University of Washington
Faculty Council on Educational Technology
October 13, 2008
36 Gerberding Hall

Chair Kaminsky called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. and welcomed new and returning members to the Faculty Council on Educational Technology (FCET).

Meeting Synopsis

1. Introduction of new and old members.
2. Approve agenda.
3. Approve minutes from June 11, 2008, meeting.
4. Chair's announcements:
5. Open announcements.
6. Old business:
   a. Webcams and legal background.
   b. Questionnaire on plagiarism tools.
   c. Data retention.
7. News from CATALYST, libraries.
8. New business:
   a. Volunteers for FCET website.
   b. Date of next meeting.

1.   Introduction of new and old members.

Introductions were made around the table. A motion was made, seconded and approved to include *ex officio* members as voting members of FCET.

2.   Approve agenda.

The agenda was approved.

3.   Approve minutes from the June 11, 2008, meeting.

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

4.   Chair's announcements.

Overview.
Chair Kaminsky distributed copies of the FCET Annual Report for the 2007-08 academic year, including attachments illustrating the poster on plagiarism presented at the fourth annual teaching and learning symposium of the University of Washington and a Class C resolution concerning live webcams on UW campuses. For the benefit of new members, Chair Kaminsky explained that each year, Council Chairs are required to submit annual reports of their Councils' activities.

He also explained that issues considered by FCET come from many sources, including Faculty Senate leadership, representatives from Catalyst, and various invited guests. One issue FCET will be following this year is funding for educational equipment. This issue was raised last year by a guest, Roberta Hopkins, Director of Classroom Support Services. She appealed for faculty support because even in relatively good economic times, it is difficult to compete with all the other priorities in a major research institution for such basic concerns. FCET will work on drafting a resolution that expresses faculty support for upgrading our classrooms to at least be on a par with classrooms in many of our public elementary and high schools.

Other issues (that will be discussed in detail later on the agenda) include plagiarism and data retention. With regard to the data retention issue Stephanie Andrews suggested that she could facilitate the invitation of a guest who could address data retention of new form of theses being produced within the humanities. Kaminsky agreed that would be helpful, and encouraged any member with connections to those having expertise related to the issues under consideration to contact him with names and phone numbers so that he can line up guests for up-coming meetings.

SEC meeting.
Chair Kaminsky also explained the function of the Senate Executive Committee, and the process for introducing Class C resolutions for possible consideration of the Faculty Senate. The Webcam resolution had come before the SEC earlier this month and had been sent back to FCET for further consideration because of several questions – most of them pertaining to legal issues – that were raised during discussion at that meeting.

5. Open Announcements.

GPSS representative Jon Deshazo reported that GPSS would like more detailed information about the activities of the Council and about how GPSS might be able to support the work of the Council. Council members were encouraged to contact Deshazo with ideas.

6. Old Business.

Webcams and legal background:
As noted under the Chair's Announcements above, the FCET resolution regarding Webcams was returned to the FCET for further consideration. Senate Executive Committee concerns centered on issues of legal responsibility for maintaining a webcam in public. Federal law concerning photography is fairly broad in that it allows anyone to take a photo of anyone or anything in a public space. State law narrows the field in some cases to stipulate that the camera cannot be concealed and that the photographer must be clearly visible. Defining what is public vs. private space seems to be the issue. FCET must redraft the resolution so that what is legally permissible is clearly defined, and it needs to be made consistent with all rules regarding photography.

The Chair proposed re-drafting the resolution and sending it via e-mail to all Council members for review and comment. Once the Council is satisfied that the redrafting answers the questions raised, the Chair will forward the document to the office of the Attorney General and the Advisory Committee for Faculty Code and Regulation for further review. Given this plan, it will be at least two more FCET meetings before the resolution is re-submitted to the SEC.

Issues and questions raised in Council discussion included whether what's recorded on webcams can be used as evidence in court (it is assumed that it can), and whether the Council had looked at webcam policies at other Universities (this being a fairly new field, the Chair had been unable to locate anything helpful on the web).

Questionnaire on plagiarism tools.
In order to provide background to new members, Chair Kaminsky explained that four years ago a faculty member brought the issue of plagiarism to the Council's attention. There's a diversity of opinion on campus as to whether plagiarism is really an issue on campus, and, if so, how it should be dealt with. The Chair's contention is that the problem is growing despite efforts to identify and punish those who plagiarize. The Council's approach (which it hopes to forward to the SEC as a recommendation to be considered by the Senate) is to employ one of the new plagiarism tools available on the web. These can be made available to students. One element of these tools is providing written "verification" that a writing assignment has been successfully screened. Professor can require that students submit verifications along with writing assignments, but they would not be encouraged to use the tools themselves to make a case of plagiarism against their students. David Masuda will be debriefing the Council at one of the next few meetings about the results of his testing of one of these tools over the summer. Ultimately, the Council might ask FCIQ and FCUL to join in the resolution to give it more strength.

A suggestions was made (and accepted) to invite Gus Kravas, Special Assistant, Office of the Provost, to talk to the Council about how the use of these tools might relate to the work that he does with students who have been caught plagiarizing in their school work.

Before drafting this resolution the Council needs to collect more evidence to strengthen its case. Kaminsky requested that Council members review the Citation Checking Tools Feedback form and make any suggestions for changes that would provide the Council with better information.

Data Retention.
The Council must decide how best to approach this issue (who has the right to store information, in what format, and with access to whom) and develop a goal that makes sense, given the purview of the Council. Anjanette Young will work with the Office of Information Management, and perhaps with the Records Retention Office, to find staff members who can address the Council about how those operations relate, as well as how those operations affect the faculty.

7.   News from Catalyst.

Tom Lewis briefed the Council on developments with Common View and the first version of the on-line grade book. Catalyst is working with the Office of Information Management to explore how class lists might be posted on the web, rather than the current system, which is not working well. Lewis anticipates that this "fix" might be up and running by Winter quarter. In addition, the information in the grade book will be downloadable to an Excel spreadsheet.

Lewis has gathered information related to the Scholarly Technology Survey and could be ready in November to present a report of his findings to the Council. The report will be published in January.

He could also distribute a preliminary report of results of a survey distributed by the E-Science Institute (Ed Lazowska's Group) to a group of principal investigators with questions about research and technology needs, including data retention.

Finally, Lewis mentioned two possible opportunities for FCET input. The first would be to help guide efforts to re-evaluate the role and function of UW Technology. There is currently no overarching advisory group that oversees the current efforts, and FCET might be part of such a group. The second would be to advise the University on very preliminary proposals from Google and Microsoft to provide the University with free e-mail. This is currently under review for legal ramifications and for possible ways it might be integrated with Catalyst and other University systems.

8.   New Business.

Volunteers for FCET website.
Council members were asked to contact Kaminsky if they are interested in volunteering for the FCET website.

Date of next meeting.
Council members were asked to e-mail Kaminsky with times they can meet during the second week of November.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.
Minutes by Susan Folk, Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty.
slfolk@u.washington.edu

Present: ***Faculty members:*** Andrews, Hudson, Kaminsky, Martin-Morris, Moskal,
                Seidler
                Ex-officio members: Young, Deshazo

Guests: Lewis

Absent: *Faculty members:* Efthimiadis, Hollmann, Masuda, Merati
President's Designee: Moy
Ex-officio members: Maring, Minton
Guests: Lane