

## **Committee on Instructional Technology**

### **Monday, April 26, 2004**

Present: Mike Albright, Lori Bork, Becky Feaster, Melissa Gibson, Kevin Kenkel, Diane Sandhoff, and Rocky Von Eye

Excused: Paul Almjeld, Anne Kelly

1. Faculty interviews. Mike Albright updated the committee on the status of his interviews with faculty. Thirty-eight full-time teaching faculty have been interviewed. Just two have not been scheduled, and Mike does not plan to meet with them for the purpose of his needs assessment. He has compiled the data and written an executive summary, and has given the report to Title III project administrators Rocky Von Eye and Kevin Kenkel for further distribution.
2. Plagiarism detection. Mike reported that 19 of 34 faculty asked to assess the need for a plagiarism detection tool gave it a "5" on a scale of 1-5. Many faculty are concerned with plagiarism on campus. Mike distributed a quote for \$1100/year from Turnitin (<http://www.turnitin.com/>), the leading plagiarism detection service, as well as a page listing pros and cons of using a service such as Turnitin. The committee decided that it would be premature to subscribe to the service now, even if funds were available. The next step should be to discuss the matter with the Dean and with the faculty as a whole for the purpose of engaging in campuswide dialog regarding plagiarism. It was suggested that this is a policy issue, and that the academic integrity policy may need to be updated. August planning days may be a good time for this discussion, if the Dean agrees.
3. Title III mini-grant RFP review. The committee discussed the recent proposal review process for the 2004 mini-grants. Several problem areas were identified for resolution in the RFP for 2005 mini-grants. These included:
  - Pool the funds available, and fund proposals until the pool is expended, rather than setting a limit of two or three grants. Specify a maximum of \$2,500 for each grant as a whole, but that amount may be spent in any justifiable way as long as the stipend does not exceed \$1,500. (E.g., equipment, materials, travel costs may exceed \$1,000, which was the limit for this year.)
  - Require that applicants submit specific budgets and justify each budget component, including the stipend. (E.g., They should state how many hours and what rate.)
  - Develop a form for proposal submission and require that applicants use the form. This will ensure consistency of information across all proposals and make proposals easier to evaluate by the committee. Ensure that the general evaluation criteria are covered in the form.
  - Applicants must pay specific attention to assessment of their projects. A follow-up report will be required of all awardees at the end of the academic year.

- Announcements about the mini-grant availability will be made during August planning sessions. The tentative deadline for proposal submission is November 1. Grantees may start work during the spring semester if they wish.
4. TLT Roundtable planning. The committee served as the initial steering committee for the establishment of a Teaching and Learning with Technology Roundtable (TLTR) next fall. See <http://www.tltgroup.org/programs/TLTR/home.htm>. The committee determined the following:
    - The TLT Roundtable should be an advisory body to the Dean.
    - Mike Albright should be one co-chair of the TLTR. Several names were proposed for the faculty co-chair of the Roundtable. These individuals will be contacted. It is expected that the faculty co-chair will facilitate most of the meetings, while Mike will perform a support role – booking facilities, promoting events, coordinating guest speakers, etc. It is very important to establish faculty “ownership” of the TLTR.
    - The biggest obstacle to having a successful TLTR will be time, finding a time that works for the most campus participants within their busy schedules.
    - Kevin and Mike will discuss with the Dean scheduling the first TLTR during August planning week. Thursday from 11-1, with brown-bag lunches, was suggested. Meeting times during the academic year will be determined at the first meeting.
    - The first TLTR meeting in the fall will be a discovery and planning meeting, to identify what it is that we wish to accomplish with the TLTR and to set programming priorities.
  5. Making the committee “official”. It was noted that the Instructional Technology Committee was not included on the list of committees distributed to the faculty by Jerry Lockett last week. Obtaining official recognition will be a task for the committee in the fall.
  6. Thanks. Mike thanked all members of the committee for their service this year and asked those who cannot or would prefer not to remain on the committee to contact him privately.

## **Pros and Cons of Turnitin**

### **Pros**

1. Over one billion documents in database – from web, ProQuest, previously submitted papers.
2. Places emphasis on originality, not replication. Detects sections that are not original.
3. Does a good job of detecting word-for-word copying.
4. Acts as an effective deterrent to most students if they know their papers will be run through Turnitin.

### **Cons**

1. Ethical issue. Papers submitted for review are automatically added to the database, a violation of the intellectual property rights of student authors.
2. Detects every exact replication, including legitimate, properly cited quotes.
3. Doesn't detect paraphrases without attribution.
4. Doesn't detect an original paper commissioned by the student and written by someone else.
5. Doesn't include all papers ever written.
6. Can be seen as punitive against students who simply don't understand about copying from existing resources and don't know how to cite sources.

### **Alternatives**

1. Have students write papers in stages so that you can review drafts and require revisions.
2. Have students write papers in groups, with each contributing sections. (Doesn't work if the group buys a paper.)
3. Give students enough advanced warning that they have time to do the research and complete the assignment. (Probably won't deter procrastinators.)
4. Make guidelines for paper submissions so specific that it is difficult to purchase a paper that meets the requirements.
5. Require students to run their own papers through Turnitin and submit an "all clear" report with the assignment.