

AI Literacy Is Not Enough: Faculty Strategies for Teaching Students to Evaluate AI-Supported Information

Monica Sava, PhD | Empire State University

Contact: monica.sava@sunyempire.edu

Abstract

Generative artificial intelligence has moved quickly into higher education, and faculty are now making instructional decisions in real time. Many early conversations have focused on course policies, academic integrity, and acceptable use. Those conversations matter, but they do not fully address the teaching challenge faculty face. Students may know how to use AI tools to brainstorm, summarize, draft, organize, or study, but they may not know how to judge the quality of the information those tools produce. This article argues that faculty need practical, teachable strategies for helping students evaluate AI-supported information before they rely on it in academic work. The focus is on helping students question claims, verify sources, examine evidence, recognize uncertainty, and notice weak or misleading data-based conclusions. Rather than treating AI only as a compliance issue, faculty can use this moment to strengthen critical thinking, information literacy, evidence evaluation, statistical reasoning, and responsible academic judgment. The article offers practical strategies that can be adapted across disciplines, course levels, and instructional formats.

Keywords: generative artificial intelligence; AI literacy; faculty development; educational technology; evidence literacy; student learning

Introduction/Background

Generative artificial intelligence has become part of everyday academic life faster than many faculty expected. Recent reviews describe generative AI as reshaping higher education pedagogy, curriculum, assessment, and student learning contexts (Liang et al., 2025; Qian, 2025; Xia et al., 2024). Students now use AI tools to brainstorm ideas, summarize readings, organize assignments, draft explanations, prepare study questions, and receive feedback. Used thoughtfully, these tools can support learning. Used casually, they can also create problems when students accept AI-supported information without asking whether it is accurate, supported, current, fair, or appropriate for the assignment.

Much of the early discussion in higher education has centered on policy. Faculty have had to decide whether AI is allowed, how students should disclose its use, and what counts as academic misconduct. Those questions are necessary, but they are not enough. AI literacy involves more than knowing how to operate a tool. It also includes critical awareness, responsible use, and the ability to judge AI-supported information (Cox, 2024). Recent work on student and faculty perceptions of generative AI also points to the need for critical thinking and data literacy when students cannot easily judge whether AI output is correct (Damiano et al., 2024). UNESCO's guidance on generative AI in education also emphasizes human-centered, responsible, and educationally grounded use of these technologies (Miao & Holmes, 2023).

The distinction matters because AI-supported responses can sound fluent, confident, and organized even when the information is incomplete, biased, outdated, unsupported, or statistically weak. Students can easily make mistakes in polished language and still sound confident. They may also assume that a response is useful because it sounds clear. Faculty therefore need practical teaching strategies that help students slow down, question claims, check evidence, verify sources, and think carefully before using AI-supported information in their own work.

This article argues that faculty development around AI should move beyond basic tool awareness and policy language. Instructors need simple, repeatable strategies that can be used across courses and disciplines to help students evaluate AI-supported information. The goal is not to discourage all AI use. The goal is to help students use AI with stronger academic judgment.

Literature Review

Why AI Policies Are Not Enough

AI policies are necessary, but they are not the same as instruction. A policy can explain whether students may use AI, how they should disclose that use, and what kinds of support are acceptable in a course. Clear expectations help protect academic integrity and give students needed boundaries. Still, a policy does not automatically teach students how to judge the quality of AI-supported information.

This is where many faculty now face a practical teaching problem. A student may follow the stated policy and still use AI-supported information poorly. One student may use AI for

brainstorming and accept an inaccurate explanation without checking it. Another may use AI to summarize a source and miss the context that was left out. Another may use AI to draft an argument and never notice that the claims are unsupported. In each case, the issue is not only whether the student used AI. The deeper issue is whether the student evaluated the information before relying on it.

Generative AI can make weak information look strong. A response may be well organized, grammatically correct, and confident in tone. To a student who is still developing academic confidence, that response may seem trustworthy. The problem is that fluency is not the same as accuracy. Clarity is not the same as evidence. A polished paragraph can still be incomplete, biased, outdated, or unsupported.

Faculty therefore need to move beyond policy language and create learning experiences that help students practice evaluation. Students need opportunities to ask what claim is being made, what evidence supports it, whether the source can be verified, what uncertainty is present, and whether the information fits the purpose of the assignment. This approach is consistent with guidance that AI in education should preserve human judgment, transparency, and responsible decision-making (Miao & Holmes, 2023).

A stronger approach treats AI as both a technology issue and a teaching issue. Students still need clear expectations, but they also need guided practice in using AI responsibly. When faculty combine policy with instruction, students are more likely to understand that AI-supported information should be questioned, checked, and revised before it becomes part of academic work.

The Faculty Challenge

Faculty are being asked to respond to generative AI while they are still learning how the tools work themselves. That is a lot to ask. Instructors are updating course policies, redesigning assignments, answering student questions, protecting academic integrity, and trying to keep courses moving. Many are doing this without enough time, training, or institutional guidance. Recent research on faculty AI use, self-efficacy, and professional development needs reinforces that instructors need practical support, not only broad expectations to adapt (Mah & Groß, 2024).

The challenge is not simply technical. Faculty do not only need to know which tools exist. They need to decide how AI fits within their teaching philosophy, course outcomes, assignments, and feedback practices. Some instructors may want to prohibit AI because they are concerned about plagiarism or overreliance. Others may want to allow AI but are unsure how to structure it responsibly. Many are somewhere in the middle. They know students are using AI, but they are not always sure how to turn that reality into a meaningful learning opportunity.

A common concern is that AI may allow students to avoid the hard work of learning. That concern deserves to be taken seriously. If students use AI to replace reading, thinking, drafting, revising, or problem-solving, then AI can weaken learning rather than support it. At the same time, avoiding AI entirely may not prepare students for academic and professional environments where these tools are becoming common. Research on generative AI and assessment also

suggests that faculty are being pushed to reconsider how learning is demonstrated, evaluated, and supported in higher education (Xia et al., 2024). The more useful question is not simply whether students should use AI. The more useful question is how faculty can teach students to use AI with judgment.

This requires faculty to make evaluation visible. Students often need help seeing the difference between generating information and evaluating information. They may understand that AI can produce a quick answer, but they may not understand that the answer still needs to be checked against sources, course concepts, evidence standards, and assignment expectations. Faculty can help by designing small, repeatable activities that ask students to pause, question, verify, and revise.

Faculty do not need to become AI experts overnight. They need workable teaching routines. A short reflection, a source check, a comparison with a course reading, or a brief review of a data-based claim can help students practice responsible AI use without requiring a full course redesign. These small practices can help students develop stronger academic judgment while keeping the work manageable for instructors.

From AI Use to AI Evaluation

One practical shift is to move the classroom conversation from AI use to AI evaluation. Students often think about AI in simple yes-or-no terms. They may ask whether AI is allowed, whether they must cite it, or whether using it will get them in trouble. Those questions are understandable, but they do not go far enough. Students also need to ask whether the information AI provides is accurate, supported, current, fair, and appropriate for the assignment.

This change in focus makes AI instruction more useful. Instead of treating AI only as a threat to academic integrity, faculty can use it as a teaching tool for critical thinking. Information literacy has long emphasized that students need to examine authority, context, evidence, and the way information is created and used (Association of College and Research Libraries, 2016). Those same habits are essential when students interact with AI-supported information.

For example, an instructor might show students an AI-supported paragraph that sounds convincing but includes unsupported claims. Students can identify the main claim, check whether evidence is provided, look for missing context, and decide what needs verification before using the paragraph in academic work. Lo's (2023) CLEAR path framework also connects generative AI use with information literacy, evaluation, adaptation, and reflection rather than treating prompting as a purely technical skill. Similarly, a recent systematic review of prompt engineering in higher education emphasizes that students need more than prompt formulas; they need curricular support for using generative AI purposefully and critically (Lee & Palmer, 2025).

Activities like this help students see that AI output is not a finished product. It is material that must be evaluated. A response may be a useful starting point, but students still have to bring their own judgment to the process. They need to decide what to keep, what to question, what to verify, what to revise, and what to reject.

The shift from use to evaluation also helps faculty avoid framing AI only as a policing problem. When the focus is only on detection, students may care more about avoiding consequences than about learning responsibly. When the focus is on evaluation, students are asked to show their thinking. They can explain how they checked information, what sources they used, what limitations they noticed, and how they improved their final work.

This approach supports academic integrity because it makes the learning process more visible. It also supports student development because it teaches habits that matter beyond one assignment or one course. Students who learn to evaluate AI-supported information are practicing broader academic skills, including source evaluation, evidence-based reasoning, data interpretation, and responsible communication.

Practical Faculty Strategies

Faculty do not need to redesign an entire course to teach students how to evaluate AI-supported information. In many cases, the most effective approach is to begin with small activities that can be added to existing assignments, discussions, or feedback routines. This practical approach aligns with recent reviews showing that generative AI is already used for a wide range of pedagogical purposes in higher education, while also raising concerns about quality, ethics, assessment, and learning design (Liang et al., 2025; Qian, 2025). These activities should help students slow down and make their evaluation process visible.

One simple strategy is to ask students to submit an AI evaluation note with an assignment. The note does not have to be long. Students can identify one AI-supported idea they considered using, explain how they checked it, name one source they used to verify it, and describe what they changed before submitting the final version. This kind of reflection helps students understand that responsible AI use involves judgment, not just disclosure.

Another strategy is to use flawed AI examples in class. Faculty can provide a short AI-supported paragraph that sounds polished but contains weak evidence, missing context, or an unsupported conclusion. Students can work individually or in groups to identify what is strong, what is questionable, and what needs verification. This makes evaluation concrete. It also helps students see that polished writing does not automatically mean strong academic work.

Faculty can also build AI evaluation into discussion boards. Instead of asking students only to respond to a reading or topic, an instructor might ask them to compare an AI-supported explanation with a course reading, textbook section, scholarly source, or dataset. Students can discuss where the AI response was useful, where it was incomplete, and what evidence was needed to improve it. This approach works especially well in online and hybrid courses because students have time to think through the evaluation process.

A fourth strategy is to include source checking as part of AI-supported work. If students use AI to generate ideas, summaries, or explanations, they can be required to verify at least one claim through an appropriate academic source. This connects with long-standing source evaluation practices such as the CRAAP test, which asks students to consider currency, relevance, authority, accuracy, and purpose when evaluating information (Blakeslee, 2004). The activity does not

need to be punitive. It can be framed as a normal part of scholarly practice. AI may help students begin, but credible sources must still support academic claims.

Faculty can also ask students to identify uncertainty. This is especially important when AI-supported information includes data, trends, comparisons, or research findings. Students can be prompted to ask what is known, what is not known, what information is missing, and whether the conclusion goes beyond the evidence. This helps students practice statistical and evidence-based reasoning even in courses that are not statistics courses.

These strategies are intentionally simple. Their value comes from repetition. When students are asked repeatedly to question, verify, revise, and explain their use of AI-supported information, they begin to develop stronger habits of academic judgment. Faculty do not need to master every AI tool to support this learning. They need to create structured opportunities for students to evaluate information before using it.

Table 1

Faculty Strategies for Teaching Students to Evaluate AI-Supported Information

Strategy	Student Task	Instructional Purpose
AI evaluation note	Explain one AI-supported idea, how it was checked, and what changed before submission.	Makes student thinking visible and emphasizes evaluation, not disclosure alone.
Flawed AI example	Review an AI-generated paragraph and identify weak claims, missing context, or unsupported conclusions.	Shows that polished writing is not the same as accurate, well-supported academic work.
Source verification	Check at least one AI-supported claim against a credible academic or professional source.	Reinforces information literacy and routine source-checking habits.
AI-to-reading comparison	Compare an AI explanation with a course reading, scholarly article, textbook section, or dataset.	Connects AI output to course evidence and disciplinary expectations.
Uncertainty check	Identify what is known, unknown, missing, or overstated in an AI-supported response.	Builds evidence evaluation, statistical reasoning, and caution with data-based claims.
Generate, evaluate, revise	Use AI as a starting point, evaluate the output, and revise before submitting final work.	Encourages responsible AI-supported learning and makes revision visible.

Examples Across Disciplines

These strategies work across disciplines because students encounter AI-supported information in many kinds of academic work. The details change by field, but the evaluation habit is the same.

Students need to identify the claim, check the evidence, verify the source, notice limitations, and decide whether the information is appropriate to use.

In a business course, students might use AI to draft a case-study recommendation, summarize customer feedback, or compare marketing strategies. Faculty can ask students to identify what evidence supports the recommendation and whether the response relies on actual data or broad assumptions. Students can also explain what information they would need before making a real business decision.

In a health or healthcare administration course, students might use AI to summarize a health trend, compare policy options, or explain an intervention. Faculty can ask students to verify whether credible research or recognized health organizations support the information. Students can also examine whether the AI-supported response identifies the population, acknowledges risks, and avoids overstating what the evidence can show.

In a criminal justice or social science course, students might use AI to summarize research on crime patterns, community programs, or social behavior. Faculty can ask students to look for missing context, stereotypes, outdated assumptions, or unsupported cause-and-effect claims. This helps students understand that social issues are complex and should not be reduced to simple explanations.

In a writing-intensive course, students might use AI to generate an outline, thesis statement, or draft paragraph. Faculty can ask students to revise the AI-supported material so that it reflects their own argument, course readings, and verified evidence. This shifts the emphasis from whether the writing sounds polished to whether it is accurate, supported, and connected to the student's learning.

In a statistics or research methods course, students might use AI to explain a correlation, summarize survey results, or interpret a chart. Faculty can ask students to identify whether the AI-supported explanation distinguishes correlation from causation, acknowledges uncertainty, and explains the data's limits. This type of activity helps students see statistical literacy as a practical evaluation skill, not only as a set of calculations.

Across these examples, the goal is not to make every course an AI course. The goal is to help students practice responsible evaluation in the context of the work they are already doing. When faculty embed small AI evaluation activities into existing assignments, students begin to see questioning, checking, and revising as normal parts of academic work.

Recommendations and Conclusions

A Simple Implementation Model

A useful way to help faculty begin is to make AI evaluation part of a small, repeatable teaching routine. The routine does not need to be complicated. It can follow three basic steps: generate, evaluate, and revise.

First, students may use AI to generate a starting point, such as a summary, outline, explanation, study question, or draft idea, when that use is allowed by the instructor. This step should be clearly connected to the assignment purpose. Students should understand that the AI-supported response is not the final product. It is only material for review.

Second, students evaluate the AI-supported material. They identify the main claim, check whether evidence is provided, verify key information with credible sources, look for missing context, and consider whether any data-based claims are overstated or unclear. This is the most important part of the process because it teaches students to pause before accepting information.

Third, students revise their work based on what they found. They may correct inaccurate information, add stronger evidence, remove unsupported claims, cite appropriate sources, explain limitations, or decide not to use the AI-supported material at all. This step helps students understand that responsible AI use requires active academic judgment.

Faculty can adapt this model in many ways. In a short activity, students might complete the process in ten minutes during class. In a larger assignment, students might submit a brief reflection explaining how they evaluated and revised AI-supported material. In an online course, students might post their evaluation process in a discussion board before submitting a final assignment. The structure is flexible, but the goal remains the same. Students should learn to treat AI-supported information as something to examine, not something to accept automatically.

This simple model also gives faculty a manageable way to assess student learning. Instead of determining only whether AI was used, faculty can ask students to show how they evaluated the information. This makes the learning process more visible and encourages students to take responsibility for the quality of their final work.

Faculty Development Application: A Short Training Model

Another application of the generate, evaluate, and revise routine is a short faculty development model for workshops, department meetings, teaching circles, or asynchronous professional development modules. The model helps faculty move from general concern about AI use to practical classroom strategies for teaching students how to evaluate AI-supported information. This matters because many instructors are not asking for complicated technology training. They need a manageable way to help students think more carefully about claims, sources, evidence, uncertainty, and data-based statements.

The proposed model can be organized around three short modules. The first module, recognizing the limits of AI-supported information, asks faculty to examine sample AI-generated responses that appear polished but contain problems such as unsupported claims, vague evidence, missing context, fabricated or unverifiable sources, or overgeneralized conclusions. Faculty can discuss why students may find these responses convincing and where evaluation is needed. This module is especially useful because it separates writing fluency from academic quality. Students often need to see that a clear paragraph can still be inaccurate, incomplete, or poorly supported.

The second module, teaching evaluation habits, gives faculty a repeatable classroom structure they can adapt to their own assignments. Faculty practices asking students to identify the main claim, determine what evidence is provided, verify one or more sources, note assumptions or missing context, and decide whether the information is strong enough to use. This module can connect to existing coursework rather than be added as a separate unit. For example, an instructor might attach the evaluation process to a discussion post, literature search, case analysis, research proposal, annotated bibliography, data interpretation activity, or business recommendation. The goal is to make evaluation part of the assignment itself, not an optional afterthought.

The third module, applying the strategy in one course activity, asks faculty to revise a current assignment by adding one explicit AI-evaluation step. Faculty might ask students to compare an AI-supported explanation with a course reading, identify unsupported claims in an AI-generated recommendation, verify whether an AI-produced citation is real and relevant, or explain why a data-based claim requires additional evidence before it can be trusted. This module gives faculty a concrete product they can use immediately. It also helps avoid the common problem of faculty development ending with broad awareness but no direct classroom application.

This training model is intentionally short. A one-hour workshop could introduce all three modules, while a longer faculty development session could allow instructors to bring an assignment and revise it during the session. The model could also be delivered asynchronously, with faculty reviewing examples, completing a short evaluation activity, and submitting one revised assignment prompt. In either format, the emphasis should remain practical. Faculty should leave with language, examples, and a classroom activity they can use without redesigning an entire course.

This application shifts faculty development from AI anxiety to instructional action. Rather than asking faculty only to monitor student AI use, the model helps instructors teach students how to evaluate information before relying on it. That shift supports academic integrity, but it also supports deeper learning. Students repeatedly asked questions, checked evidence, verified sources, and explained limitations practice habits that extend beyond one tool or one assignment. They are learning to use information more carefully in academic, professional, and civic contexts.

For institutions, this short-training model can also create consistency without requiring a single campus-wide AI policy for every course. Different disciplines may need different rules for AI use, but all students benefit from learning how to evaluate AI-supported information. Faculty development that focuses on evaluation gives instructors a shared teaching language while still allowing disciplinary flexibility. In this way, AI literacy becomes connected to broader educational goals, including information literacy, evidence-based reasoning, statistical awareness, ethical judgment, and responsible decision-making.

Implications for Educational Practice and Technology

The rise of generative AI has important implications for educational practice and technology. AI tools are not simply another set of digital resources. They are changing how students find

information, organize ideas, write draft work, study course concepts, and receive feedback. Recent systematic reviews show that generative AI is affecting curriculum, instruction, assessment, and learning-experience design across higher education (Liang et al., 2025; Qian, 2025; Xia et al., 2024). Because of this, faculty need support that goes beyond learning how a tool works. They need practical ways to help students use these tools responsibly within the learning process.

One implication is that AI instruction should be connected to existing teaching goals. Faculty already teach students to read carefully, support claims, cite sources, interpret evidence, and communicate clearly. AI evaluation can be added to those goals rather than treated as a separate topic. When students check an AI-supported response against a reading, compare it with a dataset, or revise it using course concepts, they are practicing academic skills that already matter.

A second implication is that educational technology should be evaluated by how it supports learning, not only by how quickly it produces content. AI can make academic work faster, but speed is not the same as learning. Faculty can help students understand that a quick answer still needs to be questioned, tested, and connected to evidence. This is especially important in online and hybrid courses, where students may rely heavily on digital tools while working independently.

A third implication is that faculty development should include practical examples, not only broad warnings or policy templates. Instructors need sample prompts, assignment language, evaluation checklists, discussion activities, and grading criteria that help them teach AI evaluation in manageable ways. Many faculty members are not looking for another abstract conversation about AI. They need tools they can use in a course next week. This emphasis on practical support is also reflected in research showing that faculty interest in AI-related professional development is tied to their confidence, perceptions, and use of AI tools in teaching (Mah & Groß, 2024).

Finally, institutions should recognize that responsible AI use supports student success. Students who learn to evaluate AI-supported information are better prepared to complete academic work with integrity, but they are also better prepared for workplaces where AI-supported tools are becoming common. Statistical literacy matters here because students increasingly encounter AI-supported explanations that include numbers, comparisons, trends, and data-based claims. Sharma (2017) emphasized that statistical literacy includes the ability to interpret, evaluate, and critically respond to statistical information. In an AI-supported learning environment, those skills become even more important because students must decide whether data-based claims are reasonable, supported, and appropriately explained.

Teaching students to evaluate AI-supported information should therefore be part of educational practice, not an optional technology add-on. It connects directly to information literacy, evidence-based reasoning, statistical thinking, and responsible communication. These are durable academic skills that remain valuable even as specific AI tools continue to change.

Conclusion

Generative artificial intelligence is now part of the teaching and learning environment, and faculty are being asked to respond with clarity, flexibility, and care. Recent scholarship shows that AI is already influencing higher education pedagogy, assessment, curriculum, faculty development, and student learning practices (Liang et al., 2025; Mah & Groß, 2024; Qian, 2025; Xia et al., 2024). Policies remain important because students need to know what is allowed, what must be disclosed, and how AI use fits within academic integrity expectations. However, policy alone is not enough. Students also need instruction that helps them evaluate the information AI produces.

Faculty can play an important role by helping students move from simply using AI to thinking critically about AI-supported information. This means teaching students to question claims, check evidence, verify sources, recognize uncertainty, identify weak or misleading data-based statements, and decide whether information is appropriate for academic work. These skills are not limited to one discipline or one technology tool. They are part of the broader academic judgment students need in college, in the workplace, and in everyday decision-making.

The practical strategies described in this article are intentionally manageable. Faculty can begin with small activities, brief reflections, discussion prompts, source-checking tasks, flawed AI examples, or a simple generate-evaluate-revise routine. These approaches do not require instructors to become AI experts. They require faculty to make evaluation visible and to give students repeated opportunities to practice responsible judgment.

AI will continue to change, but the need for careful thinking will not. If higher education focuses only on whether students are allowed to use AI, it will miss a larger teaching opportunity. Faculty can use this moment to strengthen students' evidence evaluation, information literacy, statistical reasoning, and academic responsibility. In that sense, AI is not only a challenge to manage. It is also an opportunity to teach students how to think more carefully about the information they choose to trust and use.

References

- Association of College and Research Libraries. (2016). *Framework for information literacy for higher education*. American Library Association.
<https://www.ala.org/acrl/standards/ilframework>
- Blakeslee, S. (2004). The CRAAP test. *LOEX Quarterly*, 31(3), Article 4.
<https://commons.emich.edu/loexquarterly/vol31/iss3/4>
- Cox, A. (2024). Algorithmic literacy, AI literacy and responsible generative AI literacy. *Journal of Web Librarianship*, 18(3), 93–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19322909.2024.2395341>
- Damiano, A. D., Lauria, E. J. M., Sarmiento, C., & Zhao, N. (2024). Early perceptions of teaching and learning using generative AI in higher education. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 52(3), 346–375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395241233290>
- Lee, D., & Palmer, E. (2025). Prompt engineering in higher education: A systematic review to help inform curricula. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 22(1), Article 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00503-7>

- Liang, J., Stephens, J. M., & Brown, G. T. L. (2025). A systematic review of the early impact of artificial intelligence on higher education curriculum, instruction, and assessment. *Frontiers in Education*, 10, Article 1522841. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1522841>
- Lo, L. S. (2023). The CLEAR path: A framework for enhancing information literacy through prompt engineering. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 49(4), Article 102720. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2023.102720>
- Mah, D.-K., & Groß, N. (2024). Artificial intelligence in higher education: Exploring faculty use, self-efficacy, distinct profiles, and professional development needs. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(1), Article 58. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00490-1>
- Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO. <https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535>
- Qian, Y. (2025). Pedagogical applications of generative AI in higher education: A systematic review of the field. *TechTrends*, 69(5), 1105–1120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-025-01100-1>
- Sharma, S. (2017). Definitions and models of statistical literacy: A literature review. *Open Review of Educational Research*, 4(1), 118–133. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2017.1354313>
- Xia, Q., Weng, X., Ouyang, F., Lin, T. J., & Chiu, T. K. F. (2024). A scoping review on how generative artificial intelligence transforms assessment in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 21(1), Article 40. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-024-00468-z>