**Obiter Dicta**

**Saving Judicial Branch Law Libraries: The Present Crisis and Beyond**

By Jonathan C. Stock

Over the last nineteen months, Connecticut experienced a unique challenge to its public law library system. Current economic conditions triggered Judicial Branch budget reductions that threatened closure of six among fifteen locations: 40% of all public access law libraries in this state. An extraordinary coalition arose supporting SNELLA in its effort to reverse a disastrous course: the American Association of Law Libraries, the Connecticut Bar Association, the Greater Bridgeport Bar Association, the Litchfield Bar Association, the Milford Bar Association, the New London County Bar Association, and the 1,145 private citizens who signed electronic petitions protesting these announced closings.

Testimony before two General Assembly Committees, Appropriations and Judiciary, helped forge a proposed bill designed to alleviate the problem as well as preventing its recurrence.
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BOBBLEHEADS CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

In addition, dozens of early and sometimes comically inaccurate early versions of bobbleheads and a beautiful, one-of-a-kind Scalia doll that was never put into production are housed in the collection. Fred Shapiro, Collections and access librarian soaked in the moment, stating that the bobbleheads “will now be archived for posterity and serve as a valuable resource to researchers in the future”.

Since our rare books librarian Mike Widener, mounted the bobbleheads exhibit (next to another exhibit of Medieval Manuscript Fragments in Law Book Bindings), the library has had a steady flow of interested and curious observers. In the Fall another fun exhibit is coming – lawyers in comic books!

SAVING JUDICIAL BRANCH LAW LIBRARIES CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

The proposal is currently traversing our legislative system; and, at this writing, its fate and final result remain ambiguous. However this drama plays out, one result already stands clear. We must vision beyond the present emergency; we must plan to insure that these events never transpire again. This article aims at starting the vision process in two distinct, but interlocking stages. One is narrating what happened; the second is suggesting why it happened.

Portraying what happened goes beyond narration. It also involves reading warning signals along the way: warning signals which, in retrospect, foreshadowed the impending crisis. Reading in retrospect acknowledges that no action on our part could have averted this crisis at the time. Economic forces were in play; and events moved fast, so fast that they became history before anyone could respond.

Continued on page 3
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History, once enacted, remains changeless forever. We cannot alter the past, but we can apply its instruction to build—and secure—a better future. The economic melt down took hold in late 2008; and it pushed State revenues into free fall. Budget cuts, applied rigorously across the board, became inevitable; and, inevitably, they impacted Judicial Law Libraries. The impact translated out at a March 13, 2009 Law Library Advisory Committee Meeting. Budget reductions, potentially as high as 20%, demanded response. Various alternatives underwent discussion including a review of funding under the prior law library system (Tier I, Tier II, and Tier III); current funding classifications (Small, Medium, and Large); the existing minimum collection standards; and a staff collection review designed to make best use of fewer dollars through resource sharing. One alternative put forward, however, sounded an ominous note. Indeed, it embodied the first warning signal along our pathway. The proposal was to compensate for drastic budget reductions by closing law libraries. Fewer locations with “everything” current, in this view, emerged as preferable to more locations with fewer things current. Although a motion to keep all law libraries open was introduced, after discussion the Committee decided instead to pass a more general resolution:

“That the Law Library System is essential to the Administration of Justice and that it is essential to maintain the law library staff as well as maintain the collections, both print and electronic.”

No commitment emerged favoring a closure strategy, but none emerged rejecting it either.

Less than six weeks later, the Law Library Advisory Committee met on April 24 in response to a growing emergency. The Judicial Branch line item for Equipment, its base for funding library resources, had been slashed from $2.5 million to zero. A previously projected 20% cut for FY 2010 became, at least pro tem, 100%. Optimism existed, however, about chances for restoring some funds. Two initiatives designed to support this effort gained approval. One required preparation of a resolution opposing the cuts, a resolution that would be sent to the Appropriations and Judiciary Committees; the other involved reviewing a list of projected expenditures and cancellations prepared by law library staff—these projections being based on the originally envisioned 20% reduction.

Residual optimism in April evaporated by mid-November. Proposed legislation aimed at restoring a $7.8 million rollback in OE funds passed the General Assembly, but snagged on a Gubernatorial veto that the Legislature—albeit narrowly—failed to override. Chief Court Administrator Judge Quinn testified before Appropriations on November 18, outlining the service cutbacks made inevitable by diminished funding. One consequence was the permanent closure of six, then undesignated, law libraries. Less than a week later, the first three locations were announced: Willimantic, Milford, and Norwich—all slated to lock their doors on April 1 of 2010.

Our narrative must pause here and reflect upon the public response--or, more precisely, the appalling lack thereof. A circumstance that should have generated outrage elicited limpid docility. Nowhere was this bland acceptance better encapsulated than in a November 23 Connecticut Law Tribune article. Chillingly entitled “The Final Chapter?,” its first sentence resonated with Edgar Allan Poe-like doom:

“The days of Connecticut Law Libraries may be numbered.”
SAVING JUDICIAL BRANCH LAW LIBRARIES

All that needed adding was *Quoth the Raven, ‘Nevermore.’* Worse than the apathy, however, was the uncritical acceptance of two wrong ideas—ideas embodying the *second and third warning signals* along our pathway. One wrong idea involved the presumptive “big picture” of online legal research replacing books. The other wrong idea, said to be acknowledged by anonymous “state officials,” involved a suggestion that—while the Judicial Law Libraries offered site licensed databases accessible only through staff—there are equivalent materials “free of charge” on the Internet.

SNELLA and AALL rose swiftly to the defense. On December 23, two letters protesting all six closures went to the Governor and Appropriations. Seven days later, the other three closings went public. Law Libraries at Bridgeport, Litchfield, and Hartford would shut their doors on July 1 of 2010. This time, however, the response was far from limpid or docile. Attorney Edward Czepiga, President-Elect of the Greater Bridgeport Bar Association, decried closure of their 132 year old library as “just horrible” in a December 30 *Connecticut Post* interview. Mary Alice Baish, AALL Washington Affairs Representative, figured invaluable in linking all constituencies together. The CBA and other effected regional bar associations joined the fray. Electronic petitions protesting these closures were composed and launched on the SNELLA website. SNELLA President Nancy Marcove and Jonathan Stock testified against the closings at a February 9 Appropriations Committee Hearing. Near its conclusion, general consensus arose about the problem: a debilitating 10% reduction in the Other Expenses line-item.

Shortly thereafter, the Judiciary Committee drafted legislation designed to address this dilemma.

House Bill 5148, entitled “An Act Concerning Funding for the Judicial Branch,” sought a definitive solution—both in the short and long term. It proposed, in the short term, to *immediately* restore OE funds lost for FY 2010: funds whose absence precipitated drastic cuts including planned closure of six law libraries. It also proposed, in the long term, that future Judicial funding requests could no longer be unilaterally reduced by the Office of Policy and Management; instead, OPM would be required to transmit such requests unchanged to the General Assembly. Budget reductions could not, henceforth, be made without Legislative consent. This change aimed to strengthen the constitutional role of Judicial as a separate co-equal branch of government with better ability to secure funds for its mandates.

The Bill went forward to a Public Hearing before Judiciary on February 26. AALL and SNELLA testified strongly in its favor, the former represented by Camilla Tubbs and the latter by Jonathan Stock. Full text of both formal statements was scanned into the Hearing documents. So also were five electronic petitions compiled on behalf of the threatened libraries at Milford, Norwich, Bridgeport, Litchfield, and Hartford—petitions signed by 1,145 Connecticut citizens on the submission date. H.B. 5148 was favorably changed and reported out of Judiciary on March 3. After passing through the Legislative Commissioner’s Office, the Bill gained favorable changes from both Chambers and moved to Appropriations on March 8. A Joint Favorable Report emerged from Appropriations on March 25, recommending that the $7.8 million loss in FY 2010 OE funds should be remedied by adding back $8 million to the same line item for FY 2011. Filed with the Legislative Commissioners’ Office four days later, our Bill emerged on Friday April 9—passing along to the Office of Legislative Research and the Office of
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Fiscal Analysis. Both offices completed their review five days later; and, on April 15, the proposal emerged as File Bill 555. Interestingly, its Fiscal Impact is assessed as “None”—the legislation being viewed as procedural in nature. Two other sections, Summary and Background Information, offer added clarification. At this writing, the Bill—listed on House Calendar 344—may soon reach the Floor for discussion and vote. Our review of what happened is over. Now we must study why it happened—the three warning signals that foreshadowed a perfect storm. These warning signals arose from popular misperceptions: one about how to best allocate scarce resources, the other two about how libraries truly serve in an electronic age. Three tasks remain before us: to interpret these warning signals, to devise a response, and to communicate this response effectively—so effectively that our perfect storm will not recur.

The first warning signal originates from an old question about dividing small budgets. Is it best to have fewer libraries with all titles current or to have more libraries with only some titles current? This concern arose first from the Law Library Advisory Committee, but its reverberations sound a leitmotif running through every symphonic movement. It demands respect, especially since the question arises from those most solemnly charged with accurate decision-making based on current law: the Judges. Our response must communicate how resource sharing best assures distribution of current information on an equitable basis. The Judicial Law Libraries are an integral system—geographically based for fair citizen access, but sharing resources so that updated materials unavailable at one location are readily transferrable from another. What matters is not that every library have every title current at all times, but that all libraries remain open so each can maintain its unique contribution to an integral resource sharing system.

Our second warning signal also rings familiar: the presumptive “big picture” that electronic information makes books—and therefore libraries—obsolete. It embodies a misperception based on partial truths selectively perceived; and partial truths selectively perceived bring danger. What rings true is that primary sources in print, if only because of volume and cost, must dwindle by percentage over time. What does not ring true is that secondary sources—geared to complex subject interpretation—should follow an identical path. Law Libraries often run key secondary sources in dual formats: print and electronic. Nor should such decisions be seen as duplicative. We need to communicate that navigating interlocking avenues in resources like Restatements of the Law, legal encyclopedias, or major treatises works best by blending computer research with traditional reading.

The third warning signal, unlike both predecessors, is new. It embodies a breathtaking misperception about the economics of electronic information: namely, that commercial databases available through public law libraries—but not accessible from personal computers and requiring messy staff interaction—are archaic. Providence has intervened, making all things needful “free” on the Internet. Google Scholar, currently offering case law gratis with enhancements, emerges as a Noble Experiment in legal information philanthropy.

Law librarians need to communicate that this vision is dangerously naïve and, if pursued to its logical conclusion, will do more than close libraries. It will bury affordable research forever. The proposed Google Book Settlement, currently near adjudication, might—if granted Court...
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approval—effect a lock on copyrighted and “orphan” works: a lock allowing one entity, along with its two former adversaries, to establish pricing. Such conduct does not bespeak an organization intent on charity. To be sure, Google currently promises to forever maintain public domain materials free. Forever constitutes a long time, especially in the business world. Our patrons must be told that, one day, Google will pull the rug. We must communicate an unpopular message: that there is no free lunch. It is an unpopular message, but we have a duty to warn.

Beyond the present crisis, a major job lies before us. The job involves communication. Let us acknowledge, as librarians, that we have not always been—historically—good at explaining to our patrons what we do and why we do it. Nor have we been good at conveying our constraints and our need for support in providing service. It is now incumbent upon us to do better. We need to engage our base in constructive dialogue: a dialogue overcoming past constraints, enhancing our support, and building a strong information future. To accomplish these objectives, we need to evolve a different kind of law librarianship: a community based law librarianship whereby understanding flows freely between those served and those who serve. Our next tasks are two-fold. We must first define community based law librarianship; then we must plan its implementation. These tasks will move forward shortly, but in another place—another place and another time.

Editor’s Note: For updates on the budget situation check http://www.courant.com/news/politics
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Message from the President

By Nancy Marcove

This has been a very exciting year to be president of SNELLA. We have been very busy this year—I believe we accomplished a great deal!

A special thanks to Lori Lantos and Ratiya Collins for their hard work on the SNELLA programs this year. We had a great fall program, “Twitter, Facebook, Myspace & Their Legal Implications,” which was very well attended. The May 18 spring program at Quinnipiac, “Promoting Your Library” is particularly timely and right around the corner.

SNELLA gives us the opportunity to lend a voice to our profession on a local level. Nowhere was this more apparent than with the threat of closure facing several of our state judicial libraries. SNELLA, AALL, and the local bar associations worked together closely this year to stay informed on the legislative developments and to gain momentum to fight these decisions. It became apparent that serious long-term decisions would be potentially made by those who do not understand what we do, who we serve, and how valuable and irreplaceable library collections are. Without taking a stand, it became clear that we would have yielded to whatever decision was coming our way. A special thanks to Mary Alice Baish (AALL government liaison), Jon Stock (our government relations chair), and Camilla Tubbs, among many others who wish to remain nameless, for their hard work on this issue.

With spring finally here, it’s hard to believe my term is nearly over. I have learned so much from this experience. SNELLA’s members are truly a great group of librarians with a lot of talent. There are so many people to thank: Ann Myers did an awesome job with our Web site this year, especially considering our need to add countless news and announcements at a moment’s notice. Ellen Javor, along with MaryAnn Kricky and Mary Ellen Lomax, not only redid our chapter’s brochure, but also straightened up our membership records. Theresa Baylock once again did a great job with the accounting. Mary Fuller was a great mentor. Kathleen Koller took meticulous notes as secretary. Jeff Dowd took over the newsletter this year—and really ran with it!

As our members are faced with ever more challenges in their daily work environments, SNELLA offers us the chance to make a difference in our communities and have a few laughs along the way! Let’s keep this momentum going—it really can make a difference. Let’s not give up the fight to protect our libraries. Let’s gain a greater voice and promote our value to the communities we serve. It was a honor working with all of you this year. I now pass the gavel to Roseann Canny.
What's a Law Librarian To Do: Working with Legal Publishers – Successfully!

Marian F. Parker
American Association of Law Libraries Vendor Liaison
mparker@aall.org

April 2010

Every day we are faced with a myriad of challenges, not least of which is what to do about our law library’s shrinking budgets and our increasing needs for quality legal information. What’s a law librarian to do? First, take a deep breath, sit back and remind yourself why you came into this profession. OK, we all love books, but more than that, we love hooking up people with information that they need. When you stop and think about it, that desire to get quality legal information to end-users is the same mission that legal publishers have. Realizing that we really have a common goal in mind will enable us to approach working with our colleagues in legal publishing more positively, rather than demonizing them and their interactions with us. Starting out with this common goal in mind will set the stage for successful working relationships – and will allow us to look at the people from the legal publishing industry who come into our libraries as partners in this big venture.

How does this attitude about “being in this together” play out in working with legal publishers’ representatives? I believe that much of what we do on a day-to-day basis is some form of negotiation – we need the other person to do something we want done or they have something that we need in order to do our own work. With negotiation as the underpinning of much of what we do, let’s look at how that works when we are dealing with representatives of our legal publishers, whether they are sales people, librarian relations people, trainers or assorted others:

- We expect them to treat us as valuable customers, respecting our time and other commitments.
- We expect them to honor the fact that we are the experts for our libraries and the needs of our users.
- We expect them to come prepared to give us both quality information and full details about their products. [Please see Amy Eaton’s excellent column “Interview with Darrell Huntsman, Vice President of New Products at LexNexis, Regarding the Launch of Lexis® for Microsoft Office” in The CRIV Sheet Vol. 32 no. 3 page 2 in the May 10, 2010 Spectrum stating objectives she expects them to fulfill.]
We expect them to come in prepared to negotiate with us for what we want.

In return, the representatives of the legal publishers should be able to expect certain things from us, as well:

- They can expect us to treat them with civility and respect, honoring appointments we have made with them.
- They can expect us to be prepared to deal with them about the issue at hand.
- They can expect us to listen and learn from them about what they have to offer.
- They can expect us to be prepared to negotiate with them.

Once we have set the stage of mutual respect and willingness to work towards our common goal, we need to develop the skills for getting what we need. So, how do we prepare ourselves for all these negotiations and what do we do? First, we need to understand how to negotiate agreements without caving in. The best way to educate ourselves on this negotiation thing is to read *Getting to YES: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In, 2d ed.*, by Roger Fisher and William Ury. This small book is packed with what you need to know to begin your life as a principled negotiator. There is a new version of the book coming out this December, that starts, “Whether you like it or not, you are a negotiator.” We can expect additional wisdom regarding the power and value of negotiation to be in this latest book.

Secondly, we need to put the lessons from this book into practice. So what are these lessons? They are:

1. Don’t bargain over positions.
2. Use the method:
   a. Separate the people from the problem
   b. Focus on interests, not positions

---

1 All headings regarding these negotiation practices come from the book mentioned: Fisher and Ury, *Getting to YES: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In, 2d ed.* [1991].
c. Invent options for mutual benefit
d. Insist on using objective criteria

3. But what if:
   a. They are more powerful
   b. They won’t play
   c. They use dirty tricks

4. And finally:
   a. You already knew all this
   b. You need to learn from doing
   c. By doing things this way, both parties win [This method is the basis of the phrase “win–win negotiation.”]

Let’s talk about what all these above mean:

1. Don’t bargain over positions -- positional bargaining involves taking a position, holding onto it and making concessions to get to a point of agreement. It is like going in to buy a car, where the dealer wants to get paid the sticker price and you offer significantly less, so the salesman goes into the manager to get a better price and this back-and-forth goes on until you reach an agreement or you walk away and go to another dealer. This can work, but it is extremely wearing, not to mention time-consuming and you know at the start that you are going to have to go through this sham, because you have both taken positions from which you are extremely reluctant to move. Neither of you may be very happy with the end result, but you do eventually come to an agreement.

2. Use the method:
   a. Separate the people from the problem – this means we need to separate the people difficulties from the substantive issues. We may think the person sent to negotiate the contract with us is really part of the evil empire, but remember that this is a person who has a job and that is to work with us. We want to keep in mind what we want out of this negotiation, not that the other person annoys us or represents a company about which we have mixed or negative feelings. We need to keep our minds on the fact that this person is really a partner working with us to achieve our goals of getting the best legal information for our end-users.
b. Focus on interests, not positions – this means that we need to realize that positions are generally what the other party states it wants, while interests may be what the other party actually needs. People may stick hard to their positions, but if we identify their interests, we are more likely to come to mutually agreeable solutions.

c. Invent options for mutual benefit – this is an expansion of focusing on interests. It is essentially a brainstorming opportunity to identify what we and the publisher really need out of this negotiation. Do not combine judging whether an interest is “good” at this stage; just get the potential interests out on the table. We can work better if we have more options to choose from to craft our final agreement, which will give us both what we need.

d. Insist on using objective criteria – Both parties should be able to expect fair standards, fair practices and procedures, and fair prices. Since we are great at research, we can identify what those fairness measures are before we begin our negotiations. This is a good opportunity for us to review the AALL Guide to Fair Business Practices for Legal Publishers and to ask the publisher rep to do so, too:  
http://www.aallnet.org/about/fair/_practice_guide.asp

We can share these guidelines with the legal publisher at the initial stage of discussions to make sure they know about them and adhere to them. This can short-circuit lots of extraneous discussion and make for a clear and objective final agreement. We can be sure to document any agreements we make along the path to the final agreement, so that nothing gets lost along the way. We can check with others to determine the efficacy of what we are trying to achieve. We can make sure that the final agreement includes all terms to which we have agreed and that we are not just signing lots of boilerplate language.

1. But what if:

a. They are more powerful – this used to be a major concern when we needed legal information. They were the big guys and we had to take it or leave it, which left little room for getting what we wanted out of the deal other than the information itself, often at an exorbitant price.
Given the current availability of quality legal information from a variety of
publishers, both commercial and governmental, with varying prices
including some free options, this situation has been greatly ameliorated. We
still want the added value that the publishers provide for primary
information and we want the ease and sophistication of using their search
engines for online products; however, in this day of shrinking budgets,
many may be forced to pursue less desirable, but more affordable options.
We can work with our negotiating partners to achieve such ends as keep us
both whole and continuing to use the products that our end-users have
come to rely upon and to cherish. We CAN come to mutual agreements,
even in these tough economic times. Remember, we have the dollars – that
is what the publishers want – and they usually want to preserve their
ongoing working relationships with us, as well. We can all ride out this
economic storm, if we acknowledge that things are not as they used to be,
rather that new rules and plays are now the game. If all this does not work,
we need to have our alternative plans in mind – and be willing to pursue
them – for getting the information we need for our end users.

b. They won’t play – This is the golden opportunity for us to show
them how to be a principled negotiator. We can listen to them, we
can respect what they have to say, we can acknowledge the
emotions involved in this and we can begin showing them how to
move to the position of starting down the path of principled
negotiations. If they actually walk away from the negotiation and
close all doors to further talks, then we already have our alterna-
tive plans in hand, as discussed above.

c. They use dirty tricks – When this occurs, we need not to put up
with it or to respond in kind. Just like we discussed in what to do
if they won’t play, we have the opportunity here to guide them
into engaging in principled negotiations. We can take the high
road. We can work through this and try to retain a decent
working relationship. If all else fails, we do have our alternative
plan in hand.

4. And finally:

a. You knew it all the time – As Fisher and Ury state, most of this
is really common sense. Many of us recognize that common
sense is often very uncommon, so having a book like theirs to
guide us can be just “golden.” When we find ourselves in the
middle of a maelstrom, we can step back and take a deep
breath and regain our own common sense. This method of
planning a negotiation and tools for carrying one out give us a
lifesaver when we so need one.
a. Learn from doing – it’s like the old saw, the way to get to Carnegie Hall is to practice, man, practice. All the rules and suggestions about what to do are just the foundation for us. We need to get out and do it to get better at it. It is, after all, a skill set – just like we teach students how to do legal research and tell them the only way to get better is to just go do it! And one more homily for this – practice makes perfect.

b. “Winning” – at the end of all this, we will have won by developing a new skill that we will put to work every day in a great many ways. We will be principled negotiators and we will show others how to interact in a similarly productive manner. We will teach those with whom we work that there can be winners all around – that there do not have to be losers in this process. That is the goal – for us to engage in “win–win” negotiating, in order to preserve ongoing working relationships while getting the quality legal information we need for our end-users.

Last of all, we need to continue to educate ourselves about how to be master negotiators who are principled in our actions. There are many resources available – books by the score, articles by the hundreds, and – no surprise – websites.

I encourage you to read and use Harvard’s website, Program on Negotiation at Harvard Law School, of which the Harvard Negotiation Project, founded by Roger Fisher, is a part:  http://www.pon.harvard.edu/ . The “About Us” section states:

The Program on Negotiation (PON) is a university consortium dedicated to developing the theory and practice of negotiation and dispute resolution. As a community of scholars and practitioners, PON serves a unique role in the world negotiation community. Founded in 1983 as a special research project at Harvard Law School, PON includes faculty, students, and staff from Harvard University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Tufts University.

At PON, we are committed to developing the theory and practice of negotiation, to nurturing the next generation of negotiation teachers and scholars, and to helping students become more effective negotiators. We accomplish this through research, seminars, courses, conferences, publications and special events.

There are various sections, including a daily blog, links to publication information and research projects, news about events, and listings of courses and training opportunities. Like so many other critical skills we need, life–long learning is the key to mastering this ability and making it part of our daily lives – a skill we use all the time.

Continued on page 22
WestlawNext
By Elaine Lee, Librarian Relations Manager

WestlawNext is a completely new platform that incorporates and builds upon those features that have made Westlaw a leader in legal research. It is the culmination of more than 5 years of development. At its core are a dramatically improved search engine, enhanced organizational tools for managing research, and an inviting dashboard with an intuitive redesign.

As the new West Librarian Relations Manager for Connecticut, I was asked by Nancy Marcove to write an article about WestlawNext from a law librarian’s point of view. I have been training librarians on this new platform since our launch in February. Although there are many impressive features, I'd like to highlight the enhancements that draw the loudest oohs and aahs.

I like the new search box!
Our new powerful search box combines the functions of database searching, the Find command, KeyCite citation research and database searching, all in one box!

If you type terms in the search box, WestlawNext will recognize the format that you use, whether you are a diehard fan of Boolean terms and connectors or you prefer using simple descriptive terms. If you use simple descriptive terms, the WestSearch search engine retrieves documents that are relevant to your search, irrespective of your specific search terms. By default, your search runs across all 12 core legal contents sets on WestlawNext, letting you see the search results for a wide range of document categories.

If you want to retrieve a document by citation, then just type the citation, e.g., 127 sct 2162, in the text box. If you need to KeyCite that same document, just type in the term keycite before the citation in the text box, e.g. keycite 127 sct 2162.

If you need to retrieve multiple documents, you can type a string of citations in the text box, separated by semicolons (see below). You can type up to 20 citations for WestlawNext to retrieve. You can then view individual documents or use the check-boxes to select documents for emailing, downloading, or printing.
And if you’re a librarian used to Westlaw database identifiers such as TP–ALL or CT–CS, and you want the same amount of control on WestlawNext, then type those identifiers in the text box. A pull-down menu automatically suggests the right database for you to search in! This trick garnered an “ooh” from one librarian I recently showed it to.

I like seeing more detail!
The results page on WestlawNext has clearly been enhanced. After you hit search, each document that is relevant to your search is displayed with your highlighted search terms within the context of surrounding terms. You can even customize the level of detail displayed in your results page! You can choose from less detail, more detail and most detail, all without a difference in price.

I like filing research into folders!
I see excitement when I show the new organizational tools on WestlawNext. For example, you can use folders to help you organize and manage your research. There’s no limit to the number of folders or sub–folders that you could create, or the number of documents or snippets of text that you can save to a folder! One librarian that I showed this to yesterday talked about how she would use the sub–folders for clients and the folders for topics. I thought that was an inventive way to use the technology.

The documents or snippets you save to your folder will be saved for the life of your WestlawNext password. The documents that you’ve viewed in your folder will be available for a year at no additional charge!
I like searching within my folders!
How many times have you thought to yourself, I know I stuck this in a folder, but where is it? The Search within My Folders filter in the left frame makes it easy to search within the documents of a folder on WestlawNext.

I like that my History is automatically saved for one year!
I hear the most oohs and aahs when I mention that WestlawNext will automatically save all your searches for one year. In addition, you can search within your history and sort according to the Client IDs that you used during the session. One librarian actually clapped and said “one year is great! I’ve been asking for this for a long time”.

I like knowing which cases I’ve read!

An eyeglasses icon appears next to a document on the results page, citing references list, or folder each time you view a full text document, navigate away from the document and then return to it. It’s a visual indicator that lets you know you’ve already viewed a particular document when using the same Client ID. This feature is especially useful if you’ve been reviewing a lot of cases and you’re not sure what you’ve already seen!

I like the fact that WestlawNext is fully integrated into Quickview!
Quickview is a service that allows customers with administrative rights to see Westlaw billing information online. Your usage of both Westlaw and WestlawNext flows into one Quickview report. That means that the same systems that you rely on now for documenting Westlaw charges will also work for WestlawNext!

I like the new clean interface!
Customer feedback was crucial in designing the new and inviting dashboard of WestlawNext. The amount of white space, colors, fonts, and placement of important information was painstakingly studied and evaluated. Most librarians do like the cleaner look of the interface.

I hope you enjoy exploring the features of WestlawNext. If you would like to send us feedback, there is an Improve WestlawNext link on the bottom of every page. Thank you for your suggestions!

Editor’s Note: Elaine Lee is the new West Librarian Relations Manager for Connecticut, based in NY. She has previously worked as a reference and electronic resources librarian at 2 private law firms. She is new to SNELLA and looks forward to meeting more members.
Wedneday, May 19, 2010
9am – 12:30pm
RSVP by May 14th

Hosted at Quinnipiac University Library
For more information and registration:
Ratiya Ruangsuwana Collins or Lori Lantos
Ratiya.Collins@lexisnexis.com / llantos@pepehazard.com
$10 for SNELLA members/$20 non-members for program costs, payable at the event.

Guest Speakers:
James M. Matarazzo

Dean, Emeritus and Professor of Library and Information Science
Dean Matarazzo has work experience at the MIT Libraries in science and reference, serials and journals, technical reports, and government publications. He is a consultant to companies and corporations on the organization, evaluation, and creation of corporate libraries, information centers, and management of information. His current research focuses on the development of a model to evaluate the worth of corporate libraries, on why some corporate libraries are excellent, and on how senior executives value library and information science. Matarazzo is a fellow of the Special Libraries Association (SLA). He received SLA’s Professional Award in 1983 and again in 1991 when he also received SLA’s President’s Award. Dr. Matarazzo was president of the Association for Library and Information Science Education (2000-2001) and is the vice president of the H.W. Wilson Foundation, Inc.

Toby Pearlstein

Director of Global Information Services, Bain & Company
Toby Pearlstein is the Director of Global Information Services at Bain & Company, Inc. Pearlstein’s responsibilities included oversight of all local Information Centers for Bain’s 35 offices globally especially setting of policies and standards, training oversight, budgeting for global expenditures, and negotiating and implementing all enterprise database contracts for both end users and professional researchers for one of the world’s leading management consulting firms. She also during this period, held position of Director of North American Information Services, as well as Manager of Boston Office Information Center.

Lunch provided compliments of LexisNexis®
SNELLA Annual Dinner  
Tuesday, June 1, 2010  
Cantina Cafe Ristorante  
74 Court Street  
Middletown, CT 06457  
Board & Committee meeting at 5:00 p.m.  
Cash Bar at 5:45 p.m.  
Dinner at 6:15 p.m.  
RSVP to Roseann Canny– Roseann.Canny@jud.ct.gov  
$20.00 per person  
(send entrée choice and check before May 27)  

Menu  
Appetizer  
Italian Antipasto  
Salad  
House Salad with House Dressing  
Pasta  
Homemade Penne Pasta with Marinara Sauce  
Entrees  
Chicken, Florentine–Style  
Eggplant Parmigiana  
(Fresh–Baked Bread & Olive Oil)  
Dessert  
Italian Pastry  
(Coffee, tea, included)  

Partially Funded by CCH
ATTENDEES

Theresa Baylock, Roseann Canny, Jeff Dowd, Kathy Koller, MaryAnn Krivicky, Mary Ellen Lomax-Bellare, Marjorie Lantos, Dottie McCaughty, Nancy Marcove, Sandee Molden, Karen Yeltima.

PROCEEDINGS

The meeting was called to order at 5:12 p.m. by President Nancy Marcove. The first order of business was to acknowledge that West had partially subsidized our Holiday Party and to express gratitude for their generosity. Lexis too, was extremely generous in their donation of $500.00 to the SNELLA scholarship fund. Education Committee members did not attend the meeting, but it was noted that Nancy will meet with educations chairs next month to discuss their plans.

Reporting for the Public Relations Committee, Dottie McCaughtry talked about the brochures. The committee attempted to revise the old brochure but it was too out-of date to be of any use. “We need to create a lively and updated brochure in time for the CBA Annual Conference in June,” remarked McCaughtry. President Marcove stressed the brochure must “tell our story”. “Why would lawyers care who we are and what we do?” It is important for the brochure to show this, commented Nancy. She then asked for volunteers to help with the new brochure. Mary Ann and Jeff agreed to do this.

FUTURE BUSINESS

Petitions are being prepared for mailing to state legislators and local bar associations in an effort to urge members to provide the Judicial branch with funding to keep the five law libraries slated to close later in 2010 open. This is in response to an announcement from Chief Court Administrator Judge Barbara Quinn on December 29, 2009. Also, AALL Government Relations Liaison chair, Mary Alice Baish and President Marcove have sent letters to the legislature and governor addressing the negative impact of these closures on our group’s behalf.

Note: Links to the petitions and letters have been added by SNELLA’s webmaster-Anne Myers.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Submitted by Kathy Koller
Please cast your vote for the 2010-2011 SNELLA Board & Committee Members to marjorie.lander@wolterskluwer.com before Monday, May 10th. Also, if you would like to run for any positions, please let Marjorie Lander know!

**Vote:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Yes ( )</th>
<th>No ( )</th>
<th>Other:________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseann Canny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camilla Tubbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Marcove</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Baylock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Koller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members at Large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Javor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Brucker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ann Krivicky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webmaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Meyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandee Molden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations/CBA Liaison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dottie McCaughtry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>________________________(to be determined)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE!
Reminder!

SNELLA Board Meeting
May 19th
Quinnipiac Law School
Faculty Commons Room
Hamden, CT
8:30 a.m.

SNELLA Board and Committee Meeting
June 1st
Cantina Cafe Ristorante
Middletown, CT
5:00 p.m.

Note: Year end committee reports are due at the June 1st meeting!
Additionally, I encourage you to read these two excellent recent articles:


In closing, I want to encourage all of us to get out there and take charge of our working relationships with the legal publishers’ representatives with whom we interact. As I said in the beginning, we are all in this together. How we make this work is up to us. And as Sarah says, let’s go have fun!