**

**CE Workshop Evaluation Form**

**Arrangement and Description Track**

Workshop **Evaluation Form:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Title** | Copyright: The Archivist and the Law |

Directions:

* Quantitative: Each item below begins with a **bolded** statement. Score each with a 1-5 ranking to indicate your assessment of the veracity of that statement based on your review of workshop overviews/agendas, evaluations, and other materials.
* Qualitative: In the comments section for each item below, please respond to the additional questions posed and any related issues that this workshop raises for you.
* Provide any additional assessments or comments not relevant to one of the specific, numbered areas in the space provided following the table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Please place an “x” in the appropriate column, use* ***1=low****, undesirable, to* ***5=high****, excellent.* | | | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1. Does the content **appeal to its specified audience**? Does it indicate specific categories of archivists and/or levels of expertise to assist potential participants in determining the workshop's relevance for them?  Comments: *It is unclear from the workshop description and objectives the level of knowledge about copyright expected from its participants. It is implied, however, that the individuals taking this workshop have at least some basic working knowledge of how to handle copyright within their particular institutional collections and for their user needs.* | | |  |  |  | X |  |
| 2. To what extent does the subject matter **reflect current archival practices** and theory commonly accepted in the profession?  Comments: *This workshop is* *exhaustive in providing background information on copyright in general and particularly within the United States.* *Some updating could be done to reflect any legal changes and archival efforts within the past few years, especially in relation to born-digital archival collections and efforts to create publically available digital collections.* | | |  |  |  | X |  |
| 3.. How **relevant/appropriate are the teaching and delivery methodologies** (lecture, video, PowerPoint, exercises, film, audiotape, discussion, simulation, case study, opportunities for in-course feedback, etc.) to the articulated goals and objectives, and to the content?"  Comments: *The 47-page handbook that Maher put together from 11 years worth of handouts and slides is a great idea to bring together all the facets of copyright history, the laws, the court cases, case studies, and considerations for archival institutions. It may be overwhelming as a stand-alone device for some participants, however, as it is expected that they read it in its entirety before the workshop. The PowerPoint, which covers the same material as the handbook, is much more visually appealing and formatted more clearly than the handbook. The handbook perhaps might be more made accessible if more clearly broken up into topics and with some minor explanatory additions before each section.* | | |  |  |  | X |  |
| 4. How workable is the **time line** or **agenda** for the course? Is there sufficient detail to indicate how the workshop will evolve? Does it allow sufficient time for active engagement between course participants and the instructor(s)?  Comments: *The focus of the two-day workshop itself is primarily on case studies and addressing copyright concerns from individual participants. The workshop leans heavily on the expectation that the participants have gone through the handbook and other readings prior to the class. The schedule for the two days seems reasonable and allows for ample time for discussion and group/individual work. The use of informal quizzes works well as a way for participants to check their understanding, provide some pressure to prepare for the workshop, and to elicit conversation (as there are rarely clear right/wrong answers in copyright).* | | |  |  |  |  | X |
| 5. To what degree does the **list of assigned readings** support the content of the proposal?  Comments: *In addition to the handbook, the brief list of suggested articles, opinion pieces, and codes of ethics are very appropriate for the workshop’s scope.* | | |  |  |  |  | X |
| 6. Does the presentation support the Learning Outcomes in the descriptions?  Comments: *The workshop very much addresses all the learning outcomes, which are as follows: the complexities associated with intellectual property, the history of copyright law, the current law and its relationship to cultural institutions such as archives, and decision-making for copyright issues.* | | |  |  |  |  | X |
| **A&D Track Considerations** | | | | | | | |
| 1.Does this content bridge, enhance, and/or build on other workshops (If so, please name) | *This workshop enhances workshops in all of the ACE categories. For example, the workshop is connected to the management workshops (e.g., Records Management for Archivists, Basics of Managing Electronic Record) because it helps archivists understand how their collections can be used under existing copyright law and educational loopholes. It also enhances the any reference workshops (e.g., Real World Reference) as it can help archivists understand the extent to which patrons can use and reproduce materials. The workshop would be useful for those interested in using collection content for physical or online exhibits (e.g., Archival Exhibitions) or putting their collections online. An understanding of intellectual property is also crucial for archival program management (e.g., Management of Cultural Institutions, Project Management for Archivists).* | | | | | | |
| 2.Does this build on other workshops not on the list? | *No, not that I know of.* | | | | | | |
| 3 Should this be part of the A&D Track? | *Yes. As indicated above, this workshop, while it may seem somewhat tangential to arrangement and description, is necessary for understanding the ethical and legal responsibilities connected to A&D.* | | | | | | |
| 4.Where would this workshop fall in the sequence of an A&D track? | *It should be grouped with other fundamental courses in other ACE categories. For example, it would make sense for an individual to take the workshop after completing workshops on basic principles, appraisal, and arrangement and description.* | | | | | | |
| Why? | *After an individual took the basic foundational A&D workshops, s/he would then need this workshop in order to take on more specific ethics workshops (e.g., Confidentiality and Privacy Issues in Digital Archives, Copyright Issues in Digital Archives) and to more fully appreciate the copyright issues s/he may encounter while taking a STS or T&S workshop.* | | | | | | |
| 5. What tier does this workshop fall in? (See attached tiers) | *This workshop is foundational.* | | | | | | |
| 6. Target Audience | Attached list of tracks can be used to indicate appropriate level of experience and job function  *The copyright workshop would be most appropriate for administrative-level personnel because of the level of detail and history given in the workshop and the emphasis on making decisions regarding material use in complex and potentially ambiguous situations. This course can assist administrators understand the institutional risks in relation to copyright and help them decide how they would want to address them both at the policy- and case-level. That said, this course could also be appropriate for anyone who has to provide reference services or make exhibits.* | | | | | | |
| 7. Is the suggested prior “experience/knowledge” appropriate? | Knowledge that participants will need to gain the most from the workshop; include any workshop (from the list of suggested A&D workshops) that you suggest be taken before attending this course.  For descriptions go to <http://www2.archivists.org/prof-education/course-catalog>  *I don’t think any extensive prior knowledge of copyright is necessary for this workshop. As mentioned above, this workshop covers a lot of material and has the potential to be overwhelming for anyone, regardless of his/her prior knowledge or experience with intellectual property.* | | | | | | |
| 8. Learning Outcomes:  Are they appropriate and/or relevant? | List of specific, measurable, and actionable outcomes that each person should be able to do (e.g. discuss, explain, evaluate, design) by the end of the course.  *The learning outcomes as provided in the workshop description and in the handbook are both appropriate and relevant. The historical and legal aspects of copyright are heavily emphasized in the readings, while decision-making (via case studies) is very much the focus of the actual workshop.* | | | | | | |
| 9. What should they be?  Please list learning outcomes. | *The learning outcomes do not need to be changed, but it may be appropriate for the purpose of the A&D track to emphasize the last learning outcome, “[Determine] the sequence of decision making needed for your management of copyright issues,” and to add that the workshop will help archivists learn how to address the copyright issues they may face when preparing collections for individual access and public display.* | | | | | | |
| 10. Can you make suggestions for competencies this workshop would fulfill? | *- Understand the deliberations involved in the arrangement and description of records, including different media formats, metadata schema, legal considerations, and access.*  *- Provide consistent and competent service to users communities.* | | | | | | |
| 11. Would parts of the content lend themselves to a different format? | |  |  | | --- | --- | | Check one: Webinar:   * 30 minute * 90minute | In person:   * 1/2 day   X1 day   * 2 day | | | | | | | |
| 12. Which parts? | *If someone has already taken this workshop, I could see there being a follow-up workshop that addresses case studies that are more specific to A&D copyright issues.* | | | | | | |
| 13. Does it lend itself to repurposing as an audio CD? | *Possibly. The history of intellectual property and copyright law could work as an audio CD.* | | | | | | |
| Which parts? | *See above.* | | | | | | |

Other comments:

* The workshop description is somewhat outdated, since it emphasizes the Eldred case from 2003.
* The copyright timeline does not have any updates since 2005.