

Guidance for Instructors: Adjusting Assessments and Practices Mid-Semester in Response to AI Concerns Fall 2026

For instructors struggling with changes you are seeing in student work in response to AI, consider treating this as a teaching moment. Sudden, unexplained changes erode trust, while dialogue and co-created adjustments can foster academic integrity and shared responsibility for learning as collective goals.

1. Open the Conversation Before You Change Anything

Lead with a conversation. It's an effective practice to conduct [mid-semester check-ins](#) with students to identify what's working and what's not in a course. Bring the concern to class directly and honestly:

- Name what you're noticing (without calling out individuals) and why it matters for students' learning, not just for compliance. Explain your concerns about students' ability to achieve their learning goals and maintain the integrity of their UNM degree.
- Ask students what they understand "appropriate AI use" to mean for this course and explain your expectations.
- Consider seeking student input on potential course adjustments. You might identify a few reasonable adjustments for students to vote on, or co-create a redesign with them. Ensure that adjustments are accessible and equitable for all students.

2. Possible Learning Assurance Options to Consider

Consider how a redesign better aligns with your learning goals rather than simply increasing surveillance.

- Add video submissions to regular formative assessments, such as discussions.
- Add oral components. Require a short meeting where students orally defend or explain their submitted work (a project, essay, or exam answer) in their own words to you or to one another in small groups. Using class time and offering a wide variety of options helps to make this an accessible option. This option is only possible if all students can make the provided meeting times.
- Raise the bar past what AI alone can produce. Redesign an assignment so the expected final product requires synthesis AI can't easily supply on its own (e.g.,

applying course concepts to a specific dataset, case, or synchronous discussion; or building on a previous synchronous draft or annotated source.)

- Increase your guidance details. State plainly what's allowed (e.g., brainstorming topics, grammar checking) vs. not allowed (e.g., generating full drafts or answers) for any specific assignment. Provide 1–2 concrete examples of acceptable vs. unacceptable use. Abstract policies can be reinterpreted as permission.
- Use the [CTL AI Assignment Guide](#), [Amaranth's AI Sketchbook](#), or repositories like [AIPedagogy.org](#) to identify authentic alternative components or options to assignments that are not serving your learning goals. Meet with a [CTL Educational Developer](#) to brainstorm possible options.
- Add asynchronous proctoring to a take-home test using [Respondus LockDown Browser and Monitor](#). In general, creating higher stakes for assignments creates an environment that can result in more cheating rather than less. Consider how you will scaffold student experience with any new tool by offering practice sessions and how you will avoid grading structures that emphasize only a few, heavily weighted assignments.

3. Communicate any Adjustments Clearly and Early

- Announce the results of your conversation in writing (email + Canvas announcement), at a minimum. If you use other channels of communication, like weekly videos, add those as well.
- Explain what's changing, why, and how it affects any course logistics. Use direct language like “You shared . . . I did . . .”
- Loop in the Accessibility Resource Center as soon as possible if any adjustments may raise accommodation questions, particularly concerning students for whom you have already received an accommodation request.

4. Looking forward

Start planning now for future semesters to adapt any assignments that aren't meeting your current learning goals before the start of term, such that students can make informed choices about their time and schedule.

References

Bertram Gallant, T., & Rettinger, D. A. (2025). *The opposite of cheating: Teaching for integrity in the age of AI*. University of Oklahoma Press.

Francis, N. J., Jones, S., & Smith, D. P. (2025). Generative AI in higher education: Balancing innovation and integrity. *British Journal of Biomedical Science*, 81, 14048.

<https://doi.org/10.3389/bjbs.2024.14048>

Luckin, R., Cukurova, M., Kent, C., & du Boulay, B. (2022). Empowering educators to be AI-ready. *Computers and Education: Artificial Intelligence*, 3, 100076.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.caeai.2022.100076>

Perkins, M., Furze, L., Roe, J., & MacVaugh, J. (2024). The Artificial Intelligence Assessment Scale (AIAS): A framework for ethical integration of generative AI in educational assessment. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, 21(6).

<https://doi.org/10.53761/q3azde36>

Ying, J. (2026). Academic integrity in the age of generative AI: A scoping review of research on higher education student voices. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 24, Article 78.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-026-09752-1>

AI Attribution Statement: Claude Sonnet was used to create a first draft based on initial research and higher education cases examined by humans. Substantive revisions were completed by humans.