

























**Example from a micro-study** 

Excerpt 1 -first year MSc-students:

Student 1: "depending on the purpose. For example if it's a step-up transformers, if you step up the voltage, you step up the current. But loading means like you are changing the loads that you control. Like for example our houses —you're applying more circuits, or more tv:s.. or stuff like that."

Lecturer comment about the passage: "If the voltage is stepped up, the current is reduced. In this way, the transformer keeps the power more or less the same on both sides. It could

The difficulty of distingushing the problem. Language and content go together!

Where does that leave us?

18

17

#### Not a review of the literature



You might still agree with authors like Dimova & Kling (2022), Hultgren et al. (2022) and Bannister (2024), that EMI and assessment is not sufficiently investigated.

Two years apart, the studies have different foci; yet they largely converge:

EMI-assessment has been focused on summative assessment

What and who to assess, when and how?

The need for functional baseline testing. Has anyone really kept an eye on the learning outcomes?

Collaboration and staff development!

#### Another recurring issue ...



Specific and high-resolution case studies of teachers and assessment in EMI-settings tend to share in their emphasis on a few recurring issues of far-reaching consequences:

There seem to be / There is a risk that there are double standards of assessment Language assessment that is not supported in criteria or syllabi

[And the other way around too btw]

Implicit expectations in EMI

Teachers not-scaffolded to address language; hence it loses weight

[A problem if there is a learning outcome for it only?]

Otto, A. and J., L. Estrada-Chinchón. (2021). Analysing EMI Assessment in Higher education. Revista Tempos e Espaços em ducação, 14(33), e15475. http://dx.doi.org/10.20952/revtee.v14(33).15475

## My concerns...

19

21



Hultgren et al., as well as Gronchi, do mention that we ... are / seem to be / risk measuring ELF-students against L1 or maybe quasi-ERPP standards.

I find this practice problematic in my own context and with the faculty I train; so, I hope we can open that up for conversation!

Connected to that concern is what appears to be a wide-spread problem (partly mentioned by both Hultgren et al., and Gronchi [and others], that EMI assessment is insufficiently related to learning outcomes in terms of language as disciplinary discourse. Is it EMI-assessment or ICLHE-assessment basically?

Collaboration is called for (but 'we' often can't afford that in today's anemic universities)

Funnily enough, that brings us to EMEassessment facing generative Al.



22

20

#### Again, an eclectic selection ...



- 1. The problem of relying on summative assessment with GAI
- 2. The problem of university standards without consideration for multilingual students
- 3. GAI-reliance perpetuates deficiency approaches



- ✓ Re-focus on negotiation and dialogue
- √ The need for greater emphasis on process
  √(formative assessment in ILO-relevant activities)
- ✓ Engage with and critique GAI-products

#### Two potentially 'recognisable' cases



Two accounts for approaches in 2024:

We can design assessment in numerous ways to make GAI-tools insufficient the task

We can engage with GAI in (some?) of our assessment activities and make sure students remain responsible for the content and monitor the process.

Both focus on Al-resistant assessment. Both are functional. Both will need continuous revision. We likely need the combination.

Neither seem to mention the training for the assessment. What learning activities are we using that prepare students (Cf. Ou et al., 2024)

Khialf, Z. (2024). Rethinking Educational Assessment in the Age of Artificial Intelligence: Insights From Recent Training Workshops. In Fostering Inclusive Education With AI and Emerging Technologies. IGI Global. https://doi.org/ 10.4018979-8-3693-7255-5.ch005 Nadeem, M., Farag, W., A., and Helal, M. (2024). Rethinking Assessment Methodologies in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Expanding Beyond ChatGPTs Scope. MSCC 2024. I.EEE.

Ou, A. W., Khuder, B., Franzetti, S., and Negretti, R. (2024). Conceptualising and cultivating Critical GAI Literacy in doctoral academic writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 66, 101166

23

24

# 

#### My concerns...



- 'Al-resistant' assessment as counter-productive in some contexts?
- Many articles and arguments about GAI fail to really exemplify critical AI awareness or competence.
- The (benign) paradox that GAI-tools generate more work with assessment.
- $\bullet \ \mbox{My limited reading experience of GAI-assessment publications by \mbox{STEM-faculty}.}$
- The study of EMI syllabi and language learning outcomes and those of ICLHE syllabi.
- $\bullet$  The absence of updated syllabi for ILOs that include GAI literacy
- The absence of the debate about sustainability, ethics, and democracy [but perhaps not today's focus]

2025-06-02

26

25



### Let's talk instead!

I planted a few questions along the way, but yours are more important...

#### My plants!



- 1. How far are we willing to extend the distinction between ICLHE- and EMI-assessment?
- 2. The problem of assessing ELF-students against L1-standards basically?
- 3. 'Al-resistant' assessment as counter-productive in some contexts?
- Many articles and arguments about GAI fail to really exemplify critical AI awareness or competence
- The (benign) paradox that GAI-tools generate more work with assessment.
- 6. My limited reading experience of GAI-assessment publications by STEM-faculty.
- The study of EMI syllabi and language learning outcomes and those of ICLHE syllabi.

  The study of EMI syllabi and language learning outcomes and those of ICLHE syllabi.
- 8. The absence of updated syllabi for ILOs that include GAI literacy
- The absence of the debate about sustainability, ethics, and democracy [but perhaps not today's focus]

2025-06-02

27 28

