

This is a pre-print version of the Timothy R. Amidon, Les Hutchinson, TyAnna Herrington, and Jessica Reyman webtext “Copyright, Content, and Control: Student Authorship Across Educational Technology Platforms,” published in *Kairos: Rhetoric, Technology, Pedagogy* (24.1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/24.1/topoi/amidon-et-al/canvas.html>

00:01 [IP Casts music, a soft harmonic resonance, builds to a crescendo]

00:06 Jessica: You’re listening to IP Casts.

00:13 [IP Casts music fades out]

00:14 Tim: I really think that’s significant about LMS isn’t just that...I think we like to see them often as shells that are course or institutionally maintained, but they’re really gateways that utilize learning tools inter-operability standards to allow other platforms to, then, play in those systems. So you can customize institution-to-institution what tools, you know, you decide that you want to plug in, and even sometimes it’s at a programmatic level. You know, there’s not a lot of oversight, I would suspect at certain campuses. If you are somebody who has been on that campus for a while and you have some reputation, you say, “I want to use this tool.” You know, IT is gonna support that integration into the platform. And so I would be concerned about what it means to participate, thinking you’re participating on a platform that’s educationally-based...you know, do you think people are really aware when they enter these learning management systems whether it’s Canvas or Blackboard or D2L that they might be participating in platforms that are for profit or that are owned, you know, by Google or Macmillan or Pearson, you know, or education-for-profit publishers. That their information might be flowing downstream in those ways.

01:34 Jessica: Yeah, I mean, I think instructors who adopt them think of them—many instructors—think of them as just as innocuous tools for, I mean, we talked about efficiency before, more containers or communication tools that aren’t necessarily thinking about those types of agreements that have been made between the tool provider, the LMS provider and third parties. And that’s what’s really some of that behind-the-scenes work. You know, you might see that there’s a new functionality within your learning management system, maybe something that helps you to accomplish a task that you could use some help with and you think, “Great, I’ll work that into my course.” But you’re not realizing that that’s another access point to student data, to student intellectual property. And you’re, by way of using that tool, agreeing to give up that work. And, again, this is another example of ways that we devalue our own students’ intellectual property and information by willingly giving that up.

02:42 Tim: Mmhmm

02:43 Jessica: And so that’s another example of that that devaluing, I think.

02:47 Les: I agree. And I think this goes back to our conversation about PDSs as well and talking about also from the instructor perspective is often times, again, I was a TA. I didn’t have a choice whether we used Desire2Learn or not. That is our platform where we do that work. And so, and we were trained: “This is how you do these assignments in there.” Without any sort of

conversation and TA training about whether or not this was going to impact student authorship, which is, of course, something we all care about. So it becomes, you know, who even has the power to say anything about this...

03:23 Tim: Hmmm...

03:24 Les: or know what sort of authorship complications are going to occur in the use of them.

03:32 Tim: The bigger implication of Vanderhye isn't necessarily, you know, in terms of student authorship even though we think a lot about it, but more about the fact that once we give people access through these gateways to content, whether it's a plagiarism detection service or a learning management service. You know, it doesn't matter what the platform type is, but once those tools have access to content—inputs that are generated—intellectual property inputs generated in schools, that they can do transformative things with them. And if it's a new thing, courts are gonna likely find it to be of fair use. So it creates potentials for innovation that maybe we don't have access to as makers.

04:19 Jessica: That's important to consider on several different levels because the way that students' intellectual property and data gets released is through different trust relationships. And so, you know, on one level, students participate in a learning management system and an instructor is gathering information about different pages they visited and how long they've spent on each page. And the student doesn't realize that all of that is viewable, but they...but there's been a system set up where the instructor can have access to that information because there's trust built between student and instructor in that, at that institution. And then, again, as Les was talking about, there's trust between instructors and administrators, if their instructors are asked to use or required to use a certain system, they do. They trust that the institution has selected this after some kind of careful deliberation and is presenting an ethical tool. But it becomes problematic when you're reaching outside of an educational environment between student and teacher and instructor and administrator to third parties. Cause that relationship simply isn't there. There is no, there's no checkpoint there to ensure that third party has the students' best interest in mind—that they are going to use data in ways that benefit the students and aren't just self-serving. And I think that's a distinction that, in my mind, is pretty important. Whether the data is collected and used to support student learning or whether it's being collected and used to serve the profit of a third party.

05:57 Tim: I think a lot of us just trust the institution is making good choices about these things. Are you all familiar with the Piazza case? It was being integrated into learning management systems across the nation. I think there was an issue at Georgia Tech in particular. They're one of the universities that had pushed back against this where Ty was. One of the things that I think was really astounding was that there was this "click-wrap agreement." The platform Piazza was bragging that they had ninety-nine percent opt-in rates, right? That, you know, ninety percent, ninety-nine percent of students that used their tool were opting into this data-sharing thing, which was called Piazza-for-business. You know, so essentially there was like one version that was for the LMS kind of to do the learning tool, and then there was another analytics side that said, "Hey, by participating in this, you can send your data to these corporations and they can do these things." So they were using those tools to find out things about students that maybe they

might want to hire or not hire. Right? So, that, you know, how many students are aware, and maybe even administrators and educators that are making decisions like, “Oh, I heard that there’s great things about these tools.” You know, and I’ve heard that from colleagues on this campus that like, “Hey, I’m having great outcomes with this tool and it’s helping me do things pedagogically that are helping students really succeed.” But then, you know, they found out afterwards that the company was doing it and they were like, “How do I negotiate this now?” Right? There’s this tension between “I really wanna use this cause it’s helping me, like, really support students as learners, but also there’s some sharing that’s really...I’m not okay with. So either I go back to, like, having less success with students or I compromise some things...”

07:36-07:49 [IP Casts music, a soft harmonic resonance, builds to a crescendo, then begins to fade out]