

July 2016

**Copyright Education Symposium
Held on the 24th May 2016**

The following notes set out the key themes raised at a series of parallel (morning /afternoon) workshops during the inaugural copyright education symposium. A number of key points, issues and possible actions from the 8 workshop groups were summarised by the workshop rapporteurs on a non-attributable basis.

Measuring effective awareness and education initiatives

Key themes:

- Identifying barriers to success and how to overcome these obstacles

Key issues:

- Noted barriers to making progress:
 - Lack of longitudinal research data in these areas;
 - Difficulty in capturing (and understanding) behaviour change;
 - Identifying and differentiating between behavioural influencing factors;
 - Limited resources to implement information sharing.

To tackle these issues, a primary task is to better share information, as well as:

- Build a base of qualitative and quantitative data;
- Increase the use of mixed research methods over time;
- Improve the quality of survey design (and consistency);
- Take a peer to peer approach (not a top down one) which:
 - Captures people's experiences
 - Acts as a role model, rather than an 'authoritarian' approach;
- Understand behaviours in wider context and build an understanding of how to change behaviour;
- Appreciate and factor in that this is a rapidly changing landscape.

Next steps:

- Simple step is to address information sharing in a practical, and resource sensitive way

Promoting dissemination of research and communicating findings to stakeholder audiences

Key themes:

- Better joining up (including within government) and fewer silos (in industry too);
- Focus on demonstrating outcomes – too much is unfocused;

- Strong need to identify our audience properly; Ensure quality and consistency in messaging/communications for greater credibility.

Key issues:

- Robust evidence is the key factor to consider. Without it, there is little/no credibility;
- Tracking behavioural change over a period of time – which needs follow-up evaluation to take place and be built into decision-making processes;
- A lot of money is being spent but no real outcomes are being demonstrated from research
- It's important to learn what actions, activities and processes didn't work and why;
- Government needs to be better joined up. Particularly DCMS, BIS, DoE – a need for more leadership here, from the IPO. Too much working in silos. A need to identify common goals, shared objectives and mutual benefits;
- Consider using 'hardware products' as way of getting copyright messages to customers;
- Often face-to-face training / knowledge sharing is the best way to get complicated or unsolicited messages over to people who are not particularly focused / interested in copyright matters;
- Who is the stakeholder here? Is the research wanted by academics, rightholders, government or business? This might influence the remit of the research and therefore the value/ scope of its conclusions.
- To ensure quality, proposed to look at peer review panels (although some disagreement on this idea) or use a body like the Science Media Group
- Be wary of too much negative messaging – try to focus on the positives
- Consider a 'fair trade' type of mark which is understood by the public
- Use influential, and influencing, peer groups, such as MumsNet. Suggested that 'we need to start with the young'.

Next steps:

- Establish a recognised best practice guide and standards;
- Ensure greater clarity with objectives and what stakeholders are planning to do with the information received;
- Try to get underneath why certain campaigns do work well: is there a magic formula that can be replicated?
- Consider what others around the world are doing for 'lessons learned'.

Improving the use of research within the education/awareness policy-making process.

Key themes:

- Are we actually making evidence based decisions or making the evidence fit the decisions?
- How do we get a young audience to understand and engage with the UK's move towards intangible goods and services?
- Copyright education should be embedded (into the wider education system) but how then do we measure and evaluate impact?
- We should recognise we are teaching a behaviour not a morals/ethics topic or part of enterprise skills

Key issues:

- Recognise we only have a limited datasets but behaviour seems to be stable – so are our campaigns working? Data will need to be mapped over the longer-term;
- There are different questions to be asked as part of this exercise – which is better: Do you know more about copyright? or do you know what’s legal/illegal?
- In the wider context: understanding of ‘end users’ and infringement is only part of the issue – what about the creators?
- Consider the grey areas of behaviour/activity – they seem to be getting bigger and more complicated;
- Education or IP – how do we know which is more important? How can we evaluate impact? Evidence versus anecdotal input?
- How should we teach? Should we be telling what and what not to do? Instead, should we focus on the value of IP and positive message, and be aware of how this fits into the wider system, and not as a separate topic;
- Might we survey university student to assess whether awareness of IP has increased?
- IPO are viewed as ‘IP police’ so need to manage a perceived lack of trust – especially when it comes to who is asking the questions;
- When evaluating campaigns, it is difficult to measure the value of citizen awareness;
- Building in evaluation from the start can only work if there is effective collaboration;
- Data: there are big problems around accessibility and sharing. People don’t understand what they’re giving away with their data. Also, we don’t know what data is out there so don’t know what we can do with it;
- Are we asking the right questions? i.e. how do we reduce ‘bad’ activity? Shouldn’t we focus on positives, i.e. how do we expand innovation, opportunity and reward?
- Can/could there be an additional question in NSS (National Student Survey) on enterprising skills that could be used to show impact of IP education?
- Stakeholder Hub – people should actively sign up to it to make sure are on the ‘radar’ and get involved with partnerships and collaboration?

Next steps:

- Think about incorporating evaluation at the beginning of the policy making process;
- Identify where we can collaborate to enable research/evaluation and data sharing;
- Create a stakeholder hub – opt in to collaboration opportunities;
- Create a template of data fields to reassure usage/transparency concerns over handling of data.

What counts as an education / awareness project and what do we know about what works or doesn’t work?

Key themes

- What does copyright education mean and does it have a wider scope than just ‘formal teaching’;
- What formal interventions should we seek (eg national curriculum);

- Can we properly assess what's working and what doesn't?

Key issues

- What does 'copyright education' mean? Most of the resources on the IP Education Map are teaching resources, rightly reflecting the fundamental part of copyright education;
- However, 'copyright education' has a broader meaning: it means that all copyright interested parties – including creators, consumers, media producers, entrepreneurs, and cultural heritage practitioners – should be able to gain the copyright knowledge they need, and know where to find it;
- The final aim of copyright education initiatives should be to boost the economy, encourage creativity, and enable education;
- Is making an intervention in the national curriculum is the most effective way forward? Other channels exist to educate, such as teacher training and CPD. Both teacher training and professional development should incorporate copyright understanding;
- There is a cultural/behavioural barrier that often people don't want to be told that what they do is wrong; however, there is also a desire to do the right thing;
- Curriculum based resources are vital and they: i) should connect with current pedagogic practice; ii) and should start at KS2; and there is a need for more resources for younger audiences; and iii) there is a need more clarity around educational licensing;
- TES was suggested as a good platform for dissemination. It was noted that teachers are an ideal partner in copyright education initiatives, as teaching is one of the most creative professions;
- There is not enough information available to assess what is actually working, so it is necessary to share more data. However, a number of good benchmarks were identified; copyright education resources should: i) be neutral; ii) focus on positive messaging and empowerment; and iii) be bottom-up rather than top-down. Copyrightuser.org was mentioned several times to illustrate these features;
- Should anti-infringement campaigns and copyright education initiatives (that address creators), be kept separate or not? Anti-infringement campaigns are important to encourage lawful consumption but they only address a portion of the UK population (around 23% infringe), whereas copyright education campaigns that aim to inform users/creators actually speak to the whole society;
- There is a lack of leadership in copyright education: leadership should be taken by an independent body, such as the UK IPO or the Department for Education.

Next steps:

- Encourage greater leadership (at various levels);
- Foster more information sharing.

What do our future research needs look like?

Key themes

- What insights or analysis are required to move the agenda forward?
- Where are the (quantitative / qualitative / long-attitudinal etc.) research gaps and recommendations for future research, empirical studies etc.

- What are the research aims in the field of copyright education and awareness?

Key issues

- Brief stock take of research already carried out in the field of copyright education
- Identified that starting point for initiatives must be understanding attitudes and behaviour, and recognised value of some studies that provide empirical insights from behavioural economics and psychology
- CREATE studies identified 5 factors why people consume unlawfully
- New business models and better legal services, along with the right sanctions could address some of these factors. Research was underway to address remaining factors
- Longitudinal studies – tracking the interventions, what gaps there are in people’s knowledge.
- Can we learn something from ‘Awareness by design’
- Bottom-up research exercises, carried out as part of the Copyright User initiative (presented in the morning), aimed at identifying the real-world copyright concerns and questions of the creative sectors, considered more credible than ‘top-down’ approaches.
- Importance of finding better ways to share data and methods among academia, industry and government despite implicit barriers
- Funding – and where does this come from because trust and independence are important
- Users and consumers were not represented at the Symposium, but deliberative exercises considered an effective way to increase the quality of the copyright debate and to make user perspectives more visible and integrated into policymaking processes.
- Importance of interrogating evidence for education and awareness purposes, and suggested that future research could utilise the following resources:
 - The OMeBa tool, which allows exploration of IPO Kantar Infringement Tracker surveys: <http://copyrightcentral.arts.gla.ac.uk/omeba/>
 - The Copyright Evidence Wiki, that provides a searchable catalogue of empirical evidence: http://www.copyrightevidence.org/evidence-wiki/index.php/Copyright_Evidence
 - The Litigation Explorer (under development), which will allow interrogation of copyright litigation in High Court and IPEC.

Next steps

Identified future research needs including:

- Better understand attitudes and behaviour through independent interdisciplinary research;
- Capture the specific knowledge needs of different creative sectors to inform production of resources;
- Develop methods to evaluate the impact of education and awareness initiatives, assessing in particular changes in behaviour and practice;
- Balanced representation of copyright interested parties, including creators, producers, investors in rights, consumers and institutional users, at all stages of research and dissemination;
- More effective partnerships between academia, industry and government;
- Transparency in disseminating findings and methods.

How can stakeholders work better together on a common research agenda?

Key themes:

- Does the way academics are paid influence their views on issues of copyright and design?
- Copyright and licensing are different things.
- Will research ever be common given differing values?
- Data is less value driven than analysis (is this better common ground?).

Key issues

- Licensing is seen as enabling versus copyright which is seen as an obstacle;
- Should we be considering work on micropayments technology to better enable use of content?
- Establishing a common research agenda is (too) difficult because it is so value loaded. Can you have neutral research?
- Research should introduce alternatives to copyright – using real life rather than theoretical positions/solutions;
- We should avoid duplication of research.
- What do we do with the research?

Next steps:

- Moderated forums for exchange of views on research;
- IPO could play 'honest broker' role;
- Agree data centralisation approach rather than analysis;
- Create a dating service between industry and academia.

To what extent can evidence improve integration of IP awareness across formal education?

Key themes:

- Is the question 'how can best practice improve integration...?'
- Need to understand drivers in formal education system – currently a fragmented picture in terms of evidence that informs this;
- How do you measure attitudes and tie copyright into wide social issues?
- How do we make evidence base useable for different teaching contexts and demands?

Key issues:

- Current drivers in formal educational organisations: What is everyone else doing? What are the risks – likelihood and impact?
- Currently, fragmented picture in terms of evidence, i.e.:
 - What is the impact of having IP education on employability – fragmented picture – since education/provision varies;

- Awareness very different in different context – example of the video – students who are learning about I&C in the context of their own practice;
- How do you measure attitudes & enable people to tie copyright & IP into wider social issues?
- ‘Evidence base’ – school staff interested in evidence but context is key – something that works with one group of learners not necessarily going to directly translate to another group – staff will be very interested in evidence and contexts of approaches and resources that work that they can take and adapt for their own learners – teaching a very iterative art;
- Relevance is incredibly important – different professional groups – context and relevance – however there is a baseline – or there should be a baseline. There is a difference between what everyone needs to know and what specific groups of professionals/roles need to know;
- Progress has come about because of the practice and work cycle, rather than driven ‘evidence’ - likely to indicate a gap in the evidence/limitations of evidence. What would be useful: a common framework approach to competencies i.e. within digital literacy/competencies; Peer influence? Is there a knowledge gap around this? How does this work?
- Policy drivers and leadership also critical;
- What are the issues around trying to teach IP? Training as info professionals – what support do people get? Is delivery effective (i.e. do they remember it)? How does what you learn in university modules relate to what you need in your professional life?
- Information professionals/librarians are used to being gatekeepers (esp. in HE). How can organisations most effectively make use of the staff & capacity they have here?
- Importance of partnerships between academics, practitioners, govt, industry – so we get the questions and the plans of action right;
- How do we evidence learners and staff moving from awareness to confidence/competence?

Next steps:

- Research suggestion: What is the threshold we are looking for in an educator, or professional?
- Research suggestion: Where teachers are interested/passionate about copyright – what is their motivation?
- Separation between copyright education and infringement.
- Myth busting work is useful

Policy and practice constraints

Key themes:

- More joined up thinking is needed to overcome barriers;
- Better shared understanding of what our aims/objectives/outcomes are;
- Role for IPO to educate wider government on value/importance of IP.

Key issues

- Lack of joined up thinking right across the sector – industry, government and rightholders. Copyright protection and awareness is usually seen as somebody else’s problem;
- Not in the national curriculum, is there space to push it in and if there is, who would lead the conversation DoE or BIS;

- What are we looking to understand?
 - Economic value
 - The value of copyrighted material
 - Time spent by creators
 - Value lost to the economy
 - Value lost in VAT
 - Cost of infringement
- We need to understand the language that works for the wide variety of customer sectors;
- We need to listen to consumers, and users, in order to 'sell' the message better;
- We need a more collective approach in order to get an agreed methodology that the majority of stakeholders can sign up to and support;
- Who needs to be at the table – government, academia, rightholders, business and users?
- We want to educate wider policy makers in HMG about the value of copyright and the issues for stakeholders;
- Who needs to lead that conversation – the IPO is the government expert on IP matters but many recognised that the IPO will have limited ability to push within wider HMG and an industry voice would help here;
- Question – why is this not going to happen? – Lack of money and lack of drive were spotlighted. But many felt that the time was right and stakeholders were increasing willing to collaborate
- We need to use the IP minister to get wider HMG interest and get greater buy-in;

Next steps:

- IPO to formulate plan for wider government engagement/education on IP