



# Artificial intelligence request for information

## Provider action plans: key considerations

TEQSA has been proactively engaging with Australian higher education providers for over 12 months to help institutions reflect on the risks generative artificial intelligence (gen AI) poses for the higher education sector. This has included concerns regarding teaching and assessment, as well as staff workload, student privacy, equity considerations and research integrity.

The request for information that TEQSA will issue in June 2024 will ask each provider to submit detailed and credible action plans that provide assurance that they are engaging with, and have a strategy to mitigate, the impact of generative artificial intelligence on the integrity of their higher education awards they offer.

TEQSA recognises the diversity of providers, student cohorts and courses in Australia's higher education sector. As it is each provider's responsibility under the *Threshold Standards* to ensure that risks to their higher education operations are being managed and mitigated effectively, TEQSA anticipates varied approaches from providers to address this emerging challenge.

TEQSA also recognises the scale of the challenge and acknowledges that providers will likely need to triage actions over the short, medium, and long term.

While there is no fixed expectation about what form the actions will take, in general TEQSA expects that action plans

- take into account the breadth of a provider's offerings, including different locations and modes of delivery and the needs of and impacts on diverse student cohorts
- consider the requirements of professional accreditation where relevant
- are actionable and have realistic timelines attached
- are able to be monitored and have their efficacy assessed
- include information on how peak corporate and academic governance bodies are overseeing the risk/s and assuring quality
- describe the mechanisms, such as strategies, change management plans, and steering groups that are, or will be, put in place to ensure long-term compliance.

There are several relevant standards within the Higher Education Standards Framework ([Threshold Standards](#)) that providers may wish to consider in developing their institutional action. Providers may find the following table of considerations useful when contemplating the breadth of the impact gen AI poses for teaching, learning and assessment.



Part A: Standards for higher education providers	Questions for consideration
1.3.1: Orientation and Progression	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do induction materials, such as information packs and introductory modules, require updating?</li> </ul>
1.4.3-5(b): Learning Outcomes and Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do any elements of the institution's current approach to learning, teaching, and assessment need to be altered?</li> <li>Are the course learning outcomes appropriate and achievable?</li> <li>Are the methods of assessment capable of ensuring a student has demonstrated attainment of the specific learning outcomes?</li> <li>Is it necessary to consult any professional accreditation bodies about the action plan?</li> </ul>
2.2.1: Diversity and Equity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has consideration been given to the impact of gen AI technologies, and the impact of assessment reform, on diverse student cohorts to safeguard equal opportunities for academic success?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do changes to course offerings and assessment reform uphold the foundational principles of fairness, accessibility, transparency, privacy and respect for the diversity of different learners?</li> <li>Do policies, practices and approaches to teaching and learning accommodate student diversity, including under-represented or disadvantaged student groups?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3.1.3: Course Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the specific context of your individual institution, what are the key risks that gen AI poses for the integrity of awards offered?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do some awards have a greater risk profile than others?</li> <li>What is the impact of different modes of delivery?</li> <li>What is the impact of different locations of delivery?</li> <li>What consideration has been given to the impact of differing access to gen AI tools?</li> <li>How will the risk profile impact the triaging of transformation activities?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3.2.3b: Staffing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What key stakeholders should be consulted on the development and execution of the action plan?                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What staff development will be required to ensure teaching staff understand the capabilities and limitations of gen AI?</li> <li>What support will be offered to staff to enact the action plan?</li> <li>What resources, support, and messaging will be delivered to students?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
3.3.1, 3.3.4: Learning Resources and Educational Support	
4.2.1a, 4.2.4-5: Research Training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do any institutional policies and procedures relating to conducting research training, or academic and research integrity need to be updated?</li> </ul>

**OFFICIAL**

5.2.1-4: Academic and Research Integrity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Are current preventative measures that seek to mitigate foreseeable risks to academic and research integrity contemporary and relevant?</li><li>• Are staff and students receiving clear and consistent guidance about the permissible use of gen AI in different activities associated with teaching, learning, assessment and research training?</li></ul>
5.3.2, 5.3.4b: Monitoring, Review and Improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• What review processes will be put in place to ensure the on-going efficacy of the action?</li><li>• How will ongoing considerations of gen AI or other emerging technologies be captured in existing processes for the review and improvement of courses?</li></ul>
6.1.4: Corporate Governance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Does the governing body take steps to ensure students and staff are treated equitably?</li><li>• Who is responsible for the oversight and governance of implementing the proposed action plan?</li><li>• What are the key milestones embedded in the action plan?<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ what are the short-term goals to be achieved within the first year?</li><li>○ what are the long-term goals to be achieved over the next several years?</li></ul></li><li>• What evidence can the provider collect to assure itself of effective implementation of the action plan? E.g. minutes from meetings of the corporate governing body and the peak academic governance body, data from student and staff evaluations, links to student and staff resources, evidence of effective and comprehensive course review processes.</li><li>• How will the provider assess the efficacy of their action plan?</li></ul>
6.2.1(h, k): Corporate Monitoring and Accountability	
6.3.1(a, d)-2(a, d, h): Academic Governance	