Proceedings of the international copyright literacy event with playful opportunities for practitioners and scholars held at the University of Edinburgh, 26th June 2019
Welcome to the Icepops Annual 2020

The annual contains contributions from the second International Copyright Literacy Event with Playful Opportunities for Practitioners and Scholars (Icepops) which was held at the University of Edinburgh on 26th June 2019.

This was the second time the conference ran, and 80 delegates attended from countries including: the UK, USA, Canada, New Zealand, Hungary, Sweden and Switzerland.

Chris Morrison and Jane Secker were the conference co-chairs, and the event was sponsored by: Copyright Licensing Agency (CLA), Educational Recording Agency (ERA) Learning on Screen, CREATe and Talis.

You can see the presentations and photos from the event at: https://copyrightliteracy.org/upcoming-events/icepops-international-copyright-literacy-event-with-playful-opportunities-for-practitioners-and-scholars/icepops-2019-photos-and-presentations/

We were very disappointed to have to postpone the 2020 conference due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The annual is a playful way of representing many of the contributions to the Icepops conference 2019 and we hope it lifts your spirits.

Icepops will return in 2021 and is scheduled to be held at the Park Inn Hotel in Cardiff on 22nd June 2021.

Copyright Notice:
This publication is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 licence (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0)
Rhodri Hughes

This annual is dedicated to the memory of Rhodri Hughes, who previously worked for the Copyright Licensing Agency and presented at Icepops 2018. He sadly passed away in May 2020.
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Catherine Parker has worked at the University of Huddersfield for over twenty years in a variety of roles. She is currently the Collections & Scholarly Communications Librarian and aims to provide easy access to high quality content for teaching, learning and research. Her main focus is on collections management and ensuring Open Access initiatives such as the University of Huddersfield Press follow the strategic direction of the University. In 2017, she and colleagues created the Game of Open Access to engage researchers with the key concepts and tools required to meet U.K. Open Access mandates for publishing.

Stephanie (Charlie) Farley has been working in higher education as a librarian and learning technologist for ten years, and provides support and training in the creation and use of Open Educational Resources (Open.Ed) at The University of Edinburgh. Her playful approach to digital skills and copyright education has led to many exciting opportunities, including developing a Playful Engagement strategy for the Information Services Group at The University of Edinburgh. Passionate about the uses of technology to enhance open education, access, and information sharing, she created and runs the award winning 23 Things for Digital Knowledge programme, consults on the use of Social Media in Learning and Teaching, and runs OER Board Game Jamworkshops across the university. Charlie tweets as: @SFarley_Charlie

Chris Jones is the Copyright & Compliance Officer at the University of Reading, UK. He previously worked for the Bodleian Libraries, as Instructional Materials Manager supporting Executive Education programmes at the Said Business School. Chris is a new member of the Universities UK / GuildHE Copyright Negotiating and Advisory Committee (CNAC) and attends meetings of the SHERLOCK copyright community of practice.

Chris Morrison is the Copyright, Licensing and Policy Manager at the University of Kent, responsible for copyright policy, licences, training and advice. He was previously the Copyright Assurance Manager at the British Library and before that worked for music collecting society PRS for Music. He is a member of the Universities UK Copyright Negotiation and Advisory Committee on whose behalf he also attends the Copyright Education Awareness Group (CEAG). He is co-author of the second edition of Copyright and E-Learning: a guide for practitioners which was published in July 2016, and is also the originator of Copyright the Card Game. Chris ‘Chris has recently completed his masters qualification in copyright law at King’s College London.

Rachel Scanlon. As the Digital Services Librarian at the Bodleian Social Sciences Library I usually introduce myself as, “I do digital stuff”. I supervise our online reading lists and the sourcing of digitizations and other digital material. This lead to my inevitable encounter with copyright and people’s general ignorance of it. I found a lot of the materials geared towards teaching readers about copyright were not suitable to the UK environment and quite a lot of the official material challenging to understand and explain. So, I started attending conferences, training sessions and community of practice meetings and tried to improve my copyright knowledge. Through attending UUKGE Guild events, SHERLOCK meetings and ICEPOPS (and generally swimming through alphabet soup) my enthusiasm for copyright grew and somehow led me to become an in house “copyright expert” advising colleagues and students and creating copyright teaching materials.

Rachel tweets as: @RSscanlon

Biographies
The Copyright team at the University of Central Lancashire is made up of three people – Clare Lane, Louise Smith and Kate Yates. Kate and Clare took over copyright about 4 years ago with no knowledge. As they handle all the licensing of software on the university network it was seen as a ‘good fit’. It was a steep learning curve but they are getting there and the transition to the CLA DCS allowed us the opportunity to learn. Louise Smith, the Law Librarian, joined the team to add the library focus and has been a great addition. With the help of resources such as Copyseek we feel we are now starting to make headway and are working on promoting the importance of copyright across the university.

Jane Secker is Senior Lecturer in Educational Development at City, University of London which she teaches on the MA in Academic Practice. She was Copyright and Digital Literacy Advisor at London School of Economics and Political Science for over 15 years where she advised staff about copyright issues and the online environment. She is Chair of the CILIP Information Literacy Group and a member of the Universities UK Copyright Negotiation and Advisory Committee which negotiates with the Copyright Licensing Agency on the higher education licence. She is also a member of the Copyright Advisory Panel which is a governance group of the UK’s Intellectual Property Office. She is co-author of Copyright and E-learning: a guide for practitioners published by Facet in 2016. Jane is a Fellow of the Higher Education Academy and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Arts. She has a PhD from the Aberystwyth University and has worked on numerous research projects funded by the British Library, JISC and the University of London. Jane and Chris tweet as @UKCopyrightLit and maintain the Copyright Literacy website: https://copyrightliteracy.org

Greg Walters is the Learning Technologist based at the University of Glasgow (UofG) Library. He has been involved in the e-learning sector since 2005 and developed a range of under- and postgraduate online courses for the Higher Education and commercial sectors. Part of Greg’s role at UofG has involved developing and communicating rights management policies and procedures to support online learning development at UofG, specifically relating to Blended and Online Learning Development (BOLD) initiatives and MOOCs. He is part of the Scottish Confederation of University and Research Libraries (SCURL) Copyright & Legal Issues steering group which formed in November 2018.

Claire Sewell is Research Support Librarian for the Physical Sciences at Cambridge University Libraries. She provides dedicated training programmes and one-to-one support to researchers on everything from managing data and academic integrity to publishing Open Access and promoting work to a wider audience. Prior to this she worked in the Office of Scholarly Communication where she worked to ensure that all library staff were best placed to support the growing needs of the research community. As part of this role she oversaw the successful Research Support Ambassador Programme which developed into a fully online resource covering topics from around the research lifecycle (including copyright!). She is also part of the Cambridge University Libraries Copyright Group who work to improve the copyright literacy of staff and library users. Claire has an MSC in Library and Information Science from Aberystwyth University, achieved CILIP Chartership in 2014 and serves as Candidate Support Officer (CILIP East), Associate Editor (New Review of Academic Librarianship) and Conference Coordinator (SLA Europe).

Janet Burgess is a mature student working on a PhD through the CREATE team at the University of Glasgow, investigating how amateur musicians find out about, perceive and apply copyright law: as a keen amateur singer in local choral societies Janet has experienced some of the challenges at first hand! During her professional life Janet worked in a range of roles, primarily focussing on administrative process improvement.
Neil Sprunt is a Teaching and Learning Librarian responsible for the development and management of the University of Manchester’s Copyright Guidance Service. Neil has been involved with copyright since taking up this role in August 2012, and has developed a number of resources to help users navigate the often murky world of copyright. The service provides a single point of contact for all copyright-related issues and enquiries at the University of Manchester, and it is designed to help staff and students understand how copyright affects them whilst enabling them to get the most out of protected materials for educational use. Neil is also a member of the UUK / GuildHE Copyright Negotiating & Advisory Committee (CNAC), the SCONUL Copyright Group and chairs the North West Academic Libraries (NoWAL) Copyright Community of Practice. In 2017/18 Neil successfully studied a Postgraduate Diploma in UK, EU & US Copyright Law at Kings College London.

Dr Karen McAulay occupies a dual role as a Performing Arts Librarian and Postdoctoral Researcher at the Royal Conservatoire of Scotland. Her doctoral thesis (University of Glasgow, 2009) was subsequently published in augmented form as a book, Our Ancient National Airs: Scottish Song Collecting from the Enlightenment to the Romantic Era, by Ashgate in 2013, and she has also contributed a chapter to the Routledge essay collection, Understanding Scotland Musically: Folk Tradition and Policy (2018). Karen has been a postdoctoral researcher on the AHRC-funded ‘Bass Culture’ project (2012–2015), and Principal Investigator for the AHRC-funded research network, ‘Claimed From Stationers’ Hall’ (2017–2018), exploring early legal deposit music collections around the UK. Karen holds a Postgraduate Diploma in Librarianship, is a Fellow of the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals, and holds a Personal Achievement Award from IAML (UK & Ireland). Additionally, she holds a Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, and is a Fellow of the Higher Education Academy.

Hannah Pyman is the Scholarly Communications Co-ordinator at the University of Essex. Within this newly-developed role, Hannah specialises in designing and delivering training and support for researchers in areas including copyright, publishing, and open research. Hannah also graduated from the University of Sheffield in January 2020 with an MA in Library and Information Services Management.

Katrine Sundsbo (Kat) is the Scholarly Communications and Research Support Manager at the University of Essex. She is the creator of the Open Access Escape Room, and co-creator of Copyright Dough. Kat is one of the main organisers of Newcomers (Network for Early Career Essex Researchers) and a member of the YERUN (Young European Research Universities Network) Open Science Working Group.

Simon Anderson is a composer, musician and music publisher. He studied music at Edinburgh and Durham universities specialising in musicology, at masters level and completing his PhD in early English church music. His career in the music industry spans over 20 years, during which time he has worked at royalty collection societies PRS and MCPS, at a print music publishing house, and since 2005 for global production music library Audio Network, where he oversees the rights side of the business. Simon completed his LLM degree at Westminster University in 2015 and was offered an Associate Fellowship of the Law School in 2017 in recognition of his ongoing contribution to the university’s free-to-access Lost In Music resource. As a writer he has recently contributed academic papers to the New Law Journal, The Quietus and the 2018 Entertainment Lawyers’ Yearbook. Simon is closely involved in music copyright education. For the past five years he has sat on the Music Publishers Association’s Education and Training Group. He lectures regularly on issues related to music and copyright both to students of law, music and media, as well as to industry professionals. He is a publisher director of the Performing Right Society and the Music Publishers Association.

Jeffrey Izzo is Assistant Professor and Mike Curb Endowed Chair of Music Industry Studies at California State University Northridge. An entertainment lawyer for over 25 years and an accomplished composer, lyricist, and performer, he has presented at numerous international conferences (including the 2019 Icepops International Copyright Conference), is a contributing author to Music Entrepreneurship, and co-author of Introduction To the Music Industry: West Coast Edition. Jeffrey is an ASCAP affiliate and member of The California Copyright Conference, The College Music Society, the Association for Popular Music Education, The Recording Academy, The Society of Composers and Lyricists, the Dramatists Guild, Songwriters of North America, and The International Association for the Study of Popular Music.

Karen McAulay is Assistant Professor and Mike Curb Endowed Chair of Music Industry Studies at California State University Northridge. An entertainment lawyer for over 25 years and an accomplished composer, lyricist, and performer, he has presented at numerous international conferences (including the 2019 Icepops International Copyright Conference), is a contributing author to Music Entrepreneurship, and co-author of Introduction To the Music Industry: West Coast Edition. Jeffrey is an ASCAP affiliate and member of The California Copyright Conference, The College Music Society, the Association for Popular Music Education, The Recording Academy, The Society of Composers and Lyricists, the Dramatists Guild, Songwriters of North America, and The International Association for the Study of Popular Music.

Hannah Pyman is the Scholarly Communications Co-ordinator at the University of Essex. Within this newly-developed role, Hannah specialises in designing and delivering training and support for researchers in areas including copyright, publishing, and open research. Hannah also graduated from the University of Sheffield in January 2020 with an MA in Library and Information Services Management.

Katrine Sundsbo (Kat) is the Scholarly Communications and Research Support Manager at the University of Essex. She is the creator of the Open Access Escape Room, and co-creator of Copyright Dough. Kat is one of the main organisers of Newcomers (Network for Early Career Essex Researchers) and a member of the YERUN (Young European Research Universities Network) Open Science Working Group.

Simon Anderson is a composer, musician and music publisher. He studied music at Edinburgh and Durham universities specialising in musicology, at masters level and completing his PhD in early English church music. His career in the music industry spans over 20 years, during which time he has worked at royalty collection societies PRS and MCPS, at a print music publishing house, and since 2005 for global production music library Audio Network, where he oversees the rights side of the business. Simon completed his LLM degree at Westminster University in 2015 and was offered an Associate Fellowship of the Law School in 2017 in recognition of his ongoing contribution to the university’s free-to-access Lost In Music resource. As a writer he has recently contributed academic papers to the New Law Journal, The Quietus and the 2018 Entertainment Lawyers’ Yearbook. Simon is closely involved in music copyright education. For the past five years he has sat on the Music Publishers Association’s Education and Training Group. He lectures regularly on issues related to music and copyright both to students of law, music and media, as well as to industry professionals. He is a publisher director of the Performing Right Society and the Music Publishers Association.
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Stop me if you think you’ve heard this one before

In our first keynote Simon Anderson introduced the University of Westminster’s online resource Lost in Music. We explored music copyright infringement and considerations that courts take into account when deliberating over a claim of plagiarism.

Delegates got to play judge and jury with an interactive game in which extracts from musical works that had been contested were played, and musical scores simultaneously shown on a screen. The voting cards indicated infringement (red), no infringement (green) and too close to call (yellow).

We got a chance to send Simon to jail with “See You In Court”, a case study in which he played a song he had written that was based on the musical structure of a global number one single from the 1970s. Over five different versions of his song he gradually added in elements of the original, and each version was voted by the jury. By the third version the original song had been identified and Simon was sent to the cells soon after. Play the game yourself at www.lostinmusic.org.

We also replayed the most significant plagiarism case of recent years, Blurred Lines. An initial vote showed that the room felt it probably was an infringement of Marvin Gaye's Got To Give It Up. Simon played out a case for the defence, showing some other disco/funk songs from the mid-1970s also shared a number of stylistic characteristics, some pre-dating the Marvin Gaye song. Finally Simon played specially prepared ‘stripped down’ versions of the two songs, with only the melody and piano parts illustrating that they are in fact very different structurally, melodically and lyrically. A second vote found many people voting against an infringement.

Finally we got to vote on some of the songs that had settled plagiarism claims out of court, including the theme from Ghostbusters, Sam Smith’s Stay With Me, and two from the pen of Noel Gallagher. Not one of the 15+ votes was unanimous, showing that infringement cases are far from clear cut.
Our second keynote was given by Stephanie (Charlie) Farley who has been working in higher education as a librarian and learning technologist for ten years, and provides support and training in the creation and use of Open Educational Resources (Open.Ed) at The University of Edinburgh. Her playful approach to digital skills and copyright education has led to many exciting opportunities, including developing a Playful Engagement strategy for the Information Services Group at The University of Edinburgh.

Passionate about the uses of technology to enhance open education, access, and information sharing, she created and runs the award winning 23 Things for Digital Knowledge programme, consults on the use of Social Media in Learning and Teaching, and runs OER Board Game Jam workshops across the university.

Charlie tweets as: @SFarley_Charlie

Fear of failure, fear of not being taken seriously, fear of not being an expert or ‘knowing enough’ can halt and obstruct learning at all levels. Charlie shared her experiences of creating a lusory attitude or playful environment to empower learners (from undergraduates to tenured staff) to experiment and engage with copyright concepts and practices away from fear and apprehension. Charlie ran an interactive, games based learning session following her keynote.


Further reading
Kapp, K.M., (2012), The Gamification of Learning and Instruction: Game based Methods and Strategies for Training and Education, John Wiley & Sons
Launch of Publishing Trap v2.0.
Jane Secker and Chris Morrison, UK
Copyright Literacy

We gave delegates at Icepops 2019 a sneak preview of our ongoing work to develop the second version of our open access and publishing choices boardgame, The Publishing Trap. Our thinking continued to evolve throughout 2019 and we were almost at the point of launching the game in March 2020 when the pandemic broke out.

Work will resume in late summer 2020 when we hope to be able to finally release the new version of the game. Further updates will be published on the copyright literacy website: https://copyrightliteracy.org/
**RULES**

- Throw the dice to move your playing piece around the board, following the instructions as you go.
- Take an OA card whenever you land on the relevant spaces.
- If you answer the question correctly, keep the card.
- If you answer the question incorrectly, return the card to the bottom of the pile.
- When two or more players are playing, all players must reach the end and publish their article before the game is complete.
- The winner is the person with the most OA cards, not the first to publish their article.
- For a longer game, continue playing until each player has landed on the pink 'congratulation' space.
The University OA policy says that the ‘author accepted version’ of an article should be placed in Pure. Has this version been typeset by the publisher?

You are invited to speak at a conference in Hawaii - go forward one space!

Transcribing interviews takes you 20 hours - go back a space!

You find articles for your literature review for free on unpaywall.org. Go forward one space!

You accidentally delete all your survey data! Go back one space.

An editor asks you to publish your article - go forward one space!
We surveyed lis-copyseek members and asked them if they participated in a community of practice (COP). They responded:

COPs can be a lifebelt in the sea of copyright
When asked how they felt about Copyright communities of practice they responded:

Copyright communities help to...

- Build confidence
- Impart knowledge
- Share best practice
- Provide support
87% of respondents felt that COPs were either essential or very useful for their role.

Along with these benefits COPs often provided cake and a social group to discuss copyright issues with.

Our respondents told us how they felt...
Our survey shows that copyright COPs are beneficial for members.

All Singing from the Copyright Hymn Sheet....

I'll be there for you

Confusion

I will survive!

Students also told us some songs which reflect their feel about copyright

They offer us an opportunity to further support each other
Rights to the art are the matter...

Copyright training sometimes slides into “Death by PowerPoint” – but hidden hyperlinks and custom slide shows can turn the tables, allowing attendees to plot their preferred path through a session, or choose their own adventure in a self-directional learning resource. At the University of Reading, postgraduate researchers access an interactive Q&A (right), providing answers to 24 common questions with one click.

The game scenario that follows explores the reproduction of two-dimensional artistic works in the public domain. Two examples help illustrate the issues. A digitisation of John Singer Sargent’s *Claude Monet Painting at the Edge of a Wood*, c.1885, is available on the Tate website, ‘released under Creative Commons CC-BY-NC-ND (3.0 Unported)’. The rather punchier alternative is to ‘License this image’, via which quoted fees can be found for use in an unpublished dissertation, or within a lecture that is free to attend. If a user opts for the CC licence despite this, the designated attribution requirements include ‘Photo © Tate’. Not, presumably, under Article 14 of the DSM Directive.

Sargent appears to capture Monet’s *Meadow with Haystacks near Giverny* (before fixation?) for which the MFA in Boston provide a digitisation, made available for download because the Museum believes it to be in the public domain. Downloaders must, however, agree to the Terms of Use, which note in cheery upper case that ‘ALL WEBSITE CONTENT IS PROTECTED UNDER COPYRIGHT’.

Obstacles to copyright literacy include well-intentioned simplifications glossing over awkward details, as well as territorial tussles recasting grey areas in black and white.

Cultural heritage institutions face great pressures, including digitisation costs that must be properly funded to unlock the value of the undisclosed public domain. This should not depend upon dubious assertions of copyright, or penalising risk-averse researchers prizing certainty at any price.

Now choose your own adventure...

To quote Shakespeare, ‘Thou art a scholar’ – specifically, an art scholar – and to quote Picasso, ‘a painter always has a father and a mother’. Your latest research traces homages and lineages, the reflections, reframings, and the referential. Your toil on canvas has led to your latest breakthrough, on paintings of paintings in paintings of painters. All you need to prove a particularly fine point is to reproduce two digitised public domain artworks in your forthcoming cash-in book and lucrative lecture tour (obligatory fantasy element: check). Will you search for these images online, or take a trip to the local Generic Municipal Gallery where the works are conveniently displayed? To search online, consult the top-left canvas overleaf. To visit the gallery, start in the mauve canvas underneath.
You arrive at the gallery, camera phone in hand. If your mission succeeds, you might just slip a fiver into one of the suggested donation slots on the way out. Maybe even buy a souvenir tea towel. One of the paintings you need is currently in a temporary exhibition alongside contemporary works, and photography is strictly forbidden. You could try to sneak a photo – it’s a public domain work, after all – by flagrantly flouting the signage (see green canvas, right). Or you could skip the exhibition and seek out the second painting instead (dark blue canvas, far right).

In the gallery gift shop, you find the perfect copy – on a postcard and poster, sizeable enough for scanning! This will be perfect. But wait! On the back, you read as follows: ‘Copyright © Generic Municipal Gallery Board and Trustees 2018. All rights reserved. For permission requests, please contact Organisations’ Unavoidable Reproduction Services (OURS).’ Disappointed, you eschew postcard and poster and sternly ask your souvenir tea towel across a stack of stock. Mostly 500-piece Picasso puzzles, and a saucersful of stress balls. It’s time to try online (top-left canvas).

You wait a while for the students to drift away, set your feet squarely and line up your shot – but just as you’re set, the attendant speaks up. “Sorry, no photography in this room.” You argue that the painting is not protected by copyright – but there is no arguing with gallery policy. If you take a photo anyway then you might be trespassing and security could be called. Not wanting to make a scene, or seem unseemly, you make a quick exit (via the gift shop). Go to the pale yellow canvas (bottom left corner).

The reverse image search turns up the same copy on the Gallery’s blog, where it is captioned ‘Public Domain! What’s your source for the goose... means free reuse. Your quest is complete and there is much rejoicing. You start a campaign to maintain free rein of the public domain.

Following your ill-advised attendance at a recent social media workshop (‘Instability for Impact: Great Minds think of Likes’ – replacing predecessor course ‘Follow your nose: Harnessing Web 2.0 to find friends and funding’), you are seized by the irresistible urge to snap a selfie with the painting first, clambering indelicately onto a central bench for the best angle. Shutting out tutting and bearing the staring, you absently step back, toppling from tippet to the hard parquet floor. Hoping this won’t affect your academic standing, you feign freedom from pain and beat a hasty, chastened, retreat. Deciding your pride prefers proverbial falls, you can exit via the gift shop (see the bottom-left canvas) or head straight home instead (top-left canvas).
Dance your way to copyright success by following these simple steps to engaging library staff with copyright training.

**Face your partner (face to face training)**
1. Start off on the right foot by offering dedicated copyright training. If this fails, try sneaking it into sessions on related topics (you will be surprised at how much overlap there is!). No one wants to be bored (dancing or at training) so try to integrate interactive elements into your sessions.

**Join hands (Handy Guides)**
2. Dance should be visually appealing and copyright can be too. Create short handy guides outlining the basics of copyright concepts such as fair dealing or Creative Commons. You can include images, links and whatever else you like. The guides can then be used as handouts at sessions or shared online as a reference tool.

**Listen to the music (podcasts)**
3. You can't dance without music and sound can also help to get the copyright message across. Try recording some simple podcasts so staff can listen and learn on the go. Content can cover everything from hot topics to guest speakers and can help to attract those unable to attend training.
so consider offering training via live/recorded webinars. These can be easily produced using freely available software and can be released as video resources later.

You can also go over your moves at any time with an online course. This helps to bring all of the moves and resources highlighted above together in one place. Although they take time to build, these courses can offer a way to reach out to a new audience.

Games can help to embed theoretical knowledge and offer a chance to practice the steps without the fear of dealing with an actual query!

Follow the steps (Games)
Know the rules by playing copyright games. There are stand-alone games or smaller options to include in a longer session.

Games can help to embed theoretical knowledge and offer a chance to practice the steps without the fear of dealing with an actual query!

Watch what your partner does (Webinars)
Steps can be complicated and you might need to watch them repeatedly. Attending in-person sessions can be difficult for some so consider offering training via live/recorded webinars. These can be easily produced using freely available software and can be released as video resources later.

Brush up on your moves (Online courses)
You can also go over your moves at any time with an online course. This helps to bring all of the moves and resources highlighted above together in one place. Although they take time to build, these courses can offer a way to reach out to a new audience.

The final performance (the big lift)
You can read more about any of the steps highlighted above and see some examples using the QR code/link on the left.

bit.ly/ICEPOPSDanceGuide
Images: Dancers, arrows & numbers - via Canva under a Free Media License; footsteps - Github via CC0.
Adapting Copyright: The Card Game
at The University of Central Lancashire

The Team
The copyright team at UCLan formed in 2018. Clare and Kate from Software Licensing and Louise (Law librarian) were tasked with improving the copyright guidance pages and delivering training to academic staff. Our own knowledge in this area was limited so we started to develop our knowledge by attending copyright education events.

The Card Game
We were introduced to Copyright: The Card Game by Jane and Chris at an event in Salford. We wanted to use the game as our method of delivering training to staff at UCLan but, due to time restrictions, we needed to reduce the game down.

Lunch and Learn
We wanted to make our sessions relaxed and informal so we planned them over the lunch period and invited staff to bring their lunch along. All attendees were given a set of the cards for reference when they need it. 1 session per month is available for staff to book onto.

The Scenario Card
We introduced a scenario card which helped merge rounds 1 and 2. We also chose to focus on materials which our academics would use the most (Books, articles, DVDs and music).

The Feedback
Some attendees felt that more time was needed so we increased the session from 1 hour to 90 minutes. This allowed more time for discussion and questions. The sessions during October and November were our best attended.

Going Forward
We are now committed and equipped to provide training sessions for staff and will continue to play the card game over lunch. We would like to provide more departmental sessions upon request so will be offering the card game as a staff development day activity.
Cluedo can’t solve the mystery of Copyright in relation to Information literacy, but this resource might help.

The following paragraphs go over the background, development, output and future direction of the Information and Digital Literacy Framework developed by Greg Walters, based at the University of Glasgow (UofG).

**Background**
Since December 2015, I’ve been working at the UofG, where I’ve employed my skills to develop online game-based learning materials to teach UK Copyright Law. Whilst developing these resources focused around Copyright Literacy, I observed that the one theme that was intertwined in all my work was Information and Digital. Whether it’s a simple task of a student looking to use an online image in their thesis, all three forms of literacies must be employed. The importance of Digital Literacy was again emphasised to me via the Jisc Digital Experience Insights Survey 2018. One key finding that stood was that only 41% of the 37,720 UK based Further and Higher students who participated, agreed their course prepared them for the Digital Workplace. Another interesting piece of data from the survey, revealed only a third of participating students agreed they were informed what digital skills they would be required to have before starting their course. My interest in the area and the above sets of data, proved the inspiration I required for me to begin developing a digital and information Literacy framework, aimed initially at UofG students.

**Development of Information and Digital Literacy framework**
During October 2018, I began collaborating with UofG College Librarian Paul Cannon, who is investigating the digital competence of University lecturers for his Professional Doctoral study. At this early stage of development, we established our target audience was under graduate students, given they make up a bulk of the UofG student population. With the target audience established, we referred to the Digital Literacy framework developed by Anglia Ruskin University (ARU), as a point of reference when trying to establish our own terminology and structure. November 2018 saw me utilising mind map software (Bubblus) to begin structuring the framework and incorporate the terminology. This process aided in finalising the five areas of our digital & information literacy framework and aligning chosen online resources to them. The online resources that were linked to are a mixture of in house UofG and external, as some of the areas, i.e. “using technology sustainably”, proved challenging when trying to find internal resources for. We decided to expand the structure of the framework to have College specific materials for each of the five areas, to ensure all students got an equal experience. Once the structure, areas and terminology were established, the next step was to effectively present the mind map of...
the framework as an easy to navigate and accessible online resource. To achieve an accessible, easy to navigate online resource, that could be output via HTML5, Articulate Storyline was chosen as all these requirements can be achieved with this software.

Over November/December 2018, I produced a working demo specifically for the College of Medical Veterinary and Life Sciences (MVLS), using Articulate to gather feedback from our College Librarians. This exercise proved useful as it allowed the online resources and functionality to be further examined and developed. The one aspect that was removed due to an inequity of materials, was catering to specific Colleges. Going forward the framework focused on providing generic materials for every type of student, within the five areas of Information and Digital literacy.

Development of the online interactive framework continued from January – August 2019, until its completion and deployment via UofG webpages open to all UofG students during early September 2019.

Output

As covered in the above section, the eventual output was making the interactive framework available via a UofG webpage at the start of September 2019. The framework has been viewed 238 times from September 2019 – January 2020. This can be viewed by viewing the link below or scanning the QR code.

https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/library/help/infolit/

You’ll notice the interactive framework isn’t the only resource available, there are links to four Moodle courses focusing on areas of digital identity, wellbeing, responsibility and use of technology. I inherited these courses from an academic member of staff from MVLS, where they were initially focused on this College specifically.

From January – August 2019, I redeveloped these courses and materials to be more generic. These courses were made available alongside the interactive framework. From September 2019, UofG students could self-enrol onto the Moodle courses, since then 39 – 78 students are enrolled on each course.

For the subsequent academic year, I’m going to attempt enrolling all first-year students onto the courses to see if this increases engagement with the resources.

Other outputs for the framework, include show casing the demo at ICEPOPS 2019 and the formation of a Digital and Information Literacy steering group within UofG. I formed the group comprising of academic, professional services to help guide and inform the materials within the framework and four Moodle courses (inaugural meeting held August 2019).

In conclusion this project, despite having achieved various outputs, there’s still progress to be made in terms of refining the frameworks associated materials. To this end, it would be useful if you could please take some time to view the framework and then fill out a quick anonymous online feedback from by viewing the link below or scanning the QR code.

https://forms.office.com/Pages/ResponsePage.aspx?id=KVxybjp2UF-8iATwEyf2BP2HkXcMlLxKnBaZ7KHGSVINkIvFLNzdEUkMwUk5WMThQ5INRSGzdUI4u

Going forward

I intend to investigate or implement the following listed below.

• Work with Student Representative Council (who now have a representative on steering group), on further enhancing and updating materials
• Collaborate with our Student Support & Wellbeing along with Academic services to examine materials around Information Security
• Introduce materials around Information Security
• Investigate the possibility of developing resources that could be used by the education sector
Making music is a key human activity and research has identified the very wide range of social, cultural, health and economic benefits which music brings. Everyone’s an amateur musician, even if we only sing in the shower, but there are perhaps a million people in the UK today who meet up in groups to make music as a social rather than as a commercial activity.

I’ve sung in local choirs and choral societies for more years than I can remember and it’s a real joy to sing as part of a group in front of (hopefully) an appreciative audience. Not so joyous, however, is the effort involved in staying on the right side of copyright law, which affects virtually every aspect of making music. Traditionally, copyright has two roles: it gives creators a level of control over the use of their work and provides a mechanism which allows them to be rewarded for their efforts, and this in turn gives them an incentive to continue creating new works. However, the processes which enable this are not always too clear or simple.

My PhD is investigating how amateur musicians, as ordinary people who make music for fun rather than as a means of earning a living, actually work with copyright law in real life. In order to get a range of views I held focus group discussions with participants from three musical traditions: people from groups which use a physical music score, including choirs, orchestras, a brass band, a pipe band, handbell ringers, and a ukulele group; people who sing folk or traditional music where freely sharing music is part of the ‘folk process’; and popular rock groups who perform cover versions of songs which by definition are virtually all in copyright. Three key themes emerged from these discussions: ignorance, confusion, and fear.

Firstly, a lot of people knew very little about copyright and many relied on other people to get it right for them. Here are some examples:

‘We’re not making any money out of our music so copyright law doesn’t apply to us’
‘I wouldn’t know if it was copyright unless I actually saw something that said ‘this is copyright’ [...] they trust Emily and the rest of us just to... not to put the choir in any deep ‘dooby-doo-doo’

Secondly, although there was a lot of support for copyright and participants recognised its importance participants found it very complicated and confusing, as shown very clearly in this word cloud:

Thirdly, the confusion led to a lot of fear, and some participants were very afraid of the penalties which they understood would be imposed if they inadvertently made a mistake. This participant had recently retired as a music teacher:

Jennifer: You know, I’ve just been really scared stiff of copyright, you know, as a teacher I was frightened to death of being taken to court to do with copyright. [...] Researcher: What did you think would happen ... if you were caught?
Jennifer: Oh, I’d be in jail! (laughter). No, I’d be named and shamed, [...] it would be a massive cloud, black mark for my name and the school [...]
The traditional record contract can be a bottomless "pit of despair" for the new artist wishing to be signed to a major label. There are many terms conditions, and provisions that can catch the inexperienced musician unawares. To learn about the most common pitfalls, let’s play:

**THE CONTRACT GAME!!!**

Jeffrey Izzo
California State University, Northridge
jeffrey.izzo@csun.edu

This slideshow is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial 3.0 United States license. For more information about this license see http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/ (In short, you can copy, distribute, and adapt this work as long as you give proper attribution and do not charge for it.)

### GAME BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms &amp; Options</th>
<th>Royalties</th>
<th>Advances &amp; Recoupment</th>
<th>Grant of Rights</th>
<th>Bits ‘n’ Bobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Download the slideshow at https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1muzZAI3W31IrVrVAKbLigbRj5xSl1UpVIIUKej3SDDw/edit#slide=id.p
Performative Silence in the Library
Karen E McAulay, RCS

This is in no sense an article about the relative merits of differing levels of silence in libraries! (Far from it: our own performing arts library aspires to a studious atmosphere conducive to study, but space limitations and student numbers make a deeply monastic hush an impossible dream, and this is doubtless experienced in many libraries.) Instead, this piece is a reflection upon my encounters with copyright in the context of music, not only as a researcher, but also as a performing arts librarian, a provider of user education - and occasionally a music arranger.

As a researcher, I recently had grant funding to set up a postdoctoral research network, 'Claimed from Stationers' Hall', investigating Georgian legal deposit music in British libraries. Legal deposit is the shadowy cousin of copyright. It's like a by-product of the copyright process, in Georgian times serving both as evidence of registration at Stationers' Hall - and safeguarding the country's creative output for future scholars. Whilst today's readers aren't always silent in libraries, thousands of legal deposit books still survive silently in the stacks of between nine and eleven national and university libraries, with music numbering amongst eight of the collections. However, not all publishers did register their work - and not all libraries kept the music they were entitled to. The research network has been investigating what survived, where, and how it's documented.

The patterns of survival of this legal deposit music is interesting, particularly considering the fact that music wasn't a degree subject in the Georgian era, and much of the music was almost considered as ephemeral, with a surfeit of light classical and popular songs, and sets of piano variations on favourite opera themes and national songs. Music is made up of twelve notes in an octave and eight steps in a scale, and a palette of rhythmic values deployed in pleasing patterns and sequences. Obviously, there is a limit to how many different patterns can be created with these building blocks, and inevitably similar melodic shapes and rhythmic patterns recur in different pieces. It is hardly surprising that there have often been legal battles about who wrote what, and what came first – one has only to look in JSTOR and newspaper databases! The Claimed From Stationers' Hall network blog has an extensive bibliography, and a few such historical cases are listed there.²

Perhaps because I also arrange music myself, I'm particularly intrigued by literature about musical arrangements. For example, the now forgotten composer Michele Caraffa once wrote a tune; the much more famous composer Gioacchino Rossini then used Caraffa's tune in an opera, and another composer called Thomas Adams wrote a set of piano variations on it. In terms of intellectual input, whose was it? Adams could not have done the arrangement without an original tune to arrange, but his creative effort was, nonetheless, not insignificant. 'This five-page score would not exist otherwise.-

Thomas Adams, Fra tante angoscie : air by Caraffa, introduced in Rossini's opera 'La Cenerentola', arranged with variations for the piano forte
(London: Clementi, Collard & Collard, [1830])

In terms of context, it should be explained that Rossini was both prolific and highly popular. Most of his operas were actually written within a decade or so, before he left Italy for France. As well as publications of his operas, and single arias (ie songs) extracted from those operas, there are also hundreds of arrangements of his early 19th century arias. His correspondence discusses ownership of orchestral parts in theatres, and licences to perform, but he's silent regarding the question of other people's arrangements of his music. In fact, Italian and French copyright was less advanced than in the UK – so maybe this explains his silence. Whatever the reason, there's no documented evidence of annoyance at his tunes being made use of as raw materials for other people's compositions. Indeed, as my example shows, he did the same thing himself!

Inevitably, there's a degree of interplay between my different roles. My experience as a librarian affects my approach as a researcher, and vice versa. Whilst my research into legal deposit music is firmly rooted in the late 18th and 19th centuries, it does mean I feel on safe ground explaining to borrowers why old music is not available on inter library loan from the British Library – it was delivered there under legal deposit, and is often very rare - if not, occasionally, unique! Whatever its age, relative importance or artistic quality, legal deposit material is part of our national musical heritage and merits careful custodianship. I like to think that readers benefit from insights I have gained through research, whilst I myself have acquired historical understanding to place today's copyright in context. I can understand the reasons for copyright legislation, whilst also appreciating the frustrations experienced by performing musicians - and by musical arrangers.

Knowledge of copyright is an essential requirement for a librarian, even if readers don't always appreciate our pearls of wisdom. Our challenge is how to inform, without appearing pedantic.
We librarians tend to be caricatured as fussy and rule-bound – it’s dangerously easy to appear so! However, the student who cannot see why they should not photocopy an entire piece of music may feel rather differently about the idea of not being paid as a composer or performer. Perhaps we can sweeten the pill by reminding readers of the positive benefits of copyright – for example, the restrictions placed on borrowers and performers are counterbalanced by schemes which actually pay out to authors, such as the ALCS – the Authors’ Licensing and Collecting Society, which actually pays out to authors:– https://www.alcs.co.uk/ or the Registration Service for the UK and Irish Public Lending Right, administered via the British Library:– https://www.bl.uk/plr/registration-service.

As a subject specialist librarian, I am often involved in user education, and to that end I’ve recently added to my skillset with a Postgraduate certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Arts Education. My teaching is usually information-literate related, but questions about copyright do arise, and readers’ queries do often provide further informal teaching opportunities.

Knowing that students and teachers often find copyright dry and restrictive, I’m always on the lookout for new pedagogical tricks to make the topic more meaningful. I’ve been looking for unusual angles to approach copyright questions, to convey the message that copyright is based on fairness for both creator and user. In this context, a chance conversation about a totally different topic recently provided me with an interesting case-study. Discussing successful library social media campaigns, I was looking for a gimmick around which we could campaign. I recalled a controversial musical work by John Cage, called ‘Four Minutes Thirty Three Seconds’. This particular piece had – ostensibly – a lot going for it. The performer can use any instrument. They sit, prepare their instrument, and then do absolutely nothing with it! The music is the ambient sound – the sound of silence. What could be more appropriate for performance in a library?! We’re a conservatoire, and we don’t just perform concertos, plays and ballets – we also offer a degree in Contemporary Performance Practice, which pushes all the boundaries. For example, a student on this course devised an entire performance about ‘stillness .. plastic, and sustainability’, sitting surrounded by artefacts in our library, playing ambient sound. The event was shared on social media, with appropriate photographs, and by permission of the student performer.

4’33’ is certainly off-the-wall and edgy enough to intrigue the punters. The more I thought about it, the more I wanted to stage it. It would engage the readers, and make the library look innovative by creating live performance events, in the hope that they might be tempted to become more regular borrowers – my initial thought was that we’d reverse the concept by ‘performing’ something that made no noise at all. In our busy working library, where our performers are sometimes a bit excitable, a performance would also ensure 4’33’ of calm, reflective silence. (In last summer’s pecha kucha presentation, I carefully factored in a six-second sample of silence, just to make my point! This was no excerpt from the piece – just a calculated pause. I could spare no more time than that.)

Luckily, I investigated further before I got carried away. I read an interview in the Telegraph where Wombles composer Mike Batt talked about the litigation caused by his description of silence BETWEEN two tracks on his CD, as a performance of 4’33”. The settlement was substantial. Far from being a gimmick, it hinged on intellectual property. It’s reminiscent of Hans Christian Anderson’s story, ‘The Emperor’s New Clothes’, in which a town’s population realises that it has had the wool pulled over its eyes, since the Emperor’s tailors have allowed him to go out stark naked, believing he is wearing the finest garments. In Cage’s piece, the audience is listening to incidental sounds, whilst the musical score itself has nothing more than the title page and empty musical staves. Exploring our discovery layer, I found David Seymour’s article discussing whether 4’33’ was even music – a conundrum that has perplexed generations of audiences! Nonetheless, the author cited Cheng Saw, who had written debating its originality, ‘protectable expression’, and ‘uncertainty of subject matter.” So it seems to me that the notices in china shops: ”look but don’t touch”. You can study and discuss the published score, with its blank lines and spaces, but possession of the score doesn’t mean you can perform it publicly. If you even invoke the title, as Batt did, then you may get into hot water.

I decided it was evidently far too risky to think of staging 4’33’ in the Whitaker Library. But maybe I’ve found a hook for talking to students about copyright, because it’s clearly an excellent vehicle for discussing intellectual property – so long as you don’t perform it live! One would like to imagine that, having explained this confusing scenario to students, they would begin to understand that, if even silence – or, an original concept involving silence – can be protected by copyright, then how much more so a score and parts with normal musical notation?

Literally whilst I was writing my Pecha Kucha presentation, I was interrupted by a lecturer with a copyright query. In conversation, they attempted to assure me that it was okay to copy a whole piece of copyright music for the particular purposes that they had in mind. I was compelled to disagree, as tactfully as possible! If we could engage with all readers on the high-level issues: what’s at stake, what copyright protects, and why appropriate licences are needed for performances – then hopefully they’d better understand the need for legislation. In the time it took to deliver my Pecha Kucha last summer, the delegates could in fact have collaboratively performed 4’33’, with time over to discuss its originality, ‘protectable expression” and “uncertain subject-matter.” However, copyright infringement would have been hugely embarrassing at an event dedicated to copyright education. Nonetheless, I remain convinced that the piece is an ideal case-study for anyone wishing to engage students in a conversation about the ethical issues surrounding copyright and performance rights. Silence itself is sometimes susceptible to legal protection!


It’s been nearly 18 months since the villain originally locked everything behind paywalls. Since October 2118, we have been trying to unlock research that was locked down, not just at the University of Essex, but all over the world. It’s now 2120 and research is still hidden behind paywalls.

Research was locked down as the villain thought it was unfair to allow full access to all research for free. Diamond Open Access, where access and publication fees are both waived, was the gold standard for a while, but now no one can access research without paying a price.

We recently discovered that there is a way (or two?) to once again become a society where research is freely available by default. What we know is that the villain has made sure research is locked down so much one needs to solve a range of puzzles in order to unlock it again.

Below are notes we have come across whilst investigating. So far nothing makes sense. Our sources say that the villain can leave clues in their comments, and that might be a good place to start. We think there are four puzzles that needs to be solved in order to know how to stop the villain.

Just as research was locked down, we managed to get ahold of the villain’s written notes. It looks like nonsense, but there might be some codes or clues in there that will make sense when we put them together with other clues. From previous investigations, we know that not all clues will be relevant, as the villain loves to trick people.

We tried reaching the villain for comment, but they refused to answer our calls. On the 1st of every month since we contacted them, we have received the comment on the right. So far none of us have been able to decode it. As far as we know, the villain knows about all the clues we have managed to collect, and we think they are playing a game with us.

“No one would be able to stop me. At least no one without an eye to detail. And further I dare To think... I mean I dare not think that anyone Ever would have the nerves to interfere with my 3rd biggest project. I will have nothing left!”

- Email comment from the Villain

Notes numbered #3, #15 and #43 – all found left behind in the villain’s old office.
The villain seems to have had some artistic inspiration somewhere amongst all of their note taking. We’re not sure what this drawing has to do with research, but with the villain trying to play games with us it could surely have some importance.

If there are any ideas it would be good to note them down at the bottom of the page. It seems that might be helpful to give some structure to any clues gathered.

We’re running out of patience with the villain, who seems certain that their clues are far too cryptic for us. But if we can just understand their mind a bit more we have the chance to unlock all research. There’s too much at stake to give up! Collaboration on this is key; with all of our minds together surely research can be free again?!

These two parts seem unrelated, but we found them together a few times. The highlighted part was always the same too, but we’re not sure why.

This concludes the information we have. Please help us decode the clues in the villain’s notes and comments!

1. _______ __ _______
2. ______
3. _______
4. ___ _________

Note to the reader:

If we managed to peak your interest with this teaser, please do get in touch with the creator (ksunds@essex.ac.uk) if you want to know more about the Open Access Escape Room. Instructions on how to set up your own Open Access Escape Room are on Figshare, under a CC BY license.
That's the magic number!

(Musical reference - Three Feet High and Rising - De La Soul, one of Neil's favourite albums).
(Very) loosely based on the musical theme of Icepops 2019, my hip hop inspired world café session was about three online resources I have developed (or am currently developing) at the University of Manchester to support teaching staff, students and researchers.

Given the time limits for each presentation, I was required to spit lyrics, well words, about the development of these resources, to fellow delegates on a rotational basis.

Like some loc'd out copyright gangsta set trippin banger, I wowed my various audiences (often completely sold out tables) with my verbal dexterity and mother flippin props, you know what I'm saying!

This included a handmade scroll of the infamous ‘Table of Doom’ a list of 657 copyright scenarios/outcomes for staff who develop teaching materials. This was essentially 10 excel spreadsheets glued together and weighted at each end with a pencil and some blue tac… mad skillz!!

Copyright for Teaching Materials – Can I use it? was a challenge, taking around a year to perfect, and leading to the assigned eLearning technologist referring to the spreadsheet behind it as the ‘Table of Doom’. However, the approach was then simplified leading to the ‘Table of Doom II’ and the result was the decision tree resource we have now.

I then, still spitting, discussed Copyright for Students – who owns what. More an introduction to copyright, with some playful elements, including quizzes, this resource was originally developed to supplement a session I delivered as part of the accredited Digital Society module which the Library runs each year. It was also inspired by a certain monkey.

Finally I demonstrated the third resource, which is currently in development (and still is… the shame) Copyright for Researchers will be ready soon, and once developed the full suite of resources will be made available via our Copyright webpages as part of our Specialist Library Support offer.

---

**Alternative lyrics - Three that’s the magic number (Icepops parody remix)**

Three, that’s the magic number
Yes, it is, it’s the magic number
Somewhere in this copyright community
Was born three, and now you’ll see,
That’s the magic number...

Copyright preaching is Neil Sprunt’s pleasure,
Pleasure and preaching starts in the heart,
Something that stimulates the IP in my measure,
Measure in my IP, raised in three parts,
Casually see but don’t do like the I roll,
Cause seein’ and doin’ when you have selfie monkeys,
Doin’ hip hop hustle, no rock and roll,
Unless your name’s Slater, cause Slater’s a Punk (three).

Academics let go, cause there’s magic in the air,
Criticise the law shows you’re out of order,
Stop look and listen to the exceptions out there,
And don’t get offended by the fair dealing that I brought you,
Risk management means the games now set,
Fly guidance when it comes to reproduction,
It stands for ‘what you can do’ and Y’all and y’all can bet,
That the action’s not a trick, but shows you the function.

[Bridge]

Everybody wants to have their own say,
Everybody wants to be free to disagree,
But my resources are the best,
And you don’t have to guess,
Neil’s suite consists of three, and we all agree,
That’s the magic number!
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