

# LIS 855, Publishing, Knowledge Institutions and Society: E-Revolutions?

School of Library and Information Studies  
University of Wisconsin-Madison  
Summer 2013

Dorothea Salo (please call me “Dorothea”)  
Office address: 4261 Helen C. White Hall  
Course link page: <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:590>

[salo@wisc.edu](mailto: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 republishing 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 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 and explain it clearly and succinctly to others
- 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, and 4b.

## Course Policies

**I wish to fully include persons with disabilities in this course. Please let me know within one week if you require special 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; students whose reading is not evident *through Learn@UW* will lose half the available Readings and Participation points from their final grade. (To make doing so more enjoyable, I have included weekly “theme songs” on the reading pages that are not in the syllabus!)

### 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 Fridays or 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 17. 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:acta>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:creativecommons>

Issue-brief topics: Google Books lawsuit; *Wiley v. Kirtsaeng* lawsuit; international treaties and accessible ebooks; SOPA/PIPA protests; the DMCA and cell-phone unlocking (trust me, it's relevant)

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://www.keepyourcopyrights.org/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/](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 imprint controversy; Harlequin Horizons imprint controversy; the Borders bankruptcy

"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](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.sfw.org/for-authors/writer-beware/vanity/>

Robertson, Edward W. "No rules, no maps, no dogma, no limits: a Failure Ahoy! manifesto." <http://www.edwardwrobertson.com/2013/04/no-rules-no-laws-no-dogma-no-limits.html>

Shatzkin, Mike. "A coming new obsession: how to handle a smaller print-book business." <http://www.idealogue.com/blog/a-coming-new-obsession-how-to-handle-a-smaller-print-book-business/>

### 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; Smashwords library lending; Apple price-fixing lawsuit; publishers fighting with Amazon over terms of sale; DRM and HTML5

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](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2111396)  
"The Traditional Publishing Bingo Card" <http://www.flickr.com/photos/shmuel1510/5546944073/> and "The Electronic Publishing Bingo Card" <http://whatever.scalzi.com/2011/03/20/the-electronic-publishing-bingo-card/>  
"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>  
Strauss, Victoria. "Print-on-demand self-publishing services." <http://www.sfw.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: 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; impact-factor protest; the "alt-metrics" movement; the Modern Language Association's new guidelines on tenure and promotion; university-press closures and near-closures; Dale Askey lawsuit  
Cairns, Michael. "ALA speech parallel universe: monographs don't support the library mission." <http://personanodata.blogspot.com/2011/06/ala-speech-parallel-universe-monographs.html>  
Kelty, Christopher. "How not to run a university press (or how sausage is made)" <http://savageminds.org/2010/08/31/how-not-to-run-a-university-press-or-how-sausage-is-made/>  
Polanka, Sue. "University presses and ebooks: a new horizon." <http://www.infotoday.com/online/jan12/Polanka-EBook-Buzz-University-Presses-and-Ebooks-A-New-Horizon.shtml>  
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/ese/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: The Cost of Knowledge petition; Finch report (UK); FASTR; OSTP open-access recommendations, CHORUS, and SHARE; state-level open-access legislation; Jeffrey Beall  
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.)  
Salo, Dorothea. "Who owns our work?" *Serials*. <http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1793/45742>  
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>

## 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 on Wikipedia; universities signing major electronic-textbook deals; MOOCs and textbooks; state legislation on college/university textbooks; Apple and textbooks; Delhi University textbook lawsuit; Boundless Learning copyright lawsuit; Georgia State e-reserves lawsuit

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>

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

## Week 7: Online, mobile and DIY "print" culture

*Learning objectives: Mobile and ebook text-consumption behaviors. Mass-digitization and digitization-aggregation projects (Google Books, ArchivesGrid, Europeana, DPLA). More on orphan works. Library digitization and the larger web.*

Linklists: <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:digitization>, <http://pinboard.in/u:dsalo/t:mlp>, <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: Amazon's fanfic initiative; 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.)

"Key findings [on library patrons and ebooks]." <http://www.thedigitalshift.com/research/patron-profiles/key-findings/>

Rogers, Jenica. "one piece of the changing landscape." <http://www.attemptingelegance.com/?p=1611>

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/>

Samuelson, "GBS as copyright reform." <http://www.slideshare.net/naypinya/samuelson-gbs-as-copyright-reform>  
Band, "GBS March Madness." <http://www.arl.org/bm-doc/gbs-march-madness-diagram-final.pdf>

## Week 8: Where's the money?

*Learning objectives: Library publishing. Crowdsourcing and crowdfunding.*

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 due this week, to give you time to work on your scenario plan. There is a fair example of the breed relevant to this week's topic at [http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/portal\\_libraries\\_and\\_the\\_academy/v012/12.4.walters.html](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/v012/12.4.walters.html).

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/>

Price, Gary. "Library as publisher: a Massachusetts public library will soon begin publishing eBooks." <http://www.infodocket.com/2013/03/11/library-as-publisher-a-massachusetts-public-library-will-soon-begin-publishing-ebooks/>

# Assignments

## Assignments

Assignments	Percentage	Due Date
Issue Brief 1	15%	(varies)
Issue Brief 2	15%	(varies)
Book Review 1	15%	Monday, July 22
Book Review 2	15%	Monday, August 12
Scenario-plan report	30%	Friday, August 23
Readings 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

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.

## ISSUE BRIEFS

Last summer, 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, please) that you will write issue briefs about, and make your choices known via the dedicated 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 1000 words long; *brevity is strongly encouraged*. 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 reading time.

Your brief should try to 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 1000 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 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 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 review to the Book Reviews forum on Learn@UW. Do NOT include it as a Microsoft 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*
- Demand Progress: *Hacking Politics*
- Larry Lessig: *The Future of Ideas: the Fate of the Commons in a Connected World*
- Jason Mazzone: *Copyfraud and Other Abuses of Intellectual Property Law*

### Ebooks, Trade Publishing, Self-Publishing

- John B. Thompson: *Books in the Digital Age* or *Merchants of Culture*
- Kristine Kathryn Rusch, *The Business Rusch* (essay collection at <http://kriswrites.com/business-rusch-publishing-articles/>) or *Changing Times* (<http://kriswrites.com/business-rusch-publishing-articles/estate-planning-series/the-business-rusch-publishing-series/>)

### 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*
- Roger C. Schonfeld: *JSTOR: A History*

### Changing Roles for Information Agencies

- Walt Crawford: *The Librarian's Guide to Micropublishing*
- Nicholas G. Tomaiuolo: *UContent: the Information Professional's Guide to User-Generated Content*
- David A. Swords ed.: *Patron-Driven Acquisitions: History and Best Practices*
- R. David Lankes, *Expect More: Demanding Better Libraries for Today's Complex World*

## SCENARIO PLANNING

What *Wired* calls "scenario planning" is one variant on "environmental scanning," 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 professionals possibly plan effective strategy around phenomena they don't understand? 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.

Perform steps 1 through 4 of the "Wired Guide to Scenario Planning" at [http://www.wired.com/special\\_multimedia/2009/ff\\_scenario\\_1708](http://www.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.

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 with a half- to one-page (double-spaced) description, and a rough estimate of the likelihood of this future coming to pass
- a list of implications for each quadrant of each scenario grid
- a list of suggested actions for each quadrant of each scenario grid for *each* interested party you choose to write about. 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)
- Ebook file formats (Adobe, IDPF, Apple, Amazon, self-publisher, university press, Big Six Five Publisher, Library of Congress, Recording for the Blind and Dyslexic)
- Digital-rights management (MPAA/RIAA, ALA, ARL, 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)
- 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)
- Regulation of the Internet on behalf of copyright holders (college/university administration, commercial author, academic author, photographer, ALA, Electronic Frontier Foundation, FCC)

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	855 Objectives	855 Measurable Outcomes
<p>1a. Students apply key concepts with respect to the relationship between power, knowledge, and information.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 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</li> <li>➤ 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</li> <li>➤ Sufficient knowledge of intellectual-property-related dilemmas, movements, and legislation (past and pending) to be a thoughtful advocate and information-agency leader</li> </ul>	<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Sufficient knowledge of publishing trends to inform collection-development decisions in academic, public, K-12, and special-library settings</li> </ul>	<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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Sufficient knowledge of intellectual-property-related dilemmas, movements, and legislation (past and pending) to be a thoughtful advocate and information-agency leader</li> <li>➤ The ability to assess a rapidly-evolving situation and explain it clearly and succinctly to others</li> <li>➤ The ability to devise a well-reasoned long-range scenario and a strategy to respond to it</li> </ul>	<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	855 Objectives	855 Measurable Outcomes
2b. Students apply core ethical principles to professional practice.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ 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</li> <li>➤ 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</li> <li>➤ Sufficient knowledge of intellectual-property-related dilemmas, movements, and legislation (past and pending) to be a thoughtful advocate and information-agency leader</li> </ul>	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Sufficient knowledge of publishing trends to inform collection-development decisions in academic, public, K-12, and special-library settings</li> <li>➤ The ability to assess a rapidly-evolving situation and explain it clearly and succinctly to others</li> <li>➤ The ability to devise a well-reasoned long-range scenario and a strategy to respond to it</li> </ul>	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The ability to assess a rapidly-evolving situation and explain it clearly and succinctly to others</li> <li>➤ The ability to write a journal-quality book review</li> </ul>	Issue briefs, scenario planning, and book reviews are graded on adherence to professional-communication norms.