

|| C++ Object Oriented Programming | By James Helfrich [ASIN: B0DTVZSPM2]

Of course, here is the ownership and copyright information for the book "C++ Object Oriented Programming" by James Helfrich.

Ownership & Copyright

Based on available information, the book is a commercially published textbook.

- **Author: James Helfrich.**
- **Publisher:** The book appears to be published by **Kendall Hunt Publishing Company**, a company that specializes in educational materials and textbooks.
- **Copyright:** The book is protected by copyright, held by the publisher and/or the author. A similar textbook on software design by the same author from the same publisher shows a copyright date of © **2023**. This means you cannot legally copy or distribute the work without permission.

Open Source Status

The book is **not open source**. It is a commercial textbook used for university courses, specifically at Brigham Young University-Idaho, and is available for purchase through university bookstores and online retailers. My search found no evidence of it being available under an open-source license.

I am new to creating and adapting educational content, so I want to understand what my boundaries are.

Here's what I'd like to do:

- Use this book to help my students better understand object-oriented programming (OOP), especially by leveraging its lab activities and instructions for using GLUT to create simple GUI/canvas applications.
- Translate the book's C++ labs and instructional content into Java, since I teach AP Computer Science A (AP CSA), a Java-based OOP course for high school students. I would compile these materials into markdown documents hosted on a private GitHub repository, accessible only to my students.
- Adapt the labs and instructions to align with AP CSA learning objectives, as there is significant overlap between the book's goals and the AP curriculum.
- Reach out to the professor (the book's author), since I was his student about four years ago and can contact him by phone or email.

Of course. This is a fantastic question that gets to the heart of how educators can responsibly use existing materials. It's a world of gray areas, but there are clear principles and best practices to guide you.

Let's break down your plan and your limits.

Disclaimer: I am an AI assistant and not a lawyer. This information should be considered for educational purposes and not as legal advice. The key legal doctrine at play here is "Fair Use."

The Legal Framework: Understanding Fair Use

Your intended use falls under a legal concept called **"Fair Use."** Fair Use allows you to use copyrighted material without permission from the copyright holder under specific circumstances. Courts use a four-factor balancing

test to determine if something qualifies as Fair Use.

Let's analyze your plan using these four factors.

1. Purpose and Character of Your Use

- **Your Use:** Educational, non-profit, for a specific class.
- **The Verdict: This weighs heavily in your favor.** The law explicitly lists "teaching, scholarship, or research" as prime examples of purposes that favor a finding of fair use.
- **Transformative Use:** You also plan to **transform** the work. You are not just photocopying the C++ labs; you are translating them to Java, adapting them for a high school audience, and mapping them to different learning objectives (AP CSA). This is a very strong argument for fair use, as you are creating something new with a different purpose.

2. The Nature of the Copyrighted Work

- **The Work:** A published textbook. It is factual and informational rather than highly creative (like a movie or novel).
- **The Verdict: This weighs in your favor.** Copyright protection is generally "thinner" for factual works than for highly creative, fictional works.

3. The Amount and Substantiality of the Portion Used

- **Your Use:** This is the most significant gray area. You are using the core pedagogical structure of the labs—the "heart of the work." If you were to translate every single lab and all the instructional text verbatim, you would be using a substantial amount of the book.
- **The Verdict: This is a potential risk.** While your use is transformative, using the *entirety* of the book's lab structure could weaken your fair use argument. Using a selection of the labs and using the book's *method* as inspiration to write your *own* similar labs would be much safer.

4. The Effect of the Use on the Potential Market

- **Your Use:** You will put the translations on a private GitHub repo for a small number of students. You are not selling it.
- **The Verdict: This likely weighs in your favor.** The key question is: "Does your action harm the author's ability to sell his book?" An argument could be made that your private, non-commercial, Java-based high school resource does not compete with or damage the market for a C++ university textbook. You are not distributing a substitute for the original book to its target audience.

What Are Your Limits? A Practical Guide

Given the analysis above, your plan has a strong foundation for being considered Fair Use. However, "Fair Use" is a defense, not an automatic right. The only way to be 100% certain is to have a judge decide.

Since that's not practical, here is a guide to your limits and your best course of action, from safest to riskiest.

Level 1: The Safest and Most Respectful Path (Highly Recommended)

Contact the author.

You have a golden ticket here. Your prior relationship with the professor is your most valuable asset. Contacting him accomplishes several things:

- It completely removes any legal ambiguity. With his permission, you don't need to rely on a Fair Use defense.
- It is the most ethical and professional route, showing respect for his work.
- It maintains and strengthens your professional network. He may be thrilled to see his work adapted for a new audience and might even offer support or suggestions.

How to phrase the email:

"Dear Professor Helfrich,

I hope this email finds you well. My name is [Your Name], and I was a student in your [Course Name] back in [Year]. I truly valued your approach to teaching OOP, and your book, "C++ Object Oriented Programming," has stuck with me.

I am now teaching AP Computer Science A to high school students, which is a Java-based curriculum. I believe the structure and problem-solving approach of your labs would be incredibly effective for my students.

I am writing to ask for your permission to adapt some of your labs. My plan would be to translate the C++ concepts and code to Java, remap the goals to the AP CSA learning objectives, and post these materials in a markdown document on a private GitHub repository, accessible only to my enrolled students.

I would, of course, provide full attribution to you and your book as the original source and inspiration. Please let me know if you would be comfortable with this educational use of your work.

Thank you again for your incredible teaching.

Sincerely, [Your Name]"

Level 2: The "Good Faith" Fair Use Path

If you cannot reach him or decide not to, you can proceed, but you should take steps to ensure your use is as fair as possible.

- **Do NOT just translate.** Truly transform the work. Use his labs as inspiration. Change the scenarios, the variable names, and the specific problems while keeping the pedagogical spirit. This makes it more "your" work.
- **Attribute, Attribute, Attribute.** At the top of your markdown document, include a clear and prominent notice: *"These labs are adapted from and inspired by the work of James Helfrich in his book 'C++ Object Oriented Programming.' All original credit belongs to him."*
- **Limit the Amount.** Don't adapt the entire book. Select a handful of labs that are most relevant to your course objectives.
- **Keep it Private.** You are already planning this, which is crucial. Never make the repository public or share the link outside your class. Ensure your students understand it is for their use only.

Conclusion

Your plan is well-intentioned and likely has a strong Fair Use argument. However, your ability to contact the author is a rare advantage. **Seeking his permission is by far the best path.** It's respectful, legally sound, and turns a potential legal gray area into a positive professional collaboration.