IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Generative AI In Nursing Education: Faculty Insights Into Student Assessment

[1]Balraj Sharma, [2]Dr. Prof. C. R. Shamsheer Begum, [3]Dr. P. Vanaja, [4]Prof. Himanshu Trivedi, [5]Veena Rani Kamboj

[1]Assistant Professor, [2]Principal, [3]Nursing Tutor,[4]Principal, [5]PHD Scholar

[1]Department of Mental Health Nursing,

[1]Liberty College of Nursing, Jaipur, India, [2]MIMS School College of Nursing, Vizianagaram Andhra Pradesh, [3]College of Nursing, Madras Medical College, Chennai, [4]Panchamrut Institute of Nursing, Gujarat University, Ahmedabad, [5]Noida International University, Uttar Pradesh

Abstract: This study explored nursing faculty perspectives on the use of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in student assessments at a regional university. A qualitative descriptive design was used, with interviews conducted among twelve faculty members who had recently graded student assessments. Data were analyzed using thematic analysis. Findings identified mixed views toward GenAI, highlighting both benefits and concerns. While GenAI was seen as supporting language use and accessibility, participants reported challenges including increased workload, reduced originality, weakened critical thinking, and threats to academic integrity. Faculty also expressed uncertainty about detecting GenAI use and emphasized the need for clearer policies and guidance. The study concludes that GenAI presents both opportunities and risks in nursing education. Effective regulation, faculty support, and student education on ethical and critical use of GenAI are essential to maintain assessment quality and ensure patient safety.

Index Terms - Component, formatting, style, styling, insert.

I. INTRODUCTION

The quick growth and technological maturity of the generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools have led to a significant rise in its usage in educational settings. GenAI systems reply to written commands given to it and produce outputs based on the user perception. As an illustration, students can use such tools to make answers or write essays to do their academic work. In such a context, assessments are any graded work that students need to do as a part of their study. GenAI uses deep-learning models to provide human-like answers to a wide range of complex prompts, which allows it to produce original content in terms of style and format specified by the user.

The unethical use of GenAI in nursing education and other fields of health is a serious issue because of the possible consequences in the care of patients. An example of a nursing student would post some piece of work produced by GenAI without utilizing the critical-thinking skills, therefore, getting no or minimal genuine learning about the subject matter. All outputs of GenAI are original, making it hard to identify any case of academic misconduct using the traditional tools of integrity assessment. As a result, students can finish a degree in nursing without having to learn fundamental theoretical information. These dangers explain why educators need to instruct learners on ethical application of GenAI and develop examinations that involve thinking and provable learning.

It is hence of great importance to help the students to responsibly and effectively use GenAI. To help students get more involved and learn more, one may teach them how to be more critical about the information generated by such tools and how to verify it. The strategy provides students with the skills that will enable them to apply GenAI in the most appropriate way in their academic activities. With GenAI being in its current state of development and expanding more widely used, students have to learn to think critically and apply these technologies in their future practice in the professional environment.

The studies of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools are growing at a high rate. However, the current literature includes mostly speculative viewpoints on how GenAI is perceived by faculty, and most of the debates focus on the possible positive aspects of implementation as opposed to empirically supported results. Although teachers regularly evaluate the work of students and use the detection tools that are said to be aimed at recognizing the use of GenAI, the validity of such tools is doubtful. As Dalalah and Dalalah (2023) mention, AI detection systems may provide both false positive and false negative results, which eliminates the possibility of any system ensuring the unwavering accuracy in identifying GenAI-generated content.

In the case when students willingly reveal that they have used GenAI, the issue of detection will be a secondary matter; the assessment should be considered based more on the merit of the presented artifact. However, disclosure is not a certification that the artifact actually demonstrates the personal understanding or learning of the student. Even in a case when a student passes an assessment with the help of GenAI, the validity of the assessment is reduced as the work obtained can no longer accurately reflect the knowledge or skills of a student.

Even in the cases when students do not report the use of GenAI, some detection tools might be able to identify its existence. Turnitin, as an example, boasts of 98% accuracy in detecting GenAI-generated content . However, the imprecision of such tools is sub-optimal, which makes it difficult to know with a high degree of certainty whether or not GenAI has been used by the faculty. This dilemma raises a thought-provoking question: how can the work of students be fairly evaluated by educators, and the role of GenAI tools in it be established? Since there is a lack of literature exploring the practices of faculty in assessing assignments and identifying the signs of GenAI usage, the authors have provided a series of specific research questions that will be used to explore this problem further.

II. Research Questions

This research paper aimed to explore the following:

1. The perception of the nursing faculty concerning the use of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) tools in student assessment.
2. The way faculty assess and grade the assessment when they suspect the use of GenAI tools.
3. What characteristics or trends have been observed by the faculty in student work that may indicate the use of GenAI tools.

III. Methodology

Research Design

In order to conduct the study, a qualitative descriptive approach that is informed by Sandelowski (2000) was used. This design was chosen due to the fact that it was classified as easy to get a plain and precise description of the experiences of the participants as said in their words. It also allowed digging into subtle and in-depth views which faculty had towards GenAI tools.

Findings were reported in accordance with Consolidated criteria of reporting qualitative researches (COREQ) framework, elaborated by Tong et al. (2007), so the transparency and rigor of presenting results is guaranteed.

The criterion used to select participants was that they had to be employed in the nursing faculty and had to have evaluated student work over the last two years. Other persons who were not on the nursing faculty or those who did not mark student examinations at that time were not included into the study.

Data Analysis

The principal investigator audio-recorded all the interviews and transcribed them word-to-word. Respondents were given a chance to check and make corrections on their transcripts; no one availed the chance. The information was exposed to a thematic analysis based on the six stages of a framework provided by Braun and Clarke (2006).

These stages comprised:
- Learning the acquaintance with the data;
- Generating initial codes;
- Categorizing codes in themes and assigning relevant data to each theme;
- Checking themes to ensure soundness and wholeness;
- Honing and decoding the meaning of every theme; and
- Conclusion of the final report through the choice of illustrative passages and connect them to the research questions.

Analysis of the transcripts was conducted independently by both authors before a meeting with consensus was held so that the consistency and credibility of the analytic process could be ensured.

IV. Results

Participants

Twenty faculty members were involved in the study. The process of recruitment was first come first served and interviewing was done until data saturation was reached. All interviews were recorded using technology and averagely, the interviews lasted between sixty minutes. The sample itself consisted of more female participants and less representatives of male gender. Their experience in teaching was one to over ten years. All the respondents were in the age group of thirty to sixty years and were members of the same institution. Both were well experienced in conducting assessment of nursing students.

V. Themes

An analysis of the information resulted in the identification of five key themes that summarize the faculty views on the use of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in the assessment of students:

- Problems that are related to assessment practices.
- Distinguishing between artificial intelligence and generative artificial intelligence.
- GenAI applications in nursing education.
- The need to control the use of GenAI.
- Ethical issues related to GenAI in examinations.

These themes highlight the main issues and perspectives of faculty with regard to the effects of GenAI in the areas of assessment, learning, and academic integrity in nursing education.

Challenges with Assessment

In the university education especially in the nursing programmes, assessment is very crucial as it helps in provision of the necessary knowledge and competencies required by the students to be competent to practice safely in future. As a result, the participants discussed the topic of assessment and the effects of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) on the quality and authenticity of the assessment in great detail. Faculty raised a number of concerns that are interrelated in their nature and that concern the effects of GenAI on the learning process of students and the assessment standards.

Overwork was one of the issues that have been determined to be significant. In the cases where the use of GenAI was in question, teachers had to spend more time re-reading and researching pupil assignments, thus, proving the adherence to assessment criteria and academic integrity standards. According to one of the participants, they were forced to spend more time examining the content word by word.

The other issue was related to the loss of originality in the work of students. The respondents noted that the answers provided by GenAI were often robotic and did not exhibit depth and complexity. Despite the fact that the language created by GenAI was usually clear and well-built, it limited the possibilities of students to express their own thoughts. This effect led to the appearance of the situation when less skilled writers were more competent, whereas the real critical thinking and personal interest to the subject were weakened.

There was also a concern on the academic quality of GenAI-generated content by faculty. The work was in most cases unsatisfactory in terms of assessment and did not reflect meaningful learning. As a result, the general level of student submissions went down, and some students turned to GenAI to generate last-minute submissions which were just good enough to earn a passing score.

The participants highlighted the need of more realistic assessment strategies that are more appropriate to the actual nursing practice. They argued that students were expected to exhibit comprehension by means of practical and applied activities as opposed to in essays where they were expected to reproduce theoretical information through their essays. This necessitates a change in the conventional test methods, and more use of diverse formations other than quizzes, examinations, and written tests.

There are different views on the manner in which GenAI-assisted work should be graded. There are faculty who believe that marking assignments should be based on content quality, regardless of whether GenAI is used or not. They have pointed out that work produced by GenAI usually got lower grades because it was not deep and analytical. Some other individuals indicated that it is difficult to recognize students who use GenAI successfully. One participant was optimistic and believed that students will one day learn to employ GenAI in their learning and not as a short cut and that over dependence of the tool would automatically translate to poor grades or failing.

Differentiating between AI and GenAI.

The terms artificial intelligence (AI) and generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) are often used interchangeably: the division between the two terms has not been properly defined. The participants did not seem to be sure about these constructs and tended to use them conjunctively, to suggest the equivalence. One of the participants noted that despite the made distinction, a clear definition of it is not easily captured. Such ambiguity explains the need to have clear definitions and even educational interventions with regard to AI and GenAI.

The topics covered as the discussion continued showed that the participants had a better understanding of the differences and similarities between the two fields. They explained that AI is mostly the alteration or improvement of an existing one, and GenAI is the creation of something completely new. The participants also recognized tools suitable to each category; i.e., tools like Grammarly were mentioned as suitable to both of the categories, as they can correct grammar and spelling and at the same time produce a textual content.

GenAI in Nursing Education

Even with such ambivalent views, the participants admitted the persistent utilitarian role of GenAI in the case of students. They also focused on the need to understand how GenAI could be applied professionally to promote learning as opposed to replacing it. One salient positive use that was found concerns the language translation: GenAI tools can be used to translate instructional resources into the native languages of their learners, thus, helping them to understand the information in their own language.

The study participants also reported that GenAI can help them correct sentence structure and grammar of students with a non-English speaking background. However, they warned that post-editing with the help of GenAI is prone to distorting the original meaning even though the translation of the content across different languages is required. Considering the enormity of the ubiquitous functioning of GenAI tools, students do not have to rely solely on their regularly set appointments with learning support services.

Faculty highlighted the importance of fair accessibility of GenAI resources by every student. They were worried that students who would be coming in disadvantaged or rural backgrounds would have a competitive disadvantage due to the lack of availability of the reliable technology or access to broadband. They however

noted that equal access is impossible, because there will always be a group of students who will have better devices or a better connection than others.

Participants also retrospected their role as educators other than assessment. The introduction of GenAI into nursing education was viewed by many as a difficulty and a possible source of reduction in the intrinsic value of the university teaching. Others argued that the growing dependency on GenAI reduces the quality and depth of the instruction and makes education more shallow and undermines the perceived value of academic qualifications.

In general, the respondents considered GenAI to have both beneficial and harmful implications on nursing education. It can either facilitate guided learning and enhance comprehension on one hand, and on the other hand, it can lead to over-dependence on technology which inhibits critical thinking of the learning material and restricts true knowledge acquisition among the students.

VI. Regulation of GenAI Use

New technologies often introduce the sense of doubt and the lack of regulatory measures. As time goes by, people and organizations strive to incorporate these innovations into the everyday life before formal rules and guidelines are put in place. When investigating the self-regulation of GenAI, the subjects found that there are a number of salient challenges.

One of the major issues was the fast-changing nature of GenAI technology. Participants challenged the possibility of being able to control a rapidly evolving system and asked the question of what to are the parts that can be regulated. It was this uncertainty that led to deliberations on the need to have clear and proper institutional policies.

The other critical problem was the development of policies that would regulate the use of GenAI. The subjects of the debate were whether these policies should encourage responsible use or create restrictions or bans. Faculty were interested in clear guidance by the university so that they felt they were supported in handling GenAI in assessments. It was considered necessary to advocate policy-making in order to set acceptable and non-acceptable applications of these tools.

Another significant aspect identified by the participants was access to detection tools and educational resources. They felt that better tools will improve their ability to detect GenAI use and promote academic integrity. Without these resources, the faculties would be disadvantaged and students may submit unnoticed works of GenAI, thus continuing to advance without gaining the necessary knowledge and skills necessary to practice.

VII. Discussion

The study analyzed the perceptions of nursing faculty toward the application of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) in student evaluations at a regional university, and thus adds to the growing body of research on the subject. In line with the results of Summers et al. (2024), faculty opinions were inconsistent, and the attitudes were positive and negative towards GenAI. Although the participants did admit that GenAI will be able to enhance the presentation and overall structure of student work, there were also complaints that its use will adversely affect the value of academic qualifications.

The main aim of assessment is to make sure that students will graduate with knowledge and skills required to practice safely in their line of work. The use of GenAI tools can encourage students to pass tests without acquiring the necessary knowledge. This is a critical threat to the safety of patients in the nursing field. They support these results and claim that unethical practice with GenAI can have a negative impact on patient care, as students may not be sufficiently ready to take clinical practice (Irwin et al., 2023).

Reported by the faculty, they spent a lot of time looking into the possible inappropriate GenAI use. Some of the common signals included unnatural or artificial language, shallow analysis, overuse of repetition and poorly developed arguments. However, the teachers also showed little confidence in available detection tools, which is similar to the views of Dalalah and Dalalah (2023). With the advancement in detection technology,

the time required in investigating is expected to reduce and trust control among the faculty in the tools will increase.

The results also highlight the need to come up with a clear distinction between artificial intelligence (AI) and GenAI. There is still a lot of confusion with regard to the distinction between the two concepts. Although GenAI can generate new text, images, audio and video, not every AI system can create new content. The difference is not as pronounced, but it is undisputable that both teachers and learners need to have a clear idea of the difference.

GenAI is likely to continue as part of the learning and evaluation of students. The faculty should therefore be in a position to determine when its application is helping to learn, and when it is not. It is also their role to ensure that students are guided to use these tools in a fair and equitable manner towards ethical and constructive use of these tools. The education on GenAI is necessary as such technologies will become a part of the future professional setting of students. In the absence of this knowledge, the safety of patients may be compromised.

GenAI is difficult to regulate because the technological progress is so fast. There is a risk that new tools and capabilities come into existence and render the policies outdated. As a result, higher education institutions need to focus on creating generalised or broad regulations that may relate to the use of all GenAI and not individual tools. These rules need to involve and encourage the faculty in their development and in their practical implementation. Without proper guidance, faculty will be unprepared to implement policies, which compromises their efficiency and effectiveness.

References

1. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
2. Dalalah, D., & Dalalah, O. M. A. (2023). The false positives and false negatives of generative AI detection tools in education and academic research: The case of ChatGPT. The International Journal of Management Education, 21(2), 100822. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100822
3. Irwin, P., Jones, D., & Fealy, S. (2023). What is ChatGPT and what do we do with it? Implications of the age of AI for nursing and midwifery practice and education: An editorial. Nurse Education Today, 127, 105835. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. nedt.2023.105835
4. Lim, W. M., Gunasekara, A., Pallant, J. L., Pallant, J. I., & Pechenkina, E. (2023). Generative AI and the future of education: Ragnarok ¨ or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management educators. The International Journal of Management Education, 21(2), 100790. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100790
5. Penltonen, L.-M., Michalowski, M., Stiglic, G., Ronquillo, C., Pruinelli, L., Song, J., O'Connor, S., Miyagawa, S., & Fukahori, H. (2024). The ChatGPT effect: Nursing education and generative artificial intelligence. Journal of Nursing Education, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.3928/01484834-20240126-01
6. Sandelowski, M. (2000). Whatever happened to qualitative description? Research in Nursing & Health, 23(4), 334–340. https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-240X(200008)23: 43.0.CO;2-G
7. Summers, A., Haddad, M. E., Prichard, R., Clarke, K.-A., Lee, J., & Oprescu, F. (2024). Navigating challenges and opportunities: Nursing student's views on generative AI in higher education. Nurse Education in Practice, 79, 104062. https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.nepr.2024.104062
8. Summers, A., & Herbst, F. (2025). Guardians of the profession. Nurse Education in Practice, 83, 104259. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2025.104259
9. Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. (2007). Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): A 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. International Journal for Quality in Health Care, 19(6), 349–357. https://doi.org/10.1093/intqhc/mzm042
10. Turnitin. (2023). AI Writing Detection Capabilities — Frequently Asked Questions. Retrieved 18/05/23 from.
11. Anthony Summers, Joanne Lee, Generative AI and nursing education: Exploring faculty views on student assessment, Journal of Professional Nursing, Volume 60,2025,Pages 168-172,ISSN 8755-7223, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.profnurs.2025.08.003.