as buying up Internet domain names with the intent of selling them to the trademark holder at an inflated price. The search chapter explains how to search for federally registered trademarks using the Patent and Trademark Office’s online database. Step-by-step instructions are given for searching for both word and graphic trademarks. Although the author cautions that screenshots may not match current webpages, I did not notice any differences between the trademark search chapter screenshots and the website when I tried the example searches. While searching state trademarks and unregistered trademarks was beyond the scope of the chapter, the author does mention that Internet search engines can be useful in identifying trademarks in use.

The single chapter on copyright uses photographs, music and other sound recordings, fiction and nonfiction writing, and other creative works as examples of the six rights secured by copyright, suggesting the complexities of applying copyright law in different contexts. Wherry does a good job of introducing the concept of fair use, emphasizing that four factors are balanced in deciding whether a specific use qualifies for the fair use exemption. The brief section on fair use in distance education settings is just enough to alert librarians to the need for further information when developing policies related to electronic reserves, course management software, and online tutorials or classes. Sections on the Conference on Fair Use guidelines, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, and recent court cases are sufficient to alert librarians to the need to pay attention to changing interpretations of copyright law.

The author explains that copyright registration is no longer required in the United States. Orphan works (that is, works still in their copyright protection period but for which the copyright owner is uncertain), have been a topic of concern to librarians and others in recent years, but the book does not discuss the difficulty a lack of a registration requirement poses for people who want to secure permission to use copyrighted materials. Like many introductions to copyright, this one asserts that “government documents are not copyrighted” (69) without clarifying that while U.S. federal government documents are not copyrighted, state and local government documents are protected by copyright unless the state has decided otherwise.

This chapter is a good orientation to copyright, but most librarians will need more information. Complete Copyright: An Everyday Guide for Librarians and Copyright Law for Librarians and Educators are easily read books targeted at librarians, but the slightly more technical but comprehensive Distance Learning and Copyright is an essential reference for librarians who deal with copyright issues extensively.1

The book includes two appendices and an index. The first appendix consists of Yehuda Berlinger’s verse versions of the copyright, patent, and trademark codes. Wherry says he finds these verses, with stanzas headed by the relevant code reference, useful in locating specific statutes. The second appendix is a list of patent and trademark depository libraries by state. The index is fairly good; I was able to find references to terms such as “cybersquatting” and mechanical patents, company names, court cases, and major laws, but there was no cross-reference from lawyer to attorney. A bibliography of suggested readings would have been a useful addition, as would a table of cases mentioned in the text.

This slim book is an excellent brief introduction to intellectual property issues for librarians and library staff. The step-by-step explanations of searching free online patent and trademark databases will be useful in most public, academic, and special libraries.—Ginger Williams (ginger.williams@wichita.edu), Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas.
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The SPEC Kit series, published by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), serves the unique purpose of providing current research library practices and policies guides for working librarians. Scholarly Communication Education Initiatives, SPEC Kit 299, surveys ARL libraries on scholarly communication education initiatives with the purpose of finding out “what kind of initiatives ARL member libraries have used or plan to use to educate faculty, administrators, students, and library staff at their institutions about scholarly communication issues” (19).

The survey was conducted in May 2007, and since then there has been a flurry of activity to start education programs in academic libraries. Despite the fact that the book was published two years ago, it provides useful information that could help libraries who are planning or newly implementing a scholarly communication education program. Without a doubt, most (if not all) library administrators are grappling with how to best instruct their librarians on these complex issues, with the intention that librarians will in turn educate others in their academic community.

This book focuses primarily on which person or group is spearheading education efforts and how they...
are doing so in regards to six targeted audience groups: faculty, nonfaculty researchers, institutional administrators, graduate students, undergraduates, and librarians or library staff. The 123 ARL member libraries were surveyed, with a 59 percent response rate, and 55 of the libraries indicated they had engaged in scholarly communication education activities. As with all SPEC Kits, this one is composed of three parts: “Survey Results,” “Representative Documents,” and “Selected Resources.”

“Survey Results” begins with an executive summary that painstakingly covers each of the six audience groups noted earlier. The survey asked respondents to answer the same set of questions for each targeted group; it is likely that the authors were looking for granularity and diversity between the groups, but there were not significant differences between the groups regarding the topics addressed in the outreach efforts. (One-on-one conversations were the most effective forms of outreach to the most audience groups, with the exception of education librarians, where formal presentations were used most often). For each audience group, the authors detail the scholarly communication topics addressed and the methods by which librarians conducted their outreach efforts. While there could be redundancy in such a presentation, the authors include quotations and comments from respondents that enhance the numbers and put them in context. This adds considerable interest and value to the summary. (The executive summary is free on ARLs website, www.arl.org/bm-doc/spec299web.pdf).

The most interesting portion of the executive summary addresses challenges related to education initiatives and outlines barriers to educating library users and staff. Helpful to anyone considering or conducting outreach efforts, knowing existing challenges is important. As expected, educating faculty presents the broadest range of challenges, ranging from concerns about promotion and tenure to a lack of interest in the issues and satisfaction with the status quo. Additionally, no respondents indicated success in “alleviating faculty concerns about the effects of open access publishing on promotion and tenure” (17). However, given that in just two short years we have seen faculty senates at several prominent universities mandate open access for their institution’s intellectual output, the concerns about open access may be waning, which is good news for education initiatives. The survey identified that the “biggest challenge for librarians revolved around having adequate staff, time, and funding to devote to an SC campaign” (15). Given the budget woes that all academic institutions are currently facing, the challenge of staffing will not likely be alleviated any time soon.

“Survey Results” includes a segment called “Survey Questions and Responses,” which is worth browsing to see the free-text responses from the respondents. Some of these responses are excerpted in the executive summary, but reading them in their entirety is revealing, though it does require some effort to put the comment in the context of the question asked.

The “Representative Documents” section constitutes about thirty-five pages of the book and serves to highlight the most useful and illustrative documents related to the topic of the survey. The documentation includes position descriptions for scholarly communication librarians, websites and blogs on scholarly communication and copyright, newsletter examples, and presentation materials. Many of these are screen shots from the Web, which are less than desirable to read on paper, but which serve to capture the content as URLs and Web content can change rapidly. Unfortunately, in the copy I read, some of the websites are difficult to read because the print is too light and the font is too small. Most useful are the presentation slides that cover topics such as “Faculty/Author Advocacy” and “Publishing Issues: Access and Today’s Publishing Environment.”

The final section of the SPEC Kit, “Selected Resources,” offers a healthy list of articles and reports that address many issues related to scholarly communication, providing an excellent bibliography for either novices who want to learn about the basics of scholarly communication or experts who are looking for additional articles that they may not have read. In particular, there is spectrum of articles addressing faculty and researcher perceptions of the publishing environment. The selected resources also contain quite a few links to brochures, committee charges, and scholarly communication websites. Some of the links to university webpages no longer work, but no matter—there are still many working links to helpful information and examples.

Scholarly Communication Education Initiatives provides a practical assessment of the status of scholarly communication education initiatives in 2007; the fact that this book was published two years ago does not detract from the value of the work. While reading survey results can be a tedious task, it is not so in this case. For readers who want practical information on directions to take in initiating a scholarly communication program, the kit offers ample information. For others, it offers gems here and there that may inform their current scholarly communication endeavors, and it is definitely worth a look.—Karen Fischer (karen-fischer@uiowa.edu), University of Iowa, Iowa City.