

LMIS minutes, December 06, 2013

Present: Jane Carlin, Denise Despres, Amy Fisher, Martin Jackson, Emily Menk, William Morse, Cindy Riche, Bryan Smith, John Wesley

Despres convened the meeting at 3 pm. The minutes from November 22, 2013 were approved.

We began by taking up Charges #9 and #10: Collaborate with the PSC to assess the viability of using electronically-administered Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms, and Work with PSC to assess the viability of a process for electronic submission of faculty evaluation files. Despres announced she had consulted with the Professional Standards Committee and it is the PSC who are charged to “assess the viability” in Charges #9 and #10. If these are deemed viable, LMIS is now charged with addressing implementation. Riche noted that she had already been consulted on using Moodle for faculty evaluations but that significant programming by IT would be necessary to have Moodle meet anonymity and other requirements. She also noted we are in contact with some schools that have implemented Moodle in this fashion. Both Riche and Morse noted that pilot programs are not obvious first steps since they essentially require developing the full infrastructure. Morse reminded us that policy should be decided first, followed by a determination of specific needs/requirements, and then beginning actual implementation.

The discussion then turned to Charge #13: Recommend ways to educate the faculty about TurnItIn and devise methods for facilitating faculty use.” Riche led off with some data. So far, 52 instructors and 1129 students have used TurnItIn . There have been 2000 submissions with 260 of those making use of Grade Mark and 88 being graded on-line. Of the 2000 submissions, TurnItIn generate 93 alarms but 87 of those were associated with a science lab where it is plausible that there would be many common phrases used by the students. Carlin asked if the data could be filtered by department and Riche is looking into it. Carlin also noted there are broader issues associated with plagiarism that LMIS can address while looking at TurnItIn. The following discussion addressed: why are faculty being encouraged to use TurnItIn (because it is paid for), why use it if faculty have personalized methods for ensuring similar papers cannot be found on-line or for recognizing individual student's writing “signatures” (yet, without also using TurnItIn we don't know if that process is successful), and are there other useful ways to use it (it can be the backbone of an in-class lesson on plagiarism).

The committee agreed that workshops, perhaps during the semester and at Faculty Orientation, would be a good way to increase faculty awareness of TurnItIn and its capabilities. This would give faculty hands-on experience, provide a venue for highlighting current user's methods of practice, and illustrate how TurnItIn can be used to give students a more precise understanding of what is and is not plagiarism. It would also be a good topic for a Wednesday at 4:00 discussion. Riche volunteered to meet with Carlin and Lori Ricigliano about getting workshops on appropriate agendas.

The committee then took up Charge #1: Provide input and guidance to the Library during implementation of the new integrated library system. (ILS). Carlin reported that planning is in progress and implementation will ramp up in January. In February, she will submit a general plan for the June roll-out. She noted the system will look very different from our current catalogs but, before Summer, there are plans for training sessions, published lists of questions and recommendations, and branding of the system. She mentioned several pluses for changing to the new system: a single search accesses all of the catalogs and journals, better sharing of data with our peer institutions, significant improvements, like better ordering processes, on the back end, and the library will not need its own server. The first cohort of schools rolled out this last June (except for UW) and their conversions to the new system are going well. Depres wondered if the faculty would need help in making the conversion and Carlin said yes, but the reports from the first cohort indicate it is not bad. We can view an existing implementation at Willamette (<http://library.willamette.edu/>). They have exactly the same site design except for naming which is decided by the individual schools.

The next topic discussed was Charge #8: “Collaborate with the Library to develop a prominent display for recent faculty scholarship in the library (or other campus venues).” Carlin outlined the current process which includes digital screens, which are updated each semester, to showcase faculty authors. There is also physical display of faculty works and the Faculty Scholarship publication is displayed at the front of the library. The Library purchases new faculty publications as soon as they find out about them but not all faculty or departments routinely share that information. In addition, the physical displays are not adequate for highlighting “the diversity of faculty achievements such as electronic publications, art exhibitions, performances, and other digital/media related academic achievements.” This last has been partially addressed by having links to new materials in Sound Ideas Suggestions from the ensuing discussion include: rethink the display locations, have a monthly spotlight highlighting recent works, announce the displays on the new University website with a link to the actual work, find a way to obtain a complete list of items in a timely fashion, invite faculty to talk about their work – perhaps with a radio show, share pertinent department links, perhaps on a rotating basis, on the University website and look into having a systematic collection of Curricula Vitae. At the end of the discussion, Carlin volunteered to write up what is already being done to help LMIS share it with the faculty.

Official business finished with a brief discussion of Charge #11: “Assess the possibility of eliminating due dates for non-Summit materials checked out to faculty.” The committee quickly agreed to recommend that this elimination not be done as it would exacerbate the significant problem of faculty keeping Library holdings in their offices for long periods of time. When asked by Fisher if there is a recall system in place, Carlin responded that it might be possible with the new Integrated Library System.

Depres adjourned the meeting at 4:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Bryan Smith