Dear Dr Russell,

**Re: Assessment reform for the age of artificial intelligence**

The University of Melbourne is pleased to respond to the Discussion Paper, *Assessment reform for the age of artificial intelligence*.

The paper provides a good overview of the assessment-related opportunities and challenges associated with the emergence of new artificial intelligence (AI) tools, offering useful guidance for providers pursuing assessment reform. TEQSA is to be commended for taking a consultative approach to these matters, and for drawing from the expertise available within Australia’s universities when it comes to assessment reform.

The University of Melbourne has been reviewing its assessment practices and academic integrity framework in the face of ongoing evolution of AI tools and their wider accessibility. Recent initiatives include:

- **Generative AI Taskforce**: The University of Melbourne has established a Generative Artificial Intelligence Taskforce (GAIT), to ensure a whole-of-University approach to monitoring, managing and investigating emergent risks and opportunities presented by generative AI technology. The Taskforce will co-ordinate the University’s strategy across ‘Teaching and Learning’, ‘Research and Research Training’ and ‘Planning and Operations’.

- **Office of Student Academic Integrity**: The University has established the Office of Student Academic Integrity as part of efforts to support a culture of integrity. The Office aims to streamline and improve processes related to student academic integrity, with scope covering undergraduate and graduate coursework students. This includes advice and reporting for staff, as well as information for students.

- **Staff guidance on Assessment, AI and Academic Integrity**: The Centre for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE) has developed a website to provide academic staff with practical advice and strategies relating to the use of generative AI tools (such as ChatGPT) for assessment and academic misconduct.

- **BEL+T Guidance on Generative AI**: As an example of discipline-specific advice, the Melbourne School of Design has developed online guidance for academic staff within the Faculty of Architecture, Building and Planning, including an overview of assessment design in built environments education in relation to generative AI. The advice provided complements that offered through the CSHE website and other University-wide resources.

The University has also committed to transforming our approach to assessment more broadly under the recent new *Advancing Students and Education Strategy*. This will include a move to more authentic, continuous forms of assessment that support student learning.
The University broadly supports the two guiding principles and the five key propositions articulated in the discussion paper. The principle advocating that students become proficient in the responsible and ethical use of AI tools is particularly welcome.

The principles and propositions are consistent with the advice that has been given to University of Melbourne staff generally and in the paper produced by the Centre for the Study of Higher Education, *Rethinking Assessment in Response to AI*. This paper outlines seven practical strategies for improving assessment design and integrity in the face of AI:

1. Shift the emphasis from assessing product to assessing process
2. Incorporate tasks that ask students to demonstrate evaluative judgement
3. Design nested or staged assessments
4. Diversify assessment formats
5. Incorporate more authentic, context-specific, or personal assignments
6. Incorporate more in-class and group assignments
7. Incorporate oral interviews to test understanding or application of knowledge.

While at slightly different levels of analysis, it can be seen from this list that there is considerable overlap with the guiding principles and five propositions in the discussion paper.

It is essential that any principles, guidelines, or propositions adopted are accessible to academic teaching staff. A challenge with any expert advice is to minimise language that might alienate those from outside the discipline. Using plain language and providing concrete examples that are clearly and closely tied to any proposed principles and propositions make them more accessible, and greatly assists with the primary aim of practical application.

Finally, the University acknowledges TEQSA’s intention in June 2024 to request action plans that outline higher education providers’ institutional strategy and governance arrangements, to help “understand and share the different approaches being taken to seize the opportunities and mitigate the risks presented” by generative AI. We look forward to engaging with TEQSA on this exercise.
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