Turnitin Faculty Feedback Survey Results

(Fall 2009 Compared to Spring 2009)

(8 responses vs. 10 responses)

| Question | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Have you used TurnItIn before this pilot? | <u>38% yes; 63% no</u> | | | | | |
| | 10% yes; 90% no | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 2. Have you used SafeAssign before this pilot? | 25% yes; 75% no | | | | | |
| | 0% yes; 100% no | | | | | |
| 3. Have you used any other type of plagiarism | <u>100% no</u> | | | | | |
| detection software before this pilot? | 100% no | | | | | |
| 4. How long to set up class(es) and | <u>57% >1 hr; 43% <1 hr</u> | | | | | |
| assignments? | 56% >1 hr; 33% 1 hr; 11% <1 hr | | | | | |
| 5. Time needed to introduce students to | <u>100% >30 minutes</u> | | | | | |
| TurnItIn. | 67% >30 min; 22% 30-45 min; 11% 1 hr | | | | | |
| 6. Was the amount of time to set up/introduce | <u>88% yes; 13% no</u> | | | | | |
| TurnItIn acceptable? | 100 yes | | | | | |
| 7. How many papers per student did you | 14% 2 times; 43% 3-5 times; 43% more than | | | | | |
| submit to TurnItIn database? | <u>5 times</u> | | | | | |
| | 56% 1-2 times; 33% 3-5 times; 11% 6-10 times | | | | | |
| 8. Did you allow students to submit papers | <u>50% yes; 50% no</u> | | | | | |
| themselves to TurnItIn before turning them | 90% yes; 10% no | | | | | |
| in for instructor to access? | | | | | | |
| 9. Did you submit papers from all students or | <u>100% all papers</u> | | | | | |
| only those you viewed as suspicious? | 100% all papers | | | | | |
| 10. Did you provide your students with copies of | 38% yes; 63% no | | | | | |
| the originality report? | 80% yes; 20% no | | | | | |
| 11. Was TurnItIn a valuable tool in your | 88% yes; 13% no | | | | | |
| classroom? | 90% yes; 10% no | | | | | |

General comments:

- The process of writing assignments and distributing them to reviewers was a little tedious. I gave weekly assignments throughout the semester and had to re-input the instructions each week. And there were restrictions about the timing of making reviewer distributions relative to summary receipt that made it impossible to set everything up at the beginning of the semester. It would also be nice to have a way of seeing the assignments as the students will see them before it begins. Rebecca Kellum, Biology
- I think Turnitin is an extremely important tool. The idea of comparing students' work against the whole internet, scholarly databases, the turned-in work of other students (worldwide!), as well as other sources is just brilliant, and goes FAR beyond the ability of an individual instructor to detect plagiarism the old-fashioned way. Using Turnitin gives me confidence that my students are doing original work. It has helped me catch plagiarism before (at my previous institution) that I would never have caught otherwise. I very much hope that UK will continue to make it available! —Diane King, Anthropology
- I've found the program to be an excellent tool. In my opinion the most valuable points are its use for organizing assignments for classes where multiple papers are submitted, it's capacity to discourage plagiarism from the

outset, it saves paper, and it provides a secure and consistent system for papers to be turned in. I have also been more apt to increase the content of comments and feedback to students with the Grademark system. –Aaron Godlaski, Psychology

- This was a great program for my course since my course was a literature course. In past semesters I have had a problem with students copying their book reviews directly from Internet sources (verbatim.) Having the students submit their work through Turnitin and subjecting it to the originality report was a big deterrent to students who might be tempted to do this. I found it to be a great program, easy to use, and I liked being able to create a database for comments and making rubrics. I would like to use it again. —Susan McHugh, Library Sciences
- I have been extremely pleased with using TurnItIn (TII) this term. At first I was worried that it might prove difficult for the student to properly submit work, for graders to use the tools, or that using TII through Blackboard would be difficult. However, my concerns were unfounded and it all went very well. The ability to check for student plagiarism or "sharing" each other's work was so easy. When one has TAs reading only some of the papers from a class, it would be possible for one paper to be submitted by each of two students and be read by two TAs without knowing there was only one original paper and not two. The ability of the program to check the internet for material that may have been cited without attribution was also helpful. The reduction in the amount of paper handling necessary was very valuable. I didn't have to worry about losing papers or having a staple come undone and losing part of a paper. There were no problems with--gee my ink ran out, I forgot my paper on my desk, or whatever the equivalent of my dog ate it excuse a student may have offered. I also really liked the Grademark function for the TAs to make notes on the paper for the student and me to see. In particular, this allowed me to make any further comments on a student paper before the paper was returned, or rather revealed to the student. I would really like to use this program again to try the rubric grading function as well. I would strongly recommend that UK continue to make TII available for us to use. It makes the whole process of having a student do written work so much less burdensome. I did not use the peer review process so I cannot comment. I really, really, really liked using Turn It In. The TAs and I could spend more time reading and commenting on student work without having to deal with all that paper collection, handling, and returning. Scores were placed simultaneously on the paper and in the Blackboard grade sheet without transcription errors. I could easily see any work sharing by students as well as any use of internet sources that were not cited properly. The TAs did not have to confer to check for two papers with verbatim answers. The interface with Blackboard was also very easy to use. ... some feedback from a student...he really liked being able to see the results of the similarity checking. – Ann Eike, **Economics**
- I have been requiring a paper or long research memo in each of my upper-level classes for some time. Since the inception of the internet and the creation of these free essay websites, I have wrestled with how to ensure that students do at least a modicum of research and work themselves. One thing I do that is easy to implement and actually seems to improve the quality of students' papers is to require them to make a copy of and attach as an appendix every source they use in writing their paper. I emphasize up front that I look through their sources and assess the quantity and quality of their research effort before I start reading their paper. I know that I still get a lot of cutting and pasting from websites, and I'm sure that every now and then a motivated (unmotivated?) student acquires an entire paper along with its references, makes copies of the references, and turns in a package that is not their own work. But this approach does significantly raise the cost of cheating, but doesn't really increase the cost to other students of writing an original research paper. And it requires almost no extra work on my part. Frank A. Scott, Jr., Gatton, Economics
- I do think the plagiarism feature was helpful in terms of teaching students about plagiarism. The visual image of highlighted text goes a long way in terms of getting this across, I think. —Jessica Hollis, English

| • | Turnitin was used as a self-assessment tool for the students; not to police student papers. In this regard I feel Turnitin served as a useful learning tool (and potentially as a deterrent). –Richard Eitel, Chemical and Materials Engineering |
|---|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Turnitin Statistics
University of Kentucky Pilot, Account # 53051
January 1, 2009 through April 15, 2010
Data by Academic Term

| | | | | Originality | Similarity Index (% of paper with unoriginal text) | | | | Peer | | Graded | |
|--|---------|----------|-------------|-------------|--|--------|--------|-------|------|---------|------------|--------|
| Period | Faculty | Students | Submissions | | red | orange | yellow | green | blue | Reviews | GradeMarks | Papers |
| Spring 09 (Jan to May) | 31 | 323 | 1927 | 1434 | 49 | 9 | 156 | 1063 | 157 | 482 | 159 | 189 |
| Fall 09 (Aug to Dec) | 84 | 712 | 2208 | 1817 | 6 | 17 | 213 | 1223 | 358 | 335 | 26 | 29 |
| Spring 2010 to date (Jan to Apr) | 88 | 750 | 1593 | 1149 | 1 | 17 | 174 | 686 | 271 | 220 | 53 | 66 |

^{*}red = 75-100% unoriginal text

Important Data Notes:

- 1. Even with the number of paper submissions increasing by 115% from Spring 2009 to Fall 2009, the percentage of papers scoring 75-100% unoriginal text fell from 3.4% to 0.3%
- 2. The number of students that used Turnitin increased 232% from Spring 2009 to mid-April 2010.
- 3. The percentage of papers that were identified with 0% matching text increased from 10.9% in Spring 2009 to 23.6% in mid-April 2010.
- 4. In Spring 2009 4% of all papers scored between 50-100% unoriginal text. By April 15, 2010, only 1.1% of papers scored between 50-100% unoriginal text.

These statistics correspond with a growing body of research — including data analysis, surveys and independent studies conducted by institutions around the world —all of which provides evidence of Turnitin's efficacy in helping educators reduce serious incidents of unoriginal content in student work and to produce better writers across the entire curriculum. A full white paper detailing this research and evidence is attached for reference as well as a summary sheet for quick review.

^{*}orange = 50-75% unoriginal text

^{*}yellow = 25-50% unoriginal text

^{*}green = 0-25% unoriginal text

^{*}blue = no unoriginal text identified