DARREN BRITTEN: Welcome, everybody, and thank you for joining us today for this webinar. My name is Darren Britten and I am the National Assistive Technology Project Officer at the Australian Disability Clearing House on Education and Training, that is ADCET for short. I'm a white man in my mid-50s, should I say, and wearing blue rimmed glasses, have a white beard and wearing a red and blue shirt today.

This webinar is being live captioned, and to activate those captions you can click on the cc button which is in the Zoom tool bar located at either the top or the bottom of your screen. We also have captions available via a browser, if you wish to use those, which will be added into the Zoom chatbox to link to those.

ADCET is hosted on Lutruwita, which is Tasmanian Aboriginal land. And in the spirit of reconciliation, ADCET respectfully acknowledges the Lutruwita nations and also recognises the Aboriginal history and culture of the land. And I pay my respect to Elders past and present, and to the many Aboriginal people that did not make elder status. I would also like to acknowledge all other countries and lands from participants in this webinar, and also acknowledge their elders and ancestors and their legacy to us, and also to any Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People that are joining us today.

Okay. To the fun stuff. Today's webinar, Inclusive Assessment Design, from Access to Participation, which is presented by Dr Juuso Nieminen, who will argue that, as important as it is to ensure access to assessment, it's also crucial to pay attention to how assessment regulates students' social participation as fully accepted members of higher education.

Before we begin just a few brief housekeeping details. As mentioned, this webinar is being live captioned by Helen from Bradley Reporting and will also be recorded. The recording will be made available on the ADCET website in the coming days. All participants of the meeting will receive information about that. If you have any technical difficulties, you can email admin@adcet.edu.au.

This presentation will run for about 45 minutes or so. Then we'll have time at the end for some questions. Throughout the presentation, please feel free to use the chatbox with us and each other, but please remember to choose "everybody" when you post something so that everybody can read what you have to say.

Juuso is happy to answer all of your questions at the end. Hopefully we have time to get through them all. If you have any questions you would like asked, please use the Q&A box rather than the chatbox so we can keep those in one place. With that being said, looking forward to it and I will hand over to you, Juuso.

JUUSO NIEMINEN: Thank you so much for a lovely introduction, Darren. Indeed, to the fun stuff of inclusive assessment. Good afternoon, everyone. Greetings from Melbourne. In this seminar I would like to present a few ideas based on the work by myself and my wonderful, lovely colleagues Anabel Morina and Gilda Biagiotti from the University of Seville.

Just before I begin, let me just note that if you happen to have any further thoughts, comments, ideas, do not hesitate to reach me. As you can see, my contact details are on the slide. Wonderful. Let's jump in.

You should see my slide changing at this point. Let me just start by acknowledging the land from where I'm joining this seminar today. I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the unceded lands, skies and waterways on which our Deakin students, staff and communities come together. I would like to pay my deep respect to the ancestors and elders of Wurundjeri country where I am located today, and I would invite you to write in the chat where you are joining the seminar today.

Before jumping into the fun stuff, let me just note that the presentation is based on one study mostly, and it's an open access study. I just wanted to make sure that to note if you want to read the full story behind this review study that we published with Anabel and Gilda, you can have a look at this paper published in the Educational Research Review. There should be a link in the chat.

There is another study that looks more towards the solutions to the issues of inclusive assessment rather than just analysing the current shortcomings of assessment. You can also see that one on the slide is also an open access article, meaning everyone has access to the paper through a link. That again will be in the chat. This is just for those who are interested in reading a bit more about these topics. These two studies also include various references to earlier work on inclusive assessments, so they also include quite a bit of inspiring materials about the topic.

All right. Without further ado, let me just provide a bit of context to my work on inclusive assessment. I do think, as we discuss assessment and inclusive assessment in the context of higher education, we just need to have an understanding of the context where assessment takes place. And to me, one key aspect to consider about the contemporary higher education systems is this idea of a universal system that has opened its doors to many historically underrepresented and marginalised students, who have not historically been able to reach education in the first place, but now as higher education systems have expanded, many students have enabled access to our system of University and higher education more broadly.

So this is the context where assessment takes place. The issue, from an analytical point of view, is to think about how to talk and think about inclusion in the space that has historically been, well, not that inclusive in the first place, and it's now in the shifting state in many societies around the world. In this presentation I will, indeed, think about how can we cross the idea of inclusion in the particular context of higher education but also in the particular context of assessment. As you will know, it is not always easy to come up with simple definitions for these ideas.

In this work and in this presentation I focus solely on assessment. By this I mean all sorts of judgments that we make of student learning skills, abilities in higher education. Assessment might happen through, say, tests and examinations, but it could also occur in many other ways. Perhaps through projects, portfolios, self and peer assessment. There is quite a large spectrum of different sorts of ways for us teachers to know what students have learned and whether they have met some predetermined outcomes for what they are supposed to learn.

Focusing on assessment as we talk about inclusive spaces in higher education is at the same time necessary but also a rather limited and narrow perspective. So I'm not even thinking about teaching and learning and how those could be made inclusive on a broader scale and really focusing on assessment today. I felt like it would be a proper way to start the presentation by justifying this choice.

Now, focusing on assessment, as I said, it's necessary because assessment determines what success and abilities look like in higher education. Often, assessment provides students with a way of narrating their success. "I got a B+", "I got 78 score out of 100". And in doing so, assessment also constructs our very idea of what we mean by failure and the opposite of abilities. Sometimes we refer to these ideas as dis abilities. Here on the slide you can see I have put the letters "dis" in cursive to demonstrate how the prefix of "dis" is attached to "abilities" and, in doing so, the idea of abilities is almost negated.

Again, I would argue that assessment plays a key role in how we understand what failure looks like or dis ability looks like in higher education. So in this way assessment has a very important discursive role in shaping what we think and talk about when we think about success.

I would also note that assessment is commonly designed to strive student learning. Now, whatever you think about this mantra, it is true how we design and implement assessment is often quite heavily correlated with how students’ study and what they learn. Assessment also defines student futures. For example, the grades and marks that we assign to students might hold importance to not just the students' current lives, but to their prospects in the future. So we would just like to note we are talking about something quite important here. As we talk about how to make higher education more inclusive for historically marginalised and underrepresented students, we do need to focus on how to make assessment inclusive as well.

However and this is a bit of a big "however" we do know, based on a lot of international research, that assessment is often the one part of higher education that sets major barriers for many diverse students and for students with disabilities, in particular. Indeed, in this presentation I will mostly focus on this idea of disabilities.

Before jumping into further details of how exactly assessment does this, let me just note a few words about the terminology here. So in this presentation I will use this terminology of "students with disabilities". Ultimately, I will present you the results of a review study. This review study included studies from all around the world and, of course, in different parts of the world, in different institutional settings done by different students, different terminologies are used. So I just wanted to acknowledge in this work that I will come to present in a moment, many forms of understandings of disabilities and terminologies related to disabilities and diversity were used, but this is the terminology that I will use to craft this complexity today.

So we know that assessment sets many inaccessible barriers for students. Perhaps the most common example of this relates to examinations. We have an institutional setting in higher education for assigning support mechanisms for students when it comes to examinations. We assign additional time, personal testing rooms, and other sorts of adjustments to make sure that examinations are made more accessible for diverse students.

We have research from various decades noting this is indeed the case. Assessment seems to be so inaccessible but we need these institutional support mechanisms to make sure that assessments, at least for some students, will be more accessible. I will unpack these thoughts in a moment in more detail.

I would just note here that the common approach to thinking about inclusion in assessment relates to what we often call "reasonable adjustments"; the idea that we should categorise student population in terms of certain characteristics and provide individualised support for some of these students, such as, indeed, students with disabilities. In many higher educational contexts, this refers to students with medical documented certificate or diagnosis that would enable them to access support. Of course, these sorts of ideas are often provided in legislation. The tricky thing and, again, I will unpack this in greater detail in a moment inclusive assessment or accessible forms of assessment are often not provided in legislation in a similar kind of a way.

So assessment does seem to provide an accessibility barrier for many students. This is just my starting point. Against this background, it is not surprising that many people working with assessment design scholars, practitioners, educators have for quite some time now asked how could we make assessment more inclusive for a diverse body of students, particularly in higher education context that are becoming, by definition, more wider and more diverse?

Now, there are at least two general viewpoints to how to answer this question. First of all and this is, I would say, the more traditional way of thinking about inclusive assessment we might think about how to assess the students in the margin as very aptly put by Russell and Kavanaugh who published a book on this topic in 2011, mostly focusing on the school context but still very much relevant here. So this approach stems from the world of measurement, meaning that we think about which students might require additional support in assessment; identify those students, often in rather medicalised ways, such as by only considering students or mostly considering students with some sort of a medical diagnosis of course, this differs a lot in different parts of the world; and then providing individualised supports for these particular students. Now, this is a crucially important way of ensuring that inclusive happens in higher education contexts and beyond.

But there is another way of thinking about this dilemma. Rather than thinking about who are these students in the margin, we could also have a look at how assessment in itself pushes certain students into the margins. So rather than seeing assessment as something neutral, something that happens a bit differently for different students, for those in the margin and those not in the margin, we start thinking about assessment as a social practice or mechanism that is not separate from this process of marginalisation but very much takes part in them itself.

To provide one example of this emerging body of literature, I actually introduced this paper you can see on the slide by Paul & Campbell, aptly titled The Person Marking Your Work Isn't Racist. That addresses racism in the context of assessment in higher education, having a look at how assessment situations might in fact push certain students in the margins, in this case via the mechanisms of racism. Now, these two viewpoints are quite different to each other. And my argument today is that we do need to be aware of both of these approaches as we talk about inclusive assessment. How to do this in practice? Let me provide some thoughts on that.

So here I would like to introduce one particular way of thinking about inclusion in the context of assessment. This thinking draws on the work of Annette Bagger, who has mostly written about inclusive assessment in the context of schools and in the context of national testing. However, because these thoughts by Bagger are situated in assessment, there are many ideas there that can be applied to assessment in higher education.

In this slide you can see a graphs that, as many graphs in educational research, is overly complex. My apologies for that. My next task is to explain what exactly can you see in the slide. So here you can see two spheres, one of them is a smaller one inside of a bigger sphere. The smaller sphere includes the words "access to assessment". And this is something in the graph that is connected to a medical model of disability. This sphere is surrounded by a bigger sphere in the slide called "participation through assessment", which is connected to the idea of social model of disability.

Now, each of these spheres is crossed with a line that divides them into inclusion and exclusion. Next up I will explain what we mean with Anabel and Gilda the other authors of this paper, what we mean with this idea of access and participation followed by multiple examples from the review paper we wrote. If this sounds a bit abstract at this point, bear with me.

So this model by Bagger first talks about access to assessment. This idea is grounded in an idea that I think many of you are quite familiar with, this idea of medical model of disability, that sees assessment adjustments as rather medical and clinical and in doing so neutral ways of providing support in assessment. This is a very nice representative example by Cohen and colleagues in 2005, a study which they note writing about assessment specific adjustments or accommodations, but they write that "Accommodations should be viewed as simply the tools for accessing or demonstrating knowledge, no different than reading glasses."

This idea is grounded in the idea that we do not redesign assessment itself but we provide support mechanisms that themselves provide access to assessment. In the slide you can see the word "to" in cursive, to really emphasise this point.

On the other side of the slide you can see a screenshot from a website by a relatively random University in this case, in this case the University of Toronto, from a website where they introduced testing service for students who might benefit from test accommodations or adjustments. Now, I'm not going to go through all of the details of the screenshot, and you shouldn't either. The point here is to demonstrate that many Universities are providing quite a large number of exam specific or assessment specific adjustments. In this case, at the University of Toronto I think if I remember correctly this was from 2023 they demonstrated that in the previous academic year yeah, 2021 2022 they provided almost 26,000 accommodated quizzes, tests, exams and online assessments. So quite a large number. This idea is really at the core of this way of thinking about inclusion in assessment as access to assessment. This is very much international default model in higher education. I think many of you are quite familiar with this idea.

Now, the other part of this model of thinking about inclusive assessment relates to paying attention to how assessment regulates students' societal participation through assessment. So here we understand assessment as a social practice through which various social consequences and effects occur. This idea is not completely separate from the previous idea of access to assessment but builds on it. Of course, we need to provide access before we can think about wider societal participation.

Here, rather than only focusing on inclusive assessment as a matter of access, we will also pay attention to how students, through assessment, may or may not be portrayed as fully accepted members of academic communities. We pay attention to how assessment disables students, indeed, focusing on the word "how" and what might be the consequences of doing so.

In the slide I have one example before providing many others, though, from the review study 2013 in a moment so in this slide you can see one example now a bit dated already. It's from a news article considering extra time in exams titled "Suitable Accommodations or Legal Cheating?" It's from 2016 so it is a bit of a dated article. I chose this as an example because it's a relatively timeless topic and you can see similar articles pop up every once in a while in Australia in beyond. Wondering whether assessment specific adjustments and considerations are or could be considered as forms of cheating?

Now, these sorts of ideas I think very aptly demonstrate how through assessment and assessment adjustments and the discourses around them we might frame certain students as potential cheaters, as potentially not fully accepted members of academic communities. For example, in this case one could analyse how assessment adjustments and the ways we think and talk about them are connected to how students come to be included or excluded in academic settings.

Now, this idea of participation through assessment is very much related to the idea of who we see as normal and able student in assessment. Again, through assessment. To me, this is a matter of whether and how assessment provides students with diverse ways of knowing, being and becoming. These ideas might sound a bit abstract but, in fact, they are ultimately rather pragmatic, rather practical and not always something very, very complex.

On this slide you can see a quote by a student who participated in a study of ours, a student with learning disabilities in this case. The student was describing their dyslexia in the context of mathematics. The student was criticising the heavily text-based culture of mathematics where your mathematical abilities almost constantly must be demonstrated through text, written text. And instead, this student, the student Yö in this study, was referring to how using colours was already a way of making assessment more diverse and making sure the abilities of a more diverse student body could be represented. The student says in an interview, "Pictures and colours help us dyslexics a lot. Nowadays, I colour code my materials, particularly if there's much mathematical yarn. I use green, turquoise...all the colours are in use. It's much easier to read than just black and white. An image can be worth more than a thousand words."

I really like this example by the student because she says how a relatively minor innovation, in this case allowing someone to use colours in their assessment, might already widen the different ways of knowing and being and becoming in higher education. So simple and at the same time a very powerful example.

All right. Let me have a look at the time. Next up I will jump to illustrate some thoughts on these ideas based on a literature review that we conducted with my colleagues, Anabel and Gilda. We were interested in seeing how inclusion could be conceptualised in the specific context of assessment. To do so we wanted to learn from earlier published literature and particularly the types of literature that would introduce student voices.

So we set two research questions for ourselves. First, what kinds of experiences do students with disabilities have about assessment and assessment adjustments? And second, how do these experiences reflect inclusion and exclusion as understood through these two ideas of access and participation based on the work of Annette Bagger?

I'm very, very briefly noting a few things about the methodology but if you have further questions about this I would be glad to have a chat later on. In the screen you can also see a graph that illustrates the literature research process. The key point here is really in the fact that they have 42 studies coming from international settings that were finally included in the review.

A few notions, we focused on qualitative studies, which means that we only included studies that aim to hear student voices through a means that were not based on quantification. So we included studies that used interviews, observations, qualitative surveys or open-ended surveys, ethnographies and so forth. These studies were published between 2010 and 2022, and we only included studies that focused on assessment. So in this case we excluded studies that talked about inclusive teaching and learning methods more broadly and we focused on all sorts of assessment practices.

In these 42 studies that we analysed, there were 868 students, and in this case these were students with disabilities and here I really need to emphasise the terminologies and definitions differed because this was an international literature review, what counted as a disability and how these studies talked about disabilities varied a lot.

These studies were almost completely focused on interview studies, even though we were quite keen on including studies that would have used more diverse methods. That's something to note. Finally, I want to note that this was an emotional training process. You might think the process of conducting a literature review is relatively dull; you focus on documents rather than, for example, conducting interviews with real people yourself. We came to note that many of these studies had findings that were so depressing that actually the process of screening for these studies and analysing these studies was actually quite cumbersome emotionally for many of us and in a moment you will see why.

Next up, I would like to illustrate some representative examples from this dataset. And in doing so I would like to further illustrate these ideas of access and participation in assessment. In each of these slides you can see a brief explanation of how these studies were thinking and talking about access and participation, as well as a quote by one student participant from one representative study.

Let me start by illustrating the idea of access to assessment by focusing on students' experience of inclusion. 22 studies out of the 42 studies reported experiences of inclusion by students when it comes to providing access. These studies mostly focused on student experiences of examinations and tests. Again, the terminology varied a bit and the adjustments related to these practices. So, for example, additional time in tests or the experience of having a personal testing room, an environment that allowed you to carefully focus on your test.

So 22 studies noted the students themselves saw these situations as providing access, and in doing so providing inclusion. For example, there was one student in the study by Slaughter and colleagues who noted, "Some students went as far as saying that extended time had made a profound difference in their academic career." One student noted, "I think it's definitely one of the things in my college career that helped me the most."

Perhaps a bit unsurprisingly, many students reported these adjustments had helped them and provided them access, as they often do.

Unfortunately, we also noted that 40 out of these 42 studies so almost every single one of them reported experience of exclusion when it comes to access. Now, this referred to the fact that students were not always provided the accommodations or adjustment that they had accessed, sometimes legally, but also, too, the fact that assessments set accessibility barriers itself.

One of the studies by Lewis & Lynn noted that closed book examinations are the most significant structural barrier for students with disabilities. And there was one student participant called Anna in a study by Kourea and colleagues who noted, "I wish I could have more breaks during an exam and not have to sit still for three hours in front of the computer." Almost all of the studies reported these sorts of experiences of exclusion by focusing on how students reported experiences of inaccessibility of assessment.

Many students also noted that the process of accessing assessment and adjustments was inaccessible in itself. One student in the study by Goegan and colleagues called the process "troublesome". Now, again, these were very, very commonly reported experiences in this dataset. One student in the study by Kunnath & Mathew in 2019 reportedly said, "I had to wait for two months to make a provision of scribe services available in my role book. I made three trips to the main campus of the University to get this done. I was alone and there was no help." So although roughly half of the studies noted these experiences of inclusion, as understood through the idea of access, almost all of them noted this sort of experience of exclusion.

So far I would say that the findings have been more or less traditional. These sorts of ideas have been largely represented in earlier literature as, indeed, demonstrated by our own review, but we next focused on having a look at how these studies what we could learn based on these studies about wider societal participation through assessment, again having a look at student experiences of both inclusion and exclusion.

Now, there were less studies that focused on these ideas but what we learn from this small number of studies was just as significant. Let me start by focusing on the experiences of inclusion as understood through the idea of how participation through assessment. There was some studies that noted that assessment and assessment adjustments would provide students with countless spaces. So even though higher education itself remains inaccessible, perhaps even discriminatory, it was assessment and assessment adjustments that could locally provide students with feelings of inclusion and indeed real inclusion.

This might sound a bit abstract. There was one particularly good study as an example by Tai and colleagues. In the study one of the students noted that this physical place where different students with disabilities gathered to do their adjusted exam provided a kind of a counter space where the norms of higher education, the norms about what constitutes ability, what constitutes disability could be disrupted. So one student reported in this study, "When I had to go to the physical place, I would see other people also getting extra time and stuff to go on breaks. It was really nice to feel normal in that sense. I haven't really felt excluded." The whole idea of normality was redefined in this what we call a counter space.

Another example of how assessment could provide experience of inclusion through this participation definition related to something that we call authentic assessment. Typically, authentic assessment refers to assessment that aims to develop student skills they would need in their future lives, perhaps in future workplace. In some sense it refers to those sort of practices that replicate workplace ideas. In our case, a small subset of the studies focused on authentic assessment as something that provided inclusion for the longer term beyond particular courses or units in University.

There was one study, actually by myself and my colleague Andrew Pesonen, in which we had a look at self-assessment as a form of authentic assessment. There was one student in the study who was studying mathematics and reported in the study that "through self-assessment you become more aware of training in mathematics because just like in any sport you constantly need to track your own performance." In this case the student felt that by taking part in self-assessment, they could be better included in the mathematic setting because they learn something from that assessment that could help them in their future studies and career.

And let us proceed to the final category of experience of exclusion through this idea of participation through assessment. Now, this is where it gets as depressing as this study gets. 24 out of these 42 studies reported such experiences of exclusion on a deeper level. These studies reached beyond the idea of inaccessibility in some local situated assessment practices, and instead noted how, through assessment, some students felt experience of exclusion on a much deeper level. These studies often reported experience of outright discrimination, such as bullying by teachers and fellow students, or denial of assessment adjustments that were already officially granted by the University and they were legally mandated.

Now, on the slide you can see two quotes by two students from two studies. The first example, which comes from a student named Udoka in a study by Nnama-Okechukwu in 2020, the student is describing the cumbersome process of getting another volunteer reader to an exam situation. The student says, "Sometimes we don't have volunteer readers in exams because the sighted students are not ready to be insulted by lecturers." In this study these volunteer readers were being bullied by teachers because they were taking part in this volunteer program.

In another study by Stampoltzis and colleagues in 2015, there was one student who reported "most of the time you are afraid of speaking, they will think that you don't study, you don't care. So it's up to you to keep your fears or fight against them", Which I think in a bit of a horrible way demonstrates this deep sense of exclusion in an academic space and how students and teachers are portrayed as kind of a battle situation when it comes to adjustments.

In many studies the students reported feelings of stigmatisation and marginalisation. Here I must emphasise it was assessment that caused these experiences to happen. Assessment was the mechanism that rendered certain students as abnormal and unfit to academic settings. For example, here is a quote by a student named Terry in a study by Ertem in 2011 who reported, "It does cause physical separation in that respect" the student is referring to adjusted exams in a separate space. "You don't get to do things the way everyone else does. Writing them with extra time and not writing them in class. You can't fix that but it's always a little frustrating. You don't want to be abnormal. You want to be normal. You want to fit with the rest of the class."

I think this is an apt example of how assessment in itself actively constructs an idea of normality on how students then need to relate them themselves to that idea. As a part of those processes, certain students taking part in assessment learn to understand themselves as abnormal.

Finally and I think this is my last example before wrapping up some students noted that inauthentic assessment did not only present barriers for access but barriers for participating in society. We often think about, for example in examination situation, through the accessibility barriers that it presents to many students. And that's exactly how I started the presentation today as well. This is extremely important. But I do think it is also important to note that as we ask students to repeatedly take part in these situations, we also regulate their wider societal participation. This was noted by one student, a bit of a critical soul in the study by Madriaga and Goodley in 2010, a student called Alan who was heavily criticising exams stating, "Do you think it's actually a good thing sticking someone in an exam room for 3 hours anyway whether they are disabled or not? Come on, think about it." The student here challenged the idea that exams would have any sort of value for University students because they don't really prepare you for society after you graduate.

Okay. It's been a while. Let me wrap up and then I will be more than glad to answer some questions and I will start some conversations with all of you. So what do we argue based on these findings from our literature review? The key point here is in order to frame assessment as a matter of inclusion. This is important. We often think about assessment as a kind of a measurement process. We want assessment to be objective. We want assessment to carefully determine whether and how well students have met their learning objectives.

As important as this theory is, because we have so strictly focused on assessment as an objective process, we have neglected the social effects of assessment in good and bad. I think our review that builds on student voices emphasises the idea that assessment is very much a matter of inclusion and exclusion. It is not a neutral objective practice but as students take part in assessment, they necessarily get included and excluded in academia in various sorts of mechanisms.

This really gives us a way of reframing assessment situations. Every assessment situation has the potential of regulating students' experiences of inclusion and exclusion. As we talk about inclusion in assessment, the study has really tried to emphasise the idea of thinking about both access and participation. Of course, these are not two completely separate ideas. We do need to understand how they are intertwined. In this particular study we separated them for the sake of our analysis but I do think it is important in the future to have a look at how they intersect.

At the moment, the issue is that inclusive assessment practices and policies very heavily focus on accessibility and much less on participation. And I do think there is a need to rethink that such policy making processes.

Finally, let me wrap up by noting that I think the big question for future research and practice, policy as well, is that we do need to better understand how assessment promotes participation of traditionally marginalised and underrepresented students. It is extremely important to provide access to assessment. We can never forget about the importance of access. But I do think we need to pay greater attention to the process of participation both when it comes to inclusion and exclusion and the role that assessment plays here.

All right. Thank you so much. Those were the ideas that I wanted to present today. If you happen to get any further thoughts, do not hesitate to reach out to me. I'm also quite new to Australia. If there's some interesting ideas and you want to think of some sort of collaboration, again please do not hesitate to reach out to me. Thank you so much and now let's open up the room for conversations.

DARREN: Excellent. Thank you, Juuso. Lots of love being shared on the screen there. Lots of applause, lots of hearts for that and I think a lot of people can certainly relate to in your research. There's been much discussion in the chat and some similar findings from research in Australia and New Zealand as well. I will get into some of the questions. We've got the time. Margaret is asking, "Do you see the need to continue the inclusion process for students who have gone past undergraduate study, those in postgraduate and beyond?"

JUUSO: Yes. For once an easy question. Yes. Of course there's some differences in postgraduate programs but we do need to think of the process of inclusion for the whole educational pathway. Absolutely.

DARREN: Thanks. Unfortunately some systems have different support mechanisms that are there. I'm just wondering, just on that question, whether you found that as well? You know, the way that students are accommodated can be different according to whether they're undergrad or postgraduate, and whether any of the research looks at any of that?

JUUSO: That's a very good question. That's also a matter of what gets reported in research because these studies these 42 studies they're very heavily focused on exams, tests. Maybe that's because those sorts of practices attract more research. I mean, the easy way out for me is to say we need to understand different concepts and how inclusion plays out in these different systems. I guess to me having worked in a couple of higher education systems, it is also a matter of whether the adjustment models that are quite dominant in most systems, whether they allow for that support for other assessment practices beyond examinations and tests.

DARREN: Yeah, yeah.

JUUSO: It seems to be a finding in my own research from various parts of the world that even though we officially grant adjustments to other sorts of assessments, say portfolios or whatever, that support is still actually not there in practice. So I'm not sure if that's an issue on large scale

DARREN: I think we're just identifying more and more issues as things come up. You've scratched the surface. Look, Gisele has asked a question as well. Have any studies in the review been in the health education programs and are there differences between disciplines?

JUUSO: That's a very good question. Yes, there were health program studies. In this particular case we did not focus on the disciplinary differences. I'm trying to think if I could no, I don't think I have any particular insights here. Now, of course, there are disciplinary differences, particularly because assessment is strongly related to what counts as valid, legitimate knowledge in a specific context. My own background is in mathematics which is very far away from the healthcare settings, of which I know very little about, but the very idea of what counts as knowledge, ability, skill, it's such a contextual idea. For example, if we think about the very typical outdated way of thinking about pure and applied sciences, assessment operates quite differently, and how inclusion operates in such contexts. For example, in my own case of mathematics where there is very little room to acknowledge students' own diversity or experiences, perhaps in social sciences how inclusion plays out in all these disciplinary processes is, I think, an extremely important next step for research in inclusive assessment.

DARREN: There is a question about feedback. How does feedback play a role in assessment?

JUUSO: Well, it does play a very crucial role. We do know that assessment without feedback is not very sufficient for learning purposes and that would also be the case for inclusion. So, feedback design, of course, is at the very heart of assessment based on contemporary view of how these processes play out. When I think about the role of feedback in providing inclusion in my own studies, I guess key mechanism for exclusion for many students with disabilities has been simply the lack of feedback, the lack of interaction between staff in higher education. This idea of studying by yourself and maybe receiving some scores or marks or grades every once in a while, but not sufficient dialogic feedback. That's something I've noted in various studies of mine.

DARREN: We've got lots of questions coming through. This is good. Have you explored any elements around spatial design of study spaces based on your research on assessment inclusion?

JUUSO: I have not but that would be such a lovely idea. Having a look at how the actual spatial design plays out in does the experience of inclusion and exclusion that would be a wonderful idea. I have had let me phrase this differently. In my research I have often had students recall these experiences. For example, I'm originally from Finland. In the Finnish University setting, according to my largescale findings, it's not that uncommon that if you have been provided additional time in your exam, you still conduct the exam in the same example as all students, which means that when the exam time is over, only some students remain in the hall and everyone else can see them at that point. So that would be an experience that has been recalled to me over and over again, an experience of exclusion that many students share communally in the Finnish system.

Again, this may or may not resonate in the Australian context. Again, I'm quite new here. But this would be, I would say, a wonderful example of those sorts of spatial processes where you are excluded in a space in front of everyone else in a hypervisible way that I think would be very interesting to study through methods that would acknowledge that spatial element.

DARREN: Yeah. Look, we probably all relate to where some students with accommodations are put into a specific spot within the room, or that some areas have different lighting and those kind of things. So it amplifies the difference that's there. Yes, great. Charlotte is saying she will follow up with you about that.

JUUSO: Yeah.

DARREN: It would certainly be interesting. You did touch on some bits of where to next with your research. Are you exploring about or co designing with inclusive assessment opportunities with students?

JUUSO: Yeah, absolutely. And that's you answered here your own question quite beautifully. Yeah, the partnership with students is certainly something that I've started to explore. I definitely direct you to the wonderful work by John Tai from Deakin University as well. With our team they have been doing research on some partnership with students with disabilities. So this is definitely one way of making sure this "nothing about us without us" principle is seen in assessment as well.

Now, this slogan is already quite well known, but whether that's very systematically shown in assessment work or assessment design, I'm not sure about that. And something that I would like to emphasise here is the idea of co designing assessment adjustments together with students. Again this is something that may or may not resonate with the Australian context. In the Finnish context, this is something that many students with disabilities really hope to be happening; they have all this knowledge about how assessment adjustments and the process of acquiring them would be made more accessible but there is not really a systematic mechanism of hearing those student voices.

DARREN: Yeah, excellent. There's a couple of questions as well around, you know, interested in doing research on those most effective forms of inclusive assessments. You know, coming up with a list of recommended tools or principles or strategies that could apply to courses as robust alternatives to exams and tests and quizzes.

JUUSO: Yeah. Well, yeah. The word "effective" is a bit of a tricky one. You could think about this from the viewpoint of access and participation. Now, maybe one thing I could emphasise here is that I know our study really puts exams and quizzes in a very negative light by focusing on student voices. Of course, they do still have their role in higher education, there is just many more accessible and more inclusive ways of using those same tools. So they can be robust. They can be wonderful tools in providing knowledge about what students can do, what they can't do, but I do think there is a lot more work to be done to make them a bit more accessible justifying to students why they are being used and what kind of knowledge they can provide and what to do with that knowledge.

What are the most effective forms? I mean, this sounds like an empirical question for me. It is also, again, a very contextual issue. The one question about disciplinary differences. My answer would be quite different in mathematics than in the health context that was raised by the first the previous question. So it is always a bit tricky to say anything. But I don't want to be the researcher who says, "it always depends". Maybe something I could note that some of these studies, they are focusing on portfolios, which is not a very novel thing anymore. I think they were studies from like the late 1990s, in that digital portfolios can be effective for learning. But there was certain studies that noted that digital portfolios allowed students to store artefacts of their learning and abilities in ways that could be more diverse, and maybe demonstrate their own personal viewpoints, histories, again, in more diverse forms. And I do think there is some potential there. Not an easy solution. I don't want to say use portfolios everywhere all the time. But there is some potential here thinking about how we provide students with opportunities to demonstrate their diverse abilities.

DARREN: Look, we're certainly touching into universal design principles and things, which is getting very context specific, depending on students, et cetera, which leads to a few other questions that are there. I just want to finish because we just need to wrap this up. In relation to that, was there any studies that commented specifically on accessibility in relation to that online assessment and/or exclusion, I suppose, from those assessments?

JUUSO: Yes. And these would have been studies about access, accessibility and inaccessibility. So many of these studies noted elements of inaccessibility when it comes to online assessment design. There's like assessments that don't allow screen readers for you to complete your quiz. So, yes. But not sure the online element of assessment was a big dimension in the studies about participation. So these would have been very access focused studies on the top of my mind.

DARREN: Excellent. I am conscious of the time. People do have to run to different things. Please everybody, can you join me in thanking Juuso for this fantastic presentation today. And also a shout out to Helen our captioner for live captioning today. Fascinating topic. We will post Juuso's details and contact details. If you would like to continue the discussion with Juuso, feel free to reach out and get in touch. Thank you once again.

Look, an email will be sent out when the recording of this webinar is available, when we put it up on to the ADCET website in the coming days. And please feel free to share this with your colleagues and continue the discussion. We'd also ask that you're able to complete a short survey on this webinar, which we'll put into the chatbox now, and also sign up for our newsletter if you aren't already.

Also, please save the date. We have an upcoming webinar which fits in perfectly with this stream of things, ADHD and Artificial Intelligence, Strategic Tools and Academic Practices for Students with ADHD. Also registrations currently are open for our Universal Design for Learning Symposium which is coming up in June. And further details for that will be available in the chatbox as well. My name is Darren Britten. On behalf of ADCET I would like to thank you again, Juuso, and everybody for joining us today. Enjoy the rest of your day. Thank you.