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1. Introductions
2. COCI Priorities
3. ASIS Overview
   a. Course lists
4. Course review
   a. Status of queue
   b. Timeline
   c. Process
   d. Comments
   e. Reviewer guide
5. Petitions to COCI (Upper-division AI, grading variance, undergrad readers/TAs, non-student readers/TAs)
   a. Policies on Undergrad/Non-student readers
   b. Multi-term Upper-division AI appointments
6. Online Proctoring Services
ICMS Guidelines: Course Approvals

2. Click “Approvals” at the top of the page to view course listings. If you have multiple levels of user access, you may need to select from the “Position” drop-down list and search for those proposals.
3. Click on a course to view and a new tab will pop up in browser.
4. Click “View Course Proposal” in the upper left hand corner of the page. You can browse through relevant tabs one at a time. If you are asked to save changes while you review the proposal, discard the changes.
5. When you are finished reviewing the tabs, click the “Codes/Dates” tab to enter your review comments. In the “Temporary Reviewer Comments” section, include your name and date of entry followed by your comments. Once finished, click the save button at the bottom of the page.
   a. Note: On Codes/Dates page, do not fill in or alter the first three text fields named “Senate Approval,” “Originator,” and “Created On.” This information should not be editable. Changes will be implemented in the system to lock these fields.
   b. Note: The save button will not pop up until you click somewhere on the screen outside of the “Temporary Reviewer Comments” box.
6. Once the “Codes/Dates” page is saved, you will see confirmation in blue writing at the top of the page. You can then close the tab and return to the original approval page to access additional courses.
To: Ralph Hexter  
Acting Chancellor 

Re: Informational Review of Existing Online Proctoring Services 

Dear Acting Chancellor Hexter: 

In the April 5th memo to the Chancellor and Provost, the Senate posed challenges to the current and growing online course offerings which require testing resources, including online proctoring services. In response to the Academic Senate’s concerns, you charged a small working group which included representatives from Undergraduate Education, Budget and Institutional Analysis, Academic Technology Services, the Center for Educational Effectiveness, IET Security, UC Davis Extension, and the Academic Senate’s Committee on Courses of Instruction, to conduct a review of existing online proctoring services. This group looked at proctoring services in use at other universities across the country to determine if they meet the following requirements and go into further detail about the top two services. See Fig. 1 for a summary.

- Can accurately and reliably confirm students’ identities  
- Meet campus IT standards for security, reliability, and integration  
- Provide an acceptable testing experience for the user, including readily available help and resources  
- Able to be used by other UC students taking an intercampus UCD online course  

The first service that this group considered is Proctor U. Proctor U’s platform attempts to replicate an in-person proctor experience and prevent cheating using customizable controls set by the institution. Currently, Proctor U is in use at UC Irvine, UC Santa Cruz, and UC Office of the President. Strengths of Proctor U include:

- Good integration with LMS, which is used to log students in and submit the exams  
- Additional ID verification that asks students to show a current government issued ID, which Proctor U uses by pulling information from public databases to confirm identities  
- 80% success rate with first layer of ID verification practice though it is more challenging with international students  
- Very few complaints about the testing experience for students  
- Keystroke pattern recognition to reduce the possibility of academic dishonesty during the exam  
- Representatives from Proctor U are available to support faculty 24/7  
- No reported issues with students enrolled from other UC’s using this service for exams  
- Options for the institution to close out and end the session or pause to let the proctor assess the situation when an anomaly is detected  
- A pricing model where the student is responsible for paying per exam and the option for campuses to include bookstore “coupons” for students to pre-purchase exams when buying other course materials.  

The second service that we looked into was Examity. Examity offers different product options based on its own proprietary levels of authentication and any other steps that the client would like to add. Other universities currently using Examity include Boston University, Northwestern University, University of Southern California, University of Wisconsin and UC Riverside. Strengths of Examity include:
- A single platform that can be used for both the fully live and the record and review proctoring models
- Pricing stratified by the authentication level used and fixed per exam or subsidized through the institution
- Additional ID verification that asks students to show a current government issued ID
- Keystroke pattern recognition and 360 degree view of the testing environment reduce the possibility of academic dishonesty during the exam
- Reliable Canvas integration so students have a single sign on
- No reported issues with students enrolled from other UC’s using this service for exams
- 2:1 student proctor ratio and wait times under one minute
- Proctors are all college educated and IT trained
- Student and faculty have access to 24/7 customer and technical support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proctor U</th>
<th>Examity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can accurately and reliably confirm students’ identities</td>
<td>Yes, though some int’l students may experience issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet campus IT standards for security, reliability, and integration</td>
<td>Most likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide an acceptable testing experience for the user, including readily available help and resources</td>
<td>Most likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to be used by other UC students taking an intercampus UCD online course</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We began this process exploring only those online proctoring options that employ people as part of their exam monitoring protocol. However, in recent years fully automated options have emerged in the marketplace. Of the two systems reviewed in this document, Examity offers both a human-proctored and fully automated test monitoring option. It may be wise to explore the pros and cons of both types of monitoring in a next phase of this project.

Our recommendation, after this initial review, is to invite Proctor U and Examity representatives to campus to demonstrate their products. Keeping this initial review group involved in that step would be wise. It would also be important to add additional individuals from the Academic Senate, particularly a current COCI member and UGC member, into that discussion. By providing these vendors a briefing, in advance, of the initial research we have done as well as the particular context of our campus, our working group feels confident that we will learn valuable information through the engagement that may help us move forward ultimately with a pilot use of one of these online proctoring tools and an assessment of the results.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Thomas  
Vice Provost & Dean  
Undergraduate Education

Kem Saichaie  
Associate Director – LTS  
Center for Educational Effectiveness

Cheryl Diermyer  
Instructional Designer  
Academic Technology Services

Linda Behrens  
Associate Dean, Online Learning & Education  
UC Extension