The Irish Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning

Volume 9 | Number 1

Article type: Short Report

Prompt to Podcast: Reimagining Assessment with Generative AI

Dr Patrick Buckland
Mary Immaculate College, Limerick, Ireland patrick.buckland@mic.ul.ie
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7825-376X

Dr Rebecca Purcell
Mary Immaculate College, Limerick, Ireland
https://orcid.org/0009-0001-0207-2118

Recommended Citation

Buckland, P & Purcell, R. (2025) Prompt to Podcast: Reimagining Assessment with Generative AI. *Irish Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.22554/v3h7jn42

Irish Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning

Vol 9, Issue 1

Short Report

Prompt to Podcast: Reimagining Assessment with Generative AI

Patrick Buckland [1] & Rebecca Purcell
Mary Immaculate College, Limerick, Ireland

Abstract

In this case study, we outline a creative approach to integrating generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) into two assessments within an undergraduate organisational behaviour module. This approach promotes higher-order cognitive skills while upholding academic rigour and remaining true to assessing the module's learning outcomes. In our first assessment, students were required to use GenAI to draft a structured review of an academic article on workplace diversity. A central characteristic was the iterative process of developing and refining prompts required to guide the GenAI towards the desired output, promoting the development of prompt engineering skills. In the second assessment, we outline how groups of students created an audio podcast based on a classical organisational experiment using GenAI to simulate an interview with the experiment's original researcher, achieved through AI-driven role-play. These examples demonstrate how AI can be positioned not only as a tool but as a collaborative partner in encouraging critical thinking, creative exploration, and digital literacy.

Keywords:

Assessment, Generative AI, Podcast, higher education

1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has become embedded into contemporary society. It powers our smartphones, cars, education, and productivity tools. With AI becoming more sophisticated, it is essential to prepare students to utilise this technology effectively and engage with it ethically. Equipping them with these competencies will make sure they are not left behind and can successfully navigate the demands of a future workforce increasingly defined by AI innovation. (Perkins et al., 2024). As educators, we must also embrace AI or risk becoming digitally obsolete (Bower et al., 2024). Integrating generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) into academic assessments can provide a creative and engaging way to assess students. As GenAI increases its capacity to generate coherent written text and execute tasks historically relied upon as evidence of student learning, educators must reconsider and revise conventional assessment paradigms (Pokkakillath & Suleri, 2023).

---

[1] Address for corresponding author patrick.buckland@mic.ul.ie

A number of strategies have been suggested to mitigate the risk of academic dishonesty. One approach is to restrict the use of GenAI (Van Slyke et al., 2023). Designing assessments that require higher-order cognitive skills, such as critical thinking, analysis, evaluation, and creativity, is another approach often recommended in the literature (Chan, 2023). Although the technology can convincingly produce written work, it struggles with tasks that demand true originality, subtle critical insight, or engagement with novel and rapidly changing contexts (Meça & Shkëlzeni, 2024). One way to take advantage of these limitations is to redesign assessments that actively reward creativity and independent thought, requiring students to generate original ideas and think critically about the material (Bennett & Abusalem, 2024). Strategies like these support pedagogical practices that emphasise process over product and foster the development of unique insights that GenAI cannot easily reproduce (Hadi Mogavi et al., 2024). Building on these principles is a third emerging approach, integrating GenAI directly into assessment design (Miller, 2024). We present a two-part case study which illustrates how that integration can move beyond using GenAI for final outputs and instead position it as a dynamic partner within the assessment process.

In the first assignment, students were tasked with using GenAI to draft a structured review of an academic article. Students demonstrated iterative prompt engineering skills by devising, testing, and refining their prompt. Prompt engineering refers to the process of carefully designing and improving prompts in order to guide an AI model to produce useful, relevant, and high-quality responses (Lee & Palmer, 2025). The assessment, far from being a simple copy-and-paste exercise, required creative problem-solving, higher-order critical thinking, and inventiveness. The second assignment built on the foundation of the first assignment and extended it into an imaginative, interactive medium where students used GenAI-mediated role-play to simulate a podcast interview with a historical researcher of a classical organisational behaviour study. Here, the technology's conversational and interactive ability becomes a springboard for exploration rather than a shortcut to completion. Creating probing questions, evaluating GenAI responses, and bringing it all together into a professionally produced podcast episode again requires critical thinking, analysis, and originality, human capacities that GenAI struggles to duplicate.

The two assessments demonstrate the new possibilities that become available when this technology is thoughtfully integrated; educators can leverage its strengths while upholding academic integrity, accurately assessing learning outcomes, and nurturing the higher-order capabilities that distinguish human learners (Williams, 2025).

2. Case Overview

The assessments were embedded in an organisational behaviour module taken by 117 third-year undergraduate students as part of an initial teacher education programme. As the majority of the students would go on to be post-primary teachers, GenAI literacy is seen as a vital skill for their future profession (Bernardi et al., 2025). The module assessment was broken into three parts. Assessment parts one and two are where we integrated GenAI, and were worth 50% of the overall grade. For both assessments, students primarily used the free version of ChatGPT (version 4, OpenAI) for text generation. For music generation, students mainly used Aimusic.so, which was powered by the Suno V3 engine. Both tools were freely available and demonstrated in class.

The third part of the assessment was a team-based critical evaluation of the organisational culture of a company chosen by the students. Their task was to analyse the culture, identify

challenges, and propose four improvement strategies aligned with the Great Places to Work 17 actionable categories. AI use was not permitted for this component for two reasons: first, to evaluate students' ability to independently apply organisational theory and exercise strategic judgement without GenAI assistance; and second, to provide a clear contrast to the earlier assessments by emphasising collaboration, critical thinking, and human-centred decision-making.

2.1 Assessment One: Integrating Prompt Engineering

The first assessment, conducted primarily in class over three weeks, took a distinctive approach to using GenAI to generate a structured review of a research article addressing workplace diversity. We divided the assessment into three components:

Part A: Prompt Development (50 Marks)

Students were required to choose an article and study it carefully. Once familiar with the article, they uploaded it to GenAI and, with its aid, wrote a structured review based on specific criteria outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Criteria for structured summary/review

Section	Target Word Count	What to Cover
1. Summary of the Article	125 words	• Concisely restate the article's purpose and scope • Identify the core arguments/aims • Note the key findings, theories, or concepts
2. Discussion of Methodology	100 words	• Specify the research design (qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-methods) • Evaluate the appropriateness of the research question • Flag methodological limitations/biases
3. Assessment of Evidence and Data	125-200 words	• Describe the data/evidence underpinning claims • Evaluate reliability (source credibility, sampling, rigour) and validity • Highlight gaps, inconsistencies, or missing data
4. Evaluation of the Main Arguments	150-200 words	• Weigh the strengths versus weaknesses of central arguments • Assess logical flow, coherence, and clarity • Discuss originality or significance relative to the literature
5. Conclusion	100 words	• Recap key evaluative points • Offer overall verdict on merit and shortcomings • Suggest avenues for future research or unanswered questions

Generating an effective prompt usually needs several iterations (Cox et al., 2024). As such, students were required to develop a prompt through an iterative process and document each step to capture the evolution of their prompt development. As such, they were advised not to copy and paste the criteria directly from Table 1 but to phrase their inputs using natural language. Students were provided a template document as a guide, which captured the iterative prompt development and the resulting outputs from GenAI. In class, students were explicitly advised not to enter any personal information into GenAI and to anonymise their

interactions. The format of the first part of assessment one in the guiding document was set up as shown below.

Iteration 1

- **Prompt**: The initial prompt you created to generate the review.
- **Evaluation of the Prompt:** What are your thoughts on the prompt after you used it? What would you change?

The above format was repeated four times, and students were instructed to use as many iterations as needed to arrive at a point where they felt they had reached the limits of how GenAI could contribute. The reflective component was central to the assessment design. We asked the student to reflect on and evaluate the GenAI's output and their interaction with the tool.

Part B: The Final Review (30 Marks)

When students felt that GenAI contributed as much as possible, they were tasked with manually adding the final touches to their review, such as formatting, adding references, and making any additions that GenAI failed to make.

Part C Reflection (20 Marks)

In the final part of Assessment One, students were first asked to give their insights from the exercise and reflect on the effectiveness of GenAI in assisting with academic reviews. They were also asked to reflect on the article's content and explain what they felt was important about the research.

The first assessment provided students with hands-on experience working with GenAI. They were challenged to think systematically about language and structure by iteratively adjusting their prompts. The manual refinement of their final prompt demonstrates the complementary strengths of automation and human expertise. GenAI delivers speed and the heavy lifting while students supply nuance, disciplinary judgement, and precise referencing. Finally, the reflective component transforms procedural know-how into lasting insight; by analysing both GenAI's role and the article's significance, learners cultivate metacognitive awareness, ethical sensitivity, and a deeper understanding of the research. Collectively, these elements prepare students to harness GenAI thoughtfully, recognise its limitations, and perform rigorous, well-reasoned academic reviews.

Feedback from students on Assessment One was positive. For many, it was their first time using GenAI, and they were initially apprehensive about engaging with the tool, especially in educational contexts. However, after completing the assessment, students expressed surprise at how useful GenAI could be as a learning partner while still retaining a healthy level of scepticism. Several students noted that the assignment helped them better understand how to communicate effectively with GenAI models.

2.2 Assessment Two: GenAI-Assisted Podcast

Assessment Two was split into two parts:

Short Report

Part A: Produce a GenAI-Assisted Podcast

Students in teams of three or four were required to choose a classical organisational behaviour experiment from a list of the most famous (or infamous) experiments of the 20th century, such as the Milgram Experiment and the Stanford Prison Experiment. They were tasked with producing a 10-minute audio podcast episode that included a GenAI role-played interview with the original researcher of the experiment. To create a credible interview script, students were required to study the experiment in depth, examining its design, key findings, and ethical implications, and use this understanding to develop a set of probing interview questions. These questions, along with the final podcast script, were submitted for review. Much of this work was completed in class under supervision, allowing instructors to monitor students' research process and provide formative feedback. Ensuring that students engaged meaningfully with the material, entered the GenAI interaction with informed intent, and that the dialogue reflected their understanding of the experiment rather than uncritically accepting AI-generated content. The students used GenAI to role-play as the original researcher. The GenAI was asked the pre-prepared questions, and the students recorded the GenAI's answers by pasting them into a Word document.

We asked students to treat their 10-minute episode like a professional broadcast when recording their podcasts. Students began their episode with a concise, branded intro that blended GenAI-generated music with a spoken teaser. In class, we demonstrated a range of no-cost GenAI music tools and free-to-use editing platforms, which let students generate custom tracks. The goal was to ensure the final product sounded polished and engaging while keeping the technical barriers as low as possible. Each student took a role such as a podcast host, researcher, or producer.

The groups were required to develop a script for the podcast that followed the following structure.

Table 2: Structure of Podcast

Segment	Description
1. Introduction	Briefly introduce the podcast, the topic, and what listeners can expect.
2. Experiment Summary	A detailed description of the experiment: objectives, methodology, findings, and significance.
3. AI Role-Play Interview	Simulate an interview with the experiment's author using GenAI. This will involve crafting questions that explore the depth and implications of the study.
4. Analysis	Discuss the strengths, weaknesses, and any controversial aspects of the experiment, incorporating insights from the interview and broader research.
5. Conclusion	Sum up the discussion, reiterating key points and relevance to the field of organisational behaviour.

In addition to the audio file, they uploaded to the institution's Yuja platform, which is a secure platform designed to help educational institutions create, manage, and distribute video and audio content. Students also submitted the list of interview questions they had crafted and a final copy of their full podcast script, making sure that the process and the product were fully documented.

Part B: Peer Review

The final part of Assessment Two required students to review one of the podcasts posted by another group. For example, students were required to state why they chose the podcast they reviewed, what was compelling or engaging, and what they thought others in their class would learn from it.

The feedback was also positive; most said they enjoyed the experience. The quality of the podcasts was reflected in their positive engagement with the assessment, which exceeded our expectations. The groups were genuinely interested in their chosen experiments and noted that the podcast format made complex psychological studies more accessible and memorable.

3. Conclusion

Successfully integrating GenAI into academic assessments requires a level of creativity and innovation that goes beyond simply policing its use. It involves positioning AI as an active collaborator that challenges students to think, create, and reflect at a deeper level (Perkins et al., 2024). We demonstrated how thoughtfully designed GenAI tasks can scaffold critical engagement rather than shortcut it. Assessment One helped students become skilled at creating effective prompts, turning a list of criteria into clear instructions for GenAI, and assessing the results critically. The emphasis we put on iterative prompt engineering challenged the students to develop an ability to translate criteria into precise GenAI instructions and evaluate critically machine-generated output. Assessment Two's GenAI-mediated podcast role-play expanded this creative partnership, inviting learners to step into the interviewer and researcher's shoes, craft probing questions, and situate GenAI responses within a coherent narrative analysis.

While the assignments allow students to apply important prompt engineering, digital, and creative skills, it is important that educators do not lose sight of the intended learning outcomes and what the assignments are ultimately assessing. The use of GenAI should enhance, rather than distract from, the core competencies being evaluated.

Three insights stood out to us. First, framing questions and refining outputs from GenAI demonstrate analytical and problem-solving capacities that are increasingly valuable in students' future careers. Prompt engineering should not be relegated to a secondary or auxiliary skill but instead as a core component of digital literacy (Lacey & Smith, 2023). Second, creative exploration of GenAI through structured reviews or imaginative podcasts shows the technology's potential as an opportunity for students and educators to be creative and innovative in their learning and assessments. Finally, by asking students to document their decision-making and critique GenAI and its content, we ensure that human judgement and ethical sensitivity stay at the heart of academic work. As we continue to negotiate the rapid evolution of GenAI, this case study gives examples of assessments that balance integrity with innovation. Instead of burying our collective heads in the pedagogic sand, we should harness GenAI's capabilities to design assessments that are creative and effectively assess learning. Treating GenAI as a dynamic partner gives students the skills to navigate an increasingly GenAI-augmented world (Krammer, 2023).

References

Bernardi, M. L., Capone, R., Faggiano, E., & Rocha, H. (2025). Generative AI in mathematics education: pre-service teachers' knowledge and implications for their professional development. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/0020739x.2025.2490104

Bower, M., Torrington, J., Lai, J. W. M., Petocz, P., & Alfano, M. (2024). How should we change teaching and assessment in response to increasingly powerful generative Artificial Intelligence? Outcomes of the ChatGPT teacher survey. *Education and Information Technologies*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-12405-0

Chan, C. K. Y. (2023). A comprehensive AI policy education framework for university teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *20*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00408-3

Cox, G., Willmers, M., Brown, R., & Held, M. (2024). Learning along the Way: A Case Study on a Pedagogically Innovative Approach to Engage Medical Students in the Creation of Open Educational Resources Using ChatGPT. *Mousaion: South African Journal of Information Studies*, *42*(1), 21-pages. https://doi.org/10.25159/0027-2639/15331

Hadi Mogavi, R., Deng, C., Juho Kim, J., Zhou, P., D. Kwon, Y., Hosny Saleh Metwally, A., Tlili, A., Bassanelli, S., Bucchiarone, A., Gujar, S., Nacke, L. E., & Hui, P. (2024). ChatGPT in education: A blessing or a curse? A qualitative study exploring early adopters' utilisation and perceptions. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans*, *2*(1), 100027. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbah.2023.100027

Krammer, S. M. S. (2023). Is there a glitch in the matrix? Artificial intelligence and management education. *Management Learning*. https://doi.org/10.1177/13505076231217667

Lacey, M. M., & Smith, D. P. (2023). Teaching and assessment of the future today: higher education and AI. *Microbiology Australia*, *44*(3), 124–126. https://doi.org/10.1071/ma23036

Lee, D., & Palmer, E. (2025). Prompt engineering in higher education: A systematic review to help inform curricula. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 22(1), Article 7.* https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-025-00503-7

Miller, W. (2024). Adapting to AI: Reimagining the role of assessment professionals. *Intersection: A Journal at the Intersection of Assessment and Learning*, *5*(4). https://doi.org/10.61669/001c.121439

Perkins, M., Roe, J., Postma, D., McGaughran, J., & Hickerson, D. (2024). Detection of GPT-4 generated text in higher education: Combining academic judgement and software to identify generative AI tool misuse. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *22*(1), 89–113. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-023-09492-6

Pokkakillath, S., & Suleri, J. (2023). ChatGPT and its impact on education. *Research in Hospitality Management*, *13*, 31–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/22243534.2023.2239579

Williams, A. (2025). Integrating artificial intelligence into higher education assessment. *Intersection: A Journal at the Intersection of Assessment and Learning*, *6*(1). https://doi.org/10.61669/001c.131915

Van Slyke, C., Johnson, R., & Sarabadani, J. (2023). Generative artificial intelligence in information systems education: Challenges, consequences, and responses. *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, *53*(1), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.17705/1cais.05301

Note: During the preparation of the manuscript, Generative AI was used for minor text editing. After which the authors reviewed the content as needed. We take full responsibility for the content of the publication and acknowledge that it is our own work.