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## Background

- The pandemic disruption required professors to
reassess their assessment strategies [1].
- Concerns included: student stress [2] and exam administration logistics (e.g., access issues, academic integrity issues).
- A shift away from the primary mode of assessment being exams would enable assessment of higher-order learning [3].
Research Question
How do instructors modify course grade weights attributed to exams and quizzes before, during, and after disruption?


## Methods

Settings and Participants: Engineering faculty at R1 university in Midwest U.S.
Data Collection: 120 syllabi collected from Fall 2019 -
Spring 2023 semesters: 28 distinct courses, Course levels ranging from 100-400
Data Analysis: (1) Frequency of courses with particular exam or exam plus quiz grade weight.; (2) Percentage of instructors repeating across semesters.

Syllabi and instructors included in study

| Syllabi and instructors included in study |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Semester | Syllabus count | \# of instructors |
| Spring 2019 | 10 | 9 |
| Fall 2019 | 14 | 13 |
| Spring 2020 <br> (original) | 11 | 10 |
| Spring 2020 <br> (COVID) | 10 | 9 |
| Fall 2020 | 13 | 12 |
| Spring 2021 | 12 | 12 |
| Fall 2021 | 13 | 9 |
| Spring 2022 | 12 | 10 |
| Fall 2022 | 12 | 10 |
| Spring 2023 | 13 | 11 |

## Results

Average exam and quiz assessment \% | Spring


A: After the disruption, testing grade weight rapidly dropped.
B: After classes shift into online settings, average exam $\%$ is
at an all-time low. As exam\% kept falling, quiz\% began to rise proportionally
C: Percentage of courses where grade weight attributed to
exams and quizzes was greater than other grading components.
D: Gradually average quiz\% began to drop.

Instructors teaching the same course and present
$100 \%$


Courses with exam \% + quiz\% change from previous offering $\mid$ Spring

| Grade Weight <br> Shift | Sp 20 | Sp R <br> $\mathbf{2 0}$ | Sp 21 | Sp 22 | Sp 23 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decreased | 3 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 4 |
| Increased | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Same | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Unknown | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |



Average exam and quiz assessment \% | Fall
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A: After the disruption, some instructors decreased their grade weight attributed to exams and quizzes, causing these to be equal to other components.
B: Shortly after, instructors gradually increased their exam\%.
C: As instructors began to decrease their exam $\%$, an increase in quiz\% followed.

Courses with exam \% + quiz\% change from previous offering $\mid$ Fall

| Grade Weight | F 20 | F 21 | F 22 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shift | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Decreased | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| Increased | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Same | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Unknown |  |  |  |

## Limitations

- Missing syllabi and missing details in some syllabi
- Some changes in grade weight distribution occur due to a change in an instructor teaching a course


## Conclusions

- The pandemic served as an external motivator for instructors to re-assess their syllabi. Instructors shifted their grade weight distribution to other assessments.
- Some instructors never made adjustments.
- Shortly after the pandemic, some instructors gradually returned to their previous grading methods.
- Instructors can shift their grade weight distribution away from exams to other assessment types, but this requires incentive/motivator. Internal incentives should be put in place by their dean/department to encourage instructors to sustain changes.
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