

# School of Information Sciences

The iSchool at Illinois

## Information Policy

Instructor: Emily Knox, Ph.D., MSLIS

Email: [knox@illinois.edu](mailto:knox@illinois.edu)

### 2 or 4 credit hours

#### Course Description

This seminar provides a basic grounding in the study of information policy as well as the concepts and issues with which library, archival, and information science practitioners need to be familiar. The course will consider information policy in U.S. and global contexts; the policy process and stakeholders; individual policies which influence information creation and access; and how librarians and other information professionals participate in policy development.

#### Learning Objectives

Students will:

- gain familiarity with various information policy issues
- gain skills and resources needed to address information policy issues in their professional lives

#### Course Materials

*Required:*

- Braman, Sandra. (2006) *Change of state: Information, policy, and power*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Other required readings are available online or on reserve.

*Syllabus and assignments based on previous Information Policy syllabi by C. Nappo & C. D'Arpa; S. Jackson; K. Shilton*

#### Assignments and Evaluation

All assignments are required for all students. Completing all assignments is not a guarantee of a passing grade. All work must be completed in order to pass this class.

- Late or incomplete assignments will not be given full credit unless the student has contacted the instructor prior to the due date of the assignment (or in the case of emergencies, as soon as practicable).
- Late assignments will include a penalty (-5 points or equivalent for each day late), and no late assignments will be accepted after 5 days from the date due.

There are different assignments depending on how many credits you are earning for the class. The weighting of each assignment in the final grade is noted below.

- Assignments are given point values which are then multiplied by the percentage given below in the credit grade distribution

### ***Assignments, Exercises & Grade Distribution***

#### *For 2 Credits*

2 response papers (50% - 25 points each) or 1 book review (50% - 50 points)  
 Policy analysis (40%)  
 Class participation (10%)

#### *For 4 credits*

Major paper (50%) or 2 Book Reviews (50% - 25 points each)  
 Policy analysis paper (40%)  
 Class discussion (10%)

### **Grading Scale**

94-100 = A  
 90-93 = A-  
 87-89 = B+  
 83-86 = B  
 80-82 = B-  
 77-79 = C+  
 73-76 = C  
 70-72 = C-  
 67-69 = D+  
 63-66 = D  
 60-62 = D-  
 59 and below = F

**Reading and Assignment Schedule**  
**Note: Schedule and readings subject to change**

**Week 1 – Introduction to Information Policy:**

- Braman – Chapter 1 & 2
- Braman, S. (2011). Defining Information Policy. *Journal of Information Policy*, 1, 1–5. <http://doi.org/10.5325/jinfopoli.1.2011.0001>
- McClure, C.R. & Jaeger, P.T. (2008). Government information policy research: Importance, approaches, and realities. *Library & Information Science Research*, 30, 257-264.
- Nelson, S. & Garcia, J. & the Public Library Association. (2003). Chapter 1. *Creating policies for results: From chaos to clarity*. Chicago, IL: ALA.
- Rubin, M. (2015). Information policy: Stakeholders and agendas. In *Foundations of Library and Information Science* (Chapter 8). Chicago: Neal-Schuman.
- Podcast
  - This American Life (2014, September 26). The secret recordings of Carmen Segarra. <http://www.thisamericanlife.org/radio-archives/episode/536/the-secret-recordings-of-carmen-segarra>

**Week 2 – History and Foundations**

- Braman – Chapter 3 (and review of chapter 2)
- Bell, D. (1979). The social framework of the information society. In M.L. Dertouzos and J. Moses (eds.), *The computer age: a Twenty year view*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press (Available through the library)
- Duff, A.S. (1998). Daniel Bell's theory of the information society. *Journal of Information Science* 24(6), 373-93.
- Schment J.R. & Lievrouw, L.A. (eds.) (1987). *Competing visions, complex realities: Social aspects of information society*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex – Introduction and Chapter 3

**Week 3 – On the Public Sphere**

- Braman – Chapter 4
- Auld, H. (2004). Patrons, customers, users, clients: Who are they and what difference does it make what we call them? *Public Libraries*, 43, 81-87.
- Buschman, J. (2005). Libraries and the decline of public purposes. *Public Library Quarterly*, 24(1), 1-12.

*Background*

- Benson, R. (2009). Shaping the public sphere: Habermas and beyond. *The American Sociologist*, 40, 175-197.
- Habermas, J. (1974). The public sphere: An encyclopedia article. *New German Critique*, 3, 49-55.

- Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere. An inquiry into a category of Bourgeois society. (Part II)* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

#### **Week 4 – Information Economy**

- Benkler, Y. (2003). The political economy of the commons. *Upgrade*, 3(3), 6-9.
- Drahos, P., & Braithwaite, J. (2002). *Information feudalism: Who owns the knowledge economy?* London: Earthscan.
  - Chapter 14: “On the Importance of the Publicness of Knowledge”, pp. 210-219
- Lester, J., & Koehler, W., C. (2007). *Fundamentals of information studies: Understanding information and its environment* (2nd ed.). New York: Neal-Schuman Publishers.
  - Chapter 9: "The Economics of Information", pp. 219-240
- Mosco, V. (2009). *The political economy of communication* (2nd ed.).
  - Chapter 2: "What is Political Economy? Definitions and Characteristics", pp. 21-36
- Rubin, M. (2015). The knowledge infrastructure. In *Foundations of Library and Information Science* (Chapter 1). Chicago: Neal-Schuman.
- Schiller, D. (1997). Information commodity: A preliminary view. In J. Davis & T. A. Hirschl & M. Stack (Eds.), *Cutting edge: Technology, information capitalism and social revolution* (pp. 103-120). London: Verso.

#### **Week 5 – Identity & Inclusion**

- Braman – Chapter 5
- Citron, Danielle Keats. (2010). Civil Rights in Our Information Age. In *The Offensive Internet*, ed. Saul Levmore and Martha C. Nussbaum. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA and London, 31-49.
- Koren, M. 1998. The right of the child to information and its practical impact on libraries. *New Review of Children’s Literature and Librarianship*, 4(1), 1-16.
- Wentz, B., Jaeger, P. T., & Lazar, J. (2011). Retrofitting accessibility: the legal inequality of after-the-fact online access for persons with disabilities in the United States. *First Monday*, 16(11).  
<http://www.uic.edu/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/viewArticle/3666/3077>
- Wilson, E. J., & Costanza-Chock, S. (2012). New voices on the net? The digital journalism divide and the costs of network exclusion. In L. Nakamura & P. Chow-White (Eds.), *Race After the Internet* (pp. 246–268). London and New York: Routledge

#### **Week 6 – Information Access**

- American Library Association. (2015). *Intellectual Freedom Manual* (9<sup>th</sup> Edition). Chicago, IL: American Library Association. Part I, Section 3 Chapter 3 – Creating IF Policies in Your Library
- Bishop, C.A. (2016). Introduction. *Access to Information as a Human Right*. El Paso, TX: IFB Scholarly Publishing.
- The Freedom of Information Act. 5 U.S.C. 552. Available at: [http://www.justice.gov/oip/foia\\_updates/Vol\\_XVII\\_4/page2.htm](http://www.justice.gov/oip/foia_updates/Vol_XVII_4/page2.htm)
- Sarah Holsen, & Martial Pasquier. (2012). Insight on Oversight: The Role of Information Commissioners in the Implementation of Access to Information Policies. *Journal of Information Policy*, 2, 214–241. <http://doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.5325/jinfopoli.2.2012.0214>
- Schrader, A.M. (1997). Why you can't censorproof your public library. *PLQ* 16(1), 3-29.

### **Week 7 – Privacy & Cybersecurity**

- Holt, J., & Malčić, S. (2015). The Privacy Ecosystem: Regulating Digital Identity in the United States and European Union. *Journal of Information Policy*, 5, 155–178. <http://doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.5325/jinfopoli.5.2015.0155>
- Pieters, W. (2011). The (social) construction of information security. *The Information Society*, 27(5). <http://dx.doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.1080/01972243.2011.607038>
- Rubin, A. (2012, February) “All your devices can be hacked.” TED Talk. [https://www.ted.com/talks/avi\\_rubin\\_all\\_your\\_devices\\_can\\_be\\_hacked?language=en](https://www.ted.com/talks/avi_rubin_all_your_devices_can_be_hacked?language=en)
- Solove, Daniel J. (2007). ‘I’ve Got Nothing to Hide’ and Other Misunderstandings of Privacy. *San Diego Law Review*, 44, 745, *GWU Law School Public Law Research Paper No. 289*. Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=998565>
- Wadell, K. (2015). Moral failings of computer science. *The Atlantic*. <http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2015/12/the-moral-failure-of-computer-science/420012/>

### **Week 8 – Surveillance & Forgetting**

- Bennett, S. C. (2012). Right to be forgotten: Reconciling EU and US perspectives, the. *Berkeley Journal of International Law* 30, 161.
- Doty, P. (2015). U.S. homeland security and risk assessment. *Government information quarterly*, 32(3), 342-352.
- Fuchs, Christian. (2011). How to define surveillance? *MATRIZES* 5 (1), 109-133
- Glenn Greenwald and Ewen MacAskill (2013, June 7). “NSA Prism Program Taps in to User Data of Apple, Google and Others,” *The Guardian* <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/jun/06/us-tech-giants-nsa-data>.

- Global Surveillance Disclosures Background Info.  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global\\_surveillance\\_disclosures\\_\(2013%E2%80%93present\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_surveillance_disclosures_(2013%E2%80%93present))
- Rosen, J. (2012). The right to be forgotten. *Stanford law review online*, 64, 88. [http://www.stanfordlawreview.org/online/privacy-paradox/right-to-be-forgotten?em\\_x=22](http://www.stanfordlawreview.org/online/privacy-paradox/right-to-be-forgotten?em_x=22)
- Videos
  - Last Week Tonight with John Oliver (2015, April 15). Government surveillance (interview with Edward Snowden). <https://citizenfourfilm.com/>
  - Poitras, L., Director. (2014). Citizenfour (On reserve at Comm and Undergraduate Libraries)

### **Week 9 – Intellectual Property**

- Braman – Chapter 6
- Boyle, James. (2008). *The Public Domain: Enclosing the Commons of the Mind*. Yale University Press <http://www.thepublicdomain.org/download/>
- What could have entered the public domain on January 1, 2016?  
<https://web.law.duke.edu/cspd/publicdomainday/2016/pre-1976>
- Electronic Frontier Foundation. (2013, March 11). Unintended consequences: Fifteen years under the DMCA.  
<https://www.eff.org/files/DMCAUnintended10.pdf>
- Levy, S. (2012, November 13). The patent problem. *Wired*.  
<http://www.wired.com/2012/11/ff-steven-levy-the-patent-problem/>
- U.S. Copyright Law (17 U.S. Code)  
<https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/17>
  - § 102 – Subject Matter
  - § 106 – Exclusive Rights
  - § 107 – Fair Use
  - § 108 - Libraries
  - § 1201 – Anti-circumvention technology
- U.S. Copyright Office. (2008). Copyright basics.  
<http://www.copyright.gov/circs/circ1.pdf> (12 pages)

### **Week 10 – Open Access & Preserving Access**

- About Creative Commons. <http://creativecommons.org/about>
- Barnum, G. (2002). Availability, access, authenticity, and persistence: Creating the environment for permanent public access to electronic government information. *Government Information Quarterly*, 19, 37-43.
- Björk, Bo-Christer. “The Hybrid Model for Open Access Publication of Scholarly Articles: A Failed Experiment?” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 63 (2012): 1496- 1504.  
[http://www.jus.uio.no/sisu/free\\_culture.lawrence\\_lessig/sisu\\_manifest.html](http://www.jus.uio.no/sisu/free_culture.lawrence_lessig/sisu_manifest.html)

- Kraus, K. (2011, August 6). When Data Disappears. *The New York Times*. <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/08/07/opinion/sunday/when-data-disappears.html>
- Suber, Peter. A Primer on Open Access. <http://legacy.earlham.edu/~peters/writing/atg.htm>

### **Week 11 – Infrastructure & Participatory Policy Design**

- Dreyer, S. & Ziebarth, L. (2014). Participatory Transparency in Social Media Governance: Combining Two Good Practices. *Journal of Information Policy*, 4, 529–546. <http://doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.5325/jinfopoli.4.2014.0529>
- Eubanks, V. (2007). Trapped in the digital divide: The distributive paradigm in community informatics. *The Journal of Community Informatics* 3(2). Retrieved from <http://ci-journal.net/index.php/ciej/article/view/293/353>.
- Fortunato, M.W-P. et al. (2013). Promoting Fair Local Organizing for Broadband Delivery: Suggestions for Community-Level Action in Persistently Underserved Communities. *Journal of Information Policy*, 3, 158–180. <http://doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.5325/jinfopoli.3.2013.0158>
- Shade, L.R. (1998). A gendered perspective on access to the information infrastructure. *The Information Society*, 14(1), 33-44.

### **Week 12 - Globalization**

- Braman – Chapter 7
- Avle, S., & Adunbi, O.. (2015). Whose Freedom? Whose Information?: Discourses on Freedom of Information Policies. *Journal of Information Policy*, 5, 179–203. <http://doi.org.proxy2.library.illinois.edu/10.5325/jinfopoli.5.2015.0179>
- Borgman, C. L. (2000). The premise and promise of a global information infrastructure. *First Monday*, 5(8).
- Câmara, Gilberto and Frederico Fonseca. “Information Policies and Open Source Software in Developing Countries.” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 58 (2007): 121-132.
- Capurro, R. (2005). Privacy. An Intercultural Perspective. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 7, 37–47.

### **Week 13 – Sustainability**

- Dao, V., Langella, I., & Carbo, J. (2011). From green to sustainability: Information Technology and an integrated sustainability framework. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 20(1), 63-79.
- Felleman, J. (1997). Deep information: The role of information policy in environmental sustainability. Chapter 1&2. New York: Greenwood.

### **Week 14 – Wrap-Up**

- Braman – Chapter 8 & 9

### **Assignment Example**

#### **Policy Analysis (40% for 2 credits/30% for 4 Credits)**

*this assignment is from K. Shilton's INST 612 syllabus.*

#### **Choose one of the following:**

##### **1. Federal or State Policy Analysis**

Investigate a piece of federal or state information legislation to consider the values in its writing and implementation. These might include personal values, moral values, societal values, cultural values, ethics, etc. Reflect on the legislation using the following questions as a guide:

1. What are the technical, legislative, and policy issues covered in this legislation?
2. What are the key issues and debates surrounding this legislation?
3. What values does the policy enable? What values does it discourage?
4. What features of the implementation highlight (or de-emphasize) these values?
5. What biases do you see in the policy? Where do those biases come from?
6. Are particular groups of people harmed by the legislation?
7. How do power dynamics play out in the legislation?
8. What could be done to address those biases?

**OR**

##### **2. Policy in Technology Analysis**

Investigate a social media technology that you currently use (e.g. Twitter, Facebook, Google+, MySpace, Orkut, Ravelry, etc.). Consider policy implications (including public policy as well as principles or rules that guide decisions) of that technology. Also think about the *values* incorporated into that technology: personal values, moral values, societal values, cultural values, ethics, etc.) Reflect on this technology using the following questions as a guide:

1. As a user, what values does the social media platform enable? What values does it discourage?
2. What features and functions of the social media platform highlight (or de-emphasize) these values?
3. What biases do you see in the systems? Do you think they are pre-existing, technical, or emergent?
4. Look at the policy statement or terms of service for your social media platform. What values does the policy enable or discourage?



5. How do the values in the policy relate to your perception of values in the system? Are the same or different?
6. Are particular groups of people harmed by the policy?
7. How might power dynamics play out in the policy?
  
8. What design solutions might mitigate some of these values conflicts?

*Formatting for Analysis Papers*

- 8-10 pages (~2500 words max)
- Name, date, course number, assignment number upper left-hand corner (Single-spaced)
- Formatting should follow Chicago Manual of Style (either Author-Date or footnotes), or APA 6<sup>th</sup> Edition, or MLA
- Number all pages in the upper right hand corner after the cover page.
- Use 12-point font, serif font (e.g., Times New Roman)
- 1-inch margins.
- Double-spaced text
- No bullet points
- Avoid using contractions
- Make sure your papers are readable—all should be compatible with MS Word. The paper you upload **MUST** be a .doc, .docx, .pdf, .rtf., .odt, or a .txt file. (No Pages files please!)

Grading Rubric:

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Points Possible</b>	<b>Points Earned</b>
Overview of the legislation/policy	10	
Analysis of the policy (see questions)	50	
Connections to overall themes/concepts presented in the class	20	
Organization and Structure	10	
Grammar, style, syntax, format	10	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	