# Academic Senate Resolutions for Consideration May 2021

## Online Proctoring Software at Foothill College

Whereas, remote proctoring services "require access to technology that not all students are guaranteed to have, can constitute an invasion of privacy for students, and can discriminate against students of color and disabled students,"[i] lower test scores for students who suffer from anxiety[ii]; and are rife with accessibility concerns[iii];

Whereas, remote proctoring services collect private user data and fail to disclose how the data is to be used, including for-profit uses[iv]

Whereas, nationally, students have spoken out and filed several lawsuits and legal complaints against online proctoring software vendors[v];

Whereas, remote proctoring conflicts with Foothill College's Strategic Vision for Equity[vi], particularly the commitment to eliminate demographically-based disparities, and the College Mission Statement[vii] that includes a commitment to eliminate disparity in achievement of student outcomes;

Resolved, that the Foothill Academic Senate does not support investing community resources, including but not limited to monetary funds, into online proctoring tools; and

Resolved, that Foothill Academic Senate recognizes that transitioning away from proctored assessments will require significant work for faculty currently using the software and recommends that the college ensure the impacted faculty receive robust institutional support to do this work in a manner that is compassionate to and realistic of faculty workload; and

Resolved, that the Foothill Committee on Online Learning and the Online Learning Office collaborate to support affected faculty by developing a set of effective strategies for alternatives to high-stakes proctored tests, such as authentic assessments that have demonstrated an increase in student motivation and provide more usable information about student learning[viii]; and

Resolved, that Foothill Academic Senate share this resolution with the Office of Online Learning and the Board of Trustees.

[i] Sarah Silverman, Autumm Caines, and Christopher Casey, et al. *"What Happens When You Close the Door on Remote Proctoring? Moving Toward Authentic Assessments with a People-Centered Approach," Educational Development in the Time of Crises* Vol. 39, No. 3 (Spring 2021). DOI: https://doi.org/10.3998/tia.17063888.0039.308 AND Claire Galligan, Hannah Rosenfeld, Molly Kleinman, et al., "Cameras in the Classroom: Facial Recognition Technology in Schools" University Of Michigan Technology Assessment Project Report 2020 http://stpp.fordschool.umich.edu/sites/stpp.fordschool.umich.edu/files/file-assets/cameras_in_the_classroom_full_report.pdf AND Shea Swauger, "Our Bodies Encoded: Algorithmic Test Proctoring in Higher Education" *Hybrid Pedagogy* April 2, 2020 https://hybridpedagogy.org/our-bodies-encoded-algorithmic-test-proctoring-in-higher-education/

[ii] Daniel Woldeab and Thomas Brothen, "21st Century Assessment: Online Proctoring, Test Anxiety, and Student Performance," *International Journal of eLearning and Distance Education* Vol 34. No. 1 (2019): accessed March 2021 https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1227595.pdf

[iii] Colleen Flaherty, "No More Proctorio: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign says it won't work with Proctorio past this summer, citing 'significant' accessibility concerns. Will other campuses be next?" February 1, 2021. https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2021/02/01/u-illinois-says-goodbye-proctorio , https://emails.illinois.edu/newsletter/1970177238.html AND SFSU Academic Senate Resolution Number: RF20-406 September, 2020 https://senate.sfsu.edu/resolution/resolution-third-party-proctoring

[iv] , In the Matter of Online Test Proctoring Companies Respondus, Inc., ProctorU, Inc; Proctorio, Inc,; Examity, Inc., and Honorlock, Inc. *Complaint and Request for Investigation, Injunction and Other Relief,* Submitted by The Electronic Privacy Information Center Office of the Attorney General of the District of Columbia. December 9, 2020. https://epic.org/privacy/dccppa/online-test-proctoring/EPIC-complaint-in-re-online-test-proctoring-companies-12-09-20.pdf

[v] Monica Chin., "College student sues Proctorio after source code copyright claim." *The Verge* April 22, 2021. AND countless change.org student led petitions such as: "Stop CSUF from using Invasive programs like Proctorio" on Change.org by D. Anon https://www.change.org/p/california-state-university-fullerton-stop-csuf-from-using-invasive-programs-like-proctorio AND Todd Feathers., "Schools are Abandoning Invasive Proctoring Software After Student Backlash" *Vice* February 26, 2021.

[vi] Foothill College Strategic Vision for Equity 2021-2025 https://foothill.edu/equityplan/

[vii] Foothill College Mission Statement https://www.foothill.edu/president/mission.html

[viii] Wiggins, Grant. (1998). Ensuring authentic performance. Chapter 2 in *Educative Assessment: Designing Assessments to Inform and Improve Student Performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 21 – 42. AND John Warner, "Choose Cooperation and Collaboration, Rather Than Surveillance" *Inside Higher Ed* May 21, 2020. https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/just-visiting/choose-cooperation-and-collaboration-rather-surveillance AND Jill Leafstedt, "Online Courses Shouldn't Use Remote Proctoring Tools. Here's Why," *EdSurge Digital Learning in Higher Ed*, April 19, 2017. https://www.edsurge.com/news/2017-04-19-online-courses-shouldn-t-use-remote-proctoring-tools-here-s-why