Transcript of FLO Friday: Using Alternative Assessments to Balance Technology, Academic Integrity, and Stress Management Goals
BCcampus webinar recorded on June 17, 2022
Moderator: Helena Prins
Presenter: Dr. Elle Ting, VCC

HELENA PRINS:
Hello and welcome, everyone. Thanks for joining us for this FLO Friday on *Using Alternative Assessments to Balance Technology, Academic Integrity and Stress Management Goals*. That's such a big title and you're in excellent company with your FLO facilitator for today Dr Elle Ting and her sidekick, Mr Summer. Elle, this is obviously a hot topic with more than 170 registrants. So everyone, my name's Helena Prins, and I'm an adviser in learning and teaching with BCcampus, and I coordinate our family of FLO events. Today I am also joined by Paula Gaube and Dhanis Ameerudeen from our tech support team. A huge thanks to them both. Just a few housekeeping items. This session is being recorded. If you do not want to be recorded, please just turn off your camera. Also, captions have been enabled for the session and you would have received the slides as a PDF document earlier. We will also share the slides out with the recording in the next couple of weeks.

As you registered, you also signed the code of conduct. So let's make sure everyone has a wonderful, positive experience today. At the end of the session, I'll share with you a link for a short survey asking for your feedback. It's anonymous and really we value hearing from our FLO participants. And if you stay till the end, I'll also share more information about some upcoming events. Next slide.

I am coming to you today from my home office here on the beautiful unceded territories of the Lekwungen Speaking People, which include the Songhees and Esquimalt Nations. Their hospitality makes it possible for me to call this beautiful place my home. As we celebrate Indigenous History Month, I'm so thankful for my team at BCcampus. It's giving me lots of opportunity to learn and work towards reconciliation and decolonization. Currently, we're actually doing an art project, and while I'm not very artsy, I'm learning tons about three powerful and inspiring women, Christi Belcourt and Leah Dorion, both Métis artists, and Jane Ash Portrais, who is Cree. I encourage you to check out their art and life stories and I'll share the links shortly.

- https://canadianart.ca/features/walking-softly-with-christi-belcourt/
- https://www.leahdorion.ca/
- https://canadahouse.com/collections/jane-ash-poitras-rca-cm

You are invited to introduce yourself in the chat and if you would like to locate yourself, please feel invited to do so. I'm now ever going to hand the session over to the very dynamic, intelligent, and witty, Dr Elle Ting. Elle, over to you.

DR ELLE TING:
Thank you so much, Helena. And hi, everybody. I'm Elle Ting. I am the research ethics board chair and a humanities faculty member at the Vancouver Community College. I'm here

today with our hosts, Helena, Paula, and Dhanis, and with all of you. And we have Mr. Summer, the ring-necked dove, deciding to join us today. So we're going to talk about something that many of us could use more of balance. And we'll explore how assessment, design and implementation can help us to balance technology, academic integrity, and stress management goals.

We would like to begin by acknowledging with gratitude that VCC is located on the traditional unceded territories of xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam), Sḵwx̱wú7mesh (Squamish), and səl̓ilw̓ətaʔɬ (Tsleil-Waututh) peoples who have been stewards of this land from time immemorial. As we're coming together online today, we extend this acknowledgement to include other nations whose ancestral homelands we are joining from remotely. So Mr Summer and I are joining from Delta, BC, situated on the unceded territories of Musqueam and Tsawwassen nations and Hun'qumi'num speaking people. (And if you would like, please feel free to share during this presentation and acknowledge in the chat about where you are situated and whose lands you are joining from.)

So some special thanks here to share, special thanks BCcampus for funding this research through its Research Fellowship program and the VCC Research Fund for resourcing part of this work as well. Big shout out to the other members of the research team Andy Sellwood, Andrew Dunn, Shaun Wong and Alexandra Cai and also all of our colleagues at VCC who took the time to participate in this project.

So just to warm us up here a bit. We've got a waterfall active I think, some of you might have tried this before on Zoom. It's when we answer a question together. But with time, our responses that they all come down in this big cascade. And so this is what we're going to do. We're going to think of an answer to this prompt. And some of you actually sent something similar ahead of this workshop, and that's great. You can work with that, but just type out in the chat.

It's five words or less. What is something you're hoping to take away from today's FLO session? And just note here. Don't share it yet. We're just going to take a few seconds just like that in a chat and don't put it in until you hear this magical sound come up. So in 15 seconds, I'll hit my buzzer and then we'll see what comes in the chat. In five words or less. What is something you're hoping to take away from today's session? Ready? OK. So if you could just hit go now. Oh, here they all come. Great. Practical tips. The Toolbox, the specific how to's and ideas for assessing students inspiration. That's a tall order, but I think we can review it. So thank you all again. I know that academic integrity in particular seems to be a hot topic, so I'm just really glad that we have a session to think some of these ideas through together. And I also received some of your questions in advance. So thank you to everybody who was able to send those. I'm going to try my best to answer these three in course of this workshop, but if there's anything else that you're curious about or you want to share in our time together, there's a couple of ways to do this.

The easiest way, of course, is just put it in the chat and Helena is going to monitor and flag me if something comes up. So thank you, Helena. Something else to check out is tablet for this session. If you haven't had a chance to already, the link should be in the chat now. So if

you go over there, what you'll see is a tablet that's sort of set up broadly into three groups. The first area is just to introduce yourself and where you're joining from, if you'd like to share that. The second is a parking lot where you can serve pop questions in any time, and I will check it after the presentation. And the third, it's just a space to share any neat stuff about, you know, academic integrity or assessments or anything else with this group. And what I'll do is I'll keep the public going for at least a week or two after this presentation. So if you want to check in there after the session or you're very welcome to do so. And I actually put all the questions that were sent ahead of this workshop in to that tablet.

I've taken a stab at answer it for you, but to be honest, I ran out of time last night, so I have to go back in there and continue to add things. Again, I do encourage you to go back there and add to it, you know, review what other people have written and just share anything that you think might be helpful. So thank you all for that. So we got a couple of outcomes that we want to focus on today. One is to describe the interplay between technology, stress and academic integrity as we're going to find that these intersect in some pretty interesting ways. And the other is to, of course, identify tools and assessment designs that can help minimize student stress, improve student engagement, and protect academic integrity, which you know once happen. But to give us some background here, we're now in our 828 day of the pandemic. So the pandemic is officially a toddler at this point. It's this terrible twos. And in the last 118 plus weeks of living in COVID times, we've seen closures for 84% of the world's students.

That's 1.6 billion learners. The average duration of closure is 22 weeks. So that means that the average student out there has now lost about two thirds of an academic year. Now, at VCC, the pandemic sort of forced this shift. 98% of our programming being face to face pre pivot to 98% of it being online or hybrid post pivot. So this has been a complete reversal of those ratios. And again, I think this is reflective of what a lot of us have experienced in that time too. The research challenges and questions that we're concentrating on actually sort of stem from a very early decision. Some of what happened early on was an institutional decision at VCC not to adopt third party online proctoring. So specifically we were looking at Proctorial as a tool. We decided against adopting it ultimately for hosts of reasons, but primarily because it was understood to be a good fit for our programming, for our student population, you know, VCC, a proud school of access. So our programming skews very heavily towards developmental and experiential learning.

So it just wasn't going to align well what we were trying to do. However, this decision was questioned, I think completely understandably by faculty who wouldn’t, in their areas high levels of academic integrity violation, following the move to online delivery. And so what we wanted to dive deeper into with our faculty is at looking at how the tools that we did have at our disposal, particularly those in the alternative assessment space, could support both access and academic integrity, which these things can sometimes seem to work against one another, where we put in, you know, mitigation tools for academic integrity, which can actually compromise accessibility in some ways and vice versa. So we wanted to see if we could balance those two things. We also saw this as an opportunity to test positioning of some of the plug and play options as sort of the best or only means of protecting academic

integrity, which is how these things are sometimes position, but don't always stand up to scrutiny.

And we also just wanted to talk to our faculty to see what successful supports look like and how we could, as a centre, particularly research, how we could improve the quality of our services and our recommendations. And what we found through this research also fits into the alternative assessment toolkit, which our team just completed, and this is an interactive decision, tree style, open educational resource. Or we are, but I'm not going to give too much away just yet. We'll come back to that piece later. One other thing that we wanted to unpack here is the relationship specifically between technology and academic integrity. So I think it's pretty common knowledge now that the online that was sort of responding with this absurd very high spike in reported academic misconduct. And because these two things happen at the same time, it was widely assumed at least we can see that. It was the move to online that caused it all by itself. But as the bard bending seagull picture sort of, it's a good reminder of just because two things happened at the same time doesn't necessarily mean that there's a direct cause effect correlation.

So we want to examine exactly what else was going on to cause a drastic surge in reported academics fraud and how technology can either contribute to or curb academic misconduct. So our methods were we started with a survey that went out to VCC instructors and sent out 939. And we heard back from 146 people, which is a response rate of about 15.5%, which is a bit far for the course. We followed up with focus groups. We had 40 registrants, of eight ultimately showed up. And I do hasten to mention this seems a very small sample size, but we had it confirmed by our IR colleagues that it was a good cross-sectional representative. So included voices from all of our schools, all our programs, which was again really important to us because VCC has such a diverse programming base. And our theoretical framework for a study is something called the fraud triangle. And I don't know if this is familiar to anybody here. It's an older model developed by criminologist name Donald Cressey in the 1950s, and he created this to explain business crime.

But it's actually since been sort of applied to other violations, including academic misconduct. So we're not the first to come up with this idea. We borrowed from research just like Varble and Feinman, but it has been a very valuable way to sort of think through some of this. There are three factors of ethical risk, and it's perceived pressure, perceived opportunity and rationalizing. And so in the academic context, perceived pressure might sound like if I fail this course, I'll build a whole program or perceived opportunities sounding like, Oh, I drew everything on my phone, so why not this is well? And then rationalization, being a learner saying what everybody else doesn't. So why shouldn't I? So I think some of these expressions might be familiar to some of us, but this is all what the fraud factors may sound like and look like in in the work that we do. And an important thing to note here is that putting pressure on any one side is going to increase the likelihood of academic fraud risk.

So if we increase the stress for students, for instance, that this could make them more likely to commit academic fraud. And this is important to note, because the majority of academic integrity protection strategies tend to focus a lot on limiting opportunity, but they don't

always address stress with the same amount of of interest. Right? And this is important because something like 70% of students have noted they could see themselves being stressed to the point of cheating, whereas only 20% of students say they would cheat if the opportunity came along. So that suggests that opportunity maybe is sort of overstated as a motivator for cheating, whereas stresses understated or as a motivator. So that's something that we wanted to kind of focus on in our research. And by the same token, alleviating student stress can probably help protect academic integrity and that's where assessment design has a direct role to play. So if we look at assessment post pivot and again, this is based on information that was shared at VCC by our colleagues, unsurprisingly, right away, there was a rapid drop in in-person assessment, basically because we're closing down sites where those activities take place.

There was a slight increase in multiple choice questions. And this again, is not entirely surprising because these were fairly easy to integrate into Moodle because our learning management system, LMS at VCC. So that's what people were doing. What was interesting to us is to see a corresponding drop in long answer questions and essays, perhaps because these were not quite as easy to integrate into our structures for LMS. But the most surprising takeaway was that there were fewer take home assignments being used. And this suppresses because we thought, well, with it being a takeaway assignment and with everybody being at home, I thought there would be an increased uptake of that. And that was not the case. What we sort of learned from our data partially explains that, and I'm not going to do a spoiler here, but it was initially kind of raised our eyebrows a little bit. For alternative assessments among our faculty, and again, this is not at all an exhaustive list, but what we saw people using were things like open book quizzes, tests and reduced weight final exams, increasing the number of assessments, higher order thinking questions, project type things, and oral exams.

The most common strategy that people reported using was open book particularly for quizzes, tests, exams, but other popular options were project assignments, higher order thinking types of assignments, and specifically case studies scenario based questions, getting back to our context, we do a lot of developmental. We do a lot of trades and professional training and experiential learning pieces. So that's where that was a good fit for us. 81% of respondents felt that modifications that they had made were effective. Some that was really good news. Those who responded that alternative assessments had been somewhat effective. So in other words, not all the way there. Those are the same instructors that noted. They just felt they needed more time to develop and measure the effectiveness of these assignments. Comments from instructors that were quite revealing. They felt that alter assessments were very effective for certain reasons that came up over and over again, some of the longer responses, notes about the focus on critical thinking, for instance.

Seeing how students could use problem solving skills based on real world problems. Again, experience learning or real life kinds of things going on. The fact that students like putting material into their own words and perhaps most hopefully this notion that having a blend of assignment types helped student equity by evening the playing field by giving students

other ways to express their ideas. The most common barriers encountered by our faculty was a lack of time to do the development. I think that's something that, again, we all know how little time we all have as instructors. So that can be a barrier, the need to have additional training, particularly for the tech. I think this is probably less pressing than it was two years ago, I think we're all seasoned now in things like Moodle and Zoom, but certainly the beginning there was a bit of a panic that people felt under skill and some of these tools and also the fear that questions and assignments would be compromising. And again, there is kind of a sort of synergy between these three things, because people are worried about investing, what little time they have into training and developing these things that would be then immediately tagged and compromised.

And that's a very real concern. Something that, of course, we'll try to talk about today is ways to mitigate that risk. I think there are certain types of assignments that are more vulnerable to that type of sharing than others. Ideally, what we'd like to see is structures where, you know, once you invest the time into the structure that you can change the content without having to rebuild every semester. I just want to kind of do a check in here with you all and ask, which assessments in your experience or that you think are most secure? And if you could pop this into the chat, I'll just give you a moment to think about that and to respond. And then I'll tell you what we found at VCC, which was kind of interesting, surprising to us. But, if you could share, I'll go over to the chat now in person, oral assessments, structured reflections, inputs. I see inputs are coming up a lot. Timed assessments. Very good. Scaffolded. Yes. What you're telling us, again, I'm seeing it continue to come in, group presentations.

A lot of it focuses on in person. A lot of it focuses on having the person in front of you through a presentation or through some other means showing you what they know. Awesome. Frequent assessments of smaller weights. Yes. Terrific. This far, everybody. Those are all correct. What we found at VCC is that prior to the pivot, so comparing instructor's observations before and after the move to online shows us a few interesting things about assumptions that are made about assessment formats and their use. So what this this chart is meant to show us is the fact that before the pivot, most VCC instructors felt that quizzes test exams were the most secure means of assessment. So 71% of them noted that they felt that these were secure, that they were accurate. They felt, on the other hand, that students were more likely to plagiarize or cheat on a take home. So getting back to what I noted earlier about it being kind of surprising to us that people weren't converting assessments to take home format, for instance, this is at least partially explained by this baseline confidence level, which is really, really low in those particular assessments.

Right. And we'll see that things kind of take an interesting turn after the pivot happened, because what happened, there was a precipitous drop in instructor confidence in quizzes, test, exams. So these were things that were previously trusted formats which were no longer trusted after the pivot. It was felt that these were compromised in the online space. And so while there was a lower level of confidence and take home assignments as well, it wasn't as steep a drop because people kind of before pivot happened didn't really trust take home as it was. So it was less trusted. But where we saw the most significant change was in

the level of concern regarding quizzes, tests, exams and the ability of those to sort of mitigate academic fraud risk. So if we dig a little more deeply into what we've been doing with online quizzes, test, exams, as noted earlier, LMS at VCC is Moodle, then it includes options for deploying and legislating quiz test exams. The most common feature that our instructors used was the timer, and I noticed that that was raised in talking about security as well.

That was also noted by our instructors who used the timer. Other popular choices were reminding students about academic integrity using Zoom to invigilate and randomizing questions. There was a direct correlation between the perceived effectiveness of the feature and how commonly the feature was used, which again, as I see it, is incredibly like for obvious right, that if people use the feature as they have successfully before or that was perceived as being useful. Some instructor comments are kind of explain this further is for instance the use of a time limit. Why that was brought in was to give students less time to search for answers, to seek, to cheat in other words. Different students getting different questions made it harder for students to answer, so it curbed that kind of inappropriate operation. Mature students understand how self-defeating it is to cheat. And I thought this was a really interesting philosophical point that came up in a number of ways during the research. The idea that students who cheat are basically wasting their own time or, that's something we could have a whole other workshop on by the way.

I thought that was really interesting that that was brought up because we average the post-secondary space. Of course we are working with adults. And so part of adulting is, you know, being responsible for your learning. Instructors feel that watching your students on Zoom will lead to less cheating. We note that you'll, that watching the students on Zoom, the idea of having this Panopticon surveillance kind of power in itself leads to less cheating. This would also be very interesting to test. We didn't do it, we didn't take that as far as we wanted to in this research project, but that was the perception and that was very interesting to us. And then the statement that breaks my heart every time I come across it is this defeated feeling that instructors have, that they don't feel that anything they do will ultimately be effective in the long run. And that's something that is a very real perception and something, again, that we hope that having conversations like the one that we're having today will help to, will help.

HELENA PRINS:
Elle, may I interrupt for a second.

DR ELLE TING:
Yes.

HELENA PRINS:
Just because there's been...

DR ELLE TING:
Oh yes.

HELENA PRINS:
A question and I think it makes sense to answer this just, how do you define effective for the study? Someone is asking what does effective mean for alternative assessments?

DR ELLE TING:
Yes, well, we left that really up to instructors, again, to explain to us why they were using specific tools. Again, if they told us, well, I think it's effective because it helps to curb inappropriate collaboration, or I think it's effective because it gives students less time to look something up on the side. So we did, it is, of course, effective as one of those very subjective, subjective things. Right? But we really left it up to instructors to explain to us, why do you think it's effective? Right. And that was what we got from the circle longer form or the focus group discussion. It is very individualized. What effective means. But, for that reason, we felt it wasn't something that we as researchers could necessarily quantify from the data. We really left it up to instructors to explain to us, like you said, this was effective. Tell us more about what makes this effective for you.

HELENA PRINS:
Thank you.

DR ELLE TING:
No worries. Thank you. That was a great question. Yes. Somebody noted effective at producing a valid assessment. Yes. Getting close to what we can call an authentic assessment or authentic measure of student skill. Like, how does that happen? And that's wrapped up with a whole bunch of other ideas, too, right? Making sure that students are who they say they are. There is an impersonation [AUDIO CUTS OUT], for instance, that the person that you are assessing is really you think, it is that skills that you're bringing as a representative of their true skills at addressing a question or completing an action. So, yes, all of those things. Thank you. Awesome question. So we also saw a mostly positive correlation between perceived effects of a feature and how much student stress because which is not good news, because again, a lot of things that instructors would say will work to me. I think it's good because it curbs cheating. I use a timer. I use sequential navigation or one way sort of movement through question sets that go backwards, right, to use question.

That all works because it eliminates the opportunity for cheating. A lot of these caused students stress, as we said, that's what we were a little bit worried about. What were students telling us about what was causing the stress? Well, the number one reaction was the timer, like the inability to finish on time. This was by far the most common response. I think it was upwards of 36 or 37 students selected. This is their number one stress. Right. There were also reports of tech issues affecting their ability to perform. And as I noted, the inability to return to previous questions is noted by a lot of students as very stressful. Some features that instructors found effective of cause less students stress were randomization. Students don't really seem to mind randomization too much, randomizing question sets or randomizing numerical value, values or variables. My partner for this project, Andy, is physics instructor. I'm not from physics, by the way, or math. I'm an English instructor to make it interesting through that way.

But he noted that he did that quite a lot in STEM is to present questions of different variables. And again, students did not seem to be fussed about that at all. And then finally, students being reminded of academic integrity or agreeing to an academic integrity statement was also viewed as an effective way to address misconduct without piling on more stress for students. So to summarize this all in one graph, what we're really after here is finding the sweet spot. So if we go back to the fraud triangle idea, the ideal deal statement we want to be in is to have a reliable assessment of student achievement. That's easy for instructors to implement and also minimizes student stress much as possible. But this is where things get trickier because based on what we are learning from instructors and what they consider effective, some of the preferred formats, while they are helpful from the instructors point of view, are stressful to learners. So these are things we talk about with time limits, regulation, those kinds of things, and that stress can translate into additional motivations.

So randomization, especially much in order to set, an academic interview reminder are the two options that kind of came up on top as the tools that are sort of low hanging fruit in terms of what the demands of the instructor, it's pretty low demand. And at the same time caused very little student stress and they're affected. These tools, I think, would also translate pretty well to face to face. So they're not limited to any one delivery format. And one of the more encouraging things I came across in a little review is that there's considerable research confirming that just having a conversation students about academic integrity is enough to motivate them to feel responsible for it, to protect academic integrity. And as well, it's like another study actually just said that 60%, 6% of students have noted that respect for the instructor is itself a key occurrence. So these are just point to this unspoken social contract, I think, that we have with one another as human beings. Great. And this unconscious tendency for us to live up or down to social expectations.

Something else that isn't addressed on the spread but turned up in the research in other ways is the importance of higher order questions. So going back to what I mentioned already about long answer and essay type questions, in many subjects is remains the most reliable way to have students demonstrate their skills. And again, I come from English, we write essays, that's what we do together. And even though these assignments take more time to build and to evaluate, they still have to serve accuracy and integrity, is very, very helpful. Students also find it less stressful more generally to have assessment broken up in stages, I think that many of you have pointed out as well and have observed in your practice. So for instance, instead of having just a single high stakes exam, just to break that up into pieces for students and going back to English again, in English composition, we would have this really big research essay, but it wouldn't just be dropped on students. It would be this got to it, right, through a working bibliography and some peer editing sort of things that they were doing.

So they weren't just thrown in cold into this, you know, 35% essay that they would train up to it gradually. Similarly, students can build a portfolio out of a number of small assignments [AUDIO CUTS OUT]. So again, every learning and assessment context is going to be different. So we have to work with our learners to find the best fit for academic integrity protection.

HELENA PRINS:
Oh, Elle there's a great conversation happening in the chat, and I...

DR ELLE TING:
Oh, right,

HELENA PRINS:
And I want you to...

DR ELLE TING:
Great.

HELENA PRINS:
Look at it later, but I do want to ask this question, if that's OK, to just ask it her...

DR ELLE TING:
Please.

HELENA PRINS:
Its Marina is asking, I'm wondering if the instructors were asked about equity and how their choice might influence students, or were the survey questions more based on what helps the instructor the most? Because I'm wondering how we can balance instructor and student needs, and I'm thinking that's where you're going to go with this. But I just wanted to ask the question.

DR ELLE TING:
Yes. I feel like you've anticipated this slide, in fact. Yes. These were additional considerations that were kind of like orbiting this work in the background. And it all does come back to you to equity, student equity. Considering how the student centered and all this, you know, what kind of needs they have. And one important thing that that came up was the fact that online proctoring is extremely invasive. Right. And this this is, so when students are writing, it assumes a certain kind of space. It assumes a certain kind of... and it's conditional on these things. So there are very real privacy concerns that come with the use of that technology. Plus the stress of surveillance just has a very negative effect on students generally. So and this is, of course, much more amplified in students who are already under vulnerable circumstance. So many of our students are vulnerable in a lot of different ways. And, you know, they don't have access to the best tech. They don't have a quiet space or schedule or English isn't, you know, the first language, etc.

So things like online proctoring tools were made with a traditional student in mind. And I think that's the problem right there, isn't that. the majority of post-secondary learners now, at least in North America, because that's the research that I was looking at. About 75% of post-secondary learners or the new majority don't fit the profile of the traditional student. We used to call these students non-traditional. We simply call them the majority now, because that's what they are. So if you have an online proctoring exam experience that was designed for traditional students and you put a non-traditional or new majority student in there, it's more likely just to turn out to be a stress test than any real measure of their skills or knowledge. So the problem is that an average student is much more likely be, for

instance, to be red flagged by proctoring software because they've got that background noise going on. Maybe they have kids at home. Right. Or, you know, maybe they're piled into a house with 16 other roommates.

All of that can trigger software in ways that, you know, could get them flagged. They might run into tech issues, as I said, or maybe they'll twitch or move the wrong way because they don't have a comfortable place to complete this assignment or complete this exam. This is the problem is these are all read as all of these actions are read as possible cheating, even though that's not what they are. And some of you might heard in the news that apparently Google's become sentient. I'm not convinced that the AI is at a point where it can read into the hearts of people, you know, and or understand their motivations as well as perhaps we've been led to believe. I think they're, you know, they're still these human things that aren't touched upon by the technology. There's also, I think, a group of people whose impact is maybe by and I get some faculty there's this concern about determined cheaters. Oh well, it doesn't matter what I do. People are going to cheat. And I think that there is a subset of the general population that acts oppositional.

I think this is something that's become certainly very clear to me during the course of the pandemic that, you know, there are just people who are going to do those things. It's a very small fraction of people. And so even while it's important to acknowledge the existence of this group of people, I don't think it really makes sense to exhaust ourselves designing solutions around them, designing solutions about what they will or won't do, because the impact really isn't as dire as I think some people imagine. I think what we need to focus on are the people who are under vulnerable circumstances, the students who could become desperate and are kind of on the fence, kind of at the point where that last thing could push them into academic misconduct. That's the group that we want to look at more carefully. That's the group that we could protect. Right. And so that's what I have to say about the determined cheaters. I know it comes up, but I feel like the impact of this group is sometimes overstated.

In almost all cases to academic misconduct is the outcome of logical, risk based decision making by students. So it's not a moral affront. It's not something personal, even though I acknowledge sometimes it feels that way. So it's important to approach prevention with that in mind and just really look to ways that tip the logical balance in favor of academic honesty. And then finally, to think of and reflect on academic misconduct as a symptom of everything else that's been going on around us. And so academic integrity feels more at risk lately because a lot of things feel more risky lately. Right. That last 2.5 years have put additional pressure on us, on our normal structures, our social expectations. I never thought I'd see the day where we were, you know, scrambling to get toilet paper or that having toilet paper was an amazing thing and something to celebrate. And yet we saw that happen. Right. So really, anything's possible. So some takeaways here. First, instructors have reported success using alternative assessments, but many do still feel they need more technical training.

They need more time to development time. Some measures that were deemed effective by instructors for protecting academic integrity are still very stressed. So that's something to

pay attention to because it's noted many times this could actually increase the risk of academic misconduct. So in a weird way, we could be undermining ourselves by addressing only opportunity and not paying enough attention to the effect on student stress. Assessments that feature randomization or academic integrity reminders are sort of a good point of entry for creating lower levels of stress while also being effective for instructors. And then, finally, a hopeful note. Instructors have had the opportunity to find new insights and to understand what it means to be a facilitator to learning in new ways that maybe you had thought that was really good to see. So this time, we'll come back to this alternative assessment tool kit, which I mentioned earlier, is designed as an open educational first that was informed by the research and everything that our group here today has talked about as well.

So it's available. I will note right away. Please don't be too judgy about its appearance. It's in beta mode. So we haven't inserted graphics or anything into it yet. We're still working on a piece, but we were anxious to share what we had and so we're eager to receive any feedback that you could offer us. I believe the link is in the chat now. But before we dive into that, what we're hoping to do here in the last few minutes we have together is to have some small group conversations about the toolkit. And so to help with this, we're going to jump into the breakout rooms. We also, by the way I hope you can really see who's part. I know that we are running out of time. If you're not able to and you have to run off, please do feel free to share any ideas that you have. Send it our way through the tablet or through email that I'll share with you. I will check in on those things even after the workshop today. So I'll leave that all open for you as well. But those who can stay with us, when you go into, when you use the link to view the toolkit, what we'd like to do is test drive it.

So it's going to ask you a few questions and what we hope it will do if it works the way that we designed it to, is that it's going to recommend some tools that you can use for your teaching learning context. And what I'd like you to tell us is if the tools are what tools recommended in your case, if they were, you know, if they made sense in your institutional or subject area or a learner context, and most importantly, perhaps do let us know if anything is missing or give us any other feedback that you have other than its appearance. Because as I said, you will have pictures soon. But we just want to know that what we have there in the decision tree design is actually lining up with what people are interested in and experiencing. So with that, can we jump into our breakout rooms? Welcome back, everybody. Oh, Jimmy, you have your hand up.

SPEAKER:
Hi. Can you hear me?

DR ELLE TING:
Yes, I can.

SPEAKER:
OK.

DR ELLE TING:
Jimmy.

SPEAKER:
Yeah. Sorry. We only had time to get access to that Web link you provided, and I guess we weren't sure where we each posted to fill out the options on that.

DR ELLE TING:
Yes. Just to sort of test drive it. And again,

SPEAKER:
Oh, test drive it? OK.

DR ELLE TING:
if you didn't have a chance. Yeah. If you didn't all have a chance to do it individually, please do free, feel free again to visit it as often as you like and just share it as necessary. As I said, it's just the bare bones decision tree structure that we're sharing. We just want to make sure that we're asking the right questions. This is, of course, just on what we heard from our own instructors, but we're just one color. Wanted to know what other people felt needed to be included, improved, changed.

SPEAKER:
Alright. Thank you.

DR ELLE TING:
Thank you. So we had a chance to kind of look through it. I'm curious if anybody here was able to share some insights on perhaps share experience using the decision tree? As I said to Jimmy, we're really sort of curious, my team members and I, in making sure that what we're asking is the appropriate set of questions. Oh, Collin, hello.

SPEAKER:
Hello.

DR ELLE TING:
Hi.

SPEAKER:
Hello, stranger. Long time no see. I put a screenshot of my options through to the decision tree there. And I may have broken your decision tree because I came up with zero results.

DR ELLE TING:
Wow, I didn't know that was possible.

SPEAKER:
Probably something that you'd be interested to know. I mean, I did, I did make it tough. You know, I don't, I'm looking at contract cheating. I've got very little time to prepare. I want lower stress options. My students are preparing for a regulatory test, and I want to use multiple choice. And there weren't any.

DR ELLE TING:
OK, so that's fascinating.

SPEAKER:
I'm seeing a couple of those in the chat. So, I don't know, maybe, maybe you've got a database turned off or something.

DR ELLE TING:
That's great. Thank you for letting us know. I did actually go through with Andrew a week ago and the funny thing is I did come up with your options as well and he's like, Oh, well, there's a bug. And he's like, I'll make sure that's fixed up and it looks like it isn't fixed. So thank you for letting us know because we made sure the actually are the intended outcome was that everybody should get at least one or two. And we were sure that there were at least one or two that could get through all the filters. I think it's actually more than that. But yeah.

SPEAKER:
Yeah. One thing I've really appreciated was that you included that regulatory. Item. You know, I talked to a lot of nursing faculty were like, hey, my students need to prepare for any class, so I need to design multiple choice exams.

DR ELLE TING:
Bingo. And that's actually, to be very honest, that is exactly the group of faculty I think drove the inclusion of that question. Because it is, as you noted, there is a national certification exam for that profession. It is a regulated profession and that is a very real concern for many of our faculty and for many of our students.

SPEAKER:
Yeah. You know, what, what I usually tell them is that, you know, the impact has a lot of money flowing into it. You know, these aren't, you know, a faculty member working on their own, you know, trying to develop an exam. It's there's a massive amount of money and time and cycle nutrition's working on this. And then it's a computerized adaptive test. And you know what? I, I know you care and you like your exams, but your exam is not parallel. It's just not right. And that that in itself is a huge challenge. So...

DR ELLE TING:
Something that that has also come for us is the idea that, well, the exams have to be stressful, and students have to be used to a stressful work environment, and that's used as justification. I've seen it used successfully, unfortunately, in, in our governance as well, because how we have things set up is that if you want a single assessment to be worth more than 35%, I think it is, you have to get deans approval and there are some areas that have requested that. So they do have 40% exams sometimes because of either real or perceived articulation requirements and sometimes because of this notion that, well, that is an indication of rigor that we want to do kind of cruelty is the point. We do want to sort of temper all students with the stress. But I guess my own personal view of that is the stress of test taking is not exactly the same stress you're going to run into as a front line health worker or an accountant even. Right? So I don't really understand the alignment there. But for many instructors, they do feel that that stress has to be implemented as part of the design.

So that's been, that's, that's a conversation that's taken us some very interesting places.

SPEAKER:
Yeah. And it seems the importance of stress in an exam is directly correlated to the amount of tuition that's paid. Higher and more important, it is to have those ideas.

DR ELLE TING:
Oh, Helena.

HELENA PRINS:
This Elaine, again, jumping in. I know we're short of time here, but one participant asked, she said, I would like to be able to bring up all the options to browse. And I'm wondering if that's enabled. Is that a possibility for people?

DR ELLE TING:
Yes. What we're planning to do and again, this is something that I hope would be clearer and probably isn't yet because it's still under development. Is there is a place that you can click that will give you the full list. I think there are 24 tools. So that, as I said, thank you for pointing this out. This is all, again, as I said, a work in progress. So we're trying to find and eliminate these bugs. And what you've told us is super helpful. That zero results thing. We thought we got rid of that last week. So we get to know that we need to focus on that again. I think Ian has a hand up. Hi Ian.

SPEAKER:
Hi. just a quick note. If you actually look at the filters, but don't hit any of them and then do your search, all 22 will show up.

DR ELLE TING:
Perfect. Thank you.

HELENA PRINS:
It's just an appreciation for your tool kit during the chat. I hope you save the chat and you can see that later long.

DR ELLE TING:
Brilliant. Thank you. Yes, it does need a little more polishing, but we're hopeful that we have something that you can all share, you can all use. Again, please do so freely. I know we've come to the end of our time together. So again, thank you very much. I've got my resources here. And I also want to invite you please to email me if you think of anything or check in to the tablet. As I said, you all have the link. And just please do keep in touch. So thank you again for taking time and have a great rest of your Friday and an awesome weekend.