

AI-Responsive Assessment Framework

1. Purpose of this Paper

This paper presents Nexus Institute of Higher Education's institutional framework for assessment design in the context of generative artificial intelligence. It is intended to cover assessment philosophy, assessment validity, assurance of learning and our academic integrity strategy, to set the context for policy and procedures around the appropriate role of artificial intelligence (AI) by students of Nexus Institute.

The paper does not specify assessments for individual subjects. That work is undertaken by subject outline writers using this paper as their authoritative reference. The paper is structured around a four-level AI classification framework aligned to current sector guidance, including TEQSA's September 2025 publication Enacting Assessment Reform in a Time of Artificial Intelligence.

The Nexus framework reflects current pedagogical and assessment scholarship, in classifying assessment into 'human' forms to assure individual learning (e.g. supervised assessments to certify that a student has met professional standards) and formative types (where students are guided to use of AI to support their learning, or in ways that equip them for ethical use of AI as a key employability skill).

This version of the paper has been expanded from an earlier draft that focused on technology masters programs. It now covers the full institutional scope, including undergraduate degrees, graduate certificates and diplomas, masters programs, supervised professional practice programs, and enabling and qualifying programs. Additional program-specific guidance will be added as further courses are developed and accredited.

This paper has been endorsed by both the Social Work and Community Services Academic Programs Committee and the AI, Technology and Robotics Academic Programs Committee and has been presented to Academic Board for institutional endorsement. Various policies and procedures, as well as supporting material, have been developed as part of the framework. The framework will be submitted to TEQSA as part of Nexus Institute's course accreditation documentation suite.

2. Context: The Current Assessment Landscape

Generative AI has become ubiquitous in student work across all disciplines and levels of study. Research published in 2025 found that 88% of UK university students used generative AI for assessments, up from 53% the previous year. The pattern in Australia is consistent. AI detection tools have been widely assessed and found to be unreliable; TEQSA, the University of Sydney, and multiple other Australian institutions have advised against using detection software as a primary integrity mechanism.

TEQSA's September 2025 guidance is unambiguous: detection alone is insufficient, and structural redesign of assessment is the only sustainable response. The guidance expects every Australian higher education provider to demonstrate, through assessment design, how student attainment of course learning outcomes is genuinely verified.

At the same time, prohibiting AI use in all assessments would be both unenforceable and educationally counterproductive. Graduates of all Nexus programs will work in environments where AI tools are standard professional infrastructure. Developing the capacity to use AI tools effectively, critically, ethically (including consideration of the environment) and responsibly is itself a graduate outcome, reflected in Graduate Attribute 4 (Lifelong Learning and Adaptability). The assessment suite across each program should reflect this dual purpose: assuring genuine learning, and preparing graduates for the professional environments they will enter.

This dual purpose applies differently across disciplines. In technology, data science, and AI programs, AI-integrated practice is central to the graduate role. In social work, community services, early childhood education, and construction management, the graduate's primary work involves direct human relationships, professional judgement, and regulated practice - contexts where direct use of AI tools may be peripheral or subject to professional standards constraints. Nonetheless, AI can be a powerful tool to promote disciplinary learning. Assessment design must reflect these disciplinary differences rather than applying a single model across the institution.

3. The AI Classification Framework

The following four-level classification is used throughout this paper. Each assessment type in the inventory below is assigned one or more of these levels. Subject outline writers must specify the applicable level for every assessment task in their subject outlines.

HUMAN	AI-BOUNDED	AI-ASSISTED	AI-INTEGRATED
AI tools prohibited. In-person or supervised. Confirms individual attainment of learning outcomes.	AI use is ethical, disclosed and strictly bounded. Human analysis and judgement is the primary work being assessed.	AI is permitted as a learning, research, productivity and analytical tool, and all use is disclosed. Student reasoning, critique, and decisions are assessed.	AI use is expected or required, structured, and itself assessed. Builds graduate capability in AI-enabled ethical professional practice.

Note: A single subject should include assessments at different AI framework classification levels; for example, a Human supervised examination for assurance of individual learning, and an AI-Assisted project for applied skill development. This is both permitted and encouraged where it serves the learning design.

4. Principles for Assurance of Learning

TEQSA's threshold standards require that assessment confirms individual student attainment of course learning outcomes. The following principles guide subject design across all programs at Nexus Institute.

Principle	Implication for subject design
A significant Human-classified assessment in every subject	Every subject must include Human-classified assessment that directly verifies individual attainment of the subject learning outcomes. This is the TEQSA assurance floor. The most common forms are supervised examination, viva voce, in-person test, role-playing, practical demonstration, or supervised professional placement sign-off. See section 5 for the recommended minimum percentages by subject type.
Human-classified assessment as a subject hurdle	The Human-classified assessment in every subject is a hurdle requirement. Students must achieve a minimum of 40% of the available marks on the Human-classified task to pass the subject, regardless of their performance on other assessment tasks. This requirement cannot be waived or substituted. Its purpose is to ensure that a student who relies on AI tools across other assessment tasks without genuine engagement in the subject's learning cannot pass the subject on the basis of those tasks alone. The hurdle does not need to carry the majority of the subject's marks, but it must carry sufficient weight to be a meaningful verification of individual attainment. A weighting of 30% or above for the assessment task is the recommended minimum, consistent with the design guidance in Section 6.
No subject should rely entirely on take-home written tasks	Submittable written assessments (reports, essays, policy briefs) can promote valuable learning but are high-risk for academic integrity without supplementary assurance. They should be combined with an oral or supervised component or redesigned as process-documented tasks with AI disclosure statements.
AI use policies must be explicit and task-specific	A blanket institutional AI policy is not sufficient. Each assessment task must state clearly which classification level applies (Human / AI-Bounded / AI-Assisted / AI-Integrated) and what is and is not permitted. Subject outlines must specify this for every assessment item.
Group assessments must include individual accountability	Every group assessment worth more than 20% of the total marks for the subject must include either an individual contribution audit, peer feedback and assessment component, or individual viva to provide assurance of individual attainment. Group-only submissions are not sufficient for CLO verification.
AI-Integrated assessments will build graduate capability	For all programs, and especially where graduates will routinely use AI in professional practice, assessments should scaffold appropriate use as well as assess AI use. This develops the AI literacy that is itself a graduate attribute at Nexus Institute (Graduate Attribute 4).
Placement and supervised practice assessments are governed by professional standards	Where a subject includes supervised professional practice (field placement, clinical placement, site-based practice), the assessment of that practice is governed by the relevant professional standards framework (e.g., AASW Practice Standards for social work). These assessments are classified as Human. AI classification does not apply to the conduct of supervised practice, though it may apply to associated reflective or academic assessment tasks within the same subject.

5. Assessment Types: Institutional Inventory

The table below presents assessment types organised by AI classification level. This inventory is intended to be comprehensive but not exhaustive. As Nexus Institute develops additional programs and disciplines, further assessment types will be added.

Column definitions:

- **Format:** whether the assessment is typically completed individually, in groups, or both.
- **AI Classification:** the level from the framework above.
- **Assurance of Learning:** the relative strength of this assessment type in confirming individual CLO attainment.
- **Context Tags:** the program types and disciplinary contexts for which this assessment is most appropriate. See the legend below.

Context Tag	Meaning
UG	Undergraduate degree programs (e.g., Bachelor of Social Work, Bachelor of Civil Construction)
PG	Postgraduate degree programs (e.g., Masters, Graduate Diploma, Graduate Certificate)
ENABLING	Enabling, qualifying, or preparatory programs (e.g., Postgraduate Qualifying Program, undergraduate preparatory)
TECHNICAL	Subjects with a significant technical, computational, or engineering component
PRACTICE	Supervised professional practice programs and placement subjects
PROF-ACCRED	Programs subject to professional accreditation standards (AASW, Engineers Australia, etc.)
HUMAN-SERVICES	Social work, community services, early childhood education, and related disciplines
ALL	Applicable across all program types and disciplines at Nexus Institute

Note: This table will be expanded as Nexus Institute develops additional programs and disciplines. Assessment types specific to engineering practice, civil construction, early childhood education, and other future programs will be added as those courses are developed. Subject outline writers working in disciplines not yet covered should contact the Academic Programs Committee through the Executive Dean for guidance.

A note on AI-mediated documentation in Human-classified assessment:

The Human classification signifies that the professional judgement at the centre of the assessment is formed through direct human observation, interaction, or supervised performance. It does not require that every document associated with the assessment be produced without any AI assistance.

In community-based, placement, and practice-oriented subjects, assessment evidence is generated across a chain that includes the student's own performance, supervisor observation and professional judgement, competency sign-offs, and reflective tasks completed by the student. Different positions in that chain carry different assurance implications, and it is useful to distinguish between two categories.

Evidential human judgement refers to the professional assessment of student competence formed through direct observation. A field supervisor observing a student conduct a client interview, a practice educator completing a competency sign-off, or an assessor evaluating a student's performance in a simulated practice scenario are all exercising evidential human judgement. That judgement cannot be generated by an AI tool: it requires the assessor to have been present, to have observed the student, and to have applied professional expertise to what they saw. Where AI tools assist a supervisor or assessor in documenting or structuring that judgement, the assurance value of the assessment is not diminished, provided the underlying observation and professional evaluation were genuinely human. The AI is mediating the expression of a human judgement, not generating the judgement itself.

Reflective human experience refers to assessment tasks that require students to engage critically with their own practice, professional development, and learning. Reflective journals, placement logs, critical incident reflections, and professional identity statements all require the student to draw on genuine personal experience. AI tools may appropriately assist a student in structuring or editing a reflection, but they cannot generate the experience, the learning, or the professional growth that the reflection is intended to evidence. Where reflective tasks carry substantial weight and authenticity is difficult to verify through the written submission alone, subject coordinators should consider triangulating the written reflection against supervisor observation records, or including a brief oral check-in as a verification mechanism.

For all Human-classified assessment, including placement assessment, the operative question for assurance of learning is whether the judgement and experience at the core of the assessment are human, not whether every associated document was produced without AI assistance. Subject outline writers should keep this distinction in mind when writing AI classification rationales for practice-based subjects.

Assessment Type and Description	Format	AI Level	Assurance	Context Tags
Lane 1 – Human Assessments (AI Prohibited or Inapplicable; In-Person, Supervised, or Practice-Based)				
Supervised Written Examination Traditional closed-book or open-book exam completed under academic supervision. Open-book variants can include specified reference sheets or documentation, testing understanding and application rather than recall.	Individual	HUMAN	Strong if invigilated carefully with policy on use of AI enabled devices in exams	ALL
In-Person Viva Voce (Oral Examination) A structured academic conversation in which the student explains, justifies, and extends their work or knowledge in real time. Strongly AI-resistant because it requires live, adaptive reasoning. Can verify a submitted artefact (e.g., "walk me through your design choices") or serve as a standalone examination. Increasingly recommended by TEQSA as a primary assurance mechanism.	Individual	HUMAN	Very strong	ALL -- particularly effective for capstone, project, and thesis subjects. May also assure placement documents, portfolios and workplace programs.

Assessment Type and Description	Format	AI Level	Assurance	Context Tags
In-Person Supervised Practical or Technical Examination A timed task completed in a supervised environment using specified resources. Tests the ability to solve problems, produce working outputs, or demonstrate technical processes independently. Applicable to technical disciplines (coding, laboratory work, construction calculations) and professional skills (interviewing, assessment, counselling).	Individual	HUMAN	Strong	ALL -- content adapted to discipline
Live Practical Demonstration (Supervised) Student demonstrates a working system, skill, or practical capability in real time to assessors, who may ask questions and set live tasks. The student must show they understand and can operate or perform what they have built or learned. Cannot be faked or delegated. Applicable across disciplines: robotics and AI systems, social work skills, construction site competencies, and early childhood practice.	Individual or Group	HUMAN	Very strong	ALL -- applied subjects where direct capability must be demonstrated
Supervised In-Class Quiz or Short Test Brief in-person assessment (15--45 minutes) targeting specific knowledge or conceptual understanding. Most useful as a low-stakes formative tool or a verification mechanism mid-trimester. Can be repeated across a subject to build a composite picture of attainment.	Individual	HUMAN	Moderate -- useful for foundational concepts; narrow in scope	ALL -- foundational and early-trimester subjects
Supervised Professional Practice Assessment Assessment of student performance during supervised field placement or professional practice. Includes learning agreements, supervision logs, mid-placement reviews, critical incident analyses, and final supervisor competency signoffs against professional standards. The assessment is classified as Human because it is conducted through live professional practice: performance is assessed through direct observation and professional judgement in a real practice environment, not through submitted documents alone.	Individual	HUMAN	Very strong, where competency signoffs are grounded in direct supervisor observation. Subject coordinators should ensure that verification mechanisms are in place for high-weight reflective tasks.	PRACTICE PROF-ACCRED HUMAN-SERVICES UG PG

Assessment Type and Description	Format	AI Level	Assurance	Context Tags
Subject coordinators and placement coordinators should note that field educators may use AI tools to assist with writing competency reports or supervision notes, and students may use AI tools to assist with drafting reflective tasks associated with placement. This does not compromise the Human classification of the assessment, provided the supervisor's professional judgement of student performance is grounded in direct observation, and provided the student's reflective tasks are genuinely grounded in personal experience. Where reflective tasks associated with placement carry significant assessment weight, subject coordinators are encouraged to include a verification mechanism such as a brief oral check-in with the subject coordinator or placement liaison, or triangulation of the student's reflection against the supervisor's observation records.				
In-Class Timed Academic Writing Task A short, supervised writing task completed in class, typically 30--60 minutes, assessing the ability to structure an argument, respond to a prompt, or synthesise information under time pressure. Particularly useful in enabling and preparatory programs where foundational academic writing skills are being developed and verified. Provides a Human baseline against which to benchmark other submitted work.	Individual	HUMAN	Moderate -- useful for foundational and enabling contexts	ENABLING UG
Simulated Practice Assessment (Role-Play with Standardised Clients) Students demonstrate professional skills through structured role-play with standardised clients, simulated participants, or peers playing assigned roles. The student must perform in real time, responding adaptively to the simulated person's communication, emotional state, and needs. Assessment focuses on the quality of interpersonal practice, professional judgement, and	Individual	HUMAN	Very strong. Live adaptive performance requires the student to draw on genuine skill and knowledge. Cannot be delegated or prepared using AI in ways that substitute for actual capability.	HUMAN-SERVICES PROF-ACCRED UG PG

Assessment Type and Description	Format	AI Level	Assurance	Context Tags
ethical conduct in the moment, none of which can be generated or rehearsed using AI in a way that transfers to live performance. Commonly used in social work, community services, disability practice, and early childhood education. Examples include intake interviews, responding to a distressed or escalating client, facilitating a community access activity, or conducting a support-planning conversation with a person who uses augmentative communication.				
Group Facilitation Assessment Students facilitate a live group session involving peers, simulated participants, or community members. Assessment focuses on the student's capacity to manage communication, inclusion, safety, and group dynamics in real time. Particularly relevant in disability support, community development, and early childhood education contexts, where facilitation of groups with diverse and complex needs is a core professional skill. Assessors observe the student's practice directly, evaluating inclusive communication, leadership, trauma-informed and person-centred facilitation, and the student's ability to respond to distress, conflict, or behavioural escalation as it arises.	Individual	HUMAN	Very strong. Facilitation performance requires live, adaptive professional skill that cannot be generated or substituted by AI preparation alone.	HUMAN-SERVICES PROF-ACCRED UG PG
Observation-Based Assessment (Real or Simulated Context) An assessor directly observes the student providing support or delivering practice in a real or simulated environment. One of the most authentic assessment methods available in human-services disciplines, because it assesses the student's actual performance in context rather than their capacity to produce a written account of practice. Assessors evaluate communication, rapport-	Individual	HUMAN	Very strong. Direct observation by a qualified assessor provides the most reliable evidence of student capability in practice contexts.	HUMAN-SERVICES PROF-ACCRED PRACTICE UG PG

Assessment Type and Description	Format	AI Level	Assurance	Context Tags
building, active support, understanding of dignity of risk and choice and control, professional boundaries, ethical conduct, and real-time problem-solving. Applicable to disability support, aged care, community services, early childhood practice, and social work field subjects.				
Community-Engaged Assessment (Live Project with Community Partner) Students work with a real community organisation, disability service, participant collective, or community group to complete a defined project or activity. Assessment focuses on the quality of relational engagement, collaborative practice, responsiveness to community needs, and ethical conduct in a real professional context. AI tools may assist students with background research or document preparation, but the relational and collaborative work at the centre of the assessment requires genuine human engagement and cannot be substituted. Suitable for community development, disability support, social work, and community services subjects where authentic community engagement is a graduate outcome.	Individual or Group	HUMAN	Strong. Real community engagement provides authentic evidence of relational and collaborative capability. Where group formats are used, individual contribution should be verified through a reflection or brief oral check-in.	HUMAN-SERVICES PROF-ACCRED UG PG
OSCE-Style Assessment (Objective Structured Clinical/Practice Examination) Adapted from allied health practice and increasingly adopted in social work and human-services education, OSCE-style assessments rotate students through a series of short, structured stations, each testing a discrete professional skill or competency under controlled conditions. The multi-station format allows assessors to sample a broad range of capabilities within	Individual	HUMAN	Very strong. The multi-station format, controlled conditions, and direct assessor observation make this one of the most robust assurance mechanisms available for human-services practice competencies.	HUMAN-SERVICES PROF-ACCRED UG PG

Assessment Type and Description	Format	AI Level	Assurance	Context Tags
a single assessment event, and the controlled conditions ensure that performance is the student's own. Stations may assess communication with people with diverse disabilities, ethical reasoning and duty-of-care decision-making, risk identification and escalation, functional or environmental assessment skills, cultural safety and trauma-informed practice, and time-pressured professional documentation. Particularly well-suited to disability practice, aged care, and community services subjects where a range of discrete professional competencies must be verified before students enter placement.				
Interprofessional Collaboration Assessment Students participate in a simulated multidisciplinary case conference or team meeting involving representatives from allied health, behaviour support, social work, family members, support coordination, or other relevant roles. Students must demonstrate collaborative communication, professional role clarity, ethical reasoning, and the capacity to contribute constructively to team decision-making in real time. Particularly relevant in disability support, aged care, and community services contexts where graduates routinely work within multidisciplinary teams.	Individual or Group	HUMAN	Strong. Live collaborative performance requires real-time professional skill and cannot be generated by AI preparation alone.	HUMAN-SERVICES PROF-ACCRED UG PG
Lane 2A -- AI-Bounded Assessments (AI Use Disclosed and Strictly Limited; Human Judgement is the Primary Work)				
Case Study Analysis with AI Disclosure Statement Students analyse a real or simulated scenario using frameworks and concepts from the subject. AI use is permitted for research assistance and drafting only; analytical judgement and recommendations must be the student's own. A compulsory AI	Individual	AI-BOUNDED	Moderate-strong -- analytical judgement is assessable; AI use documented	ALL

Assessment Type and Description	Format	AI Level	Assurance	Context Tags
disclosure statement documents how AI was used and reflects on the limitations of AI-generated content.				
Structured Debate or Ethical Argument Students are assigned a position on a contested ethics, governance, or professional question and must argue it in a structured format, then respond to counter-arguments. AI may be used for research preparation but performance is live and unscripted. Tests the ability to reason through ambiguity and defend positions under pressure.	Individual or Group	AI-BOUNDED	Moderate-strong -- live performance cannot be AI-generated	ALL -- ethics, professional practice, governance subjects
Process-Documented Report or Analysis A report or analysis in which students must document their reasoning process, including decisions made and rejected, and the justification of key choices. AI may be used for drafting or research assistance but all AI contributions must be disclosed and the student must demonstrate understanding through process documentation. Assessed on reasoning quality, not just final outputs. Applicable across disciplines: technical analysis, social work case formulation, construction project documentation.	Individual	AI-BOUNDED	Moderate -- process visibility makes delegation detectable	ALL -- subjects requiring analytical reasoning
Regulatory or Standards Compliance Audit Students conduct a compliance audit of a specified organisation, system, or practice against a given regulatory or professional standards framework (e.g., Australian Privacy Act, EU AI Act, AASW Practice Standards, National Construction Code, National Quality Framework). AI may assist with framework research; audit findings, risk ratings, and recommendations must reflect the student's own analysis. Submitted with an AI disclosure statement.	Individual or Group	AI-BOUNDED	Moderate -- evaluative judgements are context-specific and assessable	UG PG TECHNICAL HUMAN-SERVICES PROF-ACCRED
Annotated Literature Review or Evidence Synthesis Students locate, select, and critically annotate a set of sources relevant to a specified research or practice question. AI may assist with initial search and summarisation, but the	Individual	AI-BOUNDED	Moderate -- evaluative annotation is resistant to AI delegation	ALL -- research methods and advanced specialist subjects

Assessment Type and Description	Format	AI Level	Assurance	Context Tags
selection criteria, evaluative commentary, and synthesis argument must be the student's own. Each annotation must include the student's explicit assessment of the source's contribution and limitations.				
Reflective Journal (Ongoing) Students maintain a structured reflective journal across a subject or placement period, documenting their developing understanding, practice experiences, and professional identity. Entries are personal and specific to the student's own experience. AI may assist with structuring or editing, but reflection must be genuinely the student's own. Assessed on the depth, honesty, and development evident across entries.	Individual	AI-BOUNDED	Moderate-strong -- personal specificity is resistant to AI generation	ALL -- particularly effective in placement, professional practice, and bridging subjects
Policy Analysis and Legislative Interpretation Task Students interpret legislation, regulatory frameworks, practice standards, or policy documents and apply them to a specified professional scenario. AI tools may assist with summarising relevant provisions or identifying applicable standards, but the interpretive and analytical work of applying legislation or policy to a specific context requires human legal and professional reasoning. Students must demonstrate their capacity to read regulatory language accurately, identify the applicable provisions for a given scenario, and articulate what the legislation or policy requires in practice. Particularly relevant in disability support and community services subjects dealing with NDIS legislation, restrictive practices frameworks, child protection legislation, or aged care standards.	Individual	AI-BOUNDED	Moderate to strong. Interpretive and applied reasoning is context-specific and resistant to AI substitution, particularly where scenarios involve regulatory complexity or ethical tension. Pairing with a brief viva or oral component strengthens assurance.	HUMAN-SERVICES PROF-ACCRED UG PG
Critical Incident Analysis: Students analyse a real or simulated incident involving risk, harm, ethical tension, or professional decision-making. The incident may be drawn from	Individual	AI-BOUNDED	Moderate to strong. Ethical reasoning and contextual judgement are substantially	HUMAN-SERVICES PROF-ACCRED PRACTICE UG PG

Assessment Type and Description	Format	AI Level	Assurance	Context Tags
placement experience, a provided case study, or a simulated scenario. AI tools may assist with structuring the analysis or identifying relevant frameworks, but the ethical reasoning, professional judgement, and identification of appropriate responses must be the student's own. Students are expected to identify what occurred, analyse contributing factors, evaluate the professional response, identify relevant reporting or escalation obligations, and reflect on implications for future practice. Particularly relevant in disability support, aged care, social work, and early childhood contexts where critical incident reporting is a regulatory requirement.			resistant to AI substitution. Where the incident is drawn from the student's own placement experience, authenticity is further supported by triangulation with supervisor records.	
Program Logic or Theory of Change Development Students design a program logic model or theory of change for a community-based or disability-support initiative. AI tools may assist with formatting, structuring, or identifying relevant evidence, but the causal reasoning that links activities to outputs, outcomes, and impacts must be the student's own. Students must justify their assumed causal links, articulate the theory of change underlying the program design, identify measurable outcomes aligned to relevant frameworks (such as NDIS outcomes or aged care quality standards), and demonstrate understanding of the community context the program is designed to address.	Individual or Group	AI-BOUNDED	Moderate. Causal reasoning and contextual justification are assessable and substantially resistant to AI generation, particularly where students must justify assumptions against specific community or regulatory contexts.	HUMAN-SERVICES UG PG
Lane 2B -- AI-Assisted Assessments (AI as Tool; Student Reasoning and Judgement Assessed)				
Quantitative or Empirical Analysis Task Students are given a dataset or empirical problem and use appropriate tools -- including AI-	Individual	AI-ASSISTED	Moderate -- interpretation and commentary are assessable	ALL -- subjects involving data, evidence, or empirical reasoning

Assessment Type and Description	Format	AI Level	Assurance	Context Tags
assisted analysis -- to conduct analysis, produce outputs, and interpret findings. Assessment focuses on the quality of the analytical approach, interpretation of results, and communication of insights. Students explain their analytical choices in a written or oral commentary. Applicable to statistics, data science, social research, and construction or engineering data analysis.				
Professional Document Design (AI-Assisted) Students use AI tools to assist in the research, drafting, and refinement of a substantial professional document for a specified purpose and audience: a policy brief, governance framework, case plan, project specification, community needs assessment, or similar. Assessment focuses on the quality of professional judgement, contextual appropriateness, and the student's demonstrated capacity to critically evaluate and refine AI outputs.	Individual or Group	AI-ASSISTED	Moderate -- contextual judgement and recommendation quality are assessable	ALL -- governance, policy, professional practice subjects
Stakeholder Presentation with Q and A Students present findings, recommendations, or a system or practice design to a simulated stakeholder panel. Prepared materials may be AI-assisted; the Q and A session is live, unscripted, and tests depth of understanding. Particularly effective for communication-focused CLOs and subjects where translating complex work for non-specialist audiences is a key outcome.	Individual or Group	AI-ASSISTED	Moderate-strong -- live Q and A verifies individual understanding	ALL -- capstone, governance, applied project subjects
Design or Systems Integration Report Students design a system, solution, or professional intervention for a specified problem, documenting architecture or approach, component choices, integration challenges, and justification of key decisions. AI tools may be used for documentation and drafting. Assessment focuses on design decision quality, systems thinking, and the ability to justify choices against operational or practice requirements. Applicable to technology system design, social work	Individual or Group	AI-ASSISTED	Moderate -- pair with live demonstration or viva for strong assurance	ALL -- design and applied subjects

Assessment Type and Description	Format	AI Level	Assurance	Context Tags
intervention planning, construction project design, and early childhood program development.				
Critical Audit Against a Specified Standard Students conduct a systematic audit of an organisation, system, practice, or artefact against a defined evaluative standard. AI tools may be used for research and metric computation. Assessment focuses on the audit methodology, selection and application of criteria, interpretation of findings, and recommendations. The standard may be technical (algorithmic fairness metrics, structural safety), professional (AASW Practice Standards, NQF), or regulatory (privacy law, building codes). Students must justify why their chosen criteria are appropriate for the specific context.	Individual or Group	AI-ASSISTED	Moderate-strong -- contextual judgement cannot be AI-generated	ALL -- quality, compliance, and accountability subjects
Learning Portfolio with Reflective Commentary Students compile evidence of learning across the trimester -- work samples, analysis outputs, peer feedback responses -- and write a structured reflection on their development against CLOs and Graduate Attributes. AI may assist with drafting but reflection must be personal and specific. Effective at capturing learning process rather than just product.	Individual	AI-ASSISTED	Moderate -- specificity of reflection partially resists AI generation	ALL -- particularly effective in Year 1 and bridging subjects
Lane 2C -- AI-Integrated Assessments (AI Use Expected, Structured, and Assessed)				
AI-Augmented Professional Document Design Students use AI tools explicitly and systematically to develop a professional document (governance framework, policy, practice guide, project plan). Assessment focuses on the student's capacity to critically evaluate, refine, and contextualise AI outputs rather than accept them uncritically. Students submit the AI interaction log alongside the final document and a critical commentary on the AI's contribution and its limitations.	Individual or Group	AI-INTEGRATED	Moderate -- critical commentary and contextualisation are assessable	PG TECHNICAL
Prompt Engineering and AI Output Critique	Individual	AI-INTEGRATED	Moderate -- domain knowledge	PG TECHNICAL

Assessment Type and Description	Format	AI Level	Assurance	Context Tags
Students are given a complex professional task and must design a systematic prompting strategy, execute it using specified AI tools, critically evaluate the outputs against domain standards, and produce a final professionally edited deliverable. The assessment evaluates AI literacy, prompt design, domain knowledge sufficient to identify AI errors or gaps, and professional judgement.			required to critique AI outputs effectively	
Collaborative AI Development Sprint (Group Hackathon) A timed group challenge (typically 24--48 hours or a defined in-class session) in which teams use AI tools to develop and present a solution to a real or simulated industry problem. Assessment includes the group deliverable, individual contribution reflection, and a short presentation. Mirrors the working patterns of modern technology and professional service teams. Individual accountability is built into the reflection and optional viva.	Group + Individual	AI- INTEGRATED	Moderate -- individual reflection and optional viva provide assurance	PG TECHNICAL
Capstone Research or Applied Project A substantial individual or group project addressing a real, industry-connected or community-connected problem. Students plan, execute, and communicate a complete project from problem definition to final deliverable. AI tools are used throughout and their contribution must be documented and critically reflected upon. Assessed on the quality of the research or professional process, the significance of outcomes, and the student's demonstrated capacity to manage AI as a professional tool. Paired with a viva for strong assurance.	Individual or Group	AI- INTEGRATED	Moderate-strong with viva -- project scope and viva together provide strong assurance	ALL -- Research Project, Capstone subjects
Group Assessment Formats -- General Guidance				
Group Project with Individual Contribution Audit Any group project format in which each student submits an individual contribution statement documenting their specific contribution and is assessed individually on it. Mitigates free-riding. Can be combined with peer assessment where each student rates teammates on contribution.	Group + Individual	Any	Moderate -- individual statements add an accountability layer	ALL

Assessment Type and Description	Format	AI Level	Assurance	Context Tags
Adds individual accountability to collaborative work without undermining the collaboration itself. Recommend for early formative, low-stakes assessment, initially.				
Group Presentation with Individual Viva The group prepares and delivers a presentation jointly, but each student is then questioned individually on the group's content and their personal contribution. Directly addresses the risk that one strong student does all the work. The individual viva component can be brief (five to ten minutes) and still provide meaningful assurance of individual learning.	Group + Individual	Any	Strong -- individual viva verifies personal understanding	ALL -- particularly effective for capstone and project subjects

6. Recommended Assessment Design: Human floor and Hurdle Requirement

The operative protection for assurance of learning at Nexus Institute is the hurdle requirement: every subject must include at least one Human-classified assessment task, and students must achieve a passing grade on that task to pass the subject. This requirement applies regardless of a student's performance on other assessment tasks, and cannot be substituted or waived. The hurdle requirement is stated in the Use of Artificial Intelligence Policy and must be reflected in every subject outline.

The percentage guidance in the table below is intended as a design reference for subject outline writers rather than a compliance floor. It reflects considered judgement about appropriate weighting for Human-classified assessment across different subject types, and supports subject coordinators in designing assessment suites where the Human task carries sufficient weight to be meaningful. Subject coordinators are encouraged to exceed these percentages where the learning design supports it.

Subject Type	Recommended Human Weighting	Notes
Standard subject (all disciplines)	30%	At least one Human-classified assessment worth 30% or more of the total subject mark. The most common forms are supervised exam, in-person test, or viva voce.
Capstone or research project subject	30%	Human floor met through a viva on the submitted project or capstone. The viva component must be sufficient to independently confirm attainment of CLOs.
Laboratory, studio, or technical practical subject	40%	Practical demonstration and supervised practical tests provide inherently strong assurance. A higher Human floor reflects this.
Supervised professional practice subject (field placement)	100%	Placement assessment is entirely Human-classified. All placement assessment is conducted through direct observation, supervisor judgement, and professional standards frameworks. The AI classification framework does not apply to the conduct of supervised practice. Please see advice on placement in other section.
Enabling or postgraduate qualifying subject	30%	Standard weighting applies. The examination period at the end of the PQP provides the Human assurance floor for the program as a whole.
Undergraduate preparatory program subjects	40%	A higher weighting is appropriate for preparatory programs given the importance of establishing a verified baseline of individual capability before entry to undergraduate study.

Where a subject coordinator proposes a Human-classified weighting below these indicative targets, the Course Director or Executive Dean should satisfy themselves that the hurdle

requirement alone is sufficient assurance for that subject type, and that the assessment design as a whole provides credible evidence of individual student attainment of course learning outcomes.

7. Program-Specific Assessment Guidance

The following sections provide assessment design guidance for each program type offered by Nexus Institute. These sections are intended to translate the general framework into discipline-specific practice. They will be updated as additional programs are developed and accredited.

7.1. Technology Masters Programs (MAppTech, MRobAI)

7.1.1. Master of Applied Technology -- Data Science and AI Focus Area

The Data Science and AI focus area combines quantitative and technical subjects (statistical modelling, machine learning, data engineering, big data, advanced machine learning) with applied and research subjects. Assessment design should reflect this mix.

Technical subjects are well-served by in-person practical examinations and supervised technical tests for assurance, with AI-Assisted project work and data analysis tasks for applied skill development. Research project subjects should use capstone project formats with individual viva components. Machine learning subjects benefit from model development reports paired with code walkthroughs, since AI coding tools make code generation straightforward but critical interpretation remains a genuine skill to assess.

Group assessment opportunities include hackathon-style sprints (mirroring industry data science team practice) and collaborative data pipeline or system design projects, with individual contribution audits in both cases.

7.1.2. Master of Applied Technology -- Responsible AI and Digital Ethics Focus Area

The Ethics focus area spans conceptual and applied governance content: data governance frameworks, regulatory compliance, AI accountability, risk assessment, and technology audit. Assessment design needs to reflect that the primary skills being developed are analytical, evaluative, and communicative rather than technical or computational.

Human-classified assessments in this focus area are best achieved through structured debates, viva voce examinations on case-specific governance questions, and live stakeholder presentations with Q and A. Written assessments, for example policy briefs, compliance audits, critical audits against professional standards, are appropriate for applied skill development but should carry AI-Bounded or AI-Assisted classification and be paired with oral components for assurance.

7.1.3. Master of Robotics and AI

The Master of Robotics and AI combines shared AI and data science subjects with robotics-specific subjects. Robotics subjects are uniquely well-positioned for live demonstration-based assessment: a student must demonstrate a working system performing a task in real time. This is inherently resistant to AI delegation and mirrors the actual work of robotics engineers.

Subject outline writers for robotics subjects should default to live demonstration with oral Q and A as the primary Human assessment, with technical design reports or system documentation as supporting AI-Assisted tasks. Laboratory-based subjects are particularly suited to supervised practical tests. Research project subjects should follow the capstone model with individual viva. AI-Integrated assessments are appropriate in subjects where AI-assisted design or simulation is part of the professional toolkit being taught.

7.2. Bachelor of Social Work and Bachelor of Community Services

Social work and community services programs require assessment approaches that reflect the centrality of student mastery of professional practice, including human relationships, and regulated professional and ethical standards..

The three field education placements in the BSW (PRX201, PRX301, PRX351, totalling 1,000 hours) are the primary Human-classified assessment vehicle for professional practice competence. Placement assessment against AASW Practice Standards is conducted entirely through supervisor observation and structured professional review processes. AI classification does not apply to placement conduct.

Academic subjects in the BSW should include Human-classified components (viva voce, structured debate, in-person test) to provide assurance of individual attainment. Case analysis, reflective practice, and evidence synthesis are well-suited to AI-Bounded classification with compulsory AI disclosure. AI-Integrated assessments are not appropriate as primary assessment vehicles in human services programs, though AI literacy as a subject within the broader curriculum is consistent with Graduate Attribute 4.

7.3. Postgraduate Qualifying Program (PQP)

The PQP is a one-trimester enabling and qualifying program designed for students who may not yet meet all direct academic entry requirements for a Nexus postgraduate program. Assessment design must reflect this developmental context: students are building foundational academic and discipline-specific skills, not demonstrating postgraduate-level mastery.

The PQP examination period provides the primary Human assurance floor for the program. Individual in-class writing tasks and supervised short tests are well-suited to PQP subjects for formative verification. Take-home written work is appropriate for skill development but should be combined with a Human-classified component. The 30% Human floor applies to PQP subjects.

AI classification in the PQP context should be developmental: early subjects (PQP101 Academic Skills, PQP103 Programming Fundamentals) should use primarily Human and AI-Bounded assessments to establish verified baseline skills. Later subjects (PQP102 Critical Inquiry, PQP104 Mathematical Foundations) may appropriately include AI-Assisted tasks that begin to develop the AI literacy students will need in their postgraduate programs.

7.4. Future Programs

As Nexus Institute develops additional programs including a Bachelor of Civil Construction, a future Master of Engineering Practice, an Early Childhood Education program, and an

undergraduate preparatory program, program-specific assessment guidance sections will be added to this paper. Assessment types specific to those disciplines (laboratory reports, site-based practical assessments, design drawings, specifications, early childhood observation and documentation) will be added to the assessment inventory at that time.

Subject outline writers working in disciplines not yet covered by this paper should contact the Academic Programs Committee for assessment design guidance consistent with this framework.

8. Document Control

Document name	Nexus Institute AI-Responsive Assessment Framework
Category	Academic
HESF Standard	Not specified
Document owner	Executive Dean
Approver	Academic Board on recommendation of Academic Programs Committees
Date of approval	14 July 2026
Date of next review	December 2027
Change log	Version 1. Original version created May 2026. Version 2. Expanded from technology programs to full institutional scope, June 2026. Version 3. Lane 1 and Lane 2A assessment inventory expanded following disciplinary review by the Social Work and Community Services Academic Programs Committee (contributions: Ralph Forbes, Lisa Milne, APC members). Conceptual clarification added on AI-mediated documentation in Human-classified assessment. Section 6 reframed with hurdle requirement as operative assurance mechanism. Hurdle requirement added to Section 4 assurance principles. Document retitled as Nexus Institute AI-Responsive Assessment Framework. 2 July 2026.