
The University Senate

FACULTY · STUDENT · P&A · CIVIL SERVICE

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Student Academic Integrity Committee (SAIC)

March 16, 2022

Minutes of the Meeting

These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the senate, the administration, or the Board of Regents.

[In these minutes: Letter from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) Regarding Exam Monitoring Software; Response to the SAIC Letter to the Provost Regarding the McCabe Survey]

PRESENT: Kenneth Leopold (chair), Zornitsa Keremidchieva, Susan O'Conner-Von, Bibhudutta Panda, Peter Haeg, Kevin Wendt, Tracene Marshall, Ashley Busho, Sharon Dzik, Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn

REGRETS: Darren LaScotte

ABSENT: Daniela Orza, Charlie Burns, Derrick Cupp, Ilene Alexander

GUESTS: Tom Chase, chair, Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP)

OTHERS: Amber Bathke, Katie Jackson, Katie Koopmeiners

Chair Ken Leopold welcomed the committee, and members introduced themselves.

1. Letter from the Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP) Regarding Exam Monitoring Software

Leopold introduced Tom Chase, chair, Senate Committee on Educational Policy (SCEP), who presented a [letter](#) that he sent to the provost regarding concerns SCEP received from the Minnesota Student Association (MSA) regarding exam monitoring software (including Proctorio). Chase outlined the concerns that were raised and they included:

- Data security concerns, such as data retention and access to recordings and cookies
- Privacy concerns, such as the violation of students' private space and limited transparency as to the full usage of camera and audio recordings
- The perception by some students that professors assume that students will cheat, and that they lack trust in students
- Ineffectiveness, such as flagging innocent movements as possible cheating

- Accessibility and equity issues with the artificial intelligence (AI) tools used to identify suspicious behavior, such as disparities in its accuracy related to skin tones, certain religious clothing, and disability-related movements

Chase explained that the letter is asking the Executive Vice President and Provost Rachel Croson to form a task force to review the research on ethics and privacy in learning tools and systems and develop a University-wide set of guiding principles and policies regarding these tools. He further indicated that members of SCEP would be willing to serve on this task force.

Sharon Dzik and Leopold indicated that it would be good to have experts in this subject area included on this proposed task force. Tracene Marshall added that it is important to also include voices who have been previously marginalized. Bubhu Panda expressed his concern that any proposed task force needs to take into account the fact that not all campuses have a dedicated proctoring center and these resources can be essential tools. He added that it is important that people understand how to use all the features of the software in order to limit issues related to the concerns raised. Leopold agreed that this technology can serve more as a deterrent rather than a review tool to catch cheating after the fact.

Jessica Kuecker Grotjohn and Dzik commented that even if proctoring software is being used, it can still take into account disability or other accommodations afforded to certain students. Panda added that providing as much communication and notice to students was very important. Susan O'Conner-Von agreed that outlining expectations for accommodations is an important thing to address early on in the semester. Marshall and Haeg provided comments that it would be a good idea to look at how peer and online institutions are handling these types of concerns.

Ashley Busho said that these types of interactions can exacerbate student anxiety if students feel like every move that they make during an exam is being monitored. Katie Jackson noted that it is also important to have individuals who contract with these vendors through the request for proposal process to be included as well.

Hearing no further discussion, Leopold moved for the committee to endorse the letter. A vote was taken and the motion prevailed.

2. Response to the SAIC Letter to the Provost Regarding the McCabe Survey - Leopold stated that he had received a response to the previous [letter](#) that the committee sent to Executive Vice President and Provost Rachel Croson that encourages the University to engage in the McCabe academic integrity survey across all five system campuses. He shared the response from the provost:

Thank you and your committee for suggesting this opportunity.

While I have not yet heard from the various Vice Chancellors, I have discussed the possibility with Vice Provost McMaster and Vice President Phillips. Both are comfortable with the survey, conditional on managing its timing to avoid overlap with SERU and other surveys that their offices field.

Do we have a University Liaison with ICAI? Once we hear from the other campuses, perhaps that individual could meet with the appropriate units to identify a non-conflicting time for implementation.

As always, please feel free to reach out to me if I can provide anything additional.

Dzik further commented that it is great that the provost seems to be on board with this idea and is hopeful that the survey can be conducted in a manner that works logistically for each campus.

Hearing no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Chris Kwapick
University Senate Office