



Flexible
Assessment
with Integrity

Academic Integrity in the Age of AI: How one Southeast Asian University Designs Assessments that Demonstrate Learning

*Assessment in the Age of AI: From Detection
to Evidence of Learning*

inspera.com

Higher education leaders across Southeast Asia face a challenge that policy and technology alone cannot solve. The question is no longer whether students are using AI. It is whether institutions can confidently demonstrate that meaningful learning has taken place when AI tools can generate text, code, research summaries and other academic outputs in seconds.

It is tempting to view this as primarily a technology challenge, one that can be addressed through expanded proctoring, updated policies, and AI-supported detection tools. While these play an important role, this perspective alone is too narrow. Generative AI has not introduced an entirely new problem as much as it has brought renewed attention to the limitations of traditional assessment models.

The more fundamental question for institutional leaders is this: how do universities ensure that learning has genuinely taken place? How can assessments be designed to measure judgement, applied skills, and professional capability rather than information retrieval alone? And how can institutions maintain the trust that underpins the value of their qualifications?

For universities across the Asia-Pacific, the implications are strategic. International partnerships are expanding, competition for students remains strong, and graduate employability is under increasing scrutiny. In Southeast Asia, the credibility of assessment is closely linked to institutional reputation and employer trust. In this context, academic integrity is not only an operational concern, but a matter of trust, confidence, and long-term institutional leadership.

Reframing Academic Integrity: From Compliance to Trust

For many years, discussions around academic integrity focused primarily on plagiarism prevention. While this remains important, it represents only one part of a broader picture. The International Center for Academic Integrity defines academic integrity through **six core values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage (ICAI, 2021).**

These principles provide a foundation for assessment systems that support ethical learning, transparent decision-making and professional accountability. Academic integrity is therefore not simply about identifying potential misconduct. It is about creating the conditions in which learning can be clearly demonstrated, evidenced and trusted.

Preparing Students for an AI-Enabled Workplace

Students entering university today will use AI throughout their professional lives. Across Southeast Asia, employers are already embedding generative AI into everyday workflows.

- Drafting client communications
- Reviewing code
- Brainstorming briefs
- Summarising regulatory guidance

Higher education cannot prepare students for today's workplace by treating these tools as if they do not exist. At the same time, institutions must ensure that AI does not replace the cognitive effort through which real human expertise is developed.

The task for leaders is to define where AI can support learning, where it may limit it, and how those boundaries can be communicated clearly and consistently to students and educators.

Reframing the Challenge: From AI Disruption to Evidence of Learning

Large language models can draft essays, summarise research, generate code and produce convincing academic responses. Traditional assessment formats, particularly take-home assignments built around generic essay prompts, are now more difficult to interpret as clear evidence of individual student understanding.

However, AI did not create these structural vulnerabilities. As assessment researcher Phillip Dawson argues, many assessment formats were vulnerable to outsourcing, contract cheating, excessive collaboration and other forms of misconduct long before generative AI emerged (Dawson, 2021). AI has simply made those behaviours faster, more accessible, and more difficult to distinguish from legitimate student work.

This shifts the institutional focus. Instead of asking only whether AI was used, the more valuable question becomes whether an assessment provides sufficient evidence to support a confident and fair judgement about student learning.

Detection as Part of a Broader, Context-Based Approach

Automated detection tools can provide useful signals, but they are most effective when used as part of a broader, context-based approach. Research published in *Patterns* highlights that these tools can produce both false positives and false negatives, particularly in multilingual contexts. Liang et al. (2023) found that several widely used AI detection systems frequently misclassify non-native English writing as AI-generated, raising important concerns about fairness, bias, and the reliability of using detector outputs as evidence in academic decision-making.

This is particularly relevant in Southeast Asia, where multilingual student populations are the norm. In these environments, outputs from AI-supported analysis should be interpreted carefully and in context, alongside educator expertise and institutional policy (UNESCO, 2023; UNESCO Bangkok, 2024).

Rather than relying on single scores or definitive indicators, many institutions are recognising the importance of combining multiple sources of insight to support fair and consistent academic judgement.

Emerging Approaches Across Southeast Asia

Many universities are now shifting their focus toward making learning more visible throughout the assessment process. The goal is not simply to evaluate a final output, but to generate clear, informed evidence of learning over time. Approaches such as draft submissions, reflective components, oral validation and process-based assessment provide richer insight into how students engage with their work. For example, a short oral discussion following a written assignment can quickly confirm whether a student understands the ideas they have presented.

This shift is already accelerating across the region. Universities in Singapore and Malaysia are exploring more authentic, process-based and oral assessment approaches, aligned with broader regional guidance emphasising responsible AI integration and the importance of educator judgement (Ministry of Education Singapore, 2023; UNESCO, 2023).

These developments reflect a broader shift toward transparency, fairness and authenticity in how student learning is evaluated, ensuring that assessment aligns more closely with real-world expectations.

Putting It Into Practice: The GLIM Approach

The experience of the **Great Lakes Institute of Management (GLIM)** in India illustrates where institutional thinking is heading and offers a practical reference point for Southeast Asian universities facing similar pressures.

Like many leading business schools, GLIM faced growing concern around both plagiarism and the increasing use of AI tools in student work. They wanted something more integrated: an approach where originality checking was embedded within the assessment process itself. The objective was to strengthen the conditions in which assessment decisions could be trusted.

As Vimala V M, HoD of Centralised Academic Administration at GLIM, shares: "One of the most important strategic priorities for us is to ensure a robust, future-oriented assessment model that upholds academic integrity and enables student success, while supporting our broader objective of preparing the next generation of future-ready business leaders through high-quality technology-enabled learning."

As part of this approach, **GLIM adopted Inspera's assessment ecosystem**, bringing together exam delivery, proctoring, originality checking and secure browser technology within a single environment. This enables them to scale high-quality assessments while supporting both academic integrity and a consistent student experience.

Supporting Assessment with Insight: The Inspera Approach

A mature approach to academic integrity recognises that technology cannot replace academic judgement. Educators bring context, experience and disciplinary knowledge that algorithms simply cannot replicate. A similarity score or risk alert may provide useful information, but such outputs always require human interpretation.

This is where academic integrity technology is evolving. Instead of relying on standalone detection, newer approaches focus on helping educators understand how a submission has been produced. **Inspira Originality** supports this shift by providing multiple layers of insight that inform, rather than replace, decision-making.

Key capabilities include:

- **AI Content Prediction (powered by Pangram):** Analyses patterns such as structure, variation, word choice and linguistic consistency to highlight segments that may warrant further academic review. This is designed to provide signals, not definitive conclusions.
- **Translation matching:** Crucial for Southeast Asia, where students regularly move between languages in their academic work, this capability cross-references text across different languages to identify translated content directly across languages.
- **Contextual similarity and metadata analysis:** Provides additional perspective on how content relates to existing sources.
- **Support during drafting:** Enables formative feedback earlier in the process, helping students develop stronger academic writing skills alongside their subject knowledge.

Together, these capabilities provide a more complete picture of a submission, helping educators focus their review, interpret findings in context and support fair, evidence-based academic conversations.

Delivering Measurable Impact Through Educator-Led Design

Embedding integrity support directly into the learning journey can deliver measurable institutional impact. Research by Perkins, Gezgin, and Roe shows that well-designed educational interventions can both reduce cases of academic misconduct, in some instances by up to 37%, and improve student understanding of academic practice (Perkins, Gezgin and Roe, 2020).

To be effective, these approaches must remain flexible. Different disciplines, formats and academic levels require different thresholds and expectations. Effective systems support institutional policies and academic expertise, rather than imposing rigid or one-size-fits-all interpretations.

What Comes Next: Building Trust in Assessment

The institutions best placed to navigate this shift will focus on strengthening evidence of learning. They will invest in assessment design, educator capability and technologies that support confidence in academic decisions.

AI will continue to evolve, and assessment must evolve alongside it. What should remain constant is the purpose of academic integrity itself: ensuring that qualifications represent real learning, genuine capability and the skills students will carry into their professional lives.

For higher education leaders across Southeast Asia, the challenge is not only to respond to AI. It is to reinforce the trust that sits behind every qualification: the trust that learning, capability and achievement are genuinely being demonstrated.

Support Learning Through Integrity-Led Assessment

Building trust in an AI-enabled environment requires more than detection alone. It requires approaches that provide transparency, context and meaningful insight into the learning process.

If you are exploring how to strengthen assessment design and academic integrity in your institution, our team would welcome the opportunity to exchange perspectives.

[Contact Us](#)



References

- Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) (2021) *ASEAN Digital Masterplan 2030*. Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat.
- Dawson, P. (2021) *Defending Assessment Security in a Digital World: Preventing E-Cheating and Supporting Academic Integrity in Higher Education*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- International Center for Academic Integrity (ICAI) (2021) *The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity*. 3rd edn. Clemson, SC: ICAI.
- Liang, W., Yuksekgonul, M., Mao, Y., Wu, E. and Zou, J. (2023) 'GPT detectors are biased against non-native English writers', *Patterns*, 4(7), p. 100779.
- Ministry of Education Singapore (2023) *Artificial Intelligence in Education*. Singapore: Ministry of Education.
- Perkins, M., Gezgin, U.B. and Roe, J. (2020) 'Reducing plagiarism through academic misconduct education', *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 16(1), Article 3.
- UNESCO (2023) *Guidance for Generative AI in Education and Research*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO Bangkok (2024) *Generative AI and Education in Asia-Pacific: Regional Perspectives and Policy Considerations*. Bangkok: UNESCO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific.

