University Senate Instruction, Curricula and Advising Committee and
the Student Affairs Committee

Report on Charge S-2304-2: Common Hour Exams

Charge: Review the experiences of students, faculty, and staff with common hour exams at Rutgers University. Make any appropriate recommendations.

I. Introduction and Background

SC-2304 was undertaken by two senate committees – SAC and ICA – whose members formed a subcommittee to review the experiences of students, faculty, and staff with common hour exams at Rutgers University, and to make any appropriate recommendations. This report is the culmination of much work by the subcommittee, including communicating with administrative officials, conducting a survey of individuals administering common hour exams, reviewing the Rutgers University Student Assembly (RUSA, 2023) report, and reviewing information gathered from departments within Rutgers that have decreased common hour exams, other Big Ten universities, Rutgers Office of Disability Services, Rutgers Department for Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, and a research literature review. The committee considered the purpose of exams, in general, as a means to measure student learning and a way to identify gaps in learning.

A. Common Hour Exams

The definition and use of "common hour" will vary depending on the institution utilizing it. Across most institutions, common hour simply means a designated period of time within the academic schedule of a college or university that is set aside for activities other than class meetings. Common hour exams, in the context of Rutgers University, are exams that are scheduled to take place during a scheduled common hour outside of regular class times. This charge is examining Common Hour Exams (CHEs) given as midterm exams or other checkpoints during the semester and does not refer to final exams which are given following a university schedule after classes are no longer in session.

In addition, SAS is possibly the only school at Rutgers New Brunswick with some departments continuing to give common hour exams. A recommendation may be made to seek further clarity of which, if any, other schools at Rutgers University give common hour exams.

B. The Rutgers Student Assembly (RUSA) Report

In March 2023, the student assembly released a comprehensive report of a survey of the Rutgers' undergraduate population regarding common hour exams. RUSA's findings revealed, among other things, that there was widespread discontent regarding the idea of having to take a common hour exam – whether that be on the weekends or late weeknight evenings. From the RUSA Report:

Rutgers University: Common Hour Exam Policies

Rutgers enforces 10 formal policies regarding Common Hour Exams, overseen by instructional deans:

1. *Duration: Exams limited to 80 minutes to reduce student fatigue.*
2. *Instructional Time: Students excused from an equivalent class period.*
3. *Priority Conflicts: Rutgers classes and athletic events take precedence.*
4. *Multiple Exam Conflicts: Students must be offered alternate exams if enrolled in overlapping common hour exams.*
5. *Advance Notice: Instructors must announce exam times and conflict policies at the start of the term.*
6. *Alternate Exams for Priority Conflicts: Must be offered within one week of the original exam.*
7. *Multiple Common Hour Conflicts: Students must be offered as many alternate exams as needed.*
8. *Alternate Exam Timing: Must not conflict with priority activities.*
9. *Grading Standards: Alternate exams must be graded equally to original exams.*
10. *Appeals Process: Students may appeal exam conflicts to the dean of instruction; decisions are binding.*

Recommendations Be it resolved that the Rutgers University Student Assembly recommends:

1. *An exam accommodation portal is created where a student can submit appeals and documentation to their respective dean of instruction if the student and department offering the common hour examination disagree on whether a scheduling conflict constitutes grounds for missing a common hour examination.*
2. *Professors proactively establish multiple common hour examination timings, allowing students to choose one at their convenience.*
3. *Expanding the definition of what constitutes "Rutgers activities" that allow for excusals from Common Hour Exams. These "activities" currently include athletic events that students participate in, as well as conflicting classes. This should be expanded to include other conflicting activities such as: jobs that a student may hold, family-related commitments, and other extracurricular responsibilities that the student serves a pertinent function in.*

4. *Bus service for students after common hour exams: Common hour exams can take place at any time, including late nights and weekends, which can make transportation a challenge for students. Therefore, it is recommended that Rutgers University provide a bus service that is available to students directly after their common hour exams. The bus service would run to all campus areas, making it easier for students to get home safely without having to wait for an extended period.*
5. *Police officers stationed at areas with late night or weekend exams: Safety can also be a concern for students taking common hour exams during late nights or weekends. Therefore, it is proposed that Rutgers University have police officers stationed at the areas where these exams take place. The officers would provide a visible presence, making students feel safer and deterring any potential threats or disturbances.*
6. *Require Rutgers departments to publish exam dates and times in advance- specifically at the time of pre-registration: having this information be available the semester before, allows students to prepare their schedule months in advance, rather than after the semester starts, thus allowing students to proactively plan their schedules and avoid any potential conflicts with other exams or commitments.*
7. *Look into a potential collaboration with Rutgers OIT and their Teaching Labs.1 There are currently four (4) different computer labs across all of Rutgers- New Brunswick's campuses, all of which have multiple classrooms. The hours that these rooms are available reflect the computer labs' hours, which are generally open from 8 AM- 12 AM from Mondays through Thursdays, as well as on Fridays through Sundays, with adjusted hours. These rooms can be requested via faculty to teach classes in, however, outside of this time, they remain empty. It would be a worthwhile endeavor to look into utilizing these spaces as ad-hoc "testing centers", where students may come in, at a time of their choosing, to then take their exam in a potentially proctored setting*

The RUSA Report also reviewed exam practices at other Big 10 Institutions (Appendix A).

Since the release of the RUSA report, the following changes have been implemented:

1. CHEs are no longer conducted on Sundays to better accommodate personal and religious obligations
2. CHEs end by 9:05 pm for safety considerations (See Appendix B for Fall 2025 schedule)
3. School of Engineering no longer gives CHEs but instead assigns project-based work
4. The Physics and Computer Science departments decreased the number of CHEs being given and instead are giving more frequent, lower stakes assignments
5. The CHE schedule is posted prior to registration for student planning purposes
6. The new CHE policy includes formal instructions for students to appeal if a conflict exists

II. Experiences of faculty & staff

A. Survey & results

The SAS Senior Associate Dean of Undergrad Education and the Vice Provost of Undergrad Education were asked via email who should be contacted from each department administering common hour exams. It was determined the Undergraduate Vice Chair/Program Director for each department would provide the most accurate data for our survey. An email (Appendix C) was sent to those individuals in the following departments: Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Mathematics, and Physics. They, in turn, provided the names of faculty members administering common hour exams.

On 12/12/24, an anonymous Qualtrics survey (Appendices D & F) was sent to 13 faculty members in Physics (3), Chemistry (3), Biology (4), Computer Science (2) members, and Math (1). They were asked to share the survey link with any staff, grad students, or TAs who are involved in administering, proctoring, and/or grading the common hour exams. Nineteen individuals completed the survey, 10 of which were faculty members.

On 3/5/25, a second set of questions (Appendices E & G) was emailed to faculty administering common hour exams asking for department-specific information regarding class size, mode of administration, and student-to-proctor ratio.

The survey on CHEs revealed a range of important themes that reflect the challenges and opportunities within Rutgers' current testing system, concerning operational issues related to the administration of the exam, and systematic issues related to the students and faculty involved in CHEs. Ten themes initially emerged as central to understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the CHE process, each highlighting areas for potential improvement in equity, efficiency, and educational value.

The first five themes developed are CORE OPERATIONAL ISSUES such as:

1. Integrity (cheating concerns),
2. Logistics (rooms, proctors, scale)
3. Scheduling (weekday vs weekend, conflicted timing)
4. Delivery (paper vs online, ODS)
5. Value (keep vs change or eliminate)

A second set of themes would be DEEPER SYSTEMATIC ISSUES such as:

6. Equity
7. Workload
8. Student stress
9. Technology
10. Policy support

Each theme is discussed in detail below.

CORE OPERATIONAL ISSUES

1. *Academic Integrity & Cheating Concerns.* Concerns about academic dishonesty remain pervasive. Faculty and staff voiced apprehensions that students may exploit loopholes in exam formats, particularly in online or asynchronous contexts. Respondents consistently underscored the importance of maintaining a fair, standardized exam format that minimizes opportunities for misconduct. As well, common hour exams are seen as critical for maintaining fairness and preventing dishonesty while others worry about online exams (synchronous and asynchronous) would still worsen cheating.

2. *Scheduling & Timing Challenges*. A recurring issue centers on when exams are scheduled. The removal of Sunday testing options has created scheduling conflicts, increased the number of make-up exams, and placed undue burdens on both students and faculty. Evening exams were also cited as problematic, given student fatigue and logistical strain. Conflicts arise with weekday evening exams as well, TA schedules, and removal of Sunday exams. Suggestions included alternative times or preventing class conflicts.

3. *Logistical Constraints (Space, Proctors, Scale).* Managing large-scale exams (hundreds of students) is a recurring difficulty finding big enough rooms, staffing proctors and coordinating across many sections were themes discussed. Securing adequate space, coordinating proctors, and scaling exams to large student populations pose significant challenges including overcrowding, insufficient proctor coverage, and limited suitable venues contribute to stress for both faculty and students.

4. *Delivery & Administration of CHEs*. The delivery of exams varies between paper-based, electronic, and hybrid systems, leading to inconsistent experiences across departments. Faculty expressed mixed views about the reliability of technology, particularly online proctoring platforms. The survey shows varied practices in grading, proctoring and Office of Disability Services (ODS) accommodations. Paper is still dominant but electronic is emerging.

5. *Divergent Opinions on the Value of CHEs.* While some respondents see CHEs as essential checkpoints of mastery, others question their pedagogical value. Opinions diverge particularly regarding fairness and whether high-stakes exams enhance or hinder learning. Some see CHEs as the only valid way to test students; others find them burdensome and outdated. Debate centers on whether to keep, modify or eliminate them.

DEEPER SYSTEMATIC ISSUES

6. *Equity and Accessibility.* Ensuring fair access for students with disabilities or scheduling conflicts is critical. ODS accommodations are managed with varying approaches, raising concerns about consistency and fairness across departments.

7. *Faculty and TA Workload.* CHEs create significant demands on faculty and TAs, from writing and grading to proctoring and coordination. Many respondents cited strain on instructional staff, particularly in courses with multiple sections and large enrollments. Heavy workload in writing, grading, proctoring and coordinating across

many sections; concerns about insufficient staff when multiple versions of exams are required.

8. *Student Experience and Stress.* Exam scheduling, room conditions, and the overall testing atmosphere itself affect student well-being. Weeknight exams were identified as especially burdensome, often compounding existing academic and personal pressures. Student fatigue from evening exams, difficulty managing scheduling conflicts and frustration with room conditions (e.g. overcrowding) was addressed.
9. *Technology and Online Systems.* Adopting online tools offers opportunities for efficiency but raises concerns about cheating, reliability, and accessibility. Faculty expressed skepticism about proctoring software and the feasibility of large-scale online exams. Tension between traditional paper-based exams and electronic delivery; skepticism about online proctoring tools; mixed comfort with Grade scope.
10. *Policy and Institutional Support*. Faculty emphasized the need for stronger institutional backing to address logistical and structural barriers. Issues such as inadequate facilities, lack of centralized coordination, and policy inconsistencies hinder the effective administration of CHEs.

TESTIMONIALS

In addition to the trends noted above, the committee found several specific comments from the faculty survey to be particularly insightful, highlighting the logistical issues, concerns about academic integrity, and the lack of a better alternative to CHEs:

“There are no adequate spaces to give exams. Lecture halls are not made for exams. Administering exams for many hundreds to thousands of students at once is a huge effort. This mainly falls on the shoulders of NTT faculty and TA’s, and the administration cares little for the difficulties they endure. We can build huge training center for athletes, but relatively inexpensive testing centers are out of reach. It shows the priorities of the university.”

“…no good locations to take exams…”

“…obvious culture of cheating…”

“[Online exams are] worthless [as cheating is] rampant”

“[Paper exams are] labor intensive…not environmentally friendly”

SUMMARY:

While there are a number of issues with the delivery and proctoring of CHEs, there are also valid faculty concerns around academic integrity and equity of multiple test versions. There is recognition that CHEs are far from ideal, but better suited than most, if not all, alternatives.

B. Additional Stakeholders

In addition to the faculty survey, committee members also contacted other departments and offices that may be involved in CHEs as a form of assessment and in their delivery to students with accommodations.

1. Rutgers-NB SAS Department of Teaching, Learning, and Assessment

David Goldman, Director of SAS Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, informed the committee that they are generally not requested to provide input regarding the efficacy of common hour exams.

2. Rutgers-NB Office of Disability Services (ODS)

Carlie Andrews, Senior Director of ODS, was asked whether it was difficult to accommodate students through for evening CHEs, and whether ODS provided support for students with accommodations during CHEs. She responded that evening CHEs provide a challenge, noting "It is difficult to staff evening and weekend hours… but we have made adjustments to schedules to try and support evening hours as needed. In terms of a solution, it would be wonderful if we had a university testing center that any faculty or student could use to make arrangements to be proctored for an exam."

III. Formative vs. Summative Assessments Research Literature Review

In considering potential recommendations for CHEs, the committee considered whether the reliance on large exams could be replaced with alternatives, such as project work (as adopted by the School of Engineering) or through more formative assessments. The committee did a cursory survey of research on formative assessments to develop recommendations.

1. Benton, A., & Hataway, D. (2024). The illogical leap to summative without formative: Incorporating low-risk assessments to serve high-risk students better. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, *53*(3), 302–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/0047231x.2024.2339126

   Summary: This study addresses the high failure rates in anatomy and physiology courses and argues that relying solely on summative assessments is insufficient, especially for at-risk students. The authors implemented formative assessments throughout a course to support learning before each of five summative exams.

   Key Findings:

   - Formative assessments helped identify struggling students early, allowing for timely interventions.
   - There was a positive correlation between formative assessment performance and summative exam scores.
   - The approach improved overall student success, especially among high-risk populations.

- The authors advocate for low-risk, frequent assessments to guide learning and reduce failure rates.

2. Mondal, H., Tiu, D., Juhi, A., & Mondal, S. (2024). Early identification of low scorers: The role of formative assessments and summative assessments. *Cureus*. https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.76118

   Summary: This study evaluated 125 first-year medical students to determine how well formative and summative assessments predict final exam performance in physiology.

   Key Findings:

   - Both formative and summative assessments were significantly correlated with final exam scores.
   - Regression analysis showed that formative assessments can be used to predict academic risk early in the semester.
   - The second and third summative assessments had the strongest predictive power.
   - The study supports using formative assessments as a diagnostic tool to guide support strategies for low-performing students.

3. Li, T., Yeung, M., Li, E., & Leung, B. (2021). How formative are assessments for learning activities towards summative assessment? *International Journal of Teaching and Education*, *9*(2), 42–57. https://doi.org/10.52950/te.2021.9.2.004

   Summary: This paper investigates the relationship between various formative learning activities and summative exam performance in an introductory statistics course.

   Key Findings: Individual assignments had a strong positive correlation with final exam scores.

   - Group projects, surprisingly, showed a negative correlation with exam performance.
   - The study suggests that not all formative activities equally support summative outcomes.
   - Educators should rethink group work design to ensure fair assessment of individual contributions.

IV. Conclusions

While CHEs play a vital role in ensuring accountability and rigor; their current administration presents significant challenges. Addressing academic integrity concerns, providing equitable access, and strengthening institutional support are critical to improving the system. The information in this report relates to CHEs being conducted within Rutgers SAS and may serve as a pilot study for all of Rutgers University. By

adopting the recommendations in this report, Rutgers has the potential to modernize its testing services, reduce stress for students and faculty, and uphold the academic standards essential to the university's mission.

Recommendations

These recommendations pertain to the administration of Common Hour Exams (CHEs) being conducted by SAS New Brunswick departments that may affect students enrolled in different schools within Rutgers. Based on extensive review of current exam practices and the intended purpose of exams, the Rutgers University Senate recommends:

1. **We recommend that the Rutgers New Brunswick School of Arts and Sciences administration take the following actions, and that Rutgers University evaluate these recommendations for implementation across all schools giving CHEs.**
    a. Strengthen academic integrity through improved proctoring (in-person and online), multiple exam versions, and expanded faculty training.
    b. Invest in long-term infrastructure, including a dedicated testing center (as previously recommended by ICA) and secure electronic exam platforms, supported by clear online testing guidelines, and faculty and TA training.
    c. Standardize and streamline ODS accommodation procedures, improving communication among faculty, students, and support offices.
    d. Prioritize student-friendly scheduling, adequate room spacing, and regular feedback collection to refine logistics.
    e. Develop an exam accommodation portal.
    f. Consider creating a central office of assessment logistics to oversee scheduling, proctoring, accommodations, and future facility planning.
    g. Determine other schools at Rutgers giving CHEs and applying these recommendations.
2. **We Further Recommend that Rutgers New Brunswick School of Arts and Sciences Departments:**
    a. Review the effectiveness of current assessment systems (e.g., CHE) and explore alternative models such as formative assessments, cumulative quizzes, and project-based evaluations which offer opportunities for identifying gaps in knowledge
        i. Assess successes and challenges of Physics and Comp Sci departments in decreasing the use CHEs
    b. Standardize exam scheduling with designated institutional blocks with fair timing across sections, and centralized coordination of spaces and proctors.

Appendices

A. The RUSA Report also researched common exam hours and procedures at other Big Ten institutions and the findings are listed here:

University	Exam Timing & Structure	Scheduling & Conflicts	Accessibility & Accommodations	Final Exam Policies
Penn State University	Common Hours: Tue & Thu, 12:05–1:20 PM; weekend exams possible	Instructor discretion; student feedback opposes expansion	eTesting centers support secure exams and disability accommodations	Final exams worth >10% must be scheduled during official exam period; overloads (≥3 exams/day) may be rescheduled; personalized schedules via LionPATH
University of Illinois	Synchronous: during class time; Asynchronous: 24-hour window	Conflicts allowed for religion, other exams, and disabilities	Accommodations via DRES	Final exams scheduled based on the first class meeting; must occur during the designated exam week; asynchronous exams are arranged by the instructor
University of Iowa	Evening midterms: 6:30 PM start, 1.5–2 hours	Scheduled via MAUI; priority for large core courses	Makeup exams must match standards; disability support provided	Final exams scheduled via UniTime; durations can be 60, 80, or 120 minutes; conflicts (≥3 exams/day) qualify for makeup
University of Minnesota	Midterms usually during class	Exceptions need dean approval and must be listed	Conflicts accommodated if exams are outside regular hours	Final exams held during a six-day period; must follow published schedule; conflicts (≥3/day) may be adjusted; asynchronous/take-home exams allowed

University of Wisconsin–Madison	Evening exams: 5:45–7:15 PM or 7:30 PM+	Applies to daytime classes; must be in syllabus/class notes	Evening classes take precedence; final exams follow separate rules	Final exams held during an eight-day summary period; no exams allowed in last two weeks of class; take-home exams due during scheduled block
Purdue University	Evening exams: 6:30–7:30 PM, 8:00–9:00 PM, or 8:30–9:30 PM	For multidivision/space-limited courses; scheduled by departments	Alternate exams required for conflicts; evening classes take precedence	Final exams scheduled during 16th week; two-hour blocks; goal is to minimize conflicts and back-to-back exams
UCLA (Future Big Ten Member)	Midterms usually during class	Exceptions for large multi-section courses; must be published	Faculty expected to make "good-faith effort" to reschedule for conflicts	Final exams max 3 hours; must follow published schedule; alternate dates allowed for religious observances; instructors retain exams for one quarter

B. Rutgers-NB SAS Fall 2025 Common Hour Exam Schedule

All times listed below are in-person exams (except where noted):

Course	Exam Date	Day of the Week	Exam Start Time	Exam End Time
01:119:115	10/14/25	Tuesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
General Biology I	11/11/25	Tuesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
01:119:116	10/14/25	Tuesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
General Biology II	11/11/25	Tuesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
01:160:159	10/16/25	Thursday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
Gen Chem for Engineers	11/18/25	Tuesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
01:160:161	9/30/25	Tuesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
General Chemistry	10/29/25	Wednesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
	12/3/25	Wednesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM

All times listed below are in-person exams (except where noted):

Course	Exam Date	Day of the Week	Exam Start Time	Exam End Time
01:160:307	10/7/25	Tuesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
Organic Chemistry	11/6/25	Thursday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
	12/4/25	Thursday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
01:198:111	9/29/25	Monday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
Intro to Computer Sci	11/5/25	Wednesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
01:198:112	9/30/25	Tuesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
Data Structures	11/6/25	Thursday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
01:198:170	10/8/25	Wednesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
Computer Apps Business	11/12/25	Wednesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
01:640:135	9/15/25	Monday *(online: 80min*	7:30 PM	9:30 PM
Calculus I Life & Soc Sci	9/29/25	*within 2hr window)*	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
	10/23/25	Monday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
	11/13/25	Thursday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
		Thursday		
01:750:202	10/9/25	Thursday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
Extended Gen Physics	11/13/25	Thursday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
01:750:203	10/8/25	Wednesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
General Physics	11/5/25	Wednesday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
01:750:204	10/9/25	Thursday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM
General Physics	11/13/25	Thursday	7:45 PM	9:05 PM

C. Email to Faculty Administering CHEs – Sent 12/12/24

Hello - We were given your name by your undergraduate program director/vice chair at the direction of Sharo Bzostek, SAS Associate Dean of Undergrad Education, and Carolyn Moehling, Vice Provost for Undergrad Education. We'd love to hear about your experiences with common hour exams. This is a short survey on behalf of the University Senate Charge S2304, to review the experiences of those who administer common hour exams (CHE) during the semester. This survey is collecting information exclusively on midterm exams administered outside regular class meeting times, not exams administered during finals. Your insights will help us understand how these exams impact the Rutgers learning community.

Please share this survey with others (TAs, grad students, etc.) who assist you in administering, proctoring, and/or grading these exams. If possible, please complete the survey by 12/20/24. This survey is completely anonymous. Thank you for taking the time to share your thoughts.

Kind regards, Senator Lisa Rossman Murphy, Senator Carla Caponegro

D. Survey Questions

We'd love to hear about your experiences with common hour exams! This is a short survey on behalf of the University Senate Charge S2304, to review the experiences of those who administer common hour exams (CHE) during the semester and provide appropriate recommendations. This survey is collecting information exclusively on midterm exams administered outside regular class meeting times, not exams administered during finals. Your insights will help us understand how these exams impact the Rutgers learning community. This survey is completely anonymous. Thank you for taking the time to share your thoughts.

1. What is your current role at Rutgers?
    1. Faculty
    2. Staff
    3. Graduate Student
2. What role do you have in the creation and administration of CHE during the semester? Check all that apply.
    a) Proctoring the exam
    b) Grading the exam
    c) Writing the exam
    d) Course coordination and/or curriculum design
    e) Scheduling the exam
    f) Other (please explain)
3. How many CHEs do you typically hold each semester per course?
4. How many sections of your course are typically taught?
5. How many different instructors teach your course?
6. How many students take the CHE at one site?
7. How many proctors are there at each site?
8. To the best of your knowledge, what percentage of students are typically exempted from taking each CHE?
    a) Less than 5%
    b) More than 5% but less than 10%
    c) More than 10%
9. How are CHEs delivered in your course/program? Select all answers that apply.
    a) On paper
    b) Electronically
10. How are CHEs proctored in your course/program? Select all answers that apply.
    a) Faculty
    b) TAs
    c) Both
    d) Other
11. Explain How are CHEs graded in your course/program
    a) Multiple Choice
    b) Machine Graded
    c) Collective Grading

    d) Individual Grading
    e) Other
12. How are ODS accommodations managed for CHEs in your course/program?
13. What concerns, if any, do you have about current practices related to CHEs in your program and/or in general?
14. If you could change any current practices, which of the following options would you consider as a replacement for the current CHE practice?
    a) Move CHEs to class time
    b) Move in-person CHEs to a synchronous online option, utilizing proctoring software through Canvas.
    c) Move in-person CHEs to an asynchronous online option, utilizing proctoring software through Canvas, as is the practice for several required placement exams.
    d) Other (please explain)
    e) No changes are needed
15. What concerns if any would you have for the following suggestions as a replacement for the CHE:
    a) None at all
    b) A little
    c) A moderate amount
    d) A lot
    e) A great deal
    - Eliminating the practice of CHE
    - Offering exams in person during class?
    - Offering exams online during class, utilizing proctoring software through Canvas
    - Offering multiple versions of an exam
    - Offering CHEs synchronously online, utilizing proctoring software through Canvas - for all students
    - Offering CHEs synchronously online, utilizing proctoring software through Canvas, for students with exemptions
    - Offering CHEs asynchronously online, utilizing proctoring software through Canvas - for all students
    - Offering CHEs asynchronously online, utilizing proctoring software through Canvas - for students with exemptions
16. What other concerns, if any, do you have regarding changes to CHE policies & procedures?

E. **Follow-up questions** to obtain department-specific data

Emailed 3/5/25 to faculty administering CHEs

1. How many sections of the course are taught? How many students per section?
2. How many students are given the exam in one room?
3. What is the student/proctor ratio during the CHEs?
4. Are exams given on paper or online or hybrid?

F. Quantitative Analysis of Survey Data

Table 1. Responders by role

Role	***n***	**Qualitative Notes**
Faculty	10	Responses came primarily from faculty, indicating the data reflects instructor-led perspectives.
Graduate Students	3	Some TAs involved in grading/proctoring provided feedback.
Staff	1	Limited representation from admin/staff roles.

Table 2: What Roles Do They Play in CHE:

Role	***n***	**Qualitative Summary**
Proctoring	13	Nearly all respondents help with proctoring, often mentioning how labor-intensive this is.
Writing the Exam	10	Indicates deep faculty involvement in assessment design.
Course Coordination	9	Shows many have structural/administrative responsibilities.
Grading	6	Less frequent, but some mentioned concerns about workload and consistency.
Scheduling	5	A minority handle logistics. Some frustration noted over scheduling conflicts.
Other	3	Includes comments about broader admin involvement or sharing duties with ODS.

Table 3. How Many CHEs Per Semester:

Typical Number of CHEs	**Notes:**
2–3	Most faculty offer 2–3 CHEs per semester.
Shift from 2 → 1 → 0	One respondent detailed a reduction due to logistical burdens, highlighting a broader shift away from CHEs.
Qualitative Insight:	Some instructors are scaling back on CHEs entirely, citing time constraints, scheduling conflicts, and a changing student environment.

Table 4. Course Size & Structure:

Metric	Range / Summary	Qualitative Themes
Sections per course	From 3 to 75	Large variation. Some courses are very high enrollment, requiring extensive logistics.
Instructors per course	1 to 12+ (with TAs)	Many courses are team-taught with faculty and large TA teams. Described as complex and hard to coordinate.

Table 5. CHE Setup & Scale:

Element	Rangle/Summary	Qualitative Notes
Proctors per site	2 to 5	Depends on room size. One response detailed flexibility based on capacity, but others expressed concern about being understaffed.
Students per site	100–300 typically; up to 800	Larger courses face serious crowding. One comment noted the need for 2+ seats per student to reduce cheating and improve comfort.

Table 6. CHE Exemptions:

% Exempted	Count	Notes
<5%	7	Very few students are exempted — CHEs are still widely used.
5–10%	2	Slightly higher in some cases.
>10%	0	No course exempts a large number of students.

Table 7. CHE Format & Grading:

Topic	Data	Qualitative Notes
Delivery	100% Paper	Some expressed frustration with the lack of digital tools, though none are currently used.
Grading	6 use MC/Machine; 2 individual; 1 mixed	One response explained a hybrid system using Gradescope, showing innovation despite structural limits.
Proctoring	Mostly TA + Faculty	Some proctors are staff or hired help; collaborative but uneven across departments.

Table 8. ODS Accommodations:

Handling Method	Notes
ODS-administered exams	Most common — ODS handles scheduling and proctoring.
Shared model (course + ODS)	Some departments support proctors or upload exams themselves.
Instructor-delivered packets	A few instructors remain deeply involved, suggesting a lack of centralized support.
Qualitative Insight	While ODS helps, variation in process causes stress, especially in large classes with many students needing accommodations.

Table 9. Concerns About Current Practices:

Theme	Frequency	Examples & Quotes
Cheating	Frequent	“Obvious culture of cheating”; “Unproctored = worthless”
Scheduling Conflict	High	Loss of Sunday testing = “more makeup requests,” “students notify late”
Lack of Space	Several	“No good locations”; rooms too small; poor seating arrangements
Pedagogical impact	Noted	CHEs act as a checkpoint forcing engagement early. Without them, students disengage.
No concerns	5+	Multiple responses were marked “N/A” or “none.”

Table 10. Suggested Replacements or Changes:

Idea Proposed	Support	Qualitative Reactions
Move CHEs to class time	0	Seen as impractical and unfair for multi-section courses.
Synchronous/asynch-ronous online exams	0	Universally rejected due to integrity concerns.
Build testing centers	1	Suggested as long-term infrastructure solution.

Bring back Sunday exams	2	Strong support. Sundays described as ideal for logistics and fairness.
Keep current system	4	Viewed as the most legitimate and manageable option.

Table 11. Concerns with Proposed Changes:

Change Type	A Lot / Great Deal of Concern	Themes
Eliminate CHEs	7	Considered essential for standardization and rigor.
Online exams (sync or async)	8	High fear of rampant cheating and lack of value.
In-person exams during class time	6	Timing unfairness and scheduling issues for multi-sections.
Multiple exam versions	4	Acceptable in theory, but increased faculty workload a concern.

Table 12. Additional Comments / Final Reflections:

Theme	**Notes**
Online = Cheating	Strong language used: “worthless,” “staggering prevalence,” “software doesn’t help”
Importance of mid-semester CHE	One faculty emphasized how CHEs push students to confront their preparedness, unlike low-stakes assessments
Frustration with current policy	Complaints about removal of Sunday exams, limited space, and tight timelines
Survey feedback	Suggestion to improve survey layout (e.g., use essay box for long responses)

Quantitative Data Takeaways/Additional Insights:

- Faculty want to keep CHEs because they offer standardization and rigor.
- Online exams are widely opposed, especially asynchronous, due to academic integrity concerns. However, answers were not “post-Covid” specific and faculty may have been answering based on synchronous/online exam experiences during Covid
- Removal of Sunday exams is a major issue for logistics and fairness, according to faculty.

- Instructors are managing growing burdens — proctoring, grading, accommodations — with limited support.
- Structural solutions like testing centers or better scheduling are preferred over changing the CHE format.

Pros and Cons comparison of using paper vs. technology (digital tools) for CHEs:

Paper-Based Exams:

Pros: Perceived Integrity: Viewed as more secure and resistant to cheating.

Cons: Labor-Intensive: Requires significant time and manpower for printing and grading.

Standardization:

Pros: Easier to ensure consistent conditions across large-scale courses.

Cons: No Flexibility: Hard to accommodate last-minute changes or different exam versions.

Faculty Familiarity:

Pros: Long-established system with known workflows.

Cons: Manual Grading: Increases faculty/TA workload, especially for open-ended questions.

No Tech Dependence:

Pros: Avoids tech glitches, login issues, or student device disparities.

Cons: Requires large spaces, proctors, physical distribution, etc. High paper usage, especially in large-enrollment courses.

Universally Accessible:

Pros: No need for tech accommodations or student device access.

Cons: Not Scalable for Hybrid/Online: Difficult to adapt for remote or hybrid models.

Technology-Based Exams (e.g., online tools, Gradescope, LMS):

Efficiency in Grading:

Pros: Tools like Gradescope streamline multiple-choice or rubric-based grading.

Cons: Integrity Concerns

Flexibility:

Pros: Easy to adjust, modify, or version exams quickly.

Cons: Faculty Distrust: Strong cultural resistance among instructors to digital testing.

Accommodations Simplified:

Pros: Tech can help schedule and provide alternate formats for ODS students.

Cons: Not Used: 100% of current exams are still paper-based, reflecting lack of adoption.

Environmentally Friendly:

Pros: No paper waste.

Cons: Technology Barriers: Not all students have reliable access to tech or stable internet.

Potential for Innovation:

Pros: Hybrid systems (like scan/upload via Gradescope) show promise.

Cons: No Current Infrastructure: Lack of testing centers or support for secure tech-based exams.

Instant Feedback (if desired):

Pros: Can allow for faster turnaround or feedback loops.

Cons: Requires Training/Support: Many instructors may not have the tools or time to learn new systems.

Summary: Key Themes from Survey Data

Paper Exams	**Technology-Based Exams**
• Seen as legitimate, fair, and essential • Require high labor and space • Remain the current norm (100% usage) • Faculty want structural fixes (e.g., more space, better proctoring)	• Viewed as risky, untrustworthy, and impractical • Offer efficiency but lack faculty confidence • Limited adoption, though hybrid models show interest • Faculty do not want to replace paper with digital formats

G. 3/25 Follow-Up Questions Regarding Department-Specific Data

Computer Science Department:

- all paper exam
- 250 students per room (it depends on the rooms we get, there are 1100 students this semester)
- Student/proctor ratio is 50/1

Chemistry Department:

- There are typically between 100 and 250 students in each room. Each room will have a head proctor (CCB faculty) and one additional proctor (mostly graduate student teaching assistants) per 50 students. Thus, a room with 100 students has a total of 3 proctors. The room with 250 students will have 6 proctors.
- We prepare 4 versions for each exam. The same four versions will be given in each room. We also prepare an additional 4 additional versions for the make-up exams.

- The exams are on paper. We don't allow any electronic devices during the exams.
- In Organic Chemistry 2 (160:308), we offer 4 lectures with a total of 19 recitation sections. The breakdown is as follows:
    - Lecture 1: 3 sections with on average 25 students/section, 76 enrolled students
    - Lecture 2: 7 sections with on average 51 students/section, 355 enrolled students
    - Lecture 4: 4 sections with on average 38 students/section, 153 enrolled students
    - Lecture 2: 5 sections with on average 49 students/section, 244 enrolled students

Math Department:

- Each instructor gets one room for all of their students. Some instructors teach 1 lecture of 135 (so about 90 students) while other instructors teach 2 or 3 lectures (so about 180 or 270 students). Sometimes Scheduling will give only a few rooms to schedule the exams, and so we have to combine instructors. The student/proctor ratio is about 75, although that can vary.
- Each of our exams has four versions.
- The exams are taken on paper.

Physics Department:

- Typically 100-250 students per room, usually with 2-3 instructors per room depending on occupancy. Rooms with 200+ usually get 3 proctors, but rooms with 100-200 get 2 proctors, and I don't usually have rooms smaller than 100, but in cases where I do have a small room (maybe 50 students), I can get away with one proctor.
- We always do 2 versions with scrambled response options for nearest-neighbor exams, but otherwise identical in wording.
- all on paper – our exams are given as pencil-and-paper exams, but they are multiple choice and they need to fill out an Akindi bubble sheet (Canvas extension) to submit before they leave the exam room.
- we have somewhere between 35-42 sections in the course (this year was significantly larger than last year, hence a wide range), and we usually cap it at 24 students per section. Lowest enrollment in recent memory was mid 700s, but lately is in the low 900s, high 800s.