

The Show Must Go On - Examination During a Pandemic

Pamela Fleischmann
Department of Computer Science,
Kiel University
Kiel, Germany
fpa@informatik.uni-kiel.de

Mitja Kulczynski
Department of Computer Science,
Kiel University
Kiel, Germany
mku@informatik.uni-kiel.de

Dirk Nowotka
Department of Computer Science,
Kiel University
Kiel, Germany
dn@informatik.uni-kiel.de

ABSTRACT

When unexpected incidents occur, new innovative and flexible solutions are required. If this event is something such radical and dramatic like the COVID-19 pandemic, these solutions must aim to guarantee as much normality as possible while protecting lives. After a moment of shock our university decided that the students have to be able to pursue their studies for guaranteeing a degree in the expected time since most of them faced immediate financial problems due to the loss of their student jobs. This implied, for us as teachers, that we had to reorganise not only the teaching methods from nearly one day to the next, but we also had to come up with an adjusted way of examinations which had to take place in person with pen and paper under strict hygiene rules. On the other hand the correction should avoid personal contacts. We developed a framework which allowed us to correct the digitalised exams safely at home while providing the high standards given by the general data protection regulation of our country. Moreover, the time spent in the offices could be reduced to a minimum thanks to automatically generated exam sheets, automatically re-digitalised and sorted worked-on exams.

ACM Reference Format:

Pamela Fleischmann, Mitja Kulczynski, and Dirk Nowotka. 2018. The Show Must Go On - Examination During a Pandemic. In *Woodstock '18: ACM Symposium on Neural Gaze Detection*, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 6 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1122445.1122456>

1 INTRODUCTION

At the mid of March, Kiel University decided that the summer semester, starting on April 1st, has to be held as normal as possible, not in person but via online teaching until the pandemic situation becomes clearer. Since online teaching was despite some platforms for uploading code, announcements, and distributing exercise sheets as well as marking the solutions, not established for teaching in the Department of Computer Science. Solutions were needed and implemented within two weeks. Since we are responsible for teaching *Theoretical Foundations of Computer Science (TFoCS)* in the bachelor's programme at the Department of Computer Science of Kiel University during summer semesters, we were faced with the

situation to teach one of the hardest courses in the bachelor's programme in a completely new way for approximately 250 students. From March to May, reliable information from Kiel University were understandably only provided for the following week and thus long-term planning was impossible, especially for the examination phase in summer as well for the postponed second examination phase (normally at the end of March) from the previous winter semester. This absence of planning dependability clouded the complete semester for us as teachers as well as for the students whose uncertainty of the situation had to be covered in the tutorials next to their struggling with the content. In May it became clear that the rest of the semester will take place online but that the examinations have to be in person as long as the pandemic situation changes for the better. Thus, we knew that we are provided with a lecture hall in which the students are able to write an exam with at least 2 m distance between one another. Additionally, we got hygiene rules which had to be followed before, during, and after the examination which we had to care of. On one hand, we were relieved that the exam would take place nearly normally, but on the other hand it was clear that the correction of the paper-written exams could not take place as usual. Normally, one team member corrects one exercise of all exams and thus we meet with all team members in one room and pass the exams to the next corrector once an exercise of one exam is corrected. The conception that each of us corrects in their own office (notice that most of us have not been in their offices for months) and we regularly exchange stacks of exams with 2 m distance, did not convince us. This procedure would also have included that we wear rubber gloves for the whole time or we vent the exams for two hours between passing. Thus, the idea of digitalising the exams emerged: scanning the hand-written exams, correcting them from home, and uploading the corrected versions for the students to review. Consequently, a system was required such that the digital versions of the exercises can be mapped uniquely to the students while still being related to a single exams. Such a system allows us to organise the exams exercise-wise for correction and rearranging them student-wise for the review process by the students. Notice that by the digitalisation of the personalised exams, we had to fulfil the *general data protection regulation* (GDPR) [11]. The need of an own system arose after searching the literature. Preliminary experiments with similar approaches to digital postprocessing of exams (cf. [3]) turned out to be not as reliable in our setting. Second, the proposed schedule of other approaches is not build for an exam-like setting. Therefore, as a consequence and in the need to deal with our and most likely other university's situations (paper-written exam in person while meeting the Covid19 regulation), we came up with an own, highly adaptable framework. To keep up our schedule we developed an extensible framework allowing us to automatically cope with this

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Woodstock '18, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/18/06...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/1122445.1122456>

processes online to avoid contact in person as much as possible. To this extend we share not only the framework but also the insights on how we came up with the ideas. Secondly, we developed a \LaTeX class providing an easy to use tool box for creating exams and exercise sheets.

The paper is structured as follows: In Section 2, we shortly describe how teaching is normally performed (without a pandemic, home office, and online teaching), and then we elaborate how we managed to teach the lecture (TFoCS) and the associated tutorials in this very special semester. Afterwards, in Section 3 we explain in detail how the examinations were conducted including the examination itself as well as the correcting part and the ensuing return including the discussion with single students afterwards. In Section 4 we wrap things up and give a short introduction in how to configure the tool. In the last session we summarise our experiences and compare it to other approaches conducted in comparable courses at Kiel University.

2 TEACHING

Normally, the course TFoCS consists of a lecture and associated tutorials which each take place every week. Each week the students get a sheet of exercises which they can hand-in after one week for corrections. The format of the lecture is classically teacher-centred, where the lecturer presents the contents on a white- or blackboard for twice one-and-a-half-hour per week. For the tutorials, we have two forms: supervised learning time (SLT) and a teacher-centred tutorial (TCT). The SLT is offered twice a week for each four hours. During this time the students and a teacher meet in a room and the students work on the homework or the content of the lectures on their own but have a professional person available for asking questions. The TCT takes place once a week for one-and-a-half hour and in a dialogue, exercises similar to the homework (or the solutions of already corrected homework) are discussed. Both the lecture and the tutorial take place in person and are not recorded. Moreover, most of the students hand in their homework handwritten on paper, and the corrections are as well on the paper and handed back in the following tutorial. Only for announcements regarding the lecture or the tutorial, for uploading the exercise sheets as well as the lecture notes, and for managing the obtained points for the homework, the OPENOLAT-platform [6], hosted by Kiel University, is used. Attempts from our side to establish more online learning, e.g. a forum in OPENOLAT for discussions, were not used by the students in the past years. This form of teaching was managed by one professor (for the lecture), three PhD-students for the tutorials, and three student assistants, hired for 50 hours per week, for the corrections.

Adjusting to Online Teaching. Within in the two weeks of preparing the online semester and the discussion how we can guarantee that the students are able to get in touch with us and with each other, the data centre of Kiel University established and provided BigBlueButton [9] as a video conference platform and the Department of Computer Science ordered iPads by Apple™. Thus, we decided that large parts of the teaching and especially the interaction with the students, take place in BigBlueButton rooms. Nevertheless, we agreed that a lecture with 250 students via BigBlueButton would not be the same as in a lecture hall and thus, we opted to produce

short videos (ten to 15 minutes) explaining the week's content, to upload them on the OPENOLAT-platform, and to offer the tutorials to discuss the content. Therefore, the tutorial time was restructured as well: fourth a week we offered tutorials for one-and-a-half hour via BigBlueButton where exercises covering the week's content were presented and worked on interactively with the students. For getting smaller groups of students, at two time slot two parallel groups were offered. Moreover, for being responsive for the very different needs of the students (cf. [5]), one time slot was dedicated for beginners, one for advanced students, one for the students aiming for a bachelor in education and one in English language. Since we did not want to lose the idea of SLT completely, we additionally offered a time slot where the students could ask specific questions regarding the content of the lecture or the homeworks. Thus, we extended the TCT to 9 hours and reduced the SLT by 6.5 hours in comparison to the last years because we did not believe that the SLT where students work in small groups and only reach out for the supervisors when they have questions is easily transformable into a BigBlueButton conference. Since more tutorials took place in parallel, the team enlarged by one PhD-student, one student assistant hired for 50 hours per week, and one student assistant hired for 25 hours per week. The small videos were completely produced by the professor, while the TCT and SLT was covered by the PhD students. The student assistants were responsible for the correction of the homeworks. These corrections were in more detail than in the previous years to expound the problems and the very points where something went wrong since we believed that they need more guidance throughout this special semester.

Technical Summary. Exchanging document with the students as well as notifying students about changes to the weekly routine was managed with the OPENOLAT platform. Moreover we used OPENOLAT for grading the students. For the interaction with students we used BigBlueButton for groups of students and mainly email for the communication with single students; in rare cases we also used common chat clients for a synchronous communication. It is worth remarking that for the tutorials in BigBlueButton we attached a tablet and used the NOTABILITY-App [7] to simulate the whiteboard from a classroom.

Feedback. After half a semester, we conducted a midterm evaluation to get the possibility to adjust the new and unexperienced way of teaching to the students' needs. Fortunately, the majority of the students approved of the way we managed teaching. Nevertheless a lot of students missed the help and the meetings in persons - not only with us but also with each other for working on the exercises. For us astonishingly, most of the students neither used the camera nor the microphone during the tutorials for the reason that they either do not have a camera or a microphone or were afraid of disturbing the flow of the tutorial. The evaluation at the end of the semester does not differ much from the midterm evaluation even though we encouraged the students to use the microphone to ask questions instead of writing their questions (mostly formulae) in the BigBlueButton chat. In general, the students liked the extended offers for help but missed the option to ask questions in person since it is harder to formulate questions in a chat than in a personal conversation. Moreover, we got more complaints about BigBlueButton, namely overloads and not adjustable audio.

Our Impression. After a rough start, we equi-posed to the technique and the used platforms. Not surprisingly, the most important part for online teaching is a working technique, reliable software, and flexibility from all participating groups. The first two parts worked unfortunately only more or less during the semester: bad quality in the online tutorials via BigBlueButton as well as not reachable platforms due to too many persons accessing them at the same time, made it sometimes hard to provide good teaching. Most of the participants - students as well as teachers - showed a huge amount of flexibility without complaining. From our point of view the students had more problems to adjust to the new situation than the teachers for two main reasons: it is common that after a lecture or a tutorial some students reach out to the teacher to ask questions in private. Even though we stayed in the BigBlueButton conference after the event ended, nobody stayed as well to ask questions. We believe that the students who do not dare ask questions while other students listen, were also afraid that somebody is still in the conference who may blame them for their questions. This impression is tightly related to the second point: the students have problems to formulate their questions. Since we do not believe that there is any relation between formulating questions and the pandemic, we had to learn that this problem probably exists for a longer time. Normally, the students meet us directly after the tutorial or lecture, or they come to our offices, and show us what they did on a sheet of paper. In a direct conversation they are able to point at problematic parts they have written. Since most of our students did not dare turn on their camera or even the microphone, they had to write all questions which is more complicated than pointing with the finger on something. We encouraged them to take photos and upload them but we noticed that this solution is not working for them as well. We were able to capture some of these students via common chat clients where they felt safer to ask questions which were not formulated in detail. During nearly the complete semester the TCT for beginners and advanced students was frequented by 30 students in average, the tutorial in English language by 15 students in average, and the tutorial for the students aiming for a bachelor in education by six students in average. Notice that the students were allowed to participate in each tutorial they liked, even more than one per week. For us interestingly, the students of the beginner groups were more active in the sense by participating in polls (provided by BigBlueButton), answering question, and asking questions on their own even beyond the scope of the week's content. As we assumed the SLT was rarely frequented and mostly by students who wanted us to work on their homework step by step with them which is not the idea of SLT. Specific for this semester during the pandemic and not an online semester in general was in addition that the students needed more care despite the professional part: they were scared by the pandemic and the resulting uncertainty of their exams.

3 EXAMINATION

At Kiel University each undergraduate course has a final written exam in person to pass the course. This exam can be taken in one of two exam's periods: one at the end of the semester and one at the beginning of the next semester. The exam consists of a multiple choice section (reproduction of knowledge) and seven further




Figure 1: An exemplary exam page including a barcode

problems, each of them similar to, but in general easier than the problems of the homework exercises seen during the semester. The exam is set up for three hours. Supervised by the teaching assistant the exams are corrected by the team members together in a meeting room. This process usually takes three working days and requires working closely together. The final part of an exam is a review process of the corrections by the students. During an hour period the students have the chance to scrutinise their corrected exercises and mistakes in the correction from our side can be straightened. This step is also held in person in a meeting room holding roughly ten persons.

Since the Department of Computer Science disallowed online exams, we established a solution accommodating the formal regulations made by the head of the university [12]. The exam itself was finally taken in a marquee having 1000 m^2 accommodating 300 students. To keep the correction process as usual as possible and still avoid contact in person we developed an own, nearly automatic solution to digitalise the exams, correct the digital version, and provide an online review of the digitally corrected exams.

Letting a computer do the work for us required the implementation of an appropriate format. Each exam was already personalised to a particular student having their name and their student identification number on each page in the past years. However, reading plain text from scanned sheets of paper is not an easy task for a computer. Therefore, we decided to generate barcodes on every

exam page as depicted in Figure 1. Our choice of an Code-39 barcode was made after performing empirical experiments (scanning crumbled paper, slightly folded paper, as well as partially hand-writings on the code) with various encoding format e.g. QR-codes. Since our exams are created and compiled in \LaTeX we are able to use the CTAN package MAKEBARCODE [13] for generating barcodes encoding the student identification number, the page number, and the exercise number. Therefore, it is an easy task for a computer to gather the required unique information of a single page. By the additional information (page number and exercise number) in comparison to the previous years, we were also unburdened of the task to order the single pages of the exam by hand. In Listing 1 we show the import of the CTAN package and an exemplary invoking of a barcode.

Listing 1: Invoking barcodes in \LaTeX

```
1 # import the makebarcode package
2 \usepackage[code=Code39,X=.5mm,ratio=2.25,H=0.5cm]{makebarcode}
3
4 # Generating the barcode
5 \barcode{\StudentID-\arabic{ExerciseNo}-\thepage}
```

The generation of the exams is performed by using a csv-file containing the students credentials. Our \LaTeX basis file is enriched by macros being replaced during the generation of each personalised exam. Finally, the individual \LaTeX source is translated by using LATEXMK [10]. Thus, by the interaction of the exam's source code and the list of students in a csv-file, all personalised exams are generated in one step. We outline the algorithm in Listing 2.

Listing 2: Generate exams with barcodes automatically

```
1 with open('participants.csv') as student:
2     reader = csv.DictReader(student, fieldnames=self.__sdata["fieldnames"]
3         ↪ ")
4     for row in reader:
5         exam = exam_tex_file.tex
6         generated_exam = f"{outputFolder}/{row[self.__sdata["key"]]}."
7         ↪ pdf"
8         for line in exam:
9             for fieldName in fieldNames:
10                line = line.replace(fieldName, row[fieldName])
11            generated.write(line)
12        run_latexmk(generated_exam)
```

Before the exam, each student got their own personalised printed version in an envelope. During the exam, the exercises are solved using a pen as in the previous years. Afterwards, we got the exams back bagged again in the envelopes. Then, we scanned all exams into a single, large PDF-file. Since the pages were not necessarily sorted, flipped upside down, or rotated (we decided not to staple each exam such that we do not have to remove the retaining clips for scanning) our automatic processing had to take care of this step as well. Scanning of many pages at the same time naturally causes a slightly rotation on some pages and therefore noise within the received data. The decoding process is manifold: firstly, using GHOSTSCRIPT [1], each pages was converted in to a JPEG-picture interpolated by using Bresenham's line algorithm [2] throughout the entire picture. This algorithm plots the closest texture coordinate at each pixel resulting in a much better readability of our barcode – especially for a computer. Second, we extracted the particular part of the page where the barcode is rendered. This step was again performed by invoking GHOSTSCRIPT. The actual decoding of the image was performed by ZBAR [4], an open source tool supporting

Code-39 barcodes. We extracted each page, and renamed it to the decoded string of student identification number, page number, and exercise number as shown in Listing 3.

Listing 3: Split the scanned exams into single pages

```
1 for page in scanned_pdf:
2     code = decode_barcode(page) # invoke zbar-img to decode the barcode
3     create_folder(student_id)
4     extract_pdf(page, f"{student_id}/{code}.pdf") # invoke ghostscript
5         ↪ to extract a single PDF page
```

The way we invoked the previously described techniques turned out to be extremely reliable. Within our two exams each consisting of more than 3000 pages, we only failed to decode 10 pages. These errors were caused by too heavy rotations of the scanned pages or handwritings causing too much noise on the barcode.

To ease the manual correction procedure, the pages can be merged into either exercise-wise files or student-wise files. As mentioned before, since in our scenario one team member corrects a single exercise of all exams, the first choice is consequently the natural one for correction. By using the data gathered by decoding the barcodes, we sort all pages ascending to their relative page number in each exam and then merge all files having the same exercise number. The algorithm is outlined in Listing 4.

Listing 4: Merge single pages for further processing

```
1 for student_id_folder in processed_folder:
2     if not split_exercise: # merge all documents of a student in the
3         ↪ correct order
4         merge_pdfs(all_pages(student_id_folder), f"{outputFolder}/{
5             ↪ student_id}.pdf")
6     else: # merge all exercises in different PDF files
7         create_folder(f"{outputFolder}/{student_id}")
8         collected_file_names = dict()
9         for file_name in list_files(student_id_folder): # collect files
10            ↪ names for an exercise
11            student_id, page_no, exercise_no = file_name.split("-")
12            if not exercise_no in collected_file_names:
13                collected_file_names[exercise_no] = []
14            collected_file_names[exercise_no].append(file_name)
15        for exercise_no in collected_file_names: # merge PDFs and store
16            ↪ them separately
17        merge_pdfs(collected_file_names[exercise_no], f"{outputFolder}/{
18            ↪ student_id}/{exercise_no}.pdf")
```

Afterwards the resulting files were stored in a private NEXTCLOUD [8] allowing an easy access and modification by multiple team members while meeting the GDPR. For the correction we use again the NOTABILITY-App [7] which offers a build in link to WebDAV services being served by our NEXTCLOUD server. Each team member corrected a single exercise student by student and pushed the results back into the NEXTCLOUD. Again, this synchronisation is performed fully automatically. Achieved points were automatically collected into a csv-file allowing easy post processing of the data – e.g. plotting grade distributions as shown in Figure 2.

Since the Department of Computer Science guarantees the students a review of the marking, we had to make the corrected exams available for the students. Thus, for this purpose the corrected single pages of the exams were sorted student-wise: all exercises of each student were merged back into a single file and uploaded to OPENOLAT. Each student is now able to review their own exam including the corrections made by the team members. For the discussion we offered a BigBlueButton conference where the team members could answer individual questions in break-out rooms in




Figure 2: Exemplary output of the gathered exam data during corrections

a private communication while sharing the digital and corrected version of the specific exam via BigBlueButton.

4 USING OUR FRAMEWORK

We believe that our framework is beneficial for many other similar settings other than the one we face at Kiel University. We therefore decided to build a flexible and easy to reuse tool serving all benefits of our described approach.

Creating the exam. To ease the initial step of creating the exam we provide a \LaTeX class¹. This class contains many useful features e.g. an environment for solutions, changing colours to a printer friendly schema, or an exam title page holding an overview of exercises and associated points, as well as the invoking of barcodes. The important part is the former mentioned generation of barcodes on each page which is performed automatically by adding barcode as an option to our document class. The following line loads the \LaTeX class and activates, next to barcodes, an exam title page, activates printer friendly mode, and disables the solution environment.

```
\documentclass[hidesolution,bw,barcode,titlepage]{aufgabe}
```

A full documentation of implemented class options is available within the read-me file of our \LaTeX class.

Creating the students list. The list of students has to be stored in a csv-file containing the last name, the first name, the student identification number, and the email-address. Thus, an exemplary row in the file has the following form

```
Vanaken;Hans;372048;hans.vanaken@some-uni.eu
```

Notice that the *columns* are separated by semicolons.

Setting up the framework. The presented framework² – purely written in PYTHON 3 – requires three external tools installed within your system's paths: GHOSTSCRIPT [1], ZBAR [4], and LATEXMK [10]. The executables are linked within a JSON file named `toolconfig.json` being preconfigured to cope with Apples OSX and Ubuntu Linux.

¹The \LaTeX class is available at https://git.zs.informatik.uni-kiel.de/mku/latex_aufgabentemplate

²<https://git.zs.informatik.uni-kiel.de/mku/examscan>

Notice that these executable paths have to be adapted whenever using a different operating system.

The linking of the students data within the csv-file is configured within the JSON file `student_data.json`. We define the path to our csv-file holding the students data, a list of column identifiers naming each entry inside the csv-file, and a key for each row, e.g. StudentID for the student identification number as exemplarily shown in Listing 5.

Listing 5: Student data setup file `student_data.json`

```
1 {
2   "student_data" : {
3     "file_path" : "./participants.csv",
4     "fieldnames" : ["LastName", "FirstName", "StudentID", "Email"],
5     "key" : "StudentID"
6   }
7 }
```

The csv-file can be enriched by all information necessary for conducting an exam in a specific university. Notice that the `student_data.json` has to be adjusted accordingly and that renaming the *fieldnames* (cf. Listing 5) requires an analogous renaming of the macros placed within the \LaTeX exam file (e.g. replacing `##FIRSTNAME##` with `##VOORNAAM##` with the intention of changing macros to Dutch).

Executing the algorithms. After finishing the setup one calls the PYTHON 3 script `examScan.py` by simply executing `python3 examScan.py`. This call conveniently opens an elementary Graphical User Interface (GUI) being depicted in Figure 3. The GUI now allows selecting between our algorithms described in Section 3 by using your keyboard's arrow keys.

Summing the necessary steps up, the following parts are required to perform an exam with our framework:

1. Create an exam with \LaTeX by using our provided template³.
2. Create a students list as csv-file.
3. Generate and compile the personalised exams into one pdf-file by using the framework. Select technique 1 within the GUI depicted in Figure 3).
4. Print the previously obtained pdf-file.
5. Scan the worked-on exam sheets. (Notice that you do not have to sort them in before).
6. Split the obtained pdf-file in one pdf-file per sheet by using the framework. Select technique 2 within the GUI.
7. Merge the obtained pdf-files exercise-wise or student-wise by using the framework. Select technique 3 within the GUI.
8. Distribute the obtained pdf-files for correction, meeting your specific regulation for data protection (in our case NEXTCLOUD).
9. Correct the exercises with annotations or by tablet (we used the NOTABILITY-App).
10. Make the exams (student-wise sorted) available for a review process by the students.

5 CONCLUSION

Faced with a situation non of us expected, the discussion about online teaching formats and online examination speeded up. All arguments against online teaching became meaningless from one day to the next due to a lack of other options. The necessity of

³The template is available at https://git.zs.informatik.uni-kiel.de/mku/latex_aufgabentemplate. It contains next to examples a read-me file guiding you through the setup.




Figure 3: Terminal GUI for applying our algorithms

deciding fast about *what do we like in classical teaching and what to we want to keep?* as well as *which new possibilities do we have with online teaching?* brought a new way of teaching. Next to the teaching, we were confronted with the examination situation: all exams from the undergraduate courses highly depend on reproducing the content or solving small problems similar to the exercises of the homework. The solutions to these exercises can be easily found in the internet. Discussions in the Department of Computer Science about changing the form of the exercises did not result in convincing alternatives. For this reason and a relaxed pandemic situation in the summer, the Department of Computer Science decided that the exams have to take place in person including strict regulations regarding the hygiene. Since, we wanted to minimise contacts during the correction part, we built a framework for a digital correction and an online review. With this framework, we were gained the following benefits

- automatically generated exams in one pdf-file,
- automaticall sorted exams exercise-wise or student-wise for corrections or the review respectively,
- relaxed corrections from home without meetings in person,
- fast and efficient review process since the students were able to check the corrections beforehand.

The experiences we gathered showed that digitalising the exams and correcting with annotations or a tablet are not as difficult as expected once an appropriate framework is provided. Moreover, the advantages that first the exhausting work of correcting 150 times the same exercise is easier from home and second wrong corrections during the correction process can be set aright easily with annotations rather than with a pen. We noticed that we are even faster in correcting the exams in comparison to the previous years.

At our university other groups and faculties decided differently how to manage the examinations (for teaching it was required to switch to online teaching completely). We briefly compare their experiences with ours. The most remarkable situation, we know of, occurred in the Department of Economics: they decided to perform the written exams online with the result that instead of the usual 30% of students passing this year 80% passed, i.e. cheating could not be avoided. Other groups corrected in university, thus one single person per office. They faced the situation that the organisation of passing the exams among half a dozen correctors should not be underestimated for all having continuously exams to correct. Regarding the review process, some groups decided to meet in similar environments as for the exams: huge lecture hall, the student get the corrected exams at the door, take a seat, review the corrections, and afterwards may ask questions through a plexiglass window.

This procedure had on the one hand the advantage that the students and correctors met in person and were able (with mask and rubber gloves) to point with the finger on unclear parts of the corrections. On the other hand, this procedure took several hours, since first the students had to keep distance while entering the room and obtaining their exams, second the students saw the corrections the first time at this point and they had to wait for a long time until they were allowed to ask questions. As in the exams themselves, an organised way of entering and leaving the lecture hall such that each two students never meet with a distance of under 2m and are registered with their arriving and leaving time for a later on traceability, takes approximately the tripled time to the situation from the previous years. With our solution, first the cheating potential was not higher than before since the exams took place in person and even with more distance. Second, the correction process was speeded up since by the automatically exercise-wise order of the exams, passing exams and waiting for colleagues was omitted. Third, and for us the most important part, is the advantage of the review process: since the students were able to see the digital corrections online before the actual review process, they could ask immediately specific questions. Therefore, the review process was faster and more efficient than in the previous years. Please notice, that due to the new and special situation the students did not have to sign the corrected exams as it is required normally. Nevertheless, even if the review process is going to take place in person again, we will keep on with the digitalisation of the exams, the digital corrections, and the provision of the digitally corrected exams since the time savings and the more relaxed corrections are convincing for us.

We highly believe – not only due to frequent questions about our efficient way of coping with the ongoing situation within our university and one other university within our country – that our attempt forms a great start to making teaching and examination easier and less time consuming in the future by still keeping up high standards.

REFERENCES

- [1] Artifex Software Inc. Adobe, L. Peter Deutsch. 2020 (accessed January 5, 2021). *Ghostscript*. <https://www.ghostscript.com>
- [2] J. E. Bresenham. 1965. Algorithm for computer control of a digital plotter. *IBM Systems Journal* 4, 1 (1965), 25–30. <https://doi.org/10.1147/sj.41.0025>
- [3] Matt Carter. 2020 (accessed December 30, 2020). *PDF-dicer*. <https://github.com/MomsFriendlyDevCo/pdf-dicer>
- [4] ZBar developers. 2020 (accessed December 30, 2020). *ZBar*. <https://git.linuxtv.org/zbar.git>
- [5] Pamela Fleischmann, Mitja Kulczynski, Dirk Nowotka, and Thomas Wilke. 2019. Managing Heterogeneity and Bridging the Gap in Teaching Formal Methods. In *Formal Methods Teaching Workshop*. Springer, 181–195.
- [6] frentix GmbH. 2020 (accessed December 30, 2020). *OpenOlat*. <https://www.OpenOlat.com>
- [7] Ic Ginger Labs. 2020 (accessed December 30, 2020). *Notability*. <https://www.gingerlabs.com>
- [8] Nextcloud GmbH. 2020 (accessed December 30, 2020). *Nextcloud*. <https://nextcloud.com/>
- [9] BigBlueButton Inc. (accessed December 30, 2020). *BigBlueButton*. <https://bigbluebutton.org>
- [10] David J. Musliner and Evan McLean. 2020 (accessed December 30, 2020). *Latexmk*. <https://ctan.org/pkg/latexmk/>
- [11] European Parliament and European Council. 2016 (accessed December 29, 2020). *General Data Protection Regulation*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj>
- [12] Kiel University. 2020 (accessed November 12, 2020). *Information about the Coronavirus*. <https://www.uni-kiel.de/en/coronavirus>
- [13] Zdeněk Wagner. 2020 (accessed December 30, 2020). *makebarcode*. <https://ctan.org/pkg/makebarcode>