

University of Washington
Faculty Council on Educational Technology
Monday, May 15, 2006
142 Gerberding Hall

Chair Kanal called the meeting to order at 9:32 a.m.

Meeting Synopsis:

1. Approve agenda
2. Approve minutes
3. Chair's announcements
4. Open announcements
5. Committee discussion of the following topics:
 - a. Turnitin presentation
 - b. Pros and cons of Turnitin software
 - c. Report to the faculty senate
6. New Business

1. The agenda was approved.
2. The April 17, 2006 meeting minutes were approved.
3. Chair's announcements:
 - The June meeting is the last of the year.
 - Kanal has a lecture downtown and cannot be present for the June 12th meeting. Kaminsky will serve as the Chair.
4. Open announcements: none.
5. Committee discussions:
 - a. Turnitin presentation.
 - The feedback to the Turnitin presentation (compiled by Kanal) is terrible. The committee needs to discuss the pros and cons of the product and determine if it is to be recommended to the faculty senate.
 - Berger is concerned that the quality of the presenter will distort the quality of the product. The presentation was not well-prepared, but the committee needs to recover from that and decide if the product should be recommended.
 - b. Pros and cons of Turnitin software.
 - Kaminsky points out that the question is how the university will handle the ethical implications associated with the implementation of a plagiarism check, rather than what company we choose.

- In Tweedie's opinion, the Turnitin software is most impressive in matching papers with those on the Web. The least impressive aspect of the software is the need to remove each individual paper from UW.
- Brixey met with the AG's office. The problem is on the IP side. Issues such as false positives can lead to students feeling besmirched and turn out to be a time bomb for the university. The software only points to a direction. UW is responsible for figuring it out. In contrast, FERPA can be fully argued in favor of using Turnitin. The question is how significantly the body of knowledge is transformed.
- Brixey points out that student output are the university's primary revenue stream. The idea that the university will pay to hand over our revenue stream is complicated. There is also concern that Turnitin may do demographics or other processes that sell data about the papers.
- In order to proceed, UW will have to work with the AG's office and Department of Education and set up a liaison with the Family Compliance Office. Strict guidelines will need to be set up before a pilot can be done.
- Brixey reports that the AG's office cannot recommend Turnitin because of IP issues. However, they are supportive of UW building a system of our own or forming a consortium to develop a product.
- Szatmary states that the tool is useful, but the value is having papers in a database. From a financial point of view, we are paying this company to use our student papers to make money. The administration will have the additional burden of getting waivers signed and keeping track of which students signed and which did not. Szatmary asks Lane if it would be possible for Catalyst to build a system to keep track of waivers. Lane states that it would be worth discussing.
- Brixey suggests asking Google to create a free process that all universities can use. Leggott further suggests looking at institutions that chose not to use Turnitin and forming a consortium to work with Google.

c. Report to faculty senate.

- Kaminsky proposes working with students. The successful implementation of any system will largely depend on the students.
- Kanal states that we should be looking at the cause of plagiarism and educating students on the issue from day one.
- Several members support the idea of educating students on proper citing. Kaminsky believes that it would be a preventative tool against plagiarism.
- Several members agree that education for both faculty and students will be an important first step and should be emphasized in the report.
- Comments from the AG's office will be verified and condensed by Brixey before being included in the report.
- The report will recommend a pilot with Turnitin with a number of reservations. At this point, the committee is not recommending the

purchase of Turnitin. Additional resources and expertise will be needed to further evaluate the product.

- Brixey states that we need to address future issues, such as the viability of the product in the face of more varied student output.
- To prepare for the report, the committee needs to concentrate on two tasks: 1.) investigate the possibility of working with Google to develop an anti-plagiarism tool, and 2.) put together an outline of the report to discuss at the next meeting (Kanal will put the outline together and solicit comments from the committee).

6. New business: none.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:02 a.m. *Minutes by Shannon Tang, Administrative Assistant, University of Washington Educational Outreach.*

Present:

Faculty members: Berger, Brixey, Kaminsky, Kanal, Leggott, Tweedie

President's designee: Szatmary

Ex officio members: Lane, Mart, Ward

Absent: Spielberg, Miller, Conroy, Gravlee, Morton, Shaw, Campbell, Corbett, Lewis