Suggestions for the "Best of the Certificate" Compilation

Final Assignment Category #1
Creative Commons Certificate for Librarians January 2020
By Scott Cormier

1.

January 2019 Certificate for Librarians	Assignment 2: Copyright Law	A Quick Overview of Copyright by Kathy Essmiller is taken from "January 2019 Creative Commons Certificate: shared assignments" and licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

A) accuracy of content shared: I did not see any inaccuracies, but I did see an omission. In "Purpose of Copyright", the author touched on descriptions for the two primary rationales for copyright law, Utilitarian and Author's rights, without naming or defining them.   For example: "Incentive for creation of new works" in slide 1, should be tied to "Utilitarian."

B) how informative the overall work is: Quite a bit of information was covered, and the work was organized and easy to understand. I liked how she described what qualifies for a copyright and what does not, and touched on other IP protections, with an example of Facebook's trademark.

C) how creativity exhibited: The author made the material fun.   I like the use of YouTube, and I could easily see this video being used as a learning tool. There was a "fan" in the comments asking about copyright! Always a good sign.

There are quite a few links in the assignment- I wish they were clickable. One option to make links active might be to put them in the Comments section. Or if not, then provide the full URL information. One example: there is a by credit for images and slides adapted from "Copyright Basics: A Quick Introduction by Erin Owens" but I couldn't find that source with a web search.

She did not mention registering copyrighted work: in some countries, registration is a necessary part of legal enforcement, and her video might be enjoyed by people from other countries.

2.

January 2019 Certificate for Librarians	Assignment 3: Anatomy of a CC License	[Understanding Creative Commons Licenses](#) by Kylie Burgess can be found in the "[January 2019 Creative Commons Certificate: shared assignments](#)" and is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International](#) license

A) accuracy of content shared: Content is very accurate, my only question had to do with the use of "tweak" in the presentation. The author's informality helps others understand the work, but in some cases, it is important to use official language. In describing a license, "non-tweak" is not the same thing as ND.

B) how informative the overall work is: Overall, the work is very informative**.** One exception: the author mentions the public domain and gives a description, but there is no mention of the "No Rights Reserved" option allowing creators to waive their rights, or that works can be marked as Public Domain by an expert to minimize confusion and clearly identify very old works.

C) how creativity exhibited: The use of an infographic is a creative way to effectively share information.   Organizing the licenses from least restrictive to most, with the red arrow pointing the way is a particularly effective way to group the six licenses. I only wish that there would be more examples, along with definitions.

There's room: I'm not sure why she wouldn't add "fair use" along with "fair dealing" as examples of copyright exemptions.   Also, even when CC licenses are not required, their use can be helpful to users who would like to attribute works properly and introduce others to new primary sources.

In the last point of her presentation, describing the Choose a license tool, I would change Creative Commons "have" to Creative Commons "has" since CC as an organization is singular. Also, links would be great, and an example of what the tool can do… if Piktochart doesn't allow links within the infographic, maybe add them in the introduction to the chart, or afterwards as a quick list of resources?

3.

January 2019 Certificate for Librarians	Unit 4: Using CC Licenses and CC-Licensed Works	[Creative Commons: Collections VS. Remixes](#) by Jennie Simning can be found in the "[January 2019 Creative Commons Certificate: shared assignments](#)" and is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](#).

A) accuracy of content shared: Content is accurate, definitions and examples of collections and remixes with clear overview statements to keep things organized. It might help to focus more on the licenses: in the context, a collection is made up of not just "individual works" but of individually licensed items. The same applies to remixes, which are also licensed works to which certain rules apply.

B) how informative the overall work is: Information is presented in a concise way without sacrificing important material. The rule that collections assembled for commercial uses cannot include NC licenses was clearly explained, and when bullet points are used to describe choosing an adapter's license the rules are even more clear than the CC chart.

C) how creativity exhibited: The summary at the beginning of the work is useful in establishing the need for more information and sets the tone for a very well-organized presentation. The Remix section, Best Practices for Licensing in particular, is very creative and clearly presented. The remix example is great, but I would have also included attribution information for the snapshot that was added to the work too: it looks like the overall work "Watch Out" was licensed, and "boundary waters 2010" was changed by adding the unnamed/unattributed snapshot.

The fact that collections are "unchanged" is key to understanding when a collection becomes a remix. That should be added to the rules for defining a collection.

The author's statement that "You may apply any CC license to the collection" is complete, but it might be reassuring to also point out that creators of collections including an SA work are not required to apply an SA license.

4.

January 2019 Certificate for Librarians	Unit 5: CC for Librarians	[OA and OER Comparison](#) by Jen Hughes can be found in the "[January 2019 Creative Commons Certificate: shared assignments](#)" and is licensed under [CC BY-SA](#)

A) accuracy of content shared: Content shared is accurate and geared to help inform a college-level audience, which makes sense considering the subject matter. The typos, especially in "Why Is OER Important?" section should be corrected. It states that versions can be "mae" free or made "availale"

B) how informative the overall work is: The work is informative without overwhelming the reader: important points around the Budapest OA Initiative and the OER "5 Rs" were covered, for example, and the Relationship between OA and OER is clearly described in a single paragraph, which is an impressive accomplishment considering the subject matter. The information is more understandable because of the way it is presented.

C) how creativity exhibited: Very creative infographic-style presentation: I wish I had thought of it. The way the information is organized is key to helping users understand OA and OER, similarities and differences.

There are a lot of definitions and not many examples: one part in particular, explaining that access to OA materials for students, would especially benefit from links or references so that students using the infographic might know where to go for OA research articles.

In the section where she describes why OER is important to faculty and students, I would suggest addressing quality of OER by adding some evidence: maybe adding links to articles on the subject. I can understand that we do not need to be continually defending the quality of OA works, but it wouldn't hurt to show how strong they are and can be through future contributions. Links to a study that points to favorable outcomes for students who use OER compared to other resources might be helpful too.

5.

June 2019 Certificate for Librarians	Unit 5: CC for Librarians	Why Open? By Wayde Oshiro can be found in the "June 2019 Creative Commons Certificate: shared assignments" and is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

A) accuracy of content shared: In the definitions, this work did not stipulate that OA content has to be attributed properly or give examples of such, and in the attributions section, proper TASL-format information was not provided about pictures used in the presentation.

B) how informative the overall work is: The Budapest OA definition is exhaustive, but was shortened for this work, and the shorter definition by Peter Suber would have worked as an alternative if space is an issue. It would have been most informative to include both, full definitions. In general, I like the way infographics look, but the work would be more informative if it had more useful hyperlinks, if not within the Piktochart, then in the references or in notes in the sidebar.

C) how creativity exhibited: This is one of the most professional-looking presentations that I have reviewed for this assignment. The information was presented in a very attractive way. The 5Rs were defined and then used in the description of the differences between Open and Closed resources, which was a nice touch.

I would add a note to address concerns or lack of concerns about the quality of OA materials and how well the movement is being accepted/growing. Teachers must still evaluate OER materials, but that isn't a hardship considering that all materials must be evaluated for appropriateness before use.

There was no mention of Green and Gold Access to OA. I would add at least definitions, and maybe links to examples so that people who enjoy the infographic might know where to go for more information on OA, OER and CC. The community is large and growing, we should take every opportunity to not just define things, but to help people find helpful resources.