

Co-designing Open Access Assessment within a Virtual Transnational Multidisciplinary Collaboration

Abstract

This paper analyses an instructor's process of auto-ethnographic data collection as they make their way on a reflective journey within an open pedagogy faculty fellowship. As part of this professional development process, the instructor was matched with a colleague in a different discipline on a campus overseas. The faculty pair worked virtually in a multidisciplinary dialogue to create an open assessment, aligned with a specific United Nations Sustainable Development Goal, that might function in both courses, using the same directives and grading rubric. The inductive coding of this data and subsequent thematic analysis revealed four main themes: design as lack of comfort, digital professional collaborative, tapping into participatory motivation with learners, and assessing for community. The paper includes a reflection on implications for the field and suggests that assessment design may need to be reframed as a disruptive and unfamiliar process, rather than a repetition of internalized habits, if it is to remain authentic, effective, and transformative.

Keywords

Assessment, OER, UNSDGs, interdisciplinarity, diversity, student agency

Introduction and Context

In the current landscape where the emergence of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is placing pressure on higher education instructors to reflect on what constitutes authentic and effective assessment and to transform their practice (Corbin et al., 2025), there is growing interest in adopting evaluation tasks that lead students to produce sustainable artifacts, rather than 'throw away' assignments (Stancil, 2025). It is in this context that this paper situates itself: I took part in an international fellowship initiative that allowed me to work collaboratively across disciplines with a colleague in another country, to create an open access assessment that aligned with a United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (UNSDG). This paper offers an auto-ethnographic analysis of the impact of this collaboration on my practice and assessment processes.

A Landscape of Urgent Reform in Assessment

Assessment practices in higher education are under increasing pressure for reform. GenAI has rapidly disrupted this landscape, but concerns were steadily increasing before this as to what the future of assessment might look like (Spanache, 2025). There has been ongoing concern, over the past decades, in relation to a number of phenomena that plague higher education assessment practices, despite the richness of scholarship on effective evaluation, such as: lack of alignment (Ait-Hroch et al., 2025; Gashoot et al., 2026), absence of clear explicit outcomes to evaluate (Cedefop, 2026; Fawns et al, 2026), focus on memorization and regurgitation of information (French et al., 2024; Gultom, 2026; Oliveira, 2025), rigidity and lack of opportunities for personalization (Quinlan et al., 2025), accessibility issues (Nieminen et al., 2024; Esparza et al., 2026), and lack of experiential pertinence beyond the classroom space (Salinas-Navarro & Palma-Mendoza, 2026; Vlachopoulos & Makri, 2024). The COVID crisis further accelerated this malaise (Sosa-Díaz et al., 2025). The fellowship in which I took part in 2025 addresses

this urgent quest for alternate approaches to assessment and evaluation - innovative practices that are sustainable, open access, and interdisciplinary.

UN SDG Open Pedagogy Faculty Fellowship

The initiative in question is the UNSDG Open Pedagogy Faculty Fellowship. It is offered across several campus in North America (UNSDG OPFF, 2025). It was launched in 2018 and now involves 13 institutions. The fellowship seeks to create pairs of collaborative faculty members who work in a transnational and interdisciplinary manner, to create an assessment that is open access, aligns with at least one United Nations Sustainable Development Goal (UNSDG), and functions equally effectively within both course settings (Douglas College Library, 2026). This collaboration takes place virtually over one summer before the assignment is rolled out.

Deliverable and Outcome of the Project

The aim of this article is not to expand on the end product itself and the characteristics of the co-designed assignment, but to provide a minimum of context for the discussion on the process. A rapid overview follows. The collaborative instructor pair dialogue led to the development of a three-part scaled assignment. The core learning outcomes that were identified as common denominators between both courses were as follows:

- Develop an awareness of diversity in community.
- Develop tools to address diversity in community within the processes that are common in the learners' professional context.
- Reflect on interdisciplinary key skills to address diversity in the community that any professional might require.
- Contribute to educational practice by developing actionable recommendations for community in how best address diversity in community as a professional, irrespective of discipline.

The deliverables were:

- The production of a Photovoice project reflecting experiences with diversity in the community (individual).
- Reflection on the class Photovoice projects leading to the identification and extraction of key issues related to the process of addressing inclusion in community, with a parallel review of pertinent scholarly resources (team).
- Production of an OER supporting the development by professionals of any discipline of key skills to address diversity in the community they engage with (individual).

Positionality

I have been an instructor for 10 years. My research focus is inclusion. I teach a range of graduate courses within an MEd program. My interest in the fellowship came out of a personal reflection that sought to transform my assessment practices. I use Universal Design for Learning and Critical Pedagogy to design assessment tasks that are accessible, inclusive and connect with the lived experiences of learners. This was an opportunity to extend this reflection beyond my zone of comfort and to focus on further transformative parameters for assessment redesign.

Overview of the literature

A rapid overview of key themes present in the literature is necessary as part of the overview of the initiative.

Open Access Assessment

Open Educational Resources (OERs) have emerged as a steadily promising avenue for the development of accessible, equitable, and engaging teaching and learning practices over the last 30 years (Lapum et al., 2022; Moon & Park, 2021; Werth & Williams, 2022). More recently they have further gained in popularity in higher education in a context of rapid technological development, reduced costs, and increased thirst for sustainable and globally accessible resources (Ahmadfard, 2026; Orzech et al., 2025). Thus far, the interest has mostly focused on OERs as teaching resources, with growing appetite for the notion of Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) approaches to course delivery (BC Campus, 2025). The initiative described here, however, goes beyond this initial understanding of OERs and focuses on the creation of OERs as a format of assessment. Within this vision of assessment, the task gains pertinence and usefulness because it is available to the public and addresses a need in community (Hu et al., 2025). This is, however, not the only facet of teaching and learning that the Fellowship tackles; it also seeks to ground this redesign work within a multidisciplinary mindset.

Multidisciplinarity in Design

Multidisciplinarity is gaining in momentum within the academy and highlights the notion that teaching and academic research are too siloed and artificially partitioned (Li et al., 2025; Wang, 2024); it argues that more complex insights into phenomena can be gained when scholars leave the boundaries of their specialty and merge their lenses and tools (Arnold et al., 2021; Mishra, 2024). It often, however, remains an objective, rather than an achieved practice, as such endeavours encounter significant challenges (Allen, 2025). While multidisciplinary collaboration is gaining traction in research project and funding applications, it remains rare and daunting in the field of teaching collaboration (Jyoti, 2026; Singh, 2023) – which is what was attempted in this initiative – or the area of co-teaching (Ripley et al., 2026; Rooks et al., 2022). The work in this initiative was authentically multidisciplinary in the sense that the faculty members were matched by the fellowship itself, had no prior acquaintance, lived in different county, and taught in entirely different sectors (Undergraduate and graduate programs) and disciplines (Education and Marketing). While it can be daunting to create assessment tasks that work across disciplines, the common denominator which served as an engine in this initiative was the broader alignment of the assignment outcomes with the UN Sustainable Development Goals (UNSDGs).

UNSDGs as a Lens on Assessment

UNSDGs are increasingly considered in the creation of course content, within the post-secondary sector, in relation to both the development of global citizenship (Shabalala, 2025) and the development of awareness of sustainable development (Gharzeddine & Davies, 2025). The Fellowship initiative, however, examines more specifically the possible alignment of assessment practices themselves with the UNSDGs, and this is innovating (Antón-Solanas et al., 2025). The Fellowship allows participants to align their assessment co-design within any one of the UNSDGs. In this instance, UNSDG4 - *Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all* - was the overarching goal

selected (UNDESA, 2026). UNSDG4, in this instance, was selected because of the focus on inclusion and equity; very quickly indeed, in initial brainstorming sessions, it became apparent that dealing with diversity in the community and developing inclusive tools in this approach to community was a key skill both courses sought to develop – one in terms of teaching and educator training, the other in terms of data collection for marketing purposes. All students therefore would eventually professionally play a role in supporting others gain skills in dealing with community in inclusive and equitable ways. There is a growing body of scholarship emerging in relation to each of the UNSDG and there was therefore some modelling and inspiration available as to the sort of teaching and learning transformation each UNSDG might trigger (Dube, 2026; Gharzeddine & Davies, 2025), this body of research helped ground the reflection on assessment in practical examples and existing models (Chugh & Keoy Alan, 2025). Once the overarching goal of the collaboration was identified, there remained the task of communicating and co-creating effectively online to create the body of the assignment and the grading rubric.

Online Instructor Collaboration

Online faculty collaboration in relation to teaching and learning gives rise to specific challenges (Bowles, 2022; Pujolà, 2022). It mostly appears in the literature in relation to co-creation for online teaching (Kim & Pratt), or to the co-design of online courses (Papageorgiou et al., 2026). In this case, however, the central issue was slightly different as the online dialogue related to the distinct face-to-face practice of both instructors, rather than to a common focus on an online course, and this gives rise to different hurdles (Billingsley and Peiser, 2025; Syaripudin, 2026). This was not a digital dialogue focused on the creation of a common online course or component, but the virtual conversation of two faculty members, each developing a face-to-face course in a distinct discipline and seeking to find a common denominator in the assessment design. While there was a joint commitment to the Fellowship, and a desire to make the collaboration work, there was also a sense of remoteness and a lack of shared reality – in light of the geographical disparity (Ghamrawi, 2022), the distinct socio-historical context (Rienties et al., 2023), and the disciplinary divide (Gutierrez Gonzalez et al., 2024).

Theoretical Stance

Three theoretical lenses converged to support this reflection and paradigms related to sustainability, critical pedagogy, and inclusive design all came into action to shape an understanding of context.

Sustainable Development

Sustainability is central to this project and offers an effective theoretical paradigm for the reflection contained in this paper (Purvis et al., 2019). Sustainability has been developed as a paradigm, beyond operations management or energy, and is now frequently used to consider social justice, accessibility, equity, and governance in society generally and higher education more specifically (Törnblom et al., 2025). Sustainability as a paradigm is not easy to define within the context of social justice and equity and many argue that it is a set of goals and values, rather than a reductionist gauge (De Fine Lichta & Follandb, 2019). Interestingly, the notion of sustainable teaching practices and assessment practices are also emerging (Olugbenga Daramola, 2024). Sustainable Development was not, however, the only

theoretical lens used in this study, and social sustainability almost inherently connects to a broader conceptualization of social justice in education, one offered by critical pedagogy.

Critical Pedagogy

The initiative described here was transformative for me in the sense that it made me step out of my zone of comfort in relation to most dimensions of assessment design, but it more importantly created an opportunity for authentic dialogical engagement with learners, in ways I had not to date achieved in other courses. This initiative aligned itself with many of the characteristics of critical pedagogy as students themselves were encouraged to challenge all of their assumptions about assessment, in a process that became emancipatory and enabled them to connect the course to their lived experience (Aman et al., 2025). Critical pedagogy as a paradigm seeks to challenge existing power dynamics in the classroom and to question hegemonic processes and discourses, while empowering learners to disrupt existing practices which might be oppressive and marginalizing (Clark, 2018; Shih, 2026). Assessment in higher education is an area where these inequitable power dynamics are immediately tangible and rarely challenged (Alordiah & Arisi, 2025; Serrano et al., 2028). Critical pedagogy therefore offers a highly pertinent theoretical framework within which to analyse the process of the Fellowship. Beyond this, the social model of disability also needs to be considered, as it guides the rest of my practice as an inclusion specialist and therefore at the start frames much of my assessment design.

Inclusive Design

The paradigm within which I conceive and develop most of my work is that of inclusive design, and therefore more broadly the Social Model of Disability (Carmel et al., 2025). The Social Model positions disability as a social construct, and more specifically as the result of the friction which exists between individual embodiments and the way spaces, experiences, products, and services are designed (Barnes & Mercer, 2004). The Social Model informs many of my decisions with respect to assessment; it serves as a theoretical grounding for Universal Design for Learning, a framework which shapes my practice as well as my ongoing willingness to redesign and constantly finetune accessibility features in my teaching (Fovet, 2014). The social model of disability also came into play in the design collaborative described in this chapter, as it formed a large part of the contributions I offered to our collective brainstorming on the collaborative assessment design.

Methodological Process

Auto-ethnography in Educational Research

The methodological process described here is one of auto-ethnography (du Toit, 2025). Auto-ethnography as a methodology focuses on the analysis of the researcher's own experiences with a phenomenon; the investigator hence becomes both subject and researcher (Tian et al., 2025). Auto-ethnography is frequently used in the field of contemporary educational research, both in the K-12 and post-secondary sectors (Elbra-Ramsay, 2026; Yoshida et al., 2026). I analyse here the reflection I completed throughout the process of designing collaboratively online; this has been relatively seamless as the Fellowship required extensive journalling and the archiving of all collaborative working documents (summaries of online meetings and brainstorming sessions, briefs sent back on a monthly basis to the

Fellowship facilitators, archives in shared online documents of the design process and its scaffolded stages, email communication, and final report to the Fellowship, as well as the text of the final assignment itself and of the grading rubric). I also included in the analysis extracts of my teaching journal, which is composed regularly for the purpose of performance review. The analysis of a reflective and recorded Fellowship journey on teaching and learning is well suited to auto-ethnographic analysis.

Thematic Analysis

The thematic analysis built on the inductive coding (Mathis et al., 2024) of the journals and documented and archived reflection (Naeem et al., 2023). Conceptual assertions were extracted from the various coding categories and are listed below.

Assertions and Findings

Design as Lack of Comfort

This study disrupts accepted formulations and conceptualizations of assessment design as a reflective process that is centred on the instructor – their knowledge, know-how, and pedagogical beliefs. Instead, this became a process of discomfort, a journey of stepping out of habits, known parameters, and disciplinary conventions. The study suggests that deconstructing mechanisms of design that have been internalized and accepted can be transformative and empowering. This is all the more powerful that it situates itself within the practice of a UDL practitioner who is used to following re-iterative processes of redesign; the notion of disrupting patterns and challenging assessment format was therefore not new, but the transdisciplinary collaboration went much further than that. The UDL redesign process for me has become second nature, comfortable, and intuitive. The transdisciplinary online co-creation was disruptive, counter-intuitive, onerous, and lengthy. Yet, the analysis of the archived design journey clearly suggests that each painful impasse was followed by the emergence of brainstorming collaborative decisions, creating a pattern of fairly unsettling stop-and-start. While professional development for faculty tends to conceptualize and frame assessment design as a process which is easy, plannable, repeatable, and user-friendly, the authentically innovative ideas in this collaboration came about amidst frustration, deadlocks, and impasses.

Digital Professional Collaborative

While collaborative design is discussed in the literature, when it takes place in the field, it is usually within one specific institution - and more often than not in the same department-, frequently within communities of practice or research teams (Penuel et al., 2007). Similarly, when co-creation is analyzed in detail in studies, it usually centres on an instructor-instructional design relationship (Gottler, 2023). This project diverges from this pattern as it examines an online, transnational, and multidisciplinary dialogue of assessment co-creation. The notion that the most fruitful online design collaborations might be those that are the most alien and the most remote is an interesting paradox emerging from the analysis. As faculty, employees, and social beings, it is natural that one might seek out relationships of comfort and collaborations that are proximal and easy to manage. The project instead showed the pertinence of collaborative relationships that are productive because they are unusual, uncomfortable, and disruptive. It became essential that this dialogue be online because it allowed the match that was

the most unlikely, one impossible to establish in a congenial and habitual face to face manner. The online nature of the collaboration was here key to the creation of a pairing which was incongruous, not intuitive.

Tapping into Participatory Motivation with Learners

The project was transformative in reshaping the student-instructor relationship. It disrupted my own certainties about the assessment process in the course in questions and, as a result, laid the ground for an exceptional degree of engagement from learners – much of this emerging from my analysis of my teaching journal for the semester during which the assessment was implemented. The students became interested in the Fellowship, responded enthusiastically to the notion of creating OERs, and became empowered by the dialogical process. The co-design journey, in its transparency, created authenticity and vulnerability in the student-instructor relationship and entirely transformed the power dynamics and the nature of the dialogue. The disruption, vulnerability, and self-questioning described above - far from weakening the instructor status, my leadership, or ability to model skills or engage students in tasks – served as a cathartic element to cement collaboration and heightened student agency. This created a genuineness in dialogue and an increased learner involvement that reminded me of the enthusiasm and fresh curiosity often described in literature on the use of curriculum co-creation in higher education (Bao et al., 202Vardakosta et al., 2023). This project was not co-creation, but it created conditions for a collective, transparent, and transformative excitement about experimentation with assessment which was in itself impactful in radically disrupting student expectations.

Assessing for Community

Adopting OERs as assignment format has fundamentally changed the function, flavour, and structure of the assessment process. Tasks have become focused on community and usefulness to the public, and this has had an amplifying impact on the learning outcomes themselves; completion of outcomes is no longer defined simply in relation to the hermetic parameters of the course but has gained inherent purpose and meaning. The grading rubric which emerged from the collaboration has radically gained in pertinence, as it situates the demonstration of skills in a broader community context. That reflection is sustainable in nature as it has modelled for me a process which has now widened to the redesign of rubrics in other courses I regularly teach. In this sense, the collaboration has therefore had a significant impact on me as instructor and has radically revitalized my approach to evaluation. The focus on the production of OERs for community has also increased learners' investments in the process, as described previously, and given the outcomes relevance in context. The project has also achieved a degree of sustainability in relation to needs of the community itself, not just because the assignment is available in open format to the public but also because it has made the learners more aware of their community, its needs, and its proximity. My class is made up almost entirely of international graduate students and therefore this was a very important gain: students looked outwards to the landscape they now live in and found greater meaning in the contribution they could make to this environment.

Implications and Outcomes

In an age where technology is often giving instructors tunnel vision in the realm of learner evaluation – and makes them overly focused on the disruptive impact of generative artificial intelligence (Cooper et al., 2026; Kic-Drgas et al., 2026) – and where neoliberal values promote almost mechanical approaches to assessment as quantitative benchmarking (Zhang, 2024), it has been transformative for me to engage in a process that has been disruptive, uncomfortable, painful even, but also dialogical, creative, and sustainable. This raw, transparent, and authentic battle with the process of collaborative assignment creation outside of my design habits and conventional parameters for inclusive assessment has created a vulnerability in my approach to assessment in this course which has laid the grounds for a sort of *happening* – and in this sense the challenge was perhaps key as a trigger for renegotiation of all assumptions.

That experience operated a refreshing shift in the confidence with which I normally approach and lead inclusive tweaks to my assessment practices. It wiped the slate clean and placed me back in the position of learner, rather than expert. This moment of self-questioning and authenticity has also laid the ground for a beneficial shift in the instructor-student relationship. Learners, indeed, were not mere passengers in this journey; the shared vulnerability led them to also engage in a questioning of their own on their relationship to the process of assessment and its goals. It triggered a rapid interest in the concept of the OER and the notion of being a producer of content for community, rather than a consumer.

There are clearly limitations to the process of redesign which has been described here, and concerns remain in relation to the sustainability of this reflection across an instructors' teaching portfolio. The challenge mapped out in this project was cathartic. There are, however, questions as to the space and scope such a rethink can take within one's career and professional lived experience. Instructors are subject to a considerable amount of pressures in terms of workload, competing demands, responsibilities as employees, etc. (Diedericks et al., 2019; McClure, 2026). Stepping out of one's zone of comfort can quickly become unmanageable on the broader scale of the sheer volume of assessment management one is generally responsible for.

References

- Ahmadfard, M. (2026) Advancing open learning through interactive open educational resources. *Discover Education*, 5, 211. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-026-01236-z>
- Ait-Hroch, A., El Gazi, S., & Ibrahimi, A, (2025) The constructive alignment of objectives, tasks, and assessment in hybrid language training. *World Journal of Advanced Engineering Technology and Sciences*, 15(03), 2606-2627. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjaets.2025.15.3.1182>
- Allen, L. (2025). Tangled in tensions: a practice architectures study of embodied approaches in transdisciplinary higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2025.2518222>

- Alordiah, C.O., & Arisi, R. (2025). Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Assessment Integrating Social Studies Education: The Proposed Socio-Critical Assessment Integration Framework (SCAIF). *Journal of Research Initiatives*, 8(5), Article 7. <https://digitalcommons.uncfsu.edu/jri/vol8/iss5/7>
- Aman, F., Iqbal, H., & Haider, N. (2025). Exploring the Impact of Critical Pedagogy on Students' Engagement and Empowerment in Higher Education: A Transformative Approach to Teaching and Learning. *Policy Journal of Social Science Review*, 3(4), 627–644. <https://policyjssr.com/index.php/PJSSR/article/view/219>
- Antón-Solanas, I., Urcola-Pardo, F., Subirón-Valera, A. B., Ziveri, D., Wikström-Grotell, C., Aresu, A., van Wijchen, J., Jalovic, D., Törnblom, C., Nyberg, A., Rodríguez-Roca, B., & Alme, M. N. (2025). Sustainable Development Goals as a Framework for Teaching and Learning about Health Equity in European Health and Social Care Study Programmes: A Modified Delphi Approach. *Journal of medical systems*, 49(1), 187. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-025-02328-3>
- Arnold, A., Cafer, A., Green, J., Haines, S., Mann, G., & Rosenthal, M. (2021) Perspective: Promoting and fostering multidisciplinary research in universities. *Research Policy*, 50(9). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2021.104334>
- Bao, D.Q., Phong, N.D., & Tho, N.D. (2023) Co-creation in higher education and quality of college life: The roles of students' co-creation effort, interactions, and mindfulness. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 21(3). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijme.2023.100862>
- Barnes, C., & Mercer, G. (2004) Theorising and Researching Disability from a Social Model Perspective. In C. Barnes and G. Mercer (Eds.) *Implementing the Social Model of Disability: Theory and Research*. The Disability Press, pp. 1-17. <https://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/40/library/Barnes-implementing-the-social-model-chapter-1.pdf>
- BC Campus (2025) *Zero Textbook Cost (ZTC) Programs*. BCcampus Project Archives. <https://bccampus.ca/projects/archives/zcd-cred-z-degrees/>
- Billingsley, K.L., & Peiser, G. (2025, May 1) Digital Spaces for Professional Development: Benefits and Challenges of Online Communities in Further Education. *ALTC Blog*. <https://altc.alt.ac.uk/blog/2025/05/digital-spaces-for-professional-development-benefits-and-challenges-of-online-communities-in-further-education/#gref>
- Bowles, M., Al-Muhtadi, O., & Kaviani, A. (2026) The role of online communities of practice in developing blended teaching knowledge and practice during a digital transformation in higher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2025.105354>
- Carmel, J. M., Chapman, S., & Wright, P. (2025). Disability Justice: The Challenges of Inclusion in Everyday Life. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1034912X.2025.2456288>
- Cedefop. (2026). *The influence of learning outcomes*. Cedefop research paper. Publications Office of the European Union. <http://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2801/3195164>

- Chugh, M., & Keoy Alan, K.H. (2025). Open Access in Education: Unlocking Quality Learning for All to Achieve SDG 4. In: T. Choudhury, A. Awasthi, and J.S. UM (Eds) *Open Access as a Knowledge Platform for Implementing the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals*. World Sustainability Series. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-99605-4_6
- Cooper, G., Ilich, K., & Sturrock, K. (2026). Using generative artificial intelligence to reimagine feedback in higher education: a collaborative autoethnography. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2026.2653889>
- Corbin, T., Bearman, M., Boud, D., & Dawson, P. (2025). The wicked problem of AI and assessment. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2025.2553340>
- De Fine Lichta, K., & Follandb, A. (2019) Defining “Social Sustainability”: Towards a Sustainable Solution to the Conceptual Confusion. *Etikk i praksis. Nordic Journal of Applied Ethics*, 13(2), 21-39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5324/eip.v13i2.2913>
- Diedericks, J.C, Cilliers, F., & Bezuidenhout, A. (2019). Resistance to change, work engagement and psychological capital of academics in an open distance learning work environment. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management/SA Tydskrif vir Menslikehulpbronbestuur*, 17, a1142. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajhrm.v17i0.1142>
- Douglas College Library (2026) Open Educational Resources (OER): UN SDG Open Pedagogy Faculty Fellowship. *Research Guides*. <https://guides.douglascollege.ca/OER/UNSDGFellowship>
- Dube, K. (2026) Higher education quality curriculum development under the sustainable development goals banner. *Discover Education*, 5, 311. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s44217-026-01313-3>
- du Toit, E. (2025). Teaching, research, and everything in between: An autoethnographic account of academic identity. *Review of Education*, 13, e70108. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rev3.70108>
- Elbra-Ramsay, C. (2026). Back to the chalkface: an autoethnographic reawakening through the lens of self-determination. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2026.2675547>
- Esparza, W., Lorenzo, A.E., Camaño-Carballo, L., Vinueza-Fernández, I., García-Pérez, D., Romero-Riaño, P., & Esparza-Agudelo, A. (2026) Inclusive higher education for students with special educational needs: review of advances, challenges, and future directions. *Frontiers in Education*, 11, 1628793. doi: 10.3389/educ.2026.1628793
- Fawns, T., Boud, D., & Dawson, P. (2026). Identifying what our students have learned: a framework for practical assessment validation. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2026.2620053>
- Fovet, F. (2014) Social model as catalyst for innovation in design and pedagogical change. In *Widening Participation through Curriculum Open University 2014 Conference Proceedings*, Milton Keynes, UK, April 30 May 1 (pp. 135-139). <https://islandscholar.ca/islandora/object/ir%3A21093135-139>

- French, S., Dickerson, A. & Mulder, R.A. (2024) A review of the benefits and drawbacks of high-stakes final examinations in higher education. *Higher Education*, 88, 893–918. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-023-01148-z>
- Gashoot, M. , Mohamed, T. , Eves, B. & Reynolds, T. (2026) Constructive Alignment and Assessment Validity in Design and Engineering Higher Education: An Expert-Informed Small-Scale Study. *Art and Design Review*, 14, 119-135. doi: 10.4236/adr.2026.142007
- Ghamrawi N. (2022). Teachers' virtual communities of practice: A strong response in times of crisis or just another Fad? *Education and Information Technologies*, 27(5), 5889–5915. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10857-w>
- Gharzeddine, D., & Davies, D. (2025). The rise of Sustainable Development Goals in higher education institutions. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2025.2528053>
- Gutierrez Gonzalez, M. A., Mandeville, C., Edwards, F., & Rice, P. (2024). Innovating Interdisciplinarity in Higher Education: Exploring the Impact of a Grassroots Community of Practice. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry*, 12, article number 11. doi: 10.20343/teachlearningqu.12.11
- Gottler, A. (2023) Collaboration between instructional designers and subject matter experts in digital transformation projects. *Studies in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 3(2). <https://stel.pubpub.org/pub/03-02-gottler-2023/release/1>
- Gultom, M. (2026). Challenges in Implementing Authentic Assessment in English Language Courses at Higher Education Institutions. *Jurnal Ragam Pengabdian*, 3(1), 309-317. <https://doi.org/10.62710/4a11rp83>
- Hu, A., Liu, Q., & Daniel, B. (2025). Digital Technologies in Authentic Assessment in Higher Education: A Systematic Literature Review and Narrative Synthesis. *Sage Open*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251357198>
- Jyoti, S. (2026). Multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches in higher education. *International Journal of Emerging Voices in Education*, 2(2), 23–32. <https://doi.org/10.59828/ijeve.v2i2.32>
- Kic-Drgas, J., Rahmani, A., & Kılıçkaya, F. (2026). Generative AI and Classroom Assessment: Insights into Higher Education Practices from Algeria, Poland, and Türkiye. *Sage Open*, 16(2). <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/21582440261454817>
- Lapum, J., Bailey, A., St-Amand, O., Garmaise-Yee, J., Hughes, M., & Mistry, S. (2022). Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion in Open Educational Resources: An Interpretive Description of Students’ Perspectives. *Nurse Education Today*, 116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2022.105459>
- Li, X., Ni, Q., Zhou, J., Pang, S., Zhu, Y., & Song, W. (2025). Application of multidisciplinary collaborative education in general clinical training based on the CIPP model: a comparative study. *Critical Public Health*, 35(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/09581596.2025.2579364>

- Mathis, W.S., Zhao, S., Pratt, N., Weleff, J., & De Paoli, S. (2024) Inductive thematic analysis of healthcare qualitative interviews using open-source large language models: How does it compare to traditional methods? *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine*, 255. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cmpb.2024.108356> .
- McClure, K.R. (2026, April 6) Higher Ed Has a Workload Problem. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/higher-ed-has-a-workload-problem>
- Mishra, A.S. (2024) Editorial: Embracing the future: the role of multidisciplinary research. *IIM Ranchi Journal of Management Studies*, 3(1), 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IRJMS-01-2024-185>
- Moon, J., & Park, Y. (2021). A Scoping Review on Open Educational Resources to Support Interactions of Learners with Disabilities. *International Review of Research in Open and Distributed Learning*, 22(2): 315–41. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v22i1.5110>
- Naeem, M., Ozuem, W., Howell, K., & Ranfagni, S. (2023). A Step-by-Step Process of Thematic Analysis to Develop a Conceptual Model in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231205789>
- Nieminen, J.H., Moriña, A., & Biagiotti, G. (2024) Assessment as a matter of inclusion: A meta-ethnographic review of the assessment experiences of students with disabilities in higher education. *Educational Research Review*, 42, 100582. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2023.100582>.
- Oliveira, D. M. (2025). Assessment of Memorization vs. Conceptual Understanding in Biochemistry: The impact of the order of topics presentation in the classroom. *Revista De Ensino De Bioquímica*, 23(2), 122. <https://doi.org/10.16923/reb.v23i2.1140>
- Olugbenga Daramola, O. (2024) Attitude and practices of higher education academics on education for sustainable development. *Developing Academic Practice*, 1-15. DOI:10.3828/dap.2024.1
- Orzech, M. J., Zhang, J., Orzel, V., Sultana, S., Thompsell, A., Wood, J., & Yu, N. (2025). All about OER – Why, What, How, and So What: A Collective Case Study. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems*, 53(3), 242-259. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00472395241309876>
- Papageorgiou, V., Meyer, E., & Ntonia, I. (2026). Harnessing the power of collaboration: how design for online learning can empower educator practices and professional development. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 34(2), 471–494. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2025.2520443>
- Penuel, W., Roschelle, J., & Schechtman, N. (2007) Designing Formative Assessment Software with Teachers: An analysis of the co-design process. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, 2(1), 51-74. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S1793206807000300>
- Pujolà, J.T. (2022, December 14) Collaborative teaching across borders: Breaking down barriers with Virtual Exchange. *Expert Voices*. European University Association. <https://www.eua.eu/our-work/expert-voices/collaborative-teaching-across-borders-breaking-down-barriers-with-virtual-exchange.html>

- Purvis, B., Mao, Y. & Robinson, D. (2019) Three pillars of sustainability: in search of conceptual origins. *Sustainability Science*, 14, 681–695 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-018-0627-5>
- Quinlan, K. M., Sellei, G., & Fiorucci, W. (2025). Educationally authentic assessment: reframing authentic assessment in relation to students' meaningful engagement. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 30(3), 717–734. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2024.2394042>
- Rienties, B., Divjak, B., Eichhorn, M., Iniesto, F., Saunders-Smiths, G., Svetec, B., Tillmann, A., & Zizak, M. (2023). Online professional development across institutions and borders. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 20, 30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-023-00399-1>
- Ripley, D., Markauskaite, L., & Goodyear, P. (2026). Variation in approaches to interdisciplinary teaching and learning: a phenomenographic investigation. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 31(4), 744–761. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2025.2589315>
- Rooks, R.N., Scandlyn, J., Pelowich, K., & Lor, S. (2022). Co-teaching Two Interdisciplinary Courses in Higher Education. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning*, 16(2), Article 8. <https://doi.org/10.20429/ijstl.2022.160208>
- Salinas-Navarro, D. E., & Palma-Mendoza, J. A. (2026). An Experiential Learning and Authentic Assessment Framework for Challenge-Based Learning. *Education Sciences*, 16(4), 652. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci16040652>
- Serrano, M. M., O'Brien, M., Roberts, K., & Whyte, D. (2018). Critical Pedagogy and assessment in higher education: The ideal of 'authenticity' in learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 19(1), 9-21. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1469787417723244>
- Shabalala, N. P. (2025). Global citizenship education as a strategy for social, justice and identity: achieving balance for meaningful social impact. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2025.2537371>
- Shih Y-H (2026) The transformation of higher education in the context of globalization: implications from Paulo Freire's critical pedagogy. *Frontiers in Education*. doi: 10.3389/feduc.2025.1714343
- Singh, A. (2023) Challenges of a multidisciplinary approach in higher education. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Studies*, 5(9), 30-32. DOI: 10.33545/27068919.2023.v5.i9a.1049
- Stancil, S. (2025) So, Do Reusable Assignments Really Benefit Students? A Qualitative Case Study Investigating Working Graduate Student Perceptions of the Usefulness of Reusable Assignments. *Journal of Open Educational Resources in Higher Education*, 3(1). <https://www.iastatedigitalpress.com/joerhe/article/17911/galley/16404/view/>
- Sosa-Díaz, M.-J., Garrido-Arroyo, M. d. C., & González Delgado, M. Y. (2025). Transformation of Educational Models in Higher Education During and After “Emergency Remote Teaching”. *Education Sciences*, 15(9), 1249. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci15091249>

Spanache, I. (2025) *Best practices in research assessment reform across Europe*. The Executive Agency for Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation Funding [UEFISCDI], UEFISCDI team/ SECURE project. <https://share.google/D2A64IQfNSbfS4ZKJ>

Syaripudin, U. (2026). Online collegial conversation as professional development: challenges and possibilities in an Indonesian context. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2026.2617661>

Tian, X., Zhang, Z., & Xu, L. (2025). Autoethnography as a Research Method in Cross-Cultural Education Studies. *Cross-Cultural Education Studies*, 1(2), 76–90. <https://doi.org/10.63385/cces.v1i2.380>

Törnblom, K. Y., Popa, R.-G., & Krütli, P. (2025). Are social justice and sustainability interdependent? If so, how and under what conditions? *Sustainable Development*, 33(1), 1269–1283. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.3177>

UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs [UNDESA] (2026). *UNSDG4: Ensure inclusive and equitable quality education and promote lifelong learning opportunities for all*. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals/goal4>

UNSDG Open Pedagogy Faculty Fellowship [UNSDG OPFF] (2025) *About Us*. <https://unsdgopff.opened.ca/>

Vardakosta, E., Priniotakis, G., Papoutsidakis, M., Sigala, M., Tsikritsis, A., & Nikolopoulos, D. (2023). Design thinking as a co-creation methodology in higher education. A perspective on the development of teamwork and skill cultivation. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 12(2), 1029-1044. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.12.2.1029>

Vlachopoulos, D., & Makri, A. (2024) A systematic literature review on authentic assessment in higher education: Best practices for the development of 21st century skills, and policy considerations. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2024.101425>

Wang, C.C. (2024) Using design thinking for interdisciplinary curriculum design and teaching: a case study in higher education. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communication*, 11, 307. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-02813-z>

Werth, E., & Williams, K. (2022). The Why of Open Pedagogy: A Value-First Conceptualization for Enhancing Instructor Praxis. *Smart Learning Environments*, 9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40561-022-00191-0>

Yoshida, R., Kurata, N. & Yamada, K. (2026). Realities of imagined communities: collective autoethnography of identities and emotions of Japanese female international academics in Australian universities. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 53, 38 (2026) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-026-00966-1>

Zhang, X. (2024). How Does Neoliberalism Influence the Growing Trend of Higher Education? *International Journal of Educational Reform*. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/10567879241255316>