

LIS 640, Publishing, Knowledge Institutions and Society: E-Revolutions?

School of Library and Information Studies
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Dorothea Salo (please call me "Dorothea")
Office address: 4261 Helen C. White Hall
Course link page: <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:658>

salo@wisc.edu, 608-265-4733
Office hours: by appointment
Skype: dorotheasalo



To the extent possible under law, the person who associated CC0 with this work has waived all copyright and related or neighboring rights to this work. This work is published from: United States.

Course Objectives

- Sufficient knowledge of US copyright law to advise digitization projects, uncertain authors and instructors, and digital archivists on common, relatively simple fair-use, orphan-works, reuse, and (re)publishing dilemmas
- Sufficient knowledge of current trends, processes, and standards in trade and scholarly publishing to advise would-be authors, advocate for balanced laws and policies, and navigate professional publishing opportunities
- Sufficient knowledge of intellectual-property-related dilemmas, movements, and legislation (past and pending) to be a thoughtful information advocate and information-agency leader
- Sufficient knowledge of publishing trends to inform collection-development decisions in academic, public, K-12, and special-library settings
- The ability to assess a rapidly-evolving situation, explain it clearly and succinctly to others, and devise feasible responses to it
- The ability to devise a well-reasoned long-range scenario and a strategy to respond to it
- The ability to write a journal-quality book review

This course is designed to assess student progress in the following SLIS program-level outcomes: 1a, 1b, 2a, 2b, 3b, 4b, 4d.

Course Policies

I wish to fully include persons with disabilities in this course. Please let me know within one week if you require accommodation. I will try to maintain the confidentiality of this information.

Academic Honesty: I follow the academic standards for cheating and plagiarism set forth by the University of Wisconsin.

Readings

There are no required textbooks for this course. Links to all readings are on Learn@UW.

Contacting me

Please use the Learn@UW help forum *before* emailing me; please also do your best to assist your classmates there. I am not available weekends; otherwise, I do my level best to answer email within two business days. If you need to speak with me, please make an appointment with me *directly on WiscCal*, which will email me the appointment information and help ensure I'm not double-booked.

If you see dead links (it does happen, usually with no notice), weird due dates, or other syllabus problems, please post them to the "Syllabus problems" forum on Learn@UW. I will do my best to resolve them promptly.

Course week and due dates

Our course week runs from Monday to Monday beginning June 2. Late assignments will be penalized one final-grade percentage point per day or fraction thereof late. I will allow revision and resubmission at my sole discretion and on my schedule only; any student resistance will remove the opportunity.

Weekly Objectives and Readings

Most weeks have linklists associated with them. These are for enrichment, as well as assistance for those delving into related topics for issue briefs or scenario planning. You are *not* expected to read everything on the linklists!

Week 1: Copyright law and its discontents

Learning objectives: Basics of US copyright law. Fair use. First sale. Section 108 exemptions. The public domain. Copyright-related legislation and legislative attempts since 1976 (1976 Copyright Act, DMCA, ACTA, SOPA, PIPA). Copyright and library/museum digitization projects. Copyright and authors. Free culture and Creative Commons. Legislative advocacy processes inside and outside libraries.

Linklists: <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:copyright>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:sopa>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:dmca>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:treaties>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:creativecommons>
Issue-brief topics: *Wiley v. Kirtsaeng* lawsuit; international treaty negotiations (TPP, WIPO/EU) regarding copyright; fair use best-practices codes; the Author's Guild and the Author's Alliance; Creative Commons "noncommercial" controversies
Sims, Nancy. "Copyright Basics." <https://www.lib.umn.edu/copyright/basics> (please read all five sections) and "Using Copyrightable Materials" <https://www.lib.umn.edu/copyright/useoverview> (please read all six sections)
Hirtle et al. "Copyright and Cultural Institutions: Guidelines for US Libraries, Archives, and Museums." <http://ecommons.cornell.edu/handle/1813/14142/> (chapters 7-9, 11, 12, but the rest is excellent, so consider reading it)
Association for Research Libraries. "Code of Best Practices in Fair Use for Academic and Research Libraries." <http://www.arl.org/bm-doc/code-of-best-practices-fair-use.pdf> (pp. 1-12; skim the remainder, realizing you may return to it later!)
"Clauses for Writers." *Keep Your Copyrights*. <http://web.law.columbia.edu/keep-your-copyrights/contracts/clauses/by-creator/2/friendly> (Skim this to get the gist. Make sure to click through all four "fists" at page top.)
Seiderberg, Steven. "Copyright in the Age of YouTube." *ABA Journal*. http://www.abajournal.com/magazine/article/copyright_in_the_age_of_youtube/
Ars Technica. "Creative Commons images and you: a quick guide for image users." <http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2011/08/creative-commons-images-and-you/>

Week 2: Trade publishing

Learning objectives: Paper-based trade-publishing workflows and money-flows. Self-publishing. Vanity publishing. Frontlist/backlist/midlist. Costs of publishing (first-copy costs, distribution costs). The "Big Six Five." Book contracts. Royalties. Rights reversion. "Out-of-print" and why it matters. Local publishing.

Linklists: <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:publishing>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:authors>
Issue-brief topics: Big Six mergers; Penguin/Author Solutions lawsuit; Random House Hydra and Harlequin Horizons imprint controversies; Amazon negotiating with the Big Six (most recently Hachette); the Authors Guild and the Authors Alliance
"Get Published!: Who are the Big Six Publishers?" <http://www.pfspublishing.com/workshop/2011/03/get-published-who-are-the-big-six.html>
"How books are sold." http://www.netread.com/howto/publisher/index.cfm?article=how_books_are_sold.cfm
Laughran, Jennifer. "Frontlist, backlist, midlist." <http://literaticat.blogspot.com/2010/09/frontlist-backlist-midlist.html>
Deahl, Rachel. "Whither the midlist publisher?" <http://www.publishersweekly.com/pw/by-topic/industry-news/publisher-news/article/49398-whither-the-midlist-publisher-.html>
Strauss, Victoria. "Vanity/subsidy publishers." <http://www.sfga.org/for-authors/writer-beware/vanity/>
The Rejecter. "How much does a writer make?" <http://rejecter.blogspot.com/2010/08/how-much-does-writer-make.html>
Stross, Charlie. "Why I don't self-publish." <http://www.antipope.org/charlie/blog-static/2013/03/why-i-dont-self-publish.html>
Tarr, Judith. "Escaping Stockholm." <http://mizkit.com/escaping-stockholm/>

Week 3: Trade ebook publishing

Ebook publishing (standards, formats, sales models). Current consumer-ebook supply chains (Amazon, Apple, Macmillan, Microsoft, etc), market fights, and lawsuits. DRM. POD. Agency vs. wholesale sales models. Ebook licensing in libraries.

Linklists: <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:ebooks>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:amazon>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:apple>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:drm>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:pod>

Issue-brief topics: Kansas and Overdrive/3M; Big Six Five publishers, ebooks, and library lending; Douglas County Libraries ebook programs; Apple price-fixing lawsuit; DRM, HTML5, and Mozilla Firefox; the Comixology buyout; the Boston Library Consortium's ebook dilemma

O'Brien et al. "E-books in libraries: a briefing document developed in preparation for a workshop on e-lending in libraries." http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2111396

"The Traditional Publishing Bingo Card" <http://www.flickr.com/photos/shmuel510/5546944073/> and "The Electronic Publishing Bingo Card" <http://whatever.scalzi.com/2011/03/20/the-electronic-publishing-bingo-card/>

G.F. "Book production: papering over e-books." <http://www.economist.com/blogs/babbage/2014/04/book-production>

"Digital content: what's next?" <http://viewer.zmags.com/publication/7d9e3366?viewType=pubPreview&page=1#/7d9e3366/1> (articles by Stripling, Logan, Lynch.) (Please introspect about your reading experience with this -- and please read a few pages in the "native" interface before giving up and downloading the PDF. What does this say about one of librarianship's major professional organizations?)

Eisler, Barry. "The digital truths traditional publishers don't want to hear." <http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/booksblog/2013/apr/29/digital-truths-traditional-publishers>

Miller, Laura. "You can't buy that! The great e-book royalty war." http://www.salon.com/2014/03/27/you_cant_buy_that_the_great_e_book_royalty_war/

Strauss, Victoria. "Print-on-demand self-publishing services." <http://www.sfga.org/for-authors/writer-beware/pod/>

"Folding shelves." *The Economist*. <http://www.economist.com/news/international/21573966-e-books-mean-plot-twist-public-libraries-and-publishers-folding-shelves>

Week 4: Scholarly reputation and scholarly-book publishing

Learning objectives: The basic sociology of peer review. How scholarly reputation works in the humanities and the sciences. University presses, scholarly societies, and their business models. Where monographs fit in academia. Journal impact factor. Impact factor and other bibliometric measures. Alternative metrics. Libraries and university presses.

Linklists: <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:unipresses>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:bibliometrics>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:peerreview>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:swartz>

Issue-brief topics: Aaron Swartz and JSTOR; DORA impact-factor protest; the "alt-metrics" movement; university-press closures and near-closures; the Lever Initiative; development of a new "credit taxonomy" for journal articles; Oberlin Group statement on ebook licensing

Jackson, Corey. "Watching the detectives: review's past and present." <http://adanewmedia.org/2014/04/issue4-jackson/>

Fitzpatrick, Kathleen. "Evolving standards and practices in tenure and promotion reviews." <http://www.plannedobsolescence.net/evolving-standards-and-practices-in-tenure-and-promotion-reviews/>

Kelty, Christopher. "How not to run a university press (or how sausage is made)" <http://web.archive.org/web/20130120064807/http://savageminds.org/2010/08/31/how-not-to-run-a-university-press-or-how-sausage-is-made/>

Sherman, Scott. "University Presses Under Fire." <http://www.thenation.com/article/179712/university-presses-under-fire>

Reid, Alex. "university presses and scholarly networks." <http://alex-reid.net/2014/05/university-presses-and-scholarly-networks.html>

O'Malley, Mike. "Saving the AHA" <http://theaporetic.com/?p=3402> and "Book costs again" <http://theaporetic.com/?p=3484>

Lawrence, Peter A. "Lost in publication: how measurement harms science." <http://www.int-res.com/abstracts/esep/v8/n1/p9-11/>

SURFfoundation. "Users, narcissism and control: tracking the impact of scholarly publications in the 21st century." <http://www.surffoundation.nl/nl/publicaties/Documents/Users%20narcissism%20and%20control.pdf>

Lugg, Rick. "Bibliometrics and book retention." <http://sampleandhold-r2.blogspot.com/2012/02/bibliometrics-and-book-retention.html>

Week 5: Scholarly ebooks and e-journals

Learning objectives: The "Big Deal." How the Big Deal impacted the scholarly-monograph market. Legal and procedural threats to interlibrary loan. The serials crisis; protest against it. E-journal licensing. Open access; repositories; open-access journals; scam open-access publishers.

Linklists: <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:openaccess>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:e-journals>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:ereserves>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:ill>

Issue-brief topics: OSTP open-access recommendations; American History Association statements on electronic theses and dissertations; Beall's List and controversies surrounding it; mass journal cancellations from several major universities (e.g. Konstanz, Montreal); the Bohannon sting and responses to it; Elsevier and ASCE takedown notices

"Monograph & Serial Costs in ARL Libraries, 1986-2011" <http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/monograph-serial-costs.pdf>

Frazier, Ken. "The librarians' dilemma: contemplating the costs of the 'big deal.'" *D-Lib Magazine*. <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march01/frazier/03frazier.html> (look at the date! prescient!)

Suber, Peter. "Open access overview." <http://www.earlham.edu/~peters/fos/overview.htm> (Click links on anything you don't understand. Many untruths about open access are common currency still.)

Smith, Kevin. "It's the content, not the version!" <http://blogs.library.duke.edu/scholcomm/2014/02/05/its-the-content-not-the-version/>

Smith and Mangiafico. "Reason, risk, and reward: models for libraries and other stakeholders in an evolving scholarly publication ecosystem" *Cultural Anthropology*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14506/ca29.2.03>

Thornton-Verma, Henrietta. "Plan B: life after the Big Deal." *Library Journal Reviews*. <http://reviews.libraryjournal.com/2012/04/reference/plan-b-life-after-the-big-deal/>

ARL. "Report of the task force on international interlibrary loan and document delivery practices." <http://publications.arl.org/rli275/2>

Clement, Gail. "American ETD dissemination in the age of open access." <http://crln.acrl.org/content/74/11/562.full>

Ramirez et al. "Do open access electronic theses and dissertations diminish publishing opportunities in the social sciences and humanities?" <http://crl.acrl.org/content/early/2012/04/05/crl-356.short>

Week 6: Publishing and the classroom: textbooks and reference books

Learning objectives: K-12 textbook markets; legislation related to them. How college textbook markets work. E-textbooks. Open-access textbooks. TEACH Act. "Open educational resources." Apple, Barnes&Noble, Microsoft and their e-textbook bets. Reference publishing.

Linklists: <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:textbooks>

Issue-brief topics: Diversity and Wikipedia; e-textbook company buyouts or major business changes; academic-library open-textbook initiatives; US state/Canadian province legislation on college/university textbooks; Georgia State e-reserves lawsuit; Aspen Publishing casebook incident

Owen, Laura Hazard. "What Apple is wading into: a snapshot of the K-12 textbook business." *Paid Content*. <http://paidcontent.org/2012/01/21/419-the-abcs-and-123s-of-apple-and-the-k-12-textbook-market/>

Rabinowitz, David. "Living through the evolution of etextbooks." *TidBITS*. <http://tidbits.com/e/13685>

Kelty, Christopher. "The disappearing virtual library." *Al Jazeera English*. <http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/02/2012227143813304790.html>

Parry, Marc. "Students get savvier about textbook buying." *Chronicle of Higher Education*. <http://chronicle.com/article/Students-Get-Savvier-About/136827/>

Moskin, Julia. "Are Cookbooks Obsolete?" <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/11/09/dining/are-apps-making-cookbooks-obsolete.html>

Swoger, Bonnie. "Why I don't buy print reference books." <http://blogs.scientificamerican.com/information-culture/2014/04/04/why-i-dont-buy-print-reference-books/>

Listen to the interview with Wordnik founder Erin McKean (on Learn@UW).

Week 7: News publishing. Reader behavior.

Learning objectives: Mobile and ebook text-consumption behaviors. Digital news. Subscription services.

Linklists: <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:digitization>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:mplp>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:googlebooks>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:dpla>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:newsmedia>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:mobile>

Issue-brief topics: Kindle Singles; Hathi Trust's orphan-works-opening attempt; Europeana's funding; DPLA launch; crowdfunding for book publishing (n.b. you may mention crowdfunding of other media, but your brief needs to be about books, ebooks, graphic novels, etc); newspaper paywalls; Author's Guild lawsuits against Google and Hathi Trust

Pontin, Jason. "Why publishers don't like apps." *MIT Technology Review*. <http://www.technologyreview.com/news/427785/why-publishers-dont-like-apps/>

Rashbass, Andrew. "Lean back media: the shock of the old." *The Economist*. <http://www.slideshare.net/emmaturner/lean-back-media-the-shock-of-the-old> (How do and don't library patrons match up with the Economist's reader and tablet-reader demographics? Why? Can libraries change that, and if so, do they want to? Also, pay special attention to slide 71.)

Pakman, David. "The unbundling of media." <http://www.pakman.com/2011/04/15/the-unbundling-of-media/>
"Key findings [on library patrons and ebooks]." <http://www.thedigitalshift.com/research/patron-profiles/key-findings/>

Zickuhr et al. "Library services in the digital age." <http://libraries.pewinternet.org/2013/01/22/Library-services/> (Keep in mind what Henry Ford said about asking consumers what they want...)

Coker, Mark. "Examining the business model of ebook subscription services." <http://www.the-digital-reader.com/2013/10/29/examining-business-model-ebook-subscription-services-part/>

Hoffelder, Nate. "Comparing subscription eBook services." <http://www.the-digital-reader.com/2013/10/08/comparing-subscription-ebook-services/>

Week 8: Where's the support for culture? Is it in libraries?

Learning objectives: Models of cultural sustainability. Library as publisher. Crowdsourcing and crowdfunding. Preservation of cultural artifacts, especially digital ones. Mass-digitization and digitization-aggregation projects (Google Books, ArchivesGrid, Europeana, DPLA). Library digitization and the larger web. More on orphan works.

Linklists: <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:libpublishing>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:crowdsourcing>,
<http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:crowdfunding>

No issue briefs this week, to give you time to work on your scenario plan.

Scalzi, John. "Amanda Palmer, Kickstarter, and everything." <http://whatever.scalzi.com/2012/05/03/amanda-palmer-kickstarter-and-everything/>

Watters, Audrey. "Unglue.it: a crowdfunded, e-book liberation project." *Inside Higher Education*. <http://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/hack-higher-education/unglueit-crowdfunded-e-book-liberation-project>
"Unbound: how it works." <http://www.unbound.co.uk/about>

"Digital content: what's next?" <http://viewer.zmags.com/publication/7d9e3366?viewType=pubPreview&page=1#/7d9e3366/1> (articles by Larue, Brantley, Sullivan.)

Holley, Rose. "Crowdsourcing: how and why should libraries do it?" <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/march10/holley/03holley.html>

Schwartz, Meredith. "Ten questions with the Library Publishing Coalition." <http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2013/04/library-services/ten-questions-with-the-library-publishing-coalition/>

Koerber, Jennifer. "The public library as publisher." <http://lj.libraryjournal.com/2014/03/publishing/the-public-library-as-publisher/>

Smith, Kevin. "Why is adopting orphans controversial?" <http://blogs.library.duke.edu/scholcomm/2011/09/12/why-is-adopting-orphans-controversial/>

Parry, Mark. "Out of fear, colleges lock books and images away from scholars." <http://chronicle.com/article/Out-of-Fear-Institutions-Lock/127701/> (Read carefully. What *precisely* is and isn't meant by "locking books and images away from scholars" and why *precisely* is it happening?)

Carr, Nicholas. "The library of utopia." *Technology Review*. <http://www.technologyreview.com/web/40210/>

Band, "Google Books Litigation Family Tree." <http://www.librarycopyrightalliance.org/bm-doc/google-books-litigation-family-tree-7162013.pdf>

Assignments

Assignments	Percentage	Due Date
Issue Brief 1	15%	(varies)
Issue Brief 2	15%	(varies)
Book Review 1	15%	Monday, June 23
Book Review 2	15%	Monday, July 14
Scenario-plan report	30%	Friday, July 25
Readings, lectures, and forum participation	10%	

Final grade scale: 100-93.5 A; 93.4-89.5 AB; 89.4-83.5 B; 83.4-79.5 BC; 79.4-73.5 C, 69.5-73.4 D, below 69.5 F

No extra credit opportunities are available in this class. No assignment grades are dropped. Any student failing entirely to turn in an assignment listed above will automatically fail the course. I will check Learn@UW for the time you spend in content and discussion modules; if you commonly download class material to read offline, please let me know. (To make the content modules more enjoyable, I have included weekly “theme songs” on the reading pages that are not in the syllabus!)

ISSUE BRIEFS

When I first taught this course, several students were distressed at the reading load; there’s quite a lot happening in this space, and it’s hard to assimilate it all in eight short weeks! This summer, the readings and I will provide you background knowledge and analysis, and you will crowdsource current-events coverage via *issue briefs*. These are short pithy explanations of a salient topic, such as you might write to help a supervisor or a committee you participate in get up to speed quickly.

During the first week of class, read through the syllabus, choose TWO topics (from different weeks) that you will write issue briefs about, and make your choices known on the issue-brief discussion forum in Learn@UW. To ensure breadth of coverage, no topic may be repeated by a second student until all topics have been chosen once.

Issue briefs may be no more than 750 words long; *brevity is strongly encouraged*, and you may use graphics and visualizations as you see fit (subject to fair-use analysis if you adopt someone else’s). They should be posted to the weekly Learn@UW forum by 5 pm Central Time, *the Monday of the week the issue is listed under*. (Exception: Week 1 issue briefs are due the Monday of Week 2. If you choose issues from both Week 1 and Week 2, they are due the same day!) Please post your issue briefs directly as forum text, *not as Word or PDF documents*, to save your colleagues and me time.

Your brief should address the following questions, as relevant and appropriate:

- What’s the issue?
- Who’s on which side of it, and what do they want? (As appropriate; not all listed issues are confrontational.)
- What’s going on just now (e.g. lawsuits, online spats, legislative or treaty action, business fights)?
- So what? What’s at stake? What’s the library / archive / other information agency angle? Which information professionals should care, and why?
- What actions are available to information agencies and information professionals? What should we do?

Please informally (a linklist will do; I don’t need a formal bibliography) list your sources (and any additional recommended reading, if you wish) after your brief; this does not count against your 750 words. While you may certainly plunder my linklists for sources, I expect at least one source that I have not bookmarked!

Grading criteria:

- Adroit management of the trade-off between brevity and thoroughness
- Correctness of factual content (I warn you, there is a great deal of mis- and disinformation out there; as information professionals, you are expected to use appropriate discernment to pick through it all!)
- Currency of factual content (everything’s changing fast!)
- Accuracy of analysis (which includes not falling for hype or zealotry!)
- Soundness of recommendations (I will give due allowance for how novel these topics are for many of you, but this won’t be the first time in your career you’ll have to form a viable plan quickly on limited information)

You are required to read all posted issue briefs and forum discussion thereof, as I am assigning them in lieu of far more extensive reading. I will remove one percentage point from your readings / participation grade for each week you do not. You are encouraged to ask questions about issue briefs and discuss them further on the forums. (Don’t worry, issue-brief

authors; I will be there to back you up if you need it!) Please keep empty cheerleading and/or outrage to a minimum; substantive comments and questions only, to preserve your classmates' and my patience with Learn@UW's terrible forum user interface.

BOOK REVIEWS

Choose two books listed below, each from a different category, and review the books as though you were reviewing for an ALA divisional journal (e.g. *Information Technology and Libraries*, *Reference and User Services Quarterly*, or *College and Research Libraries*). A good book review is no more (ideally much less) than 1000 words long (I am giving you a breather here; most review venues insist on half that or less) and engagingly written. It often includes a BRIEF summary of the book's argument(s), a summary of the book's strengths and weaknesses, and a recommendation (or not) for library purchase containing a statement of appropriate audiences for the book. Examples of high-quality book reviews can be found at the *Feminist Collections* website: <http://womenst.library.wisc.edu/publications/feminist-coll.html>

At least one book in each category is available electronically: on the open web, via UW-Madison library subscription, or for relatively-inexpensive purchase. Several others are on print reserve in the SLIS Library. You should be able to find some in local public libraries. Please use discretion in checking out books! If you would like to review a relevant book I haven't listed, email me its citation no later than the Monday of Week 3, so that I can decide whether to allow it. (Usually I say yes.)

Post your reviews to the Book Reviews forum on Learn@UW by 5 pm the days they are due. Do NOT include it as a Word file or PDF, please! The forum is open all semester long; feel free to turn in reviews early. You are not required to read all posted reviews, but I do recommend that you read reviews for as many of the different books/collections as possible.

Grading criteria: Writing suitable for a professional journal (use the Writing Center if you need it), appropriate structure, depth of analysis and critique of the book's arguments, savvy collection-development recommendations.

Copyright and the Cultural Commons

- James Boyle: *The Public Domain: enclosing the commons of the mind*
- Jason Mazzone: *Copyfraud and Other Abuses of Intellectual Property Law*
- Adrian Johns: *Piracy: the intellectual property wars from Gutenberg to Gates*
- Susan M. Bielstein: *Permissions, A Survival Guide: blunt talk about art as intellectual property*

Ebooks, Trade Publishing, Self-Publishing

- John B. Thompson: *Books in the Digital Age or Merchants of Culture*
- Michael Bhaskar: *The Content Machine*
- Kristine Kathryn Rusch: *The Business Rusch* (essay collection at <http://kriswrites.com/business-rusch-publishing-articles/>)
- Ted Striphas: *The Late Age of Print: everyday book culture from consumerism to control*

Academic Publishing

- Christine Borgman: *Scholarship in the Digital Age*
- Kathleen Fitzpatrick: *Planned Obsolescence: publishing, technology, and the future of the academy*
- Michael Nielsen: *Reinventing Discovery*
- Cohen and Scheinfeldt eds.: *Hacking the Academy: new approaches to scholarship and teaching from digital humanities*

Changing Roles for Information Agencies

- Walt Crawford: *The Librarian's Guide to Micropublishing*
- David A. Swords ed.: *Patron-Driven Acquisitions: History and Best Practices*
- R. David Lankes: *Expect More: Demanding Better Libraries for Today's Complex World*
- Brown, Oberlander, Pitcher, and Utarro: *The Library Publishing Toolkit*

SCENARIO PLANNING

What *Wired* calls "scenario planning" is one variant on "environmental scanning" (see my linklist of environmental-scanlike writings at <https://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:enviroscan>) which is aimed at understanding a relevant social/technical/financial environment and building forecasts based on that understanding. Environmental scanning is a key part of strategic planning for organizations, information agencies hardly least; how can leaders possibly plan effective strategy around phenomena they don't understand and stakeholders they know nothing about? This assignment is a guided scenario plan, to accustom you to the technique so that you can use it to guide policy and planning in your future careers. The assignment will also provide you with in-depth knowledge of a key area of change and/or controversy in the current publishing scene.

Read “How to build scenarios” at <http://archive.wired.com/wired/scenarios/build.html> and then perform steps 1 through 4 of the “Wired Guide to Scenario Planning” at http://archive.wired.com/special_multimedia/2009/ff_scenario_1708 with respect to ONE of the situations listed below, as though you were writing a formal, professional strategic-planning document to be disseminated publicly by an information agency or a professional/trade organization (such as ALA, ARL, ASIST, IDPF...) Research the points of view and actions of at least THREE of the interested parties listed beside the situation you choose to analyze; you may consider others (including unlisted parties) if you wish.

If you would like a model, though one not tied to the process I am asking you to use, look at Tyler Walter’s “The Future Role of Publishing Services in University Libraries” at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/pla.2012.0041>.

Your written scenario plan should include:

- a list of “key uncertainties,” with sufficient description to identify each one, and a brief description of the directions each could go
- a list of “key certainties,” with sufficient description to unambiguously identify each one
- one or more Step 2 scenario grids; each quadrant should be described in two sentences or less. You may choose to do more than one scenario grid if you cannot decide on only two most-important uncertainties.
- a possible future (Step 3) from *each quadrant of each scenario grid*. Each future should have a half- to one-page (double-spaced) description of its implications, and a rough estimate of its likelihood of coming to pass
- for each quadrant of each scenario grid, a list of implications (likely real-world impacts, positive and negative) for *each* of the interested parties whose point of view and actions you have researched (Step 4). You should feel free to list implications for other parties as well.
- a list of suggested actions for each quadrant of each scenario grid for *each* interested party you researched (Step 4). Repeating actions across parties is acceptable where warranted, but the lists should not be identical across all parties.

I will not answer the question “how long should this be?” It should be as long as it needs to be to address all the above requirements, and no longer. Professional writing in the information professions rarely involves explicit length limits.

Situations:

- Orphan works (Hathi Trust, academic-library digitization arm, archives/special collections, publisher with extensive backlist, professional photographer)
- Copyright reform in the US (ALA, ACRL, university press, open-access publisher, trade author, MPAA/RIAA)
- Library lending for trade ebooks (urban public library, rural public library, Big Six Five Publisher, indie ebook publisher/platform such as Smashwords, Amazon, Apple)
- Digital-rights management (W3C, ALA, ebook sales platform such as Amazon or Apple or Smashwords, Big Six Five Publisher, indie publisher, Electronic Frontier Foundation)
- Open access to research articles (Elsevier, Public Library of Science, scholarly author in the sciences, large research library, small liberal-arts college library)
- Open access to monographs (established humanities scholar, humanities Ph.D candidate, academic library, university press, Lever Initiative participant)
- Open access to theses and dissertations (established humanities scholar, humanities Ph.D candidate, science Ph.D candidate, established scientist, academic library, university press)
- Textbooks, e-textbooks, and open textbooks (major print textbook publisher, K-12 library, academic library, college/university administration, MOOC platform, Apple, Amazon)
- Self-publishing (commercial/trade midlist author, commercial/trade major author, new author, ebook sales platform such as Amazon or Apple or Smashwords, public library)

If you would like to analyze a different situation, email me no later than the Monday of Week 5 to propose it. I am likely to suggest interested parties you should consider as you perform your analysis.

Grading criteria:

- Accuracy and currency of factual information
- Depth and plausibility of analysis
- Cogency and realism of suggested courses of action
- Professional-quality expression (Yes, this means poor grammar, spelling, and rhetoric will cost you. The Writing Center is at your service! I am willing to skim drafts, but I do not have time to do extensive copyediting for you.)

SLIS Goals	640 Objectives	640 Measurable Outcomes
<p>1a. Students apply key concepts with respect to the relationship between power, knowledge, and information.</p>	<p>Sufficient knowledge of US copyright law to advise digitization projects, uncertain authors and instructors, and digital archivists on common, relatively simple fair-use, orphan-works, reuse, and republishing dilemmas</p> <p>Sufficient knowledge of current trends, processes, and standards in trade and scholarly publishing to advise would-be authors, advocate for balanced laws and policies, and navigate professional publishing opportunities</p> <p>Sufficient knowledge of intellectual-property-related dilemmas, movements, and legislation (past and pending) to be a thoughtful advocate and information-agency leader</p>	<p>Issue briefs are required to address power issues with respect to struggles over information. Scenario plan must gauge reasonable courses of action for actors with varying amounts of power in the information industries, and is graded on the plausibility of those courses of action.</p>
<p>1b. Students apply key concepts with respect to theories and practices of literacies, reading, and information use.</p>	<p>Sufficient knowledge of publishing trends to inform collection-development decisions in academic, public, K-12, and special-library settings</p>	<p>Book reviews must recommend appropriate audiences and library collections for the books read.</p>
<p>2a. Students evaluate and debate information policy and ethics applicable in local, national, or global contexts.</p>	<p>Sufficient knowledge of intellectual-property-related dilemmas, movements, and legislation (past and pending) to be a thoughtful advocate and information-agency leader</p> <p>The ability to assess a rapidly-evolving situation, explain it clearly and succinctly to others, and devise a feasible response to it.</p> <p>The ability to devise a well-reasoned long-range scenario and a strategy to respond to it</p>	<p>Both issue briefs and scenario planning demand consideration of policy and ethics issues. Depending on books chosen, the book review may address them as well.</p>

SLIS Goals	640 Objectives	640 Measurable Outcomes
2b. Students apply core ethical principles to professional practice.	<p>Sufficient knowledge of US copyright law to advise digitization projects, uncertain authors and instructors, and digital archivists on common, relatively simple fair-use, orphan-works, reuse, and republishing dilemmas</p> <p>Sufficient knowledge of current trends, processes, and standards in trade and scholarly publishing to advise would-be authors, advocate for balanced laws and policies, and navigate professional publishing opportunities</p> <p>Sufficient knowledge of intellectual-property-related dilemmas, movements, and legislation (past and pending) to be a thoughtful advocate and information-agency leader</p>	Issue briefs, many topics for which address core ethical principles such as accessibility of information, are required to suggest a course of action for libraries and information professionals.
3b. Students search, select, and evaluate print and digital information resources.	<p>Sufficient knowledge of publishing trends to inform collection-development decisions in academic, public, K-12, and special-library settings</p> <p>The ability to assess a rapidly-evolving situation, explain it clearly and succinctly to others, and devise a feasible response to it</p> <p>The ability to devise a well-reasoned long-range scenario and a strategy to respond to it</p>	Issue briefs require appropriate selection and evaluation of information sources, many of which may be biased or incomplete.
4b. Students demonstrate good oral and written communication skills.	<p>The ability to assess a rapidly-evolving situation and explain it clearly and succinctly to others, and devise a feasible response to it</p> <p>The ability to write a journal-quality book review</p>	Issue briefs, scenario planning, and book reviews are graded on adherence to professional-communication norms.
4d. Students demonstrate innovation and skills necessary for leadership.	<p>The ability to assess a rapidly-evolving situation, explain it clearly and succinctly to others, and devise feasible responses to it</p> <p>The ability to devise a well-reasoned long-range scenario and a strategy to respond to it</p>	Issue briefs and scenario plan are graded on depth of analysis and realism of proposed action, both key components of good strategic planning (which is itself a key leadership skill).