

**University of Washington  
Faculty Council on Educational Technology**

The Faculty Council on Educational Technology met Thursday, November 18, at 10:00 a.m., in 36 Gerberding. The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

**Synopsis:**

1. Approve agenda, announcements, minutes
2. Old Business
  - Status on pilot study / subcommittee for automated plagiarism check.*
  - Status of report to Faculty Senate*
  - Revisit and revise our 'core priorities' (see reverse).*
3. New Business - Performance contract w/ legislature – orientation and discussion.

**Approve agenda, announcements, minutes**

The agenda was approved, with the addition of the issue of the installation of wi-fi on the Seattle campus under New Business. The minutes were approved.

Co-chair David Kirschtel announced he has accepted another position and will be leaving the University in mid-December. The council may want to consider designating a new co-chair, since Kirschtel feels the "troika" approach has worked well so far. Co-chair Kalpana Kanal told council members that she has agreed to attend both SEC and Senate meetings in Kirschtel's place.

Kirschtel reported that the co-chairs would like to re-task the council so that it is more service-oriented. Priorities would be to bring Ed Tech items to the attention of the Faculty Senate, investigate Ed Tech issues, and take on small projects with subcommittees rather than one big project that involves the entire committee. He asked council members to consider closing last year's agenda item that called for a comprehensive report to the Faculty Senate on Ed Tech, since the project was so far-reaching that it has been beyond the scope of the council.

Co-chair James Kitts told the council that the co-chairs have devised a system they call "movers and shakers," which requires that anyone who has a deep interest in a particular issue and brings it before the council will take leadership in a task group and prepare a document that can be acted upon by the council as a whole. This should enable the council to be better informed and take more decisive action, and will help to ensure that only those items to which there is genuine commitment come before the council.

Kay Pilcher announced an ethics seminar today at 3:30 by highly regarded ethics professor (name) McCabe. She can't go, but perhaps someone could go and report back. Cara Lane said she may be able to do this.

Arnold Berger announced that he proposed the pilot program for TurnItIn.com (automated plagiarism checking) to the chairs of the Academics Committee at the Bothell campus, but no one was interested in adopting it. They felt plagiarism is not a problem at Bothell, and that all the problem is at the Seattle campus. Berger also said he has completed work on his Worthington grant project that involved taping Ed Tech experts, and found it to be a very worthwhile project. Anyone can do this for any course, it's relatively simple to do, and most people he contacted are very accepting of the idea.

Shawn Brixey told the council about a project his students are beginning in partnership with Apple Computer. They are sending IChat AV cameras in Fed Ex boxes to global locations where great intellectuals are lecturing and are collecting the lectures in real time. This creates an archive of priceless information at a low cost, since they can send the laptops at a much lower cost than that of sending a human being to the conferences. The project will begin after the first of the year.

Kitts thanked everyone for their announcements – anyone who wants to work forward to a proposal may turn an announcement into a proposal. He also said he has set up a new Website that FCET members can use for discussion. He asked for volunteers to maintain the site, and will also ask Tom Lewis about possibly maintaining the site.

### **Old Business**

**Automated plagiarism check** – Discussion at the last meeting revealed this as a subject of great interest to the council, with the possibility of creating a Web page for discussion. Kitts asked for volunteers for a subcommittee. Berger, Brixey, Gravlee Lane, and Lewis will serve, and will invite Kaminsky.

**Proposed report to the Faculty Senate** – After a brief discussion, it was agreed that this project, which carried over from many discussions last year, was too big and was not well-defined. Many interesting ideas were generated, but the project (which would have resulted in a Best Practices document) never got beyond the idea stage. However, Lane (PETTT) has collected some of the ideas that were generated and believes she can use them in PETTT workshops. She would like any to have any other documents that were generated, so the information is not lost. It was moved, seconded and unanimously passed to close the project and turn over all existing document to Lane. Lane suggested that the resulting PETTT workshops could be advised to SEC and to the Faculty Senate, with acknowledgement of FCET's involvement.

**Core Priorities, revisit and revise** – Kitts drew the council's attention to the FCET core priorities written by Kimberlee Gillis-Bridges last year:

#### **FCET's core priorities as summarized in the Faculty Senate document (September 29, 2004):**

- Ensuring that faculty who currently use educational technology have access to the classrooms and equipment they need
- Discussing methods for adequately training and supporting faculty who want to integrate technology into their courses
- Developing ways to create incentives for faculty who use educational technology
- Assessing the impact of educational technology on teaching and learning
- Publicizing successful educational technology use

Kitts asked whether the council wants to use these priorities or revise them. Discussion revealed that the document should be revised, especially on the following points:

- Assessing the impact of Ed Tech on teaching and learning is too broad and is out of the scope of FCET
- Publicizing Ed Tech use should be done by an administrative unit, not FCET

Nancy McMurrer and Kay Pilcher will form a working group to revise the document and present a draft at a future meeting.

### **New Business**

**Performance contract** – Kirschtel reported on the performance contract now being floated for discussion by faculty councils. In essence, this contract is an agreement between the legislature and the UW for more autonomy in money matters in return for agreement on a set of performance standards. Kirschtel recommended that FCET look at the document to determine whether there is anything that needs to be

communicated to SEC about it. FCET could send SEC a letter about the contract. Brixey commented that this is not a large or profound document, but it could have profound effects. He will serve on a subcommittee with Kirschtel and Pilcher to do a very pragmatic review and suggest any wording changes they think might be appropriate.

**Wi-Fi Issue** - Kirschtel reported an announcement at the SEC meeting that wi-fi will be installed at the UW and that a \$1.00 per telephone tax will be levied across campus to pay for wi-fi. This is an Ed Tech issue – should FCET chime in? What is the current status of the project, which appears to be going forward very quickly?

Berger said that wi-fi was installed at Bothell without consultation with the faculty and this has caused problems. With wi-fi, faculty have no idea whether students are taking notes, Web surfing, or cheating. There should be a discussion of whether to install wi-fi, not just how to fund it. Perhaps FCET could draft a letter to SEC, stating faculty concerns and recommending a code of conduct. Faculty should be made aware that there is a dark side to wi-fi, in the loss of classroom control.

Pilcher said she gets the TAC minutes and understands wi-fi will be installed over three years in common spaces only. She does not believe the issue of classroom wi-fi has come up. She will try to get more information. Perhaps FCET should have the TAC chair come and talk about critical issues, and write a letter to TAC about the issues FCET faculty members have with wi-fi.

Brixey anticipates a slash and burn strategy with department phones if the tax is instituted. This would be detrimental to his department, which uses many secure phone lines for data transmission. It is probably not possible to get this train stopped, but it may be possible to steer it.

Kirschtel sees this as a direct benefit to students that should be a direct student cost and not a telephone tax. Wi-fi has educational value, but is also a very large risk to classroom control.

Kitts proposed that FCET draft two letters, one on the funding issues and another on the policy issues. FCET should weigh in quickly on the funding issue, and should devote meeting time to making sure wi-fi is a sane implementation.

Kitts will invite the TAC chair to come to the next FCET meeting. Berger and Brixey will work together to draft a letter on some of the concerns raised by the installation of wi-fi.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:29 a.m. *Minutes by Linda Fullerton, Recorder.*

**Present:**

Professors: Berger, Brixey, Gravlee, Kanal, Kirschtel, Kitts  
Ex-Officio: McMurrer, Lane, Pilcher

**Absent:**

Professors: Kaminsky, Leggott, Rojas, Roth, Sinanan  
Ex-Officio: Albrecht, Lewis, Szatmary