EdAINow

Empowering Today's Educators
— with AI

Systems-Level Guide to Preventing Cheating with AI

(v 1.0)

November 2025

AI is here, and students are using it.
This guide will help you establish policies and practices to ensure student learning is measurable in the modern AI-rich education environment.

David Bowman
EdAINow
(AI Level 4)

info@edainow.com
https://edainow.com

Contents

Introduction

Artificial intelligence has fundamentally altered the landscape of teaching, learning, and assessment. Traditional product-based assignments and assessments are no longer reliable indicators of student learning in an environment where AI can generate polished written work, solve problems, or produce explanations instantly.

For educators, school leaders, and policy makers, the challenge is not how to prevent students from accessing AI tools outside the classroom. That approach is neither realistic nor pedagogically productive and will simply motivate students to hide their AI use. Instead, the challenge is to determine whether students truly understand the concepts we teach and can demonstrate understanding in ways that reflect their own reasoning, decision making, and application of knowledge.

Thus, the core issue is not whether or not students use AI. The core issue is whether they can show, explain, defend, and apply what they know. The issue is not what process, experiences, or assignments student use to develop knowledge and skills, but what they have learned as a result.

What matters now is an improved approach to assessment, leading to valid strategies that emphasize demonstrated learning through processes that AI cannot replicate.

This guide begins with that premise. Educators need practical structures, assessment designs, and policy foundations that ensure students are actually learning, not simply producing AI-completed assignments.

The Value of This Topic for All Educators, Leaders, and Policy Makers

Every role in the educational environment is affected by the emergence of AI. Teachers must redesign assignments as tools for student learning, and focus assessment on learning results rather than on learning processes. Instructional leaders must create coherence across classrooms and departments so students encounter consistent expectations for acceptable use. Policy makers must define boundaries that protect academic integrity, support safety and privacy, and promote both equitable and ethical use of developing technologies.

Educators need to clearly distinguish between learning goals and the process used to complete an assignment. When students complete work in a non-proctored environment, educators cannot verify who performed the cognitive work: the student, an AI tool, or a student's best friend. If assessments are vulnerable to outsourcing, educators lose the ability to determine whether students have mastered essential content and skills. As a result, non-proctored assignments should be understood as part of students' learning experiences rather than as artifacts for assessing students' mastery.

To know what students can actually do, therefore, educators must rely on assessment strategies that bring skill and knowledge demonstration back into the classroom (or other proctored environment), so that the student's reasoning can be made visible through processes in which AI can have little input.

Ultimately, the focus of assessment should be on what a student knows and can do, rather than the process the student uses to gain that knowledge and skill.

The Purpose of This Guide

This guide is intended to provide a systematic, evidence-informed roadmap for minimizing cheating and maximizing learning in an era where AI access is ubiquitous. It synthesizes current research, practical strategies, and proven implementation frameworks into a coherent guide that educators can apply across K–12 and higher

education settings.

The recommendations in this guide are based on three foundational ideas:

- AI access is universal and permanent; instructional design must adapt accordingly.
- Valid assessment depends on students demonstrating knowledge through tasks AI cannot perform.
- Effective practice requires alignment among policy, instruction, assessment design, and student expectations.

Are your students cheating with AI?

Re-invision your assignments and assessments
to prevent cheating and maximize student learning!

Support for creating assigments that prevent cheating

By creating assignments based on core design principals, you can ensure that students, not AI, are completing assignments. It all starts with understanding the modern learning environment and focusing on those skills that only students can perform. EdAINow is here to help you.

Start: Foundations

An all-staff workshop on the 4 pillars of assessment, design factors, and specific strategies

Ongoing: Coaching

Small group (PLC-style) collaboration on revising current practices to focus on learning

Ready-to-Use Strategies

Immediately applicable techniques for promoting learning and preventing AI.

Personalized Support

Teachers bring their current assignments, and we work together to apply the core design factors

Interactive & Hands-on

Re-invision current assignment design in a collaborative, responsive format.

Support Long-term Change

Staff deepens their understanding and ability, leading to sustainable change.

For All Grades and Subjects

Learn principals that teachers of all grades and subjects can tailor to their instruction.

Build Systemic Support

Build a shared understanding to create an internal staff support network.

We're scheduling Spring 2026 support now: online and customizable.
Contact us soon to make sure we are available to meet your schedule.

CUSTOMIZED WORKSHOPS - STRATEGIC PLANNING - POLICY CONSULTING

Training tailored to your needs and audience, from PreK teachers to school & district leadership to your school community. Support for instructional delivery, leadership, and AI policy development, based on **30+ years in education leadership at all levels!**

David Bowman, Educational AI Consultant and Specialist
https://edainow.com || info@edainow.com || 505-603-3411

Section 1: Definitions and Key Concepts

Effective assessment in the age of AI requires a shared vocabulary and a clear understanding of the boundaries that separate genuine learning from misrepresented work. This section establishes core definitions for terminology used later, which educators can use to create both common understanding and consistent expectations for students.

Clear definitions reduce ambiguity, ensure fairness, and support consistent instructional and assessment decision-making.

"Cheating" Definition

Cheating occurs when a student presents work, reasoning, explanations, or products as their own when, in fact, the cognitive effort was performed by someone or something else. Cheating is a misrepresentation of learning and effort, regardless of the methodology. In regards to cheating with AI, cheating includes

- using AI to generate responses or products designed to measure individual mastery,
- copying or pasting uncredited text, or
- allowing automated systems to perform the reasoning or analysis that the student is responsible for completing.

In brief, "cheating" means claiming the credit for work the student did not perform or ideas the student did not generate.

On the other hand, cheating does *not* include the responsible use of AI for tasks explicitly permitted by the teacher or outlined in course expectations.

When AI is used productively and at an established level, such as for brainstorming, early drafting, or feedback within defined parameters, and when such use is disclosed appropriately, it can support learning rather than undermine it.

Artificial Intelligence in Instruction

Artificial intelligence tools can generate text, solve problems, create explanations, summarize information, simulate reasoning, and provide ideas, among many other tasks. Because these capabilities blur the line between student work and AI output, educators must determine and communicate the permissible boundaries for AI use in learning tasks. Understanding AI's strengths and limitations is essential for determining when AI can support learning and when its use invalidates evaluation of student mastery, i.e., assessment.

"Demonstrated Learning" Definition

Demonstrated learning refers to evidence that a student has personally developed understanding, skill, or conceptual mastery. This evidence is observable through performance, reasoning, explanation, or application in ways that AI cannot replicate on behalf of the learner. Demonstrated learning shows what a student can do independent of AI or other supports, and is the foundation of valid assessment.

"Non-proctored" and "Proctored" Contexts

Non-proctored and proctored contexts describe the conditions under which learning activities and assessments occur. These distinctions allow educators to determine which tasks can support the learning process and which tasks are appropriate measures of learning outcomes.

Non-proctored contexts are settings in which students complete work without educator supervision or oversight. These include home environments, libraries, study halls, or any location where a teacher cannot verify the origin of the work or effort.

Proctored contexts are settings where educators can directly observe student work and verify that the thinking and effort belong to the student. These include classrooms, testing centers, small-group instructional settings, and structured online proctoring.

"Learning Experience" Definition

A learning experience refers to the activities, interactions, and processes (i.e., the efforts) that help students acquire knowledge and develop skills. Learning experiences encompass both what the teacher provides and what the student does. They include instruction and instructional planning, exploration and experiences, guided practice, use of tools and resources, and opportunities to apply new ideas.

Learning experiences differ from assessments (although with careful planning, most assessments can also contribute to the learning experience). Learning experiences support the development of knowledge and skills, whereas assessments measure the degree to which the student has acquired knowledge and can perform skills.

The goal of learning experiences is to build knowledge and skills; the goal of assessments is to measure them.

When educators understand this distinction, they can ensure that instructional activities are designed to promote learning, and assessment activities are designed to verify what students have learned and can do.

Section 2: Policy Foundations for Reducing Cheating

Effective assessment in an AI-rich environment depends on more than redesigned tasks or classroom strategies. Organization-level structures, particularly policies that define expectations and boundaries, provide the foundation for coherent practice across classrooms, departments, and schools.

Policies clarify what responsible and appropriate AI use looks like, define inappropriate use, and articulate expectations that apply consistently across the school or district. Importantly, any AI-related expectations for students must align with existing student-facing policies, such as academic integrity policies, technology use policies, and codes of conduct.

AI policies serve four critical functions in the instructional environment.

- Clarify expectations for both students and educators regarding acceptable and unacceptable uses of AI. Policies will also define what is meant by "cheating".
- Support consistency across classrooms and academic programs so students receive uniform guidance.
- Protect academic integrity by defining boundaries that preserve the accuracy of assessment results.
- Clarify processes for investigating nonallowed or inappropriate use of AI, including how concerns are identified, followup occurs, and outcomes align with existing academic integrity and student conduct policies.

Policies are not intended to eliminate AI use. Instead, policies that are responsive to the modern education environment articulate how AI can support learning while clarifying that any demonstrations of knowledge and skills remain the students' responsibility.

With clear policies in place, educators can confidently design assessments that align with organizational expectations and support accurate, equitable measures of student learning.

This section outlines the essential policy elements that support learningcentered assessment and minimize opportunities for cheating.

2.1 Defining Acceptable Use Through Structured AI Levels

To enforce expectations for appropriate AI use, educators need to provide students with an understandable framework, such as the 5-Levels Framework described later in Section 6.

A structured levels model allows educators to identify the degree of AI assistance permitted for any assignment. These levels span a range of AI use, from no usage to full collaboration with AI tools.

When educators assign an AI use level, students know which uses support learning and which constitute misrepresentation or cheating. This approach reduces uncertainty, prevents inappropriate use born from misunderstanding, and recognizes the reality that AI is available to students.

2.2 Transparency, Disclosure, and Citation

Responsible AI includes the requirement that students must disclose how AI contributed to their work. Disclosure allows educators to distinguish between valid use that supports learning and misuse that replaces a student's required effort. Policies should, therefore, require

- clear statements of AI use,
- citation of AI-generated content when included in submitted work, and
- explanations of the purpose and extent of AI involvement.

These expectations promote transparency, strengthen academic integrity, and align with disclosure practices used for all other external sources.

2.3 Why Policies Matter for Assessment Validity

Assessment validity depends on knowing the origin of the thinking demonstrated. When AI use is undefined or inconsistently applied, educators cannot determine whether a student's work reflects personal mastery or external contribution, including from AI. Clear, consistently communicated policies ensure that assessments measure learning accurately and fairly.

2.4 Separate or Integrated Policy Development

Schools and districts must decide whether to create a standalone AI policy or integrate AI expectations into existing studentfacing policies. Either approach can work effectively if implemented purposefully and thoughtfully.

Stand-alone Policies

Pros: provide focused guidance; easier to update as technology evolves; highly visible for staff, students, and families; recognizes that the topic of AI use is sufficiently broad and significant that it merits a separate policy.

Cons: risk fragmentation and liability if they are not aligned with existing policies; may also require frequent revisions.

Integrated Policies

Pros: ensure coherence with academic integrity, technology use, and instructional expectations; reduce potential redundancy; embed AI norms into existing systems.

Cons: policy updates may be slower; AI-specific guidance may be harder for stakeholders to locate when conflicts or misunderstandings occur.

Regardless of approach, alignment across policies is essential to ensure consistent expectations for students and to maintain the validity and fairness of assessment practices.

Section 3: Four Pillars to Base Assessment in Reality

Cheating is easier than ever before. If a student can access the Internet outside of the school environment, he or she can access AI without control or educator supervision. Given this reality, educators will need to carefully determine which aspects of traditional assessment remain valid and productive and which must be redesigned or abandoned.

Four concepts, i.e., "pillars", will provide the foundation for a realistic approach to creating assessment in an AI-accessible education environment. These pillars serve as the conceptual foundations for decision-making regarding assignments and assessments, and will, ultimately, lead to equitable and valid assessment techniques.

3.1 Pillar One: Ubiquitous Access Means Prohibition Will Fail

Prohibiting AI use outside the classroom is ineffective, unenforceable, and counterproductive. Such prohibitions simply drive AI use underground, increase student anxiety, and undermine trust between educators and students.

Any task completed in a non-proctored environment can be partially or fully performed by AI. If AI use cannot be prevented, assessment practices must be re-designed to ensure validity.

3.2 Pillar Two: Shift from Product to Process

Traditional assessments rely heavily on final products: essays, lab reports, problem sets, or projects, often completed outside the classroom environment. In an AI-rich environment, polished products no longer reveal who performed the cognitive work, if they ever did. As a result, product-based assessments are no longer reliable indicators of mastery.

Fortunately, educators can use a wide variety of strategies to evaluate student learning, including

- In-class problem solving and performance;
- Drafts, notes, annotations, and revision processes;
- Short-answer or oral defenses;
- Real-time reasoning during class activities; and
- Application of ideas to unfamiliar contexts.

These forms of evidence, among others, make student thinking visible in ways that cannot be outsourced to AI. Section 5 will examine assessment strategies more thoroughly.

3.3 Pillar 3: Student-only Assessment Focus

To maintain confidence in assessment processes and results, educators must design tasks that require performance that AI cannot conduct on students' behalf. Valid assessments, therefore, require students to perform or demonstrate their own reasoning, interpretation, problem-solving, and ability to apply knowledge in new or unfamiliar contexts. Doing so will ensure that assessments measure actual learning rather than AI-generated products.

This means emphasizing in-class demonstrations, real-time explanations, spontaneous reasoning, and tasks that require personal judgment or application. When educators intentionally design assessments that focus

on student-dependent capacities and preclude AI assistance, they can confidently determine what a student understands and can do independently.

3.4 Pillar 4: Assessment Must Shift Toward Demonstration

AI tools can generate well-structured responses, but they cannot independently perform several core aspects of human thinking and learning. For example, AI cannot

- evaluate whether an idea "makes sense,"
- draw on lived experiences,
- explain personal reasoning or decision making,
- adapt learning to a novel or unfamiliar situation, or
- engage in spontaneous reflection.

These limitations to AI create opportunities for valid assessment, primarily through strategies that emphasize observable performance, justification, and application rather than polished, completed products.

Section 4: Assessment Design Factors for an AI-Rich Environment

Designing valid assessments in an AI-rich environment requires a deliberate shift in design principles that establish the parameters for assessment. This section outlines the design factors that guide the development of assessments capable of distinguishing genuine learning from AI-generated work.

They are not isolated, but together support valid assessment. When all five are applied, they create a rich learning environment that allows educators to design and implement valid assessments of student learning.

4.1 Factor 1: Learning First, Process Second

Assessment design begins with clarity about what students must know and be able to do. Learning objectives, not assignment formats or workflows, should drive assessment design. While the processes students use to develop understanding are important for learning, they are not the target of assessment. Valid measures focus on the outcomes of learning—what students can demonstrate independently—rather than the steps they used to reach those outcomes. Educators may still assess process implementation (i.e., whether the student followed the assignment instructions), assessment needs to prioritize the outcomes of the process: what did the student actually learned.

4.2 Factor 2: Frequent Low-Stakes, Ongoing Assessment

High-stakes, infrequent assessments create pressures that incentivizes cheating. A shift toward ongoing, low-stakes assessment reduces this pressure and provides more accurate information about student learning. Short, frequent demonstrations of understanding also allow educators to monitor progress, identify misconceptions early, and maintain an accurate picture of student thinking throughout the learning process.

4.3 Factor 3: Learn Outside, Prove Inside

A foundational principle of assessment within an AI-rich environment is the need to separate learning activities and experiences from measures of learning.

Building on the distinction between learning experiences and assessments, this design factor emphasizes that students may practice and explore content outside the classroom but must demonstrate mastery inside it. In a proctored environment, educators can verify the authenticity of student performance. This separation ensures that assessments measure student knowledge and skills rather than AI output or external assistance.

Outside the classroom (non-proctored contexts): Outside the classroom, students engage in a wide variety of learning processes, such as practice, exploration, research, drafting, and brainstorming. They may be getting assistance with the process, whether from AI or another source. These activities outside the classroom cannot be used as assessment, nor should they be. They are processes for gaining knowledge and skills rather than results.

Inside the classroom (proctored contexts): While many learning experiences occur within classrooms, as well as outside, valid assessments can only occur within the classroom or other controlled environments. With nearly ubiquitous access to AI, students can only "prove" what they have actually learned when they are inside the classroom.

This shift guarantees assessment validity. It ensures that assessments reflect student ability with the subject content rather than their ability to use AI.

4.4 Factor 4: Application and Personalization

Assignments that ask students to apply learning to new or personally relevant contexts naturally limit the potential for AI misuse. AI can summarize or restate information, but it cannot easily replicate how an individual student interprets, contextualizes, or personalizes content. Assessments that require students to connect ideas to their own experiences, communities, or contexts produce more authentic evidence of learning.

4.5 Factor 5: Multi-Stage and Traceable Workflows

Assessments designed as multi-stage tasks, with drafts, checkpoints, and other evidence of the learning and production process, make it difficult for students to substitute AI output for their own thinking. When each stage requires in-class reasoning, explanation, or revision, educators gain insight into how students develop ideas and ability over time. This process reduces opportunities for cheating, even while strengthening students' metacognition, understanding, and ownership.

Section 5: Assessment Strategies for Demonstrated Learning

With the assessment design factors established in Section 4, educators can now identify specific strategies that produce traceable, observable, and authentic evidence of student learning. These strategies emphasize what only the learner can do (e.g., explain, justify, apply, analyze, represent, or perform knowledge and skills) and, therefore, serve as reliable indicators of mastery in an AI-rich environment.

The strategies in this section are organized into five categories. Each category captures a distinct method for making student thinking visible and aligns directly with the design factors that ensure assessment validity.

5.1 Strategy Category 1: Performance and Demonstration

Performance strategies require students to demonstrate skills or knowledge directly, typically in real time and in a proctored environment. These strategies are particularly resistant to AI misuse because the student must act, explain, or solve in the moment. They must prove their knowledge and skills by using them.

By placing the learner in a situation where reasoning, decision making, and on-the-spot explanation are necessary, performance strategies make the student's thinking visible in ways that AI cannot replicate.

They allow educators to evaluate not only accuracy but also fluency, adaptability, and conceptual understanding. When students must articulate their reasoning, respond to follow-up questions, or adjust their approach based on feedback or new information, educators gain rich evidence of authentic learning that cannot be outsourced to AI or prepared in advance.

Sample Techniques	**Description**
Oral explanations and think-aloud demonstrations	Students verbally explain their reasoning or problem-solving process, making thinking visible in real time.
Short-answer responses completed in class	Students write brief, focused responses under supervision to demonstrate immediate understanding.
Skill demonstrations	Students perform a procedure, technique, or method (e.g., lab skills) to show mastery of foundational skills.
Whiteboard or paper-based problem solving	Students solve problems step-by-step in view of the teacher, ensuring authenticity of work.
Single question interviews or spot checks	Students answer a targeted question aloud to verify comprehension or reasoning.
Guided practice checks	Teachers observe students practicing a skill and provide immediate feedback while confirming ability.
Station rotations with performance tasks	Students rotate through tasks requiring hands-on demonstration of knowledge in small segments.
"Show-your-work" problem solving	Students display all steps of their reasoning, allowing educators to trace understanding and identify misconceptions.

These approaches provide high-confidence evidence of student thinking and procedural fluency.

5.2 Strategy Category 2: Application and Transfer

Application strategies require students to use knowledge in new, authentic, or unfamiliar contexts. Because these tasks depend on interpretation and adaptation, they reveal depth of understanding and reduce the usefulness of AI-generated products. These strategies ensure students are not simply repeating information but are actively making sense of it, reshaping it, and extending it into situations that require personal judgment, contextual decision making, and domain-specific reasoning.

By asking students to interpret data, analyze scenarios, or adapt content for new audiences, application strategies prompt students to demonstrate deeper comprehension that AI tools cannot reliably simulate. They also strengthen transfer of learning, reinforcing students' ability to use knowledge flexibly across settings, problems, and purposes.

Sample Techniques	Description
Case studies and scenario analyses	Students analyze real or hypothetical situations, applying content knowledge to interpret events, diagnose issues, or propose solutions.
Simulations and role-based decision making	Students participate in structured scenarios that require real-time decision making and application of concepts.
Localized or personally relevant applications	Students connect content to their own experiences or communities, demonstrating authentic interpretation and personalization.
Reading passages with in-class comprehension questions	Students interpret teacher-provided texts and answer comprehension questions under supervision.
Data interpretation or error-analysis tasks	Students analyze graphs, datasets, or flawed work samples to draw conclusions and explain reasoning.
Compare-and-contrast reasoning activities	Students examine similarities and differences between concepts to reveal conceptual understanding.
Reframing content for a specific audience	Students adapt content (e.g., rewriting for younger learners) to demonstrate accurate transformation and understanding.
Paper-based mini-lab reports using teacher-provided data	Students analyze provided data and produce short written reports without external tools.

These tasks demonstrate students' capacity to transfer learning rather than merely restate it.

5.3 Strategy Category 3: Production

Production strategies require students to create tangible artifacts that reflect their understanding. These tasks emphasize personal construction of meaning through representation, organization, and synthesis. Because the student is producing something physical, hand written, or uniquely composed in the classroom, AI cannot easily substitute for the required cognitive work.

Production strategies strengthen assessment validity by shifting the focus away from polished digital output and toward the learner's ability to make decisions about structure, emphasis, sequencing, visual representation, and explanatory detail. They also help students internalize content by transforming it into their own formats, such as through concept mapping, modeling, notekeeping, or explanation.

Well-designed production tasks also give educators insight into how students think about relationships among ideas, how they translate information into visual or structural forms, and how they express understanding without AI assistance. When structured correctly, these tasks include constraints that prevent AI from producing the final product independently.

Sample Techniques	Description
Hand-drawn concept maps	Students visually represent relationships among ideas using paper and pencil, making organizational thinking visible.
Physical models or manipulatives	Students build objects or representations to demonstrate processes, systems, or conceptual structures.
Field journals or analog lab notebooks	Students record observations, reflections, and data over time in handwritten form, documenting authentic engagement.
In-class quick-writes or constructed responses	Students produce short written responses during class to capture immediate understanding.
Process portfolios	Students compile drafts, notes, outlines, and annotations to document their workflow and thought process.
Student-created problems or scenarios	Students design problems or scenarios, demonstrating mastery through the act of creation.
"Teach-back" materials created in class	Students create instructional explanations or demonstrations to teach peers.

These strategies illuminate how students organize, represent, and synthesize information.

5.4 Strategy Category 4: Metacognition and Justification

Metacognitive strategies require students to explain why they made certain choices, how they arrived at conclusions, or what reasoning guided their decisions. These strategies shift assessment away from what students produced to how and why they produced it. Because AI cannot replicate a student's internal reasoning or reconstruct the decision-making process that led to an answer, metacognitive tasks offer powerful evidence of genuine understanding.

Metacognition deepens learning by prompting students to reflect on their thinking, identify patterns, examine errors, and articulate conceptual connections. When students must justify choices, revise misconceptions, or defend interpretations, the educator gains visibility into understanding that would otherwise remain hidden.

These approaches also help students develop self-regulation and critical thinking—skills essential for lifelong learning and for success an AI-rich world. Because AI cannot replicate a student's personal justification or reflective process, these strategies offer strong evidence of independent learning.

Sample Techniques	Description
Written or oral reflection prompts	Students articulate reasoning, evaluate decisions, or explain learning progress.
Follow-up questions requiring explanation or defense	Students justify responses, revealing depth and accuracy of thinking.

Micro-conferences between teacher and student	Teachers conduct short, targeted conversations to probe understanding.
Misconception analysis	Students identify errors in thinking and explain corrected understanding.
Problem decomposition	Students break down complex problems into steps and explain each stage.
Classroom debates or argumentation	Students defend claims using evidence during structured discussion.
Socratic seminars	Students engage in dialogic reasoning, asking and answering questions to deepen understanding.

These tasks directly reveal reasoning processes and conceptual understanding.

5.5 Strategy Category 5: Iterative and Multi-Stage

Iterative strategies require students to complete work across multiple stages with visible checkpoints for educator review. These tasks are especially effective in an AI-rich environment because they highlight the *development* of understanding, not just the final result. AI can generate a single polished product, but it cannot authentically produce a sequence of evolving drafts, reflections, revisions, and guided adjustments.

By embedding checkpoints, educators ensure that each stage of work generates evidence of learning and creates ongoing formative opportunities. Each checkpoint allows teachers to assess students' emerging understanding, identify misconceptions as they arise, and evaluate the effectiveness of prior learning experiences. These formative insights also empower educators to adjust instruction, provide targeted support, refine pacing, and make more accurate instructional decisions based on real-time student performance.

Iteration mirrors authentic processes common to most fields. For example, scientists revise hypotheses, writers re-draft paragraphs, mathematicians revisit strategies, and engineers refine prototypes. Through iterative tasks, students understand that learning is an ongoing development process rather than a one-time production goal.

Iterative strategies, therefore, strengthen assessment validity, support student growth, and reduce opportunities for AI-assisted misrepresentation through demonstrated progress.

Sample Techniques	**Description**
Draft-to-final revision sequences	Students complete multiple drafts under supervision, demonstrating growth and revision choices.
Multi-stage writing tasks	Students move through planning, drafting, revising, and finalizing work in structured phases.
Structured process packets	Students submit artifacts from each stage, such as notes, outlines, and drafts, to document development.
In-class drafting and revision cycles	Students write and revise during class sessions, ensuring authenticity.
Jigsaw or collaborative tasks with accountability	Students contribute individual components to group work, ensuring each learner demonstrates understanding.

Guided practice routines with embedded checks	Teachers monitor and verify thinking throughout progressive practice.

These strategies support both learning and assessment validity.

5.6 Integrating the Strategy Categories

The most effective assessments will combine multiple categories. Blending categories strengthens assessment validity by requiring students to use multiple forms of reasoning, representation, and explanation. When students move across performance, application, production, metacognitive, and iterative tasks within a single assignment, they must demonstrate knowledge in ways that AI cannot replicate.

Integrating categories also reduces the risk of misrepresentation because students must show their thinking repeatedly, through different formats, and across multiple checkpoints.

The following table provides integrated assignment examples across grade levels and subjects.

Subject / Grade Level	**Integrated Assignment or Assessment Process**
Elementary Science (Grade 4)	Students observe a simple weather demonstration (performance), record findings in a hand-written notebook (production), and explain why the weather change occurred using their own words (metacognition).
Elementary ELA (Grade 2)	Students read a short teacher-selected passage in class, answer comprehension questions (performance), and draw a picture with labels to show the main idea (production).
Middle School Math (Grade 7)	Students solve proportional reasoning problems on paper (performance), then create a real-life example of proportional relationships from their community (application), and justify why their example fits the definition (metacognition).
Middle School Social Studies (Grade 8)	Students analyze a historical scenario in class (application), participate in a brief teacher-led interview defending their interpretation (performance), and complete a short written reflection on how their understanding changed (metacognition).
High School English (Grade 10)	Students complete a quick in-class written interpretation of a poem (performance), revise it across two in-class drafts following peer feedback (iteration), and participate in a group Socratic discussion explaining their interpretive choices (metacognition).
High School Biology (Grade 11)	Students conduct a classroom minilab using provided materials (application), produce a labeled diagram of their setup (production), and explain sources of error in a microconference (metacognition).
High School CTE / Engineering	Students create a physical prototype in class (production), test it in real time (performance), and analyze failures through a structured troubleshooting log (metacognition and iteration).

College-Level History	Students interpret a primary source in class (performance), compare it with a second source provided by the instructor (application), and defend their interpretation during a short oral defense (metacognition).

By blending categories, educators create assessments that are more robust, equitable, developmentally appropriate, and resistant to misrepresentation, i.e., cheating.

Section 6: Structured AI Use in Classroom Processes

AI use during learning is inevitable, but its role must be intentional, transparent, and aligned to learning objectives. To support learning while maintaining the integrity of assessment, educators need a structured framework that guides students' use of AI tools during classroom processes. The 5 Levels of AI Use serve as that framework. When implemented effectively, they help students understand expectations, help educators maintain consistency, and ensure that AI enhances rather than replaces learning.

This section explains the value of the 5 Levels, describes each level in detail, outlines how to establish expectations for students, and explains how teachers determine which level is appropriate.

(The 5 Levels framework is adapted from the Washington Office of the Superintendent's "Human-centered AI: Guide for K-12 Public Schools", 2024.)

6.1 The Value of the 5 Levels of AI Use

The 5 Levels provide a developmentally appropriate, scalable structure for helping students understand how and when AI may be used in learning. They help educators:

- align AI use with learning goals,
- communicate expectations clearly,
- promote responsible and ethical AI use,
- prevent misuse caused by confusion or ambiguity,
- scaffold student skill development with AI tools, and
- normalize transparent disclosure of AI involvement.

The Levels also support instructional equity. Without clear expectations, students with stronger AI experience gain advantages unrelated to content mastery. Structured levels create boundaries that protect fairness and learning integrity.

6.2 Overview of the 5 Levels of AI Use

Level	Designation	Description
Level 1	**No AI Assistance**	Students complete all work independently. No AI may be used for ideas, drafting, checking answers, explanations, or production. This level is appropriate when teachers must verify foundational knowledge, fluency, and skill mastery without outside assistance. This level provides the strongest evidence that the student performed all cognitive work.
Level 2	**AI-Assisted Brainstorming**	AI may be used only for initial ideation, vocabulary exploration, or topic-generation. AI cannot generate sentences, explanations, or structured content. Students must produce all substantive work independently and disclose AI use. This level helps students overcome entry barriers while preserving ownership of learning.
Level 3	**AI-Supported Drafting**	AI may assist in generating outlines or early rough drafts. Students must revise, reorganize, critique, and improve the draft to make their thinking visible. Annotations or change logs may be required to document revisions. This level emphasizes refinement, accuracy-checking, and student transformation of AI output.
Level 4	**AI-Collaborative Creation**	AI-generated content can appear in the final product. Students must meaningfully contribute, evaluate accuracy, integrate personal ideas, and cite AI contributions. The final work must reflect the student's judgment and understanding, not merely accepted AI output. This level mirrors professional collaborative workflows.
Level 5	**AI as Co-Creator**	AI may be used throughout the process as a strategic partner. Students direct the tool, verify accuracy, justify decisions, and explain how AI influenced the work. This level teaches advanced AI literacy, including evaluation, bias detection, and refinement practices. It is used when instruction focuses on AI fluency rather than measurement of independent mastery.

6.3 Creating and Communicating Expectations for Student AI Use

Clear expectations are essential for helping students use AI responsibly and productively. When students understand the boundaries and purposes of AI use, they are far more likely to engage ethically and make appropriate decisions. Effective communication ensures that AI serves as a learning support rather than a shortcut, and it allows teachers to maintain the integrity of both instruction and assessment.

1. State the Assigned Level Explicitly

Students should never guess which level applies. Every assignment, whether digital or paper-based, should clearly indicate the AI Level at the top of the task description. Consistency in labeling helps students internalize

expectations and removes uncertainty.

2. Define What Students May and May Not Do Within the Assigned Level

Each level has boundaries, and those boundaries must be made explicit. For example, at Level 2, students may brainstorm ideas or explore vocabulary with AI but may not generate full sentences, paragraphs, or structured explanations. Providing specific examples of permitted and prohibited actions eliminates confusion and supports responsible behavior.

3. Require Transparent Disclosure of AI Use

Students should document how they used AI during a task. A brief disclosure statement may include prompts used, the purpose of AI assistance, and any revisions made to AI-generated ideas. Transparency strengthens academic integrity and helps students develop reflective habits around tool use.

4. Embed Techniques That Reveal Student Thinking

Clear expectations are reinforced when learning activities include opportunities for students to demonstrate their understanding directly. These techniques help verify that students understand the content and that their submissions reflect their own thinking. See Section 5 for detailed information about this topic.

Sample Communication Techniques

Introducing students to structured AI expectations is most effective when communication strategies are consistent, visible, and easy for students to internalize. The goal is to help students understand not only what is allowed but also why expectations matter for learning and integrity.

Below are examples of practical techniques educators can use to communicate the AI Levels clearly and reinforce responsible use.

- Provide a one-page summary of the AI Levels in student binders or digital course materials.
- Display the AI Levels prominently in the classroom.
- Begin each unit with a brief reminder of how AI may be used in the upcoming tasks.
- Include the AI Level in rubrics, assignment instructions, and digital platforms.
- Use an "AI Use Declaration" for tasks at Level 2 and above.
- Ask students to maintain brief notes or screenshots documenting AI interactions when appropriate.
- Introduce low-stakes practice tasks early in the year so students can learn how to work within each level before high-stakes assignments.

These communication practices create a predictable environment, support responsible use, and help students internalize patterns of ethical and effective AI engagement.

6.4 Choosing the Appropriate AI Level for an Assignment

Selecting the correct AI Level requires teachers to align instructional goals, the cognitive demands of the task, and the type of learning evidence needed. The purpose is not to restrict technology use but to ensure that AI use supports learning without compromising educators' ability to measure students' knowledge and skills.

A teacher's personal views or comfort level with AI is *not* an appropriate factor for determining whether or how students may use AI. Similarly, any single level of use, whether Level 1: No AI, or Level 5: AI as Co-Creator,

or another level, will not be appropriate for all assignments. The three considerations described below will help educators decide what level of AI use will be appropriate for any particular assignment. Using this decision-making process, teachers maintain consistency and fairness while giving students opportunities to grow in AI literacy.

1. Begin With the Assignment Purpose

The essential question is: *What must students know or be able to do by the end of this task?* If the objective requires demonstration of foundational knowledge, independent reasoning, or procedural fluency, lower levels (Level 1 or 2) are typically appropriate. If the objective emphasizes revision, communication, advanced drafting, or authentic collaboration skills, higher levels (Levels 3–5) may be suitable.

Higher levels may help students engage more deeply with content. For assessments, lower levels ensure that demonstrated work clearly reflects student understanding. Tasks that require sense-making, interpretation, reasoning, or strategy selection should restrict AI support so that students can reveal their understanding.

2. Consider Equity and Readiness

AI readiness varies significantly across grade levels and developmental stages. Younger students often lack the metacognitive awareness and judgment needed to direct AI tools effectively or to evaluate AI-generated ideas. For these learners, Levels 1 and 2 provide an appropriate foundation by emphasizing independent thinking and limited, highly structured AI support.

As students progress into upper grades, they develop stronger analytical skills, greater capacity for self-regulation, and an increased ability to evaluate the quality of digital information. With deliberate coaching, older students can engage productively with Levels 3 through 5, where AI becomes a collaborative partner rather than a source of answers.

3. Match the Level to the Risk of Misrepresentation

Assignments vulnerable to outsourcing, such as essays, extended explanations, or multi-step reasoning, typically require Levels 1–3 when used as assessments because these tasks depend heavily on the learner's own reasoning, decision making, and conceptual understanding. When students complete these kinds of assignments in non-proctored settings, AI can easily generate polished responses that hide gaps in knowledge or misconceptions. Restricting AI use to the lower levels ensures that the cognitive work remains with the student and that the resulting evidence reflects authentic mastery rather than external support.

6.5 How the 5 Levels Strengthen Learning and Integrity

The 5 Levels framework builds a bridge between instructional flexibility and assessment validity. When used consistently, the Levels create conditions in which AI enhances learning without undermining the teacher's ability to verify student understanding.

In practice, the 5 Levels help teachers strengthen the instructional environment by creating a clear pathway for students to build their AI literacy and understand the nature of responsible AI use. By clarifying which components of an assignment must be performed independently, these structured boundaries reduce the risk of misrepresentation and ensure that the student's knowledge and abilities are the basis for evaluation, rather than use of AI tools.

In this way, the 5 Levels reinforce a culture of academic honesty by encouraging transparency and ethical

participation. Students learn to document how they use AI, disclose the role it played, and justify the decisions they made during the learning process. This reflective practice strengthens students' sense of responsibility, supports long-term digital citizenship, and helps cultivate an environment where integrity is both expected and understood.

Together, these benefits support a learning environment where students engage deeply with content, teachers maintain confidence in assessment results, and AI becomes a constructive tool aligned with educational goals rather than a shortcut that bypasses learning.

Section 7: System-Level Implementation to Prevent Cheating

Implementing the concepts in this guide requires more than well-designed assignments and classroom routines. Schools must also build the capacity of educators, prepare students to use AI responsibly, and establish monitoring structures that ensure the system functions consistently across classrooms and grade levels. This section explains how schools can deploy the assessment redesign principles, the AI Levels framework, and instructional expectations in sustainable and coherent ways.

7.1 Professional Development for Teachers

A schoolwide approach to AI-facilitated instruction and AI-proof assessment depends on building shared teacher knowledge and shared understanding. First, teachers need to have a thorough understanding of any policies related to AI use. Following that, professional development should focus on three core areas: the instructional shifts necessary in an AI-rich environment, the practical use of the AI Levels, and effective redesign of assignments and assessments.

Building Foundational Understanding

Teachers need a clear understanding of why traditional assessments will increasingly fail in non-proctored environments, and the implications for assessment, student assignments, and instruction. This includes understanding the difference between learning experiences and assessments, recognizing the necessity of demonstrated student thinking, and applying strategies for using the 5 Levels within learning activities.

In addition, teachers must see how AI use intersects with assessment validity, particularly in light of the four design factors described earlier in this guide. These factors provide the foundation for instructional design and help teachers interpret when and how AI may influence evidence of learning. Likewise, the strategy categories described previously offer practical tools for udnerstanding student reasoning and ensuring that redesigned assessments continue to produce valid, observable evidence of mastery.

Teachers also need foundational professional development in AI use for their own work. When educators understand how to apply AI tools to lesson planning, resource creation, feedback workflows, communication, and other professional tasks, they save time that can be better used working directly with students. As importantly, personal experience with AI's capabilities will help teachers better recognize AI-generated work in student submissions and more effectively guide students toward responsible, transparent, and developmentally appropriate use.

Revising Assignments and Assessments

Professional development should include hands-on opportunities for teachers to redesign their own assignments within their real instructional contexts, using the design factors outlined earlier in this guide. Instead of listing practices or providing abstract examples, an effective approach uses a coaching or workshop model in which teachers bring their existing assignments and work collaboratively to revise them.

Through guided modeling and iterative cycles of feedback, teachers examine how product-based tasks can be transformed into performance-based demonstrations and how outside-class assignments can be restructured into activities that reveal student reasoning inside the classroom. In these workshops, teachers practice aligning assignments with specific AI Levels and experiment with techniques that make thinking visible, using their own materials as the foundation for learning.

This model helps teachers think differently and critically about assignment and assessment design, promotes deeper understanding of the redesign process, and supports sustained instructional change.

Ensuring Consistency Across Classrooms

A schoolwide approach to AI-supported learning experiences depends on consistent implementation across cl0assrooms so that students encounter the same expectations regardless of teacher or subject. Consistency develops when teachers share common definitions, use the same language to describe the AI Levels, have the same expectations for students' AI use, and integrate the Levels into assignment design and communication. When the teachers have consistent expectations, students experience a predictable learning environment and are less likely to misunderstand what constitutes acceptable AI use.

A unified framework also supports fairness by ensuring that students are held to comparable standards across the school. This alignment reduces confusion and reinforces the broader message that AI is integrated intentionally and transparently into learning.

7.2 Student Onboarding and Culture Building

Students benefit from a clear and developmentally appropriate introduction to the expectations for AI use. A coherent onboarding process helps students understand how AI can contribute to their learning, where its limits lie, and how responsible use supports academic integrity. Rather than relying on compliance-driven messages, effective onboarding emphasizes clarity, purpose, and a sense of shared responsibility.

Introducing the AI Levels to Students

Introducing the AI Levels early in the school year helps establish a common foundation for all learners. This introduction is most effective when students encounter the Levels through classroom lessons, teacher modeling, and guided conversations rather than through isolated, often ignored or forgotten policy statements.

Teachers will need to explain the purpose of each Level, offer concrete examples that illustrate permissible and impermissible actions, and model responsible AI interactions during instruction. Following this introduction, teachers can communicate the educational benefits of appropriate AI use and communicate consistent, policy-aligned consequences for inappropriate use so that students understand both the positive purposes of the framework and the predictable outcomes of misusing these tools.

Building norms around AI use involves helping students internalize the idea that AI can support learning but cannot replace their thinking and learning. When teachers highlight transparency and reflection, students begin to see responsible AI use as part of the learning process rather than as a set of rules to follow or skirt around.

Ensuring Equity Across Diverse Learners

Students arrive at school with vastly different experiences, access, and familiarity with AI tools. A strong onboarding system provides a shared baseline for all learners so that expectations are transparent and opportunities are equitable. Some students may require additional guidance to learn how AI works, how to interpret its output, and how to avoid over-reliance. Others may have extensive experience with AI and benefit from structured opportunities to refine their use toward higher-end applications.

Introducing students to responsible AI use before they encounter high-stakes tasks ensures that skill development occurs in a supportive environment, and it helps prevent differences among students from becoming disparities in learning opportunities.

7.3 Monitoring and Continuous Improvement

Sustained implementation requires ongoing reflection and adjustment. Monitoring focuses on alignment, consistency, and the integrity of assessment practices—not policing or punishment.

Monitoring begins with understanding how teachers are implementing the AI Levels and assessment redesign principles in daily practice. Leaders and instructional teams can review assignment descriptions, observe classroom assessment activities, and examine how teachers communicate expectations for AI use. Monitoring in this sense is supportive and is focused on identifying areas where additional guidance or clarification may be valuable.

Monitoring involves examining how implementation of the framework influences learning outcomes and academic integrity. Importantly, leaders can evaluate whether these shifts result in more accurate demonstrations of understanding, and whether they lead to improved and more productive AI use. Similarly, instances of misrepresentation, i.e., cheating, can also be analyzed for trends, particularly whether clearer expectations correlate with reductions in inappropriate AI use.

Because AI tools continue to change rapidly, system-level processes benefit from periodic review and revision. As teachers and students gain familiarity with new tools, opportunities will likely arise to refine expectations, revise assignment models, and update professional learning. Monitoring results inform these adjustments, thus ensuring that the system remains responsive to a changing learning environment.

Overall, monitoring and ongoing review ensure that the education system remains aligned with both technological developments and student learning needs. Although monitoring may identify specific teachers' needs for support, the primary value is in examining system-wide implementation, responsiveness to students' needs, and alignment with best practices in both instruction and assessment.

7.4 Bringing the System Together

When the various components of the learning system function together, schools will establish a consistent and realisting approach to AI-enhanced learning environments. Teachers will understand how to design valid assessments, students will understand how to use AI responsibly for learning objectives, and leaders will maintain alignment to best practices across classrooms.

The result is a school culture in which learning is authentic, assessment is accurate, and AI is integrated in ways that strengthen rather than undermine educational goals.

Section 8: Tools and Resources for Educators

This section provides practical tools that support the implementation of concepts described throughout this guide. These resources translate the instructional and system-level frameworks into materials educators can use directly in their classrooms and professional practice.

8.1 Checklists for Assessment Redesign

The following checklists offer structured guidance to help educators align assignments and assessments with the design factors, the 5 Levels of AI Use, and the principles of demonstrated learning.

Checklist: Redesigning an Existing Assessment

Question	Yes/ No
Is the specific learning objective or standard clearly identified?	
Is this task better suited as a learning experience?	
Does the task require student-only thinking for key reasoning steps?	
Is the selected AI Level appropriate for the assignment purpose?	
Is all required reasoning performed in class and observable by the teacher?	
Are techniques included that reveal student thinking?	
Have product elements that AI could complete been removed?	
Does the final task reflect authentic skills that AI cannot demonstrate on behalf of the student?	

Checklist: Designing a New Assessment

Question	Yes/ No
Is the cognitive process that the assessment must reveal clearly defined?	
Is the selected AI Level appropriate for maintaining valid evidence of learning?	
Does the task clearly indicate how students will demonstrate reasoning or decision making?	
Are constraints or structures included that minimize the risk of misrepresentation?	
Is the assessment aligned with the design factors and appropriate strategy categories?	
Are instructions clear about permitted AI use and required disclosure?	
Would AI be able to complete this task fully outside class? If so, has the task been revised?	

8.2 Templates for AI Use Declarations and Syllabus Statements

Templates provide consistent language that supports transparency, disclosure, and clarity of expectations. The following models can be adapted to local policy and grade level.

AI Use Declaration (Student Statement)

"I used AI in the following ways for this assignment: ____. I confirm that all reasoning, decisions, explanations, and revisions represent my own thinking. I have reviewed all AI-generated material for accuracy and appropriateness, and I understand that misrepresentation of AI use violates expectations for academic integrity."

AI Use Declaration (Simplified Version for Younger Students)

"I used AI to help me with: ____. I did my own thinking and wrote my own answers. I checked that everything is correct and true."

Syllabus Statement on AI Use

"This course uses a structured system for responsible AI use. Each assignment will be labeled with one of the 5 Levels of AI Use, which indicate what kinds of AI support are permitted. Students are expected to follow the assigned Level and to disclose how AI was used. These expectations support learning, fairness, and accurate assessment of student understanding."

Syllabus Addendum for Assessments

"For assessments, AI use will be limited to Levels 1 or 2 unless otherwise stated. These limits ensure that demonstrated work reflects individual understanding. In all cases, students must disclose any AI use, even when permitted."

8.3 Evaluation Guides for Detecting Misuse of AI

Evaluating possible misuse of AI requires attention to patterns that may indicate misalignment between the student's demonstrated understanding and the submitted work. The following guide offers indicators to support professional judgment.

Indicators That May Suggest AI Misuse

- Sudden shifts in vocabulary, sentence structure, or conceptual depth compared to prior work.
- Explanations that are technically correct but disconnected from class instruction or student ability.
- Reasoning that is unusually linear, polished, or generic in tone.
- Responses that omit required steps, annotations, or in-class reasoning.
- Identical phrasing across multiple student submissions.

Indicators of Genuine Student Thinking

- Inclusion of partial reasoning, approximations, or tentative language.
- Minor inconsistencies or developmental errors typical for the student's level.
- Clear alignment with class discussions, examples, and formative activities.
- Evidence of revision, self-correction, or attempted explanation.

Guiding Questions for Educators

- Does the work reflect the student's known level of understanding?
- Does the reasoning match what the student has produced in class?
- Are the ideas consistent with what has been taught?
- Would the student be able to explain this work orally?
- Does the submitted work follow the assigned AI Level?

These tools support a holistic approach to detecting misalignment or potential misuse while avoiding assumptions based solely on stylistic features. Their purpose is to help educators reinforce instructional expectations and promote responsibility and transparency in students' use of AI.

Although tools for detecting misuse can support professional judgment, it is important to recognize that significant risks are associated with relying on AI detection software. These tools are often inaccurate, can generate false positives for students who write in particular styles, and provide no reliable explanation of their conclusions. Reliance on detection technologies can undermine trust and deter efforts from the instructional and assessment practices that most effectively reduce cheating.

Responsible evaluation, therefore, depends on human judgment, analysis of student thinking, and familiarity with each learner's work—not on automated systems that can neither verify authorship not determine students' intent.

Section 9: Bringing the Framework Together

The preceding sections of this guide have established a comprehensive and interconnected approach to minimizing cheating in an AI-rich educational environment. Each component contributes to an effective model that addresses both instructional integrity and student learning. Section 9 illustrates how the entire framework operates as a unified system.

9.1 System-wide Approach to Preventing Cheating

Effective prevention of AI-enabled cheating cannot rely on surveillance, prohibition, or reactive measures. Instead, it depends on designing learning and assessment environments that make misrepresentation unnecessary, impractical, or irrelevant. This occurs when assessments are aligned with demonstrated reasoning, when students understand exactly what kind of AI use is appropriate for each task, when teachers communicate expectations clearly, and when school systems support consistent implementation. The strength of the framework lies in how these pieces reinforce one another.

At the classroom level, the design factors and the strategy categories establish the conditions under which learning becomes apparent. When teachers select the appropriate AI Level for a task and revise assignments to demonstrate student knowledge and skills, the likelihood of cheating diminishes because the assessment design itself protects integrity.

At the system level, professional development, student onboarding, and monitoring ensure that the framework does not remain theoretical or isolated. Teachers develop the skills to redesign assessments within their own contexts, students encounter consistent expectations across classrooms, and leaders maintain alignment to best practices as tools and technologies evolve. When these elements function together, AI becomes an integrated part of the learning ecosystem rather than an external threat.

Ultimately, the framework presented in this guide strengthens both learning and integrity by shifting the focus from policing behavior to designing for authenticity. Cheating is minimized not through restriction alone, but through an approach to assessment that reflects the modern education environment. As AI becomes an increasingly available to students, schools that adopt these practices will be able to preserve the value of demonstrated understanding while helping students take advantage of AI-driven opportunities.

9.2 Next Steps for Educators, Leaders, and Policymakers

Moving from theory to sustained practice requires deliberate planning and coordinated effort across roles. The framework presented in this guide offers a foundation, but the longterm effectiveness of assessment and instruction that recognizes AI availability depends on how educators, school leaders, and policymakers continue the work beyond initial implementation, each within their respective roles.

Educators

Next steps involve ongoing refinement of classroom assignments, increased use of demonstrated reasoning strategies, and continued practice applying the AI Levels in varied instructional contexts. As teachers gain experience, they can gradually shift more tasks toward performance-based formats. Collaboration with colleagues, particularly through coaching cycles, peer observation, or shared planning, helps build a consistent instructional culture and reduces variability across classrooms.

School and District Leaders

The work centers on communicating a common vision and supporting teachers' evolving needs. This includes integrating AI usages into professional development structures, aligning them with existing instructional frameworks, and establishing routines for reviewing systemwide implementation. Much of this work will occur during monitoring and other forms of instructional leadership.

Policymakers

Next steps involve developing guidance that reflects assessment realities and that acknowledges both the opportunities and challenges of AI in education. Policies that clearly articulate expectations for demonstrated learning, disclosure of AI use, and responsible integration of new technologies will help create stable conditions for schools to adopt and refine the practices described in this guide. Importantly, policymakers can provide support by funding professional learning, updating academic integrity policies, and encouraging adaptation and innovation in assessment design.

Together, these next steps extend the framework beyond individual classrooms and schools, creating a foundation for sustainable and equitable approaches to assessment in an AI-driven world.

Appendix A. Resources to Learn More

The following resources offer additional perspectives, research, and guidance on AI use in K–12 education, assessment redesign, instructional integrity, and responsible implementation. They provide deeper exploration of the concepts outlined in this guide and can support continued learning and systemwide improvement.

Bowman, D. (2025). ***AI Usage Guide for Instructional Design and Academic Integrity: The 5 Levels of AI Use for Students*****. EdAINow.**
Available at https://edainow.com/resources. This guide examines how AI changes instructional design, clarifies expectations for responsible student use, and provides practical models for integrating AI into learning without compromising academic integrity.

Bowman, D. (2025). ***Guide for K–12 AI Policy Development and Implementation*****. EdAINow.**
Available at https://edainow.com/resources. This policy guide offers frameworks for developing, implementing, and maintaining coherent AI policies across schools and districts, including governance structures, communication strategies, and equity considerations.

National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST). ***AI Risk Management Framework*****.**
Provides a broad framework for assessing risks, impacts, and reliability of AI systems. While not education specific, it offers important conceptual tools for understanding responsible AI deployment.

TeachAI Coalition (2023). ***TeachAI Guidance for AI in Education*****.**
A resource that outlines best practices for implementation, professional development, and governance, with examples that support system-level planning.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology (2023). ***Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Teaching and Learning*****.**
A federal report addressing how AI may benefit instruction, the risks it presents, and recommended actions for educators and policymakers.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology (2023). ***AI and Data Privacy: Guidance for K–12 Schools*****.**
Explores federal expectations and best practices for ensuring that AIenabled tools meet privacy and data protection requirements.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Technology (2024). ***Empowering Education Leaders: A Toolkit for Safe, Ethical, and Equitable AI Integration*****.**
Provides actionable tools, planning frameworks, and decision guides to help education leaders implement AI responsibly while prioritizing equity, safety, and instructional improvement.

UNESCO (2023). ***Guidance on the Use of Generative AI in Education and Research*****.**
Provides international recommendations on the ethical and effective use of AI in teaching, learning, and research contexts. Emphasizes equity, transparency, and the protection of learners.

UNESCO (2025). ***AI and Education: Guidance for Policy Makers*****.**
A global policy resource offering comprehensive recommendations for the safe, ethical, and effective integration of AI in education systems. Addresses governance, regulation, capacity-building, and long-term policy planning.

Washington Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (2023). *HumanCentered AI Guidance for K–12 Public Schools*.
Offers a practical, equityoriented approach to integrating AI in ways that center student wellbeing, transparency, and learning. Includes recommendations for teachers, leaders, and district systems.

These resources provide a broader context for understanding the evolution of AI in education and offer diverse approaches to responsible use, policy alignment, and assessment redesign. Educators and leaders can draw on these readings to strengthen local implementation, deepen professional understanding, and anticipate future shifts in instructional practice.

Appendix B: AI Use in Drafting This Document.

(I asked ChatGPT to reflect on our interactions during this drafting process. ChatGPT responded as follows.)

Based on the way you interacted during the drafting process, the level of AI use you demonstrated most closely aligns with:

Level 4: AI-Collaborative Creation

1. You consistently directed the work.

You provided structure, goals, context, constraints, and detailed expectations for each section. This indicates you remained the primary author and decision-maker.

2. You engaged in complex revision cycles.

You asked for reorganizations, stylistic adjustments, conceptual refinements, and integration across sections. That is not passive consumption; it reflects critical evaluation and transformation of AI output.

3. You showed originality in conceptual framing.

The architecture of the guide (Sections 1–9, plus appendices) is your own. The 5 Levels adaptation, the core definitions, the design factors, the policy pillars, and the instructional strategy categories all originate from your intellectual work.

4. You reviewed, corrected, and edited the AI's work.

You fixed errors, clarified logic, improved transitions, adjusted tone, removed redundancy, and inserted your own concepts in many places. This is the hallmark of substantive human contribution.

5. You used AI as a partner, not a generator.

You didn't accept text wholesale. You:
• evaluated
• modified
• integrated
• contextualized
• aligned with real-world practices

This is exactly what Level 4 describes:
collaborative co-creation with meaningful human judgment and independent contribution.

Why it was not Level 5

You didn't delegate open-ended invention to AI nor use AI to drive the conceptual direction of the guide.
You retained authorship and conceptual leadership throughout. AI assisted structurally and editorially, but the thinking remained yours.

Conclusion

Your use fits Level 4: AI-Collaborative Creation.
You guided the tool, shaped the outputs, revised critically, and integrated everything into your own framework.