

## Awareness and Perception of Copyright Among Teaching Faculty at Canadian Universities

Lisa Di Valentino  
Ph.D. candidate, Library and Information Science  
The University of Western Ontario  
[ldivalen@uwo.ca](mailto:ldivalen@uwo.ca)

Presented at the ABC Copyright Conference, May 5, 2015, University of Winnipeg

### **Abstract**

This article describes the background, methodology, and results of a preliminary study undertaken in 2014 to determine university faculty awareness and perceptions of copyright as it affects teaching and learning. An online survey questionnaire was distributed (via faculty associations) to teaching faculty across Canada, seeking feedback about the copyright policies and training opportunities at their institutions, where they go for copyright assistance, and how they would respond to various copyright-related scenarios that may arise in the course of teaching.

Most of the respondents are aware of the copyright policies or guidelines at their universities, but much fewer know whether or not their institution offers copyright training. Of those who are aware of training opportunities, only one third have taken advantage of them. When needing assistance, faculty members are most likely to go to a librarian or to the institution's copyright policy.

Responses to the four scenarios suggest that faculty members are more likely to share digital copyrighted materials (including online works) with their students, whereas they are more likely to ask permission or guidance when it comes to print materials.

Comments from the respondents touch upon issues of the complexity of copyright, and the often time-consuming process of obtaining permissions for the use of copyrighted materials in teaching.

This study was supported by an Ontario Graduate Scholarship.

### **Keywords**

copyright; faculty; academic libraries; survey

### **Introduction**

Copyright in Canada is governed by the *Copyright Act*, as well as the judicial interpretations of the act. Copyright is defined in the law as the exclusive right to "produce or reproduce the work or any substantial part thereof in any material form

whatever,” and includes exclusive rights to communicate or perform the work (*Copyright Act*, 1985, s. 3). Copyright owners also have the right to authorize a collective society to administrate on their behalf, for example by negotiating and entering into licensing agreements and collecting remuneration. Collective societies may also apply to the Copyright Board to certify a tariff, which is a remuneration scheme similar to a licensing agreement but not negotiated between parties.

Users of copyrighted material also have rights under the copyright law, by which they are permitted to copy, communicate, perform, integrate, or otherwise deal with a work without permission or payment; these rights are also known as exceptions to infringement. In the educational context, the *Copyright Act* includes specific exceptions for schools (ss. 29.4–30.04) and libraries (ss. 30.1–30.21). Educational institutions and the individuals within them can also take advantage of the fair dealing exception (ss. 29–29.2), which is broader in scope than the specific educational exceptions; whether a given dealing is “fair” is determined by an analysis considering several factors, set out by the Supreme Court in its momentous case *CCH Canadian Limited v. Law Society of Upper Canada (CCH)*.

Among the concerns of university administrations is the risk of litigation due to unintentional copyright infringement by faculty who may be unacquainted with the finer points of copyright law. This concern is not unfounded: in April 2013, Access Copyright, a collective society, filed suit against York University, alleging that faculty members have copied protected works outside of the scope of user exceptions in the *Copyright Act*. It is therefore in the interests of post-secondary institutions to become familiar with what faculty know and think about copyright, particularly as sharing of materials is infinitely easier in the digital age, and there exist demonstrable gaps in copyright literacy even among scholars in information studies (Burkell, Fortier, Di Valentino, & Roberts, 2015, p. 7). It is also in the interest of students and the public for university faculty to be familiar with what they *are* permitted to do with copyrighted materials, particularly with respect to fair dealing, so that teaching and learning are not unnecessarily restricted (Hobbs, Jaszi, & Aufderheide, 2007, pp. 16–20; Schlipp, 2008, p. 18; Trosow, 2013, p. 215).

This article describes the results of a preliminary study investigating faculty awareness with regard to Canadian copyright law, how it affects the ability to teach, the people and resources faculty are mostly likely to go to for guidance, and faculty members’ own practices related to copyright compliance.

## **Background**

Before 2010, all Canadian universities had entered into agreements with Access Copyright whereby they were granted the licence to make certain types of reprographic copies of works in Access Copyright’s repertoire for a fee paid per full-time student. Although they are known as “blanket” licences—as opposed to transactional licences, which are pay-per-use—the agreements were limited both in the types of uses permitted and in the materials covered. In 2010, the universities were unable to reach agreements on blanket licensing terms with Access Copyright, partly due to the fairly

large increase in proposed fees to cover digital copying, and concerns that the licence terms overlap with other licences with individual publishers or database providers, resulting in double payment for use of certain materials (Lorinc, 2010). Consequently, Access Copyright applied to the Copyright Board for a tariff encompassing the reprographic copies that had been covered under the blanket licence, along with certain digital copies (Wilkinson, 2010).

In 2012, two events had a direct impact on how universities would come to manage copyright compliance among faculty, staff, and students in their institutions. First, the Supreme Court decided five copyright-related cases (known as the Pentalogy); in one of them, *Alberta (Education) v. Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency (Access Copyright)* (2012), the court held that the copying of excerpts of copyrighted works by elementary and secondary school teachers, and the distribution of these copies to students in the class, were fair dealing. The Court reasoned, drawing on its previous decision in *CCH*, that copying for class instruction falls under the purpose of “research and private study” as enumerated in the legislation. This point that “research and private study” should be interpreted from the point of view of the end user was also made in *Society of Composers, Authors and Music Publishers of Canada v. Bell Canada* (2012), another Pentalogy decision. In this case, the Court ruled that 30-second previews of songs are used by consumers for research purposes, and can be considered fair dealing (para. 30).

The second event was the enactment of a number of amendments to the *Copyright Act*. One amendment was the addition of “education” to the list of allowable purposes of fair dealing (*Copyright Act*, 1985, s. 29). Exceptions for educational institutions were modified to address digital uses of copyrighted works (ss. 30.02, 30.04) and participation in classes over the Internet (s. 30.01). Another amendment was the reduction of maximum statutory damages that may be awarded for non-commercial infringement (s. 38.1).

Whereas it might have been uncertain before 2012 whether certain types of copying common in university teaching would fall under the ambit of fair dealing, the *Alberta* and *Bell* cases and legislative amendments provided strong assurance that they did (Trosow, 2013).

Between 2012 and 2013, following these two events, a number of universities entered into new agreements with Access Copyright, while several opted to proceed without a blanket licence and manage copyright compliance in-house by relying on a combination of publishers’ licences, public domain works, open access works, and institutional copyright policies addressing fair dealing and educational exceptions (Di Valentino, 2013; Geist, 2013). Those Canadian universities that continued to operate under the Access Copyright licences were required in mid-2015 to decide whether they will continue this partnership. As of the time of writing, nine Universities Canada (UC) member institutions have publicly stated that they will not renew their Access Copyright licences, bringing the ratio to more than half of member institutions outside Quebec, as compared to 37% in 2014 (Di Valentino, 2015).

These changes mean that copyright is being managed more and more “in-house.” For example, in 2013, 75.6% of the largest UC-member universities (31 out of 41) had a copyright-specific contact person, office, or e-mail address (Di Valentino, 2013); in 2015 the proportion rose to 90% (37 out of 41).

There is more focus in universities on the exceptions in copyright law such as fair dealing, which can be a bit “fuzzier” in application from the point of view of the user. Institutions can also rely on specific educational exceptions, which are more circumscribed than fair dealing in that the permissions are clearer, but there are also more limitations, which can lead to confusion.

Faculty members at these institutions cannot rely on the existence of a blanket licence when deciding what materials will be used in course curriculum, and how the materials will be disseminated to students. Instead, faculty would need to determine the copyright status of each work that would be used, any licence terms, how each work can be used, and any alternatives that may be available. However, most faculty members are not experts in Canadian copyright law.

When educators lack understanding of copyright law, there is a danger that they will use copyrighted materials improperly. To mitigate against this possibility, administrators craft overly conservative policies (Chase, 1993, p. 1; Crews, 1990, cited in Chase, 1993, pp. 5-6; Nair, 2013; Trosow, 2010, p. 546). However, conservative policies may discourage faculty from using the materials in ways they are legally permitted, and may ultimately lead to the weakening of user rights over time (Trosow, 2010, p. 549, 2013, p. 215).

## ***Literature Review***

Existing studies of individuals’ awareness of and attitude towards copyright issues in education have examined administrators (Chase, 1994; Gatlin & Arn, 1999; Kordsmeier, Gatlin-Watts, & Arn, 2000), librarians (Charbonneau & Priehs, 2014; Eye, 2013; Granbery, 2013), and archivists (Dryden, 2010). Several studies have looked at copyright knowledge levels in American K-12 and university educators. James (1981) surveyed teachers at different school levels in Arkansas and concluded that there is a lack of copyright understanding among educators, both in actuality as well as in the teachers’ perceptions of their own knowledge (cited in Chase, 1993, p. 3). Even media directors, who one would imagine would have a more developed knowledge of copyright law than their colleagues in other subjects, were found to demonstrate limited competency in their understanding (Clark, 1984, cited in Chase, 1993, p. 4). Elementary and secondary school teachers were found to lack proficiency in understanding of copyright law, although those with at least five years of experience using multimedia in the classroom knew more than those with less experience (Shane, 1999). A survey of university faculty in Ohio showed that, generally, copyright knowledge levels of post-secondary educators and administrators in the U.S. are low; that instructors of web-based courses have some knowledge of copyright legislation and the issues but are mostly unaware about major provisions of the statute; and that instructors who were aware of their institution’s copyright policy knew more than those who were not (Renner, 2005). In 2006 a group of librarians provided a survey to faculty members at two health

sciences departments in Alabama and Texas. They found that respondents reported a limited knowledge of copyright and admitted gaps in their understanding, but that they did not want a required copyright course due to time constraints (Smith et al., 2006). Sims (2011) surveyed and interviewed faculty and library staff at the University of Minnesota and found that there is a gap in faculty understanding of the fundamentals of copyright law, including how copyright rights manifest and how long they last. She also found that fair use (the American equivalent of fair dealing) is “an area of tremendous confusion.” (p. 295)

There is very little discussion of Canadian university faculty awareness of copyright in the literature; this is unsurprising as the changes leading to the necessity of such a study have only occurred in the past five years. Horava (2010) reports that a lack of a coordinated approach to copyright leaves libraries facing challenges in interpreting the issues and in educating faculty and students. Trosow notes the importance of copyright literacy, particularly of user rights and exceptions, in order to avoid “serious [copyright] rights accretion that only becomes more difficult to reverse over time.” (Trosow, 2010, p. 549, see also 2013, p. 215).

More universities have updated copyright policies (Di Valentino, 2014), but having a policy is only part of the solution. The policy needs to be communicated to and understood by those who are expected to abide by it, for example, university faculty.

This study aims to determine what university faculty think about copyright and about their institution’s policy and training efforts, and whether they take advantage of them. It is also meant to discover what faculty would actually do when faced with copyright questions in teaching.

## ***Methodology***

In 2010 Tony Horava published a study looking at how copyright issues are communicated to the university user community (including faculty, staff, and students) by the library and librarians. He collected data via a survey and follow-up interviews. The respondents were directors or managers of university libraries. Among other things, the respondents indicated that librarians were mostly engaged in individual assistance in terms of copyright awareness and education. The next most-used strategy was information literacy programs, and then faculty liaison and outreach. Respondents also said that faculty liaison and outreach were the most important methods of raising awareness (Horava, 2010).

This study is based on Horava, but looking at the issue from the other side: a survey was devised that asked teaching faculty whether their institutions had copyright policies or training. The survey also asked if faculty members took advantage of the training and where they went if they had questions about copyright. The survey provided a few copyright-related scenarios that often arise in teaching, and asked faculty members how they would respond. The survey included space for individual comments about policies, training, and copyright in general.

There was no incentive offered to complete the study, except that the results would be made openly available. The study underwent ethics clearance at the University of Western Ontario.

The target population was all teaching faculty in Canada: full-time, part time, contract, adjunct, and post-doctoral fellows, who are responsible for constructing the syllabus for and teaching a course. In order for the survey to circulate as widely as possible among many universities, the list of members of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (now Universities Canada) was consulted, and the respective faculty associations were contacted asking them to distribute the request to their members. The survey was open from October 27 to December 2, 2014, and resulted in 201 complete responses.

## ***Results and Discussion***

A breakdown of the responses to each question (excluding comments) can be found in the Appendix.

Demographically, a quarter of the respondents were in the Arts & Humanities (25.4%), followed by Science (17.9%), then Social Science (16.9%).

The survey asked whether the respondent's university had a copyright policy or set of guidelines, a question that was intended to determine whether the respondent knew about the policy or guidelines. Just over 90% said that their institution did have a copyright policy or set of guidelines, 1% said that it did not, and 8.5% did not know.

Next, the survey asked whether the university offered training in copyright literacy to faculty. While 40% said that it did, another 40% said that they didn't know.

For those who said "yes," a follow-up question asked what kind of training is offered. The respondents could choose more than one option. The majority of these respondents, 70%, indicated that workshops were offered. Thirty-seven-and-a-half percent noted one-on-one sessions and 19% online tutorials. Those who said that their university offers training were asked whether they have personally attended any of this training. Only 26% of these participants had attended training. However, of those who attended training, only one respondent said that her/his knowledge of copyright was not in any way enhanced by the experience, while the rest said that their copyright knowledge was "greatly" or "somewhat" enhanced. So training and education works from the point of view of the learner, and the issue is how to encourage them to attend.

The next set of questions asked whether copyright information was sought from another person in the past 12 months. The respondent could choose more than one response. The results were about evenly split with somewhat more responding that they hadn't asked anyone else for copyright information (53%) than had (47%). Of those who did, 55% asked a librarian, while 40% asked a colleague. Twenty-seven percent of respondents asked people who were not on the list of options, such as a copyright officer or an e-mail list such as ABC Copyright. All but three of these 94 respondents

(97%) found an adequate answer to their question. Of the three who left unsatisfied, two had asked colleagues and one a librarian.

Participants were then asked if they had consulted any print or online resource in the past 12 months for answers to a copyright question. The respondent could choose more than one response. Slightly more respondents had consulted a resource than had not. More than half (54%) went to the university policy and 47% went to their university's web site. Thirty one percent went to another web site, and 23% went straight to the *Copyright Act*. Again, the vast majority (91%) found an adequate answer although a few more were disappointed as compared to those who asked human beings.

There was no statistical relationship between who or what was consulted and whether the faculty member received an adequate answer, likely because there were so few responses that indicated inadequate answers.

The survey included four scenarios to see how respondents would act if they were deciding how to use information in teaching.

The first scenario asked if they would show a YouTube video to students during class, if the video was on an official-looking account. Fifty-eight percent said that they would show the video, while 16% would ask the copyright owner for permission, and 14% would ask someone else such as a librarian. Seven-and-a-half percent said they would not show the video at all. This scenario is based on the new educational exception for Internet materials (*Copyright Act*, 1985, s. 30.04), which states that it can be displayed if there is no notice stating otherwise, and the instructor has no reason to believe that the posted material is itself infringing copyright.

In the second scenario, the instructor has a copy of an older academic article in print that cannot easily be found elsewhere. The question was whether they would scan the article and upload it to a learning management system. Thirty-two percent said they would ask someone such as their department head or librarian whether they can do this. The next highest response was to upload the article, at 27.4%. Eighteen and a half percent would ask permission from the copyright owner, but 15% would not upload it. This sort of thing would probably fall under fair dealing (*Copyright Act*, 1985, s. 29), even under the more restrictive policies such as Universities Canada's model policy (Association of Universities and Colleges Canada, 2012).

The next scenario concerns distance education. The instructor would like to upload a slide show to the learning management system that contains some copyrighted images. Thirty-three percent of respondents would upload the slide show, while 28.4% would ask permission from the copyright owners. Nineteen percent would ask for an opinion from someone else, and 14% would not upload the slide show with images. This scenario illustrates another of the new educational exception in the *Copyright Act*, namely to telecommunicate a lesson to enrolled students, such as those in a distance course (*Copyright Act*, 1985, s. 30.01).

The last scenario concerns a PDF version of a book that is not protected by a technological protection measure; it asks whether the instructor who has bought the PDF would upload it or part of it to the learning management system. Not surprisingly, only 2% said that they would upload the whole book. What may be surprising is that only 25% of respondents would upload the most relevant chapter, and 44% would not upload any of it. These responses might relate to the fact that the e-book is a personal copy, and not licenced through the library. Perhaps the respondents felt that by purchasing the e-book themselves they were contractually obligated to keep it to themselves. (That might in fact be a term of the purchase contract, but this issue cannot be adequately addressed in this article.) In many institutional fair dealing policies, including Universities Canada's, one chapter of a book is considered an example of a permitted use. In fact, in the *CCH* case, the Great Library had provided a copy of a rather lengthy monograph chapter to a lawyer, but it was not found by the Supreme Court to be copyright infringement.

The survey also included spaces for respondents to make comments on institutional policy, guidance, and copyright in general. Some of the comments added options that were not provided for in the scenarios, such as putting a book on reserve, providing a citation for the students to find the resource themselves, removing images from the slide show before posting it, using course packs, and contacting the copyright officer to obtain clearance (which is required at some institutions).

There were also many comments about the perceived difficulty in understanding copyright rules. Respondents said that the issue is "complex," "messy," and has "grey areas." They complained that it is "confusing" and that "the rules seem to change." One said, "I just want to know whether I can or cannot do something. And if I can't do it, what are my options." Some are afraid to use copyrighted content at all, and one respondent said that this was the impression left after a copyright education session at her own institution.

A few comments made reference to "expertise" and the idea that faculty members are not qualified to make copyright decisions, even with respect to their own teaching—for example one respondent wrote that fair dealing is "a question for the experts," but did not specify who those experts might be. Another asked, "As an untrained amateur, how do [we] know that [we] are right in [our] interpretation and application of information?"

Another theme that arose more than once was the issue of expediency and convenience. Seeking copyright permission can be an "onerous process," but the respondents are looking for "quick answers." One respondent said that "life was so much easier with Access Copyright."

## **Conclusion**

It was concerning to see that while nearly all respondents are aware of their institution's copyright policy or guidelines, 40% didn't know whether copyright training was offered. Perhaps the institution or its library provides effective copyright training, but if the intended audience doesn't know about it, it might as well not exist. As Horava (2010)

points out, copyright communication and education are key (p. 4). However, simple communication might not be enough, since only a quarter of respondents who knew about their institution's training options actually attended them. Without knowing the particulars of the training options, it is not possible to surmise why this might be.

When respondents have questions about the use of copyrighted works in their teaching, they will, more likely than not, go to a librarian or to the institution's copyright policy. Furthermore, some of the comments had to do with the time-consuming process of getting copyright permission or clearance if necessary. If it takes days and weeks to see if the materials can be used, the instructor may not bother to ask for permission, or may elect not to use the material at all. One respondent pointed out that adjunct faculty are not always on campus, and if they're looking for a quick answer from a librarian it is not always easy to obtain. It would be a good idea, then, for institutions to have an up-to-date and easily accessible copyright policy and guide, and a designated copyright contact in the library who is able to answer questions on a timely basis.

From the scenario responses and some of the comments, it seems that respondents are more comfortable reproducing and displaying materials that are freely available on the Internet, like YouTube videos and images, but more likely to ask for permission or guidance when it comes to print materials or even electronic versions of print materials like PDFs. So, 58% of respondents would go ahead and show a YouTube video in class, while less than half of that number (27%) would scan and upload a print article without asking for guidance first.

### ***Limitations and Future Research***

This study is descriptive and cannot be generalized. As noted above, the population studied was all teaching faculty in Canada. According to Statistics Canada, there were approximately 45,000 full-time university teaching faculty in Canada in 2010–2011 (Statistics Canada, 2012). To this must be added the number of part-time and adjunct faculty, as well as graduate and post-doctoral students who are responsible for courses. Given the size of the population, the response rate is extremely low, less than one half of a percent. Furthermore, participants were recruited for the most part via the institution's faculty association, which might not include faculty other than full-time. The survey did not ask for the participant's job status, so it is impossible to determine whether the responses are an accurate and valid representation of the population. The respondents are self-selected, so perhaps the faculty members who have no complaints did not bother to respond.

The study did not ask whether the respondent's institution had a blanket licence with Access Copyright. The options available for the scenario questions were not comprehensive, as some respondents noted. More than one respondent commented that their answers would depend on other factors that were not outlined in the questions. There are also many other scenarios that could have been included to increase validity. Further research could include interviews with teaching faculty to get more information about how they perceive copyright and copyright management, and how they use copyrighted materials. Respondents would then have the opportunity to

explain in more detail why they would respond to the scenarios the way they did. It would also be interesting to know the reasons that respondents have not attended their institution's copyright training sessions.

For future research into copyright awareness and perception of teaching faculty, these limitations will be corrected or mitigated. However, this preliminary survey does provide insight into what some faculty members think about copyright and how institutional efforts affect teaching. This information could assist universities in designing programs to educate and assist faculty in making decisions about the use of materials in their courses.

## References

[Alberta \(Education\) v. Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency \(Access Copyright\)](#), 2012 SCC 37.

Association of Universities and Colleges Canada. (2012, October 9). [Fair dealing policy for universities](#).

Burkell, J. A., Fortier, A., Di Valentino, L., & Roberts, S. T. (2015). [Enhancing key digital literacy skills: Information privacy, information security, and copyright/intellectual property](#). Canada: Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

[CCH Canadian Limited v Law Society of Upper Canada](#), 2004 SCC 13.

Charbonneau, D., & Priehs, M. (2014). Copyright awareness, partnerships, and training issues in academic libraries. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 40(3/4), 228–233.

Chase, M. E. (1993). [Educators' attitudes and related copyright issues in education: A review of selected research 1980-1992](#). *MC Journal: The Journal of Academic Media Librarianship*, 1(1), 1–9.

Chase, M. E. (1994). [An Analysis of the knowledge levels of media directors concerning relevant copyright issues in higher education](#) (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.

Clark, J. H. (1984). *Formulation of a guide to university copyright policy revision* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO.

[Copyright Act](#), R.S.C. 1985, c. C-42.

Crews, K. D. (1990). *Copyright policies at American research universities: Balancing information needs and legal limits* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles, CA.

- Di Valentino, L. (2013). [Review of Canadian university fair dealing policies](#). SSRN.
- Di Valentino, L. (2014, February 7). [Canadian university fair dealing policies, part two](#) [Blog post]. *Fair Dealing in Education*.
- Di Valentino, L. (2015, October 15). [Access Copyright renewals update](#) [Blog post]. *Fair Dealing in Education*.
- Dryden, J. (2010). [What Canadian archivists know about copyright and where they get their knowledge](#). *Archivaria*, 69, 77–116.
- Eye, J. (2013). [Knowledge level of library deans and directors in copyright law](#). *Journal of Librarianship & Scholarly Communication*, 2(1), 1–14.
- Gatlin, R., & Arn, J. V. (1999). AACSB deans' understanding of multimedia copyright laws and guidelines. *Journal of Education for Business*, 74(6), 368–371.
- Geist, M. (2013, August 30). [Schools navigate learning curve for new copyright rules: Geist](#). *Toronto Star*.
- Granbery, M. T. (2013, January). [Copyright education: The impact of training for school librarians](#) (Unpublished masters thesis). The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC.
- Hobbs, R., Jaszi, P., & Aufderheide, P. (2007). [The cost of copyright confusion for media literacy](#). Washington, DC: Center for Social Media.
- Horava, T. (2010). [Copyright communication in Canadian academic libraries: A national survey](#). *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*, 34(1), 1–38.
- James, A. F. (1981). *Educator attitudes concerning copyright* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR.
- Kordsmeier, W., Gatlin-Watts, R., & Arn, J. V. (2000). [University administrators' understanding of multimedia copyright guidelines](#). *Educational Technology & Society*, 3(1).
- Lorinc, J. (2010, August 16). [Universities in dispute with copyright collective over fees](#). *University Affairs*.
- Nair, M. (2013, September 12). [Guideline v. practice](#) [Blog post]. *Fair Duty*.
- Renner, J. R. (2005). Knowledge level of postsecondary educators regarding copyright and copyright-related issues. In *Center for Intellectual Property in the Digital Environment* (Ed.), *Colleges, code, and copyright: The impact of digital networks and technological controls on copyright and the dissemination of information in higher education* (pp. 90–115). Chicago, IL: Association of College and Research Libraries.

- Schlipp, J. (2008). Coaching teaching faculty: Copyright awareness programs in academic libraries. *Kentucky Libraries*, 72(3), 18–22.
- Shane, S. L. (1999). *An analysis of the knowledge levels of California K-12 teachers concerning copyright issues related to classroom multimedia projects* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA.
- Sims, N. (2011). [Lies, damned lies, and copyright \(mis\)information: Empowering faculty by addressing key points of confusion](#). In *ACRL 2011* (pp. 282–296). Philadelphia, PA.
- Smith, K. H., Tobia, R. C., Plutchak, T. S., Howell, L. M., Pfeiffer, S. J., & Fitts, M. S. (2006). Copyright knowledge of faculty at two academic health science campuses: Results of a survey. *Serials Review*, 32(2), 59–67.
- Statistics Canada. (2012, May 3). [Full-time teaching staff at Canadian universities, by rank and sex](#).
- Trosow, S. E. (2010). [Bill C-32 and the educational sector: Overcoming impediments to fair dealing](#). In M. Geist (Ed.), *From “radical extremism” to “balanced copyright”: Canadian copyright and the digital agenda* (pp. 541–568). Toronto: Irwin Law.
- Trosow, S. E. (2013). Fair dealing practices in the post-secondary education sector after the Pentalogy. In M. Geist (Ed.), [The Copyright Pentalogy: How the Supreme Court of Canada shook the foundations of Canadian copyright law](#) (pp. 213–233). Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Wilkinson, M. A. (2010). Copyright, collectives, and contracts: New math for educational institutions and libraries. In M. Geist (Ed.), *From “radical extremism” to “balanced copyright”: Canadian copyright and the digital agenda* (pp. 503–540). Toronto: Irwin Law.

## **Appendix**

### **Survey results**

#### **Q1 In which faculty or faculties are you employed? (can choose more than one)**

- Arts and Humanities **51/201 [25.4%]**
- Science **36/201 [17.9%]**
- Social Sciences **34/201 [16.9%]**
- Health Sciences (including Medicine, Dentistry, Pharmacy) **28/201 [13.9%]**
- Information Studies / Library Studies / Media Studies **14/201 [7.0%]**
- Other **16/201 [8.0%]**
- Business **13/201 [6.5%]**
- Engineering **11/201 [5.5%]**
- Education **10/201 [5.0%]**
- Law **0/201 [0.0%]**

#### **Q2 Does your institution have a copyright policy or set of guidelines?**

- Yes **182/201 [90.5%]**
- I don't know **17/201 [8.5%]**
- No **2/201 [1.0%]**

#### **Q3 Does your institution offer training in copyright literacy to faculty?**

- I don't know **82/201 [40.8%]**
- Yes **80/201 [39.8%]**
- No **39/201 [19.4%]**

#### **Q4 What type of training is offered? (only if answer to Q3 is “yes”) (can choose more than one)**

- Workshops **56/80 [70%]**
- One-on-one sessions **30/80 [37.5%]**
- Online tutorials **15/80 [18.8%]**
- Other **15/80 [18.8%]**
- I don't know **7/80 [8.8%]**

#### **Q5 Have you attended any copyright literacy training session held by your institution in the past 12 months? (only if answer to Q3 is “yes”)**

- No **59/80 [73.8%]**
- Yes **21/80 [26.3%]**

**Q6 Do you feel that your knowledge of copyright was enhanced by the experience? (only if answer to Q5 is “yes”)**

- Yes, somewhat **13/21 [61.9%]**
- Yes, greatly **7/21 [33.3%]**
- No **1/21 [4.8%]**

**Q7 Have you ever asked another person for guidance on copyright issues in the past 12 months?**

- No **107/201 [53.2%]**
- Yes **94/201 [46.8%]**

**Q8 Whom did you ask? (only if answer to Q7 is “yes”) (can choose more than one)**

- Librarian **52/94 [55.3%]**
- Colleague **38/94 [40.4%]**
- Other **25/94 [26.6%]**
- Head of faculty or department **8/94 [8.5%]**
- University legal counsel **2/94 [2.1%]**
- Outside legal counsel **1/94 [1.1%]**

**Q9 Did you find an adequate answer to your question? (only if answer to Q3 is “yes”)**

- Yes, somewhat **48/94 [51.1%]**
- Yes, completely **43/94 [45.7%]**
- No **3/94 [3.2%]**

**Q10 Have you ever searched for copyright information from any print or electronic resource in the past 12 months?**

- Yes **103/201 [51.2%]**
- No **98/201 [48.8%]**

**Q11 What resources did you consult? (only if answer to Q10 is “yes”) (can choose more than one)**

- University copyright policy or guidelines **56/103 [54.4%]**
- University web site (including library web site) **48/103 [46.6%]**
- Other web site **32/103 [31.1%]**
- Copyright Act **23/103 [23.3%]**
- Other copyright policy or guidelines **18/103 [17.5%]**
- Other **10/103 [9.7%]**
- Book about copyright **8/103 [7.8%]**

**Q12 Did you find an adequate answer to your question? (only if answer to Q10 is “yes”)**

- Yes, somewhat **60/103 [58.3%]**
- Yes, completely **34/103 [33.0%]**
- No **9/103 [8.7%]**

**Q13 You would like to show a YouTube video to students during a class. The video is on the page of an official-looking account. The video description includes a copyright notice and the name of the copyright owner, but no other information.**

- I would show the video **117/201 [58.2%]**
- I would ask permission of the copyright owner to show the video **32/201 [15.9%]**
- I would ask someone (e.g. dean, librarian) whether I may show the video **28/201 [13.9%]**
- I would not show the video **15/201 [7.5%]**
- I don't know **8/201 [4.0%]**
- I would ask permission of YouTube to show the video **1/201 [0.5%]**

**Q14 You would like students to read an older (but still copyrighted) academic article that is only available in print form. The library does not have a copy of the journal, but you have one.**

- I would ask someone (e.g. dean, librarian) whether I may copy the article **64/201 [31.8%]**
- I would upload the entire article to the course management system **55/201 [27.4%]**
- I would ask permission of the copyright owner to upload the article **37/201 [18.4%]**
- I would not upload the article **30/201 [14.9%]**
- I don't know **15/201 [7.5%]**

**Q15 You are conducting a distance education course that takes place online. You have created slide shows that you would like to make available to students via the course management system. The slide shows contain some copyrighted images.**

- I would upload the slide shows **67/201 [33.3%]**
- I would ask permission of the copyright holders to make the images available **57/201 [28.4%]**
- I would ask someone (e.g. dean, librarian) whether I may upload the slide shows **38/201 [18.9%]**
- I would not upload the slide shows **28/201 [13.9%]**
- I don't know **11/201 [5.5%]**

**Q16 You have purchased a PDF version of a book and would like to upload it in its entirety to the course management system for students to access. The book contains a copyright notice but is not protected by a digital lock.**

- I would not upload the book **89/201 [44.3%]**
- I would upload the most relevant chapter of the book to the CMS **50/201 [24.9%]**
- I would ask permission of the copyright owner to upload the book **31/201 [15.4%]**
- I would ask someone (e.g. dean or librarian) whether I may upload the book **25/201 [12.4%]**
- I would upload the entire book to the CMS **4/201 [2.0%]**
- I don't know **2/201 [1.0%]**