EDUC 473/698T
Cyberethics for Educators. Ethical and Legal Implications for Classroom Technology: Cybersafety, Cyberethics and Cybersecurity (C3)

SYLLABUS

Instructor:	Davina Pruitt-Mentle
Office:	Rms., 2127 Tawes
Phone:	301-405-8202
Email:	dpruitt@umd.edu
Website:	www.edtechoutreach.umd.edu
Office Hours:	By appointment
Credits:	3 credit

Catalogue Description:
This course addresses several of the major ethical and policy issues that are changing the way educators think about new information and communication technologies in the classroom setting.

Course Description:
This course addresses several of the major ethical and policy issues that are changing the way educators think about new information and communication technologies in the classroom setting. Specifically, the course was designed to help educators meet MTTS –standard **III. Legal, Social and Ethical Issues:** *Demonstrate an understanding of the legal, social and ethical issues related to technology use.*(ISTE NETS*T standard VI. Social, Ethical, Legal and Human Issues).

This course will cover three broad categories Cybersafety, Cyberethics and Cybersecurity (C3) and how they are interrelated, providing the opportunity for vigorous discussion and exploration of the complex issues involved in C3 technology policy in the educational setting. Participants will hear from a number of information technology experts and explore a variety of topics including Netiquette, Acceptable Use of Computing Resources, Electronic Cheating, High-Tech Hate Speech, Intellectual Property, Copyright, Privacy and Security, and current Federal and State Regulations. Through a variety of case studies and group work, detailing IT issues, recent case law, position papers, original articles and resources, as well as scenarios for discussion educators will give consideration to responses that can be applied in their own settings.

Course Rationale:
The digital age has created new concerns regarding the use of non-traditional electronic and Internet resources in the classroom setting. The speed with which students acquire information technology skills may be chronically outpacing educators' abilities to insure that positive habits of on-line behavior are being formed. Yet, there are important lessons of responsibility that accompany the freedom the Internet provides learners. Stakeholders in the educational setting need to be aware of current laws and policies regarding appropriate/legal use. Substantial changes are being made in federal information policy that affects educators and students in the 21st century.

*Course content helps educators address ISTE NETS*T II, VI A-E and MTTS Standard III, INTASC Principles 3,4,5,7,9 , NCATE framework 3,4, UMCP Conceptual Framework 2,3,4,5.. Teachers apply technology to facilitate a variety of effective assessment and evaluation strategies.*

1. Identify ethical and legal issues using technology.
2. Analyze issues related to the uses of technology in educational settings.
3. Establish classroom policies and procedures that ensure compliance with copyright law, *Fair Use* guidelines, security, privacy and student online protection.
4. Use classroom procedures to manage an equitable, safe and healthy environment for students.

Course Objectives:

Emphasis will be placed on building skills and confidence in participants' abilities to:

1. Identify and explore the legislative policies connected with C3 issues
2. Explore the threats and consequences of information technology misuse
3. Discuss parent, teacher, and community responsibilities for establishing and teaching responsible behavior in the new environment
4. Identify national and local organizations and services associated with C3 issues
5. Utilize state and national content and technology standards focusing on social, ethical and legal issues in designing technology-enhanced instruction and school technology plans
6. Demonstrate knowledge of social, legal, and ethical issues related to technology use through practical application
7. Establish classroom policies and procedures that ensure compliance with copyright law, Fair-Use guidelines, security, and child protection
8. Identify promising practices for teaching responsible ethical use of information technologies across all levels of education
9. Utilize strategies to ensure equal access to media and technology resources for all students
10. Model appropriate use of educational technologies
11. Critically review technology inequities and explore methods to deal with those inequities
12. Critical evaluate software and hardware applications for enhancing instruction and school administration
13. Discuss Universal Design principles in the context of general education environments and curriculum materials
14. Share knowledge of important issues and trends related to social, ethical and legal content through online collaborative group discussions and reflect upon student experiences in a Web enhanced/Web-based course.

Readings:

Recommended readings are found in the WebCT online format. **Others** can be found at www.edtechoutreach.umd.edu. Any hardcopy outside readings will be on file in the Curriculum Library (0220 Benjamin Bldg. –located in the basement).

Texts: None to purchase

Methodology:
This course will utilize a **combination** of face to face (when needed) and on-line lecture and reading materials, hands-on experiences, discussions, guest speakers, group work and projects to help participants understand several of the major ethical and policy issues that are changing the way educators think about new information and communication technologies in the classroom setting.

Student Expectations and Procedures:
1. Students are expected to obtain and actively use a computer account with access to the Internet and WebCT discussion site (the University provides such accounts free to enrolled students.) Students are expected to use **anti-virus software and backup all work**. Since the course will meet on-line it is of importance that you assure that your computer access can easily support the WebCT environment. WebCT Student Manual - **http://www.courses.umd.edu/studentmanual/.** Make photocopies or electronic backups of all work submitted.

2. Completion of assigned tasks and readings prior to each class is required in order to facilitate student learning.
3. It is expected that students will initiate, participate in and facilitate (both in class and on-line) discussions on course topics, issues and readings. Please see the on-line discussion grading rubric.
4. If you have a **documented disability and wish to discuss academic accommodations** please contact me as soon as possible.
5. Students missing the deadline for an assignment must make immediate arrangements with the instructor to fulfill that requirement before the next class session.
6. Please carefully edit all written assignments (All papers must be typed. It is recommended that materials be prepared on a personal computer (e.g., Word processor). Standard Paper size (81/2 X 11) should be used. Papers should be double spaced with 1 ½ inch margins at top, bottom, and sides, using font size 12 and either Times New Roman or Arial font style). A lack of care in proofreading or composition can negatively affect your final grade.
7. The citation style employed should be accurate, acceptable, and recognizable (MLA, Chicago (15th ed.) or APA (5th ed.) practice. The American Psychological Association (APA: http://www.apa.org) style of citation is preferred. For quick basics, visit:
    a. University of Maryland - http://www.lib.umd.edu/groups/learning/onlinewriting.html
    b. Columbia University Press - http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cup/cgos/idx_basic.html
    c. Harvard Writing Center Resources - http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~expos/index.cgi?section=resources
    d. Purdue's Online Writing Lab (OWL) - http://owl.english.purdue.edu/
    e. Rensselaer polytechnic Institute Writing Center - http://rpi.edu/web/writingcenter/handouts.html
    f. University of Wisconsin-Madison Writing Center - http://www.wisc.edu/writing/
8. The University of Maryland has developed a policy describing appropriate academic conduct. Turning in assignments that use substantial portions of the work of others without attribution is considered plagiarizing and is specifically prohibited. Please review information regarding the Honor Code and other academic integrity policies at: http://www.jpo.umd.edu/conduct/conduct.html.
9. Should you find it necessary to take an Incomplete (I) in this class, please complete the standard UMCP Incomplete Contract form available in the College of Education Access Center, 1210 Benjamin Building, two weeks before the end of the semester.
10. No part of any lecture or course content may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any informational storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the instructor.

Instructor Responsibilities

Just as we have high expectations for students, we also have high expectations for ourselves. Students should expect that the instructor for this course will:

1. Be prepared for class, read and return students' work in a timely manner, and be interested and engaged in students' work;
2. Remember that each student brings different background knowledge about both content and online experiences to this course, as well as help students develop their personal interests whenever possible;
3. Help students identify sources of additional substantive and methodological expertise, as needed;
4. Meet with students individually or in groups upon request and be available in person, by telephone, and by email to answer questions; and
5. Work hard, have fun and empower students to plan and engage in high quality discussions and experiences.
6. Email with students is not always a low threshold technology. Students sometimes feel that faculty/instructors should be available to answer questions 24/7 or whenever the student is online. This expectation of an immediate response can occasionally create a negative communication environment. Students' emails can also add significantly to faculty/instructor workload. While my past performance has indicated that I return emails promptly (sometimes to students surprise within minutes), in order to eliminate the possibility of problems due to assumptions, the following is the course minimal guideline: All emails will be answered within 24 hours of receipt except on weekends (begins after 4:00 on Friday)-which may take longer. I do

however; HIGHLY recommend that you send emails whenever a question arises, while the above is only a statement of minimal expectations on my part.

Grading Policy and Rubrics:

Grades will be based on the timeliness, content, clarity of writing and creativity of work in assignments completed for this course. The extent and quality of participation in course discussions (face to face –if needed and virtual) will also be evaluated in determining the final grade. The relative portion of the grade assigned to each course component will include:

1. **Participation** in face to face/on-line discussions **(25%)**
2. **Mini-assignments and activities** (i.e., Cyberawareness month activity calendar; netiquette profile) and evaluation, critiquing, and discussion of peer work **(25%)**
3. **Final Project.** The final project for this course involves the development of a curriculum unit for the classroom or presentation for faculty development or student enrichment activity related to a social, ethical and/or legal content area of interest. Have an idea for something similar? I am always open to creative ideas of high quality that are of interest to participants. Final product **(35%)**
4. **Final Reflection** -- reflecting on your own ideas and practices as well as on those introduced in this course –informal discussion thread **(15%)**

All deadlines will be detailed in the course outline.

To check your final grade, go to the *University of Maryland Web Page*. Click on *Testudo*. Next click on *Records & Registration*, and then click on *View Your Grades*. You may also want to click on the *Unofficial Transcripts*.

The evaluation criteria for this course are described in more detail in the **grading rubric.**

The grading rubric describes participant performance expectations and efforts most valued. Professionalism, completeness, timeliness and quality are all considered in the evaluation process.

WAM (Work Stations at Maryland) Student Computer Account

Secure a **WAM** account application form from 1400 Computer Science Building (the Computer Center Program Library). Complete the application. Turn it in to the Program Library (located in 1400 Computer Science Bldg.) between 9 A.M. and 4:30 P.M. You will need a picture ID and evidence of current University of Maryland registration.

If you have any questions, call the Program Library at (301) 405-4261. For General Information, call **Academic Information Technology Services** at (301) 405-7171.

Additional Numbers

- Consultant Lab (computer questions or problems): (301) 405-1500
- Dial-Up Access Lines:
    - 56K Modem Pool: 301-209-0700 (time limit: 3 hrs per day; 40 hrs per 14-day period) (Prompt: annex:) (WAM-id)
    - 56K Modem Pool: 301-864-2087 (time limit: 15 minutes) (Prompt: ascend%) (WAM-id)
    - 56K Modem Pool: 410-962-8865 (time limit: 3 hours) (Prompt: ascend%) (WAM-id)
    - 56K Modem Pool: 410-962-8867 (time limit: 15 minutes) (Prompt: ascend%) (WAM-id)
    - See also the definitive page of UM dialups at
    - http://noc.umd.edu/Dialup/

Educational Technology Outreach Grading Rubric

Letter Grade or quality component	Extent, Quality and Creativity of Work	Completeness of Work	Timelessness of work	Participation in discussions
A+ Exceptional Quality	Exceptional Quality and insight; honors spirit of task; a rare and valuable contribution to understanding	100% complete (or beyond); a model for others to follow; honors spirit of task	100% on time	Insightful, thoughtful and stimulating contributions to discussions; beyond what is normally expected; 100%
A Above High Quality	Convincingly on target with the purpose of the assignment; evidence of growth; learning difficult to refute; worthy contribution to our understanding; reader not distracted by errors in grammar, writing flow, spelling or punctuation	What is missing may not be missed; accurate; a whole product	Almost always on time; rare but forgivable tardiness	Thought provoking discussions; 100% contribution
A- High Quality	Fulfills all primary requirements of the assignment; some evidence of growth; learning difficult to refute; contribution to our understanding; reader not distracted by errors in grammar, writing flow, spelling or punctuation	A whole product but lacks "the extras"; accurate; on target with regard to task	Almost always on time; rare but forgivable tardiness	At least 95% contribution to discussions; dialogue thoughtful and insightful but lacks vigor or conviction
B+/B Moderate to Medium Quality	Competent and worthy; provides credible evidence of learning and growth; may not completely honor spirit of task; perhaps an "off-day"; errors of grammar, spelling, punctuation distract the reader	Moderate shortcomings; minor elements missing; affects instructor's ability to see the product as a whole	Late and/or often enough to alarm instructor; not necessarily chronic	Moderate participation with some insightful comments
B- Sufficient Quality	Passable; only enough to get by; needs more proofreading or writing skills	Sufficient; least you could do and justify	Some tasks could be late	Barely participates in discussion; class contributions add little insightfulness and do not provoke further discussion
C Low to poor Quality	Undergraduate level/quality; unsophisticated; exhibits little course concept or concepts	Evidence of learning or growth insufficient	Excessively or repeatedly late	Limited participation in discussion; Little if any preparation or thought in dialogue
F Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Difficult to recognize as the assigned task or not turned in at all	Missing/not submitted	Little if any participation in discussions

Tentative Course Outline

Session	Topic
Session 1: 1-4-06	*WebCT and Overview* *Standards* *Cyberethics: Responsibilities of Educators*
Session 2: 1-5-06	*Credibility, Critique and Evaluation*
Session 3: 1-6-06	*Netiquette* *Acronyms*
Session 4: 1-9-06	*Cyber plagiarism*
Session 5: 1-10-06	*Intellectual Property* *Copyright* *Fair Use*
Session 6: 1-11-06	*Acceptable Use policies* *Legislation* *The good, the bad and the ugly*
Session 7:1-12-06	*Social Equity Issues* *Digital Divide* *Gender* *AT*
Session 8: 1-13-06	*Cybersafety* *Filtering* *E-rate*
Session 9: 1-16-06	*On-line Bullying*
Session 10: 1-17-06	*Curriculum Examples*
Session 11: 1-18-06	*Cybersecurity* *Phishing* *Hoaxes* *Viruses*
Session 12: 1-19-06	*Hacking* *Downloading*
Session 13: 1-20-06	*Identify theft* *Backing up* *Virus protection* *passwords*
Session 14/15: 1-23-06	*Closure*

Journal Articles:

Akbaba, S. & Kurubacak, G., (1998). Teachers' attitudes towards technology. *Computers in Social Studies Journal* [Online serial], 7(4). Available: www.webcom.com/journal/akbaba.html

Alberta Learning. (2000). *Information and communication technology, kindergarten to grade 12* [Outline document]. Edmonton, AB: Author. Available: http://ednet.edc.gov.ab.ca/ict/.

American Library Association. (1998). Presidential Committee on Information Literacy. Final report. Chicago, IL: Author. Available: www.ala.org/acrl/nili/ilit1st.html. (ERIC No. ED 315 074)

Balagopal, S. "Adapting Activities and Increasing Independence in Inclusive Settings Using Windows and Microsoft Office", Richmond Community Schools, Presented at NECC, June, 2001.

Bohlin, R. (1993). Computers and gender difference: Achieving equity. *Computers in the Schools*, 9(2-3), 155-166.
Carpenter, C. (1996). Online ethics: What's a teacher to do? Learning and Leading with Technology 23(6), 40-41, 60.

Chaika, Melissa. "Ethical Considerations in Gender-Oriented Entertainment Technology," Crossroads, Association for Computing Machinery, 1999.

Cifuentes, L. (1997). From sages to guides: A professional development study. Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 5(1), 67-77.

Clark, K.D. (2000, Winter). Urban Middle School Teachers' Use of Instructional Technology. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education.* 33(2), 178-193.

"Closing the Gender Gap: Gender Gaps Fact Sheet." American Association of University Women,1997.

Committee on Instructional Technology Literacy, National Research Council (1999). Being fluent with Instructional Technology. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press [Online]. Available: http://stills.nap.edu/html/beingfluent/

Educational Testing Service. (1999). Does it compute? The relationship between educational technology and student achievement in mathematics [Online document]. Princeton: NJ: Author. Available: www.ets.org/research/textonly/pic/dic/dicfig6.html.

"Educators play key role in promoting gender equity." Horizons. Midwest Desegregation Assistance Center, 1998.

"Expecting the Best from A Girl. That's What You'll Get." Women's College Coalition. Mount Holyoke College.

Gaicquinta, Joseph B., Baur, Jo Anne, and Levin, Jane. Beyond Technology's Promise: An examination of children's educational computing at home. Cambridge University Press:Great Britain, 1993.

Grunner, C., Bennet, D., Clements, M., Hawkins, J., Honey, M., and Moeller, B. "Gender and te
Haughland, S. (1997). Children's home computer use: An opportunity for parent/teacher collaboration. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 25(2), 133-135.

Halbert, Terry & Ingulli, E. (2002). *CyberEthics.* Temple University
ISBN: 0-324-11664-0 © 2002

Hoffman, J. L. & Lyons, D.L. (1997). Evaluating instructional software. Learning and Leading with Technology, 25(2), 52-56.

Lauman, J. L. (2000, Winter). Student home computer use: A review of the literature. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education.* 33(2), 196-203.

McAdoo, M. (1994). Equity: Has technology bridged the gap? Electronic Learning, 13(7), 24-34.

Miller-Lachman, L. (1994). Bytes and bias: Eliminating cultural stereotypes from educational software. School Library Journal, 40(11), 26-30.

Miller, Leslie, Chaika, Melissa, Groppe, Laura. "Girls' Preferences in Software Design: Insights from a Focus Group." Center for Technology in Teaching and Learning and Center for Research on Parallel Computations, Interpersonal Computing and Technology: An Electronic Journal for the 21st Century, 1996.

Moonen, B., & Voogt, J. (1998, October). Teacher in-service training in networks: Results from the first phase. Paper presented at TelEd '98: ISTE's Seventh International Conference on Telecommunications and Multimedia in Education, New Orleans, LA. Available http://users.edte.utwente.nl/moonenb/paperteled98.htm

National Center for Education Statistics. (1998). *The condition of education 1998, indicator 3* [Online document]. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office. Available: www.ed.gov/pubs98/condition98.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983,1995,1997,2000,2002). *A nation at risk: The imperative for education reform* [Online document]. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. Available: www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk.

National Commission on Teaching and America's future (Summary report). *Teacher to Teacher.* Available: www.nbpts.org/nbpts/about/what-matters.html

Omoregie, M., & Coleman, B. (1996, March). Teaching infusion: The impact of technology infusion in creating quality instruction materials. Paper presented at the Annual National Conference on Creating the Quality School, Oklahoma City, OK. (ERIC No. ED 415 213)

Reed, Penny. "Resource Guide for Teachers and Administrators about Assistive Technology", Available http://www.wati.org/resourceguide.htm , March, 2001.

Reis, S. M. & Westberg, K.L. (1998). Curriculum compacting and achievement test scores: What does research say? *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 42(2), 123-128.

Sakamoto, A. Video game use and the development of socio-cognitive abilities in children: Three Surveys of elementary school students. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24, 1994.

Salehi, S. (1990). Promoting equity through educational technology networks. Baltimore, MD: Maryland State Department of Education (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 322 897).

Sheingold, K. (1991). Restructuring for learning with technology: The potential of synergy. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(1), 17-27.

Swanson, Dr. Janese Ed.D. "What We Can Do to Get Girls Involved in Technology," 1999.

"Technology Gender Gap Develops While Gaps in Math and Science Narrow, AAUW Foundation Report Shows." American Association of University Women, 1998.

The American Heritage Dictionary. Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1986.

"Title IX at 25: Report Card On Gender Equity, Executive Summary." American Association of University Women.

Wilder, Gita, Mackie, Diana, Cooper, Joel. Gender and Computers: Two Surveys of Computer Related Attitudes. Sex Roles, Vol.13, 3-4, 1985.

Willard, Nancy E. (2002). *Computer ethics, etiquette and safety for the 21st-century student.* ISTE. ISBN1-56484-184-7

Vannatta, R.A. (2000). Integrating, infusing, modeling: Preparing technology-using educators. *Journal of Computing in Teacher Education*, 16(2), 6-14.

Young, B. J. (2000, Winter). Gender differences in student attitudes toward computers. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education.* 33(2), 204-216.
Adelson, Rachel "Computer Toys R Us vs. Them." Computer Confidence for Women, 1996.