My journey from ordinary, average community college composition instructor to intellectual property rights pedagogical philosopher began during spring semester in 2005. Working in class one day, students prepared mini-presentations on a logical fallacy they were assigned to teach their classmates. I had done this lesson many times before, but this time students could use Microsoft PowerPoint because we were scheduled in a computer-equipped classroom. Two students stood up to give their presentation on “equivocation.” They started by projecting a picture of President Bill Clinton, his finger wagging in the air. With a click of the mouse, the famous words also appeared on the screen: “I did not have sexual relations with that woman.”

I walked away from that class session impressed not only by students’ efforts, but also by how easily the ability to point, click, and copy was necessarily changing my classroom. The picture of Bill Clinton was undoubtedly copyrighted by the Associated Press or some similar organization, so I began asking myself some important questions: “Why shouldn’t my students have the same right to use such materials in educational settings that I have?” and “Wouldn’t it be overkill to ask students to fully document such uses in perfect MLA style?”

At semester’s end, the point, click and copy world came crashing into my pedagogy in a more unwelcome way. In the blind read part of our portfolio assessment process, I received an essay that I had already seen. Unmistakably, the essay was the same work a current student had submitted to me in her portfolio—a rough draft from earlier in the semester, but clearly the same essay. I
made copies of my student’s essay and the essay I read in the assessment process, and delivered them to our portfolio coordinator, who passed them on to the other instructor involved.

Two days later, I confronted my student with what I had discovered. The student broke down in my office, cried profuse tears, and swore her innocence. I had little reason to doubt her: I had read numerous drafts of the essay, beginning with the initial paragraphs; I had also seen her work on that very essay several times with peer assistants in our writing center. My trust in her was not misplaced. When confronted by my colleague, the other student involved in the situation confessed: Overwhelmed by many factors, he had discreetly helped himself to a friend’s essay while supposedly resolving her computer problems.

From there, I began searching for answers. I searched for college copyright, fair use, and plagiarism policies on the Internet. Plagiarism policies were plentiful, but many were vague like my own college’s policy:

Each student is expected to be honest in their own work ... When producing work for a course, students are expected to present their own ideas and to appropriately acknowledge the incorporation of another person’s work. Not doing so is dishonest. (Lansing Community College)

Most were better, giving at least some specifics about the types of activities considered plagiarism; a few laid out specific consequences. However, copyright and fair use policies specifically directed at students creating academic work were difficult to find. The preamble to such polices often reads like that of my institution:

In the educational setting faculty and staff often have the need to use or incorporate, in whole or in part, existing works, information or materials in connection with course preparation, course presentation or course materials. (Lansing Community College)

Students, even as employees of the college, seem not to be considered end users of the policy. A few, like the copyright and fair use policy of Butler Community College, include student employees in the mix, but don’t specifically include student classroom activities:

All Butler Community College faculty, staff, and students are expected to act as responsible users of the copyrighted works.
of others ... This policy applies to Butler faculty, staff, students, and other entities performing collaborative work or service for the college, whether compensated by the College or not.

In short, college policies that clearly acknowledged student fair use rights in preparing academic assignments—especially for media materials—were virtually non-existent.¹ In my first forty-six tries, I found only one college that specifically mentioned student work in its fair use statement. Colleges seem to produce only one explanation of copyright and fair use directed at students: warnings about and prohibitions against peer-to-peer file sharing, specifically using any college resources to do so.

College policies concerning intellectual property seem to focus on economic rather than educational issues. Our official statements sometimes address students as quasi-professionals developing content in their student employee positions or as consumers of college resources. When it comes to students as the most junior members of the academic community, we provide dire warnings of copyright violation, but we provide little backing for students as creators of their own intellectual property. Our official policies often fail to acknowledge the applicability of copyright and fair use to student academic work. If we examine our college webpages, we will probably find help for students negotiating copyright issues—with perhaps a small mention that student work is automatically copyrighted once it’s put into some tangible form. As instructors, we expect students to contribute to our academic discourse (on a level appropriate to their development), but we give little recognition to student rights in such situations and overwhelmingly focus on their responsibilities. Worse yet, we tend to focus on one sub-issue concerning intellectual property: plagiarism. Yet, if students are not taught the inherent value of their own work in educational settings, we cannot expect them to understand the value of others’ work.

I find this situation especially troubling in community college settings with their often intense focus on career training and an over-dependence on adjunct faculty. At my institution, we are seeing a heavy influx of students returning for job training, and nearly all pass through our transfer composition or business/technical writing courses. These students will join a workforce and produce documents using a variety of sources and images available with the click of a mouse. Unfortunately, our transfer composition courses don’t always reflect or address this reality. Newly trained adjunct faculty do enter our classrooms with pedagogy that more accurately faces this changing world; they tend to believe that students should, at the very least, be including images in their written work and should consider the implications of using a variety of others’ intellectual
property. However, in our intensive exit competency assessment, our students often face trouble when images are included, because “we are teaching writing.” Our faculty discussions of student competency are too often limited to white pages of black, printed text and our discussions of intellectual property are limited to plagiarism and source usage. Because 80% of our faculty are poorly paid adjuncts (many of whom finished their advanced degrees 10 or more years ago), they have little chance for professional development outside of the college’s Center for Teaching Excellence, which, in serving a broad spectrum of faculty needs, is not going to address the latest issues in composition and professional writing. Too often, community colleges are meeting the future head-on with 20th-century, if not 19th-century, ideas about written communication and intellectual property. How are we supposed to train 21st-century workers if we are not teaching them to communicate effectively in the 21st century?

Inspired by Jim Porter, Kate Latterell, Dânielle Nicole DeVoss, Johndan Johnson-Eilola, and Stuart Selber (2006) and their call to recognize much of the student use of digital materials as fair use and not plagiarism in its most classic sense, I went to our Curriculum and Instruction Council, the body charged with making such decisions. At that point, in 2006, I asked for two things: First, a more well-defined definition of plagiarism with some clear consequences for those students who intend to deceive, and second, a clear statement of student fair use rights. When it came to the issue of blatant academic dishonesty, some council members supported a change, but others did not. The idea of a student fair use statement met with confusion. Reactions varied from those who saw no need for such a policy, to those who thought students would be covered under the faculty fair use statement, to those who didn’t know what I was talking about.

In the end, only the plagiarism policy was changed. Our current statement considers plagiarism as including “but not limited to the use, by paraphrase or direct quotation or the inclusion of electronic sources, of the published or unpublished work of another person without full and clear acknowledgment.” Unfortunately, I think my efforts resulted in a step backwards. If an instructor chooses to do so, the current policy could be used against students who use a cartoon or photograph from the Web in a PowerPoint presentation but only give minimal acknowledgement—even if the student avoided complete documentation for sound rhetorical purposes, such as not distracting too greatly from the presentation’s visual design.2

Still, the next semester, students in my classes continued to weave borrowed media materials into great classroom projects with little formal documentation (in what many of my colleagues would consider incidences of plagiarism or copyright violation). And at the semester’s end while reading portfolios as an
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external reader, I found that a former student, who previously failed a course with me, gave his essay to a friend when they re-took that class together. At the time, I also served as our college’s Writing Across the Curriculum coordinator. When our Center for Teaching Excellence asked for workshop suggestions, plagiarism made its way high on the list, and I got the call. Instructors largely wanted to know “how do I catch the villains?” not “how do I help students become good, independent thinkers and ethical researchers?”

Now, over three years later, I still present the plagiarism workshop on a regular basis. If faculty members have suspicions that a student has submitted a plagiarized essay, someone tells them my name and I talk with them about the problem. Much of the conversation revolves around how to respond to the situation because of the institution’s near silence on the issue. My college’s official outlook on the issues of copyright, fair use, and plagiarism has changed little, but I feel as if I’ve changed immensely. Despite somehow finding myself as the college’s de facto plagiarism expert, I encourage my Children’s Literature students to borrow pictures of book covers from Internet booksellers when completing various projects. We’ve had many instructors and even a dean call for the purchase of a plagiarism-detection service, and my opinion is usually asked. I always give a vehement “no,” pointing out student rights to their own work.

DONE, NOT DONE

My experiences call to my mind T.H. White’s retelling of the Arthurian legends, The Once and Future King. In the book, Merlin sends young Arthur to live as an ant. Once there, the future king learns the ants’ way of thinking: “done” or “not done.” College composition instructors (as well as college policy makers) too often view plagiarism as something a student has “done” or “not done.” In reality, though, the inclusion of others’ intellectual property into our own work takes on myriad possibilities, where, like all good writing, audience and purpose influence how the writer must handle the situation. I have come to realize that in our discussion of intellectual property our focus is too narrow, our vocabulary too limited, and our pedagogy too restricted. And so, after my failed attempts to change college policy, I began to consider all of the questions that no one seemed to answer: Isn’t intellectual property, not plagiarism, the true overarching issue? How can we talk about plagiarism when we don’t talk about the value, both philosophically and monetarily, of someone’s creative works and ideas? How can we emphasize the need for student research when we don’t mention that their ability to include part of another’s work in their own is protected by the fair use doctrine? How can we even expect students to
understand why we have plagiarism policies and require documentation if we don’t discuss the value that the academy places on original thought? How can we prepare them for a world of work where the issues will expand to copyright infringement and not just plagiarism? Instead of confining copyright and fair use to a sign by the departmental copier, shouldn’t I be bringing these issues into my classroom, helping my students understand the complicated world in which they must create?

In answering these questions for myself, I decided that a “done, not done” mentality will no longer serve students—if it ever truly did. If a structure and policies do not exist within the college to address these issues, real change would have to start on the ground, in my classroom. I could begin helping students to think about how they use the intellectual property of others and their responsibilities in using those materials. Furthermore, if, as Porter and DeVoss (2006) argued, the ability to “remix” using digital works may help create economic growth, then those who can successfully negotiate that terrain will be in demand as employees. The ability to include all kinds of graphics and media in many different kinds of communication has eliminated the days of grey pages of texts in nearly all contexts; the digital environment in which our current students will work requires them to include, not just refer to, the intellectual property of others—and they must be prepared to consider their rights and obligations in doing so.

Community college instructors, especially, might see such an addition to their pedagogy as a drain on already precious time. After all, our teaching load is heavy. Although College Composition and Communication guidelines state that a teaching load should be limited to 60 students per semester, a 2007 survey by Two-year College English Association found that the average load was 94 students; over 20% of community college writing faculty reported teaching between 111 and 130 students each semester (Jaschik, 2007). Kami Day (2008) acknowledged that

when community college teachers think about teaching source citation, they think often about teaching students not to plagiarize or about what the consequences should be for plagiarism, partly because they do not have much time to spend learning about and problematizing plagiarism and are not aware of its complexities and gatekeeping functions. (p. 44)

However, as community college instructors, the needs of students to negotiate the various uses of others’ intellectual property in various digital environments can no longer be ignored. According to the American Association of Community Colleges (2008a), students at two-year schools make up 46%
of the undergraduate population and 41% of first-time freshmen. Of those students, 63% intend to eventually complete four-year degrees (2008b). As DeVoss and Annette Rosati (2002) pointed out:

Admittedly, most first-year writing courses and curricula are already packed, perhaps overloaded—testament to the importance of first-year writing. But as we work toward acculturating students into the processes and function of academic writing and engaging them in appropriate academic processes, we must make room for addressing new research and writing spaces. (p. 201)

Knowing that I could no longer overlook these complex and pressing needs, I set out to change how I discuss intellectual property within my classroom. Specifically, I wanted students to understand their rights and responsibilities and to learn to think critically about the multitude of ways those rights and responsibilities will influence the work they produce in my class and in the future. My goal, overall, was to integrate discussions about intellectual property into our everyday activities as much as possible. When composition teachers explore the issues surrounding intellectual property, we perhaps limit that conversation to the “plagiarism and source usage day” and fail to see how these issues fit into the other subjects we must cover. Consequently, it’s little wonder that when we look at adding to our burden a more comprehensive pedagogy about intellectual property, we may want to say “no more.” However, by addressing the issues in small pieces at the appropriate times, perhaps we can weave the necessary discussions into our everyday classroom experiences, with little or no need to give up course time.

In its final report on plagiarism, the U.K.’s Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) for higher education found that encouraging academic honesty requires that institutions provide students

with clear explanations of what is valued (integrity, honest, wide-ranging research, choosing and using others’ ideas etc.) and why academic conventions are important. Students should encounter the information in printed material, discuss it with teachers, and see staff treating each other in accordance with the principles (Carroll, 2004)

In small doses throughout each term, I attempt to do just that: Put the expectations in writing, encourage discussion about such issues (both in the outside world and in their own writing for the class), and model my decision-
making processes when it comes to borrowed intellectual property. In this way, I’ve added very little to my workload, but I have extended the breadth and depth of our deliberations about these issues. The purpose in describing the work in my classroom here is to demonstrate that it is possible to expand the discussion of intellectual property well beyond the “done, not done” mode of teaching plagiarism in the first-year composition classroom—without detracting from important tasks already at hand. Instead, by changing how we present our course documents and cover topics such as the conventions of documentation, research, and source usage, we can begin to prepare students to negotiate the digital environment in which they must work and produce written communication.

EVERYDAY WORK WITH INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CONCERNS

Course Policies and Documents

The first day of any class is usually spent in course logistics, such as reviewing the syllabus and grading policies. I include definitions of intellectual property, copyright, fair use, and plagiarism in my syllabus. Even if I point out those particular policies with my class and direct students to Web sites that define copyright and fair use and provide resources for avoiding plagiarism, I can’t just say “go and look.” I have also had to teach myself to express the various definitions in everyday terms, understandable to students fresh out of high school as well as those who have been out of school for many years. Intellectual property, I try to tell students, is much like real estate: It is property a person can own. Although the ideas behind creative works—such as books, songs, and paintings—can’t be touched and manipulated like physical property, they still belong to the creator. Copyright is a law that guarantees creators of such materials control over how their works and ideas are used in the future. Copyright law, I try to explain, prevents others from making money off the creator’s ideas; in other words, copyright holders can charge or require permission for someone to use their original work. If someone unethically uses that work without the creator’s permission or paying for such use, we call that infringement. Luckily, I tell my classes, the fair use doctrine provides exceptions to copyright control for educational and other creative purposes. Plagiarism, I try to point out, is a very different—but still unethical—use of someone else’s intellectual property. Plagiarism is claiming (or giving the appearance of claiming) someone else’s intellectual property as one’s own, especially in academic settings.
I attempt to set the discussion within the context of the academic world and the world they will enter as professionals. We talk about how plagiarism (taking credit for work not their own) will be their main concern while in college. In submitting papers using outside sources for college credit, they’re using parts of another’s work and not attempting to make money; therefore, fair use protects them from copyright infringement. Unfortunately, if they submit someone else’s work as if it were their own, they are attempting to receive that college credit dishonestly. In this case, they have committed plagiarism. In completing their course work, they may not be faced with decisions about using copyrighted materials outside those fair use principles. Someday, however, such decisions could affect their job, their employer, and the financial and legal standing of all involved. If they don’t examine who owns an idea or creative work and don’t analyze their motives in using all or part that original work, they could be asking for trouble. In my class, in future classes, and in their careers, they absolutely must consider audience and purpose (as well as personal motive) if they hope to make the best decisions they can about the uses of others’ works.

My students also begin the semester learning a simple truth they’ve probably never deeply considered: They own the rights to the work they produce in my class—and indeed the work they produce in any class. I spell out those rights along with my limited rights to read and respond to their work in my syllabus. On the very first day, students complete, only if they so choose, an “Informed Consent for Use of Student Work” that reinforces their ownership of their work and gives me the ability to use their work in certain settings.

If administrators, instructors, and copyright holders wonder why students hold so little respect for the intellectual property rights of others in a digital age, we should probably look no further than how we view student work. To catch the students who knowingly and unknowingly plagiarize, more and more colleges require students to submit every essay to a plagiarism-detection service. Plagiarism-detection services require that students sign releases, essentially acknowledging that the service has “the right to ‘reproduce, display, disclose, and otherwise use’ student work for their business purposes” (CCCC IP, 2006). The underlying message here is, of course, that their original work holds little value in comparison to the need to catch others who submit unoriginal work. Although most students probably never consider that their work has any creative value, they need to begin somewhere, understanding that their ideas and thoughts hold value and that they deserve authorial and legal credit for them. We should start that understanding in our composition classrooms. We cannot expect them to make good decisions about the ownership and credit of others’ work until they see themselves as authors who must make decisions about how they will allow others to use their intellectual property.
The Philosophy and Mechanics of Documentation

In the reflections my students complete throughout the semester, they regularly vent their frustration at the mechanics and seemingly arbitrary rules of the MLA documentation system. To combat such resistance, I used to fall back on the “do it or it’s plagiarism” mentality—clearly just another version of that “done, not done” mode of thinking. Now, I realize the importance of explaining to students the rationale behind documentation and citation, no matter what system a student is required to use in an essay. In a sense, I attempt to answer the question so many students ask about documentation: “Why do we have to do this?” To answer that question, we begin by referring back to the syllabus and to information about copyright, fair use, and plagiarism. When I ask them about the audience and purpose of their college essays, students reliably respond with “you, my other professors” and “to show that I’m learning something.” Students and I, therefore, work under the assumption that what we do is for the sake of education and not for economic gain—that what they’re doing falls under fair use. Still, that recognition alone doesn’t answer their “why do we have to do this?” question when it comes to documentation. Consequently, we need to discuss certain values in the academic world, touching on three important points.

First is that those in a college or university setting value original thinking. Students create knowledge. Very importantly, though, that original thinking and newly created knowledge doesn’t just come from nowhere, but from careful consideration of what others have said. As members of the academy, we include the basis for our new knowledge and ideas within our written work. When we incorporate such source materials in an educational setting, we do not need to ask for permission, but we do need to fulfill our responsibility to recognize the creators of those materials, thus avoiding plagiarism. Because we place equal value on original thinking and positioning ourselves within the ideas of others, we have an exceptionally high responsibility to fulfill in formal essays. To demonstrate that we have included the ideas and knowledge of others as well as added to the larger academic discussion, college writers need to clearly distinguish their own ideas and knowledge from the ideas and knowledge of others. Citation signals to readers that “the borrowed materials end here.” Looking at professional essays and sample student essays helps students to understand that even the most rudimentary citations help to distinguish the writer’s research from their own knowledge.

Second, we discuss how educators value knowing the dependability of a source. We also have our own credibility or ethos to maintain. The more authority our sources have, the better we look as writers. Along those same lines,
I tell students that they just might inspire someone to find and read one of their sources. I’ve demonstrated how an idea presented in an article I read on plagiarism led me to yet another article and that article led to yet more and varied reading. I point out how I discovered the second article by tracing the references in the first article I read and how the same scenario played out in the works cited of the next article.

Third, people in the business of creating and disseminating knowledge—particularly college professors and students—largely want acknowledgement for their ideas. My students admit readily that they want their work acknowledged with a good grade. I hope to build on that point and explain that college professors want to have their ideas acknowledged by others—whether those others agree with them or not. In considering such intellectual property issues, Laura Murray (2008) argued that “plagiarism and copyright infringement are transgressions against two distinct but overlapping economies of knowledge: citation systems and market systems” (p. 174). With this in mind, I now attempt to guide student use of others’ work in a way that will make them think in both their academic and professional careers. Borrowing Murray’s notion of citation as “the currency of our research,” I tell students that we really should recognize others’ ideas, even if they’re covered under the doctrine of fair use in their school work. Consequently, we must always ask ourselves a question, “must I pay with the currency of citation or the U.S. dollar?” In the essays they write during their college career, I hope students consistently answer that they must pay with the currency of citation. I also hope that when the question of paying for intellectual property comes up in their professional lives, they will again give careful consideration to audience and purpose and decide on the proper pay: recognition or financial payment, as needed.

Even with their understanding the need for citation, students balk at paying attention to the details of MLA documentation style. To impress upon students the value of well-done documentation, I’ve returned to the “pay with citation currency” idea: I’ve been holding Works Cited auctions. I bring in samples of several works cited pages from real student essays, including both poor and excellent examples. Students are then assigned to role play the author of one source on any one of the works cited. The question, of course, becomes, “were you happy with the ‘citation pay’ you received for your intellectual property?” We can set an “exchange rate” for each sample works cited by reversing the process and have some students “bid” on the work cited they want for their essay. The monetary analogy seems to work; students come to understand that poorly done documentation is worth very little in the currency of citation, so we set out to learn and use the mechanics of documentation to the best of our ability.
Research and Source Evaluation

My institution emphasizes library research, and many of my colleagues view the Web as the enemy—the tempter, seducing students into plagiarism and poor choices about materials used in their essays. DeVoss and Rosati (2002) pointed out, however, that “to make the Web a better research space—a space where students will be doing critical, thoughtful, thorough research instead of searching for papers to plagiarize—we must engage students in tasks appropriate to the complexity of the online space” (p. 201). Most of us, in our undergraduate composition courses, were taught to look up a source in references such as Periodicals for College Libraries to determine its appropriateness for our essays. In our current digital environment, the Web can be used to provide students with a much deeper and richer view of the sources they are using. My students begin the process of evaluating sources with exactly what they’re supposed to be using in their essays, a periodical found on and downloaded from the library subscription databases. Unfortunately, that span of several gray pages provides very little context for the student to reach any conclusions about the source, but browsing the publication’s Web site provides more insight into a source’s value than any reference work.

When researching and evaluating sources, students and I look at their sources through the same lens of intellectual property and academic values. Students take a source—from The Nation or The National Review, for instance—and first find the homepage for the publication. Immediately, the headlines and political cartoons clue students into any potential biases in the source. When they visit the sites for Time or Newsweek, they are annoyed by the pop-up ads, but they are absolutely clear that the purpose of these publications, on some level, is to make money. In visiting the online presence of scholarly journals, students see the editorial boards, submission guidelines, and intended audience for these publications. They learn to follow important links like “About Us,” where they can learn whether the authors of the source are journalists or experts on some level. Side searches can help them find the curriculum vitae of the “expert” authors in journals and how the publications stack up against a variety of Web sites dedicated to their topics. All along, we ask the same questions students should always be asking about the value of these sources, framing our discussions and reports in the terms of academic values and intellectual property we have already discussed:

- Does the source reference and integrate the work of others?
- Does the source say something new or intriguing about the topic?
- Does the source pull from a plurality of ideas or just a few?
• Does the source pay with “the currency of citation” for the ideas of others?
• Is the authorship of the source clear? If not, is the ownership of the source clear?

In 15–20 minutes of surfing, students instinctively learn more about the value of authorship and ownership of intellectual property (and how it can enhance their own work) than I could teach in days of lecture.

*The Requisite Plagiarism Discussion*

When presenting the general topic of plagiarism, the discussion must center on what constitutes both proper use and misuse of others’ intellectual property. The goal, as Porter and DeVoss stated in a 2006 conference presentation, is that “instead of becoming plagiarism police, our role should be to teach students how to make ethical decisions regarding copying and the re-use of others’ text.” The U.K. Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) found that plagiarism must be explained to students in “everyday language” in conjunction with examples of both acceptable and unacceptable behaviors (Carroll, 2004). If ethical decision-making is indeed the goal, then, necessarily, the discussion centers on two variables familiar to all first-year composition instructors: audience and purpose. Appropriate to this goal is a problem-based learning approach in which students must make decisions for themselves about the motives behind utilizing others’ works. I have tried several versions of this task: the latest involves students examining a variety of works regarding the use or misuse of others’ intellectual property, some of it clearly copyrighted material. These works include:

• an essay purchased from an online paper mill;
• an essay filled with ideas cut and pasted from sources, improper paraphrases, and missing citations;
• a church bulletin, featuring the famous picture of a sailor kissing a nurse on Times Square during V-E Day celebrations (with no recognition of the photographer or copyright holder), to commemorate Veteran’s Day;
• a PowerPoint presentation, submitted for an assignment in an online class, in which borrowed pictures are referenced only with the photographer’s name and URL;
• a YouTube video, usually a mash-up, such as Monty Python’s “Camelot” playing against scenes from the original Star Trek series; and
• a television commercial featuring a popular song as background music.
Students are told only that the works utilize the intellectual property of others. Working in groups, they research and discover the original source materials; locate definitions and policies concerning copyright, fair use, and plagiarism (including those of our own institution); make a determination as to the appropriate use of the intellectual property; and pose recommendations for further action. Students are told they must examine the purpose and intended audience for the work they scrutinize, and they report their findings to the entire class.

In the discussion that follows, I have to give the warning that all good composition teachers must: Misrepresenting the works of others as your own will most likely result in failure. At this point, I have tried to expand the vocabulary I use, hoping to move beyond simply a monolithic offense of plagiarism. Although “everyday language” is important, students need to know that plagiarism is not just a blanket offense. For example, when I present prohibitions against buying, borrowing, or stealing an essay, I make sure to use the word *collusion*, the term used in British and Australian universities for such an offense. Similarly, when students piece together parts of other works to make themselves sound better, I refer to it as *mosaic plagiarism*. I explain how this type of plagiarism, like collusion, is intended to deceive readers into thinking the writer created something new. My experience working with other faculty members has taught me that our vague college policy and the lack of clear policies and consequences in individual syllabi lead to a great deal of the worst instances of plagiarism on campus. Therefore, students and I refer back to the syllabus and the policy I noted to them at the semester’s start, and I make clear the consequences for this worst of offenses: If students are caught intentionally misrepresenting another’s work as their own, they will receive a 0.0 in the course.

Our discussion eventually leads us to inadvertent plagiarism, that offense committed by students who do not yet have adequate skills in documentation and source integration. To assist students in learning how to correctly and ethically integrate sources, they submit copies of the actual sources to me along with their essays and they are expected to revise to eliminate poor source integration. If they still are not correcting plagiarism that’s the result of poor source integration or documentation in revised essays (especially after they’ve been warned about the problem), they should not expect a 2.0—the grade that will make the course acceptable as a core, transferable class—because they have not met the course learning objectives. Time and opportunity to learn must be given to students as they learn these academic conventions; they will not grow as authors unless we clearly distinguish between the various types of plagiarism for them and provide them with the methods to adjust to the standards of authorship in academia.
Intellectual Property in Digital Realms

Because our program’s outcomes are still firmly anchored in print-based production, finding methods to teach students about intellectual property in digital and online environments has been difficult. However, even for such text-heavy classes, composition teachers can find some means for teaching about digital rights management. My students maintain a wiki that they pass onto future generations of students. They leave written advice on a variety of topics for making it successfully through Composition II. They illustrate their ideas with photographs they take themselves, short videos on topics of interest, and add screen shots of essays to illustrate points. Before they start adding to the wiki, we click on the Creative Commons Attribution Share-Alike 3.0 License link that appears at the bottom of our page. They explore the Creative Commons site and learn what rights we are retaining for our work. In addition to learning where they can find “free” resources, students have also had to make the difficult decision not to use “the perfect” cartoon or picture because they do not have the rights to do so.

MOVING FORWARD, IF ONLY A STEP AT A TIME

As composition instructors, we can no longer ignore that communication is changing. Students are already heavy consumers of multimodal texts, not only taking in the written word that appears on their computer screen, but also the video, pictures, and graphic materials that surround it. We need not doubt that they have the ability to copy and paste or otherwise embed what they find on the Web into their work. Moreover, the 21st-century workplace will probably demand that they do so—and that they do so ethically. No one, especially in an academic environment, would argue that we should allow students to dishonestly take credit for the work of others; however, we need to prepare students to make the best, most creative use of what the digital world has to offer and do so in a way that appropriately recognizes others’ intellectual property. As Kathleen Henning (2003) posited: “Teaching must integrate the best of technology with the best of the ‘old’ ways, accepting inevitable change even if it doesn’t seem better at first” (p. 311).

Compositionists understand reading and writing as basic literacies. However, if we carefully examine current pedagogy, we will find that we have long been imparting another kind of literacy—the literacy of intellectual property—even though we never saw it as such. We have always taught about plagiarism and the proper citation of source material. Like it or not,
the onslaught of the digital realm has increased the urgency and scope of that literacy. We must now think about issues of copyright, fair use, and digital management rights in addition to plagiarism. Deborah Brandt (1995) noted that literacy has two ways of expanding. First, a literacy can increase vertically as we learn and accumulate of a certain kind of literacy; for example, we can expand our written or spoken vocabulary. Second, literacy can increase horizontally by adding on new types of literacies. Once, we only had a spoken vocabulary, but eventually we learned to read and write as well as do math. We need to expand intellectual property rights literacy both vertically and horizontally in our first-year composition classrooms.

Such an expansion will no doubt be uncomfortable for many of us, and we surely will only be scratching the surface of that new literacy. Fortunately, we need not overturn everything we are currently doing. Instead, writing instructors simply need to examine what they are already teaching and find methods for including a deeper discussion of intellectual property use and abuse. Through my experience, I’ve learned that by making intellectual property part of our regular discussions, students are beginning to ask questions as they go. After reading a sample student essay, one young woman asked, “She used the exact word I wanted for my essay, but I didn’t know so until I read it. If I use that word, is it plagiarism?” The class overwhelmingly decided no; it was not plagiarism. She was not stealing the writer’s ideas; she was simply realizing that she had found the exact word she was searching for. While doing his research, another student found an article title, based on a pun, and he wanted to use that same pun for his title. His peer reviewers, before I could even give input, had already decided that he could probably use a similar pun but couldn’t “steal” the exact title. They, too, have now expanded the discussion of intellectual property beyond a “done, not done” view of plagiarism. Hopefully, they also now care more about the precedents for and originality of their own work.

In a point, click, and copy world, writing instructors must be called to become intellectual property pedagogical philosophers. We must advocate for clear but strong policies against the misuse of intellectual property, including the abuse of student rights to their own work. As we stand up for our own rights to fairly and ethically use others’ intellectual property in our academic pursuits, we must also insist on students having those same rights in their academic pursuits. Although the work of expanding the literacy of intellectual property begins with infusing it into many facets of our first-year composition courses, it cannot end there.
NOTES

1. As an example, Chris Boulton’s (2007) master’s thesis analyzed print advertisements for designer children’s clothing. However, unable to clear the copyright on many of the advertisements he examined, the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, based on their graduate school’s Guidelines for Master’s Theses and Doctoral Dissertations, forced the removal of the ads from bound copies and versions available through university’s Web site. UMass guidelines fail to even mention fair use exceptions for its students pursuing any research that might involve commenting on copyrighted materials. For more information, refer to Open Access resources at http://www.openstudents.org/2008/07/08/fair-game/

2. To my knowledge no student has yet to face serious disciplinary action for such source usage. Similarly, the policy has had little effect on those who commit truly serious infractions. In fall semester 2008, a developmental writing student submitted a purchased essay as part of his portfolio for exit competency assessment, and was caught. When his instructor awarded him a 0.0 for his efforts, he told her, “I didn’t get much for my $45, did I?” The student then simply retook the placement test and received the bare minimum score needed for entrance into our transfer-level composition course.
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