

CLEAR

#CLEAR2023AEC

Donald Balasa | American Association of Medical Assistants Rachel Schoenig | Cornerstone Strategies



- Ogletree v. Cleveland State Univ., 1:21-cv-00500 (N.D. Ohio Dec. 20, 2022)
- "How Public Test Offerors Can Minimize Legal Exposure in Light of Ogletree v. Cleveland State University," CLEAR Exam Review; Winter 2023





#### **Parties and Court**

- Plaintiff: Aaron Ogletree, student at Cleveland State University
- Defendant: Cleveland State University (CSU)
- United State District Court, Northern District of Ohio (a federal trial court)



### **Statement of the Case**

 "Plaintiff alleges that Defendant violated his rights under the Fourth Amendment [as applied to Ohio by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment] and seeks injunctive and declaratory relief."



### **Fourth Amendment**

- The 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment protects "[t]he right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against <u>unreasonable</u> searches and seizures."
- Applicable only to government actors (e.g., state universities and licensing bodies)



### **Court's Decision**

 "[T]he Court issues a declaratory judgment and permanently enjoins Cleveland State from violating Mr.
Ogletree's Fourth Amendment rights..."





- Immunocompromised (Feb. 2021)
- Failed Daily Health Assessments
- Not allowed on campus for classes or exams



#### Facts

- General Chemistry II syllabus (Jan. 2021)—"Must show surroundings, screen, work area."
- Objected to by Ogletree
- Removed by professor

2023 CLEAR ANNUAL EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE



#### Facts

- Feb 2021 test—Ogletree's bedroom
- Only suitable testing environment in the house
- Was informed of room scan two hours before test



#### Facts

- Not enough time to organize and put away Form 1099s
- Ogletree was <u>relying</u> on the fact that the professor removed the scan requirement.
- Ogletree acquiesced and performed scan.



### Legal Analysis

- Fourth Amendment: When does a search become <u>unreasonable</u>?
- "A 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment search 'occurs when the government violates: (1) a subjective expectation of privacy that; (2) society recognizes as reasonable.""



## Legal Analysis

- Was Ogletree's expectation of privacy reasonable?
- CSU argued that it was not. Room scans are an "industry-wide practice" and students "frequently acquiesce in their use."



# Was Ogletree's expectation of privacy reasonable?

- One's home, especially one's bedroom, has heightened constitutional protection.
- What's the big deal?
- But, two-hours notice!?

2023 CLEAR ANNUAL EDUCATIONAL CONFERENCE



### **Test of Reasonableness**

"Whether a particular search meets the reasonableness standard 'is judged by balancing its: (1) intrusion on the individual's 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment interests against its: (2) promotion of legitimate governmental interests."





#### **CSU's Interests**

- Room scans facilitate proctoring of tests and academic fairness and integrity.
- Defendant has a legitimate purpose in preserving test integrity.



## **Points Against CSU**

1. Examinees can still cheat. "...[S]tudents could access their cell phones or notes in another room, since CSU does not require students to remain on camera for the duration of the test."



- Therefore, the CSU room scan practice is <u>not sufficient</u> for preserving test integrity.
- (But, in reality, there is no foolproof way of preventing <u>all</u> cheating!)



- 2. The CSU room scan practice is <u>not</u> <u>necessary</u> for preserving test integrity.
- "Plaintiff points to other procedural safeguards...against cheating."



- Other procedural safeguards:
- Programs that prevent Internet access
- Recording students during tests
- Using artificial intelligence (AI) to detect suspicious movement or plagiarism



- 3. CSU DOES NOT REQUIRE room scans and does not have a <u>uniform policy</u>.
- "[CSU has] a variable policy—<u>enforced,</u> <u>unevenly</u>, in the discretion of a combination of proctors and professors of using remote scans..."



"The decision [to require room scans] is left to individual faculty in their discretion—a policy that acknowledges that such means are not strictly necessary, but an available option among many."



- 4. Examinees are able to see the room scans of other examinees, thus increasing the privacy concerns.
- (My understanding is that this is not usually the case with room scans.)



- 5. Mr. Ogletree was given only twohours notice.
- Apparently, the professor's change in the syllabus was not communicated adequately to the proctor.



### **Court's Conclusion**

- "[T]he Court concludes that Mr. Ogletree's privacy interests in his home outweigh Cleveland State's interests in scanning his room."
- Unreasonable under the 4<sup>th</sup> Amendment





### **Precedential Weight**

- Binding precedent (controlling authority) only in the Northern District of Ohio
- Non-binding precedent (persuasive authority) elsewhere
- Precedential weight may be lessened by the factual anomalies of this case.



 Public testing bodies should implement written policies and practices that <u>minimize</u> the likelihood of cheating on remotelyproctored exams.



 2. Public testing bodies should gather evidence that room scans for remotely-proctored tests enhance test security in ways that cannot be provided by other security measures.



 3. Public testing bodies should issue to test candidates written test policies and procedures and that are uniformly and consistently enforced.



- 4. Room scans should not be visible to other examinees.
- 5. All test candidates should be given adequate, written notice of all relevant matters.



#### **Speaker Contact Information**

Donald A. Balasa, JD, MBA, dbalasa@aama-ntl.org Rachel R. Schoenig, JD, Rachel.schoenig@cornerston estrategies.org

IIIII

# C L E A R 2 0 2 3 A E C



## Thank You



