

MICHIGAN STATE
U N I V E R S I T Y

November 11, 2010

MEMORANDUM

TO: Executive Committee of Academic Council

FROM: Kim A. Wilcox, Provost 

RE: Proposal to Amend the Code of Teaching Responsibility and Integrity of Scholarship and Grades - Proctoring

I forward to ECAC a request to amend the Code of Teaching Responsibility and Integrity of Scholarship and Grades - Proctoring. The request is prompted by a growing need, particularly with the expansion of online and hybrid instruction, to be explicit about arrangements for proctoring student work. Issues related to when, how, and whom is responsible for proctoring student work require serious consideration by the faculty, and clear communication to students.

I ask for referral to appropriate standing committees for consideration of this proposal.

Attachments



**OFFICE OF THE
PROVOST**

Michigan State University
430 Administration Building
East Lansing, MI 48824-1046

517-335-6550
Fax: 517-355-9601
provost.msu.edu

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

November 5, 2010

To: Kim A. Wilcox, Provost

Fr: Linda O. Stanford, Associate Provost for Academic Services

Re: Request for Policy Changes to the Code of Teaching Responsibility and Integrity of Scholarship and Grades - **Proctoring**.

REQUEST:

In fairness to students, there is a need to be explicit if proctoring is required. In certain instances assessment of student performance cannot occur with accuracy unless the instructor requires proctoring. If proctoring is required, it should be stated in the syllabus.

The following three changes to current policy are proposed for all instruction and delivery models.

1. Code of Teaching Responsibility:

2. Course Syllabi section - add: "any required proctoring arrangements."

This does not infer proctoring is required but if proctoring is required, then it must be listed on the syllabus.

2. Code of Teaching Responsibility:

3. Student Assessment and Final Grades section - add: "Assessment methods should be appropriate to the learning objectives of the course. In that context, instructors are expected to take reasonable steps to create an assessment environment that promotes academic integrity. If proctoring or other security measures are necessary to ensure integrity of assessments, then such measures should be administered consistently in all course delivery methods, e.g. face-to-face or online."

3. Integrity of Scholarship and Grades:

Item 1. - add: "proctoring" to the third sentence in item 1. to read: "Practices that maintain the integrity of scholarship and grades include providing accurate information for academic and admission records, adherence to unit-approved professional standards and honor codes, proctoring, and completion of original academic work by the student to whom it is assigned, without unauthorized aid of any kind."



**Office of the
Provost**

Administration Building
East Lansing, MI
48824-1046

Fax: 517-355-9601
www.provost.msu.edu

BACKGROUND:

With ongoing changes in delivery methods (online, hybrid, face-to-face) including expansion of the number of online courses, how to proctor a course has become increasingly important. The most salient reasons to propose policy changes relate to the need for refined ways to assess student performance, detect student surrogates, and support pedagogical innovation.

Assessment of Student Performance.

It is difficult to assess the performance of a student in a course if the instructor cannot authenticate who the student is.

Student Surrogates.

If the examination setting is not proctored, then the possibility of a surrogate taking the examination is enhanced. Inadvertent condoning of this situation is unfair to honest students. Making it easy for surrogacy to thrive fosters an environment that renders the university in violation of best practices and the spirit of the Code of Teaching Responsibility, <http://www.hr.msu.edu/documents/facacadhandbooks/facultyhandbook/codeofteaching.htm>.

The key phrase in Item 3 is: "Instructors shall be responsible for assessing a student's performance based on announced criteria and on standards of academic achievement."

The phrase, "student's performance based on standards of academic achievement," places responsibility for examination security squarely on the instructor. Instructors already take reasonable measures to assure that academic dishonesty does not occur. Being clear, a priori, that proctoring may be or is required in a course is an important part of effective communication.

Pedagogical Innovation.

Faculty perceive pedagogical limitations with online delivery models and may employ hybrid models rather than totally online models simply because there is difficulty with accurate authentication for interactive assessment including performance on examinations.

Attachment: draft Academic Programs catalog text

C: L. June, Estry, Klomparens, B.Brown, Guenther, Rovig, Trevarthen

Code of Teaching Responsibility - Faculty Handbook

V. INSTRUCTION (Cont.)

This policy was approved by the Academic Council on November 4, 1969 and the Academic Senate on November 19, 1969; it was subsequently revised by Academic Council on May 19, 1976, February 27, 1996, and April 19, 2005 (effective Fall semester 2005).

Satisfaction of teaching responsibilities by instructional staff members (herein referred to as instructors) is essential to the successful functioning of a university. This University conceives these responsibilities to be so important that performance by instructors in meeting the provisions of this Code shall be taken into consideration in determining salary increases, tenure, and promotion.

1. **Course content:** Instructors shall be responsible for ensuring that the content of the courses they teach is consistent with the course descriptions approved by the University Committee on Curriculum and the Academic Council. Instructors shall direct class activities toward the fulfillment of course objectives and shall evaluate student performance in a manner consistent with these objectives.
2. **Course syllabi:** Instructors shall be responsible for distributing a course syllabus (either in print or electronic form) at the beginning of the semester. The syllabus shall minimally include:
 - o instructional objectives;
 - o instructor contact information and office hours;
 - o grading criteria and methods used to determine final course grades;
 - o date of the final examination and tentative dates of required assignments, quizzes, and tests, if applicable;
 - o attendance policy, if different from the University attendance policy and especially when that attendance policy affects student grades; and
 - o required and recommended course materials to be purchased, including textbooks and supplies.
 - o any required proctoring arrangements.
3. **Student Assessment and Final Grades:** Instructors shall be responsible for informing students, in a timely manner so as to enhance learning, of the grading criteria and methods used to determine grades on individual assignments. Instructors shall be responsible for assessing a student's performance based on announced criteria and on standards of academic achievement. Instructors shall submit final course grades in accordance with University deadlines. Assessment methods should be appropriate to the learning objectives of a course. In that context, instructors are expected to take reasonable steps to create an assessment environment that promotes academic integrity. If proctoring or other security measures are necessary to ensure integrity of assessments, then such measures should be administered consistently in all course delivery methods, e.g. face-to-face or online.
4. **Testing Documents:** Instructors shall be responsible for returning to students student answers to quizzes, tests, and examinations with such promptness to enhance the learning experience. Instructors shall retain final examination answers for at least one semester to allow students to review or to retrieve them. All testing questions (whether on quizzes, tests, or mid-semester or final examinations) are an integral part of course materials, and the decision whether to allow students to retain them is left to the discretion of the instructor.

5. **Term Papers and Comparable Projects:** Instructors shall be responsible for returning to students student term papers and other comparable projects with sufficient promptness to enhance the learning experience. Term papers and other comparable projects are the property of students who prepare them. Instructors shall retain such unclaimed course work for at least one semester to allow students to retrieve such work. Instructors have a right to retain a copy of student course work for their own files.
6. **Class Meetings:** Instructors shall be responsible for meeting their classes regularly and at scheduled times. To allow units to take appropriate action, instructors shall notify their units if they are to be absent and have not made suitable arrangements regarding their classes.
7. **Applicability of the Code of Teaching Responsibility to Student Assistants:** Instructors of courses in which assistants are authorized to perform teaching, grading, or other instructional functions shall be responsible for acquainting such individuals with the provisions of this Code and for monitoring their compliance.
8. **Instructor Accessibility to Students:** Instructors shall be responsible for being accessible to students outside of class time and therefore shall schedule and keep office hours for student conferences. Office hours should be scheduled at times convenient to both students and instructors with the additional option of mutually convenient prearranged appointments for students whose schedules conflict with announced office hours. Each teaching unit shall determine the minimum number of office hours for instructors in that unit. Instructors who serve as academic advisors also shall be responsible for maintaining appropriate office hours before and during enrollment periods. In addition to office hours, instructor accessibility through e-mail and other means is encouraged.
9. **Commercialization of Course Notes and Materials:** The University prohibits students from commercializing their notes of lectures and University-provided class materials *without the written consent of the instructor*. Instructors may allow commercialization by including permission in the course syllabus or other written statement distributed to all students in the class.

Hearing Procedures

1. Students may register complaints regarding an instructor's failure to comply with the provisions of the *Code of Teaching Responsibility* directly with that instructor.
2. Students may also take complaints directly to teaching units' chief administrators or their designates. If those persons are unable to resolve matters to the student's satisfaction, they are obligated to transmit written complaints to unit committees charged with hearing such complaints. A copy of any complaint transmitted shall be sent to the instructor. A written report of the action or recommendation of such groups will be forwarded to the student and to the instructor, normally within ten working days of the receipt of the complaint.
3. Complaints coming to the University Ombudsman will be reported, in writing, to chief administrators of the teaching units involved when in the Ombudsman's opinion a hearing appears necessary. It will be the responsibility of chief administrators or their designates to inform the instructor and to refer such unresolved complaints to the unit committees charged with hearing such complaints. A written report of the action or recommendation of such groups will be forwarded to the University Ombudsman, to the student, and to the instructor, normally within ten working days of the receipt of the complaint.
4. Students wishing to appeal a teaching unit action or recommendation may do so as outlined in *Academic Freedom Report for Students at Michigan State University*,

Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities, or Medical Student Rights and Responsibilities .

Such complaints must normally be initiated no later than the middle of the semester following the one wherein alleged violations occurred. Exceptions shall be made in cases where the involved instructor or student is absent from the University during the semester following the one wherein alleged violations occurred.

Integrity of Scholarship and Grades

The following statement of university policy addresses principles and procedures to be used in instances of academic dishonesty, violations of professional standards, and falsification of academic or admission records, herein after referred to as academic misconduct. [See General Student Regulation 1.00, Protection of Scholarship and Grades.]

1. The principles of truth and honesty are recognized as fundamental to a community of scholars. The university expects both instructors and students to honor these principles and, in so doing, to protect the validity of university education and grades. Practices that maintain the integrity of scholarship and grades include providing accurate information for academic and admission records, adherence to unit-approved professional standards and honor codes, proctoring, and completion of original academic work by the student to whom it is assigned, without unauthorized aid of any kind. To encourage adherence to the principles of truth and honesty, instructors should exercise care in planning and supervising academic work.
2. If an instructor alleges a student has committed an act of academic misconduct, the instructor is responsible for taking appropriate action. Depending on the instructor's judgment of a specific instance, the instructor may give the student a penalty grade. A penalty grade may be a reduced score or grade for the assignment or a reduced grade for the course. [For a definition of "penalty grade", see Academic Freedom Report (AFR) 8.1.15 and Graduate Students Rights and Responsibilities (GSRR) 8.1.15.]
3. When an instructor gives an undergraduate or graduate student a penalty grade for academic misconduct, the instructor must provide a written description of the details of the academic misconduct to the student and to the student's academic dean. The student's academic dean will add the written description to the student's academic record, where it will remain, unless the student successfully grieves the allegation.
4. In notifying the student's academic dean of the student's act of academic misconduct, the instructor may request the student's academic dean to initiate an academic disciplinary hearing to impose sanctions in addition to, or other than, a penalty grade.
5. When in the judgment of the student's academic dean, a sanction in addition to, or other than, a penalty grade is warranted (e.g., dismissal from a unit or program), the dean may call for an academic disciplinary hearing. In calling for an academic disciplinary hearing, the student's academic dean may act independently or in response to a request by the instructor. [See AFR 4.3.1.1, GSRR 5.5.2, and Medical Student Rights and Responsibilities (MSRR) 5.1.3.1.]
6. A student accused of academic misconduct may request an academic grievance hearing to contest the allegation before the appropriate hearing board of the department, school, or college in which the alleged academic dishonesty occurred. In

- cases involving academic misconduct, no student may be dismissed from a course or program of study without an academic disciplinary hearing.
7. On the first offense of academic misconduct, the student must attend an educational program on academic integrity and academic misconduct provided by the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education and Dean of Undergraduate Studies for undergraduate students and the Dean of The Graduate School for graduate students.
 8. In cases involving undergraduate students in which the student's academic dean, or designee, calls for an academic disciplinary hearing, the student's academic dean will refer the case to the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education. The Associate Provost will notify the student in writing of the call for a disciplinary hearing and will invite the student to a meeting to determine the appropriate judiciary for the hearing. [See AFR 4.3.1.1.]
 9. In cases involving graduate students in which the student's academic dean, or designee, calls for an academic disciplinary hearing, the student's academic dean will refer the case to the Dean of The Graduate School. The Dean of The Graduate School will notify the student in writing of the call for a disciplinary hearing and will invite the student to a meeting to determine the appropriate judiciary for the hearing. At this meeting, the student will be asked to select either an administrative disciplinary hearing conducted by the Dean of The Graduate School or a disciplinary hearing conducted by the college hearing board within the student's college. In cases of ambiguous jurisdiction involving graduate students, the Dean of The Graduate School will select the appropriate judiciary. [See GSRR 5.5.2.]
 10. Either party may appeal a decision of an administrative disciplinary hearing or a disciplinary hearing board to the appropriate appellate board. [See AFR 2.4.7.1, GSRR 5.5.2.1, and MSRR 5.8.1.]
-

Examinations

In keeping with university practice, entry into, and participation in, course examinations is controlled through electronic and visual means and by proctored examination site procedures.

In certain courses, such as those offered online, an individual student may be required to arrange to take examinations in a proctored environment away from campus. Any costs associated with taking such proctored examinations are the responsibility of the student. The Michigan State University Testing Office is a proctored-testing site for distance learning, www.testingoffice.msu.edu/. It is a member of the Consortium of College Testing Centers which is a free referral service provided by the National College Testing Association to facilitate distance learning, www.ncta-testing.org.

Current – no proposed changes