



Journal of Copyright in Education and Librarianship

JCEL is published by Clemson University Press
ISSN 2473-8336 | jcel-pub.org

Volume 2, Issue 2

The Search for a Service Model of Copyright Best Practices in Academic Libraries

Stephanie Lewin-Lane, Nora Dethloff, Julie Grob, Adam Townes, and
Ashley Lierman



© 2018 Lewin-Lane et al. This open access article is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

The Search for a Service Model of Copyright Best Practices in Academic Libraries

Stephanie Lewin-Lane
University of Houston Libraries

Nora Dethloff
University of Houston Libraries

Julie Grob
University of Houston Libraries

Adam Townes
University of Houston Libraries

Ashley Lierman
University of Houston Libraries

Author Note: Stephanie Lewin-Lane, Coordinator of the Music Library, University of Houston Libraries. Nora Dethloff, Head of Research Materials Procurement, University of Houston Libraries. Julie Grob, Coordinator for Instruction — Special Collections, University of Houston Libraries. Adam Townes, Coordinator of Research Services, University of Houston Libraries. Ashley Lierman, Instructional Design Librarian, University of Houston Libraries. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Stephanie Lewin-Lane, splewin@uh.edu, or Nora Dethloff, ndethloff@uh.edu.

Abstract

To add to their suite of available copyright services and to create a service model of best practices, the University of Houston Libraries' newly formed Copyright Team initiated a literature review and performed an environmental scan of peer institutions' copyright policies and procedures. This article outlines the impetus and results for both studies and offers future considerations.

The Search for a Service Model of Copyright Best Practices in Academic Libraries

Historically, librarians at the University of Houston (UH) have been tasked with answering copyright questions from the campus community in an ad hoc manner. This situation has led to concerns about the breadth of knowledge within the libraries, consistency across responses, and the amount of time librarians were dedicating to answering copyright questions that may fall outside their scope. In February 2015, the University of Houston Libraries formed a Copyright Team to address these concerns and to provide an organized method of providing answers to copyright inquiries for UH students, faculty, and staff, as well as outside researchers accessing UH collections.

The UH Copyright Team consists of six librarians with experience or deep interest in copyright issues in higher education, such as the TEACH Act, music copyright, and publishing rights. The librarians serve for 3 years on a rotating basis and engage in consistent training opportunities to expand their copyright knowledge, particularly in areas targeted as knowledge gaps by team members. The team was commissioned by the library administration with the following charge:

The UH Libraries Copyright Team will serve as a source of information on copyright best practices related to research, teaching, and learning. The team's work will include the following:

- *Investigating, identifying, creating, and disseminating best practices regarding copyright issues to both internal and external stakeholders;*
- *Sharing best practices in response to internal and external copyright queries on behalf of the library when appropriate;*
- *Tracking copyright expertise and experience within the library and directing internal and external copyright queries when appropriate;*
- *Facilitating discussions and building engagement within the library around copyright issues in higher education;*
- *Updating internal and external stakeholders on new developments in copyright;*
- *Reporting the work of the team to UH Libraries on a regular basis.*

To begin, the Copyright Team set up an online copyright LibGuide with links to useful information for faculty and students. Additionally, a query service was established that allowed members of the UH community to ask questions pertaining to copyright and to receive a formal answer from the team within a 7-day period. Team members also began to teach copyright-related workshops at faculty request.

As the Copyright Team continued its official work, members sought to determine the best means to both provide services to address the wide variety of copyright needs on campus and to meet the requirements laid out by the team's charge. The team quickly realized that the range of potential roles was too large to perform in addition to other job responsibilities. They sought examples of best practices from other institutions that were related to establishing and administering copyright services in an academic research library. They wanted to see what kinds of services were most frequently offered, who within the library typically provided such services, and what kinds of policies guided the services. They also hoped that a successful model existed that would allow the team to efficiently set up their own program and with confidence in its results. With this in mind, the team started with a literature review.

Literature Review

The purpose of the literature review was to establish if prior scholarship existed regarding the creation of copyright service programs in higher education, with an emphasis on academic libraries. The Copyright Team planned to use any information gleaned from the literature as a model for expanding and improving their suite of services. As copyright law has seen some changes in the digital age and to maintain currency, the team focused on scholarship published within the last 10 years that discussed copyright services in higher education in the United States.

Much of the literature concentrates on the types of services being offered by staff or groups pertaining to copyright issues, such as gaining permissions and publishing rights. The most common services mentioned in the literature include answering copyright questions, creating online educational resources, and (to a slightly lesser degree) providing copyright workshops and presentations to the campus community. However, Albitz (2013), Wagner (2008), and Gilliland and Bradigan (2013) stress the importance of staff considerations, training, and credibility, particularly in regard to credentials. Albitz suggests that obtaining additional academic degrees or certificates in law can elevate the perception of how much authority staff may have in providing

copyright advice. However, it is not believed to be necessary in providing the service overall.

Regardless of credentials, the literature regarding advice on copyright inquiries cautions that librarians should clearly distinguish their information from legal advice. Nonetheless, Zabel and Hickey (2011) and Graveline (2011) suggest that librarians should not be deterred from providing copyright information for fear that users will misconstrue it. The researchers advise librarians to seek support from university administration and counsel when addressing copyright matters on campus and to partner with other colleges and departments to provide support at the university level when possible (Graveline, 2011; Quartey, 2008).

Remarkably, while several authors suggest engagement with university legal counsel as a best practice for library copyright services, the libraries in the literature seem to be responsible for the majority of copyright outreach and guidance without legal counsel assistance. For example, the library at William Paterson University of New Jersey has been responsible for further-reaching copyright services, such as managing copyright in reserves policies, educating faculty one on one, creating university-level web resources for copyright, and hosting a campus-wide copyright symposium. They also initiated a review of copyright policies with the university-level Library Advisory Committee and presented programs on copyright to both Faculty Senate and the College of Science and Health (Wagner, 2008).

Outreach and the promotion of services is a common theme in the literature. The Copyright Management Office (CMO) at Ohio State University's Health Science Library, for example, has a budget for copyright permissions that is largely used as an outreach tool to encourage the use of library services; it also responds to copyright questions, most of which pertain to permissions and fair use (Gilliland & Bradigan, 2014). For communication methods, Peters (2011) and Quartey (2008) both advise leveraging web technology for the broad distribution of copyright information, and Zabel and Hickey (2011) suggest taking opportunities in processes related to interlibrary loans and course reserves to educate users about fair use and user rights. Along with Graveline (2011), Peters finds that most community members within the university have only basic copyright knowledge, although different audiences may be at varying levels. Agreeing with Zabel and Hickey (2011), Peters also advises librarians to position themselves in copyright matters as advocates for user rights. Zabel and Hickey also recommend open access licensing for any materials for which the library owns a copyright.

Conversely, Utah State University’s Copyright Committee is one example that is led by the university libraries but operates at the university level. With the support of administration and under the advisement of university counsel, they have had success with outreach efforts, including an informational website and “road show” presentations to faculty (Duncan, Clement, & Rozum, 2013). In another example of working closely with administration, the University of Alabama Libraries have held copyright workshops for faculty as part of a faculty development series sponsored by the Associate Provost (Graveline, 2011).

The literature shows that many libraries have made significant inroads in copyright outreach, but a number of gaps in current practice have also been identified. Bishop (2011) finds that self-service online copyright information on ARL members’ websites is often difficult to navigate for average users. When responding to queries and providing advice, librarians who handle copyright generally tend to be comfortable with fair use but are often weaker in other areas, such as the TEACH Act, and many have expressed a desire for more training on these issues (Charbonneau & Priehs, 2014).

Environmental Scan Process and Methodology

To address the gaps identified in the literature review and to expand their knowledge regarding best practices for building and supporting copyright services within an academic library, the UH Copyright Team members determined that an environmental scan was also necessary. The team wanted to investigate services offered by other academic libraries, as well as the methods by which such services are administered, and decided to proceed by reviewing library websites and conducting interviews with those responsible for copyright-related services at a variety of institutions.

Regional Universities	Peer Institutions	Aspirational Programs
<i>Texas A&M University</i>	<i>University of Cincinnati</i>	<i>Duke University</i>
<i>University of Texas at Austin</i>	<i>University of Illinois at Chicago</i>	<i>University of Virginia</i>
<i>Texas Tech University</i>	<i>Arizona State University</i>	<i>Indiana University</i>
<i>University of Texas at Dallas</i>	<i>University of Oklahoma</i>	<i>Cornell University</i>
<i>Rice University</i>	<i>Temple University</i>	<i>Columbia University</i>

Figure 1: List of Universities for Environmental Scan

To provide a balanced sample, the team selected 15 university libraries for inclusion in the scan: five universities in Texas, five universities identified as peer institutions by the UH Department of Research, and five university libraries known for their nationally recognized copyright programs (Figure 1). Those with nationally recognized copyright programs were identified as aspirational in terms of the copyright services offered or the copyright expertise in their libraries.

To begin drafting the environmental scan questions, the team created a statement of purpose:

To inform the development of the Copyright Team's practice, we will investigate and identify best practices in copyright services offered by other academic libraries and the methods by which such services are administered.

With this purpose in mind, the following open-ended questions were generated:

1. Are you currently offering a service in which you respond to copyright-related queries?
2. Are you currently offering any other copyright-related services?
3. If you are not offering either copyright query or any other copyright-related services, why not?
4. Tell us about the service(s) you offer.
5. Who is the audience you serve?
(Library/Campus/Public)
6. Who do the majority of questions come from?
7. What kinds of questions do they have?
8. Who administers the service?
9. What type of training or credentials do they have?
10. What resources and activities have you developed as part of this service?
11. How do you track the usage of the service?
12. How many questions would you estimate you get a year?
13. Do you have policies or best practices that inform the service?
14. How did you develop them?
15. Is there anything you wish you had done differently?
16. Is there anything of note that we have not asked about?

Using these questions as a guide, the team then gathered data from each institution's website to discern the strength of web presence regarding copyright services and to identify potential offerings or best practices. Most information was sparse, with little description about the scope, personnel, outreach efforts, policy work, or instruction practices.

The available details consisted primarily of contact information for relevant service personnel, web apps for question submissions, referrals to another non-library copyright advisory office on campus, university legal counsel, and other useful online reference sources. All the institutions offered some form of copyright support through their websites, and six of them provided a copyright question and answer service.

The next step was to engage in phone interviews for more in-depth information. For each institution selected, a team member reached out to the person listed on its website as being responsible for copyright-related services and invited them to be interviewed by telephone. Ultimately, the team conducted interviews with librarians from 11 of the 15 institutions selected, who were almost evenly split among the regional universities, peer institutions, and aspirational programs. Librarians from the remaining institutions were contacted, but were either non-responsive or indicated that they were not interested in taking part in the interview. One librarian explained that although he was the most logical person to contact for copyright-related questions, the services offered at his library were not formalized enough to merit a telephone interview. For the remainder of this article, all results will refer only to the 11 institutions at which the person responsible for copyright-related services agreed to be interviewed.

Environmental Scan Results

The following analysis of the environmental scan results is based on the information gathered from the 11 respondents. It outlines the patterns seen in the data. Full details can be viewed in the Appendix.

Of the 11 institutions surveyed, 10 offer a query service, although the levels of formalization vary across institutions. Nine offer some other type of copyright service, such as online resources, reference consultations, and instruction support. Campus users are identified as the primary audiences for copyright services, with the majority of questions received originating primarily from faculty members and librarians. The types of questions pertain to a range of topics that include university policy, trademarks, and author rights, with the topics of fair use, instructional support, and publication help in the majority. Services are typically provided through online research guides, such as LibGuides, presentations, workshops, and informational web pages.

According to the survey data, copyright services are generally organized around an individual or team or are provided on an ad-hoc basis by various library personnel. Nine of the 11 people interviewed

have an MLIS/MLS, of which three also have a law degree. Two of the interviewees hold a law degree without an MLIS. Where services are provided by a designated person, that individual is frequently designated as the *Scholarly Communications Librarian*. At the libraries where teams administer the copyright services, team members appear to have a diverse set of backgrounds and skill sets.

As far as procedures regarding copyright service usage assessment, seven respondents track information using varied methods and software. Overall, surveys are used to gather usage statistics, and spreadsheets are used to organize and assess the data. An analysis of the tracked data given shows a wide range of answers that were too inconsistent to identify useful patterns. Five institutions have some sort of policy or best practice that informs the service, of which two are specific to course reserves and two refer to the university policy on copyright. Knowledge on the development of the policies is limited, mostly due to non-participation in their formation because the policies were in place when the participant assumed responsibility of the copyright service or they were mandated by University Counsel.

Looking back on their experience regarding creating, growing, or supporting copyright services, seven of the 11 respondents wished they had prior copyright knowledge or had done something differently. Increased professional training and more marketing of services were each mentioned twice. Some participants also expressed a desire for more library or institutional support in disseminating information about the services through faculty/staff orientation offerings. This was strengthened by one respondent when asked if he or she would like to add anything additional to their interview answers. "Balancing service with advocacy," was the answer.

Conclusion

Based on the literature review and survey results, it appears that the creation of copyright services in academic libraries is still an emergent area with no clear universal service model, save for offering a query service. However, data gathered in the environmental survey shows common patron needs, such as publication help, fair use advice, and instructional support, which could be a focus for a new model.

Due to the lack of easily available information, librarians might find themselves struggling to "reinvent the wheel" when establishing copyright services and best practices, or they may delay adding or offering services at all. The aforementioned example of the UH Copyright

Team brainstorming an overwhelming list of potential projects caused the team to struggle with identifying priorities, leading to the authors undertaking the literature review and environmental survey outlined in this article. This added almost an entire year to the time required for us to strategically expand our suite of copyright services beyond a query offering, which may not be feasible to others looking to do the same.

However, through the gathering of data in the environmental scan, the team was able to identify patterns that could be used to create a service model of best practices. Therefore, it is suggested that a centralized repository of copyright services, policies, and procedures currently being offered by academic institutions, along with staff credentials and training, be created. The repository could be established through a professional organization or hosted by an institution. Information could be gathered through an online survey. The repository would be a positive step toward creating a service model for establishing best practices or enhancing copyright services.

Appendix

Environmental Survey Data

Q0: Web data only or in person response?

Participant 1	In person
Participant 2	In person
Participant 3	In person
Participant 4	In person
Participant 5	In person
Participant 6	In person
Participant 7	In person
Participant 8	In person
Participant 9	In person
Participant 10	Web only
Participant 11	Web only
Participant 12	In person
Participant 13	Web only
Participant 14	In person
Participant 15	Web only

Q1: Are you currently offering a service in which you respond to copyright-related queries?

		Service explicitly mentioned on a website
Participant 1	Yes	No
Participant 2	Yes	No
Participant 3	Yes	Yes
Participant 4	Yes	No
Participant 5	Yes	No
Participant 6	Yes	Yes

Participant 7	Yes	Yes
Participant 8	Yes	No
Participant 9	Yes	Yes
Participant 10	Unknown	No
Participant 11	Yes	Yes
Participant 12	Yes	Yes
Participant 13	Unknown	No
Participant 14	No	No
Participant 15	Unknown	No

Note: The minimum criterion for service is providing specific contact information for copyright-related questions.

Q2: Are you currently offering any other copyright-related services?

		Does web site mention other copyright services?
Participant 1	Yes	No
Participant 2	Yes	No
Participant 3	Yes	Yes
Participant 4	Yes	No
Participant 5	Yes	No
Participant 6	No	No
Participant 7	Yes	Yes
Participant 8	No	No
Participant 9	Yes	Yes
Participant 10	Unknown	No
Participant 11	Unknown	No
Participant 12	Yes	Yes
Participant 13	Yes	Yes
Participant 14	Yes	Yes
Participant 15	Yes	Yes

Q3: If you are not offering either copyright query or any other copyright-related services, why not?

	Query?	Other?	Why not?
Participant 1	Yes	Yes	n/a
Participant 2	Yes	Yes	n/a
Participant 3	Yes	Yes	n/a
Participant 4	Yes	Yes	n/a
Participant 5	Yes	Yes	n/a
Participant 6	Yes	No	Waiting for a specialist, always planned on having a lawyer hired for the copyright team
Participant 7	Yes	Yes	n/a
Participant 8	Yes	No	Query informal by either email or phone call
Participant 9	Yes	Yes	n/a
Participant 10	Unknown	Unknown	n/a
Participant 11	Yes	Unknown	n/a
Participant 12	Yes	Yes	n/a
Participant 13	Unknown	Yes	n/a
Participant 14	No	Yes	n/a
Participant 15	Unknown	Yes	n/a

Q4: Tell us about the service(s) you offer*

Participant 1	Instruction (drop-in); Queries; Scholarly support services
Participant 2	Consultations (reference); Online resource(s); Queries
Participant 3	Assist creators; Consultations (reference); Consultations (university); Licensing/permissions help; Online resource(s); Presentations; Queries
Participant 4	Instruction (course-related); Instruction (drop-in); Queries

Participant 5	Instruction (course-related); Instruction (drop-in); Online resource(s); Queries
Participant 6	Consultations (reference); Queries
Participant 7	Consultations (reference); Consultations (university); Online resource(s); Outreach; Presentations; Queries
Participant 8	Online resource(s); Outreach; Queries
Participant 9	Consultations (reference); Consultations (university); Instruction (course-related); Instruction (drop-in); Queries
Participant 10	Queries
Participant 11	Queries
Participant 12	Assist creators; Online resource(s); Presentations; Queries; Scholarly support service
Participant 13	Queries
Participant 14	Assist creators; Online resource(s); Queries; Scholarly support service
Participant 15	Assist creators; Consultations (university); Queries; Scholarly support services

Q5: Who is the audience you serve?*

Participant 1	Campus; Community; Internal – Library; Internal – University
Participant 2	Campus; Community
Participant 3	Campus; Community; Outside librarians
Participant 4	Alumni; Campus; Community
Participant 5	Campus
Participant 6	Campus
Participant 7	Campus; Extended/Distance Campus
Participant 8	Campus
Participant 9	Campus; Community
Participant 10	No response
Participant 11	No response
Participant 12	Campus

Participant 13	No response
Participant 14	Faculty
Participant 15	No response

Q6: Who do the majority of questions come from?*

Participant 1	Campus units; Faculty; Grad students; Honors students; Librarians
Participant 2	Campus units; Faculty; Instructional design staff; Librarians
Participant 3	Faculty; Librarians; Music School; Staff; Students; University Press
Participant 4	Faculty; Grad students
Participant 5	Faculty; Librarians
Participant 6	Faculty; Librarians; Students
Participant 7	No response
Participant 8	Faculty
Participant 9	Faculty; Grad students; Librarians
Participant 10	No response
Participant 11	No response
Participant 12	Community; Faculty; Grad students; Librarians
Participant 13	No response
Participant 14	Faculty
Participant 15	No response

Q7: What kinds of questions do they have?*

Participant 1	Institutional Repository help; Instructional support; Policy help; Publication help; Trademark/Patent assistance; Wide range
Participant 2	Author rights; Fair use; Instructional support; Publication help; Thesis/Dissertation content
Participant 3	Fair use; Music copyright/licensing; Permissions; Public Domain

Participant 4	Creative Commons; Fair use; Instructional support; Permissions; Thesis/Dissertation content
Participant 5	Fair use; TEACH Act
Participant 6	Fair use; Publication help; TEACH Act
Participant 7	General copyright support
Participant 8	Fair use; General copyright support
Participant 9	Creator rights; Fair use; Instructional support; Permissions; Publication help
Participant 10	No response
Participant 11	No response
Participant 12	Creator rights; Fair Use; Institutional repository help; Instructional support; Publication help
Participant 13	No response
Participant 14	Instructional support; Publication help
Participant 15	No response

Q8: Who administers the service?

Participant 1	Scholarly Communications Librarian
Participant 2	Scholarly Communications Librarian
Participant 3	Head of Copyright Program; Library science graduate student; School of Law Externs
Participant 4	Scholarly Communications Librarian
Participant 5	Professor; Scholarly Communications Librarian; Staff member
Participant 6	Director of Information Policy
Participant 7	Copyright/Fair Use Librarian
Participant 8	Director of the Law Library
Participant 9	Office of Copyright and Scholarly Communication (3 librarians)
Participant 10	No response
Participant 11	No response
Participant 12	Part-time lawyer; Half-time staff member
Participant 13	No response

Participant 14	Subject librarian
Participant 15	No response

Q9. What type of training or credentials do they have?

Participant 1	MLIS; On the job
Participant 2	MLIS; On the job; Professional Development
Participant 3	Law degree; MLIS
Participant 4	MLIS; Professional Development
Participant 5	MLIS
Participant 6	Law degree
Participant 7	MLIS; Professional Development
Participant 8	Law degree; MLIS
Participant 9	Law degree; MLIS; On the job
Participant 10	No response
Participant 11	No response
Participant 12	Law degree
Participant 13	No response
Participant 14	MLIS
Participant 15	No response

Q10. What resources and activities have you developed as part of this service?*

Participant 1	Marketing; Online resource(s)
Participant 2	Instructional resources
Participant 3	Online resource(s)
Participant 4	Collection support and policies; Instructional resources
Participant 5	Copyright statements; Instructional resources; Online resource(s)
Participant 6	Copyright statements; Online resource(s)
Participant 7	Instructional resources; Internal training; Marketing
Participant 8	Online resource(s)

Participant 9	Instructional resources; Online resource(s)
Participant 10	No response
Participant 11	No response
Participant 12	Instructional resources; Online resource(s)
Participant 13	No response
Participant 14	n/a
Participant 15	No response

Q11. How do you track the usage of the service?

Participant 1	Tracks usage statistics
Participant 2	Google form created especially for copyright: Who asked the question, User demographics, Question content, Time invested, Free text notes
Participant 3	Qualtrics survey used library-wide to track reference interactions; In addition, tracks question content and user demographics
Participant 4	Spreadsheet
Participant 5	LibAnswers
Participant 6	Jirra
Participant 7	Spreadsheet
Participant 8	Not tracked
Participant 9	Not tracked
Participant 10	No response
Participant 11	No response
Participant 12	Not tracked
Participant 13	No response
Participant 14	Not tracked
Participant 15	No response

Q12. How many questions would you estimate you get a year?
(answers are approximate)

Participant 1	60
---------------	----

Participant 2	52
Participant 3	176
Participant 4	120
Participant 5	100
Participant 6	No response
Participant 7	240
Participant 8	12
Participant 9	175
Participant 10	No response
Participant 11	No response
Participant 12	Not tracking — not sure
Participant 13	No response
Participant 14	Not tracking — not sure
Participant 15	No response

Q13. Do you have policies or best practices that inform the service?

Participant 1	Yes
Participant 2	Yes — specific to course reserves
Participant 3	Refers to university policy
Participant 4	No
Participant 5	No
Participant 6	No
Participant 7	Refers to university policy
Participant 8	No
Participant 9	No
Participant 10	No response
Participant 11	No response
Participant 12	No
Participant 13	No response
Participant 14	Yes — specific to course reserves
Participant 15	No response

Q14. How did you develop them?

Participant 1	Scholarly Communications Librarian developed from professional experience and institutional needs
Participant 2	At the library level, with help from General Counsel
Participant 3	n/a
Participant 4	n/a
Participant 5	n/a
Participant 6	n/a
Participant 7	n/a
Participant 8	No response
Participant 9	No response
Participant 10	No response
Participant 11	No response
Participant 12	No response
Participant 13	No response
Participant 14	No response
Participant 15	No response

Q15. Is there anything you wish you had done differently?*

Participant 1	Increased professional training
Participant 2	Increased marketing/awareness; Tracking of statistics
Participant 3	Increased marketing/awareness
Participant 4	Increased clarity of service; Increased professional training
Participant 5	Provided new faculty orientation workshop
Participant 6	Increased library focus on copyright services
Participant 7	n/a
Participant 8	No response
Participant 9	Sharing questions throughout the library to utilize diverse expertise
Participant 10	No response

Participant 11	No response
Participant 12	No response
Participant 13	No response
Participant 14	No response
Participant 15	No response

Q16. Is there anything of note that we have not asked about?

- Cultivate a relationship with University Counsel
 - Need for a specific person to be in charge of copyright service
 - Balancing service with advocacy
-

* Environmental Survey Answer Key

Key—Q4

Assist creators	Offers assistance with registration of original works, assignment of rights, understanding of personal copyright rights, etc.
Consultations (reference)	Meets with individuals or groups to discuss specific copyright situations/needs/questions
Consultations (university)	Offers copyright support to library projects (such as digitization, institutional repository, policy creation, etc.) or university-wide department projects
Instruction (course-related)	Instruction session for specific class or related to class assignment
Instruction (drop-in)	Instruction sessions offered at library; not related to course
Licensing/Permissions help	Offers assistance on licensing works for use and/or obtaining permissions
Online resource(s)	Offers one or more original online resource with copyright information

Outreach	Attends events, maintains blog, send email updates, or otherwise performs functions designed to promote services and increase awareness
Presentations	Offers preplanned presentations to campus community upon request or on schedule
Queries	Any service that specifically provides responses to copyright related questions. This could include questions received via phone, email, or in person, or via web form. Having a dedicated copyright contact email counts as a query service
Scholarly support services	Offers assistance with research, publishing support, support with institutional review process, support with institutional repository submission, ORCID support, or other services related to scholarly work and copyright not falling into another category

Key—Q5

Campus	Reply was “campus” or “university” without further breakdown; assumes service is available to all university faculty, students, and staff
Community	External to university, unaffiliated users
Internal - library	Library employees
Internal - university	University departments or organizations
Outside librarians	Professional colleagues from other institutions

Key—Q6

Librarians	Response included librarians or library staff
------------	---

Key—Q7

Instructional support	Relating to the teaching of courses in any environment (in person, online, etc.)
-----------------------	--

Publication help	Assistance with process of creating, submitting, or negotiating publication rights. Includes assistance with what materials can be included in publication
Wide range	Wide variety of questions

Key—Q8

Law Degree	JD or unspecified professional law degree
MLIS	Any master's level library degree
Networking	Knowledge gained from professional colleagues
On the job	Knowledge gained through work experience within or outside the library profession
Professional Development	Continuing education training, courses, webinars, conference attendance

Key—10

Collection support and policies	Copyright information related to use or support of library collections
Copyright statements	Literally, statements detailing copyright protection or usage restrictions
Instructional resources	Prepared presentations, workshops, syllabi, handouts for class use, worksheets, and other materials related to in person or online instruction
Internal training	Training for other library staff
Marketing	Includes marketing, PR, and outreach, including creation of marketing materials, website, etc. both on and off campus
Online resource(s)	Original online resource with copyright information

Key—Q15

Professional training	Training specific to the people running the service
-----------------------	---

References

Albitz, R. S. (2013). Copyright information management and the university library: Staffing, organizational placement and authority. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 39(5), 429–435. doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2013.04.002

Bishop, J. (2011). Copyright across the cohort: A qualitative evaluation of the dissemination of intellectual property information on ARL websites. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, June 2011, 9–23. Retrieved from <http://unllib.unl.edu/LPP/bishop.htm>

Charbonneau, D. H., & Priehs, M. (2014). Copyright awareness, partnerships, and training issues in academic libraries. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40(3), 228–233. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1122&context=slisfrp>

Duncan, J., Clement, S., & Rozum, B. (2013). Teaching our faculty: Developing copyright and scholarly communication outreach programs. In S. Davis-Kahl & M. Kaye-Hensley (Eds.), *Common ground at the nexus of information literacy and scholarly communication* (pp. 269–285). Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries.

Gilliland, A. T., & Bradigan, P. S. (2014). Copyright information queries in the health sciences: Trends and implications from the Ohio State University. *Journal of the Medical Library Association*, 102(2), 114–117. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3988760/>

Graveline, J. D. (2011). Launching a successful copyright education program. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 18(1), 92–96. doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2011.550534

Hickey, D., & Zabel, D. (2011). The reuse evangelist: Taking ownership of copyright questions at your library. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 51(1), 9–11. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/refuserserq.51.1.9

Peters, T. (2011). Copyright to the university: Tips on informing, educating, and enabling. *College & Research Libraries News*, 72(10), 592–601. Retrieved from <http://crln.acrl.org/index.php/crlnews/article/view/8654/9096>

Quartey, S. (2008). Developing a campus copyright education program: Conquering the challenge. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserve*, 18(1), 93–100. doi.org/10.1300/J474v18n01_10

Wagner, V. H. (2008). Processing reserves, seeking permissions and engaging the campus: How the library serves as the copyright touchstone. *Journal of Interlibrary Loan, Document Delivery & Electronic Reserve*, 18(2), 247–254. doi.org/10.1300/10723030802099970