

BA IN ELT PROGRAMS

Student GenAI Collaboration Appendices

Three strand-specific appendices for transparent, instructor-approved use of generative AI

Appendix A	English Language Skill Development
Appendix B	English for Academic Purposes (EAP)
Appendix C	Teaching Practicum

How to use these appendices

- Instructor assigns the level.** The permitted GenAI level (1-5) must be identified before work begins; assignment-specific limits override the general descriptions.
- Student documents the process.** Complete the appendix that matches the course strand. Level 1 requires a no-AI declaration; Levels 2-5 require progressively stronger evidence of prompting, decision-making, verification, and reflection.
- Submit evidence with the final work.** Attach planning notes, prompt records, original and revised versions, source-verification records, or workflow evidence as required by the assigned level.
- Assessment focuses on learning and judgment.** A polished product is not sufficient. The appendix makes visible the student's language development, academic integrity, pedagogical reasoning, and independent decision-making.

Evidence expected by level

Level	Student-AI relationship	Minimum appendix evidence
1	Independent performance	Signed no-AI declaration and instructor verification.
2	AI supports input/planning	Tool and prompt log; record of what was kept or discarded; final output produced by the student.
3	AI acts as coach/critical friend	Original work, AI feedback, revised work, and rationale for accepting or rejecting suggestions.
4	AI assists complex task completion	Detailed verification, source/fact checks, critical evaluation, and evidence of substantive revision.
5	AI is integrated strategically	Documented multi-stage workflow, safeguards, quality-control decisions, and reflection on transfer to future practice.

Core principle: AI is supplementary and must be used transparently within instructor-approved contexts. The final submission must preserve the student's authentic voice, critical thinking, and required originality.

APPENDIX A

Student AI Collaboration Log: English Language Skill Development

For General English, integrated skills, pronunciation, speaking, listening, reading, and writing courses. The assessment target remains language growth and communicative performance; AI may support learning, but students must show evidence of learning rather than only a polished product.

Student:		Student ID:	
Course/Subject:		Instructor:	
Assignment/Topic:		Submission date:	

1. Assigned GenAI level and boundaries

The instructor identifies the permitted level before the student begins. Check one level and record any assignment-specific limits.

Select	Level	Permitted role of AI	Required evidence
☐	1 - No AI	No GenAI, translation software, grammar correction, or similar assistance. Appropriate for baseline diagnostics, timed writing, live speaking, and supervised reading/listening checks.	No-AI declaration
☐	2 - Input and planning	AI may provide comprehensible input and planning support, such as graded texts, glossaries, models, or practice items. Student output remains fully human.	Planning/prompt log
☐	3 - Coaching/collaboration	AI may act as a coach for feedback, error noticing, and reformulation options. The student must submit a change log and explain decisions.	Revision trail + rationale
☐	4 - Complex task support	AI may support extended or integrated performance tasks. The student is assessed on verification, selection, revision, accuracy, and appropriateness for the target level.	Verification + substantive revision
☐	5 - Integrated workflow	AI may be integrated into a personalized learning system. The student is assessed on learning design, progress monitoring, reflection, and transfer to real communication.	Workflow record + reflection

Instructor-approved tools, limits, or prohibited uses:

2. How AI supported my language learning

Check every use that applies. For Level 1, check only "No AI used."

- ☐ **No AI used:** I completed the assessed task independently.
- ☐ **Comprehensible input:** AI adapted a text, explanation, transcript, or example to an appropriate language level.
- ☐ **Vocabulary/pronunciation support:** AI generated a glossary, collocation list, pronunciation model, or focused practice.
- ☐ **Planning/brainstorming:** AI helped me organize ideas before I produced my own language.
- ☐ **Practice generation:** AI created questions, role-plays, drills, or rehearsal opportunities.
- ☐ **Feedback/error noticing:** AI identified possible errors or patterns for me to examine.
- ☐ **Reformulation options:** AI suggested alternatives, and I selected or rejected them based on meaning, level, and voice.
- ☐ **Complex performance support:** AI supported debate preparation, an extended presentation, or an integrated reading-to-write/speak task.
- ☐ **Personalized learning design:** AI helped me build a micro-syllabus, practice plan, spaced-repetition set, or progress-monitoring routine.
- ☐ **Other:** _____

3. AI interaction and decision log

Record the most important interactions. Attach screenshots or a complete transcript when required by the instructor.

Tool/model	Prompt or request	Output used, changed, or rejected	Why this decision supported my learning

4. Evidence of my own language production

- ☐ **Baseline or first attempt attached:** I included my original notes, draft, recording, or first performance sample.
- ☐ **Final student-produced work attached:** The final language reflects my own intended meaning and communicative choices.
- ☐ **Revision trail attached (Levels 3-5):** I showed what changed after AI feedback and explained why.
- ☐ **Independent performance evidence attached:** I demonstrated the target language without AI in a live, timed, or follow-up task when required.

One representative change

My original wording/performance	My revised wording/performance

Why I accepted, modified, or rejected the AI suggestion:

5. My human review and corrections

- ☐ **Meaning and accuracy:** I confirmed that the final language communicates what I intended and does not introduce false or distorted information.
- ☐ **Target-level appropriateness:** I checked vocabulary, grammar, register, pronunciation, and complexity against the course level.
- ☐ **Authentic voice:** I removed language I would not normally understand, explain, or use.
- ☐ **Learning rather than replacement:** I can explain the relevant language choices and reproduce the skill independently.
- ☐ **Attribution:** I disclosed any AI-generated wording, examples, translations, or corrections that remain in the submitted work.

6. Reflection on language growth and transfer

What did I learn about English from this AI-supported process?

What can I now do independently in real communication that I could not do as well before?

7. Academic integrity disclosure

Transparency statement

I used generative AI only within the level and conditions approved by my instructor. I documented the tools, prompts, outputs, and decisions that materially affected my work. My final submission represents my own intended meaning, language learning, and critical judgment, and I can explain and reproduce the assessed skills independently.

- ☐ No AI, translation, grammar-checking, or similar assistance appears in the work without disclosure or attribution.
- ☐ I verified that the final submission meets the course originality requirement (90-100%).
- ☐ I understand that incomplete or inaccurate documentation may be treated as an academic-integrity concern.

Student signature:		Date:	
Instructor review:	☐ Complete ☐ Revision required	Initials:	

APPENDIX B

Student AI Collaboration Log: English for Academic Purposes (EAP)

For academic reading, writing, research literacy, source use, and citation practices. The assessment target emphasizes research integrity, evidence handling, genre control, and transparent documentation of AI use at every level above Level 1.

Student:		Student ID:	
Course/Subject:		Instructor:	
Assignment/Topic:		Submission date:	

1. Assigned GenAI level and boundaries

The instructor identifies the permitted level before the student begins. Check one level and record any assignment-specific limits.

Select	Level	Permitted role of AI	Required evidence
☐	1 - No AI	No GenAI or similar assistance. Appropriate for supervised paragraphs, source-use quizzes, summary/paraphrase tasks, and timed argument writing.	No-AI declaration
☐	2 - Input and planning	AI may clarify concepts, refine questions, or suggest outlines and planning options. Student drafts remain human; prompts and kept/discarded ideas must be documented.	Planning/prompt log
☐	3 - Coaching/collaboration	AI may act as editor and critical friend for clarity, cohesion, hedging, and register. A revision trail and integrity statement are required.	Revision trail + rationale
☐	4 - Complex task support	AI may support literature mapping, gap statements, or methodological options. The student must fact-check, verify sources, correct citations, and rewrite substantively.	Verification + substantive revision
☐	5 - Integrated workflow	AI may be integrated into advanced scholarly workflows. The student must demonstrate synthesis, epistemic caution, strategic prompting, and full workflow transparency.	Workflow record + reflection

Instructor-approved tools, databases, limits, or prohibited uses:

2. How AI supported my academic work

- ☐ **No AI used:** I completed the assessed task independently.
- ☐ **Concept clarification:** AI helped explain a theory, term, method, or assignment requirement that I then checked against course sources.
- ☐ **Research-question refinement:** AI suggested alternative wording or scope; I made the final research decision.
- ☐ **Planning/outline options:** AI generated possible structures; I kept, changed, or rejected elements.
- ☐ **Genre modeling:** AI helped me notice conventions of an academic genre without replacing my own draft.
- ☐ **Editing/critical-friend feedback:** AI commented on clarity, cohesion, hedging, stance, register, or disciplinary language.
- ☐ **Literature mapping/gap exploration:** AI proposed themes, relationships, or possible gaps that I independently verified.
- ☐ **Methodological options:** AI suggested possible designs, instruments, or analytical procedures that I evaluated against research principles.
- ☐ **Scholarly synthesis workflow:** AI supported comparison across multiple sources, theoretical framing, or development of an original study/argument.
- ☐ **Other:** _____

3. AI planning, prompting, and source-verification log

AI output is not a scholarly source. Record how you verified claims using the original publication, database record, course text, or other authoritative source.

Tool/model + prompt	AI output or claim	Source/claim verification performed	Decision and section affected

4. Research integrity and evidence handling

- ☐ **Source existence:** I retrieved and read every source cited in the final work; I did not cite references only because an AI tool supplied them.
- ☐ **Claim accuracy:** I checked important factual, theoretical, and methodological claims against the original sources.
- ☐ **Quotation accuracy:** I verified wording, page numbers, and context for every direct quotation.
- ☐ **Citation accuracy:** I checked author names, dates, titles, publication details, in-text citations, and reference entries.
- ☐ **No fabricated evidence:** I removed or corrected invented references, statistics, findings, quotations, or participant information.
- ☐ **Evidence-claim alignment:** The sources cited actually support the claims I make.
- ☐ **Epistemic caution:** I qualified uncertain or contested claims and avoided presenting AI-generated speculation as fact.

5. Revision trail and academic decision-making

Attach the original student draft, relevant AI feedback/output, and the revised version for Levels 3-5.

AI suggestion or generated passage	My action: accept / modify / reject	Academic reason for my decision

6. My independent scholarly contribution

State the central claim, interpretation, synthesis, or research decision that is distinctly yours.

Explain how your final work goes beyond surface editing or AI-generated summary.

7. Academic integrity disclosure

Transparency statement

I used generative AI only within the level and conditions approved by my instructor. I have documented material prompts, outputs, revisions, and decisions. I independently verified all sources, citations, quotations, claims, and evidence. The final argument, synthesis, interpretation, and scholarly decisions are my own, and no AI-generated or tool-assisted content remains undisclosed or unattributed.

- ☐ Every cited source exists, was accessed by me, and supports the claim for which it is cited.
- ☐ No fabricated references, quotations, data, findings, or participant information appear in the submission.
- ☐ I verified that the final submission meets the course originality requirement (90-100%).
- ☐ I understand that incomplete documentation or unverified AI output may constitute an academic-integrity violation.

Student signature:		Date:	
Instructor review:	☐ Complete ☐ Revision required	Initials:	

APPENDIX C

Student AI Collaboration Log: Teaching Practicum

For lesson planning, materials design, microteaching, observation, reflection, assessment design, and curriculum work. The assessment target is pedagogical reasoning and classroom decision-making, with explicit attention to alignment, SLA, UDL, feasibility, privacy, bias, and accessibility.

Student:		Student ID:	
Course/Subject:		Instructor:	
Assignment/Topic:		Submission date:	

1. Assigned GenAI level and boundaries

The instructor identifies the permitted level before the student begins. Check one level and record any assignment-specific limits.

Select	Level	Permitted role of AI	Required evidence
☐	1 - No AI	No GenAI. Appropriate for live teaching, observation notes, spontaneous classroom decisions, and independent demonstrations of pedagogical knowledge.	No-AI declaration
☐	2 - Input and planning	AI may generate planning ideas, activity options, instructions, or differentiation possibilities. The student must justify choices through SLA, UDL, and course principles.	Planning/prompt log
☐	3 - Coaching/collaboration	AI may act as a design partner for worksheets, rubrics, or feedback language. Annotated revisions must show adaptation for actual learners and context.	Revision trail + rationale
☐	4 - Complex task support	AI may support unit plans, assessment systems, or intervention plans. The student must evaluate feasibility, evidence, alignment, and classroom consequences.	Verification + substantive revision
☐	5 - Integrated workflow	AI may be orchestrated across planning, teaching, assessment, and reflection. The student must document safeguards, data-informed decisions, inclusive design, and professional learning.	Workflow record + reflection

Instructor-approved tools, learner-data restrictions, limits, or prohibited uses:

2. How AI supported my professional task

- ☐ **No AI used:** I completed the assessed task or live teaching performance independently.
- ☐ **Activity/lesson ideas:** AI suggested possible tasks, examples, sequences, or instructions.
- ☐ **SLA-informed planning:** AI helped explore input, interaction, noticing, output, scaffolding, feedback, or developmental readiness.
- ☐ **UDL/differentiation:** AI suggested multiple means of engagement, representation, or action/expressions for diverse learners.
- ☐ **Materials design:** AI drafted or adapted worksheets, texts, prompts, visuals, examples, or practice items.
- ☐ **Assessment/feedback design:** AI drafted criteria, rubric language, questions, exemplars, or feedback phrasing.
- ☐ **Complex professional planning:** AI supported a unit, assessment system, intervention, or reteaching plan.
- ☐ **Data-informed reflection:** AI helped identify patterns in de-identified classroom evidence and generate options for next steps.
- ☐ **Curriculum/inclusive innovation:** AI supported coordinated design across planning, teaching, assessment, reflection, and accessibility.
- ☐ **Other:** _____

3. Pedagogical decision log

Document the decisions that most affected the lesson, materials, assessment, or reflection. Do not include identifiable learner data.

Learner/context need	AI tool, prompt, or suggestion	My adaptation or rejection	SLA/UDL/evidence-based rationale

4. Alignment, feasibility, and ethical safeguards

- ☐ **Objectives-tasks-assessment alignment:** The learning objectives, classroom activities, and assessment evidence match one another.
- ☐ **Learner and context fit:** I adapted AI suggestions to actual age, proficiency, needs, resources, time, and institutional context.
- ☐ **SLA rationale:** I can explain how the design supports language acquisition rather than merely keeping learners busy.
- ☐ **UDL and accessibility:** The design offers appropriate access, participation, and expression without lowering essential learning goals.
- ☐ **Feasibility:** The plan can be implemented with the available time, technology, materials, and classroom management conditions.
- ☐ **Bias and representation:** I reviewed examples, roles, cultural content, and assumptions for bias, stereotyping, or exclusion.
- ☐ **Privacy and consent:** I did not enter identifiable student, colleague, school, assessment, or observation data into an AI system without explicit authorization.
- ☐ **Professional accountability:** I remain responsible for the final pedagogical decisions and their consequences.

5. Evidence from implementation or professional review

- ☐ **Original planning/material attached:** I included my initial human thinking before or alongside AI support.
- ☐ **Annotated adaptation attached (Levels 3-5):** I showed how AI-generated materials were changed for learners and context.
- ☐ **Teaching/observation evidence attached:** I included observation notes, samples, assessment evidence, or feedback when permitted.
- ☐ **Post-teaching revision attached:** I changed the plan or materials based on what actually happened in the classroom.

AI-supported proposal	What happened / what I observed	My professional decision and next step

6. Reflection on pedagogical learning

Which AI suggestion was least appropriate for these learners, and why?

What did you learn that will improve a future planning-teaching-assessment-reflection cycle?

7. Academic and professional integrity disclosure

Transparency statement

I used generative AI only within the level and conditions approved by my instructor. I documented material prompts, outputs, adaptations, and professional decisions. The final lesson, materials, assessment, or reflection reflects my own pedagogical reasoning and responsibility. I evaluated AI suggestions through course principles, SLA, UDL, classroom evidence, feasibility, and ethical safeguards.

- ☐ No identifiable learner, colleague, school, observation, or assessment data was entered into an AI system without authorization.
- ☐ All AI-generated materials were reviewed for accuracy, bias, accessibility, cultural appropriateness, and classroom feasibility.
- ☐ I verified that the final submission meets the course originality requirement (90-100%).
- ☐ I understand that I remain professionally accountable for all instructional and assessment decisions.

Student signature:		Date:	
Instructor review:	☐ Complete ☐ Revision required	Initials:	