in Undergraduate Chemical Engineering Thermodynamics Course: A Case Study From Sunway University Malaysia. *Digital Chemical Engineering*, *12*, 1–10. DOI: 10.1016/j.dche.2024.100167

Kovaleva, Y., Happonen, A., Garcia, M. B., & Kasurinen, J. (2024). Female-Inclusive Practices for Software Engineering and Computer Science Higher Education: A Literature Review. *Proceedings of the Annual Doctoral Symposium of Computer Science 2024*. https://doi.org/https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3776/paper08.pdf

Landfried, M., Chen, E., Savelli, L. B., Cooper, M., Price, B. N., & Emmerling, D. (2023). MPH Capstone experiences: Promising practices and lessons learned. *Frontiers in Public Health*, *11*, 1–11. DOI: 10.3389/fpubh.2023.1129330 PMID: 37250082

Lee, V. R., Pope, D., Miles, S., & Zárate, R. C. (2024). Cheating in the Age of Generative AI: A High School Survey Study of Cheating Behaviors Before and After the Release of ChatGPT. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *7*, 1–10. DOI: 10.1016/j.caeai.2024.100253

Mangubat, J. C., Mangubat, M. R., Uy, T. B. L., Acut, D. P., & Garcia, M. B. (2025). Safeguarding Educational Innovations Amid AI Disruptions: A Reassessment of Patenting for Sustained Intellectual Property Protection. In *Pitfalls of AI Integration in Education: Skill Obsolescence, Misuse, and Bias*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0122-8.ch013

Martínez-Requejo, S., Redondo-Duarte, S., Jiménez-García, E., & Ruiz-Lázaro, J. (2025). Technoethics and the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Educational Contexts: Reflections on Integrity, Transparency, and Equity. In *Pitfalls of AI Integration in Education: Skill Obsolescence, Misuse, and Bias*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0122-8.ch010

Miller, J. C., Fernando, E. Q., Miranda, J. P. P., Bansil, J. A., Hernandez, H. E., & Regala, A. R. (2024). Extended Reality Technologies in Physical Fitness for Health Promotion: Insights from Bibliometric Research. In *Emerging Technologies for Health Literacy and Medical Practice*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-1214-8.ch005

Miranda, J. P. P., Cruz, M. A. D., Fernandez, A. B., Balahadia, F. F., Aviles, J. S., Caro, C. A., Liwanag, I. G., & Gaña, E. P. (2025). Erosion of Critical Academic Skills Due to AI Dependency Among Tertiary Students: A Path Analysis. In *Pitfalls of AI Integration in Education: Skill Obsolescence, Misuse, and Bias*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0122-8.ch002

Montenegro-Rueda, M., Luque-de la Rosa, A., Sarasola Sánchez-Serrano, J. L., & Fernández-Cerero, J. (2021). Assessment in Higher Education during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Systematic Review. *Sustainability (Basel)*, *13*(19), 1–13. DOI: 10.3390/su131910509

Ofosu-Ampong, K., Acheampong, B., Kevor, M., & Amankwah-Sarfo, F. (2023). Acceptance of Artificial Intelligence (ChatGPT) in Education: Trust, Innovativeness and Psychological Need of Students. *Information and Knowledge Management*, *13*(4), 37–47. DOI: 10.7176/IKM/13-4-03

Ofosu-Ampong, K., Agyekum, M. W., & Garcia, M. B. (2024). Long-Term Pandemic Management and the Need to Invest in Digital Transformation: A Resilience Theory Perspective. In *Transformative Approaches to Patient Literacy and Healthcare Innovation* (pp. 242-260). IGI Global. DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-3661-8.ch012

Olugbade, D. (2025). A Systematic Review of the Role of AI-Enabled Chatbots in Modern Education: Benefits, Risks, and Implementation Complexity. In *Pitfalls of AI Integration in Education: Skill Obsolescence, Misuse, and Bias*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0122-8.ch018

Petil, E. D., Florece, M. E. A., Gomez, M. G. A., Villaruel, K. B., Fernandez, H. G. C. Q., Dela Cruz, C. M. B., & Ferrer-Rafols, R. B. (2025). Virtual Reality in Physical Education: An Innovative Approach to Optimize Physical and Mental Health. In *Global Innovations in Physical Education and Health*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3693-3952-7.ch005

Preiksaitis, C., & Rose, C. (2023). Opportunities, Challenges, and Future Directions of Generative Artificial Intelligence in Medical Education: Scoping Review. *JMIR Medical Education*, *9*, 1–13. DOI: 10.2196/48785 PMID: 37862079

Revano, T. F., & Garcia, M. B. (2020). Manufacturing Design Thinkers in Higher Education Institutions: The Use of Design Thinking Curriculum in the Education Landscape. *2020 IEEE 12th International Conference on Humanoid, Nanotechnology, Information Technology, Communication and Control, Environment, and Management (HNICEM)*, 1-5. DOI: 10.1109/HNICEM51456.2020.9400034

Riebe, L., Girardi, A., & Whitsed, C. (2016). A Systematic Literature Review of Teamwork Pedagogy in Higher Education. *Small Group Research*, *47*(6), 619–664. DOI: 10.1177/1046496416665221

Ryan, M. (2011). Evaluating Portfolio Use as a Tool for Assessment and Professional Development in Graduate Nursing Education. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, *27*(2), 84–91. DOI: 10.1016/j.profnurs.2010.09.008 PMID: 21420040

Salinas-Navarro, D. E., Vilalta-Perdomo, E., Michel-Villarreal, R., & Montesinos, L. (2024). Using Generative Artificial Intelligence Tools to Explain and Enhance Experiential Learning for Authentic Assessment. *Education Sciences*, *14*(1), 1–24. DOI: 10.3390/educsci14010083

See, B. H., Gorard, S., Lu, B., Dong, L., & Siddiqui, N. (2022). Is Technology Always Helpful?: A Critical Review of the Impact on Learning Outcomes of Education Technology in Supporting Formative Assessment in Schools. *Research Papers in Education*, *37*(6), 1064–1096. DOI: 10.1080/02671522.2021.1907778

Slack, H. R., & Priestley, M. (2023). Online Learning and Assessment During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Exploring the Impact on Undergraduate Student Well-Being. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *48*(3), 333–349. DOI: 10.1080/02602938.2022.2076804

Slavinska, A., Palkova, K., Grigoroviča, E., Edelmers, E., & Pētersons, A. (2024). Narrative Review of Legal Aspects in the Integration of Simulation-Based Education into Medical and Healthcare Curricula. *Laws*, *13*(2), 1–20. DOI: 10.3390/laws13020015

Stephenson, S., Rogers, O., Ivy, C., Barron, R., & Burke, J. (2020). Designing Effective Capstone Experiences and Projects for Entry-Level Doctoral Students in Occupational Therapy: One Program's Approaches and Lessons Learned. *The Open Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *8*(3), 1–12. DOI: 10.15453/2168-6408.1727 PMID: 33552752

Swiecki, Z., Khosravi, H., Chen, G., Martinez-Maldonado, R., Lodge, J. M., Milligan, S., Selwyn, N., & Gašević, D. (2022). Assessment in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *3*, 1–10. DOI: 10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100075

Taneja, D., Prabagaren, H., & Thomas, M. R. (2025). AI in Academia: Balancing Integrity, Ethics, and Learning Amid Evolving Norms of Authorship and Scholarship. In *Pitfalls of AI Integration in Education: Skill Obsolescence, Misuse, and Bias*. IGI Global., DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0122-8.ch014

Tenhunen, S., Männistö, T., Luukkainen, M., & Ihantola, P. (2023). A Systematic Literature Review of Capstone Courses in Software Engineering. *Information and Software Technology*, *159*, 1–21. DOI: 10.1016/j.infsof.2023.107191

Topping, K. J., Gehringer, E., Khosravi, H., Gudipati, S., Jadhav, K., & Susarla, S. (2025). Enhancing Peer Assessment with Artificial Intelligence. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *22*(1), 1–33. DOI: 10.1186/s41239-024-00501-1

Valderama, A. M., Tuazon, J. B., & Garcia, M. B. (2022). Promoting Student Thinking and Engagement Through Question-Based and Gamified Learning. *2022 IEEE 14th International Conference on Humanoid, Nanotechnology, Information Technology, Communication and Control, Environment and Management (HNICEM)*. DOI: 10.1109/HNICEM57413.2022.10109470

Walter, Y. (2024). Embracing the Future of Artificial Intelligence in the Classroom: The Relevance of Ai Literacy, Prompt Engineering, and Critical Thinking in Modern Education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *21*(1), 1–29. DOI: 10.1186/s41239-024-00448-3

Xiao, J., Bozkurt, A., Nichols, M., Pazurek, A., Stracke, C. M., Bai, J. Y. H., Farrow, R., Mulligan, D., Nerantzi, C., Sharma, R. C., Singh, L., Frumin, I., Swindell, A., Honeychurch, S., Bond, M., Dron, J., Moore, S., Leng, J., & Slagter van Tryon, P. J.. (2025). Venturing into the Unknown: Critical Insights into Grey Areas and Pioneering Future Directions in Educational Generative AI Research. *TechTrends*, ●●●, 1–16. DOI: 10.1007/s11528-025-01060-6

Yilmaz, R., & Karaoglan Yilmaz, F. G. (2023). The Effect of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI)-Based Tool Use on Students' Computational Thinking Skills, Programming Self-Efficacy and Motivation. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, *4*, 1–14. DOI: 10.1016/j.caeai.2023.100147

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Educational Assessment: The systematic process of evaluating student learning, skills, and performance through various tools and methods to measure educational outcomes.

Academic Dishonesty: The act of cheating, plagiarism, or misrepresenting one's own work in an academic setting to gain an unfair advantage.

Artificial Intelligence: A field of computer science focused on creating systems capable of performing tasks that typically require human intelligence.

Generative AI: A type of artificial intelligence that can generate new content, such as text, images, or audio, based on the data it has been trained on.

Technology-Enhanced Assessment: The use of digital tools, such as e-assessments and online platform.