Academic Senate Curriculum & Instruction Meeting Minutes 10/28/20

Chair: Ewa Golebiowska

Attendees: Juliann Binienda, Kelly Dormer, Darin Ellis (WSU representative), Tom Fischer, Ewa Golebiowska (Chair), Manoj Kulchania, Sandra Oliver-McNeil, Richard Pineau, Brad Roth, Stella Resko, Affi Kadadu (Student Senate), Clay Walker, and Pramod Khosla.

Guests: Nathan Chavez CIT, David Straus (Dean of Student Affairs)

Members Student Affairs Committee: David Merolla, Christine Pagel, Pynthia Capee, Krysta Ryzewski, Shauna Reeves, Thomas Karr, Jenn Wareham, Rajan Varmon, Pramod Khosher, Mark Wezel

Absent:

Minutes By: Sandra Oliver-McNeil

Meeting Called to Order at 1: 00pm by Chair Ewa Golebiowska

Approval of October 2, 2020 Minutes: Motion to approve minutes by Richard Pineau and second by Juilann Binienda.

Agenda Item:

1. **Proctoring exams Respondence Lockdown Browser:**
   Nathan Chavez from CIT was present to review Respondence Lockdown Browser that is imbedded into Canvas to electronically proctor exams. Several members of the Academic Senate Curriculum and Instruction Committee and Student Affairs participated in a mock quiz using Respondence.
   Feedback included:
   - Prep work was intense and time consuming
   - Concerns that cheating was not always recognized by the software as it only picks up eye and body movement. It did not pick up objects in the room. Other objects that had faces on them were picked up as other people in the room.
   - There was no face recognition to compare to One-card picture
   - Chrome books did not have camera capability and could not be used when Respondence was used.
   - Speaking to someone on the phone using speaker was not recognized by the software so there was a way to still cheat.
   - Members of both committees stated that they see concerns about how intrusive the monitoring devices are especially with recording students, and able to store between 1-4 years.
   - Student feedback included increased anxiety that they would make an error and be accused of cheating when they were not.

   Issues with the software:

- The software only picked up eye movement and would shut down the exam if the student looked away from the camera
- Software needed to be downloaded on the device in advance of the exam.
- Kelly Dormer from Student Disability received feedback from students that included not being able to play music, students could not use the bathroom during the exam, increased student test taking anxiety and more students were requesting accommodations for being exempt from taking exams using Respondence.
- All products have issues as Respondence Lockdown.
- Zoom one on one proctoring is not realistic for large classes
- Issues arise when the technology does not work smoothly

Nathan Chavez reported the following information about other proctoring formats:

- Students have issues when they log into an exam and there is another person who is not their instructor. They know someone is watching them, but they cannot see them. Receiving verbal instructions from someone they cannot see also increases anxiety.
- There is a question if the anxiety is due to taking an exam or around virtual.
- Any concerns about student misconduct are settled by the department/instructor and in some cases by the Conduct Officer in Dean of Students.
- Reports that are generated by Respondence include rate of face recognition and eye movement. Recording can be reviewed (but not downloaded) by faculty.

David Strauss Feedback:

- Cheating occurs most frequently with the use of sharing information among students using What App Group, Chevrolet.com to upload questions and get answers, and dividing up questions and sharing answers. They are discovered when faculty suspects cheating and investigates. Last year 150 students in Chemistry and Biology classes were found to be using the above platforms. Appropriate action was taken.

Academic Senate Curriculum and Instruction Committee and the Student Affairs Committee recommended a motion be sent to the Policy Committee and Interim Provost Clabo with the above concerns.

2. **Final Exam Schedule:** Richard Pineau and Kurt Kruschinska have reviewed the 32 page document that outlines the policy and schedule for final exams for Fall 2020. Since many courses are now asynchronized, synchronized, and face-to-face, scheduling of Final exams by the University has become a complicated process. According to University policy, there needs to be a final product required that week, whether an exam, project, or paper due. Darrin Ellis reminded members of the committees that courses that were asynchronized in the past had open windows when exams were available to complete. It was up to the student to take the exam during that period. The issue arises when asynchronized classes want to administer a final exam synchronized. Students have various schedules for class, home responsibilities and work.

University policy states that students can not have 3 final exams in one day. It is recognized that there would be conflicts and there is a need for faculty to be flexible. Students need to know

that they have the right to approach and instructor with the smallest class to ask for an alternative test time.

Decision: Kurt and Richard will use the gride for synchronized, face to face and group courses that has already been developed. Asynchronized courses will be provided with guidelines. It is recognized that conflicts will occur, and faculty will be expected to work with students. Faculty will be reminded that grades need to be recorded within 72 hours after final exam. Delaying entering grades by faculty has repercussions for students including loss of financial aid, employer tuition reimbursement, and late registration fees.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00 pm