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Charge
The Computing Resources Committee reviews and recommends policy concerning technology as used by faculty in instruction, research, and service on campus and off-campus. It assists in planning and advocating for the necessary technology to maximize student learning and enhance faculty research and service activities to OSU and the wider community. It acts to advise other committees and Information Services as well as providing leadership in adoption and effective use of computing for instruction, research, and service. The Committee shall consist of six Faculty, at least four of whom must be Teaching Faculty, and two Students, and the following ex-officio, non-voting members: the Vice Provost for Information Services or a designated representative, and a representative from Technology Across the Curriculum (TAC). The Vice Provost for Information Services may recommend a resource person from Information Services as another ex-officio, non-voting member. The CRC chair serves as an ex-officio member of the Information Technology Coordinating Committee (ITCC). The committee met a minimum of once per month. (4/12)

Membership
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stefanie Buck, Co-Chair '13</th>
<th>OSU Libraries</th>
<th>The Chair of the CRC also acts as liaison to the ITCC.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stuart Sarbacker, Co-Chair '14</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Reff '14</td>
<td>Student Health Services</td>
<td>CRC representative to the Google mail and apps committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Flint '15</td>
<td>Registrar’s office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victor Hsu '15</td>
<td>Biochemistry</td>
<td>CRC representative to the classroom committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Nafshun '13</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>CRC representative to the Blackboard Operations Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Brooks</td>
<td>Vice Provost for Information Services, Ex-Officio</td>
<td>David Barber is her official representative when Lois is unavailable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Dorbolo, Technology Across the Curriculum</td>
<td>Information Services, Ex-Officio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We did not have a student representative this year. A student was recruited but failed to attend all but the first two meetings.

Action Items/Highlights

1. SafeAssign Plagiarism Prevention Tool in Blackboard
The Blackboard Operations Committee, headed by Lynn Greenough (TAC), asked for our input regarding the implementation of SafeAssign, the plagiarism prevention tool that is a part of the Blackboard LMS. Lynn Greenough demonstrated the tool to the
committee and informed us about the process that led to turning on SafeAssign in Blackboard. The CRC had a number of conversations on SafeAssign and the implications for instruction. Other guests who came to the meetings on SafeAssign included Dan Schwab from Student Conduct, Raphelle Rhoads and Sophie Wilson from College Student Services Administration and Jon Dorbolo from Technology Across the Curriculum (TAC). One of the main concerns expressed by the CRC is that this tool not be used for punishment but for prevention. The CRC highly encourages faculty to allow students to use the “draft mode” which allows students to check their work for potential issues and correct these before submitting the paper. TAC is providing the training materials and webinars to help train faculty on using SafeAssign which was made available at the end of the winter term, but will most likely be used starting in the fall. The CRC also highly recommended that the syllabus in a course using SafeAssign include a statement about the use of SafeAssign in the class and the consequences of plagiarism. The recommendation was sent to Bill Bogley and the Curriculum Council, but the Council expressed concern about the length of the course syllabi already. The CRC highly recommends that such a statement be added to any course using SafeAssign. The other significant issue about SafeAssign brought up by members of the CRC is the database to which the students’ papers are uploaded. The CRC raised concerns about student privacy and intellectual property. Lynn Greenough, Jon Dorbolo and Stefanie Buck (Co-chair) presented SafeAssign to the faculty senate executive committee and presented it to the faculty senate.

2. Photo Roster App
In 2012, Jon Dorbolo discussed with the CRC the creation of a photo roster app. In the current photo roster system, students are opted out until they opt in. CRC provided significant input into discussion/conversation. The members of the CRC expressed considerable interest in their project and its implications for the quality for teaching. Concerns raised included the privacy and safety of the students, potential issues of discrimination (faculty judging student by their picture), and where the app would reside (who would take responsibility and maintain it) after it is developed. Some of these issues, such ownership, have not been resolved, but the ASOSU has approved the project and the registrar indicated that this is FERPA complaint, a concern expressed by CRC members. The CRC recommended that there be policies (safety, discrimination) and training available to faculty who decide to use the tool. The CRC may be able to make suggestions for new features once the tool is implemented. The question of whether the current system is going away or how it may change is not yet resolved. The app also needs to address campus-wide app standards and accessibility.

In 2013, Jon indicated to CRC that he had applied for a TRF grant to support development of an app, and would present in fall 2013 on the success of the project and the next steps.

3. LMS Review Process
Lois Brooks invited members of the CRC to participate in the preliminary presentations by four different LMS vendors in the spring quarter. Cheryl Middleton and Dianna Fischer, co-chairs of the committee, briefed the CRC on the purpose of the LMS review process. The CRC drafted a list of questions to take to the presentation and which can be used in fall 2013 during the RFP process. Issues that the CRC feels are important are ease of migration, support, integration with other third party tools, student data security, and how well the vendor keeps up with changes in technology. They also wanted to know what the benefits are to moving to a new platform as opposed to staying with the current platform and the pros and cons of using an open-source product. These are issues which will be revisited in the fall during the RFP process.

4. Move to Gmail and Google Apps
Lois Brooks provided regular updates to the CRC regarding the move from ONID email to Gmail for OSU students and the acquisition of Google apps for campus-wide use. Lucas Turpin attended a CRC meeting to discuss the move and implications for faculty and students. The CRC members noted that Microsoft products are still superior in terms of functionality to Google Apps and Google Docs may not work for all classroom applications. They also noted that transferring documents between the two systems is buggy. The CRC may be able to assist in assessment of these tools in the classroom once they have been in place for a while.

5. Other
- The CRC received regular updates on the classroom committee
- Yousef Qassim (TAC) updated the CRC on the new clicker technology
- Lois Brooks presented the IT strategic plan to the CRC
- David Barber provided regular TRF updates

Recommended Action Items for 2013-2014
- Partner with TAC on assessing the effectiveness and use of SafeAssign at the end of the fall term and/or the end of the academic year 2014.
- Partner with the TRF committee to host a showcase of submitted TRF proposals for that year and successful TRF proposals from past years to spur an interest in TRF. The CRC could also host a forum for future and successful TRF awardees to discuss the process and also to connect like proposals to each other.
- Continued involvement in the LMS RFP process. This is potentially a very significant change for the campus and all members of the CRC should participate in the process as much as possible.
- Discussions on cloud services and the benefits to the OSU community.
- Technology budget and how funds are distributed (e.g., computer labs). There are many questions about how many labs and types of labs are supported by the campus and TRF. Maintenance is taking up more of the TRF funding and less on innovative development. CRC needs to evaluate how faculty members are using labs.
- Discussion on the potential move of faculty email accounts to Gmail and implications for instruction.