

Maintaining Assignment Integrity in the Age of AI

This document was assembled in consultation with IITS, the Faculty Center, and the Chair of the Academic Senate. It will be updated as needed by the Faculty Center.

The Academic Senate's 2026 [Statement of Principles Regarding the Implications of Artificial Intelligence on Academic Programs at CSUSM](#) highlights the new challenges created by generative AI in relation to course-level assessments and evaluating student learning outcomes. "Open" (take-home, unsupervised) written assignments are particularly susceptible to AI disruption. While faculty may create course policies that prohibit student AI use on assessments, current "AI detection" methodologies are not reliable, so a "detect and sanction approach" to maintaining assignment/course integrity is not viable. Instead, faculty need to re-evaluate current assessments to determine whether they still reliably measure student learning, rather than cognitive offloading to AI.

This document focuses on summative assessments which evaluate student learning of an entire instructional unit (typically exams, term papers, final projects, etc.). Because formative assessments are focused on skill and knowledge development and typically contribute to a smaller fraction of a course grade, student AI use may have a lesser impact on formative assessments.

Summative assessments in which AI is expected to have a low disruptive impact.

- "Closed" (live, monitored) summative assessments
 - In-class exams
 - In-class writing assignments
 - In-class creative tasks
 - In-person lab practical/skills demonstration/task performance/clinical assessment
 - Oral exams (in person or in an online synchronous format)
 - In-person or online synchronous oral presentations, followed by live Q+A
 - Online asynchronous class with several "closed" (likely in-person) summative assessments (class must be scheduled as hybrid)
- "Open" written summative assessments where the writing process is made visible (and can be evaluated) through extensive in-class writing (concept outlines, scaffolded mini-writeups, drafts, peer and instructor feedback, etc.)
- "Mostly-closed" online assessments

- Online synchronous or asynchronous exams that use [Respondus Lockdown Browser](#) and [Respondus Monitor](#)*, a limited exam timeframe, randomly ordered questions, and a single question visible at any time.

* Respondus Lockdown Browser and Respondus Monitor are both [available to CSUSM faculty](#). Note that the Respondus Monitor tracks student movement/behavior using their laptop camera, which can raise privacy concerns. This type of technology is controversial and has been the [subject of lawsuits](#).

Summative assessments in which AI is expected to have a moderate disruptive impact.

(Students may use technological “work arounds” to compromise these assessments)

- “Open” written summative assessments where writing process visibility is enhanced, for example by using [Turnitin Clarity](#)** to monitor the writing process over time (typing vs. pasting, revision behavior).
** Turnitin Clarity is currently being evaluated by IITS
- “Semi-closed” online assessments
 - Online synchronous or asynchronous exams that use Respondus lockdown browser (without Respondus Monitor), a limited exam timeframe, randomly ordered questions, and a single question visible at any time.

Summative assessments in which AI is expected to have a high disruptive impact.

- Traditional “open” assessments which do not provide process transparency
 - Traditional term papers or written projects
 - Take-home essay exams
 - Recorded oral presentations
 - Slide shows/powerpoints
 - Scaffolded written assignments where “parts” are completed outside class time

Note that adopting/encouraging AI use in the classroom and on assignments does reduce the importance of summative assessment integrity. Unless course SLOs indicate

otherwise, students will presumably need to demonstrate mastery of some skills and knowledge independent of AI assistance.

Recommended Resources

Gallant T.B. and Rettinger D.A. (2025). *The Opposite of Cheating: Teaching for Integrity in the Age of AI*. University of Oklahoma Press. 266 pp.

Lodge J.M. et al. (2025). [Enacting assessment reform in a time of artificial intelligence](#). Australian Government Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency.

Justus, Z. and Janos, N. [Five AI myths and why we must move past them](#). Inside Higher Education, 4/28/26

Teaching with Generative AI Resource Hub. MIT Sloan Teaching and Learning Technologies. <https://mitsloanedtech.mit.edu/ai>