**Community of Practice on Reimagined Assessment**

**Meeting Summary for Mar. 2, 2023**

In attendance Lorelei Hanson, Jon Dron, Deb Homuth, Anne-Maria Scott, Wendell Kisner

Many congratulations to Eliana on the birth of her daughter.

Best wishes to Anne-Marie on her next great adventure, she will be sorely missed by all.

March 17th pm plan: Deb to follow up with Eliana and Anne-Marie and to report to everyone asap.

1. Financing of the C of P
* Lorelei and Jon to follow up with Matt to discuss further financial “asks” should they arise for the C of P. Is there money, for example, to provide an honorarium for a guest speaker?
* Lorelei and Eliana to sort out if funds are available for more than three months of RA support.
1. Replacing Anne-Marie on the C of P/Keeping the Lines of Communication open
* Lorelei and Jon to ask Elaine and Meghan to join the C of P.
1. Role of the Website

We would like to act as a transparent catalyst for change. To do so means we cannot be too free form in style and function. Therefore, understanding how, what, and why we are communicating through our website is important. Inviting a never-ending stream of people is somewhat problematic too. So, there will be people who continue to join in but perhaps not droves of them.

We will use the website to:

1. Keep the historical record of what is discussed.
2. Provide a problem corner where we share thoughts about thorny issues we are thinking about with respect to current and reimagined assessment.
3. Provide a solution sharing corner where we share resources, worthwhile approaches, etc. for anyone to consider.
4. Provide a blog where people from the C of P take turns providing some first person, stream of consciousness thinking on reimagined assessment as it relates to their current work.

Currently, the website resides “outside” AU and moving it “inside” AU will be important on the near horizon.

1. A Brief Summary of Today’s Discussion on Two Current Institutional Challenges
2. Anne-Marie shared an interesting Twitter post she read about whether when students write in their own first language and then use Google Translate to translate, whether what they have translated into English is considered original work? Or not? This question raises all kinds of questions about what we are trying to measure? What about other technology tools including Chat GPT? Are we parsing the question of student ownership on particular tech tools as opposed to the issue of what we are measuring? Is that really where the conversation should be focussed? What about the role of the teacher with respect to Chat GPT? What about the social implications of AI? Isn’t there some validity to the use of AI if student shame and embarrassment are involved? What about when students want to be anonymous in course chats for fear of embarrassment? What does that say abut the culture that the teacher/instructor has created? And how do these questions relate to what the teacher/instructor believes they are assessing and why? Surely, the fact that such questions are being asked at all warrants more time and effort on shaping institutional change around reimagined assessment.
3. However, if such conversations are to happen, there must be a process for allowing them to rise to the surface. To that end, we ought to consider the current course production process including the language we use to describe it. For example, we don’t say that courses are “developed”, we say they are “produced”. The absence of a sense of collaborative process begins with the language we use. The presentation of academic integrity, non-academic integrity, appeals etc. is firmly rooted in policy, as it should be, however, despite best intentions elements of restorative justice may be getting lost along the way. Revisiting what we say to students regarding academic integrity, appeals, etc. how and where we say it is essential if we are concerned about a culture of assessment that is built on this notion of “walking alongside” students on their academic journey. What we are really talking about is how a reimagined course development process can shift the culture and how a reimagined culture can shift the course development process. Perhaps a pilot course development project could begin to consider those changes; however, movement on several fronts must occur for real change to happen. Specifically, faculty that design courses have a different worldview from course production staff and vice-versa. As a result, communication is challenging currently and perhaps even broken. But there is no reason that can’t change. A pilot project that uses a problem-solving perspective, that reimagines course development, that incorporates signature pedagogies, that employs universal design principles, that mixes external expertise with internal participation, and that allows the two groups to sit alongside one another and communicate/work differently together towards a common end would be an important step in the right direction. The pilot would need to be transparent, and it would need, if it was to result in any cultural changes, to be accompanied by other concrete initiatives including opening lines of communication and shifting the overall culture away from control to mutual trust while also considering policy and best practice documents. If people don’t think the time is now, they need only consider the real and potential erosion of market share to recognize that time is of the essence.

**Next Meeting: Thursday, March 30th at 3:00pm MT via ZOOM**

**Deb will send a meeting invitation with the meeting link included.**