AI in Assessment

Case study 16: Video Assessment: Secure and Authentic

Keywords
Postgraduate, video, presentation, AI, integrity, authenticity, redesign, principles, fairness

Scenario Summary
When AI-generated content started showing up in student submissions, the coordinator of a postgraduate diploma faced a new dilemma: how do you secure assessments for online programmes in the age of AI? Rather than relying on software to detect AI use, they chose to redesign the assessment, aiming to ensure authenticity and fairness while keeping it feasible to mark. Students' feedback on the redesign revealed what worked, what didn't and highlighted the trade-offs that came with design choices.

Context
Each year, higher education lecturers from Namibia register for an online, year-long Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Education to develop their teaching practice. The cohort at the centre of this case study comprised of 80 students, studying across six courses with each having a dedicated lecturer, through a mix of asynchronous and synchronous sessions on Teams.

The coordinator, who also teaches on technology integration in teaching and learning, first noticed the problem in 2025: students' written assessments seemed to include a worrying amount of AI generated content. Students complete four assessments across their course; each being weighted 25% of the total course mark. The initial fix, running submissions through the AI detection tool Quillbot, turned out to be unhelpful. The tool was unreliable, especially for assessments submitted by students whose first language was not English. Chasing down AI use with software wasn't working. The coordinator decided to redesign the assessment.

The assessment in question included a written submission which asked students to reflect on the effective teaching and learning practices they had developed over the programme, backed by evidence in the form of screenshots - a classroom observation form completed by a colleague, student feedback, an improved assessment brief or rubric. It was individual work, and AI was permitted only for idea generation and editing.

Once the redesign was in place, the coordinator wanted to know whether it had actually worked - was it effective in curbing AI use, and did it align with principles of good assessment practice? The coordinator interviewed 26 students via email to explore this. These findings are also shared in this case study.

Purpose
The guiding insight behind the redesign was that assessment should be examined through the lens of good design principles, not through rules about AI use: "designing with intentionality should be the starting point with clarity about what the task is meant to achieve. Assessment redesign builds validity into the assessment design rather than attempting to impose it through unenforceable rules" (Corbin, Dawson, & Liu, 2025).

CC-BY 4.0

Even in the age of AI, assessments can be redesigned to require reflection on personal learning experiences, ensuring authenticity and fostering critical thinking skills.

Process

The written submission became a recorded PowerPoint video. Students now had three minutes to discuss effective teaching and learning practices they achieved in the programme, while presenting screenshots of evidence of those achievements. ScreenPal was recommended as the most user-friendly application to use to create the video and record the slides at the same time, and it was free for students to use. Sample videos gave them a model to work from.

The assessment required the students to judge the quality of their work as they had to select and critically evaluate their artefacts collected throughout the programme: "to capture the students' development and understanding over time" (Corbin, Dawson, & Liu, 2025). As opposed to "evaluating only the final product, which could be AI generated." Fittingly, for a technology integration course, the assessment itself became an exercise in using digital tools purposefully.

Lessons Learnt

Fundamentally, there are trade-offs inherent in all design decisions, as the coordinator shared: "assessment security may come at the expense of authenticity, while authenticity may come at the expense of feasibility. We must also consider integrity and fairness."

Students shared their views on the merits and shortcomings of the redesigned assessment - their perspectives didn't always agree with each other:

What students valued

Students described the assessment as authentic and relevant to their work in higher education: "it required reflection on evidence of personal learning experiences... the process was similar to compiling a teaching portfolio." Some expressed appreciating the opportunity "to step out of their comfort zone... they discovered strengths that they did not know they had." They were pushed to make deliberate decisions about which achievements to evaluate, moving beyond description into judgement. Some reported that the assessment discouraged the use of AI as it relied on "reflection, evidence, and personal presentation." Another student acknowledged their use of AI, noting that the assessment did not discourage responsible AI use, using it only to refine their draft. Students also appreciated the flexibility of the assessment as they could complete it in their own time; this also reduced anxiety levels in comparison to in-person oral assessments.

Where it fell short

There were differences in the resources available for different groups of students to the complete the assessment, favouring some and creating difficulties for other students. It was more difficult for students to complete if they were less digitally literate or if they resided in an area with limited network coverage or could only use an on old device. The coordinator reported that: "assessment practises must demonstrate fairness to ensure equitable learning and achievement opportunities for all students." Fairness has to be actively maintained, assessment practices have to be checked against the experience of students, colleagues, and the wider literature.

The anxiety was real for some students; some didn't like being on camera, or felt the task was too overwhelming requiring them to balance too much. Others wanted more time than the time limit allowed. The coordinator noted: "this example points to the trade-offs inherent in the design decisions, in particular feasibility. So yes, from a marker's perspective, if I gave more time it would allow more depth, but it would be time consuming."

CC-BY 4.0

Next Steps

The redesigned assessment is staying. The coordinator judged it a success and will continue to use it with future cohorts.

The access gap is the piece still to solve. The coordinator's next step is to introduce greater flexibility around how students complete the assessment - for example, allowing them to record their video through PowerPoint instead of ScreenPal, or simply letting students use their phone to record.

Relevance Policy Principles

This case shows integrity eroding quietly over time, and a coordinator choosing to rebuild it through design rather than enforcement (Principle 7). The result was an assessment that remained feasible for the coordinator to mark (Principle 6) and felt authentic to students completing it (Principle 3) and promoted their learning (Principle 2).

Citations

Corbin, T., Dawson, P., & Liu, D. (2025). Talk is cheap: Why structural assessment changes are needed for a time of GenAI. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 0(0), 1–11.

Case Study Contact

Katherine Carter (Namibia University of Science and Technology; Faculty of Commerce, Human Sciences and Education): carterkatherine@fastmail.fm

CC - BY