

A Teacher's Compendium For Reimagining Evidence of Learning in the Age of GenAI

About this document

This compendium gathers examples of assignments, assessments, and pedagogical practices developed within the Department of Media and Culture Studies at Utrecht University. While many of these examples respond to the rise of GenAI in higher education, they also address broader systemic challenges in higher education, including workload pressures.

This compendium has been developed as a toolkit within the educational context of the department of Media and Culture Studies at Utrecht University. Primary team compiling this included: Ani Encheva (Research Assistant), Annette Markham (Director of the *Futures + Literacies + Methods* Lab), Sigrid Merx (Director of Education) and Eva Midden (Director of Education).

Note to readers

This is a living document, and we warmly welcome contributions. You can add your input by using the template, with a blank copy included at the end of the document for you to copy and paste, and by following a similar length (maximum 2 pages, unless there is additional material that would fit better in an appendix), style, and voice to the existing entries. Don't have time? We can interview you instead, giving you a chance to talk through your contribution, after which we will help shape it into the template. If you have any questions, please feel free to get in touch with Ani Encheva at:

a.encheva@uu.nl

Table of Contents

From Individual Written Paper to Group Paper + Oral Exam.....	3
Podcast Recording Assignment.....	7
Expanding on an Essay from a Previous Course.....	9
Discussing the Writing Process.....	11
Draft-Feedback-Revision-Final Assignment.....	13
Pop Quizzes Replace Reading Response Essays.....	15
Tutorial to Search for Literature.....	17
Collective Class Paper and Response Paper + Personal Reflection...19	
Practitioner Interviews and Critical Comparison with GenAI	
Responses Through an Interactive Group Presentation.....	24
Research Findings, GenAI, and Algorithmic Bias.....	26
Blank Template.....	27



From Individual Written Paper to Group Paper + Oral Exam

Time period: 2025-2026, Block 2. Tested once

Course: *Platforms, Streaming, and Cultural Production*

Contributed by: Dr. Karin van Es and Prof. Dr. Eggo Müller

Summary: This case retains a written research paper, but makes this a group assignment as P/F. To retain individual assessment, it then adds an oral exam. While students might be using GenAI in their paper, the oral component ensures they have not outsourced the course's learning objectives to these technologies.

What is the assignment, assessment, or pedagogical practice?

Students work in groups of 3-4 to conduct an analysis of a platform for audiovisual (AV) content, linked to one of the course week topics and applying relevant dimensions of the walkthrough method.

- From week 2 of the course students are already working in their groups each week in class analyzing their selected case from different perspectives to develop their research.
- Before the winter break, students submit and present an extended abstract of max. 1200 words, which is mandatory, not graded, meant to receive feedback, and a requirement to qualify for the oral defense.
- After receiving feedback, students submit a final group report of max. 3000 words. The final written report is graded pass/fail and must pass before they can take the oral defense.
- Then, students complete an individual oral exam (20 minutes per student), which counts for 100% of the final grade.

<p>What prompted you to develop this and why?</p>	<p>The initial motivation was realizing that the traditional final paper would not be GenAI resilient. The instructors followed a CDH workshop with Prof. Dr. Annette Markham together where they developed the approach.</p>
<p>What are the learning objectives/course goals?</p>	<p>This course is intended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● First, for students to develop an overview and understanding of the phenomenon of platforms, streaming, and cultural production, as well as relevant critical cultural inquiries into digital technologies. ● Second, it aims to foster students' ability to analyze the mutual shaping of platforms, datafication and cultural production. <p>By the end of the course, students can...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ...identify and assess platforms as computational, software-based systems; ● ...define and apply key concepts and relevant theories about platforms, data and cultural production; ● ...critically engage with the components of platforms for audiovisual content; ● ...analyze the interplay between platforms and cultural production.
<p>What are the assessment criteria?</p>	<p>In the oral exam, students are assessed on their understanding of the group research, use of relevant theories and methods, grasp of the conceptual and methodological framework, the clarity and depth of their reflection, and their critical thinking about the analysis and its implications. For a full breakdown of the assessment criteria, see the attached rubric.</p>
<p>Further comments, reflections, thoughts, suggestions...</p>	<p>In asking questions about the paper and making students defend decisions it was rather easy for the instructors to discern how well students knew the relevant theories and concepts, the method, and their case. Additionally, the instructors had a positive and productive experience grading in a duo. This process involved completing the rubric together directly after the oral exam with some short feedback, which was then emailed to the students.</p> <p>The instructors also reported that conducting the oral exams together was enjoyable and that it allowed them to have meaningful, serious conversations with the students about their work. Some students were rather nervous, others enjoyed the conversation and the recognition. Most students liked working in groups on their paper and they prepared the orals together. Those were the students with the higher scores. The quality of the papers that were submitted was fluctuating. While the paper was not graded, it was needed to have a pass to be able to defend.</p> <p>Students could prepare their exams based on a set of generic questions that the instructors shared with them in advance.</p>

	The instructors estimated that the time investment was fairly similar to what it would have been if students had submitted individual papers requiring feedback.
--	--

Oral Exam Rubrics for *Platforms, Streaming & Cultural Production (2025-2025)**

Name student:

Examinors: Karin van Es & Eggo Müller

	Excellent (10.0-9.0)	Very good (9.0-7.5)	Good (7.5-6.5)	Sufficient (6.5-5.5)	Failed (> 5.5)
Dimensions					
Overall understanding of topic and paper	Shows an exceptional understanding of the topic with a fully developed argument per the categories below	Shows a deep/robust understanding of the topic with a fully developed argument per the categories below	Shows a limited understanding of the topic, not quite a fully developed argument per the categories below	Shows a superficial understanding of the topic, argument not developed enough per the categories below	Shows no understanding of the topic and no argument per the categories below
Argument	Most convincingly articulates a position or argument	Clearly articulates a position or argument	Articulates a position or argument that is incomplete or limited in scope	Articulates a position or argument that is unfocused or ambiguous	Does not articulate a position or argument
Evidence	Presents overwhelming evidence that is relevant and accurate	Presents evidence that is relevant and accurate	Presents evidence that is mostly relevant and/or mostly accurate	Presents evidence that is somewhat inaccurate and/or irrelevant, but corrects when prompted	Presents a lot of inaccurate and/or irrelevant evidence

	Presents overwhelming amount of evidence to support argument	Presents sufficient amount of evidence to support argument	Presents limited evidence to support argument	Does not present enough evidence to support argument, but augments when prompted	Doesn't present enough evidence to support argument, even when prompted repeatedly
(Theoretical) Implications	Extensively discusses the major implications of the argument or position in relation to relevant theories or debates	Fully discusses the major implications of the argument or position in relation to relevant theories or debates	Adequately discusses some of the major implications of the position in relation to relevant theories or debates	Discusses minor implications (missing the major ones) without relation to relevant theories or debates	Doesn't discuss the implications of the argument or position with no relation to theories or debates
Structure	There is an explicit and convincing logic in the progression of ideas	There is logic in the progression of ideas	There are a few areas of disjointedness or intermittent lack of logical progression of ideas	Ideas are somewhat disjointed and/or do not always flow logically, making it a bit difficult to follow	Ideas are disjointed and/or do not flow logically, hence argument is very difficult to follow
Prompting		Did not have to prompt with probing questions at all	Prompted minimally (one or two probing questions)	Prompted a lot (a series of probing questions)	Prompting with probing questions shows no effect

Dutch grade:

Date:

Signature examiner(s):

* Inspired by Susan Ambrose's rubrics for oral exams in her Upper Division History Course at Carnegie Mellon University.



**Utrecht
University**

Sharing science,
shaping tomorrow

Podcast Recording Assignment

Time period: Block 4, 2025-26. Pilot Study.

Course: *Creator Cultures: Media Industries and the Digital Economy*

Contributed by: Dr. Lucie Chateau with Dr. Ed Spencer

Summary: This case presents a group podcast assignment that is scaffolded through several stages, including a proof of concept, the development of an evaluation rubric by students, and a final podcast episode.

<p>What is the assignment, assessment, or pedagogical practice?</p>	<p>The podcast assignment (60%, groupwork) consists of a few components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First, students submit a proof of concept in for approval, which must include a show description and rationale, plus a self-designed rubric. The rationale should state the podcast title, episode theme, and explain how it connects to digital culture using ideas from the first four weeks. The self-designed rubric will include different categories for what students intend to produce, distinguishing between what would need to be delivered to reach ‘good’ / ‘pass’ / ‘fail’. Both the proof of concept and self-designed rubric receive numerical grades. • Podcast episode recording (20 min, pass/fail). Students work in a group of up to four to create a fictional podcast episode of no more than 20 minutes based on one course theme. The podcast should engage with that theme critically, playfully, or parodically, target an imagined podcast audience, give each member a role, and show thought about format, audience engagement, and distribution. All podcast recordings happen in the same week in a recording studio in Utrecht.
<p>What prompted you to develop this and why?</p>	<p>The goal of developing this assignment was, most of all, to make the course and its assessments more AI-aware. The podcast assessment, in such a form, is considered to be relatively AI-proof due to its delivery and performance in situ, and the fact that it relies on students who have engaged in the course and the process of creating the podcast episode format iteratively throughout seminars. The hope is that, through the very hands-on process of designing the podcast episode, students will be participating in critical discussions and learn the value of dialogue as a humanities skill that should be honed in classrooms and through debate, and not deferred to AI.</p>
<p>What are the learning objectives/course goals?</p>	<p>This course’s learning objectives are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students learn to critically understand the global landscape of digital creator cultures, exploring their socio-cultural, economic, and ethical dimensions. • Students analyze and engage with platform content and organizational structures, using relevant tools and methods to assess how platforms shape content production, distribution, and community dynamics. • Students develop practical skills in content creation through the form of a podcast for a specific platform, tailored to the platform’s technical, cultural, and audience requirements.
<p>What are the assessment criteria?</p>	<p>The podcast recording is graded pass/fail, while the proof of concept and self-designed rubric submitted 10 days earlier receive the numerical grade. This</p>

	<p>approach avoids judging students' creativity directly and instead focuses on process, growth, and iterative learning.</p> <p>Assessment is based on students developing their work through stages such as proposals, feedback, presentations, rehearsals, and the final recording, with the proof of concept as the key graded outcomes. It is evaluated against the course learning goals and higher-order skills, such as creation, innovation, and transformation. Students must show a well-developed plan for their podcast, including format, rationale, genre, theoretical engagement, audience, and platform awareness.</p> <p>The self-designed rubric is part of this process. Because “critical,” “playful,” and “parodic” podcasts involve different genres and expectations, students define their own criteria and what they aim to deliver. In this way, the rubric acts as a promise, encouraging structured reflection, clear goals, and self-evaluation rather than imposing one fixed standard of success.</p>
<p>Further comments, reflections, thoughts, suggestions...</p>	<p>The assessment is also designed to address the more creative learning goals of the course that stress “practical skills in content creation,” as this course should emphasize creative methods. In this course, the instructors are using the podcast recording both as an experiential goal and a creative method. The medium of podcasting is also not only the vector through which students will deliver on the learning goals but the object of study itself, playing a dual role in terms of pedagogical practice and engaging in a cultural object critically.</p>



**Utrecht
University**

Sharing science,
shaping tomorrow

Expanding on an Essay from a Previous Course

Time period: 2025-2026, Block 2. Tested once

Course: *Philosophy of Science for Cultural Inquiry*

Contributed by: Dr. Evelyn Wan with Dr. Sarah Trottier

<p>Summary: This case presents an assignment in which students revisit an essay from an earlier course and expand it using Philosophy of Science perspectives learned throughout the course.</p>	
<p>What is the assignment, assessment, or pedagogical practice?</p>	<p>This assessment practice entails that students select an essay from an earlier course and expand it using Philosophy of Science (PoS) perspectives. Students are asked to provide an outline, attaching the former essay, as mid-term (ungraded, just for feed forward). After submission of the final essay, they are invited for a ‘fireside chat’ learning reflection session (half an hour for 4-5 students), where they explain and discuss their process and reflect on key takeaways from the course. Students get a participation score based on class group presentation, oral learning reflection and mindmap (20%) and the final written assignment score (80%).</p>
<p>What prompted you to develop this and why?</p>	<p>Key design consideration of the testing was to center the learning experience and lean into writing rather than focusing on fear of GenAI and fraud prevention.</p>
<p>What are the learning objectives/course goals?</p>	<p>During this course, students learn to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recognise, describe, and discuss different philosophical movements; ● Place scientific approaches in a historical context; ● Read and analyse cultural-philosophical texts; ● Apply philosophy of science approaches to cases from their disciplines; ● Compare different philosophy of science approaches; ● Practise writing skills, such as situating texts and building connections between theory and case study, in preparation for their BA thesis trajectory.
<p>What are the assessment criteria?</p>	<p>Vision on holistic grading:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Visual: visual digestion and representation of the interconnectedness of different concepts and perspectives covered in class. ● Oral: group presentation; personal conversation explaining learning process, justification of choices. ● Writing (strongest weighing still): reoriented toward focused grading on the integration of philosophical perspectives, removed emphasis on case.
<p>Further comments, reflections, thoughts, suggestions...</p>	<p>This assignment resulted in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Enhanced learning satisfaction and stronger embedding in the BA programme: The assignment increased both affective and intellectual engagement by allowing students to revisit earlier work, recognize their own growth, deepen projects they cared about, and add new perspectives. At the

same time, it was more clearly embedded in the broader BA learning trajectory, helping students connect ideas across courses, reorganize prior knowledge, and approach a wider range of cases through more diverse combinations of perspectives.

- **Stronger preparation for BA thesis writing:** The assignment oriented the course more clearly toward thesis-level work by showing students that arguments can always be deepened and strengthened through philosophy-of-science perspectives. Many engaged concepts more rigorously, sometimes producing intricate and advanced analyses, while also learning how to revise and restructure existing writing rather than treating earlier papers as fixed.
- **Genuine diversity in the courses, case studies, and types of previous essays students drew on:** They revisited final essays, reflective essays, weekly assignments, research proposals, BA theses, and papers written for other universities, including in disciplines such as law and philosophy. As a result, the range of case studies expanded significantly compared to previous years, spanning the full breadth of the degree, from film and television to new media, algorithmic media/AI, theatre/performance, and games.

Additionally, students expressed that there was no point in going to GenAI: they already knew their case and had invested in knowledge building in an earlier course. The task was also deemed too complex for AI to handle or too messy to prompt, given the intricacies of concepts and objects from the former course and the philosophical perspectives from this course. Some students also seemed convinced that classmates would not resort to GenAI, contributing to a general atmosphere that everyone could do this work better than GenAI.



Utrecht
University

Sharing science,
shaping tomorrow

Discussing the Writing Process

Time period: Tested in various courses throughout 2025-2026, including *Storytelling in Media and Performance*, *Fan Cultures and the Civic Imagination*, *Introduction to Media Studies* (UCU course)

Contributed by: Dr. Dan Hassler-Forest

<p>Summary: This case highlights a pedagogical practice in which the instructor regularly builds opportunities in each course for discussions with students about the writing process.</p>	
<p>What is the assignment, assessment, or pedagogical practice?</p>	<p>This pedagogical practice includes building in opportunities for more elaborate and systematic discussions with students about the writing process, alongside reflection on the value of writing as a form of personal expression. This includes talking more explicitly about different forms of writing, about finding and experimenting with one’s voice, and about making space for forms of writing that do not have to be strictly “academic” but can be more personal and creative. It also involves teaching and encouraging students to position themselves in their writing and to connect abstract concepts and theories to concrete practices and objects.</p> <p>The need for such conversations is made even more urgent by the instructor’s impression that students often do not feel fully seen in the work they do. That is why they consistently reassure students that they are good writers and that they are capable of writing without the assistance of GenAI.</p> <p>At the same time, it is important to explain that what students are learning is not simply, or not even, how to write an academic paper, but how to develop communication skills that will be valuable in any field they enter. Writing, in this sense, is about being able to communicate something clearly to another person and to connect higher-level ideas to what may at first seem like a chaotic range of practices or objects.</p>
<p>What prompted you to develop this and why?</p>	<p>At first, when GenAI tools such as ChatGPT entered the educational scene, the instructor felt rather hopeless and began to question whether there was still any point in teaching writing. Over time, however, they read many blogs, essays, and reflections by others who were experiencing similar frustrations but who ultimately argued that this was not a hopeless fight. Instead, they saw it as a moment to return to the fundamentals of Humanities education and engage in more thorough and systematic discussions about the writing process, the value of writing, and the reasons why students should invest time and energy in producing their own work.</p> <p>In this sense, the arrival of GenAI has also had a positive effect in that it has pushed various educational actors across the world to appreciate, or at least revisit, the fundamental values of their fields and of the work they do – values that may previously have been taken for granted or not examined closely enough.</p>
<p>Further comments, reflections, thoughts, suggestions...</p>	<p>The instructor has found that the explicit shifting of the writing process as something that is purely the outcome of the research process to a central component within it (i.e. “writing is thinking”) has helped students develop their ideas incrementally while also taking more explicit ownership of them. For many (not all!), this has also clearly improved their enjoyment of this process as something that isn’t experienced merely as “homework” but as an expression of their own ideas and positions.</p>



Draft-Feedback-Revision-Final Assignment

Time period: Tested in various courses throughout 2025-2026, including *Storytelling in Media and Performance*, *Fan Cultures and the Civic Imagination*, *Introduction to Media Studies* (UCU course)

Contributed by: Dr. Dan Hassler-Forest

Summary: This case highlights an assessment practice centered on a scaffolded assignment with multiple stages, including draft submission, feedback, revision, and final submission.

What is the assignment, assessment, or pedagogical practice?	This assessment practice involves having students submit a completed essay for feedback and a provisional grade, after which they can revise and resubmit it for a final grade. Besides the advantage of getting students used to incremental writing in preparation for their thesis (among other things), this also makes it easier for instructors to learn from students' changing techniques and styles, for instance by first engaging a student in dialogue about the specifics of their writing process after they submit a piece of writing that gives the impression of having been at least LLM-assisted. This teaches instructors to recognize the large variety of deviations from "standard" styles of student papers, while giving students who in many cases have knowingly incorporated GenAI-assisted writing an opportunity to remedy this without immediately being penalized. As the revised final paper clearly indicates all changes from the first submission along with a written reflection on the paper's further development, the second round is far less demanding in terms of assessment.
What prompted you to develop this and why?	The instructor first developed this approach after encouraging students to experiment more freely with voice, register, and style in their term papers, and subsequently realizing that the risk of failure still led most students to remain mostly within the relative safety of standardized student writing styles and forms. Building in a feedback phase that precedes a final version gave students a "safety net" that helped them try out different ways of writing. With the advent of ChatGPT and

	similar tools shortly thereafter, this method became doubly useful for the reasons described above.
Further comments, reflections, thoughts, suggestions...	<p>This practice requires only a limited increase of grading time and energy, while it substantially lowers the threshold for students to engage in doing their own writing and learn from their own mistakes.</p> <p>Additionally, the instructor observes that such an assessment practice leads to more fundamental discussions around what students are doing and how they are engaging in the learning and assessment process.</p>



Pop Quizzes Replace Reading Response Essays

Time period: Tested in various courses throughout 2025-2026, including *New Digital Media Theories* (MA), *Play, Perform, Participate* (RMA), and *Critical Discourse Analysis* (BA, UCU course)

Contributed by: Prof. Dr. Annette Markham with Dr. Anne Helmond

Summary: This case presents individual pop quizzes as a way to assess whether students have completed the assigned reading and to encourage them to come to class prepared.

What is the assignment, assessment, or pedagogical practice?	The pop quizzes consist mainly of multiple-choice questions, usually with three or four answers to choose from, and only occasionally, though rarely, true-false questions. The quiz is given weekly, so it is not really a “pop” quiz, but more like a quick/small quiz. There are no more than six questions in total each week, covering two or three readings. The questions focus on identifying key points or examples used by an author in an article.
What prompted you to develop this and why?	Shifting from weekly reading essays to pop quizzes was inspired by the intrusion of GenAI in the writing assignments, of course, but also the recognition that often, what teachers actually want when they have weekly response assignments is for students to read, to complete the assigned readings, and to come to class prepared. The goal of pop quizzes is to gauge students’ overall reading and attention to the content of the reading materials.
What are the assessment criteria?	The goal is to reward students for doing the reading rather than punish them for not always fully understanding it. Therefore, the questions are designed to test the most basic levels of reading comprehension through recall. As the weeks progress, questions may be added that test the student’s ability to synthesize. But the quiz is

	<p>not intended to evaluate higher learning levels of interpretation, comparison, or application.</p> <p>Generally, the lowest quiz score is dropped. Weekly, if one or more students successfully challenge a question, everyone will earn credit for it. This happens when the questions or answers are poorly formulated, as for example when several answers could reasonably be considered correct.</p>
<p>Notes on design</p>	<p>The pop quiz format and content should be stress-tested. In one co-taught course iteration, one instructor would draft the first version of the quiz questions, and the other would add more questions. Then, they would review each other's questions. If they could not answer a question themselves, they took that as a sign that it was too difficult.</p> <p>If each instructor writes questions based on the readings they assigned, the questions they write may be too complex, simply because they know the material too well. Checking each other's questions ensures better clarity and appropriate level..</p> <p>Writing multiple choice quiz questions may seem easy, but there is a science behind it, and teachers are advised to read up on this in advance, especially if they don't have very much prior experience.</p> <p>We print different versions of the same quiz to help minimize cheating. All quizzes are completed by hand on one side of A4 (but quizzes are also easily shrunk to one side of A5 if one wants to minimize paper usage).</p>
<p>Further comments, reflections, thoughts, suggestions...</p>	<p>One result of this pop quiz approach is that students can achieve a full score of 10 out of 10. In other words, it allows students to earn higher grades than they might under other assessment formats. For many students, this is a refreshing, rather rewarding, and much appreciated experience.</p> <p>Students in the Humanities are often unaccustomed to the practice of multiple choice quizzes. They must be instructed how to circle a single answer, how to flip it over when completed, and how to avoid looking at their neighbor's exam.</p> <p>It is essential to reflect on what the goal of a multiple choice exam is. Here, it is used for rewarding reading at the most basic level. This has worked very well for purpose.</p>



Tutorial to Search for Literature

Time period: Block 2, Tested 1 Time (2025-2026).

Course: *Research Lab II* in the MA Film and Television Cultures

Contributed by: Dr. Jasmijn van Gorp

Summary: This case presents a tutorial where students learn how to search for literature as well as to critically reflect on the role of databases and tools in doing such research.

What is the assignment, assessment, or pedagogical practice?

This is a literature search tutorial, the aim of which is two-fold, namely to teach students:

- (1) how to find relevant literature using various databases and search strategies and
- (2) how to critically reflect on the role of digital databases and generative AI tools in their search process.

The databases and tools used in this tutorial include Zotero, Google Scholar, WorldCat, Project MUSE, JSTOR, ChatGPT, and Excel.

In this tutorial, students first use Google Scholar and a university library database to compile a list of publications relevant to their thesis. They then use ChatGPT to generate a list of authors. In the final phase, they compare the results of the three search strategies and critically evaluate and refine their final list of publications. Upon completion of the tutorial, students will have developed a preliminary reference list for further reading and will have critically reflected on their search process.

What prompted you to develop this and why?

Students often struggle to find relevant literature for their papers and thesis projects. One of the reasons is that students tend to use just one database for their search, most often Google Scholar. Moreover, and more importantly, the mere use of a database does not guarantee search success, making it essential to use multiple search strategies and to critically reflect on the database at hand in order to select and assess relevant literature.

	<p>More recently, GenAI tools such as ChatGPT have challenged traditional approaches to literature research and writing assignments. Given the instructor’s background in digital tool criticism (see Koolen, Van Gorp and Ossenbruggen, 2019), they aimed to develop a tutorial that teaches students how to search for literature and to critically reflect on the role of databases and GenAI tools in doing such research.</p>
<p>What are the learning objectives/course goals?</p>	<p>Specifically, by completing this tutorial, students will be able to...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● ...understand the impact of their chosen search system on their search results; ● ...understand the importance of diversifying queries and boolean operators; ● ...critically assess literature for relevance; ● ...learn to work with Zotero Plugin and export Zotero results into a bibliography; ● ...understand the impact of GenAI on search results.
<p>What are the assessment criteria?</p>	<p>The tutorial can be delivered as an in-class workshop (2–3 hours) or assigned as a take-home assignment.</p> <p>It is a tutorial without assessment criteria yet. It can be graded as a Pass/Fail, or with a grade on students’ reflection/analysis on their literature search process.</p>
<p>Edusources Package</p>	<p>This tutorial includes an Edusources package containing a lecturer’s manual and two versions of the same tutorial: one with Excel steps and one without. Links to those materials, along with accompanying information, can be found both on this website and below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Beyond Google Scholar: Student tutorial (version without excel) ● Beyond Google Scholar: Student tutorial (excel version) ● Beyond Google Scholar: Lecturer’s manual



Collective Class Paper and Response Paper + Personal Reflection

Time period: Block 2. Tested once in 2025-2026

Course: *The Thinking Body*

Contributed by: Dr. Irene Alcubilla Troughton

Summary: This case consists on the writing of a case-study analysis paper with a whole class, and an individual assignment of a response paper to the collective one

What is the assignment, assessment, or pedagogical practice?

The collective class paper assignment consists of the collective writing of six short papers (around 1200 words) during the seminar of week 6. During this seminar, students are divided in groups and in the 4 hours allocated to this session, they will create, with the whole of the class, a total of six short papers.

The writing process is divided into 5 phases. Each group begins with phase 1 and after they have completed this phase, they will give their essay to the next group. Once every group has a new essay, everyone will start with phase 2, and so on. At the end, you have, as a class, 6 short essays that are written by everyone.

In order to do this assignment, the writing process of each short paper is divided in five stages:

- **Phase 1:** Select and describe an object of study that is appropriate and interesting for this course. Try to be original.
- **Phase 2:** Identify one concept or theory that is relevant for the study of this object. Describe the concepts/theory and their main authors in the context of the 4E approach to cognition.
- **Phase 3:** Formulate a research question for the object of study and the theories selected. This research question should clearly address the dialogue between object and theory, reflecting on how theoretical insights might be used to analyse or reflect on the object/phenomenon or how the object/phenomenon can be used to demonstrate or question what is argued by the theory.
- **Phase 4:** perform a case study analysis based on the theoretical framework, the description of the object and the research question.

- **Phase 5:** write an introduction and a conclusion to the short paper.

The written essays should comply with the following criteria:

- **Selection of case study:** The essay chooses an appropriate and original case study that showcases the intersection between a 4E approach to cognition and the arts. The description of the case study is clear and the reason why it is a relevant object of study is made patent in the essay.
- **Use and description of theory:** The essay shows understanding of the 4E perspective on cognition; it selects appropriate theories/concepts for the object of study and describes them appropriately and accurately.
- **Research question:** The research question is concise, clear and appropriate for the case study as well as the theories selected. It clearly addresses the dialogue between object and theory, reflecting on how theoretical insights might be used to analyse or reflect on the object/phenomenon or how the object/phenomenon can be used to demonstrate or question what is argued by the theory.
- **Analysis:** the main line of argumentation is strong and convincing. Relevant aspects of the case study are clearly described to the reader, in a way that serves the line of argumentation and that connects to 4E cognition.
- **Writing style:** The writing is flowing, easy for the reader to follow, and, as much as possible, free of spelling and grammar errors.

The response paper to the collective class paper is around 1500-1800 words. In the response paper, students provide a critical reaction to the collective paper they have read. In the response paper, students are expected to provide a critical reading of a text that builds on one or several aspects of it, linking it to further sources, examples or ideas. In the response paper, students draw on the ideas of others, making decisions on what are the key ideas/threads/propositions of the text, and how they can be discussed or connected to other topics of research. The ideal responder also brings something of themselves to the reaction, providing both academic observations and their own interests. A response paper is therefore their chance to explain and communicate, in an academic manner, their personal point of view and understanding of a particular idea.

In order to write the response paper, students should follow the next steps:

1. Start by explaining the idea or position that the paper argues for and that you will be responding to. In order to make this selection, you could ask yourself the following questions: what was significant? What do I remember? What did I react to?
2. Proceed by briefly positioning yourself: from which expertise/discipline are you coming from? How does it allow you to relate to the idea/proposition of the text that you selected?
3. Connect your own thoughts to the idea/proposition selected: do you agree or disagree with the idea? Have you identified a conflict in the argumentation of the text? Could this idea be related to another object of study? Has the idea changed your perspective on a certain topic; if so, how? How can the selected idea/proposition be connected to other texts that you may have read or to issues you might have experienced?
4. Arrive at a short conclusion of your insights

Each student is individually graded for this assignment. The grading criteria is

as follows:

1. Understanding of the source text (30%):

- The paper clearly identifies the main idea, argument, or proposition from the collective paper that it responds to
- The chosen focus demonstrates an accurate and nuanced understanding of the source text
- The student avoids summarizing the entire paper and instead highlights what is significant or thought-provoking

2. Critical engagement and originality (30%):

- The paper goes beyond description to offer a thoughtful and critical response
- The response demonstrates independent thinking by connecting the chosen idea to other theories, examples, or personal insights
- The paper shows the student's ability to formulate and support their own viewpoint

3. Coherence and structure (20%):

- The paper follows a clear and logical structure
- Arguments develop in a coherent way, with clear connections between sections
- The conclusion effectively summarizes key insights

4. Positioning (10%):

- The paper clearly explains the student's own disciplinary, academic, or personal standpoint.
- The paper demonstrates how this perspective shapes their interpretation and response to the chosen idea

5. Academic writing and referencing (10%)

- Writing is clear, precise, and appropriately academic in tone
- References to texts, theories, or examples are accurate, relevant, and correctly cited in the Chicago Manual Style
- The paper demonstrates care in presentation, style, and proofreading

Personal reflection: the second part of the final assignment consists of a text of around 500-700 words that reflects on the process of writing an academic paper in a collective manner, responding to the following questions:

- How was this different from the way in which you normally write an academic paper?
- What was your experience of working with people coming from various disciplines?
- What kind of difficulties did you encounter, individually and as a group, and how did you navigate them?
- How do you look back at your input during this assignment, during the group work and in the final essays that you have read?

This part of the assignment is a pass or fail. In order to be able to get a numerical

	<p>grade in the response paper, the student needs to achieve a passing grade in the personal reflection.</p>
<p>What prompted you to develop this and why?</p>	<p>This case was developed as a result of reflections on reasons why students make use of Gen AI in written assignments. Time pressure, difficulties with formulating thoughts on paper, disinterest were issues that I tried to tackle with this assignment.</p> <p>The first part of this assignment (collective class paper) attempts to make the students reflect on the practice of writing, along with its challenges and pleasures, and to collectively overcome possible difficulties, instead of relying on gen AI. It also encourages students to actively work with each other, distributing tasks and reaching agreements in a short period of time.</p> <p>The collective paper needs to be written in the time span of one seminar (4 hours), with clear timeslots dedicated to each part of the paper, which gave students a very clear goal and structure. As the written parts of the paper need to be a collective effort, students were encouraged to discuss with each other, help each other understand specific concepts, formulate and re-formulate phrases, select suitable case studies, summarise and apply theories to case studies. Because each round they needed to work with text written by others, writer's block was less present (they already had something to build on), and they practiced making an argument while building on the works of others.</p> <p>The second part of the assignment (a response paper and a personal reflection) tried to tackle the problem of a lack of interest in the topic of the paper. The response paper was meant for students to build on or criticise parts of the collective paper that they found interesting or not convincing, from their own discipline and interests. The personal reflection on the process of writing a collective paper was meant to stimulate their thinking around academic writing.</p>
<p>What are the learning objectives/course goals?</p>	<p>The learning objectives of the course are the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discuss and explain key ideas and debates from selected theoretical texts about 4E cognition 2. Use concepts from 4E cognition to examine and interpret artistic and media case studies 3. Work together in interdisciplinary groups to combine different perspectives and ideas and apply them in presentations and written work 4. Reflect on and evaluate interdisciplinary and collective ways of working 5. Critique previous work by forming and supporting their own argument <p>Each learning goal is tested through a mix of individual and group activities. Students discuss and explain theoretical approaches (goal 1) during seminars by means of class discussions and presentations of advanced texts. Goal 2 is assessed through in-class exercises applying concepts to media objects, as well as in the collective case study analysis developed on week 6. Students furthermore learn to apply ideas through interdisciplinary collaboration (goal 3) in group assignments. Students' capacity to evaluate and critique modes of working and previous work (goals 4-5) is tested in two written assignments: an individual reflection on interdisciplinary and collective modes of working, and a written response to a class</p>

	paper, in which they evaluate the paper's argument, make judgements, and present their own informed position.
What are the assessment criteria?	The collective class paper is an ungraded in-class exercise that constitutes the basis for the response paper, which is 60% of their final grade in the course.
Further comments, reflections, thoughts, suggestions...	<p>In the personal reflections I read that everyone was very satisfied with the in-class assignment of the collective class paper. They all found it rewarding (to be able to complete a paper in four hours) and interesting, prompting reflection on different ways of approaching academic writing. They all felt useful within their groups, and were able to see how the final product was a collaboration of the whole class.</p> <p>In the response papers, I read exciting takes, with some students showing real interest and putting something of themselves in the writing. However, I did notice some papers that seemed to be written by Gen AI. While this is unavoidable, I wonder if there could be something else that could ensure that the students do not rely on Chat GPT for their writing, like an oral presentation of their response paper.</p>



Practitioner Interviews and Critical Comparison with GenAI Responses Through an Interactive Group Presentation

Course: *Theory and Practice of the Humanities* (BA)

Contributed by: Dr. Ingrid Hoofd

Summary: This assignment asks students to interview a practitioner about dilemmas encountered in professional practice, generate a response to the same dilemma using ChatGPT or another GenAI tool, and critically compare the AI-generated response with the practitioner’s insights in an interactive group presentation.

What is the assignment, assessment, or pedagogical practice?

This assignment centers on a 20-minute interactive group presentation (20% of the final grade) in which students explore how Humanities expertise is applied in practice outside the university. Working in groups of 4-5, students identify a project, event, or professional practice where people with a Humanities background apply specialized professional knowledge. They investigate the challenges, dilemmas, and trade-offs involved in this work and place one such challenge at the center of the presentations.

In preparation for this presentation, students are expected to interview a practitioner from the chosen field or, if this is not possible, analyze a relevant text written by a Humanities professional. In addition, they must ask ChatGPT or another GenAI tool to generate a short text about the same dilemma and critically discuss this AI-generated response in relation to the practitioner's perspectives.

The presentation must also engage with the Code of Conduct for Scientific Integrity and Alpha and Gamma Rays, while encouraging active participation and discussion among classmates through an interactive presentation format.

What are the learning objectives/course goals?

The goals of this course, of which this assignment is a part, are for students to:

- ... learn to reflect on scientific practice within their field in various ways.
- learn to approach scientific texts in their field using a ‘meta-perspective’.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ... learn to reflect, both orally and in writing, using concepts and reasoning from the history of science, the philosophy of science, and criticism of science, on how researchers write about research in their specialty. <p>Upon successful completion of the course, students are able to explain, both orally and in writing, to non-specialists how scientific knowledge is created within their field. They are also able to describe how researchers in their specialty think about research, the nature of scientific knowledge, the societal relevance of their work, and their role in addressing complex issues. In addition, students develop a stronger understanding of what attracts them to their field of specialization and are better able to articulate this.</p>
<p>What are the assessment criteria?</p>	<p>In addition to the usual assessment criteria – such as clear slides, understandable delivery, good time management, audience engagement, a strong conclusion, and fair distribution of work – other criteria for evaluating the presentation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does it concern a specific practice? • Is it clear which specialized Humanities expertise plays a role? • Do challenges (e.g. dilemmas, trade-offs) come to life through collected information (interview, texts, visual material)? • Is the analysis of the GenAI text integrated into the presentation? • Is the presentation interactive (e.g. does it encourage the audience to think along, carry out an assignment, or solve a problem)? Does the use of the space align with this? • Does the presentation refer to the Code of Conduct and to Alpha and Gamma rays?



Research Findings, GenAI, and Algorithmic Bias

Course: *The Art of Creation* (BA)

Contributed by: Dr. Ingrid Hoofd

Summary: This assignment asks students to compare the research findings they have assembled on an art/media-related topic with responses generated by ChatGPT, Consensus, or Google AI to the same research questions, and to critically reflect on the differences using Safiya Noble’s work on algorithmic bias as a critical lens.

What is the assignment, assessment, or pedagogical practice?

This assignment guides students through a series of close-reading, analytical, and critical reflection exercises focused on two texts. In the first stage, students conduct a close reading of a text by Pagliarini and Lund by identifying its central research question, reconstructing the authors’ reasoning and argumentation, analyzing their understanding of the relationship between artist and medium, and reflecting on the significance of particular sections of the text. Students also examine how the authors operationalize concepts such as “alive art” in order to critique dominant Western notions of individual creative genius.

In the second stage, students analyze a text by Safiya Noble on algorithms and power by identifying the chapter’s central argument, locating where this argument appears most explicitly, and evaluating how Noble develops her claims through supporting arguments, examples, and critiques of search technologies and algorithmic systems.

Finally, students apply Noble’s critical framework to contemporary generative AI systems by prompting ChatGPT, Google AI Overview, or Consensus with a question related to their own research topic. Using Noble’s questions about information quality, intended audiences, exclusion, harm, and forgetting as analytical criteria, students critically evaluate AI-generated responses and compare them with their own research findings.



Blank Template

Time period:

Course:

Contributed by:

Summary:

What is the assignment, assessment, or pedagogical practice?

What prompted you to develop this and why?

What are the learning objectives/course goals?

What are the assessment criteria?

Further comments, reflections, thoughts, suggestions...

