<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 9</td>
<td>October 10</td>
<td>October 11</td>
<td>October 12</td>
<td>October 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Session 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;10:00 – 11:30 am</td>
<td><strong>Recommended Session:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Student Panel on Socio-Emotional Wellness&lt;br&gt;12:00 – 1:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultations** (scheduled individually and by request)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 16</td>
<td>October 17</td>
<td>October 18</td>
<td>October 19</td>
<td>October 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Session 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;10:00 – 11:00 am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommended Session:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Co-Created Rubrics&lt;br&gt;12:00 – 1:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultations** (scheduled individually and by request)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 23</td>
<td>October 24</td>
<td>October 25</td>
<td>October 26</td>
<td>October 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Session 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;10:00 – 11:30 am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommended Session:</strong>&lt;br&gt;Generative AI and Transparent Design in Research Assignments&lt;br&gt;12:00 – 1:00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultations** (scheduled individually and by request)

- All times are **Central Time (CT)**
- **Core Sessions**: This practicum includes three (3) 60-90 minute Core Sessions that everyone is expected to attend. Each Core Session will be offered once and recorded.
- **Recommended Sessions**: 60-minute Recommended Sessions are offered as an opportunity to further explore topics either touched on during or could not fit into Core Sessions. Attendance is not required but considered optional if you want to learn more. Recommended Sessions will be offered once each iteration and recorded.
- **Consultations**: You have an opportunity to schedule up to two (2) 30-minute Consultations with a Consultant during the practicum. You can receive individualized guidance on implementing topics covered in Core Sessions or Recommended Sessions. Consultations are not required but encouraged.
Week 1

Core Session 1: Why and how does equity matter in assessment?

Monday, October 9 at 10:00 – 11:00 am (CT)

Session Facilitator/Moderator: Jen Keys (Searle Center)

Session Panelists: Hilary Zimmerman (OIDI), Jackie Wickham Smith (SPS), Jim Stachowiak (AccessibleNU), Lauri Dietz (Searle Center)

Why should we consider redesigning assessments? How should equity be honored in the process? How could we create more equitable classrooms by redesigning assessments?

In this first core session, we discuss the integration of equity into student-centered assessments in multiple Northwestern contexts. We will showcase how equitable assessment practices can meet your learning goals and preserve rigor in your courses, while also supporting your students’ learning needs. Integrating transparency into curriculum design supports not only student learning in an individual course; it can also develop students’ intrinsic motivation to learn as they anticipate and plan for what comes ahead in a course or academic program. The transparency model enables instructors to learn, identify, and adjust based on specific student needs so that all students can be successful in their academic journeys. This panel will include representatives from AccessibleNU, the Office of Institutional Diversity and Inclusion, the Searle Center for Advancing Learning and Teaching, and School for Professional Studies to address why and how equity matters in assessment—in programmatic assessment, course-level assessment, and assignment-level assessments.

By the end of this session, participants will have engaged with panelists who:

- Discuss the significance of transparency and equity in the assessment process
- Examine how rigorous standards can be upheld within assessment frameworks
- Illuminate ways in which biases can have a negative impact on assessment outcomes
- Discuss strategies and approaches to place student learning at the center of the assessment process

Recommended Session: Student Panel on Socio-Emotional Wellness

Wednesday, October 11 at 12:00 – 1:00 pm (CT)

Session Facilitator: Meaghan Fritz (Writing)

Session Panelists: A variety of undergraduate students who have taken ungraded writing-centered courses with Meaghan Fritz; current and former research assistants who have worked with Meaghan Fritz and Lisa Del Torto on their longitudinal research study on the effects of ungrading and alternative assessment practices in their courses

This session will turn to students who have either directly experienced ungrading and other alternative assessment practices in Meaghan Fritz’s courses or who have worked closely with Fritz and her colleague, Lisa Del Torto, in interviewing former students as part of their longitudinal research study. In a Q&A format, students will respond specifically to questions regarding more holistic aspects of learning, focusing on areas of mental health, anxiety, and stress as it pertains to their experiences with assessment. Students will discuss their learning motivation in ungraded courses, the rigor of those learning experiences, and how alternative assessment practices impacted their educational experience broadly.

By the end of the session, participants will better understand:

- Students’ perspectives on alternative assessment and how it impacted their overall learning and wellbeing
- The impact of traditional grades-based assessment on students’ overall learning and wellbeing
- The ways in which students’ views on alternative assessment can vary across disciplines and experiences
Week 2

Core Session 2: When and where might we implement alternative grading strategies?

Tuesday, October 17 at 10:00 – 11:30 am (CT)

Session Facilitators: Lauri Dietz (Searle Center), Reggie Jackson (Medill), Veronica Berns (WCAS)

How do we save time and center learning? If we still have to give letter grades at the end of the quarter, what are the options for making assessments more meaningful and aligned with our course objectives?

In this session, we investigate one of the biggest barriers to equitable assessment: grades. What can instructors do to mitigate the potential problems of grading and better align their assessment practices to the course goals so that all students can thrive? This session explores how grades can demotivate learning and introduces a range of alternative grading frameworks and strategies that can create more equitable outcomes for all students. By highlighting and experimenting with different grading practices, participants will leave with a menu of options they can employ at any scale, within a range of constraints, and in any combination to increase students’ intrinsic motivation to learn and to reduce potential grading bias that can unwittingly perpetuate systemic barriers. Plus, when grading practices are better aligned with the purpose of a course, instructors get the added benefit of spending far less time and stress on grading.

By the end of this session, participants will make progress towards:

- Articulating how grades can demotivate learning
- Exploring assessment frameworks that decenter grading
- Reflecting on how at least one alternative grading framework could apply to their teaching context

Recommended Session: Co-Created Rubrics: Prioritizing Transparency, Equity, and Relevance in Course Assessment

Thursday, October 19 at 12:00 – 1:00 pm (CT)

Session Facilitator: Lina Eskew (Searle Center)

How do we ensure clarity, equity, and relevance in course assessments? How can educators and students collaboratively craft rubrics that don’t just serve as a scoring guide but promote clearer, more inclusive assessment methods that align with course learning outcomes and students’ diverse learning experiences?

While rubrics are an integral part of assessment toolkits, the challenge lies in making them transparent, inclusive, and in alignment with our course learning outcomes. In this session, we delve deeply into the significance of course rubrics for equitable assessment. We will shed light on the limitations of traditional rubrics, which often fail to represent the myriad voices of students and introduce rubric co-creation as an equitable approach. Participants will engage in rubric analysis and design techniques that will minimize ambiguity in the assessment process and maximize the academic success of all students.

By the end of this session, participants will have advanced in:

- Recognizing the limitations of traditional rubrics
- Unpacking the process of rubric design co-creation to prioritize transparency and equity
- Reflecting on how the concept of co-created rubrics can be infused into their learning and teaching context
Core Session 3: What types of feedback can we use to assess and promote learning?

Monday, October 23 at 10:00 – 11:30 am (CT)

**Session Lead Facilitator:** Meaghan Fritz (Writing)

**Session Co-Facilitators:** Kiki Zissimopoulos (McCormick), Lisa Del Torto (Writing)

*How do we take whatever grading scheme we have and take it to the next level through giving high-quality, actionable feedback on student work?*

This session explores the role that feedback plays in systems of assessment. We will invite participants to individually reflect on how feedback fits into their current assessment practices, while also presenting a variety of approaches for utilizing feedback in ways that can foster more equitable assessment. We will examine feedback as an opportunity to engage with students more equitably through a continuum of learning, presenting feedback as a strategic triangle of approaches comprising peer-feedback, instructor feedback (both from instructor to student and student to instructor), and students’ own metacognitive self-feedback. Participants will have time to converse in small groups and with session facilitators on the differences between feedback and assessment in their different disciplines, the impact that implementing different kinds of feedback have or could have on their assessment practices and on their students’ overall learning, and strategies for incorporating feedback into a more equitable version of assessment in their classes.

By the end of this session, participants will better understand:
- The role of feedback in systems of assessment
- The impact that they want feedback to have on their students’ learning
- The larger impact of how they give feedback

**Recommended Session: Generative AI and Transparent Design in Research Assignments**

Thursday, October 26 at 12:00 – 1:00 pm (CT)

**Session Facilitators:** Anne Zald (Libraries), Michelle Guittar (Libraries)

Research from Project Information Literacy (RIL) and [Transparency in Learning and Teaching (TILT) Higher Ed](https://tilthighered.com) provide insights into what promotes student success on research assignments. This workshop will introduce these research findings, then proceed to activities that provide workshop participants the opportunity to apply the “Purpose, Tasks, Criteria” assignment review framework developed by TILT Higher Ed. Starting with analysis of activities designed for use in library instruction sessions, interacting with current generative AI (GAI) tools, the workshop will also analyze examples of research assignments developed by faculty, how those are communicated to students, and how research assignments might be modified or changed in light of new technologies.

By the end of this session, participants will be able to:
- Apply TILT Higher Ed’s transparency framework (i.e., Purpose, Task, Criteria) to revise their design of research assignments
- Analyze faculty research assignment handouts using the framework to negotiate with faculty on content issues for research-assignment-related library instructions
- Guide students’ interrogation and use of GAI tools during the research process