Message From the Chair
Leah Sandwell-Weiss
2012 - 2013 ALL - SIS Chair

Welcome to our Fall 2012 Newsletter! I’m excited to be the Chair for 2012 - 2013 for this organization that does such good work for our profession, our members, and our patrons and institutions.

As you’ll see in this issue, ALL-SIS members had a busy, productive time at the AALL Annual Meeting and are continuing that work into this new academic year. We have lots of program reviews, articles from grant recipients and first-timers, and both old and new columns, Law Librarian in the Dark and The Collaborative Librarian. I’d like to thank Sue Kelleher for her many years of faithfully putting the Member News column together - this role has been taken on by Thomas Sneed, so send your news to him at tsneed2@emory.edu.

ALL-SIS has a lot on our plate this year: several task forces will complete their charges within the next few months, such as Strategic Planning, the Task Force on Identifying Skills and Knowledge for Legal Practice, and the Library Marketing and Outreach task force. And I’m very excited about a member-suggested committee on research and scholarship, charged with promoting law librarian scholarship.

However, one thing that the Board members and I have realized is that we have a lot of committees and task forces with charges that seem to overlap or which may have lived past their original purpose. So the Board is reviewing all the commit-
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Over the last few years the topic of law school graduates’ preparedness for practice (or lack thereof) has been a hot topic in most venues in which law librarians communicate. We in academia often wonder if we are teaching the research skills that our students will need in the “real world”. Therefore I am very excited about a new feature in the Newsletter this year, The Collaborative Law Librarian. Make sure to check out Thomas Sneed’s column on page 2!

But don’t stop there. This issue is chock full of reviews of programs at our Annual Meeting in Boston, which will hopefully be helpful to those of you who were unable to attend. There is also lots of Member News, a DVD set to read about, AALL announcements, and some important information about the new ALL-SIS website. I hope you enjoy this issue and will use your Newsletter as your voice by contributing an article!
By now, everyone’s fall semester has begun and the students are keeping us busy with legal writing memos and cite checking exercises, while the faculty are teaching and working on their most recent scholarly publication. As a diversion from your daily work load, let me welcome you to our new column, The Collaborative Law Librarian. The title will become more evident as you read on, but let me provide you with several reasons for the concept.

I recently came across an article that included a discussion of whether we, as academic law librarians, are teaching the right legal research skills to our students. Certainly not a new question for our profession, and I still think the answer is yes. However, I have come to question not whether what we are teaching is right, but whether it is actually enough. There is so much out there for attorneys to turn to for research beyond Westlaw, Lexis and a print copy of the (insert your state here) code, and take a minute to think about all of the law office technologies that didn’t exist just a few years ago.

The line for the Thompson Reuters’ caricature drawings at the recent AALL annual meeting provided another inspiration. As I waited, I started talking with the vendor representative next to the display for handbooks and eReaders. I was curious about the prominent product placement, and asked about usage for this particular product. She discussed how popular these electronic versions had become with attorneys, and therefore the reason for this particular item being in the prime location. This is an area of growth for the company and of great interest to private law librarians.

The days of attorneys lugging to court the large handbooks with bent edges is ending. The proliferation of wireless connections, even in your local courthouse, is no doubt adding to this change. However, at my academic law library, we don’t provide this type of electronic option for print materials and are only peripherally discussing this technology with students. We are obviously behind our private firm colleagues in a fast moving area of information delivery.

Therefore, this column. I plan to deal with subjects relevant to the legal world and information technology just outside the usual scope of current academic law library conversation. This may include the new technology fad, the changing nature of law practice as it relates to technology, or a new database providing some wow factor that is catching the legal world by storm. The title of the column comes from the plan to include features from our colleagues within PLL-SIS. Private firm librarians can bring a new perspective and we can learn and benefit from these types of collaborative efforts.

As this is a new endeavor, I am also glad to hear suggestions and comments. Feel free to e-mail me at thomas.sneed@emory.edu to let me know what you think or if you have any ideas for future columns, and I hope you enjoy The Collaborative Law Librarian.

Potential Topics:
- Law office technology
- Project Management concepts
- Potential / current law school classes on these topics
- Research patterns in law firms (Google, Fastcase / Casemaker, WLN, LNA, etc.)
- Use of “secondary” commercial vendors (Bloomberg, CCH, etc.).

Time Line for Articles:
- Fall 2012: Introduction
- Winter 2013: Thomas
- Summer 2013: PLL-SIS member
- Fall 2013: Thomas
- Winter 2014: PLL-SIS member
- Summer 2014: Thomas
AALL Program Reviews
Program A4: E-Stats Collection for Your Non-Stacks Collection
Theodora Belniak, S.U.N.Y. Buffalo Law School

Electronic materials have changed the face of our libraries. They’ve pushed access to the library beyond physical holdings, and have created unique problems and benefits. They’ve also opened up an entirely new way to evaluate collections and to think about collection development. Ian Kipnes, Acquisitions and Budget Control Librarian at California Western School of Law Library, brought in three vendors to discuss collecting and using e-statistics.

Ian set the background of the discussion about data collection, and the vendors discussed the problems with data crunching. Some of those problems are:
- fluffing of statistics (e.g., counting eight quick clicks on one resource as eight uses),
- huge data sets in different places with different types of usage being tracked,
- statistics in differing formats across vendor platforms,
- incomplete data,
- an inability to de-duplicate across platforms automatically, and
- an inability to break down usage by IP address within an institutional subscription.

Overall, the biggest issue is interpreting the data without spending your working life gathering it and tweaking it in an Excel spreadsheet. The different platforms and levels of access make it very difficult to paint a complete picture of an institution’s usage. It is this big picture that everyone wants to look at, and a market need exists for a product that can provide a comprehensive view of an institution and its needs with little intervention on the part of a collection’s manager.

In response to this need, here are the products that were presented with links to further information.

- SwetsWise Selection Reports, presented by Sujay Darji: Harvests data from multiple journal and database platforms, adds in impact factors and qualitative data, can create packages from data, can help de-dupe, and more. For more information on this product, here is a link to its webpage: http://www.swets.com/swetswise/selection-support

- PubGet and PaperStats, presented by Ian Connor: Focus is on collection-based decisions; uses statistics to help paint the big picture about your collection. Partnered with OCLC, ILLiad, and others to track holdings. Will help defend content spending and predict content needs. For more information on this product, here is a link to its webpage: http://corporate.pubget.com/library/paperstats

- OneLog, presented by Peter Sharkales: Sold as an electronic resource management system. Provides usage tracking, monitoring of concurrent users, password management, many types of reporting options, data analysis and mobile device tracking. For more information on this product, here is a link to its webpage: http://www.onelog.com/

Having never used these products, I cannot comment on their efficacy in dealing with the issues outlined above. However, I am given hope that vendors recognize that collection managers are using this data to drive decisions, and that there are attempts to divert the data deluge to a useful end.
AALL Program Reviews

Walking the Tight Rope: Licensed Data Access and Restrictions

Ingrid Mattson, Moritz Law Library, Ohio State University

Wrapping up my MLIS degree mere days before AALL began, I sought out some programs that were not necessarily aimed at academic law librarians, reasoning that I would have almost every other day of the year to develop my academic skills. Grouped under the private law library (PLL) rubric, *Walking the Tight Rope: Licensed Data Access and Restrictions* was an exceptional program presented by a panel comprised of two law firm librarians (Linda-Jean Schneider, Electronic Resources Manager at Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP; and Loretta F. Orndorff, Director of Library Services at Cozen O’Connor LLP), an attorney (Scott B. Schwartz, General Counsel at Dansko, previously intellectual property counsel at Cozen O’Connor LLP), and a membership law librarian (Regina L. Smith, Executive Director of Jenkins Law Library).

The two law firm librarians lead the discussion with frequent, humorous interruptions (in the form of quacking noises from a Boston Duck Tours noise-maker) by Mr. Schwartz who regularly disagreed with various contractual positions vendors take as well as any inclinations a librarian may have to let sleeping contract terms lie. The presentation was premised on the fact that contracts with electronic resources vendors must be carefully negotiated in order to (1) allow for the actual usage behaviors of end users, and (2) enable law firms and law schools to comply with the contract terms.

There is at least one significant difference between the agreements negotiated between vendors and law firm or private libraries and between vendors and academic law libraries: the scope of content access seems significantly greater in law schools. However, the panel highlighted a number of notable issues that have bearing on the work done by those law librarians in academia, whether they teach, work in public services, or actually negotiate the contracts themselves. Or as stated in the program summary, the panel had useful lessons for “[a]ll librarians who have a role in managing the use of licensed digital data.”

**Negotiation**

Lesson one from the panel: every contract should be reviewed carefully and negotiated if necessary. Mr. Schwartz frequently asked the audience to close its eyes and participate in polls. The lead-in poll was whether anyone had ever simply signed an agreement as presented by the vendor. He reported there were only a few who raised their hands, and somewhat surprisingly he empathized with the librarian’s plight: at any given time, a librarian may feel as though there is not enough time to thoroughly review and negotiate a contract, may lack institutional support or the ability to obtain counsel to assist without great effort, or may simply feel he or she does not have sufficient leverage to negotiate more reasonable terms.

Nonetheless, librarians’ end goal should be to enter into a contract that is “reasonable,” i.e., one that contains terms that allow end users to access the database in the way they expect and enables the firm or school to monitor compliance. That may require building more time into the negotiation process, determining who has signing authority in your institution, and/or establishing a good working relationship with your institution’s legal counsel.

The panelists also reminded the audience that “the contract” will likely include more than one document, all of which need to be requested and

(Continued on page 5)
Walking the Tight Rope (cont’d)

reviewed for terms before agreeing to anything. For example, by signing just a master agreement, you could also be agreeing to any terms included in the order form, any pricing documents, privacy statements, online terms and conditions that accompany the database, and nondisclosure agreements. Do not be afraid to ask questions. While it is possible (or perhaps probable) that your primary contact will be a sales person, keep pushing to make sure you understand what you are signing. The sales person may have to run changes by their legal counsel. While this could take time, it does not hurt to ask for changes that may actually turn out to be relatively painless for the vendor but which make a big difference for your patrons.

Finally, Ms. Smith addressed confidentiality clauses in contracts. As her library is a public entity, her board of directors will not allow her to enter into any agreements that contain confidentiality clauses. She reports that she regularly crosses these clauses out, engages in a few weeks of banter with the vendor’s legal department, then successfully enters agreements without the offending clauses. Without reviewing agreements in detail, you could unwittingly commit the library to impermissible obligations.

Implications for Public Services and Reference

Ms. Smith also highlighted a number of issues that arise in law libraries that provide access to online research databases to the public (i.e., anyone other than law students and faculty). First and foremost, remote access to online resources is often prohibited. In other words, patrons can only access the databases onsite—that is, when the law library is open. While this may not seem problematic at first glance, make sure you are aware of any plans your law school may have to extend certain library services to alumni, particularly as many new graduates are pursuing private practice and may expect to be able to access library databases remotely. According to Ms. Smith, though remote access can be expensive, it is a real service to patrons.

Privacy can also be a sticky situation for patrons using public terminals. The issue develops another wrinkle if your patrons are attorneys with confidentiality obligations. Be aware of the protections, if any, in data privacy clauses and set up your computer systems accordingly. For example, it is possible to create search history settings that auto-erase after a browser is closed. Additionally, a vendor’s contract or terms of use within the database may state the vendor will track searches in some fashion. This may not be the case, or it could be of no consequence if the tracking is fairly innocuous, but it is important to be aware of the contract’s terms.

Teaching Students

Ms. Schneider briefly raised issues she sees with respect to newer associates in firms—issues which could reflect on the training or lack thereof from law schools. Ms. Schneider’s law firm established a six-month training program for new associates and provided training instruction on a variety of topics including professional responsibility and ethics. Consequently she is familiar with educational “gaps” new associates may have.

The panel began the program by pointing out that illegally downloading or otherwise misappropriating online legal database content could expose a firm to criminal or civil sanctions in the same way illegally downloading music and videos could. Given this fact, all attorneys at law firms, particularly newer attorneys, are explicitly informed of usage rules and restrictions with respect to online databases. This information is conveyed in a number of ways (e.g., research seminars, email signatures, newsletters, signs, pop-up windows), and librarians also educate new attorneys on data privacy and security issues. At times, protecting confidentiality and securi-
ty is a best practice that also results in contract compliance. For example, attorneys are often reminded to keep their user names and passwords private. If one attorney has forgotten his or her password or has logged on at his or her office and cannot subsequently log into a database at home, the attorney is aware that they cannot use another attorney’s (or their paralegal’s) log in information.

Ms. Schneider and Ms. Orndorff also addressed a habit that is easily developed in law school but should perhaps be curtailed, or at least discussed. Often with the agreements entered into by law firms, attorneys can download content for their own use or can even share that content within the firm, but they are not permitted to share the content beyond the firm (e.g., with clients). (One nefarious example that comes to mind in particular is a circumstance in which the client is a corporation that does not subscribe to various databases, but the in-house counsel with whom a law firm attorney works may request specific documents knowing the law firm attorney does have access.) Law students have the freedom to cut and paste, copy and send, download and email all manner of content from online databases, and they are encouraged to do so in the form of receiving points for prizes from vendors. These habits, however, may result in practices that at best simply hamper an attorney’s ability to exchange information and at worst implicate ethics violations.

All of these issues are lessons that could be incorporated into legal research and writing classes or clinical coursework at academic law libraries. Law school orientation involving librarians should also include instruction on these topics. As is well known, Westlaw and LexisNexis contracts almost invariably prohibit use of their databases by law students for nonacademic purposes. Consider whether simply mentioning this once during orientation is enough to protect the law school in the event of a contract dispute. While academic law librarians often focus on whether a reliance on Westlaw or LexisNexis online inhibits a student’s ability to effectively research once they are in practice, free-for-all access to these databases may have greater implications for how students understand and approach their professional obligations once they are in practice.

**Monitoring Compliance**

One panelist’s response to an audience question at the conclusion of the program confounded me: sometimes all that is needed to prevent an end user from breaching a contract is educating the user that the action they are about to take would constitute a breach. Technical solutions may exist that would prevent a patron from conducting research outside the databases to which you have subscribed, racking up extraordinary charges for which you did not budget. Technical solutions may also exist to prevent a user from logging on at separate computers (or at their desktop computers as well as their mobile devices). This does not always mean, however, that a vendor will implement these solutions within their database. This could be the case for any number of reasons (e.g., it is too costly, it is not in their interest, they do not see facilitating your contract compliance as an issue they should address).

Consequently, educating end users is ultimately a librarian’s best approach. Whether including information regarding database restrictions in research seminars, email signatures, newsletters, signs, or pop-up windows, remember that the law firm or school that signed the contract is often ultimately responsible for how patrons use online databases. As Mr. Schwartz put it, no one wants to see their law firm (or in ALL-SIS members’ cases, their law school) in the news as a defendant in a copyright or breach of contract law suit with a vendor. Perhaps just as importantly, academic
Boston was home for this year’s AALL Annual Meeting. Boston is a venue that everyone enjoys, with something of interest for every taste. The conference also had a lot to offer in the smorgasbord of technology presentations for law librarians. Since I am technology oriented, I explored the programs that highlight changes in technology and law librarianship.

The conference for me started with the workshop on designing mobile apps, W4: Going Mobile: Building Mobile Applications. The workshop was held at Harvard Law School Library. This was a beautiful setting and the campus has the historical feeling that one would expect. The morning portion of the workshop was devoted to the ‘where’ and ‘whys’ of mobile applications. The lecture focused on the libraries’ need for mobile apps, an introduction to designing mobile apps, and a case study in designing mobile apps. The morning ended with a hands-on designing session for a library mobile app for the participant’s library.

The workshop continued throughout the afternoon to give the attendees an overview of the currently available apps and then moved into a discussion of the online websites that give you practical help in designing and implementing your own library website, what information and features to include in your app, whether you need an app or a web page, and finally a design session for a library app. Finally, there was a practical work session on your earlier designed app and a discussion of promoting the app to your community. The speakers were engaging and informative and the presentations were by PowerPoint supplemented with online examples.

The technology programs at the AALL Annual Meeting always include CS-SIS’s Cool Tools presentation. The Cool Tools Café is my favorite event at the conference. It is a chance to get a look at new apps and programs that are available to law librarians. Judging by the turnout, this event is becoming everyone’s favorite. I arrived 15 minutes early and the room was already overflowing with eager technology-seeking librarians. This conference event continues to expand every year and yet the rooms that are assigned seem to be getting smaller. This event needs more space to fully exploit the information that is being delivered. This year there were 18 tables to highlight the technology. If you have not attended in the past, the format is a large room with tables set up and one or more presenters at each table demonstrating new technology tools to small groups of attendees. This format is great for getting a rough overview of the products. Handouts are available with websites for further study of the tools. Large crowds and a small room raised the level of noise so that at times it was hard to hear the presentations. Additionally, there was such a demand at this event that there were large groups around every table. Nevertheless, the event was a big success and a lot of new technology for librarians was demonstrated. I really enjoy this presentation sponsored and staffed by the CS-SIS.

The technology demonstrated ran the gamut of librarian requirements. The products fell into 4 major categories: Collaboration Tools, iPad and Android Apps, Presentation Tools, and Online Web tools for librarians. Rather than belabor the point I will discuss the groups briefly as a whole and highlight one or two of the individual tools.

The first group, Collaboration Tools, includes a variety of websites and apps. The offerings include mind mapping software such as Mindomo, iThoughHD and MindManager (now Mindjet) and online storage and sharing apps, such as Dropbox, Box, and Teambox. Mind mapping tools allow you to share your ideas or collaborate in the cloud and are accessible from iPad or desktop. Online
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collaboration and/or cloud storage tools are everywhere now. These tools allow you to have a desktop storage box and load it and access the material from any computer. I have used Dropbox for several conferences and committees and find it to be a great tool for large documents or a variety of documents that everyone needs to see. You can have multiple storage boxes for different committees and they remain private. Only the individuals that you allow access can see the documents. Box and Teambox do the same thing with some differences. They are all good; it is only a matter of preference which one you like. Try them out and see.

Additional Collaboration Tools were for online meetings and conferences and included Teamburner, AnyMeeting and Meetings.io. These tools are similar to other well-known online conference tools such as GotoMeeting. They all have different features but essentially allow you to conference with scheduled meetings from your home library phone or computer. Everyone will have a different view of these tools; you will need to see which one you like the best.

There were several tables devoted exclusively to iPad and Android Apps for librarians. iPads are still dominant and there are more apps for iPads than Android tablets. However, Android apps are catching up to the iPad and many of the newer apps were demonstrated for the new Android tablets. You can review these tools and all of the presentation tools with website URLs at the CS-SIS webpage, http://cssis.org/education/annual-meeting/2012/i2-cool-tools-cafe. There are also downloadable online handouts for the tools on the website.

Presentation Tools for librarians that were demonstrated included Prezi, Instructure Canvas, LibGuides, and applications for creating tutorials including Jing, Camtasia, Screencast and other software. Prezi is new and is an interesting change from PowerPoint. Prezi presentations are cloud based and have a variety of functions that are not available in the traditional PowerPoint presentation format.

Online Tools include a variety of applications and websites. The applications showcased included Zoho, Firefox add-ons for librarians, translation tools, and social media websites such as Pinterest. The Firefox add-ons are very interesting but only useful if you use Firefox. Chrome users are out in the cold. Nonetheless, several add-ons deserve a look such as CiteGenie, Jureeka, Recap (if you use PACER), and FireShot. Descriptions and links to these add-ons are available at Firefox and the CS-SIS URL above.

There were many other technology-oriented programs at AALL this year. I was unable to get to all of them of course but I did see several that were interesting. C-1: Searching Legal Opinions: The Google Scholar Approach was a very informative look at Google Scholar. Dr. Anurag Acharya, one of the founding engineers of Google Scholar, spoke about Google Scholar and the recently implemented changes to the U.S. case law component. The legal search engine of Google Scholar Advanced Scholar Search is a great resource and many of us who use it regularly wondered why they changed it. Dr. Acharya explained the process and the changes that were made based upon comments from the Google user community. He also answered questions about the search functionality and took comments on how we would like to see it changed in the future. This research tool is one that all law librarians should be able to use and recommend for your public patrons as well as bar members, students, and faculty.

If you are an electronic service librarian or web developer librarian, you might have been
AALL Program Reviews

Technology and Law Librarianship (cont’d)
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interested in the CS-SIS Program: Enhancing Your Library’s Web Presence with HTML5. This program was for very serious web-oriented librarians only. HTML5, the new coding language, promises to dramatically increase the functionality of web documents and web applications. It was a good program for the intended audience. This program included some hands-on coding help in HTML5.

Finally, B-6: Finding Your Inner Nancy Drew: Public Records Resources Online was a program that had a tremendous amount of good web information. The presenters, Jennifer McMahan and Bridget Gilhool, walked the audience through finding free web sites for real property data, birth/death and marriage/divorce records, company affiliations, professional licenses, court records, and more. The websites are all listed on their very good handout. If you missed this program you can find the handout at http://www.cmcgc.com/Media/handouts/320723/B6_McMahan_A.pdf.

Remember, if you missed any of the technology or other programs at the Annual Meeting the handout materials and some of the PowerPoints are available for free at the following site: http://www.softconference.com/aall/handouts/handouts.html. They are also available on the AALL2Go site http://aall.sclivelearningcenter.com/index.aspx?PID=6277.

AALL 2012 is over. I hope we all took much information away from the conference to help us make new innovations to help our library community. I look forward to AALL 2013 for new changes in technology that help change the way we interact with our library community. Librarians must continue to keep themselves informed and updated on technology to produce more innovative learning tools for our patrons and user communities; that is the direction of the future for libraries.

(Continued from page 6)

Walking the Tight Rope (cont’d)

law librarians should be sending law students into practice with sensitivity to the professional implications of their online legal database use.

Special thanks to Linda-Jean Schneider who helped me develop ideas raised on the panel that have greater implications for academic law libraries.

AALL Boston, Where Everybody Knows Your Name

Christine George, S.U.N.Y. Buffalo Law School

I’ll admit it. When I first stepped into the exhibit hall, I was ready to step right back out. It was so big, there was so much going on, and there were law librarians everywhere. Day 1 of my first AALL conference was overwhelming. I started off with CONELL, and by the end of the program, my voice was hoarse and my bag held multiple fistfuls of business cards. I was exhausted and couldn’t imagine how I was going to last the next couple of days. I had not only planned out one schedule, but two alternate schedules. It was utter insanity. Even now I’m not sure how I made it through.

Well, that’s not entirely true. Bless you, Dunkin Donuts, and your deliciously caffeinated iced coffee.

When I arrived in Boston, I didn’t have goal for the conference. I knew there were sessions and gatherings that I wanted to attend, but I wasn’t really thinking big picture. So, you can imagine my surprise when I found myself living out the confer-
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For the uninitiated, it is safe to say that the U.S. Government Printing Office’s (GPO’s) Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP), is in a state of transition. In recent years, with the numbers of items available in print falling drastically in favor of digital resources, the increased difficulties associated with housing materials, and the widespread budget constraints placed on libraries all over the country, questions abound regarding the future of this program. In order to chart a way in these difficult times, the GPO initiated a comprehensive survey to determine a new course for the program. To that end, the program “The New FDLP: A Collaborative Future for Government Information” attempted to address the GPO’s initial survey findings. The coordinator and moderator was Janet L. Fischer, Golden Gate University School of Law Library, and presenters were Mary Alice Baish, U.S. Government Printing Office, Library Program Services and Arlene Weible, Oregon State Library.

The New FDLP program was broken into two distinct parts. The first presentation by Ms. Baish largely discussed the methodology, scope and response rates of the FDLP Forecast Study, a mixed method survey that the GPO launched in February of this year. The goal of the survey was to determine what direction the FDLP libraries should take, particularly with respect to e-resources, comprehensive collecting, the housing of resources, and the viability of collaboration efforts. Part of a multi-phased process, the study’s results are still in the process of being tabulated and final conclusions are expected to be publicized beginning in the late fall of this year. It should be noted that while the electronic return date listed on the survey was June 30, 2012, Ms. Baish encouraged all late submissions at the conference.

The second half of The New FDLP, ably presented by Ms. Weible, focused on the role of the states by discussing regional libraries, digitization and preservation, reference and cataloging, and the collaborative efforts that could be taken with other libraries in each of these aspects to make more effective use of resources. Although most of her presentation involved her experience with organizing the Oregon Federal Regional Collection and how its materials had been dispersed amongst the University of Oregon, Portland State University, Oregon State University, and the Oregon State Library, other examples were provided for each of the other contexts.

With its packed attendance, the largest criticism of this program was made by government documents librarians who stated that much (if not all) of this information was already covered in a recent FDLP webinar. In addition, because none of the substantive parts of the survey had as yet been tabulated, some complained that the program was premature and was only of minimal relevance. Most attendees, however, appreciated the fact that the GPO was soliciting their input on the future of the FDLP program as they eagerly await the final results of the survey.
Most academic law libraries have considered the question of how to better utilize student assistants. My library is no different, and we are currently discussing potential plans to create other ways to handle faculty requests using student workers. As the title of this session suggests, this program provided insight into two ways to approach the use of student research assistants in the law school setting.

The speakers for this session were Barbara Garavaglia, moderator and Director of the University of Michigan Law Library, Jennifer Selby, Head of Reference and Faculty Services with the University of Michigan Law Library, and Linda Karr O’Conner, Director of the Scholarly Support & Research Assistant Program with the Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library at UCLA. The session was held in a question and answer style, with Ms. Garavaglia alternating the questions between the two other panelists.

The strength of this program was the description of two very different, yet highly successful, methods of utilizing student research assistants. The Michigan model employs approximately 6 students year-round who work as mini-reference librarians and are assigned projects as received from the faculty. In contrast, the UCLA program can have anywhere between 45-70 student RAs, and the students are paired with the appropriate faculty member based on skills, interests and needs. Due to the differences in size, there are also major variations in student hours worked and budgets for the two systems.

While the programs do have differences in size and methods, there are also similarities between the two. Both Michigan and UCLA have a significant interview processes to vet the students, and there is continuous supervision from the professional librarians. There is also extensive buy-in from the faculty, with both schools reporting between 60 and 70 faculty members using the programs during any given school year.

As the hour continued, I came to appreciate the hard work from everyone involved to make these programs into the institutional stalwarts they have become. The Michigan model is on a smaller scale that could be viable for most libraries, while the UCLA program has become similar to a mid-sized law firm. Whatever their differences, both programs have put their libraries in a very visible and indispensable position regarding faculty research. If this is an area of potential growth for your library, I would recommend taking a look at these two law libraries and their excellent work with student research assistants.

(Continued from page 9)

AALL Boston.... (cont’d)

ence theme of “Learn Connect Grow.” The learning took all forms, from learning about embedded librarians, digital repositories, current privacy concerns, the law of the Salem Witchcraft Trials (totally worth waking up early for an 8:30 session) to learning how to score the best swag (I’m still in love with my Kiss My App shirt). Connecting happened in all places with all sorts of law librarians from all over not just the country but the world. CONELL covered a lot of connections, but there were other events like Beer & Edits or various caucuses and meet ups that led to a fairly easy camaraderie. I was surprised by the amount of re-connecting I was able to do as well. I had planned to meet up with former classmates, but I hadn’t anticipated how many other blasts from my past I’d see. There was the alum and a professor from my library school program, former co-workers, and
The double-session program on researching international human rights law provided a wealth of valuable information for librarians who face the sometimes daunting task of human rights research.

The first part of the program focused on the United Nations. Marci Hoffman of UC Berkeley spoke about researching materials related to the UN’s Charter-based bodies that work to protect human rights on an international scale. After providing a brief overview of how these groups are structured, Marci focused on the Human Rights Council (HRC). She discussed how a Charter-based violation is monitored by presenting an example based on the current events in Syria. She used this example to show how each of the HRC’s three human rights monitoring mechanisms work in a practical way: the Universal Periodic Review (UPR), the complaint procedure authorized by the HRC’s resolution 5/1, and special procedures under country- or theme-based mandates.

Marci described how, in the UPR process, a three-state working group (troika) reviews three categories of information and documents related to potential human rights violations: from the state, from experts, and from other stakeholders (such as NGOs). These documents, as well other information about how human rights issues are being monitored by the HRC in Syria, are freely available through the Syrian Arab Republic page on the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) website: http://www.ohchr.org/EN/countries/MENARegion/Pages/SYIndex.aspx.

Next, Marci described the complaint procedure, which involves an investigation of patterns of violations, rather than single complaints, by a HRC working group. This procedure is confidential, which makes it difficult for researchers to find documentation related to it.

Finally, Marci described the special procedures, based on country and thematic mandates, spearheaded by a Special Rapporteur. The focus of this type of procedure is to examine, monitor, and report on human rights violations by any country, and ratification of treaties is not required to be subject to this type of investigation.

The next speaker was Mary Rumsey of the University of Minnesota. Mary explained how each human rights treaty authorized one or more treaty-based bodies to investigate human rights violations and enforce human rights treaties. She focused on three mechanisms used by these bodies to accomplish this: (1) an inquiry procedure, (2) State party reporting, and (3) individual communications.

As an example of an inquiry procedure, Mary described the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) inquiry into human rights violations against women in Mexico. CEDAW first collected information from multiple sources, including other treaty bodies, special rapporteurs, and the state of Mexico. After a site visit and additional meetings, the committee concluded its inquiry and issued a report. These reports are available to researchers through the CEDAW website, at http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/reports.htm.

Mary also briefly touched on the inquiry procedure for the Committee Against Torture (CAT), which has completed seven inquiries to date. Unlike the CEDAW documentation, materials related
to CAT inquiries are available through UN documentations databases, including ODS and UN-Bisnet.

Next, Mary explained the process for State party reports. The UN’s treaty-based bodies collect reports from the individual States regarding their human rights protections. These reports can prompt the treaty body to create a list of issues, to which the State party replies in writing. After discussing these issues, the committee’s evaluation and any follow-up by the State party are also issued in writing. A researcher can search for these documents in the Treaty Bodies Database on the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), located at http://tb.ohchr.org/default.aspx. Websites for the individual committees generally have additional materials related to the State party reporting process, including “shadow reports” from NGOs.

Mary concluded by discussing individual communications. She outlined the process by which human rights treaty committees investigate individual complaints of treaty violations, which involves a complaint to the committee (often delivered by an NGO), a response by the State party against which the complaint is lodged, an investigation, and an issuance of the view or decision of the committee. Because much of the process is confidential, it can be difficult to find materials related to it. However, the NGO that issued the complaint may publish materials related to it on its website. Treaty commentaries can also be helpful to learn more about these processes, as can law review articles and blogs. Mary also mentioned an additional website, http://www.bayefsky.com, which serves as a web index for these types of materials.

In the afternoon session, the 2011 FCIL Schaeffer Grant for Foreign Law Librarians recipient, Argentinian law librarian Gloria Orrego Hoyos, spoke about the inter-American human right system. Her remarks focused on the work of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) (http://www.oas.org/en/iachr/), a body of the Organization of American States that has been established to protect human rights throughout the region.

To illustrate the IACHR’s work, Gloria discussed an actual IACHR proceeding: Chilean judge Karen Atala’s complaint to the IACHR of sexual orientation discrimination. Judge Atala claimed that this discrimination violated the American Convention on Human Rights, which explicitly protects “attributes of personality.” Gloria outlined the procedure in Judge Atala’s case, which includes registration and review of the complaint, an invitation to the parties to try to achieve a “friendly settlement,” and, if such a settlement is not reached and a human rights violation is found, a recommendation of action to restore any violated human rights.

The final speaker was Jim Hart of the University of Cincinnati, who spoke on the European system of human rights protections. He primarily discussed the work of the Council of Europe (http://hub.coe.int/), whose member nations are signatories to the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). This convention authorized the creation of the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) (http://www.echr.coe.int/ECHR/Homepage_EN), to which parties can appeal the member states’ statutes and court decisions that violate the provisions of the ECHR.

In his presentation, Jim outlined the path of a case to and through the ECtHR. After all of the domestic remedies are exhausted, the plaintiff can apply to the ECtHR to have his or her case heard.
Workplace stress, although unpleasant, is an expected part of the job. But what happens when personal stress comes to the office?

Maxine Wright, Law Collection Management Librarian at North Carolina Central University, and Valerie Wright, LMSW and Coordinating Manager of the Pediatric Resource Project at the Harlem Hospital Center, designed an excellent session to help administrators and colleagues think about and answer that question.

First, Valerie noted the common bond between librarians and social workers: we both find resources for people in need. Then, she offered a few comments to set the scene for the role playing later in the session: dealing with conflict, like depression and divorce, is different from internal conflict within the organization, conflict and stress are interrelated, but different. Conflict may lead to stress, the body's response to conflict, and, as a supervisor, you can be facilitators (but don't try to be a social worker without the training).

After her brief introduction, Maxine and Valerie role-played some common sensitive issues that may arise with staff.

**Scenario 1: Child custody issue.**

**Circumstances:** Your employee is frequently absent and her work performance has declined noticeably. When questioned about her absences, the employee lets you know that the situation will be going on for a year.

**Valerie's recommendations:** Know your facts: make sure you know the background of the situational crisis. Everything is disrupted for the employee because of this crisis. Engage active listening, and paraphrase the feelings being expressed. Try to bring the employee into the decision-making process to address the end result, “What do you think I can do to help you manage your stress? Manage this situation?” This engagement will empower the employee.

**Scenario 2: Depression.**

**Circumstances:** An employee with a once great track record is coming to work in a greatly altered state from his usual. His clothes aren’t clean, and his personal hygiene has been neglected. The employee is not talking as much as usual, is inattentive, and is making mistakes. When approached about his performance, the employee sobs uncontrollably.

**Valerie’s recommendations:** Be sure to establish boundaries in the beginning of the conversation; ‘I’m not a therapist, but I can help you connect with a therapist at XYZ.’ Reduce the employee's anxiety by assuring him that his job is not in jeopardy. In a few days, follow up and ask if the employee has gotten help. Offer to sit with him when he makes the call if he needs the extra support. Gently let him know that sustaining his job will not be possible if he doesn’t get help. Valerie suggested that a manager should check in if the work hasn’t improved; if it has improved, move on.

**Scenario 3: Caring for Aging Parents**

**Circumstances:** An employee has started leaving work frequently with no advanced notice. She'll pop her head into your office and say there’s an emergency at home. There were fifteen emergencies in the last two months alone.

**Valerie’s recommendations:** Schedule a meeting with the employee, and ask what is going on at home. The employee says that her mother is living with her and it’s taken over her life. It helps to know the facts: it’s very demanding to care for an aging parent. Express empathy: 'I didn’t know you were caring for her; it’s a difficult change.' Let her know that you are not trying to add to her stress, and encour-
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Helping Others Learn (cont’d)

age her to search out support groups, such as AARP or the Department of Aging. And, always remember, your role is not to solve the problem but to guide the solution.

Scenario 4: Homelessness

Circumstances: Someone finds a suitcase in the library filled with clothes and personal possessions. It was discovered that it belongs to a current employee that is going through a divorce and has been living in the library.

Valerie’s recommendations: First, know the facts: the faces of the homeless have changed. Financial and relationship problems may push people into homelessness. Approach the employee and let him know that he cannot live in the library. If he won’t/can’t listen to the help being offered, be firm, be clear, and don’t address accusations made in anger.

After a few more short scenarios touching on domestic violence and the chronic illness of a child, Valerie and Maxine fielded questions from the audience. Valerie offered the following advice for any situation:

- First, be prepared and knowledgeable about the topic beforehand, if possible.
- Second, use the two Bs, brief and boundaries. Be brief and get to the point of the problem; define boundaries and be clear on your role. You are not here to solve the problem or be a therapist for your employee.
- Try to reduce employee anxiety about the safety of his job, communicate empathy.
- Finally, try to obtain a commitment from the employee to seek outside assistance for the issue.

Message From the Chair (cont’d)

It’s also time to submit programs for the 2013 Annual Meeting in Seattle. As you probably know, the process has changed, as AALL attempts to shape the educational content in Seattle to address the needs of AALL members. I recommend that you take a look at the survey results for program ideas, if you haven’t already. You can find them at http://www.aallnet.org/conference/education/future-meetings/program-proposers/survey. More information about the process is available at http://www.aallnet.org/conference/education/future-meetings/program-proposers. Then, when you have a program proposal, contact Shannon Burchard, burchards@usfca.edu, Chair of the ALL-SIS Programs Committee. The Programs Committee can help you refine your proposal and get through the process. You can also contact Alison Shea, our AMPC Liaison, at aashea@law.fordham.edu or Julie Pabarja, julie.pabarja@dlapiper.com, the AMPC Chair, with questions you may have about the process. The deadline to submit a program is October 15, 2012.

That’s it for now - have a great Fall Semester and take care.
Three law librarians from Canada - Catherine Cotter (University of New Brunswick), John Papadopoulos (University of Toronto), and Nancy McCormack (Queen’s University) - enlightened the Americans about some of the mysteries of Canadian legislation research during their Monday morning program at the AALL annual meeting in Boston.

They began by explaining how a bill becomes a law, Canadian-style:

1) There are three readings of the bill in each chamber of Parliament, the House of Commons and the Senate. At the end of this, an identical version of the bill is passed by both chambers and it is sent to the Governor General.
2) There is a “royal assent.”
3) The law is “proclaimed into force.”

Researchers can find information about Canadian legislation from 2001 to the present on LEGISinfo, the Canadian Parliament’s legislative website (http://parl.gc.ca/LegisInfo/Home.aspx). Statutory codification was the other main topic of discussion. There is no official “codification” of Canadian statutes similar to the U.S. Code. However, periodically, all federal laws in force are published in a “revised” or “consolidated” publication. The last official publication of the consolidated federal statutes was the Revised Statutes of Canada (R.S.C.) in 1985.

There is a yearly compilation of federal statutory changes, the Statutes of Canada (S.C.). This compilation includes new statutes and amendments to existing statutes only, and not the full text of all of the statutes in force. Statutes are organized in each yearly compilation by chapter number.

The Canadian Department of Justice’s Justice Laws Website is an important resource for Canadian statutory research (http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/). It provides free online access to federal statutes (and regulations promulgated pursuant to many of them) from 2001 to the present. The Canadian Legal Information Institute (CanLII) (http://www.canlii.org/en/) also provides access to official versions of Canadian statutes.

It is possible to track federal Canadian statutes back in time and see how and when they have been amended, as long as you understand the publication system described above. The Canadian Department of Justice has created a tool to assist with this process: the Table of Public Statutes and Responsible Ministers (http://laws.justice.gc.ca/eng/TablePublicStatutes/index.html). This resource includes all of the statutes from the 1985 Revised Statutes of Canada and their amendments.

Provincial statutes were also discussed. The example selected to demonstrate provincial statutory research was the Ontario Oleomargarine Act. According to this statute, which was repealed in 1997, oleomargarine is “any food substance other than butter, of whatever origin, source or composition that is prepared for the same uses as butter and that is manufactured wholly or in part from any fat or oil other than that of milk[].” (Source: Ontario Provincial Government e-Laws website, at http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/repealedstatutes/english/elaws_rep_statutes_90005_e.htm.) Ontario enacted some strict legal requirements related to the use of this substance, including the prohibition of mixing it with butter for sale or to serve to the public. This statute just goes to show that statutory research can offer an interesting glimpse into social concerns at a particular point in history on both sides of the border.
The J-1 Tuesday afternoon session; “Asking Hard Questions: Teaching Through Questions and Controversy” offered a number of ideas for energizing your classroom and encouraging your students to really engage with the information. Based on Bloom’s Taxonomy, the speakers gave suggestions for developing questions that grab student attention while covering course content and assessing student learning.

Meg Butler of Georgia State University College of Law was the first speaker. Starting from her advice to “prep your questions”, she gave suggestions for developing good questions. One of these was the “think-pair-share” which asks students to pair up, think over the question, and then share with the class. Another was the “Exit Strategy” that asked the students what the most important thing they learned in that class. She also ran a role-playing game that allowed the audience to experience good questioning techniques.

Charles Pipins of the Florida Coastal School of Law demonstrated using controversy to teach. He first played a YouTube clip of a reality TV show that revolved around a controversial legal situation (marriage between first cousins) that led into a series of questions, such as “how would you start the research?”, “which sources would you look in?”, “Based on your research, what questions would you ask the client”, etc. His presentation demonstrated ways to grab student attention and immerse them in a simulated “real world” research problem. He discussed the benefits of using controversy to engage students, and also cautioned teachers that controversial issues can be emotionally upsetting for students.

The last speaker was Michael Robak, who spoke on metacognition and Bloom’s taxonomy in the classroom. He discussed how to ask questions that encourage the students to think about what they know and what they don’t know, and use that knowledge to drive their legal research process. As an example, he gave a legal research question about whether an institution that advocates legislation can have nonprofit status. Students looking at the tax code would find a statute stating that if a substantial amount of the institution’s activities are about advocating legislation, then they cannot have nonprofit status. However, through a series of questions, students can be brought to an “aha” moment when they realize that “substantial” isn’t necessarily clear, and that a treatise which has cases interpreting the meaning of “substantial” would be a critical next step.

Asking Hard Questions: Teaching Through Questions and Controversy provided many ideas to help teachers create lessons that engage student interest and help students analyze and evaluate both the legal research process and the information they find.

(Continued from page 11)

AALL Boston... (cont’d)

the law librarians who had helped me in law school. The reconnections helped me realize that AALL wasn’t an overwhelming conference, but more of a reunion.

By far one of my favorite moments of the conference happened to be one of the final ones. Perhaps you caught my whoop of joy and happy dance on Tuesday when I won the free conference registration raffle before I had to run off to catch my shuttle to the airport.

See you next year.
AALL Program Reviews

CONELL Grants

[Ed. Note: The CONELL Grants are cash awards to enable newer law librarians to attend CONELL in conjunction with the AALL Annual Meeting. As a condition of the award, each winner agrees to write a short article for the ALL-SIS Newsletter about her/his experience at CONELL.]

My CONELL Experience
Kelly Leong, Duke University School of Law

Attending CONELL, thanks to the ALL-SIS grant I received, was a great pleasure and fantastic experience. Having attended the two previous AALL Annual Meetings in Denver and Philadelphia, I came to CONELL with some annual meeting experience, but still feeling a little lost among the hustle and bustle. Having been employed at Duke University School of Law since I was a library student, CONELL was an important opportunity to meet newer law librarians from firms and other academic institutions with similar questions to mine: How do I join committees? What are special interest sections? Am I getting the most out my AALL membership? What do you do in the exhibit hall?

The morning session was devoted to learning about AALL and the Executive Board, with breakout sessions comprised of an executive board member and a group of newer librarians. It was an opportunity to ask questions and get some answers. My group sat down with board member, Diane Rodriguez, for a discussion about the daily challenges we face, advancing in the profession, and growing within AALL. We then went on to a mini version of the exhibition hall where all the SIS’s, caucuses and other AALL groups had representatives to chat with us. Of course, they passed out lots of candy along with information. (After three Annual Meetings, I have learned that you can go the entire conference without paying for a meal, but there is no such thing as a free lunch.)

After enjoying the morning activities and lunch, we spent the afternoon building our networking skills. The Mocktail Reception was an interesting and unexpected feature of CONELL, replacing the city tour offered at previous CONELLS. All attendees were given an alias and provided with a list of facts and interests for our assumed persona. The group then networked under these assumed identities to build networking skills. Presumably, our skills were sharpened given the need to improvise with limited information about our assumed identity. There were lots of laughs as individuals embellished their list of facts and we were forced to move away from our familiar networking questions (where do you work, how long have you been there, etc.).

The most valuable part of my CONELL experience was meeting newer law librarians from law firms. As an academic librarian teaching legal research, it is important to know what law firm librarians encounter with their new associates. For example, what research skills do new associates lack? How can the academic librarian teach their students to avoid the $85,000 Lexis or Westlaw bill? (That one is an actual anecdote from CONELL.) It has always been my goal to work collaboratively with firm librarians to develop my teaching skills and to teach my students research skills that will serve them not only as students, but as attorneys. I met so many wonderful law firm librarians and I am looking forward to developing a broader network of librarian professionals beyond my (fantastic) Duke colleagues.

CONELL was a rewarding experience and I want to thank the membership of ALL-SIS for allowing me the opportunity to attend. I highly recommend CONELL to newer law librarians.
Just Your Typical CONELL Day: So I see that you own a greenhouse...”

Jennifer Mart-Rice, Chase College of Law

Walking into Republic Ballroom A at 8:00 A.M. on a Saturday morning for CONELL was not necessarily my idea of “cheerful fun” after a long day of travel and a night out in Boston. However, after a few cups of coffee, I was off to take on the “world” consisting of those individuals who would be, or who already are, my colleagues for what I hope will be many years to come. I was very grateful that the Committee members and those who helped at CONELL this year were very welcoming and appeared to be in very high spirits. We all know what that means: when you are given a smile you cannot resist returning it in kind.

The early morning events went by very quickly and gave me a chance to hear from a variety of individuals associated with the greater AALL association. In addition to these meet and greets, we were given the opportunity to introduce ourselves to other CONELL attendees and discover where people were employed, some of their hobbies, and other information that we otherwise would have never discovered. With all of this information reeling through our heads, we were divided into two groups and sent our separate ways: some to “Speed Networking” and others to the “Marketplace.” Here is where my day proceeded to an all new level of “interesting.”

While trying to open a door I, being the not so cautious or tentative person at times and with an apparent a lack of caffeine for the day, happened to slice open the top of my right index finger. Not only did this cause me to be late to our speed networking session, which I can assure you is not the impression you want to make to a room full of people, I also had to sit in the very front chair with what I envisioned to be an enormous white paper towel “Band-Aid” to make up part of my not so inconspicuous attire. Of course, being right-handed, I sat for the first ten or so minutes in vain trying to avoid shaking hands with those who came to sit in front of me, as my finger throbbed on. As we all know, this is something that others will quickly begin to notice, especially when part of the focus at CONELL this year was to help people learn how to build our social skills and to network more efficiently.

During this particular session members of CONELL were milling around the room to verify that everyone was moving along at the designated time, making general observations, and giving social pointers. It was at this moment, about ten minutes into the session, that my savior appeared and rescued me. Yes, “savior” does sounds extreme, however considering my throbbing finger, the odd looks I was getting from my lack of handshaking, and the overall awkwardness that had appeared and seemed to be teasing my future forty-five minutes, that is precisely how I pictured her at this moment. Like many CONELL attendees, I’m sure that I appeared a little overwhelmed and a little awkward inside the session but overall I am pretty sure that I appeared to be in distress as she took pity on me and made it her personal goal to rescue me from my situation and pain by searching for First Aid supplies. After an eternity, which in reality was probably five minutes, she returned with supplies to clean my wound and to bandage it properly. I do believe that it has not been since my childhood that I have appreciated medical attention so much!

Funny how sometimes the little things in life do make your whole day better and at this moment, in my so far information overloaded day, I finally had a moment of mental rest. Perhaps it was my mild case of hypochondria rearing its ugly head, which is an entirely different short story, but things appeared to become less awkward during the speed networking event and I was able to focus on what

(Continued on page 20)
my colleagues were saying and not not my finger that felt to be the size of a banana due to its throbbing. Now, one month and a nasty-looking scar later, I am able to chuckle at the situation, truly appreciate what a mental difference the actions of this person made, and how nice it is to know that people do care and help out those in trauma without fear of a lawsuit. The point that attendees should gain from my little experience is that we should all be grateful and appreciative that people like her are among our present/future colleagues; hence why she makes savior status.

At this moment I briefly considered turning back the clock to restart my day or crawl into bed to sleep off the afternoon. However, the former, without Superman by my side to fly around the world to reverse time and save me, was unlikely and the latter just seemed to be a copout strategy. By now you’re probably thinking: “Wow! This chick had quite the morning. She must either be quite unlucky or a melodramatic mess.” I just want to clear the air and state that I’m not particularly overly dramatic but sometimes the little things build upon one another until it’s just a hot mess. In regards to luck, let me just tell you that not only am I lucky enough to have gotten a scholarship to attend this interesting and informative conference, (thank you very much to all of those who played a part in that) but somehow I was lucky enough to convince the powers that be that I had had enough drama throughout my morning and perhaps I needed to have an afternoon filled with hysterics. I mean really, what more could you ask for from your “average” CONELL/AALL Annual meeting?

After lunch we were led to another Ballroom to participate in our Mocktail Dessert Reception. As a brief overview, a Mocktail is designed to encourage participants to engage with one another to discover what they can contribute to another or where they can benefit from the other person’s experience and/or expertise.\(^1\) Participants are given individual profiles that detail their occupation, personal interests, and family life. Mocktail attendees then attempt to network throughout the room. The purpose is for everyone to find those individuals with whom they share interests or who could provide services for a need that has been stated in your profile. When you made a connection with someone, you were to then exchange “business cards” and then work on exiting the conversation. However, it was quite the struggle to push one’s actual life into the background and try to be the person on your card. It was very hard to not ask a person where they really were employed and what their actual interests were; after all it was a great time to sit and mingle with others and get to know them a bit better. The card that I was given stated on one side that I owned my own greenhouse and floral shop and on the reverse that I was married to an investment banker and in our spare time we liked to take extreme vacations and perform extreme sports. Some of the information on my card did detail my actual life and so I did feel a little more confident discussing those things with others in the room.

The afternoon consisted of everyone wandering around the room in search of their potential mates while trying to memorize the information on their cards before they approached anyone. Even now, after a month, I cannot help but think that we all must have looked as if we were on a singles cruise in the Caribbean. The majority of the afternoon was filled with lots of giggles and long pauses as questions were asked and responses were “researched” on the back of our individual cards. In addition to these entertaining moments came those speed greeters who seemed to be lingering on the outside of most social circles waiting for the proper moment to...
Your Typical CONELL Day (cont’d)

pounce and disappear just as suddenly. I call them speed greeters because they were simply lingering about with what I saw as a singular motive: to give out and grab all of the necessary cards in order to speed up the process of the Mocktail. I must point out that at one moment I did consider engaging and then sending off one of them on a wild goose hunt for some fictitious person who would be their perfect match. Sadly, I reprimanded myself mentally and reminded myself that not everyone is a social butterfly.

With about fifteen minutes left in the socialization part of the Mocktail, another gentleman and I were discussing these speed greeters because one had just left our sides empty handed after we had failed her compatibility test. It was then that another somewhat smiley gentleman made a beeline in our direction and I felt both of us stiffen slightly while we gauged his motive. As we greeted him with a smile he shook both of our hands and turned his attention to me. “So I see that you own a greenhouse and floral shop. I would like to exchange cards with you so that I can contact you later about better ways in which to grow my pot.” I think that for a solid minute I stood there in stunned silence as he then turned to my colleague and said something along the lines of: “And I see you are in international business. Perhaps I could get your card to discuss exporting my pot that she’s helping me grow.” As you can imagine, we were all three laughing together as we properly introduced ourselves and discussed this apparent immediate shift in profession since his card, from what I can remember, dealt nothing with drug cultivation or exportation. I cannot imagine ending the Mocktail on a better note.

Later that afternoon when we were reviewing the Mocktail and our experiences, quite a few participants expressed their dissatisfaction with the interaction and the situation overall. However, I feel that it is important for septics to see the overarching goal of this particular interaction. It put everyone on a level playing field so that those with varying backgrounds, employment differences, differing political views, and the like could focus on their social and networking skills over their self-promotion skills. Let’s face it, none of us were yet very comfortable about our jobs, if we had one, and no one is to the point that they cannot benefit from a little more social interaction and skill building. Therefore, if you took nothing else away from CONELL, make sure you did take away this: many of the colleagues that we are going to be with for the remainder of our careers are quite amusing, interesting, and supportive. So embrace them as such and have the career of a lifetime. I’m just glad that I got to meet them first at CONELL, 2012.

---


Piercing the Veil of Sovereignty (cont’d)

If the case is found to be admissible, then it is subjected to an initial analysis, which determines whether there was a violation. Thereafter, the case, based on the referral requests of the parties throughout the course of the proceedings, can make its way through the Chamber and Grand Chamber.

An ECHR member nation that loses a case in the ECtHR is required to take action so that there is “just satisfaction” for the personal plaintiff and all people. This ensures that these same human rights violations are not committed in the future. The status of this action can be monitored by resolutions and action plans.

Jim concluded by discussing the impact of the European Union becoming a party to the ECHR.
AALL Program Reviews

The Law of the Salem Witch Trials (D-3)

Steven R. Miller, President, Ohio Regional Association of Law Libraries (ORALL)

The Legal History and Rare Books SIS sponsored an impressive educational program for all librarians and researchers interested in the historical development of law and use of early American legal research sources. Program presenters explained how seventeenth-century, Anglo-American courts reconciled supernatural beliefs with the rule of law. The presenters identified and showed the primary and secondary legal history materials that were used in the discussion including rare books, scarce documents, and materials now widely available electronically.

Lawrence Ross, of the Jacob Burns Law Library of George Washington University, reviewed the legal research resources used in the program, outlined the governmental organization and laws of the Massachusetts Colony, and the death of Giles Corey who was pressed to death during the Salem Witch Trials (1692). Mark Podvia of the Dickinson School of Law Library of the Pennsylvania State University reviewed the law of witchcraft in Europe, England, and the American colonies. Karen Wahl, also of the Jacob Burns Law Library of George Washington University, discussed the Salem Witch Trials of 1692, which account for one-half of all executed persons convicted of witchcraft in the American colonies in the seventeenth century. Lawrence and Karen used the rich Salem Witch Trials collection of the Jacob Burns Law Library and databases of pre-Revolutionary materials to prepare their presentations.

In the past 10 years, several online resources have become available that provide researchers with digital images of historical documents, books, and other materials published in the colonial period. Subscription online resources include: Making of Modern Law (MOML) Legal Treatises 1800-1926, MOML Trials 1600-1926, MOML Primary Sources, World Trials, Rise of American Law, HeinOnline Law Journal Library, Justis English Reports, The Publications of the Seldon Society, Gale Eighteenth Century Collections Online (ECCO), JSTOR, and LLMC Digital. Lawrence Ross gave tips on searching for old English words appearing in early Anglo-American documents. For example, when searching for words containing the letter “f” for the letter “s,” search for the letter “s” first, and then go back into these databases and substitute the letter “f” for the letter “s.”

The presenters discussed how to locate primary and secondary historical legal sources on early American witchcraft trials, including publicly available databases. Free online resources used included: the Library of Congress, Project Gutenberg, Internet Archive, Google Books, HathiTrust Digital Library, and UVA Salem Witch Trial Documentary Archive and Transcription Project. The availability of subscription and free online resources allows faculty and students to research historical documents from their laptop and tablet computers.

Lawrence Ross’ PowerPoint, replete with images of books, illustrations, and historical documents, included only one document that was unavailable online - Staunford, Les Plees del Coron (1557); however, the translation is available in electronic form: Sir Matthew Hale, Historia Placitorum Coronae, or The History of the Pleas of the Crown (1736) (via ECCO). All other documents used in the presentation were available online. This represents an impressive quantity of pre-Revolutionary materials now available online to researchers. Lawrence mentioned the use of these online databases for an advanced legal research history seminar.

Mark Podvia stated the law of witchcraft practiced in the American colonies in the seventeenth
and early eighteenth centuries can be traced all the way back to references found in the Bible (e.g., Exodus XXII, 18; Leviticus XX, 27; and Deuteronomy XVIII, 10, 11). Inquisitors Heinrich Kramer and Jacob Sprenger wrote The Malleus Maleficarum. First published in Germany, witch trials began throughout Europe following the publication of this book and continued until the early 1700’s. An estimated 40,000 to 100,000 people were executed during that period for witchcraft. Seventy-five to eighty-five percent of them were women.

The Witchcraft Act of 1542 (33 Hen. VIII c. 8) is the first Act to define witchcraft as a felony in England. Edward VI repealed the Act in 1547. The Witchcraft Act of 1562 (5 Eliz. I c. 16) instituted the death penalty only where the accused caused actual harm through the use of witchcraft. The Witchcraft Act of 1604 (2 Ja. I c. 12) expanded the Act of 1562 to bring the penalty of death without benefit of clergy to anyone who invoked evil spirits or communed with familiar spirits. The Act remained in force until 1735. Midwife Joan Wright of Jamestown, Virginia was the first person in the American colonies known to have been arraigned for being a witch. The record is unclear as to whether she was found guilty of practicing witchcraft.

In 1635, the Maryland Assembly adopted the English Witchcraft Act of 1604. The first person accused of witchcraft in New England was Jane Hawkins, a midwife, in 1638. Three later years later, the General Court of the Massachusetts Bay Colony adopted the witchcraft act. Unlike English law, a person in the American colonies could be executed for being convicted for just being a witch. No harm had to be shown as a result of practicing witchcraft as was required in England.

Connecticut enacted the death penalty for anyone convicted of being a witch in 1642. Also Young of Windsor was the first person known to have been executed for witchcraft in the American colonies. She was hung in Hartford, Connecticut on May 26, 1647. In 1648, Margaret Jones of Charlestown, Massachusetts, a healer and herbalist, became the first woman executed by hanging for practicing witchcraft in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. John and Joan Carrington of Wethersfield, Connecticut were the first married couple executed for witchcraft in the American colonies. The captain of a ship bound for Maryland in 1659 hanged Elizabeth Richardson because others claimed she had caused a storm at sea using witchcraft.

Margaret Mattson was tried for witchcraft in Pennsylvania in 1683. At the only recorded trial for witchcraft in Pennsylvania, Mattson was found guilty “of having the Common Forme of a Witch, but not Guilty In manner and Forme as Shee stands Endicted” and sentenced to six months good behavior. According to tradition, William Penn asked her “Hast thou ridden through the air on a broomstick?” After the confused defendant replied “yes,” William Penn reportedly said there was nothing in the laws of Pennsylvania that made riding a broomstick a crime.

Nearly 200 were accused of being witches at the Salem Witch Trials of 1692, where 19 were hung and one pressed to death. Giles Corey was pressed to death under heavy stones for refusing to submit to a trial for witchcraft. Lawrence Ross examined the penalty of peine et fort as a penalty for contempt for refusing to stand trial rather than punishment for the alleged crime.

Karen Wahl examined the evidentiary rules used during the Salem Witch Trials (1692). Breaking with English and Massachusetts law, the special Court of Oyer and Terminer allowed the admission of “spectral evidence” testimony. Increase Mather, President of Harvard College, wrote Cases of Conscience Concerning Evil Spirits In a Dialogue between S. & B (1692).
Mather argued it was “better that ten suspected witches should escape than one innocent person should be condemned.” He recommended the court exclude spectral evidence. Samuel Willard, a Boston clergyman, circulated Some Miscellany Observations On Our Present Debates in a Dialogue between S. & B (1692). Willard argued Satan might create the specter of an innocent person. A recommended reading on spectral evidence is Wendell D. Cracker, “Spectral Evidence, Non Spectral Acts of Witchcraft, and Confession at Salem in 1692,” The Historical Journal, 40(2): 331-358 (June 1997).

Governor Sir William Phips ordered the Court of Oyer and Terminer to exclude spectral evidence from trial and to require proof of guilt by clear and convincing evidence. With spectral evidence excluded from trial, twenty-eight of the last thirty-three witchcraft trials ended in acquittals. Phips ended the trials in late 1692 and pardoned those imprisoned in May 1693. After the Salem Witch Trials, witch-hunts, prosecutions, and trials declined in the American colonies and eventually died out in the early 1700’s.

Breakfasts with ALL-SIS
Kumar Percy Jayasuriya, Georgetown Law Library

During the AALL meeting in Boston the Academic Law Libraries – Special Interest Section (ALL – SIS) organized two breakfast speakers who were especially interesting and worth noting. Organized by Erika Wayne of Stanford law library, these two presentations covered issues of interest to all academic law librarians.

Daniel Shuman of the Sunlight Foundation spoke during the annual ALL – SIS breakfast meeting and covered issues of government transparency. While this is a topic of frequent debate with in academic law libraries, Daniel brought different viewpoints based upon grass-root traditions of fostering public participation in the government process. AALL as an organization and law librarians individually advocate for government organizations to publish legal information. The Sunlight Foundation shares that goal and also seeks to provide opportunities for the public to monitor governmental actions and eliminate corruption. Daniel’s presentation included several new ideas which stimulated conversation after the 7 AM meeting. His PowerPoint slides are available online. http://sunlightfoundation.com/blog/2012/07/24/law-libraries-government-transparency-and-the-internet/


The second morning event was also a 7 AM session. This was an interactive workshop on management techniques led by an improv comedian. In slightly more than an hour Zach Ward succeeded in waking up a groggy and possibly grumpy group of law librarians. He also managed to cover a significant amount of ground about how to communicate more effectively and listen more successfully. The most amazing moment was when he convinced a shy attendee to participate in a demonstration. Not only did she appear to enjoy it, she also proved to be the most effective communicator of that exercise. While some in the audience were not ready for interactive learning first thing in the morning, most participants were thrilled to attend an educational session that made them laugh. You can learn more about the improv group online at

(Continued from page 23)
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Welcome to the new academic year! Now in its fourth year, A Law Librarian in the Dark discusses movies for law libraries and law library feature film collections. Movies about lawyers, law schools, litigation, famous trials, crime and punishment, or movies that contain “legal themes” are all possible topics. If you have a DVD title that you would like me to review, e-mail me at yasmin.harker@law.cuny.edu.

In this issue, instead of a movie, I will be looking back at a tremendously engaging TV series: Battlestar Galactica. The series, which ran from 2004-2009, is an excellent show that touched on a number of legal and political issues including torture, due process, civil rights and civil liberties, the role of the military in civilian matters, abortion, religion and the law, and the role of technology in society.

The 2004 series is a reimagining of a 1978 television series with the same name. It is about a human civilization which lives on a group of twelve planets known as the Twelve Colonies of Kobol (the planet names are derived form signs of the Zodiac: Caprica, Tauron, Sagittaron, etc.) The humans have been at war with a cybernetic race called the Cylon. Although the humans had created the Cylon to be soldiers and domestic servants, the Cylon eventually revolted.

The series begins with a Cylon sneak attack that decimates virtually the entire human race. Out of billions of people, only 50,000 (those who happened to be in spaceships during the attack) remain. Headed by Commander William Adama (Edward James Olmos), the Battlestar Galactica leads the surviving ships as they flee from the Cylon. The surviving humans appoint Secretary of Education Laura Roslin (Mary McDonnel) as President and Adama and Roslin decide that in order to survive, they must find the mythological thirteenth colony called “Earth” and start a new civilization away from the clutches of the Cylon. However, there are signs that Cylon spies have infiltrated the surviving population and are planning something.

Obviously, it is impossible to describe all the plot twists and turns that happened over the five-year run of the series, but the episodes are filled with fascinating legal issues. Several episodes deal with the legal implications of interrogation, torture, and prisoner abuse. Others discuss the place of military governance over a civilian population. In one episode, the survivors must decide whether abortion will be legal. In another episode, the place of religious leaders in government is explored.

Battlestar Galactica is so ripe with legal issues for discussion that a series of three interviews between law professors Daniel Solove, David Hoffman and Deven Desai, and the series creators Ron Moore and David Eike were held for that purpose. Part I explores the legal systems of the show and the balance between civil liberties and security. Part II discusses politics and commerce and Part III discusses legal issues related to Cylons, such as the legal status of robots and Cylon legal structures. It also discusses religion in the law. The interviews can be found at the Concurring Opinions blog: http://www.concurringopinions.com/archives/2008/02/battlestar_gala.html

The DVD set, “Battlestar Galactica, the Complete Series” was released in April 2010 by Universal Studios.
As many of you know, the ALL-SIS website is in the process of migrating to the new AALLNet platform. (More information from AALL is at http://www.aallnet.org/Redesign/)

**New Site - Overview**

The ALL-SIS site is our main online repository of SIS information and resources. Our site’s audience includes ALL-SIS members and committees, members of AALL, and others interested in academic law libraries. The site is hosted by AALL, which recently adopted a new content management system that many SISs will be using for their sites. These new SIS sites will have a more consistent look and feel, and they’ll match the updated branding on AALLNet. So our new ALL-SIS site will look quite different, but rest assured that it will still have the content that’s available on the current site.

**Migration - Overview**

The current timeline is:

- **August** – SIS Webmasters finishing reviewing websites and planning for conversion
- **September** – AALL will use a vendor to automatically migrate current ALL-SIS content into the new CMS
- **October – December** – content will be “cleaned up” and organized
- **January** – New ALL-SIS website will launch

The ALL-SIS site migration will involve over 2000 files. On the current site, over 150 files have been updated in 2012; approximately half of the files are HTML; and there are three password-protected groups of files (Collection Development information, the Faculty Services Toolkit, and the Legal Research teaching materials.) In other words: there is quite a bit of content that will be transitioned to the new site.

**September Status Report**

AALL’s vendor has downloaded content from the current site and will be uploading it to the new system. Before January 2013, when the new site is scheduled to go live, the ALL-SIS webmaster will be maintaining two separate sites. (Any changes to the existing, publicly-available site must also be made on the new, "work-in-progress" site.) So if you are looking forward to any substantial changes or additions to ALL-SIS site content, please stay tuned for the January launch!

Questions? Feel free to contact Ellen Augustiniak, Chair of the Task Force to Review and Update the ALL-SIS Web Presence at eaugustini-ak@law.uci.edu, or Creighton Miller, ALL-SIS Webmaster at creighton.miller@washburn.edu.

(Piercing the Veil of Sovereignty (cont’d))

This benefits the entire human rights regime in Europe, as EU decisions can affect human rights.

Overall, this program was very informative and interesting for law librarians who are tasked with researching human rights issues. This can be a difficult area to research, as there are so many different treaties and organizations whose purpose is the protection of human rights. However, the four presenters did an excellent job of describing how human rights are being protected around the world, and how researchers can more easily find information about these important activities.

(Continued from page 21)
Nicholas Stark joined the staff of The George Washington University Law Library in July 2012 as a reference librarian.

The Moritz Law Library at The Ohio State University recently hired Ingrid Mattson as a reference librarian. Ingrid has a J.D. from Seattle University and an M.L.I.S. from the University of Washington. She previously practiced law as an IP attorney, and interned with the Gallagher Law Library at the University of Washington and the New York Law Institute.

Mary Beth Chappell is the new assistant law librarian for research at the MacMillan Law Library at the Emory University School of Law. Mary Beth has a J.D. from Emory University and her M.S.I.S. from the University of Tennessee. Prior to becoming a librarian, she worked in the publishing industry for Zachary Shuster Hormsworth Literary and Entertainment Agency.

Melanie Oberlin Knapp is the now the Head of Reference and Instructional Services at the George Mason University School of Law Library. Melanie started at George Mason in the summer of 2010 as the Instructional Services Librarian, and previously worked at the Moritz Law Library at Ohio State University.

Taryn Rucinski is the editor of PEN-e, an environmental notes blog from the Pace Law School Library. The blog can be found at http://paceenvironmentalnotes.blogspot.com/ and is a gateway to news, commentary, legal research notes, new books and articles and legislation on Environmental Law, Energy, Land Use Law and related legal topics. Taryn is the environmental law / reference librarian at Pace Law School.

The ALL-SIS Newsletter is pleased to recognize three of our members who are listed in the Fastcase Top 50 for 2012: Tom Boone, Reference Librarian at Loyola Law School; Jason Eiseman, Librarian for Emerging Technologies at Yale Law School; and Roger Skalbeck, Associate Law Librarian for Electronic Resources & Services at Georgetown University Law Library. We want to congratulate them on their excellent work and contributions to the legal profession.

Dennis S. Sears, associate director for Legal Research and Reference at Brigham Young University’s Howard W. Hunter Law Library, received the Daniel L. Wade Foreign, Comparative and International Law Special Interest Section Outstanding Service Award at the annual meeting of the American Association of Law Libraries in July 2012.

The Lawton Chiles Legal Information Center at the University of Florida Levin College of Law announces the hiring of three new librarians, effective August 2012:

Shamika Dalton joined the University of Florida Levin College of Law as a Reference Librarian and Adjunct Professor of Law. Dalton graduated summa cum laude from North Carolina Central University with a Bachelor of Social Work in 2008, and she received the Dual JD/MLS degrees in December 2011.

Michael G. Moore started at the University of Florida Levin College of Law as a Reference Librarian and Adjunct Professor of Law. Moore graduated summa cum laude from the University of Pittsburgh with a Bachelor of Philosophy and earned a master’s degree from the University of Iowa. He earned his law degree, with honors, from the University of Florida Levin College of Law where he served as editor in chief.
of the Florida Law Review. Moore earned an MLIS and a Special Certificate in Law Librarianship from the University of Washington where he received the Earl C. Borgeson Research in Law Librarianship Award. Before joining UF Moore completed directed fieldwork at the University of Michigan Law Library.

Loren Turner joined the University of Florida Levin College of Law as a Reference Librarian and Adjunct Professor of Law. Turner earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in Italian Studies from Loyola University in Chicago and received a J.D. from American University Washington College of Law. After graduating from law school, Ms. Turner practiced law at a boutique law firm in downtown Chicago specializing in family law litigation. She then earned her Master of Science (M.S.) in Library and Information Science from the University of Illinois. While pursuing her Master of Science, Ms. Turner worked at the Pritzker Legal Research Cen-

AALL Announcements

Save the Date – AALL Law Library Management Online Course

November 1-December 14 AALL will offer a six-week online course designed to help you achieve higher management performance and advance your career potential. You will have an opportunity to connect and collaborate with peers. Topics will include effective law library management, communication effectiveness, negotiation and making the case for library value, and more. Stay tuned—registration opens in October.

AALL2go Pick of the Month

AALL’s Continuing Professional Education Committee selected the following as “pick of the month” for August, and September:

August: Accounting - Prepare for Your Future

Do you need to learn how to read a balance sheet, an income statement, or interpret cash flows? Perhaps you yearn for a better understanding of financial auditing processes or more insight into how funds are allocated in your organization. Spencer Simons, director of the O’Quinn Law Library at the University of Houston, reviews the basics of accounting reports and procedures to help law librarians better understand the terminology and accounting processes used by the financial managers in their organizations.

Why should law librarians have a better sense of accounting principles? Law librarians who understand the drivers of financial decisions in their organizations will better equip themselves to work effectively within the budgeting process. Many law librarians also do business intelligence research and find themselves working with unfamiliar language.

This 69-minute audio program was presented at the AALL Annual Meeting in Denver on July 12, 2010, and is available free to members on AALL2go.


At the 2012 AALL Annual Meeting, two law firm librarians gave a detailed presentation on how to prove the true value of law librarians. They demonstrated how hard data and soft skills can be used in a numbers-based evaluation that can be effectively used to show worth.

(Continued on page 29)
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Using the framework of a value assurance cycle, the presenters showed how librarians can audit existing staff and services; align library goals; appraise operations by determining a quantifiable measurement of time, cost, and quality; and act on the gathered data by making changes in the library. In addition to showing the importance of hard data, librarians must also showcase their “soft skills” that are often excluded from libraries’ annual reports. The presenters emphasized the importance of including the librarian’s leadership qualities and emotional intelligence when illustrating the value of the library.

This session provides a detailed overview of how to implement quality-improvement projects to prove the value of librarians, resources, and services. All library managers who have been challenged to show the value of their libraries would benefit from watching this excellent program. This program is presented in streaming video with accompanying PowerPoint slides.

Find this and more than 100 other free continuing education programs and webinars for AALL members on AALL2go!

ALL-SIS Committees 2012 - 2013

Note: Charges for this year’s Committees are posted on the ALL-SIS website at http://www.aallnet.org/sis/allsis/committees/charges/index.asp. Last year’s Committee Reports are posted at http://www.aallnet.org/sis/allsis/committees/reports/index.asp.

AALS Liaison
Barbara Bintliff
Board Liaison: Leah Sandwell-Weiss

ALL-NEW
Carissa Vogel, Chair
Amanda Runyon, Vice-Chair (2014)
Robb Farmer (2013)
Elizabeth Farrell (2013)
James Kelly (2013)
Shawn Friend (2014)
Julie Lim (2014)
Jacob Sayward (2013)
Colleen Martinez Skiner (2013)
Duane Strojny (2013)
Carla P. Wale (2014)
Board Liaison: Kumar Jayasuriya

Archives/Website
David Lehmann, Chair
Christine George (2014)
Margaret Maes (2014)
Barbara Ginzburg (eGroup Manager)
Barbara Traub (Newsletter Editor)
Anne Robins (ALL-SIS Archivist)
Creighton Miller (ALL-SIS Webmaster)
Board Liaison: Leah Sandwell-Weiss

Awards
Jane Larrington, Chair
Irene Crisci (2013)
Lisa Goodman (2013)
Matthew M Morrison (2013)
Cathy Wagar (2014)
Annmarie Zell (2014)
Board Liaison: Debora Person
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Breakfasts with ALL-SIS (cont’d)


ALL – SIS hosted several presentations and roundtable discussions sessions in Boston. Of all those offerings, these two gatherings were exceptional.
ALL-SIS Committees (cont’d)

(Continued from page 29)

Bluebook Task Force
Ryan Harrington - Co-Chair
Andrew Christensen - Co-Chair
Patrick Flanagan (2013)
Kumar Jayasuriya (2013)
Isa Lang (2013)
Gordon Russell (2013)
Terri Saint-Amour (2013)
Merle Slyhoff (2013)
I-Wei Wang (2014)
Board Liaison: Leah Sandwell-Weiss

Bylaws
Joel Fishman, Chair
Beth Adelman (2013)
Amy D. Ash (2014)
Dan Baker (2013)
James Duggan (2013)
Lynn Wishart (2014)
Board Liaison: Debora Person

CALI
Kris Niedringhaus, Chair (2014)
Sue Altmeyer (2014)
Beth DiFelice (2013)
Shaun Esposito (2013)
Joseph Gerken (2015)
Faye Jones (2015)
Susanna Leers (2015)
Tawnya Plumb (2015)
Board Liaison: Lauren Collins

Collection Development
Lisa Junghahn, Chair (2013)
Theodora Belniak (2013)
Patricia Fox (2014)
Jean Mattimoe (2013)
Wendy Moore (2013)
Anne Myers (2013)
Eric Parker (2013)
Olivia L Weeks (2013)
Helen Wohl (2014)
Jane Woldow (2013)
Xiaoming Zhang (2013)
Board Liaison: Meg Butler

Continuing Education
Julie Graves Krishnaswami, Chair (2013)
Jennifer Wertkin, Vice-Chair (2014)
Sara Gilles (2013)
Beth Given (2014)
Gary Hill (2013)
Catherine Leamer (2013)
Charles Pipins (2014)
Caroline Young (2014)
Board Liaison: Lauren Collins

Continuing Status/Tenure
Uwe Beltz, Chair
Eric Young, Vice-Chair (2014)
Benjamin Carlson (2013)
Elizabeth Caulfield (2014)
Steven Ellis (2014)
Raquel Gabriel (2013)
Gary Hill (2013)
Miriam Murphy (2013)
Michele Thomas (2014)
Board Liaison: Lauren Collins

Directors’ Breakfast
See Local Arrangements, below

eGroup Manager
Barbara Ginzburg, List Manager
Board Liaison: Leah Sandwell-Weiss

Faculty Services
Jessica Wimer, Chair (2013)
Maggie Adams (2013)
June Casey (2013)
Jen Davitt (2013)
Bill Ketchum (2013)
Lisa Peters (2013)
Katy Stein (2014)
Christine Tsou (2014)
Stefanie Weigmann (2013)
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Clare Willis (2013)
Board Liaison: Lauren Collins

Legal Research & Sourcebook
Nolan Wright, Chair
Deborah Schander, Vice-Chair (2014)
David Bachman (2013)
Jan Bissett (2014)
Susan Boland (2013)
Catherine Deane (2014)
Julienne Grant (2013)
George R. Jackson (2014)
Adeen Postar (2013)
Laura Ross (2013)
Christine Ryan (2013)
Nina Scholtz (2014)
Karen Skinner (2014)
Marsha Stacey (2014)
Board Liaison: Kumar Jayasuriya

Local Arrangements
Penny Hazelton, Chair
Board Liaison: Meg Butler
[Ed. Note: The Directors’ Breakfast, Middle Managers’ Breakfast, and Local Arrangements Committees are being combined into one Local Arrangements Committee.]

Membership
Colleen Manning, Chair
Nona Beisenherz
Sarah Gotschall
Lisa Parisi
Adeen Postar
Carissa Vogel
Board Liaison: Lauren Collins

Middle Managers’ Meeting
See Local Arrangements, above.

Newsletter
Barbara Gellis Traub, Chair & Editor
Theodora Belnia (2014)
Taryn Rucinski (2014)
Margaret Schilt (2014)
Karen Schneiderman (2014)
Thomas Sneed (2014)
Yasmin Sokar-Harker (2013)
I-Wei Wang (2013)
Board Liaison: Leah Sandwell-Weiss

Nominations
Ron Wheeler, Chair
Joan Stringfellow, Vice-Chair
Ed Hart
Board Liaison: Kumar Jayasuriya

Programs
Shannon Burchard, Chair (2013)
Yasmin Sokkar Harker, Vice-Chair (2014)
David Armond (2014)
John Cannan (2013)
Christine Hepler (2014)
Elizabeth Outler (2014)
Kate Irwin-Smiler (2013)
Board Liaison: Meg Butler

Public Relations
Mark Popielarski, Chair (2013)
Valerie Aggerbeck (2014)
Jordan Gilbertson (2014)
Julia Jaet (2014)
Lisa Junghahn (2013)
Jessica Randall (2013)
Board Liaison: Debora Person

Research & Scholarship Committee
D.R. Jones, Chair (2013)
Andrea M. Alexander (2013)
Michael Chiorazzi (2013)
Susan DeMaine (2013)
Jordan Gilbertson (2013)
Benjamin John Keele (2013)
Anne Klinefelter (2013)
Sarah Lamdan (2013)
Catherine Lemmer (2013)
Ellen Richardson (2013)
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Statistics
Taryn Rucinski (2013)
Carla P. Wale (2013)
Board Liaison: Meg Butler

Alissa Black-Dorward, Chair (2013)
Uwe Beltz (2013)
Suzanne Corriell (2013)
Kimberli A Morris (2014)
Jason Sowards (2014)
Board Liaison: Kumar Jayasuriya

Strategic Planning
Merle Slyhoff, Chair (2013)
Casey Duncan (2013)
Todd Melnick (2013)
Margaret Schilt (2013)
Sabrina Sondhi (2013)
Andrew Winston (2013)
Jason Zarin (2013)
Board Liaison: Leah Sandwell-Weiss

Student Services
Morgan Stoddard, Chair (2013)
Frances Brillantine, Vice-Chair (2014)
Amy Ash (2014)
Maureen Cahill (2013)
Heather Casey (2013)
Patricia Dickerson (2013)
Stacy Etheredge (2014)
Jennifer Prilliman (2013)
Erin Schlicht (2014)
Board Liaison: Meg Butler

Task Force on Identifying Skills & Knowledge for Legal Practice
Susan Nevelow Mart, Chair (2013)
Toni Aiello (2013)
Sheri Lewis (2013)
Shawn Nevers (2013)
Alison Shea (2013)
Nolan Wright (2013)
Jason Zarin (2013)
Board Liaison: Debora Person

Task Force on Library Marketing & Outreach
Amanda Runyon, Chair (2013)
Carol Watson, Vice-Chair (2013)
L. Cindy Dabney (2013)
Liz McCurry Johnson (2013)
Emily Lawson (2013)
Shira Meagher (2013)
Jamie Sommer (2013)
TJ Striepe (2013)
Michelle Thomas (2013)
Board Liaison: Debora Person

Task Force on Scholarly Communication
Michelle Pearse, Co-chair
Ken Hirsch, Co-chair
Board Liaison: Kumar Jayasuriya

Task Force on the Use of Mobile Technology
Jenny Wondracek, Chair
Rhea Ballard-Thrower (2013)
Karina Condra (2013)
Whitney Curtis (2013)
Jez Gaddoura (2013)
Jamie Marie Keller (2013)
Nichelle Perry (2013)
Carla P. Wale (2013)
Michael Whiteman (2013)
Board Liaison: Debora Person

Task Force to Review & Update the ALL-SIS Web Presence
Ellen Augustiniak, Chair (2013)
Thomas Boone (2013)
Barbara Ginzburg (2013)
Jessica Hanes (2013)
Jacquelyn McCloud (2013)
Creighton Miller (ALL-SIS Webmaster)
Sharon Nelson (2013)
Courtney Selby (2013)
Board Liaison: Meg Butler

Webmaster
Creighton Miller
ALL-SIS was established in 1979 to promote interest in and to address issues of common concern to those employed in academic law libraries. The SIS serves as the umbrella organization for all interests—administration, collection development, consortia, directors, fees for service, interlibrary loan, public services, technical services, middle management, etc.

ALL-SIS provides opportunities for all librarians to contribute to the overall betterment of the entire academic law community. ALL-SIS has grown to approximately 1200 members and is the largest SIS in AALL. Our members come from all aspects of academic law librarianship. Because of the SIS’s broad coverage and subtopic focus, all those working in academic law libraries can benefit from membership and are en-

---

**The ALL-SIS Discussion Group**

The ALL-SIS discussion group, aka mailing list, is used for official ALL-SIS announcements, news from AALL, and discussion of topics of interest to our members. To read or post to the discussion group go to [http://community.aallnet.org/AALLNET/Communities/ViewDiscussions/AllDiscussions/](http://community.aallnet.org/AALLNET/Communities/ViewDiscussions/AllDiscussions/)

If you are not logged into AALLNET, you will have to do so. You can then choose the ALL-SIS Group from the list of eGroups. For more information consult the AALL My Communities Quick Start Users' Guide available at [http://www.aallnet.org/main-menu/Member-Communities/discuss/mycommunities-qsguide.pdf](http://www.aallnet.org/main-menu/Member-Communities/discuss/mycommunities-qsguide.pdf)

---

**ALL-SIS on the Web**


Electronic versions of The ALL-SIS Newsletter are available on our website, as well as other vital information.

---

**Newsletter Information & Deadlines for 2012 - 2013 Academic Year**

Please submit all articles and announcements to the ALL-SIS Newsletter Editor. Are you working on any interesting special projects? Have you attended a meeting and learned something you want to share with colleagues? Do you just want to rant and rave about some problems related to academic law librarianship? If you answered “yes” to any of these questions, please send your thoughts. Any format, printed, faxed, or e-mailed will do, but it would be easiest for Newsletter production if the article is sent either as an attached text or word processing file or as the body of an e-mail. The **deadline** for the next issue is **Jan. 31, 2013**. Thank you for your contributions and for your consideration.