

Rethinking Writing Assessment in the Age of Generative AI: Toward a Conceptual Framework for First-Year Writing

Abeeb Hammed

Rhetoric and Writing Studies, Department of English, Wayne State University, Detroit, USA.

Email: abeeb.hammed@wayne.edu

Abstract

Emerging technologies have changed the dimensions of the first-year writing classroom. Before AI, assessment focused on traditional rubrics that emphasized arguments, rhetorical strategies, and language conventions. While this traditional checklist remains important for assessing student writing, it is also necessary to argue that the traditional rubric is insufficient for evaluating student performance in the current age of AI. We acknowledge that a rubric is not necessarily designed to detect AI use. However, there is a growing need for AI-informed assessment. A final-product rubric alone may provide insufficient evidence about the student's writing process, decision-making, and authorship when AI is involved. An AI-informed assessment offers additional dimensions for evaluation, including student agency, AI literacy, ethical use, reflection and metacognition, and revision, to assess student writing skills and knowledge. This article argues that an AI-informed assessment is not a replacement for the existing rubric conventions but expands the assessment horizon in the AI-mediated first-year writing classroom. It identifies interrelated assessment dimensions—agency, AI literacy, ethical use, reflection, metacognition, and revision—and describes observable forms of evidence through which each dimension could be assessed. For example, agency may be examined through students' explanations of their decisions to accept, modify, or reject AI-generated suggestions; AI literacy through their ability to evaluate AI outputs for accuracy, relevance, and rhetorical appropriateness; ethical use through transparent disclosure and responsible integration of AI; and reflection and metacognition through students' explanations of their writing decisions and learning processes. Revision focuses on how students critically transform both their own writing and AI-generated material rather than simply accepting machine-produced text. The article argues that the use of AI itself is not the primary thing being graded. Instead, the framework assesses the student's rhetorical and intellectual decisions surrounding AI use.

Keywords: First-Year Writing; Generative AI; Assessment; Performance; Pedagogy.

How to Cite: Hammed, A. (2026). Rethinking Writing Assessment in the Age of Generative AI: Toward a Conceptual Framework for First-Year Writing. *International Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics*, 9(2), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.52589/IJLLL-HAWOOU>

© 2026 by the authors. Published by AB Journals. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license.

INTRODUCTION

Writing has long been difficult for many students, including native speakers. For years, writing has followed a conventional path, from students' first drafts to teachers' assessments. Writing difficulty increases when teaching and assessment strategies focus solely on proficiency and precision. When ChatGPT was launched in November 2022, we all assumed writing classrooms would not remain in this same pattern. Technological advancements compound the challenges instructors face in teaching and assessment, raising concerns about academic integrity.

The evolution of generative AI, hence, requires us to reexamine how first-year writing courses should be taught and assessed. ChatGPT has influenced composition classrooms (Floridi et al. 2023). Rather than criticizing AI in classrooms, institutions, programs, and individual assignments, institutions, programs, and individual assignments continue to differ considerably in AI policies. Instructors may need to adopt a strategy that supports the writing course's learning objectives and aligns with current AI-assisted writing pedagogy, including the development of learners' AI literacy (Godwin-Jones, 2022). The emergence of AI has transformed writing classrooms, making these tools powerful for generating ideas, summarizing concepts, and revising rough drafts. These opportunities also complicate the way instructors determine whether students have achieved the intended learning outcomes. The assessment problem, therefore, is not simply whether students should be permitted to use AI, but what evidence instructors should collect to evaluate learning when AI participates in the writing process

We now believe writing is no longer solely the responsibility of writers; technology has become a participant in the process. This system is evolutionary, as first-year writing practices have undergone a paradigm shift. More research has examined this (Li et al., 2023; Barrett & Pack, 2025; Sanz-Tejeda et al., 2025). Research has also examined instructors' use of AI tools to evaluate student essays (Alawad, 2025; Lo & Chan, 2025; Ataseven, Bokeoglu & Tasdemir, 2025). However, research on how to rethink and redesign the assessment framework for first-year writers using generative AI remains limited, and this article aims to address this gap. Now that AI is incorporated into composition pedagogy, assessment must account for the processes through which students use, evaluate, modify, and sometimes reject AI-generated content.

Students' papers are still traditionally graded using existing rubric checklists. When generative AI mediates student assignments, questions of language centeredness and academic integrity resurface, sparking widespread concern among learners and their teachers (Alhardi 2023; Zhang 2025). We do not doubt that the increasing capacities of AI have resulted in great concern regarding student assessment while "simultaneously maintaining academic integrity, which is crucial for preserving the value and credibility of academic work" (Sol et al., 2025, p. 2). Although academic integrity remains an important concern, the use of generative AI also raises a broader problem of assessment validity. Traditional rubric-based assessment often evaluates the final written product as evidence of student learning. However, when AI contributes to the generation, revision, or restructuring of a text, the final product may provide less direct evidence of the student's own writing ability and learning process. This creates a distinction between whether students have followed institutional AI-use policies and whether an assessment provides sufficient evidence of learning.

AI development requires writing instructors to consider a new way to assess students' knowledge and writing skills. For this reason, Koh et al. (2023) argue that AI forces us to reconsider how we assess student literacy. We do not doubt that this traditional rubric has been

excellent in evaluating students' performance and learnability (Goodrich, 2000). The traditional rubric criteria, which include thesis, organization, language and style, and grammatical coherence, remain significant and fundamental to the learning objectives of the first-year writing course. Now that AI is involved, many writing instructors are still concerned and have raised questions about academic integrity. That is why the traditional rubric remains focused on conventional evaluation.

For many reasons, many instructors incorporate AI detectors in their Learning Management System when grading students' projects to detect AI plagiarism. Some argue that detector software such as Turnitin and OpenAI can support students' development of understanding of course content and conventions, and serve as a general safeguard against university malpractice (Davis 2007); however, this approach does not reflect the current complex AI-informed pedagogy in first-year writing classrooms.

If we detect students' writing for plagiarism using detector tools alone, without adequate knowledge of how students write, we may engage in prohibited behavior, because any assessment that centers on detection reinforces the teacher's power in the classroom and raises questions about students' self-expression. That is the reason Alexander et al. (2023) argue that "there seems to be no reliable way of establishing whether a text was written by a human or generated by an AI" (p. 40). We can argue that any assessment that relies solely on detector software does not necessarily measure students' competencies; rather, it creates performance pressure. Assessment should help instructors understand how students think about using AI.

Building on these assessment challenges, this article proposes an AI-informed writing assessment framework that expands conventional criteria beyond the quality of the final product to include student agency, AI literacy, ethical AI use, reflection, metacognition, and revision. These dimensions are synthesized from complementary traditions in writing assessment, process writing, AI literacy, academic integrity, and metacognitive learning. Writing assessment and process-writing scholarship emphasize writing as a process rather than solely a finished product, while AI-literacy scholarship highlights students' ability to critically evaluate and use AI-generated information.

Research on academic integrity provides a basis for considering responsible and transparent AI use, and metacognitive scholarship supports the assessment of students' awareness of their writing decisions and learning processes. Together, these perspectives provide the conceptual foundation for the proposed framework, which treats AI-mediated writing as both a product and a learning process. The proposal aims to promote learning goals by informing students of their agency and competencies through assessment as they write with AI tools. This article examines the rhetorical embodiment of writing assessment that reflects social practice as generative AI becomes part of the writing classroom.

GENERATIVE AI AND FIRST-YEAR WRITING

First-year writing students are not new to digital tools, even before ChatGPT's advent in November 2022. The Copilot in MS Word has been excellent. However, AI brings different scenarios into the first-year composition classroom. We are now in the digital age, where no one writes the first draft any longer. Pedagogically, AI software is designed to help writers generate text. According to Ranade and Eyman (2024), generative AI has taken on a role at the prewriting stage, while most tasks still rely on students. As first-year writing remains central

to academic writing, ChatGPT has expanded its text-generation capabilities to support learning goals.

The emergence of generative AI in the composition classroom is reshaping how instructors respond to the dynamism of first-year writing. Before AI, students wrote with other tools. We see ordinary pens, typewriters, and word processors primarily as means of inscription and editing, while AI can produce substantive linguistic content. This difference in tools creates a distinctive assessment problem. ChatGPT is a fully functional language model that can “transform literacy practices in classrooms” (Ciampa et al., p. 186). These literary practices include production, revision, decision-making, and authorship. This shows how powerfully the tool can reimagine writing instruction. ChatGPT can support brainstorming, revising, and summarizing ideas and arguments. First-year writing remains an exercise in human agency.

We are especially interested in first-year writing because it is a general course for all newly admitted students and emphasizes critical thinking, reflection, rhetorical awareness, and research knowledge. First-year writing students are taught language literacy, rhetorical analysis, argumentative construction, multimodality, and reflective practices so they can write rough drafts, establish claims, seek evidence, and analyze visual artifacts. These practices are changing as generative AI emerges. Students no longer need to write alone; they are already incorporating these tools into their composition. Text is now a product of humans and emerging tools. This integration has raised questions about who authors are, whose agency matters, what current learning goals should be, and how we assess student writing in the age of AI.

Research has shown how writing instructors respond to college writing. A couple of literature reviews on AI and composition pedagogy show improvements in student performance and literacy development, along with criticism we cannot ignore. Abdallah et al. (2024) examine the success and risks involved in integrating generative AI into first-year college writing. We recognize that generative AI has its own risks. This is the challenging part of its development in the classroom. Sadeghpour et al. (2025) argue that although generative AI tools help improve lower-order problems in writing, such as grammar and spelling, “authors would gradually lose authority over their own narrative and tone” (p. 13). This argument is also a major concern if writers rely too heavily on these tools for every piece of writing, since ChatGPT is trained on a model that generates general language and data.

Su and Tran (2024) further claim that writers who frequently use generative AI may lack inventiveness in their writing. Hands et al. (2026) support this criticism, arguing that students often do not even know whether they have misused the tool, as long as it gives them the result they want. These concerns are real and cannot be disregarded. However, other scholars have also expressed optimism about the use of generative AI in the current composition classroom. They have established how generative AI can positively impact student writing skills. Nguyen et al. (2024) argue that the evolution of ChatGPT has revolutionized first-year writing conventions by providing comprehensive support and improving student performance. Almassaad et al. (2024) also recognize opportunities for writers using tools such as ChatGPT, given its capacity to generate original content and provide overall writing assistance.

Another key point is the impressive productivity of these tools and their role in the learning system. Our worry should be about responsible use. Student writers should know when to use ChatGPT and when not to. When students use these tools as partners, they retain agency and authorship. We understand it might be difficult to distinguish when AI is used as a partner and when it is used as a generator. This is where transparency comes in. Students have to be transparent with instructors and collaborate with them.

If students use AI to generate ideas, it means technology plays a more significant role in assisting them. This practice does not automatically undermine student writing skills and knowledge. We still believe students can interrogate and evaluate AI-generated content and arguments. For example, if a student in my ENG 1020 class uses ChatGPT to rewrite paragraphs for better clarity, the student still owns the writing, not ChatGPT. Integrating emerging technologies into first-year writing need not be regarded as a loss of student awareness. We can ascertain the importance of AI use through ethics, guidance, and evaluation. The writers' competencies should be based on a critical evaluation of ChatGPT's output.

Understanding the strengths and weaknesses of generative AI in the composition program, one thing is certain: tools have existed for some time, and we may have little control over their development in student writing. What matters is that stakeholders in the composition program, instructors, and students themselves adopt a strategic approach that supports student improvement without undermining their authority and agency. In this regard, research has shown both positive and negative perspectives on generative AI in composition pedagogy. A notable gap in the research is the assessment of student writing in the AI-mediated composition classroom, which underlies the focus of this article. Assessment, a key instructional approach for evaluating student performance, is reshaping policies and expectations for student papers in the age of generative AI. We need to develop a working system that balances traditional rubric-based assessment in first-year writing with the new adaptive writing practices introduced by generative AI.

WRITING ASSESSMENT BEFORE AI

Even before the Conference on College Composition and Communication, assessment was an urgent matter for student enrollment in many higher institutions. According to Huot, “the use of essay placement exams at Harvard and other prestigious institutions in the century was justified in response to the growing perception that students were underprepared for the rigors of university study” (p. 1). At Harvard and other institutions, assessment was political. The decisions and policies regarding assessment were in the hands of politicians in Congress and perhaps some university administrators. Nothing was specific to teaching writing, which made the assessment foundation bureaucratic.

Luckily, CCCC came. We began to see writing teachers engaging in conversations about student assessment in composition classrooms. According to Blake (1999), writing assessment was at the center of the CCCC in 1950, even though it was not called *assessment* at that time; the common term was *testing*. The CCCC plays a major role in writing assessment within composition studies, as numerous articles across pedagogy, theory, and research have been published. Beyond the fundamental testing system, we are very concerned about the politics, policies, and practices of writing assessment. The rhetorical foundation shapes how writing instructors respond to the overarching issues of what matters and how it matters when evaluating students' essays.

This moment came when CCC published its first “Position Statement” on writing assessment, which literally expands the scope of assessment to include our roles in shaping the epistemological component of assessment in composition programs. The statement directly claims that assessment must be specific, purposeful, contextual, and ethical. The principles of purpose, context, specificity, and ethics identified in writing-assessment scholarship provide a useful foundation for reconsidering assessment in AI-mediated writing. Generative AI, however, changes how each principle must be understood. Purpose requires instructors to

reconsider what students are expected to learn when AI can generate polished ideas and prose; the focus may shift toward students' rhetorical decisions, critical evaluation, and learning. Context requires assessment to account for different levels and forms of permitted AI use, rather than treating AI use as uniformly acceptable or unacceptable. Ethics requires instructors to establish expectations for transparent, responsible, and appropriate use of AI. Specificity requires greater clarity about what is being assessed and what evidence demonstrates achievement of those outcomes, particularly when the final text may involve AI assistance.

Together, these principles provide a conceptual bridge from established writing-assessment practices to an AI-informed framework that evaluates both students' written products and the processes through which they produce them. CCC's Position Statement underscores the importance of assessment as social behavior and the ability to reinforce, redirect, and reenact its literacy as a shared responsibility of all stakeholders, including students, instructors, and writing program administrators.

After the CCC arrangement, writing assessment becomes a rhetorical matter. We can now say assessment is an established part of teaching writing. Instructors are shifting to creating rubrics that emphasize student writing skills. Before the emergence of AI, this conventional rubric served as the primary evaluation principle for assessing student writing quality. However, rubric evaluation checklists remained product-oriented, and scholarship has long challenged centering assessment on the final product, which overlooks students' thoughts and arguments and fails to account for the process of writing practice (Xie & Lei, 2022).

We should also recognize that learning as well as writing is recursive. AI can intervene at multiple stages of the recursive process, and assessment should capture evidence across those stages. This practice will compel a justifiable means for process-oriented AI assessment. These may include reflections on AI use, drafts, annotations, and AI disclosures. Process orientation in writing assessment can impact student success. As Saiz-Manzanares et al. (2017) claim, process-oriented feedback can improve results more than traditional feedback. First-year writing has long been treated as a process-based system that includes peer review, reflective practices, and revision of the first draft. Students also use writing centers when needed; they can use grammar books and dictionaries to check grammar and correct spelling. This practice existed before emerging technologies emerged. In most cases, assessment still depends on the final product, regardless of the effort students put into their writing. Students can reconsider and redeliberate their ideas, making writing practice more student-focused rather than focused on the ultimate goal of achieving the best grade.

FYW ASSESSMENT IN AI-MEDIATED CLASSROOM

First-year writing assessment should be approached differently from other composition courses because of its established purpose. First-year writing focuses on four learning objectives, which include: 1. Using reading to identify, analyze, evaluate, and respond to arguments, rhetorical elements, and genre conventions in college-level texts. 2. Composing persuasive academic genres and using a flexible writing process that includes brainstorming ideas, planning, drafting, and giving and receiving feedback. 3. Use a flexible research process to find, evaluate, and use information from secondary sources to support and formulate new ideas and arguments, and 4. Use written reflection to plan and evaluate one's own learning and writing. These learning objectives offer a different assessment approach from courses such as intermediate writing and technical communication.

Because many of these students are transitioning from high school to college, they may struggle to meet the standards of traditional rubrics. Traditional rubric conventions can shock students when they first encounter academic writing standards and learning objectives. We are aware that traditional rubrics have clearly supported progress in student writing development. According to Jonsson & Panadero (2017), rubrics, exemplars, and quality feedback do help. However, the success rate is still not yielding the best results; that is why Menrabi & Boud (2025) claim that a “neglected area, however, is that existing assessment strategies have been less than successful in building a foundation for developing and sustaining students’ knowledge and skills that contribute to their future writing achievement” (p. 258).

Many of these students find it easy to use emerging tools quickly to pass the course. For first-year writing, assessment should be designed with the students’ AI thinking in mind. Many first-year writers are only required to take the course; the motivation may be low, especially for those from sciences and engineering. The best way to track progress in their writing without undermining learning outcomes is to develop an AI-informed assessment approach. Now that AI is in composition classrooms, the whole narrative changes. Students do not have to go through the long route in producing a text, since ChatGPT has the capacity to generate arguments, revise their papers, generate outlines, and generally improve the lower-order concerns such as grammar and spelling; students may decide to use the AI system for a complete draft if what instructors evaluate is the final draft. This attitude will conflict with the learning objectives if students produce nothing on their own. For both writers and teachers, AI can complicate composition class if we don’t take appropriate measures.

AI can generate text that meets the instructor’s rubric criteria, challenging the way we assess student performance. The traditional rubric may matter less for measuring individual writing skills in the classroom. That is why Alolaywi (2026) says most of the studies on traditional rubrics “emphasize perceived usefulness or error detection rather than comprehensive measures of writing quality and learning progression” (p. 121).

Moving forward, we can find a balance by recognizing what traditional rubrics achieve, since first-year writing centers on audience awareness, argument construction, and evidence gathering. This assessment pattern is equally important as to how students learn in the AI age. While traditional rubrics still help measure content knowledge (Montgomery 2002) and instructors retain traditional evaluation benchmarks, incorporating an AI-mediated assessment approach can lead to greater writing success in the current AI environment. If students want to use AI, they should know when, how, and why they should use it. These questions should be reflected in AI-informed assessment design.

The assessment design in this system will help students determine whether ChatGPT can generate the argument they want and support their claim effectively. This approach helps us recognize the importance of traditional rubrics by serving as a foundation for AI-informed assessment. Since we are not replacing the existing evaluation checklist, we propose an AI-informed assessment to complement it. An AI-informed assessment is important in order to capture the current reality of an AI composition classroom. The proposal provides a conceptual framework that preserves students’ intellectual competencies while still supporting their grade.

We still strongly believe traditional criteria are pivotal to first-year writing; however, we can expand the scope to support a more nuanced approach, aligned with the emerging technologies students use to write. This paradigm shift enables writing instructors to rethink first-year writing learning objectives and assessment patterns. An AI-informed assessment responds to the intellectual effort, innovative skills, and practices involved in producing a text.

TRADITIONAL RUBRIC AND AI-INFORMED ASSESSMENT

I will provide the traditional rubric my institution uses to evaluate student writing projects. Essentially, the main project first-year writers do is an argumentative essay. Students are expected to compose arguments by using rhetorical appeals and captivating language to reach their audience. The traditional rubric criteria include the following:

Table 1: Traditional Rubric Conventions

Criteria	Comments
Introduction	To effectively present the rhetorical situation of the argument.
Claim	To make a clear claim that presents the writer's perspective and also uses supporting claims to develop major claim.
Evidence	To effectively analyze, integrate and respond to sources.
Rhetorical Strategies	To strategically uses rhetorical appeal and language choices to support the argument.
Writing Style	To use advanced grammatical techniques to enhance the piece; sentence structure, tone, choice of words.
Formatting and citation	To utilize the required format (in this case MLA), which includes font, citing sources
Organization	To transition between supporting ideas and argumentative structure.

While we maintain these traditional criteria, we must reexamine our assessment strategies for current AI-mediated first-year writing. These AI assessment dimensions are not new in writing instruction; we need to consider how to apply them in the overall evaluation of student performance. The following are the provided AI-informed assessment dimensions that I believe can support and expand the traditional rubric convention:

Table 2: AI Assessment Framework

AI-Informed Dimensions	Comments
Student Agency	Assessment should be based on the changes students make to AI-generated content. Students are aware of their own agency while they take control of what AI produces. An explanation of why and how AI is used is important.
AI literacy	Assessment must reflect students' ability to evaluate and critically use AI output. The emerging technologies are also a skill development. Students who know how to use AI tools can always fact-check the information given by AI.
Ethical AI use	Students must be responsible in their use of AI. They must disclose how they use it in accordance with the course learning goals. Instructors should have a clear understanding of how their students use AI to evaluate their writing projects judiciously.
Reflection and metacognition	Students must make the right decisions about the ideas generated by AI. They should be able to see that AI helps improve their

	writing development while avoiding overreliance. Students should provide a reflective statement describing AI's influence. This decision-making should be reflected in their overall performance.
Revision	Assessment must follow the order of different revised drafts students make whenever they use AI. When they revise AI drafts, they will know what to add and what to remove. Evidence that AI suggestions were evaluated rather than simply accepted.

IMPLICATIONS

Student writing has shifted significantly because of generative AI in the classroom. This innovation has called for a change in how we assess student work. An AI-informed rubric assessment simply evaluates student performance based on the student's engagement with AI tools. Traditional assessment conventions will need to shift to an AI-informed approach to better reflect current writing dynamics. An AI-informed rubric is not offered here as a replacement for the existing traditional assessment; rather, it supports engagement with first-year writing in the face of ChatGPT.

Generative AI is a new skill set that supports writing processes; writers become skilled in using these tools in ways that prepare them for future careers. An AI-informed rubric assessment can be a productive approach that synthesizes the new knowledge writers and instructors engage with. We can now understand how important it is for instructors to reevaluate traditional rubric criteria and suggest an improved grading system that supports AI-mediated text. In this practice, instructors can evaluate whether students engage with emerging technologies ethically, critically, and responsibly in ways that make them competent writers.

An AI-informed rubric assessment should value human judgment. This process will help instructors see student writing as an exercise in agency and authority. Instructors are responsible for working with students, understanding how they write, and understanding what they think about using AI in their work. This practice will inform an AI-mediated assessment that does not outright reject the use of AI. We know ChatGPT can generate texts in various versions; however, writers ultimately evaluate what it produces. Hence, students must determine whether ChatGPT's arguments are inaccurate, whether its ideas are incomplete, whether its language is overly general, and which content to accept or reject. ChatGPT can also make mistakes.

Aligning first-year writing with generative AI development, writers should also bear in mind that AI tools are fallible. Errors can arise when critical evaluation is neglected. Overreliance on these tools can lead to inaccurate or unreliable information. Writers are responsible for checking accuracy and critiquing the generated text. This decision-making will inform a revised approach to assessing their writing projects. If instructors understand how students use AI, they should be able to evaluate essays based on students' engagement with AI. For example, a student who evaluates, modifies, and responsibly uses AI tools cannot be graded the same as a student who generates the entire text from ChatGPT to earn an excellent grade. Assessment in this sense requires instructors to know their students' writing development.

An AI-informed rubric assessment also supports the writing process from pre-writing to post-writing stages. Because AI tools can assist with brainstorming, editing, outlining, and revising,

instructors can assign different roles to students, since AI can do almost everything. Therefore, an AI-informed rubric assessment gives students the opportunity to demonstrate the key parts of the writing process, and instructors support this practice by providing an enabling environment for in-class writing activities, peer review, revisions, and reflection. The writing process shows how student writing develops while also engaging with AI. Everyone, including AI, becomes a participant.

CONCLUSION

An AI rubric assessment does not treat AI as an authoritative tool that can replace traditional rubrics; rather, it expands the dimensional framework to first-year writing assessment. We retain the traditional rubric criteria; however, they do not ultimately reflect current first-year writing practice. First-year students come from all majors on campus; teaching and assessment must reflect current trends and program policies that emphasize skill development and literacy in the contemporary age of artificial intelligence.

We acknowledge that current writing practice in the first-year writing classroom needs critical engagement and policy decisions; we must re-examine and re-evaluate all aspects of writing. Traditional rubrics remain important to us as graders; an AI-informed assessment prompts us to reconsider how we evaluate student work while reducing our bias and subjectivity. We still value and emphasize critical thinking, rhetorical strategies, mechanics, formatting, expression, and organization as traditional rubric criteria; an AI-informed assessment adds an important layer as we rethink those criteria to meet current composition requirements. The important point is that the use of AI itself would not become the primary thing being assessed. Instead, the framework assesses the student's rhetorical and intellectual decisions in AI use.

Integrating AI itself is not our objective; rather, we want to incorporate classroom practices within already established technologies. Hence, an AI-informed assessment, alongside existing rubric conventions, reforms evaluation in critical thinking, rhetorical awareness, human judgment, the AI-assisted writing process, AI literacy, responsible and ethical AI engagement, metacognition, and reflection. Rethinking assessment in this sense, we develop an AI-informed assessment framework that emphasizes student performance and writing skills and that not only aligns with the current trajectory of writing practices but also centers writers in the composition classroom through self-awareness, skill development, and student-learning-centeredness.

Overall, instructors need to acknowledge that assessment should not focus on the final product of student writing. Assessment is the entire process. Current traditional rubrics reinforce performance on the final draft, which misrepresents students' actual writing capacities. In an AI-informed assessment, performance is judged based on students' writing skills, agency, ethical use of AI, and overall AI literacy for future careers.

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank my advisor, Prof. Richard Marback, for his thoughtful feedback and guidance throughout the development and revision of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Abdallah, N., Katmah, R., Khalaf, K., & Jelinek, H. F. (2025). Systematic review of ChatGPT in higher education: Navigating impact on learning, wellbeing, and collaboration. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 12, 101866.
- Alharbi, W. (2023). AI in the foreign language classroom: A pedagogical overview of automated writing assistance tools. *Education Research International*, (1), 4253331. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2023/4253331>
- Alexander, K., Savvidou, C., & Alexander, C. (2023). Who wrote this essay? Detecting AI-generated writing in second language education in higher education. *Teaching English with Technology*, 23(2), 25-43.
- Alolaywi, Y. (2026). Assessing writing Outcomes: A comparative study of artificial intelligence versus traditional assessment techniques. *Arab World English Journal (AWEJ) Special Issue*.
- Almassaad, A., Alajlan, H., and Alebaikan, R. (2024). Student perceptions of generative artificial intelligence: Investigating utilization, benefits, and challenges in higher education. *Systems*, 12:385. doi: 10.3390/systems12100385
- Alawad, E. A. (2025). Transformative assessment in academic writing: AI-based feedback systems with adaptive rubrics. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 141-149.
- Ataseven, H., Bökeoğlu, Ö. Ç., & Taşdemir, F. (2025). Can AI assess writing skills like a human? A reliability analysis. *Journal of Theoretical Educational Sciences*, 18(4), 757-775.
- CCCC Committee on Assessment. (1994). Writing Assessment: A Position Statement. *CCC*: 46, 430-437.
- Ciampa, K., Wolfe, Z. M., & Bronstein, B. (2023). ChatGPT in education: Transforming digital literacy practices. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 67(3), 186-195.
- Davis, M. (2007). The role of Turnitin within the formative process of academic writing: A tool for learning and unlearning. *Brookes eJournal of Learning and Teaching*, 2. Retrieved January 15, 2010
- Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., ... & Vayena, E. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. *Minds and Machines*, 28(4), 689-707.
- Godwin-Jones, R. (2022). Partnering with AI: Intelligent writing assistance and instructed language learning. *Language Learning & Technology*, 26(2), 5–24. <http://doi.org/10125/73474>
- Goodrich Andrade, H. (2000). Using rubrics to promote thinking and learning. *Educational Leadership*, 57(5), 13-18.
- Hands, C., Barton, C., Coulby, C., Qi Saw, Q., Farrell, A., Stevens, C., ... & Lindsay, R. (2026). AI or nay? How students balance the benefits and limitations of generative AI in higher education. *Developing Academic Practice*, 2026(Special), 115-128.
- Huot, B. (2003). *Rearticulating writing assessment for teaching and learning*. Utah State University Press.
- Jonsson, A., & Panadero, E. (2017). The use and design of rubrics to support assessment for learning. In D. Carless, S. M. Bridges, C. Chan, & R. Glofcheski (Eds.), *Scaling up assessment for learning in higher education* (99–111). Springer.
- Koh, E., & Doroudi, S. (2023). Learning, teaching, and assessment with generative artificial intelligence: towards a plateau of productivity. *Learning: Research and Practice*, 9(2), 109-116.

- Li, Z., Liang, C., Peng, J., & Yin, M. (2024, May). The value, benefits, and concerns of generative AI-powered assistance in writing. In *Proceedings of the 2024 CHI conference on human factors in computing systems* (pp. 1-25).
- Lo, N., & Chan, S. (2025). Examining the role of generative AI in academic writing assessment: a mixed-methods study in higher education. *ESP Rev*, 7(2), 7-45.
- Mehrabi, A., & Boud, D. (2025). How can first-year assessment contribute to the continuing development of students' academic writing skills? *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 32(3), 257-275.
- Montgomery, K. (2002). Authentic tasks and rubrics: Going beyond traditional assessments in college teaching. *College Teaching*, 50(1), 34-40.
- Nguyen, A., Hong, Y., Dang, B., & Huang, X. (2024). Human-AI collaboration patterns in AI-assisted academic writing. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2024.2323593>.
- Ranade, N., & Eyman, D. (2024). Introduction: Composing with generative AI. *Computers and Composition*, 71, 102834.
- Sáiz-Manzanares, M. C., Cuesta Segura, I. I., Alegre Calderón, J. M., & Peñacoba Antona, L. (2017). Effects of different types of rubric-based feedback on learning outcomes. In *Frontiers in Education* (2), 34. Frontiers Media SA.
- Sadeghpour, M., Arakala, A., & Rao, A. (2025). Generative AI in collaborative academic report writing: Advantages, disadvantages, and ethical considerations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.08832*.
- Sanz-Tejeda, A., Domínguez-Oller, J. C., Baldaquí-Escandell, J. M., Gómez-Díaz, R., & García-Rodríguez, A. (2025). The impact of generative AI on academic reading and writing: a synthesis of recent evidence (2023–2025). In *Frontiers in Education* (10), 1711718. Frontiers Media SA.
- Sol, K., Sok, S., & Heng, K. (2025). Rethinking assessment in higher education in the age of generative AI. *Encyclopedia of educational innovation*, 1-5.
- Su, A. A. T., & Tran, T. H. N. (2024). The benefits and weaknesses of ChatGPT on students' learning writing. *International Journal of AI in Language Education*, 1(1), 20-28.
- Xie, Q., & Lei, Y. (2022). Diagnostic assessment of L2 academic writing product, process and self-regulatory strategy use with a comparative dimension. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, 19(3), 231-263.
- Yancey, K. B. (1999). Looking Back as We Look Forward: Historicizing Writing Assessment. *College Composition and Communication*, 50(3), 483–503. <https://doi.org/10.58680/ccc19991341>.
- Zhang, J. (2025). ChatGPT or “CheatGPT”? EFL teachers' perceptions of scoring AI-assisted English writing through the lens of assessment literacy. *Digital Applied Linguistics*, 2, 102486-102486.