



2026 SYMPOSIUM

# Assessment in the age of AI: do's, don'ts and don't knows for current practices

Programme & Book of Abstracts | Version 2 | Published 24 March 2026



UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN  
IYUNIVESITHI YASEKAPA • UNIVERSITEIT VAN KAAPSTAD



# Assessment in the age of AI: do's, don'ts and don't knows for current practices

2026 Symposium  
University of Cape Town and Stellenbosch University

Date: 1 April 2026 | 9am to 4.30pm  
Venue: Kramer Law Building at the University of Cape Town

09:00-09:30	Quad	Registration and coffee
09:30-9:40	Lecture Theatre 1	Welcome and opening remarks
09:40-10:20	Lecture Theatre 1	UCT & SU student panel (Undergraduates)
10:20-10:30	Quad	Break



## Round 1

10:30-11:25 parallel sessions (Round 1)					
Room 1 (Lecture Theatre 1):		Room 2 (Lecture Theatre 3):		Room 3 (Classroom 2A):	
<b>Presentation 1</b> 10:30-10:45	<b>Starting with outcomes: A principled approach to AI-responsive assessment redesign</b> <i>Francois Cilliers (UCT)</i> <a href="#">Click to view the related guide</a>	<b>Presentation 4</b> 10:30-10:45	<b>AI as cognitive scaffolding: Assessment practices to encourage in an AI-enabled pre-clinical medical curriculum</b> <i>Jaisubash Jayakumar (UCT)</i>	<b>Presentation 7</b> 10:30-10:45	<b>Building student confidence and trust for ethical and responsible use of AI tools in postgraduate assessments</b> <i>Ziyanda Mwanda-Vacu (UWC)</i>
<b>Presentation 2</b> 10:45-11:00	<b>Assessment regimes as bureaucratic desiring-machines and apparatuses of capture in the AI-suffused global south university: A conversation with Deleuze and Guattari</b> <i>Yunus Omar (UCT)</i>	<b>Presentation 5</b> 10:45-11:00	<b>Automated marking: We don't know, but we need a plan</b> <i>Jacques Rousseau (UCT)</i>	<b>Presentation 8</b> 10:45-11:00	<b>ScreenPal as an assessment redesign in the era of artificial intelligence: Don't knows for current practices</b> <i>Katherine Carter (Namibia University of Science and Technology)</i>
<b>Presentation 3</b> 11:00-11:15	<b>Writing under watch: how does writing process surveillance tools affect the writing process</b> <i>Zaaid Orrie (UCT)</i>	<b>Presentation 6</b> 11:00-11:15	<b>Considering the burden of proof for AI-supported grading</b> <i>Stephen Marquard (UCT)</i>	<b>Presentation 9</b> 11:00-11:15	<b>Disembodied pedagogies</b> <i>Gaortwe Moabi (University of South Africa)</i>
<b>Discussion</b> 11:15-11:25		<b>Discussion</b> 11:15-11:25		<b>Discussion</b> 11:15-11:25	
<b>11:25</b>	<b>Changeover</b>				



## Round 2

11:30-12:30 parallel sessions (Round 2)					
Room 1 (Lecture Theatre 1):		Room 2 (Lecture Theatre 3):		Room 3 (Classroom 2A):	
<b>Presentation 10</b> 11:30-11:45	<b>Human-AI collaboration in the assessment of mechanical engineering capstone reports</b> <i>Lukas du Plessis (UCT) &amp; Wolfgang Knupp (Microsoft)</i>	<b>Presentation 14</b> 11:30-11:45	<b>Roots before branches: Towards a framework for epistemologically informed AI-enabled assessment design</b> <i>Sonja Strydom (SU)</i>	<b>Presentation 18</b> 11:30-11:45	<b>Assessment in the age of AI: Do's, don'ts and don't knows from spanish language and literature classroom</b> <i>Katia de la Cruz García (UCT)</i>
<b>Presentation 11</b> 11:45-12:00	<b>Engineering assessments in the age of AI</b> <i>Wei Hua Ho (UCT)</i>	<b>Presentation 15</b> 11:45-12:00	<b>From detection to deliberation: re-centring practical wisdom in assessment design in the age of AI</b> <i>Cobus Oosthuizen (Boston City Campus)</i>	<b>Presentation 19</b> 11:45-12:00	<b>Protecting the integrity of learning in the age of AI: Repositioning teaching, learning and assessment</b> <i>Hanelie Adendorff (SU)</i>
<b>Presentation 12</b> 12:00-12:15	<b>Erosion, erasure or evolution? Writing formation in the age of GenAI</b> <i>Erica George (SU)</i>	<b>Presentation 16</b> 12:00-12:15	<b>From do's and don'ts to design judgement: using the AI BAR to navigate assessment in the age of AI</b> <i>Emma Swart (SU)</i>	<b>Presentation 20</b> 12:00-12:15	<b>Integrating content knowledge, critical thinking and academic writing: A collaborative approach to strengthening student learning in the age of artificial intelligence (AI).</b> <i>Rhondeline Marais (UWC)</i>
<b>Presentation 13</b> 12:15-12:30	<b>Age of AI: don't knows in assessing AI-supported mathematical modelling in first-year engineering</b> <i>Yasheemah Williams (UCT)</i>	<b>Presentation 17</b> 12:15-12:30	<b>Reflecting on the success of a multi-objective AI-led formative assignment</b> <i>Richard Higgs (UCT)</i>	<b>Discussion</b> 12:15-12:30	
<b>12:30-13:30</b>	<b>Quad</b>	<b>Lunch</b>			





## Round 3

13:30-14:15 parallel sessions (Round 3)							
Room 1 (Lecture Theatre 1):		Room 2 (Lecture Theatre 3):		Room 3 (Classroom 2A):			
<b>Presentation 21</b> 13:30-13:45	<b>The augmented artist: A design thinking framework for artificial intelligence (AI) literacy and process-led assessment in tertiary music education</b> <i>Alden Clapper (UCT)</i>	<b>Presentation 23</b> 13:30-13:45	<b>Productive disruption through partnership: Student-staff dialogue on AI use in assessments</b> <i>Cheng-Wen Huang &amp; Andrew Deacon (UCT)</i>	<b>Presentation 25</b> 13:30-13:45	<b>Assessment in the age of AI: reframing practice through a critical AI study-buddy model</b> <i>Susann Louw (UWC)</i>		
<b>Presentation 22</b> 13:45-14:00	<b>Critically evaluating AI use through assessment in weed science education</b> <i>Chamé Viljoen (SU)</i>	<b>Presentation 24</b> 13:45-14:00	<b>Reflections of a serial AI educator: Designing assessment for reality</b> <i>Jodie Layman-Lemphane (SU)</i>	<b>Lightning Talk 3</b> 13:45-13:50	<b>Analog inscriptions in a digital age</b> <i>Taneha Hans (SU)</i>		
<b>Lightning Talk 1</b> 14:00-14:05	<b>AI use in astronomy undergrad, how to cope? Lesson learnt</b> <i>Lucia Marchetti (UCT)</i>	<b>Lightning Talk 2</b> 14:00-14:05	<b>Using AI to build trust and facilitate student engagement</b> <i>Shameemah Abrahams (UCT)</i>	<b>Lightning Talk 4</b> 13:50-13:55	<b>Changing Assessment Practices: Insights from UCT staff</b> <i>Sukaina Walji (UCT)</i>		
				<b>Lightning Talk 5</b> 13:55-14:00	<b>Developing an artificial intelligence (AI) transparency declaration form</b> <i>Sharief Hendricks (UCT)</i>		
<b>Discussion</b> 14:05-14:15		<b>Discussion</b> 14:05-14:15		<b>Discussion</b> 14:00-14:15			
<b>14:15-14:20</b>	<b>Changeover</b>						
<b>14:20-15:00</b>	<b>Lecture Theatre 1</b>	UCT & SU student panel (Postgraduates)					
<b>15:00-15:15</b>	<b>Quad</b>	Tea break					



## Round 4

15:20-16:30 parallel sessions (Round 4)							
Room 1 (TBC):		Room 2 (TBC):		Room 3 (TBC):		Room 4 (TBC):	
<b>Workshop 1</b> 15:20-16:30	<b>Assessment as AI literacy pedagogy: practical do's for integrated design</b> <i>Joricke van der Merwe &amp; Nadine Hamman (UCT)</i>	<b>Workshop 2</b> 15:20-16:30	<b>From provenance to agency: bridging the "relevance gap" in AI-enabled assessment</b> <i>Prince Sarpong (UFS)</i>	<b>Workshop 3</b> 15:20-16:30	<b>From principle to practice: Working with the AI Use Bar as an assessment design tool</b> <i>Hanelie Adendorff (SU)</i>	<b>Workshop 4</b> 15:20-16:30	<b>The power of the AI position statement — starting conversations, building connections</b> <i>Shanali Govender &amp; Christine Immenga (UCT)</i>



## Useful guides on AI and assessment shaping the symposium conversations

Do's, Don'ts and Don't Knows  
**Responding to AI in assessment in Universities:**  
A Practical Guide for Lecturers  
UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN | Stellenbosch  
VERSION 2

This guide discusses the state of play regarding assessment practices in higher education at this time, and foregrounds what assessment practitioners need to be aware of and be prepared to enact in the age of AI.

Start with Outcomes  
**Framework for purposive assessment redesign in an age of AI**  
A Practice Guide  
UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

This guide introduces you to practical tools including a typology that will facilitate a critical review of the relevance of your learning outcomes, as well as a framework for exploring redesign possibilities.

## Abstracts



### Presentation 1

#### **Starting with outcomes: A principled approach to AI-responsive assessment redesign**

Francois Cilliers (UCT)

Universities worldwide are grappling with the implications of generative AI (GenAI) for assessment. Many institutional responses have focused on protecting existing practices through increased invigilation, stricter controls, or detection tools; and assessment redesign tools and frameworks typically focus on the assessment task. While understandable, these responses risk being reactive and defensive, inadvertently preserving approaches that no longer align with what graduates need to know and do in an AI-enabled world. Institutions may be solving the wrong problem.

This presentation proposes a shift in focus: rather than asking how assessment can be protected from GenAI, educators should begin by asking whether their intended learning outcomes remain meaningful in a world where AI is widely available. To support this shift, we introduce the Start with Outcomes typology and application framework for GenAI-responsive assessment redesign. The typology categorises learning outcomes into five groups - human-centric, GenAI-augmented, GenAI-enabled, GenAI-dominant, and obsolete - allowing educators to examine how GenAI changes the relevance, nature, and value of different kinds of learning as a foundation for redesigning assessment.

Building on this typology, the framework provides a structured process for reviewing outcomes and aligning assessment accordingly. It encourages educators to reconsider educational purpose before redesigning assessment tasks, ensuring that responses to GenAI are guided by pedagogical intent rather than technological affordances.

By foregrounding learning outcomes as the starting point for redesign, this approach offers a principled and generative alternative to reactive responses. It enables educators to engage creatively and critically with AI-enabled learning while considering implications for equity, justice, and the future purposes of higher education.



### Presentation 2

#### **Assessment regimes as bureaucratic desiring-machines and apparatuses of capture in the AI-suffused Global South university: A conversation with Deleuze and Guattari**

Yunus Omar (UCT)

This paper explores regimes of assessment in the neoliberal Global South university through the conceptual lens(es) of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari. The paper frames regimes of assessment as bureaucratic desiring-machines and apparatuses of capture. I argue that assessment regimes in the neoliberalised Global South university territorialises the intellectual flows of the humanities in the Global South, reterritorialising heterogeneous, situated knowledges onto the normative canvas of global academic capitalism and its associated metrics. This creates a schizoid position for students and academic scholars, splitting their intellectual selves between the political desire to engage with local contexts, and the reterritorialising pressures to (re-)produce forms of knowledge work amenable to imported, normally Eurocentric evaluation frameworks.

The paper posits that the integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into this assemblage, through algorithmic grading, learning analytics, and plagiarism detection, risks an epistemicide of subaltern knowledge forms. Drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's nomad science and rhizomatic thought, the paper advocates for an aesthetics of assessment incorporating a justice-centred model of evaluation. This prioritises mapping student-becoming as these relate to their capacity to make novel connections, engaging their production of contextually relevant newness against the logics of normative, capitalist academic assessment orientations. This activates a pedagogical orientation that harnesses the critical potential of the humanities to transform assessment into a catalyst of epistemic justice and intellectual experimentation in the AI-suffused Global South university.

## Abstracts



### Presentation 3

#### **Writing under watch: How does writing process surveillance tools affect the writing process** Zaaid Orrie (UCT)

As confidence in AI text detection tools erodes, institutions are turning to writing process monitoring tools as an alternative way to assure academic integrity. Unlike detection tools that assess a finished product, these tools record the act of writing itself, including keystrokes, construction time, and draft history, giving educators a retrospective of a student's entire writing session.

The appeal is understandable. If we cannot reliably detect AI-generated text, maybe we can verify authentic human authorship through process. Yet we know very little about what this kind of monitoring does to student writers.

This presentation draws on panopticism in education, writing anxiety research, and research on how being observed changes behaviour to ask a question the field has not yet answered. This presentation does not argue for or against these tools. It identifies a significant gap in the evidence and asks whether, in trying to verify authentic writing, we risk changing it.



### Presentation 4

#### **AI as cognitive scaffolding: Assessment practices to encourage in an AI-enabled pre-clinical medical curriculum** Jaisubash Jayakumar (UCT)

The rapid integration of generative AI into higher education presents an opportunity to rethink assessment in ways that better align with contemporary learning practices. Responding to the “Do's” dimension of the Do's, Don'ts and Don't Knows framework, this pilot study identifies assessment practices that can be confidently encouraged in an AI-enabled context.

Drawing on qualitative thematic analysis of 41 Year 2 MBChB student feedback, the findings show that students primarily use AI as a cognitive scaffolding tool to clarify complex concepts, translate dense lecture material, and support iterative understanding. Rather than replacing learning, AI was typically positioned by students as a supplementary explanatory resource used after formal teaching. The analysis highlights emerging good practices centered on intentional, learning-oriented assessment design. Students reported deeper engagement where assessment emphasised conceptual explanation and applied reasoning. Approaches that foreground process over product such as staged tasks, structured reflection, and opportunities to critique AI outputs were particularly well aligned with students' learning needs.

These practices appear to reduce extraneous cognitive load while simultaneously strengthening evaluative judgement, metacognitive awareness, and knowledge integration. The study therefore supports assessment designs that explicitly acknowledge AI as part of the learning environment while maintaining clear expectations for independent disciplinary reasoning. Embedding authentic, explanation-rich tasks within a coherent programme of assessment enables educators to harness AI productively without compromising academic standards. By integrating insights from cognitive load theory, constructivism, and threshold concepts, this paper offers empirically grounded practices that lecturers can confidently adopt to sustain meaningful assessment in an AI-enabled medical curriculum.

## Abstracts



### Presentation 5

#### Automated marking: We don't know, but we need a plan

Jacques Rousseau (UCT)

AI in assessment is a "wicked problem", characterised by transient solutions and significant "don't knows" regarding institutional impact. This presentation focuses on automated marking and its potential contributions to uncertainty surrounding academic labor, and the perceived value of higher education.

A primary "don't know" involves the academic pipeline: while AI offers financial efficiency in marking large cohorts, as well as consistency in judgment, it risks "deskilling" junior scholars who rely on grading to develop evaluative judgement. However, those junior scholars are already – are will soon be – using AI tools to grade submissions in any case, and strategic institutional responses should not be premised on fictions.

This presentation argues for boldness in response to these problems, rather than operating in denial of obvious trends towards using AI in both the generation and evaluation of assessments. Institutions must move develop policy that allows for these trends, and that provides a programmatic framework in which human markers moderate AI input to ensure consonance with the submitted task, informed by their subject knowledge and awareness of context.

With this in mind, a tiered approach is recommended, with human engagement varying in proportion to factors such as the seniority, complexity, and size of courses; and thus, the nature of assignments in those courses.

We "don't know" the long-term impact of AI in assessment on teaching expertise, nor how to balance costs and perceived value. Policy discussion in this area must accommodate the inevitable, and ubiquitous, use of AI for assessing assignments.



### Presentation 6

#### Considering the burden of proof for AI-supported grading

Stephen Marquard (UCT)

Using AI tools to grade student work is a high-risk, high-reward activity. It is high risk because of the many ways AI behaviour may be misaligned with assessment goals and the difficulty of characterising AI performance across a wide range of contexts, potentially leading to assessment feedback and judgements which have low validity and/or reliability. It is high-reward because of the potential for significantly reducing effort and therefore also cost involved in providing student feedback and grades, and providing students with much faster and potentially more detailed and helpful feedback.

AI-supported grading is now within reach of almost all educators, with solutions ranging from out-of-the-box use of consumer-facing and enterprise LLMs such as ChatGPT, Gemini, Claude and Copilot to special-purpose AI-driven assessment applications which may be custom-built for local needs, available as a licensed service, or integrated into learning management systems.

In adopting one or more of these tools in a given teaching context, is there a burden of proof to establish that the AI-enhanced grading process is robust, reliable and valid, or at least as good or better than human grading? Who bears this burden of proof, and what would constitute proof in a given context? Or is the concept of proof too absolute, and is what we are seeing a redistribution and redefinition of risk in the teaching and learning relationship?

This presentation will explore these issues in the context of AI innovation projects at the University of Cape Town and decision-making processes around AI assessment tools.

## Abstracts



### Presentation 7

#### Building student confidence and trust for ethical and responsible use of AI tools in postgraduate assessments

Ziyanda Mwanda-Vacu (UWC)

While the use of AI tools has increased exponentially over the past few years. There is the assumption that all students know, understand and that they are using AI tools for cheating purposes (academic dishonesty). With a student population of 109 (48 Postgraduate Diploma and 61 Masters students ).

At the school, a positive and developmental stance has been taken to firstly acknowledge the saturation in students' knowledge of AI tools. This is due to the student population with some students working in remote areas with limited access to digital tools. Secondly, it was important to build awareness and trust by exposing students to AI tools and how to use AI tools responsibly and ethically through a series of information sessions and guidelines. Lastly, while students are required to declare the use of AI tools, it is not often clear how lecturers will engage with these declarations which often results in students being anxious with fear that they will be assessed negatively upon declaring their usage of AI tools. At the School, students are positively affirmed that lecturers simply want to understand their learning process in order to support them effectively. This resulted in more students openly declaring the tools and how they have used the tools which gave the staff members a better understanding of some of the academic challenges students are facing.

These issues inform subsequent lecturer discussion points during the online teaching sessions and ultimately curriculum improvement.



### Presentation 8

#### ScreenPal as an assessment redesign in the era of artificial intelligence: Don't knows for current practices

Katherine Carter (Namibia University of Science and Technology)

This study examined students' reflections on creating a ScreenPal video as an assessment in the Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Education in Namibia. Eighty students in the course, Technology Integration, were tasked with discussing their achievements in the programme and presenting screenshots of evidence in a recorded PowerPoint video.

The research examined whether the assessment, designed to reduce the overuse of Artificial Intelligence, also aligned with principles of good assessment practice, including fairness and authenticity. Based on twenty-six interviews, conflicting views emerged. Some students criticised the assessment as causing anxiety and advantaging those who are confident in speaking. Other students appreciated stepping out of their comfort zone and were proud of the work they created. Several students characterised the assessment as fair, as it provided flexibility and equipped all students with guided instructions and exemplars. Other students, however, experienced internet instability and technical glitches, leading to abandonment of the software itself. The assessment was described as authentic, as it required reflection on evidence of personal learning experiences. Other students acknowledged using Artificial Intelligence to refine their drafts.

The findings remind us to examine assessment not through rules about AI use but through the lens of good design principles, acknowledging that there are no perfect solutions. In our attempts to redesign assessments in the era of AI, we must recognise the trade-offs inherent in all design decisions. Designing with intentionality should be the starting point, with clarity about what the task is meant to achieve.

## Abstracts



### Presentation 9

#### Disembodied pedagogies

Gaorutwe Moabi (University of South Africa)

Humanity, human autonomy, and creativity have been led to a collective hallucination. Artificial intelligence, where assessments and educational methodologies are concerned, has potential perils. This paper seeks to elaborate that AI has been ignored as a phenomenon of Western civilization, an effective pedagogical tool that, when pedestalized, steals and forfeits human autonomy. Disembodied pedagogies are nourished by AI: they establish both lecturers and students into receiving objects.

Suchlike pedagogies are a further stimulation of students' credulity which is substantiated by an indoctrination of intellectual miscarriage. To combat the suggested docility of students by AI and overcome the contradiction it forges, a banking education or pedagogy must be radically relinquished as it maintains the submersion of conscience and the decrease of human competencies in pursuit of a critical interventionist pedagogy.

A critical interventionist pedagogical approach or method is a combatant against the provisions of AI; it is a denial of ontological and epistemological abstractions of those who are unrightly isolated and detached from their true intellectual agency. In terms of assessment, considerable attention is given to written essays or assignments – and further critique ChatGPT: the claim of it as a revolutionary aid for students and argue its ability to forge academic dishonesty and the erosion of students' independence and development skills.

Using Paulo Freire's Banking Concept of Education, this paper argues that education is a revolutionary futurity: it is an affirmation that humankind's immobility, capitalized on by AI, is a fatal threat to human autonomy and agency. It critically and closely engages with the humankind as those who are privy to their shortcomings but are unable to act on them without depending fully on the vices such as AI and some offerings made by the Fourth Industrial Revolution.



### Presentation 10

#### Human–AI collaboration in the assessment of mechanical engineering capstone reports

Lukas du Plessis (UCT) & Wolfgang Knupp (Microsoft)

Assessing capstone mechanical engineering design reports presents a persistent challenge: large cohorts, open-ended artefacts, multi-dimensional rubrics, and the need for fairness and consistency across diverse projects. This presentation outlines a structured Human–AI collaboration framework for grading final-year Mechanical Engineering capstone reports. The approach augments — rather than replaces — academic judgement.

The framework integrates rubric-aligned large language model evaluation, structured qualitative feedback generation, and quantitative calibration. Reports are assessed against clearly defined performance descriptors linked to graduate attributes, after which AI-generated scoring suggestions undergo human moderation. To enhance inter-report consistency, a comparative ranking layer inspired by Swiss pairing and statistical rating methods stabilises grade bands across large cohorts. This reduces grading drift, mitigates cognitive fatigue, and improves transparency in borderline decisions. The system was piloted in a senior Mechanical Engineering capstone module with over 100 reports. The work was supported by a grant from UCT's DVC for Teaching & Learning, Prof Brandon Collier-Reed, with technical development led by Mr Wolfgang Knupp (Microsoft AI), co-presenter of the talk. The pilot compared independent human grading with AI-supported grading and revealed significant differences. While this underscores the need for improved prompt engineering, ranking refinement, and further tool development, it also raises an important question: disagreement alone does not justify dismissing AI as "inaccurate."

The talk argues that academic authority must remain central. When treated as decision-support rather than decision-making, carefully designed Human–AI collaboration can preserve academic standards while addressing scalability pressures in engineering education.

## Abstracts



### Presentation 11

#### Engineering assessments in the age of AI

Wei Hua Ho (UCT)

Generative AI has caused disruptions and distress to higher education globally. The main concerns are about a readily available tool that can help students generate a (apparently) highly sophisticated answer to a "difficult" task, potentially reducing the integrity and purpose of an assessment. Specifically, within the field of engineering and technology, these include building complex simulation models and writing complex codes.

Generally, the reactions, I have encountered, are either to "switch back" to administered assessments with strict conditions ensuring no access to generative AI tools or hand-written submissions. Neither is optimal and does not represent realities of the modern workplace where tertiary engineering education is designed to provide training for. In this talk, I will propose an alternate view of the increasing availability and encroachment of generative AI tools, by reducing the "clarity" of the assessment. Absolute clarity of assessment is often seen as the most important aspect of assessments, but I would argue that it does not fully reflect the workplace reality that engineers are being trained for. Vagueness in this sense is not about ambiguity of requirements, but open-endedness where no specific instructions or analysis are requested hence requiring students to decide what is necessary and what is not from a broad body of knowledge. When done appropriately, a "vague" question can still lead students to a desired outcome as in a well-crafted problem-based learning environment.

In this talk, an example from fluid dynamics will be used to illustrate my argument. Additionally, I found that if the same vague assessment is posed to a generative AI tool, it prompts in a similar manner as an educator would thus potentially achieve similar learning outcomes without necessarily increasing workload. This form of assessment has been implemented in classes of between 70-100-ish students.



### Presentation 12

#### Erosion, erasure or evolution? Writing formation in the age of GenAI

Erica George (SU)

Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) and its use in higher education are forcing us to reconsider the efficacy and the relevance of long-held assumptions, beliefs and conventions about the writing process. It is now possible to generate coherent technical writing easily from the black box of algorithmic processing and epistemic opacity. We leap from input to output with diminished visibility into the intervening cognitive and evaluative processes, in which the uploaded text no longer guarantees reasoning, authorship, or evaluative judgment (Bearman et al., 2024; Corbin et al., 2025).

In engineering, all design decisions, uncertainties and accountability must be traceable across documentation practices and communicative artefacts (Trevelyan, 2014). This presentation draws on writing in and across the disciplines to explore an open question: Do current curricular responses to GenAI, however well-intentioned, displace writing formation that traditionally develops through sustained disciplinary enculturation when considering a shift towards:

1. Group-based artefacts
2. Facilitation-based models of delivery
3. Adoption of later-stage writing interventions
4. GenAI writing platforms as proxies for pedagogical investment

GenAI should meaningfully support the writing process by being infused within a vertically integrated writing spine (Kasneci et al., 2023; Cheng et al., 2024). Long-term enculturation is required for writing processes that focus on engineering genres, standards and professional judgement as cumulative capacities rather than isolated competencies. This presentation ends with a wicked question for collective deliberation: Are we witnessing the erosion, erasure or entropy of writing in education, or are we enabling the evolution of writing through pedagogic and collaborative recalibration?

## Abstracts



### Presentation 13

#### Age of AI: Don't knows in assessing ai-supported mathematical modelling in first-year engineering

Yasheemah Williams (UCT)

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly integrated into mathematical modelling (MM) in engineering education, offering adaptive feedback, guided prompts, and real-time conceptual support. In first-year engineering mathematics, where students often struggle with abstraction and problem formulation, AI-assisted tools show promise in strengthening engagement and conceptual understanding. This study investigates how embedding AI within modelling-eliciting activities influences students' conceptual learning and interaction across different stages of the modelling process. However, the rapid adoption of AI introduces critical "Don't Knows" in assessment practice. When AI scaffolds reasoning, how can educators validly measure individual conceptual understanding? Do improved assessment outcomes reflect genuine cognitive development, or AI-mediated procedural efficiency? How should assessment frameworks account for varying levels of student reliance on AI during formulation, analysis, and interpretation? These questions remain unresolved due to limited and sometimes conflicting evidence regarding interpretability, epistemic ownership, and fairness in AI-supported environments.

Using a mixed-methods design (n=+40), the study analyses assessment performance, progression metrics, student reflections, and lecturer observations to examine patterns of conceptual growth and engagement. As an ongoing initiative, the project does not yet offer definitive assessment solutions. Instead, it foregrounds emerging tensions and uncertainties surrounding AI-assisted evaluation in mathematical modelling. By articulating these wicked questions, this presentation contributes to the symposium's exploration of the Age of AI—highlighting areas where practice is advancing faster than evidence and where assessment redesign requires cautious, research-informed deliberation.



### Presentation 14

#### Roots before branches: Towards a framework for epistemologically informed AI-enabled assessment design

Sonja Strydom (SU)

Higher education responses to generative AI (GenAI) have unfolded mostly in reverse by beginning with urgent concerns around assessment integrity, prioritisation of detection tools, and reactive policy development (Potter et al., 2023; Wang et al., 2024). A subsequent movement of scholarship shifted focus to how GenAI reshapes students' learning processes, epistemic awareness, and engagement with knowledge (McPhee et al., 2025; Young et al., 2024). Yet an important dimension related to educators' own epistemological beliefs remains underexamined. Personal epistemological beliefs associated with the certainty, simplicity, source, justification, and nature of learning are central to teaching and assessment (Hofer & Pintrich, 1997; Hofer, 2001) but have not been interrogated in relation to GenAI and assessment.

This paper presents empirical findings from a collaborative reflective inquiry involving nine scholars from diverse disciplines and international contexts. Grounded in Bourdieu's theory of practice and Habermas' communicative action, the study examined how educators' epistemic assumptions shape their interpretations of GenAI and influence their assessment decisions. The analysis reveals tensions between commitments to dialogue, inquiry-based learning, and persistent corrective or control-oriented assessment tendencies, intensified by GenAI's role as delegated epistemic authority.

A contribution of this work is the development of a preliminary framework for epistemologically informed AI-present assessment design, which maps five epistemic dimensions to assessment tensions, AI-related complications, and pedagogical strategies. The framework serves as both a reflective tool and a practical approach to discipline-specific assessment design in an era in which constructs such as validity, reliability, and authenticity are increasingly undermined by refined AI-generated outputs (Kaldaras et al., 2024; Cotton et al., 2023). As higher education institutions move away from unreliable detection tools (RNZ, 2025; McKenna & Kramm, 2025), the framework positions epistemological awareness as a prerequisite to sustainable assessment change.

## Abstracts



### Presentation 15

#### From detection to deliberation: Re-centering practical wisdom in assessment design in the age of AI

Cobus Oosthuizen (Boston City Campus)

Generative AI has intensified long-standing tensions in higher-education assessment, particularly around academic integrity, authorship, and fairness. Much of the institutional response to AI has focused on technical solutions: detection tools, assessment redesign aimed at “AI-proofing,” and increasingly elaborate procedural controls. While understandable, this response risks addressing symptoms rather than the underlying challenge. This paper argues that the central issue in assessment in an AI-enabled world is not detection, but the erosion—and urgent re-centring—of human judgment.

Drawing on the concept of *phronēsis* (practical wisdom), the paper reframes assessment as a deliberative, context-sensitive practice rather than a purely procedural or rule-based activity. AI systems excel in pattern reproduction and linguistic fluency, but they do not possess moral agency, contextual accountability, or responsibility for judgment. Assessment practices that privilege product over process, and compliance over reasoning, therefore create precisely the conditions under which AI becomes disruptive.

The paper engages directly with the Do's, Don'ts, and Don't Knows framework. It identifies emerging Do's in assessment practice that foreground deliberation, justification, and situated reasoning, including reflective commentaries, oral examinations, process narratives, and supervisor-mediated assessment conversations. These approaches do not seek to exclude AI, but rather require students to account transparently for its use within their own decision-making processes.

It also critically examines several Don'ts, including over-reliance on AI-detection technologies, attempts to design ever more contrived “AI-resistant” assessments, and the framing of AI primarily as a cheating problem rather than an epistemic and pedagogical challenge.

Finally, the paper surfaces key Don't Knows that remain unresolved: Can practical wisdom itself be assessed without becoming proceduralised? Where should discretion reside in increasingly standardised systems? How much AI assistance is compatible with epistemic responsibility and trust in assessment?

The paper concludes by proposing a shift from detection-centred assessment regimes to deliberation-centred ones, positioning practical wisdom as a critical capability for assessors, students, and institutions navigating assessment in the age of AI.

## Abstracts



### Presentation 16

#### From do's and don'ts to design judgement: Using the AI BAR to navigate assessment in the age of AI

Emma Swart (SU)

Generative AI has intensified long-standing questions about assessment design, academic integrity and the visibility of student learning. In response, recent guidance on assessment in the age of Gen AI has articulated a set of emerging Do's, Don'ts, and Don't Knows to support lecturers in navigating this rapidly evolving terrain. Yet, in practice, equally thoughtful educators often arrive at different positions on whether and how Gen AI should be permitted in assessment, even when working from shared principles.

This presentation introduces the Gen AI Use Pedagogical Spectrum (GenAI Use BAR) as a sense-making and design tool for assessment decision-making in AI-enabled contexts. Rather than prescribing correct or incorrect positions on AI use, the AI BAR makes visible the pedagogical reasoning underpinning different stances — from restricting AI use to explicitly encouraging it — by foregrounding assessment purpose, the kind of student thinking being valued, and what forms of engagement need to remain visible.

Using illustrative assessment examples, the presentation maps common Do's, Don'ts and Don't Knows onto the GenAI Use BAR to show how disagreements about Gen AI often reflect differing judgments about what assessment is for, rather than a lack of awareness or ethical commitment. The GenAI Use BAR is proposed as a shared language that can support more transparent, defensible, and context-sensitive assessment design in an AI-enabled university.



### Presentation 17

#### Reflecting on the success of a multi-objective AI-led formative assignment

Richard Higgs (UCT)

Richard Higgs presents a reflection and evaluation of a 4-year experience of administering a formative assignment that requires Masters students (10-20 students per class) to use LLMs for learning core metaphysical concepts in a course module, and to reflect on the affective experience of using AI, the accuracy of the generated content, and its validity for academic purposes. At the same time, the assignment itself applies the metaphysical concepts introduced.

The objectives of the assignment are mapped against the course objectives as well as Bloom's taxonomy of the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains.

## Abstracts



### Presentation 18

#### Assessment in the age of AI: Do's, don'ts and don't knows from Spanish language and literature classroom

Katia de la Cruz García (UCT)

This presentation reflects on the process of rethinking assessment in two undergraduate Spanish language and literature courses at the University of Cape Town: SLL2074S with 12 students and SLL1068F with 17 students. Through my participation in the UCT Assessment Studio and the development of an AI integration project, I revisited my assessment scheme and began redesigning it in response to the reality we now face with AI in higher education. This process led me to adopt a more deliberate human-centred approach, where AI is included ethically and thoughtfully in the classroom. While trying to support the development of soft skills and, at the same time, build students' literacy around AI, this reflection brings together the Do's, Don'ts, and Don't Knows that have emerged from this experience.

Several "Do's" have emerged from this work. Continuous assessment allows learning to unfold over time rather than being captured in a single moment, process over product. Writing assignments are structured as staged processes in which students develop and refine an argument before producing the final text. Short oral examinations create space for students to explain their ideas, defend interpretations, and make their thinking visible. Within this framework, AI can be included ethically and transparently as a reflective support tool rather than a generator of academic work.

The redesign has also clarified some "Don'ts". Attempts to create AI-proof assessments, overly complicated tasks, or multiple simultaneous changes to assessment structures often shift attention away from learning itself.

At the same time, important "Don't Knows" remain. Will strengthening soft skills such as creativity, collaboration, empathy, etc. be enough to sustain meaningful assessment in an AI-enabled environment? Will educational chatbots meaningfully support student learning in the long run? And should lecturers commit to a clear pedagogical position on AI, or remain consciously open-minded while practices continue to evolve?

## Abstracts



### Presentation 19

#### Protecting the integrity of learning in the age of AI: Repositioning teaching, learning and assessment

Hanelie Adendorff (SU)

Across higher education, responses to generative AI (GenAI) have largely focused on the capabilities of the technology and the risks it poses to assessment credibility. This paper takes a different starting point. Rather than asking what AI can do, we ask what higher education must protect.

Drawing on the development of our AI position statement, we examine the deliberations that led us to foreground the integrity of learning as the central concern. We argue that the current moment is not merely a technological disruption but a shift in how we are in the world, necessitating renewed clarity about the purpose of higher education.

Although positioned within the 'Do' stream, this paper does not offer a definitive blueprint for assessment in the age of AI. Instead, it re-centres a prior question: what is higher education for? We argue that even in current debates, focused heavily on assessment, our primary concern must remain learning. Assessment is not the purpose of higher education; it is a means of supporting and evidencing learning. When assessment becomes the central object of protection, rather than the learning it is intended to serve, we risk mistaking the instrument for the aim.

By foregrounding learning, and commitments to epistemic justice and human relations, we open a principled space for ongoing collective deliberation about the responsibilities of the university at this moment in time. This contribution is therefore an invitation to continually clarify what we are cultivating, why it matters, and how our assessment practices serve that purpose.



### Presentation 20

#### Integrating content knowledge, critical thinking and academic writing: A collaborative approach to strengthening student learning in the age of artificial intelligence (AI)

Rhondeline Marais (UWC)

This paper explores a collaborative teaching and assessment approach to a class of 180 students between two modules within the same faculty: a disciplinary content module and an academic literacy (AL) module. Both modules have identified persistent challenges in students' writing, particularly their inability to expand on ideas, critically engage with concepts, and construct coherent sentences and well-developed paragraphs. However, the growing reliance on artificial intelligence (AI) to generate essays has further perpetuated the challenge faced by academics. While AI can produce structurally sound responses, students often demonstrate limited conceptual understanding and struggle to engage critically with the given topic and scope.

To address these challenges, the two modules have designed a semester-long, integrated approach to a shared essay assignment. Each week aligned tutorial tasks are implemented across both modules. The content module focuses on conceptual engagement, disciplinary knowledge, and critical thinking, while the AL module develops argument construction, paragraph development, and sentence coherence. Students are required to draft sections of their essays in class, beginning with their own understanding of the topic before consulting AI software and incorporating sources. They must also question and analyse what AI provided and justify why they used the AI information. This structured, scaffolded process enables students to transmit insights and discussions from one module to the other and reflect on their own learning and usage of AI, which will strengthen the students content mastery and writing proficiency.

The initiative promotes interdepartmental collaboration and intentional curriculum embedding, ensuring that writing and thinking are developed concurrently rather than in isolation. While acknowledging the supportive role AI can play, the paper argues that process-driven, collaborative pedagogy is essential for cultivating independent thinkers, competent academic writers, and emerging knowledge producers who will use AI responsibly and ethically.

## Abstracts



### Presentation 21

#### The augmented artist: A design thinking framework for artificial intelligence (AI) literacy and process-led assessment in tertiary music education

Alden Clapper (UCT)

Positioning Design Thinking (DT) as the pedagogical spine for a developing Artificial Intelligence (AI) Literacy curriculum, this presentation outlines a prospective pilot intervention at the University of Cape Town's South African College of Music (SACM). Moving beyond an instrumental approach to AI, this Master's research aims to develop a curriculum, presented as a series of workshops, that cultivate a human-centred mindset, protecting practical artistic fundamentals while augmenting creative entrepreneurship.

Aligned with the UCT/SU Practical Guide for Lecturers, this research identifies a critical "Do": utilising DT's five-stage methodology to scaffold the integration of AI. Through prioritising synchronous, process-led assessment, the evaluation lens is shifted from AI-generated outputs to the student's reflective decision-making and epistemic vigilance. The proximity of the SACM to Hasso Plattner d.school—pioneers of DT, and one of only three d.schools globally—offers a unique opportunity for expert consultation and radical collaboration in refining these pedagogical prototypes.

The presentation interrogates the wicked question of ethics and academic integrity in arts and arts education: how can we assess mastery when the output can so easily be outsourced? The research prioritises a feedback loop over initial perfection, achieved through framing the curriculum as an iterative series of workshops. This shift will allow for the documentation of process as product, empowering music students to harness AI as a collaborator for branding and marketing, without compromising the critical thinking and practice required for professional performance.



### Presentation 22

#### Critically evaluating AI use through assessment in weed science education

Charné Viljoen (SU)

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence (AI) tools into higher education presents both challenges and opportunities for assessment design. Rather than prohibiting AI use in practical learning contexts, this case study presents an assessment approach that explicitly incorporates AI-based weed identification applications as objects of critical evaluation. The intervention responds to a growing need for assessment practices that make AI engagement visible, structured, and pedagogically meaningful.

Accurate weed identification forms the foundation of effective, integrated weed management. In a third-year Weed Science module, 30 students worked in groups of three to complete a Weed Identification Journal documenting 30 weed species. Initial practical sessions required identification using traditional morphological keys and printed resources before subsequent sessions introduced AI-based applications (PlantNet, Seek, and student-selected tools).

Assessment criteria were deliberately redesigned to evaluate not only species identification accuracy, but also students' ability to 1) compare AI outputs with morphological evidence, 2) identify misclassifications and potential algorithmic bias, 3) evaluate tool reliability across grass and broadleaf species, and 4) justify appropriate contexts for AI use in professional agronomy practice.

Reflection frameworks were integrated to assess critical judgement and epistemic responsibility. AI use was therefore not concealed or discouraged, but explicitly required to be interrogated within the assessment process.

Student submissions demonstrated increased disciplinary confidence, improved verification behaviour, and a clear shift from passive acceptance of AI outputs toward evidence-based validation. Students articulated conditions under which AI should not be trusted, indicating development of professional judgement rather than technological dependence.

## Abstracts



### Presentation 23

#### **Productive disruption through partnership: student–staff dialogue on AI use in assessments** Cheng-Wen Huang & Andrew Deacon (UCT)

Generative AI unsettles traditional university assessment practices, often triggering defensive, compliance-driven or integrity-focused responses. In seeking to resist casting students as transgressors while recognising student roles in shaping emerging AI use, frequent suggestions have included conducting facilitated discussions with students about acceptable and responsible AI use. We share insights from a participatory action research intervention involving a structured student–staff dialogue about generative AI use within specific courses. These facilitated workshops were conducted at lecturers' invitation and integrated into disciplinary teaching contexts. The workshop model included four components: (1) surfacing students' aspirations for graduate capabilities, (2) demystifying how generative AI systems function and where their limitations lie, (3) analysing discipline-specific AI use scenarios, and (4) co-developing shared understandings of acceptable AI practices within the scenario cases.

#### **From these facilitated discussions with students:**

**“Do”:** Create structured, discipline-specific dialogue spaces where AI literacy, relational trust and shared norm-setting are prioritised. Demystifying AI in an academic context, adopting a non-punitive tone, and embedding discussions in disciplinary realities foster more meaningful engagement and reduce adversarial dynamics.

**“Don't”:** rely solely on top-down policy statements or generic integrity warnings without cultivating shared understanding. Not surprisingly, conversations framed implicitly as surveillance or control, resulted in students becoming disengaged or responding defensively.

**“Don't Know”:** how to resolve contested AI use. When a practice is deeply contested, how can genuine partnership be achieved?

The literature affirms how challenging it is for lecturers and students to find shared understandings. This presentation offers an approach to opening conversation and considering a more student–staff partnership approach to developing emerging “Do” in AI-enabled assessment practices.

## Abstracts



### Presentation 24

#### Reflections of a serial AI educator: Designing assessment for reality

Jodie Layman-Lemphane (SU)

Generative AI is no longer an emerging disruption; it is embedded in everyday academic work. Yet assessment practices often continue to orbit avoidance, prohibition, or detection. After three years of iterative implementation across undergraduate and postgraduate contexts, this session reflects on what becomes possible when we stop asking how to keep AI out and instead design for its presence.

Drawing on cross-faculty survey data (n=680), students report extensive AI use for brainstorming, clarification, drafting, and feedback. However, they remain in a persistent “don't know” space: unsure whether their practices are legitimate, uncertain how peers and lecturers engage with AI, and anxious about potential penalties. Institutional messaging frequently lags behind this reality, creating a hidden curriculum of risk management rather than learning.

In response, I adopted a deliberately transparent approach: modelling my own AI use, inviting students to discuss theirs, and embedding critique, verification, and reflection into assessment. Rather than eroding standards, this shift surfaced deeper engagement with judgement, authorship, and responsibility. Workflows accelerated, idea diversity expanded, and conversations about quality became more sophisticated.

From early missteps, resistance, and continuing ambiguity, several principles now guide my practice: assume AI presence, assess thinking rather than production, reward critical engagement with outputs, and cultivate AI literacy through participation.

If AI can already generate answers, higher education must focus on developing graduates who can interrogate them.



### Presentation 25

#### Assessment in the age of AI: Reframing practice through a critical AI study-buddy model

Susann Louw (UWC)

The rapid integration of generative artificial intelligence in higher education has intensified concerns about academic integrity, over-reliance on automation, and the potential erosion of critical thinking. Rather than positioning AI as either a threat to assessment or an uncritical solution, this paper proposes a reframing of assessment practice through a critical AI study-buddy model. Grounded in critical literacy theory and sociocultural learning frameworks, the model conceptualises AI as a dialogic partner that scaffolds metacognitive engagement rather than replaces student reasoning.

Drawing on a recently published theoretical framework, the paper translates the AI study-buddy model into assessment design principles structured around three progressive phases: foundation setting, guided practice, and independent application. These phases foreground transparency, structured prompting, bias identification, and reflective AI declarations as mechanisms for sustaining academic integrity while fostering higher-order thinking. The presentation moves beyond conceptual argument to illustrate practical implementation through examples from three Afrikaans language education modules in teacher education. In these modules (class sizes range from 20 to 330 students per module), students engage AI tools to unpack theoretical concepts, critique AI-generated interpretations, and refine their own written responses, with assessment criteria explicitly evaluating the quality of questioning, critical comparison, and ethical reflection.

The paper argues that assessment in the age of AI should not focus solely on detection or restriction, but on designing tasks that require visible thinking, epistemic judgement, and accountable AI engagement. By reframing assessment as a site of critical dialogue rather than technological policing, institutions can harness AI's affordances while preserving human agency and intellectual rigour.

## Abstracts



### Lightning Talk 1

#### AI use in astronomy undergrad, how to cope? Lesson learnt

Lucia Marchetti (UCT)

In recent years, students' use of AI tools in UCT's undergraduate astronomy courses has increased. While AI can serve as a helpful source of additional explanations and content summaries, it is also being used, more concerningly, to assist with at-home assignments. In response to this trend, I introduced a new assessment approach in my second-year astronomy course (about 35 students every year), including oral examinations, to ensure that learning objectives continued to be met.

In my short talk, I will present last year's outcomes and compare them with results from earlier years, when no countermeasures were in place. I will also reflect on the overall process, drawing on both my own experience and feedback received from students.



### Lightning Talk 2

#### Using AI to build trust and facilitate student engagement

Shameemah Abrahams (UCT)

When last have you trusted a prepared student to independently perform a high-stakes task? Do your students trust you with their learning difficulties?

A trust relationship is that vulnerable and transformative space where meaningful growth and understanding occurs. Fostering trust between students and lecturers can be challenged by various barriers ranging from an elitist culture, humiliation-based teaching, to an unwillingness to be vulnerable. Generative artificial intelligence (genAI) has added another barrier to trust-building. Lecturers are skeptical that students use AI ethically in their assessments and learning activities. Additionally, students hide their use of AI for fear of repercussions. These behaviours can lead to a breakdown of trust and form a barrier to effective learning.

Based on a case study of undergraduate students (class size of 13), I was able to increase student engagement and foster trust between myself and the students. I used genAI (Co-Pilot, Gemini) to develop formative quizzes based on course material and learning objectives. The gamification of the quizzes enabled student engagement with even the least engaged student participating in the quiz. I openly discussed with the students how I used genAI to generate the quizzes, including validating the answers. Following this, students voluntarily shared their experiences with AI and we discussed ethical use, validating outputs and confidentiality. These vulnerable opportunities for transparency led to students willing learning ethical uses of AI, acknowledging its limitations and effects on their learning acquisition.

Let us do, by sharing that vulnerable space with students and fostering an authentic and enriched learning environment.

## Abstracts

### Lightning Talk 3

#### **Analog inscriptions in a digital age**

Taneha Hans (SU)

This qualitative research examines how the use of large language models (LLMs) reshapes undergraduate students' engagement with disciplinary theory and conceptual reasoning during assessment preparation. The research was conducted within a module taken by 60 students at a South African university, situated at the intersection of thermodynamics, fluid mechanics and heat transfer. Drawing on a social semiotic perspective, the study analyses students' assessment documents and semi-structured interviews. The analysis identifies scoping as a key disciplinary semiotic process through which students delimit problem spaces, articulate assumptions, and mobilise theoretical principles, enabling reasoning to become materially realised in their solutions.

The results indicate a shift in epistemic authority from students' interpretive engagement with disciplinary resources toward LLMs as tools for stabilising meaning and validating knowledge claims. As this delegation becomes habitual, students report reduced confidence in their own interpretations. The findings suggest that conceptual reasoning develops through sustained engagement with the interpretive difficulty of disciplinary representations. While AI tools can bypass this process, they can also assist with conceptual understanding through multiple representations of the same idea. The study therefore suggests that AI can support conceptual reasoning when it enters the meaning-making process at the right moment.

### Lightning Talk 4

#### **Changing assessment practices: Insights from UCT staff**

Sukaina Walji (UCT)

This lightning talk shares early insights from the 2026 University of Cape Town staff survey on artificial intelligence (AI) and assessment. The survey explores how assessment instructions and methods are shifting in response to AI, as well as staff concerns about student use potentially undermining learning outcomes. It also examines how assessors themselves are engaging with AI tools, what they use them for, and their confidence levels in applying them. Staff interest in emerging AI applications and the kinds of support they rely on are also highlighted. By comparing results with the 2025 survey, the talk reveals how staff experiences, perspectives, and needs are evolving over time.

These findings provide a snapshot of how higher education professionals are navigating assessment in the age of AI, balancing innovation with integrity, and moving toward more creative and principled approaches.

### Lightning Talk 5

#### **Developing an artificial intelligence (AI) transparency declaration form**

Sharief Hendricks (UCT)

One of the main pillars of the UCT Framework for AI is promoting and ensuring assessment integrity. To promote and ensure integrity, transparency in terms of AI usage from students when submitting assignments and research projects is required. For the Faculty of Health Sciences BSc. Medicine Honours Science and Communication Course (a class of ~80 Postgraduate Students), we have developed an "AI Declaration Transparency Form" along with the plagiarism declaration. This "AI Declaration Transparency Form" encourages students to indicate how they used AI for their assignments and research projects.

The form has already been adapted by other undergraduate and postgraduate courses within our division. The purpose of this presentation is to share the declaration and gain input for further development.

## Abstracts



### Workshop 1

#### Assessment as AI literacy pedagogy: practical do's for integrated design

Joricke van der Merwe & Nadine Hamman (UCT)

Generative AI has disrupted traditional assessment practices, leaving faculty oscillating between banning AI tools and accepting uncritical adoption. Neither approach develops the critical AI literacy essential for students' professional futures.

This 60-minute interactive workshop offers faculty a practical framework for transforming this challenge into a pedagogical opportunity. Rather than treating AI literacy as separate content, participants learn how to redesign assessments that simultaneously develop disciplinary knowledge and critical AI competencies through intentional, integrated design.

Drawing on evidence-based practices from the UCT/Stellenbosch guide *Responding to AI in Assessment in Universities* (Adendorff et al., 2026), the workshop engages participants in hands-on redesign focused on three core principles:

- (1) starting with learning outcomes rather than AI rules,
- (2) adopting a multi-literacies mindset that foregrounds critical judgment and ethical reasoning, and
- (3) designing process-focused assessments that make student thinking visible.

Participants work with their own assessments, applying practical tools to identify where AI can meaningfully support learning versus where independent demonstration is essential. Through concrete examples and guided activities, faculty develop strategies for creating authentic assessments that build students' capacity to critically evaluate, ethically engage with, and strategically leverage AI tools.

Participants leave with actionable next steps, assessment redesign templates, and resource pack access supporting ongoing implementation. This workshop positions assessment as a pedagogical vehicle for developing critical AI literacy rather than a battleground for detection.

## Abstracts



### Workshop 2

#### From provenance to agency: bridging the "relevance gap" in AI-enabled assessment Prince Sarpong (UFS)

The recent operationalisation of generative AI by global firms, such as McKinsey & Company (Financial Times, January 2026), highlights a widening 'relevance gap' between academic assessment and professional reality. While the labour market increasingly rewards the utility of AI-mediated outcomes by asking "does it work?", higher education, by design, currently focuses on the provenance of the output, asking "did you write it?". This creates a profound divergence and raises a critical question: How do we grade students on their ability to manage the AI (Agency), without failing to check if they actually understand the subject matter (Mastery)?

This workshop highlights the limitations of the prevailing approach of functionally treating AI use mainly as an ethical compliance issue, arguing that 'responsible use' without 'epistemic competence' produces graduates who are ethically compliant but operationally obsolete. In response, we proffer the Cognitive Growth Index (CGI): a framework that layers epistemic agency on top of subject mastery (Sarpong, 2025). By shifting the unit of analysis from the static text to the allocation of decision rights, educators can distinguish between students who passively succumb to the algorithm and those who actively steer the system toward higher-order insights (Sarpong, 2026).

Participants will engage with live workflows to operationalise this shift, demonstrating how to design assessments that satisfy the rigorous demands of academic integrity while preparing students for the high-agency requirements of the generative economy.

#### Workshop Outline and Interactive Deliverables (60 Minutes)

To transition from theoretical frameworks to practical implementation, this workshop operationalises the Cognitive Growth Index (CGI) through a structured, hands-on methodology. While an experimental sandbox will be used to demonstrate the epistemic audit process, the ultimate deliverable is a universal assessment rubric applicable to any mainstream generative AI tool.

#### Part 1:

The Epistemic Debt (15 minutes): A critical deconstruction of current assessment vulnerabilities, establishing the CGI criteria for measuring the allocation of human agency versus algorithmic regression-to-the-mean.

#### Part 2:

The Epistemic Audit in Practice (15 minutes): A demonstration using Cognitio, a specialised assessment sandbox designed to operationalise the Cognitive Growth Index (CGI). This environment preserves the traditional evaluation of student output but shifts the instructor's primary focus away from AI detection, which the platform renders redundant. Instead, it demonstrates a layered audit through recursive dialogue and inquisitorial quizzing (Epistemic Command Assessment) to validate that the student possesses the conceptual command to defend the logic within the submitted output (assignment).

#### Part 3:

Hands-On Application and Mainstream Translation (20 minutes): Participants will be provided with temporary access to the sandbox to execute a mock assessment task. After experiencing firsthand how the system audits epistemic agency and knowledge ownership, we will deconstruct the exercise to demonstrate how these exact auditing principles can be applied when students use unstructured, public LLMs.

#### Part 4:

Redesigning the Rubric (10 minutes): A closing synthesis where participants use the insights generated from the beta test to map out a universal, tool-agnostic assessment rubric that satisfies both academic integrity and industrial utility.

Participants will leave with the theoretical CGI framework, empirical experience in auditing agency, and a scalable rubric to answer the questions of assessment in a generative economy.

## Abstracts



### Workshop 3

#### From principle to practice: Working with the AI Use Bar as an assessment design tool

Hanelie Adendorff (SU)

This interactive workshop builds on a companion paper introducing the AI Use Bar as a strategic assessment design tool. The Bar conceptualises AI use not as a binary of permission or prohibition, but as a continuum of pedagogic positioning. Each position protects certain aspects of learning while introducing specific risks and uncertainties.

In this session, participants will work in small groups alongside student representatives, recognising that responsible AI use in assessment is relational and co-constructed rather than unilaterally imposed. Each group will interrogate one position on the Bar using sample learning outcomes drawn from both STEM and Humanities contexts.

#### Together, academics and students will examine:

- When in a developmental trajectory a particular position may be appropriate;
- What forms of learning and authorship it protects;
- What risks it introduces;
- The key “Do’s” required for responsible implementation;
- The “Don’ts” that undermine pedagogic integrity;
- The “Don’t Knows” that remain unresolved.

By deliberately juxtaposing academic design intentions with student perspectives on feasibility, fairness and clarity, the workshop seeks to surface implicit assumptions about independence, capability and responsibility.

Although situated in the ‘Do’ stream, the session explicitly engages with uncertainty. By moving beyond tool-centred debates toward outcome-centred assessment strategy, the workshop equips participants with a principled framework for making context-sensitive decisions about AI in teaching, learning and assessment.

## Abstracts



### Workshop 4

#### **The power of the AI position statement — starting conversations, building connections**

Shanali Govender & Christine Immenga (UCT)

This workshop invites participants to move beyond institutional, one-size-fits-all AI policies and develop a contextually meaningful AI position statement for their own courses. Drawing on the democratic education principles of John Dewey — particularly the idea that education must prepare learners to participate actively, critically, and equitably — participants will explore what it means to take a principled, relational stance toward AI in their specific teaching context.

The workshop begins with a brief framing of why a course-level AI position statement matters: not as a compliance exercise, but as an act of pedagogical responsibility. Participants will hear from facilitators about their own experience developing such a statement, the conversations it sparked with students, and the tensions it helped to surface.

A structured writing activity then invites each participant to draft the core of their own position statement, guided by key questions including: What learning processes matter most in your course, and why? What are students likely to use AI for — and what do you want to protect? What is the relationship between your students, the AI tools available to them, and you? How does your position connect to your broader values as an educator? Participants will work in small groups, loosely organised by discipline or course type, to develop and refine their drafts with peers.

The workshop closes with a brief reflection on the relational dimension of AI use in education — the idea that an AI position statement is not an isolated policy document, but an expression of the kind of classroom community you want to build.

Participants will leave with a working draft of a course AI position statement and a set of prompting questions to continue refining it.



# Thank You

## Organizing committee:

- Ms Sukaina Walji - CILT (UCT)
- Professor Francois Cilliers - ADP (UCT), DHSE (UCT)
- Ms Sanet Steyn - CEA (UCT)
- Dr Cheng-Wen Huang - CILT (UCT)
- Ms Soraya Lester – CILT (UCT)
- Dr Sonja Strydom - CLT (SU)
- Dr Hanelie Adendorff - CTL (SU)
- Ms Emma Swart- CTL (SU)



**UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN**  
IYUNIVESITHI YASEKAPA • UNIVERSITEIT VAN KAAPSTAD

