

AIWG Proctoring Pilot Guidelines

Spring 2024

These guidelines have been developed by the Academic Integrity Working Group (AIWG) to ensure transparent and equitable practices across courses participating in the proctoring pilot overseen by the AIWG. It is important that all exams are administered in a manner that is consistent with students' best interests and Stanford's educational goals. A crucial part of the AIWG's work is to determine the efficacy of proctoring and develop effective practices for proctoring exams at Stanford. To best assist in this objective, it is essential course staff and students are aware of what will happen in exam rooms and in the larger context of proctored exams so that in-depth feedback can be collected.

1. Purpose and Background

The AIWG defines proctoring as the act of exam administrators overseeing students taking exams using fair and sensible practices to uphold the Honor Code.

The primary goals of the AIWG Proctoring Pilot are to:

- Determine the efficacy of proctoring at Stanford
- Develop effective proctoring practices that ensure exam environments are fair, equitable, and conducive to academic integrity
- Provide opportunities for Stanford students, staff, and faculty - especially those who are in the pilot - to share their thoughts and feedback

The AIWG views the primary roles of a proctor during exams as:

- Promoting a fair and equitable testing environment
- Enhancing student trust in the integrity of the testing environment by reducing student concerns about unpermitted aid
- Allowing students to focus on their own exam and learning
- Being available to quickly answer questions from students

2. Participating Course Policies

The AIWG values transparency, openness, and fairness with the Stanford community. Therefore, the AIWG *requires* instructors participating in the proctoring pilot to include a statement on the [Honor Code](#) in their syllabus including what is considered permitted and unpermitted aid in the course, especially in exams (examples may be found in the [CTL syllabus template](#)). It is recommended that instructors communicate with students about the reasons for distinctions between permitted and

unpermitted aid and how they relate to student learning. Instructors should provide guidance to proctors on what kinds of questions they are allowed to answer during exams (e.g., how proctors may clarify exam questions). For courses in the proctoring pilot, the AIWG also *requires* the following statement be included in the course syllabus:

This course is participating in the proctoring pilot overseen by the Academic Integrity Working Group (AIWG). The purpose of this pilot is to determine the efficacy of proctoring and develop effective practices for proctoring in-person exams at Stanford. To find more details on the pilot or the working group, please visit the AIWG's [webpage](#).

Course staff (TAs, CAs, instructors, etc.) are the only allowable proctors for exams. Exceptions include:

- For exams administered by the Office of Accessible Education (OAE), their CTC (Centralized Testing Center) staff are also allowable proctors.
- For exams administered by the Athletics Department for traveling athletes, their professional and coaching staff are also allowable proctors.
- For exams where additional or substitute proctors are necessary, such arrangements are allowed subject to written approval by the head instructor and such additional or substitute proctors affirming in writing that they will uphold the responsibilities of being a proctor.

For off-campus, course-approved exam administrations (including those for traveling athletes), the head instructor should approve the proctoring arrangement ([Sample Agreement](#))

3. Exam Setup

To facilitate a smooth exam proctoring process, the AIWG *requires* the following preparations, which are informed by best practices at other institutions and in the literature:

- Include course and/or exam-specific Honor Code guidelines on the cover page of exams, and require students to sign an affirmation on their understanding and commitment to uphold the spirit and letter of the Honor Code.
- Set up assigned seating for exams. A guide for creating seating charts in the most commonly used large exam rooms can be found [here](#). If the exam room does not have seat numbers, alternatives include pre-placing exams with students' names on appropriately spaced seats, or using a grid/table with the correct number and orientation of seats for the room. For smaller courses where course staff know who everyone is, an alternative is to note where students sit in relation to one another after the exam begins.
- Ask students to bring only what is essential for the exam. Any other items (e.g. backpacks, purses, tennis racquets, skateboards, electronic devices, etc.) will be left at the front or side of the room (whichever is appropriate to the testing set-up) to avoid students accessing unpermitted items during the exam.

- Remind students to silence/cancel alarms on their phones before exams begin.
- Display or project a digital clock at the front of the room when there isn't already a visible accurate clock or provide verbal time updates at standard intervals (e.g., 1 hour remaining).

4. Proctor Procedure During Exams

To ensure fair and standard procedures across all proctored exams in the pilot, the AIWG provides the following guidance to proctors:

- There should be at least two proctors for exam rooms with more than 50 students and additional proctors for even larger exam rooms to ensure adequate visibility and access to students.
- Apart from going to students to answer their questions, course staff proctoring exams should generally remain stationary and limit walkthroughs to every 20-30 minutes to reduce distractions.
- If communication is needed between proctors, please use digital or written methods (rather than talking/whispering) to avoid disturbing students during the exam.

Upon witnessing any potential Honor Code violation:

- A proctor must not approach or confront the student or prevent them from finishing their exam.
- A proctor should notate what they saw, where the student was sitting, and when this occurred; this information should be sent to the instructor after the exam.
- A proctor may ask other proctors in the room to note a general area of concern, but should avoid identifying specific students or behaviors to avoid creating a confirmation bias (e.g., from proctor 1 to proctor 2, “would you please pay attention to the back right quadrant of the room for the next few minutes?” instead of “doesn’t it look like the student in seat N26 is looking at their phone”).
- A proctor may make a general announcement to the entire exam room (e.g., announce “please remember that phone use is prohibited” if someone seems to be using their phone) in order to help reduce the possible extent and impact of any potential Honor Code concerns.

The OAE will administer exams for students with a “Private Exam Room” accommodation at the CTC (Centralized Testing Center):

- To provide the CTC proctor similar lines of sight to students seated in partitioned and separate spaces, cameras will provide live video feeds (without recording) during exams.
- Course staff will remain in contact with the CTC (in case students have questions or there are exam updates/corrections to share).

5. Honor Code Concerns

To ensure fairness and equity in the examination process, proctors must counteract unconscious bias with intentional effort. The student actions that occur during an exam should be seen with an open mind, not an overly suspicious viewpoint. Varying the distance and direction of one's gaze, stretching, fidgeting, other body movements, as well as types of clothing and self-regulating for temperature and other senses, are part of a range of variations that should never *on their own* be grounds for an Honor Code concern. As with other course staff responsibilities, proctoring is subject to [Stanford policies on Non Discrimination](#) and must adhere to the rights and procedures provided in the [Stanford Student Conduct Charter of 2023](#) (e.g., presumption of innocence and standards of evidence).

After an exam and after reviewing the student's submitted work, if the course staff and course instructor wish to proceed with a formal Honor Code concern to the Office of Community Standards (OCS), the *course instructor* should file the [concern form](#) with OCS (rather than any other course staff). It should be indicated that the course is participating in the AIWG Proctoring Pilot, and if the witness who originated the concern is a proctor, this should be noted.

Under Honor Code [interpretations](#), academic penalties on the basis of suspected dishonesty are prohibited until after a student has accepted responsibility or been found responsible for a formal Honor Code violation.