Of course. Creating an online hub for AI assessments is an excellent idea, given the rapid changes in higher education. Based on the provided sources and our conversation, here is a comprehensive file that collects key concepts, strategies, resources, and practical examples to help you get started.

This document is structured to serve as a foundational resource for your online hub, covering the essential areas you'll need to address.

File: Getting Started with an Online Hub for Al in Assessment

Section 1: Foundational Principles & Core Concepts

This section covers the "why" and "what" of AI in assessment. It establishes the key ideas that should underpin your hub's content.

- The Rationale for Rethinking Assessment: The widespread availability of generative Al tools like ChatGPT poses a significant threat to the integrity of traditional assessments, particularly written ones. It's becoming harder to know if work is student-created or Al-generated. The response shouldn't be a simple return to invigilated, closed-book exams, which have pedagogical drawbacks. Instead, the goal is to create more diverse, authentic, and Al-resilient assessments that focus on higher-order skills like critical thinking, creativity, and evaluation.
- A Dual-Priority Approach: Assessment design should balance two main goals:
 - 1. **Assuring Human Competency**: Developing students' foundational knowledge and unaided skills.
 - 2. **Developing Human-Al Collaboration Skills**: Building students' competencies to use Al tools effectively and ethically, mirroring future workplace demands.
- Formative vs. Summative Assessment: Emphasise formative assessment, which is
 integrated into the learning process to foster development, over summative
 assessment, which often fails to provide timely, actionable feedback. All can be a
 powerful tool for enhancing formative feedback.
- The Problem with Al Detection Tools: A crucial point to include early on is that Al detection services are not recommended. They have poor accuracy records, can be biased against non-native English speakers, and may create an unnecessarily adversarial classroom climate. OpenAl's own detector had only a 26% success rate. Your hub should strongly advise against their use.
- The Importance of AI Literacy: Both students and instructors need training in AI literacy. For students, this includes understanding how AI works, its ethical implications (bias, privacy), critical thinking to evaluate AI output, and lifelong learning skills.
 Instructors also need to understand AI's capabilities to design effective assessments and use AI tools responsibly in their own teaching preparation.

Section 2: A Framework for Assessment Types

Your hub can provide a clear structure for educators by categorising assessments based on the role Al plays. This three-part model is a recurring theme in the sources.

1. Al-Free Assessments:

- Description: Tasks intentionally designed to be completed without Al assistance to assess foundational skills and unaided thinking.
- Examples: Invigilated in-person exams, oral examinations (viva voce), live presentations, in-class discussions and activities.

2. Al-Assisted Assessments:

- Description: Students are permitted to use AI for limited, specific tasks under clear guidelines (e.g., brainstorming, grammar checking, outlining). The core cognitive work remains the student's responsibility.
- Guidance Needed: This requires very clear communication from instructors about what is and isn't allowed. You could feature a section on crafting syllabus statements (see Section 5).

3. Al-Integrated Assessments:

- Description: Al tools are purposefully embedded as a core part of the assessment task. Students are *required* to engage with Al to complete the work. This approach focuses on developing Al collaboration skills.
- Two Main Approaches:
 - Al to Enhance Traditional Assessment: Al is a tool to support disciplinary learning (e.g., Al generates a first draft for the student to critique and revise).
 - Al as the Key Object of Study: The assessment focuses on understanding Al itself (e.g., evaluating Al output for bias or analysing how prompt design affects results).

Section 3: Practical Guide to Assessment Design & Examples

This section will be the core of your hub, offering concrete, actionable ideas for instructors. It combines the lists of authentic assessments with the newer Al-integrated methodologies.

Part A: Al-Resistant & Authentic Assessment Strategies

These are assessments where Al's current limitations make it difficult for a student to simply outsource the core task. Many are drawn from our previous conversations and are reinforced in the new sources.

Focus on Process, Not Just Product: This is a key Al-resilient strategy.

- Scaffolded/Staged Assignments: Break large assignments into smaller, sequential tasks (e.g., proposal, annotated bibliography, draft, final version), with feedback at each stage.
- Reflective Journals/Learning Logs: Ask students to document and reflect on their learning process.
- Incorporate Personalisation and Context: Make tasks specific to the student or the class context.
 - Personal Connection: Ask students to connect course concepts to their personal life experiences.
 - Context-Specific Content: Require reference to specific in-class discussions, guest lectures, or local materials not available to public AI models.
- Use Diverse and Multimodal Formats: Move beyond traditional essays.
 - Oral & Performance-Based: Oral exams, debates, presentations, role-plays, and interviews are difficult for AI to replicate in real-time.
 - Visual & Digital: Infographics, podcasts, videos, websites, ePortfolios, and concept maps require creative synthesis that AI struggles with.
- In-Class & Collaborative Work: Supervised or group environments reduce opportunities for AI misuse.
 - In-class Activities: Low-stakes writing, problem-solving, and peer review done during class time.
 - Group Projects: Require collaboration, with peer assessments of individual contributions.

Part B: Al-Integrated Assessment Methodologies

These are specific, innovative assignments where AI use is required. Your hub could feature these prominently as forward-looking examples.

- Al First, Human Revision: Students use Al to generate a first draft and their task is to critically evaluate, fact-check, and revise it. This assesses critical thinking and editing skills.
- Human First, Al Review: Students write an initial draft themselves, then use Al as a
 feedback tool to suggest improvements. This assesses their ability to evaluate and
 incorporate feedback.
- Al as a Simulated Collaborator: Students engage in a role-play with an Al acting as a specific persona (e.g., a patient for a nursing student, a historical figure for a history student, or a job interviewer).
- Al Output Critique: Students are given Al-generated text or images and must analyse them for accuracy, bias, or stylistic flaws.
- **Prompt Engineering & Process Analysis**: The assessment focuses on the students' process of designing and refining prompts to achieve a specific outcome from an AI, and reflecting on how inputs shape outputs.
- **Human vs. Al Comparison**: Students compare a human-written piece against an Al-generated one on the same topic and analyse the differences in reasoning, style, and quality.

Section 4: Instructor Resources & Support

This section provides tools and guidance for educators implementing these new assessments.

- **Using AI as an Instructor**: Highlight how instructors can use AI ethically to support their work.
 - Course & Assignment Design: Generate ideas for lesson plans, learning objectives, case studies, exam questions, and rubrics.
 - Feedback Generation: Use AI to provide initial draft feedback on student work, identify common patterns, or suggest constructive comments. Crucially, AI should not assign final grades.
 - Syllabus Chatbots: Create chatbots trained on the course syllabus to provide 24/7 student support.
- Developing Rubrics: Your hub should host sample rubrics for these new types of assessments. Good rubrics are essential, especially when grading process-based or multimodal projects. You can note that rubrics can be co-constructed with students to increase their ownership.
- Resource Links: Curate a list of external guides, articles, and university teaching centre
 pages. The sources you provided contain many excellent links. Key institutions to
 reference include Harvard's Bok Center, University of Wisconsin, Montclair State
 University, Monash University, and Western University.

Section 5: Policy & Academic Integrity

This section helps instructors and departments establish clear expectations.

- Crafting a Syllabus Statement: This is a critical first step for any instructor. A syllabus statement should explicitly outline the course policy on AI use.
 - Provide Examples: Offer templates for different stances, from "Al Prohibited" to
 "Al Permitted with Citation" to "Al Required".
 - Best Practices: Advise instructors to post the policy on their course website, reiterate it on assignment prompts, and discuss it in class.
- **Discussing "The Line"**: Acknowledge the ambiguity and anxiety both students and staff feel about defining acceptable versus unacceptable AI use. Frame this as an ongoing conversation rather than a fixed rule. Your hub can be a place to facilitate this discussion.
- Ethical Considerations: Create a dedicated page on the ethics of AI, covering:
 - Bias: Al models can generate biased or stereotypical content based on their training data.
 - **Hallucinations**: All can invent facts and sources.

 Data Privacy: Students should not input personal information or unpublished intellectual property into public AI tools.

By structuring your online hub around these five sections, you will create a comprehensive, practical, and research-informed resource that can effectively guide educators in navigating the new landscape of AI in assessment.