

A mind shift towards more flexible assessments: are we there yet?

Wilma Elston & Grant Penny



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

- Biesta, G., 2009. Good education in an age of measurement: On the need to reconnect with the question of purpose in education. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability (formerly: Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education)*, 21(1), pp.33-46.
- Boud, D. and Dochy, F., 2010. Assessment 2020. Seven propositions for assessment reform in higher education.
- Li, J. and De Luca, R., 2014. Review of assessment feedback. *Studies in higher education*, 39(2), pp.378-393.

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

- Dopmeijer, JM, Nuijen, J., Busch, MCM, and Tak, N.I., 2021. Monitor Mental health and Substance use Higher education students. Sub-report I. Mental health of students in higher education.
- Herrington, J., Reeves, T.C. and Oliver, R., 2014. Authentic learning environments. *Handbook of research on educational communications and technology*, pp.401-412.
- Pekrun, R., 2006. The control-value theory of achievement emotions: Assumptions, corollaries, and implications for educational research and practice. *Educational psychology review*, 18(4), pp.315-341.
- Reeve, J., 2012. A self-determination theory perspective on student engagement. In *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 149-172). Springer, Boston, MA.

(Online) Assessment design

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

- Knight, S., 2022. Assessment and feedback higher education landscape review: survey outcomes. JISC.
- Pauli, M. and Ferrell, G., 2020. The future of assessment: five principles, five targets for 2025.



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, SnowlTech, 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)

	Open book (no declarative knowledge)				Closed book (declarative knowledge)
Exam type	Projects / larger assignments	Remote exams (using assignment tool)	Remote exams (using digital exam tool)	Oral exams	Online proctored exams
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)

Assessment guidelines at TU Delft (page 2)

B. Unique exam for each student			Different versions per question (random questions from pool): 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)
		Different exam version (e.g. exam version A and B, recommended for exams in Brightspace Assignments)	
	Variation in cases and datasets (recommended for case studies, computational assignments, etc.)		

Assessment guidelines at TU Delft (page 3)

D. Course of assessment	Honor's pledge (recommended)			
			Random order of questions (make sure the order makes sense)	Random order of questions (make sure the order makes sense)
		Limited time slots (minimal 30 minutes per slot)		

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?](#)

Thank you

Please feel free to reach out to us for further discussion:

Wilma Elston
w.elston@tudelft.nl

Grant Penny
g.r.penny@tudelft.nl