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Have your assessments changed in the last five years?
Nature and Purpose of Assessment

Determine accountability
Application of knowledge
Feedback and growth
Subjectification, qualification and socialisation functions of education

Nature and Purpose of Assessment

Find "value" in their education (value what they learn)

Be in "control" of their learning process (autonomy and SDL)

Agentic engagement

" Seamlessly integrated" and the golden thread

A good assessment is a good assessment regardless of it being online or not
Considers existing and emerging (global) technologies
Designed to circumvent dishonesty
Does not increase the negatives – balancing act
Challenges faced – examples from South Africa

Data
Accessibility to networks
Devices
Physical space to work
Access to study materials
Large numbers

Assessment flexibility during COVID (1)

JISC assessment report suggested change already in 2019
Academic and assessment regulations were adapted to suit assessment modes/needs*
Accommodating different learning approaches by being flexible?
Huge impact on academic staff

Assessment flexibility during COVID (2)

Take-home assessments or exams (results remained the same)

Open book assessments (giving more control to students; less structure and amendable memorandum)

Extra time, extra opportunities

Huge data bank of questions; questions randomized

Follow-up oral exams (TU Delft)

Use of text-matching/plagiarism tools
The proctoring and privacy dilemma

Mad rush to identify most suited proctoring system/s

(Inspera, EduSynch, Examity, Proctorio, ProctorU, ProctorTrack, The Invigilator, SmowlTech, uLearn, Certify, GradeScope, ExamSoft in addition to Turnitin or SafeAssign)

Cheating problems were encountered specifically in certain subjects

Students became creative;

(Used digital tools, such as calculators and programming tools (mathematics and IT for example), shared answers using various online platforms, used paper mills, online resources)

Students refused to be proctored

Invasion of privacy (GDPR)

How authentic are online assessments without proctoring or invigilation?
### Assessment guidelines at TU Delft (page 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exam type</th>
<th>Open book (no declarative knowledge)</th>
<th>Closed book (declarative knowledge)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects / larger assignments</td>
<td>Remote exams (using assignment tool)</td>
<td>Oral exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remote exams (using digital exam tool)</td>
<td>Online proctored exams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A. Question construction

- Open-ended questions (strongly recommended)
- No factual questions (strongly recommended)
- No recycling of existing questions (required)
- No standard questions that can be googled (required)

---

- Parametrization of numerical assignments / questions (required for numerical answers)
- Parametrization of numerical assignments / questions (required for numerical answers)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Unique exam for each student</th>
<th>Different versions per question <em>(random questions from pool)</em>: small variations, or different but equivalent questions (in difficulty and topic) (advised for open-ended questions, required for all closed-ended questions, e.g. multiple choice)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different exam version <em>(e.g. exam version A and B, recommended for exams in Brightspace Assignments)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variation in cases and datasets <em>(recommended for case studies, computational assignments, etc.)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment guidelines at TU Delft (page 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Course of assessment</th>
<th>Honor's pledge (recommended)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random order of questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(make sure the order makes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Random order of questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(make sure the order makes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited time slots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(minimal 30 minutes per</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>slot)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://teaching-support.tudelft.nl/creating-fraud-resistant-exams/
For further consideration...

Should we be designing assessments that provide us with data that leads to assessment improvements?
What role should students have in shaping assessments?

Food for thought

“Fierce competition rages between institutions to provide students with high-quality online experiences, independent of physical location” (Pelletier, et al., 2022: 36). As education becomes global, how do you become better at online assessment?
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