The beginning of each academic year is always filled with excitement – meeting new students during orientation and welcoming back returning students as classes begin. All of this, of course, is punctuated by our efforts to reexamine and prepare our libraries in anticipation of their arrival. For me, this year, the excitement is underscored by the opportunity to serve as your ALL-SIS Chair for 2019-2020.

Before embracing the new semester, I would be remiss if I did not give one last nod to the splendidness of the passing summer. It was wonderful to see so many of you at the AALL Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. I want to sincerely thank our Local Arrangements Committee and the Georgetown Law Center for hosting a lively, festive reception. For those of you unable to attend, you were most certainly missed.

I would also like to say thank you to Anna Lawless-Collins, who served as Chair of ALL-SIS during the past year, as well as to Caroline Osborne and Amanda Runyon, who are rotating off of the Executive Board. Your leadership and dedicated efforts on behalf of ALL-SIS have enriched the organization in so many ways. I would like to extend a hearty welcome to our new Executive Board members, Sabrina Sondhi and Amanda Watson. I look forward to working with you along with our continuing board member, Ingrid Mattson.

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

Lisa A. Goodman
Texas A&M University School of Law

“...I did not give one last nod to the splendidness of the passing summer.”

FROM THE EDITOR

The bulk of the fall newsletter includes a look back at this year’s annual meeting! The program reviews, which start on page 10, should help you decide which programs are worth revisiting through the recordings or which missed programs are ones that deserve a listen. On top of the program reviews, Michelle Penn, ALL-SIS CONELL grant winner, offers her perspective on what it was like to attend CONELL for the first time. Sarah Gotschall walks us through how to start a caucus, and Marlene Harmon and Nina Scholtz give us important updates on what is happening with our ALL-SIS colleagues.

As you peruse this newsletter, also please remember that we are always looking for content. We want to hear from you, so if you have any questions, suggestions, ideas or articles you would like to submit, please contact me, the Editor, Katie Hanschke at katie.hanschke@vanderbilt.edu.

In this issue: CONELL Report / A Critter Caucus is Born: How Can You Get Your Own? / Member News / Program Reviews /
Further, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to everyone who volunteered for and serves on an ALL-SIS Committee. Your hard work, enthusiasm, commitment, and ideas make this great organization what it is today. Over the course of the year, the ALL-SIS Board will continue working on an initiative to review our committee structure in efforts to ensure that we are making the most efficient and effective use of our committees’ efforts.

Other initiatives that I would like to focus on this year include collaborating with our firm librarian colleagues and attorneys to ensure that our research instruction continues to meet the demands of modern law practice and continuing to develop meaningful ways to support and encourage law library scholarship.

In turning to the new academic year and all that it brings, I have been thinking a lot lately about leadership. The incoming students that we welcome are the future leaders of our law schools, the legal profession, our communities, and our world. Further, no matter our position within our libraries or professional organizations, we too can strive to demonstrate and inspire leadership. There are many qualities that define good leadership and an abundance of scholarship discussing them in great detail. Some of the qualities that each of us can take into our everyday work include creativity and innovation, accountability, integrity, commitment, appreciation, and empathy, just to name a few. As we all focus our thoughts and attention on the newness of fall, let us proceed keeping in mind the ability to lead from all levels.

On the Saturday before AALL, I made my way through the convention hall along with approximately 80 other new librarians. After being welcomed by the friendly CONELL Committee members, we enjoyed a hot breakfast, and the AALL Executive Board answered our questions about their experiences working in law librarianship and with AALL. The Executive Board encouraged us not to be intimidated by our relative inexperience and to get involved with AALL, reminding us that our fresh eyes can be an asset to both our libraries and AALL as an organization.

After meeting with the Executive Committee, we had what ended up being one of my favorite sessions of the entire conference. The session was dedicated to the idea of “being a leader without being the boss.” Research and reference librarians, some relatively new to the profession and some quite experienced, discussed the different ways one can exemplify leadership in a library. It was a helpful reminder that leadership can come in many forms, and many great leaders are not necessarily in traditional management positions. I found it refreshing to acknowledge that everyone in a library can make valuable leadership contributions regardless of their formal titles, and I appreciated that the panel discussed concrete steps we can take to burnish our leadership skills and take on new roles.
We then moved onto speed networking, which allowed us to meet many of our fellow attendees in a very short amount of time. The introvert in me had not been looking forward to this, but it actually was a great way to meet peers working in different types of positions from around the country. Many of the librarians I know are academic reference librarians, so it was nice to get out of my little bubble and meet different types of librarians. Because there were so many of us, we were all able to meet a bunch of newer librarians that we might not have met otherwise. (And it is the closest I will ever get to experiencing speed dating.) It was also a great reminder to join my local AALL state and regional chapters, so I can see at least some of the people I met more often than the annual meeting.

Then it was onto the marketplace, where we got to meet representatives from the different AALL committees, special interest sections, chapters and caucuses. It was a wonderful way to learn about the different communities, some of which I had not even known existed prior to the marketplace. I ended up joining an SIS I had not known about before and taking on a new service project.

After eating lunch, we braved the D.C. humidity and summer heat to see the sights of the city, with a stop at the Lincoln Memorial. All in all, CONELL was a great way to ease into the AALL Annual Conference, letting us get to know some more friendly faces and gain a better understanding of both how AALL works and the opportunities available to us through AALL. I am very appreciative that the 2019 ALL-SIS CONELL Grant allowed me to attend CONELL, and I am thankful to all the librarians who organized and helped make CONELL a great experience.

Recipients of ALL-SIS’s CONELL Grant have the opportunity to reflect on their experiences in an article for the newsletter. For more information on ALL-SIS grants for AALL professional development opportunities like the Leadership Institute, see https://www.aallnet.org/allsis/awards-grants/.

A CRITTER CAUCUS IS BORN: HOW CAN YOU GET YOUR OWN?

As we know, AALL provides a variety of entities, such as special interest sections (SIS), chapters and caucuses, to facilitate connection, communication, and cooperation between AALL members around shared areas of interest. Has anyone, other than myself, ever wondered what the difference is between a SIS and caucus? Well, a caucus is less formal than a SIS and allows members to focus more narrowly on specific areas of interest. You can explore the 15 current caucuses and join them (for free!) on the AALL Caucuses website. They cover a wide range of interests, such as animal law, empirical research, and native peoples law, to name a few.
A CRITTER CAUCUS IS BORN

AALL Caucus Guidelines

The AALL Caucus Guidelines allows members to create caucuses for the following purposes:

- Shared background of members
- Shared work environments
- Shared professional interests
- Those that arose out of the work of a Special Committee or other Executive Board directive

A caucus is defined as an “informal group of at least 15 AALL members who share a common interest in line with one of the above-stated purposes and whose area of interest does not conflict with any other established entity of the Association.”

Nicholas Wants and his Legal Research Crits Caucus

The list of caucuses will soon have one more! Nicholas Mignanelli, librarian assistant professor and reference librarian at the University of Miami School of Law, is currently navigating the AALL procedures to create the Legal Research Crits Caucus. A recent winner of the 2019 AALL LexisNexis Call for Papers (New Member Division) for his paper on critical legal research, Nicholas decided to connect with others interested in the topic through a caucus. He held a well-attended caucus organization meeting at the 2019 AALL Conference.

Thanks to Nicholas for sharing his experience with creating a caucus by answering the following questions!

How did you get interested in starting a critical legal research caucus?

I decided to start a caucus around the concept of Critical Legal Research (CLR) when I realized there were several librarians writing in this area (and even more with a general interest in critical approaches to practices and teaching legal research). I thought a caucus would be the perfect way to bring these individuals together to collaborate.

Why did you decide on the caucus form instead of an SIS?

I think starting and sustaining an SIS is more involved. Additionally, I think the shared affinity for an SIS needs to be a little broader, i.e., librarians who work in a particular type of library. I think caucuses are great because they are an informal way to connect people with a more focused area of interest.

By the way, what is critical legal research?

In short, CLR is the practice of applying the insights of critical legal theory and critical theory to the process of legal research and analysis. CLR aims to expose how power structures covertly shape the organization of legal information and the tools of legal information retrieval, deploying an array of methods designed to transcend the limitations that these power structures set on legal innovation, law reform, and, ultimately, human freedom.

For further reading, I would suggest Steven M. Barkan’s “Deconstructing Legal Research: A Law Librarian's Commentary on Critical Legal Studies,” Jill Anne Farmer’s “A Poststructuralist Analysis of the Legal Re-
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search Process,” Richard Delgado & Jean Stefancic’s “Why Do We Ask the Same Questions? The Triple Helix Dilemma Revisited,” Julie Krishnaswami’s “Critical Information Theory: A New Foundation for Teaching Regulatory Research,” Yasmin Sokkar Harker’s “Legal Information for Social Justice: The New ACRL Framework and Critical Information Literacy,” Nicholas Stump’s “Following New Lights: Critical Legal Research Strategies as a Spark for Law Reform in Appalachia,” and my paper “Critical Legal Research: Who Needs It?” Where possible, I’ve tried to link to open access sources. If you’re having trouble accessing any of these articles, however, email me at nmignanelli@law.miami.edu and I’ll send them to you (it’s what the authors would have wanted).

What are the steps to create a caucus?

First, you need to get 15 people to join your caucus. Next, you need to come up with a statement of purpose and elect a chair (we decided to substitute the title “chair” for “coordinator”). Finally, you need to submit a registration form. AALL’s Executive Board then considers your application at its next meeting.

How are your efforts to create the caucus going so far?

Really well, I think. I was able get 15 AALL members by (1) holding an organizing meeting at the Annual Conference in July and (2) begging my closest friends in the profession to let me put their names on our list. I’ve submitted our registration form, so we should be on the agenda for the Executive Board’s next meeting in November.

What do you hope that your caucus will accomplish?

I hope this caucus will be a space for discussing how power structures influence the organization of legal information and embed biases in legal research tools, as well as how we can use and convey strategies for transcending the problems this phenomenon creates. I hasten to add that I think this discussion is more important than ever in the age of so-called “AI-powered legal research.”

At next year’s Annual Conference in New Orleans, we’re hoping to host a panel on “Critical Approaches to Teaching Legal Research.” Yasmin Sokkar Harker, Julie Krishnaswami, and Nicholas F. Stump have all agreed to be panelists, and Taryn Marks has agreed to serve as our moderator. The next step, of course, is getting approval! //
**AWARDS, HONORS, AND LEADERSHIP**

Congratulations to Karen Selden for receiving the 2019 Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award for Outstanding Contributions in Technical Services Law Librarianship from AALL’s Technical Services Special Interest Section. Karen is the Metadata Services Librarian and Interim Head of Technical Services at the William A. Wise Law Library, University of Colorado Law School. She has held leadership roles at the local, regional, and national levels; served actively on committees, and published and presented significant scholarly and professional work.

Andrew Lang, Reference Librarian, University of Pennsylvania Biddle Law Library, has let us know that he has been elected to serve as Vice President/President-Elect of the Greater Philadelphia Law Library Association (GPLLA). Andy’s term began in July, after the AALL Annual Meeting, and he is looking forward to an exciting and productive next two years working with the rest of the GPLLA Board.

The new editor of the RIPS Law Librarian Blog is Malikah Hall, now in her third year as a Reference Librarian and Instructional Assistant Professor at Texas A&M University School of Law. Malikah, who served as the chair of PEGA-SIS last year, has also been appointed to the AALL Diversity and Inclusion Committee and the AALL Legal Research Competencies Review Special Committee. She presented for the first time at AALL this summer on the panel Developing and Achieving Your Leadership Potential.

Adrienne DeWitt, Reference Librarian at Campbell University School of Law, reports that Campbell Law is celebrating 10 years in Raleigh, North Carolina, and 40 years in legal education! To help celebrate this momentous anniversary year, the Law Library is in the process of creating an online guide consisting of a curated collection of regional newspaper articles from the Law School’s beginning in the early 1970s on up to 1990. Currently, they have completed years 1974–1976, and they are continually adding more content. You can find the guide here: [https://law-campbell.libguides.com/campbell1040celebration](https://law-campbell.libguides.com/campbell1040celebration).

**DIRECTOR APPOINTMENTS**

Kim Nayyer is now the Edward Cornell Law Librarian, Associate Dean for Library Services, and Professor of the Practice at Cornell Law School. Before joining Cornell in May 2019, Kim was Associate University Librarian, Law and Adjunct Associate Professor at University of Victoria, where she directed the law library, oversaw the copyright office, taught advanced and introductory legal research and writing, and participated in the administration of the UVic Libraries system.

Rebecca Rich has joined the Drexel Kline School of Law faculty as Director, Legal Research Center & Assistant Teaching Professor Law. Most recently, Becka was senior associate director and interim director of the Panza Maurer Law Library at Nova Southeastern University.

As of August 1, 2019, Lisa Goodman became Executive Professor and Director of the Dee J. Kelly Law Library at Texas A&M University School of Law. Lisa previously held the position of Associate Law Librarian for Administration at the Lillian Goldman Law Library at Yale.

*cont’d*
MEMBER NEWS

PROMOTIONS AND NEW HIRES

Rachel Hollis joined Concordia University School of Law in Boise, Idaho as its Technical Services Librarian in June 2019. Rachel has more than 15 years serving in a variety of librarianship roles.

Caitlin Swift has been appointed as new Associate Director and Head of Research Services at Campbell University School of Law Library. Caitlin joined the Campbell library staff in 2010 and most recently served as Senior Reference Librarian. Adrienne DeWitt tells us, “We are all looking forward to working with Caitlin in her new role here at Campbell Law.”

The Westminster Law Library at the University of Denver Sturm College of Law recently hired a new Faculty Services Librarian. Michelle Penn began her work with DU Law on June 24. Michelle received her JD from Washington University School of Law in St. Louis, MO, her Ph.D. in Modern European History from the University of Colorado-Boulder, and her MLIS from the University of Arizona. Prior to coming to the University of Denver, Michelle was the Faculty Services Librarian at the Fordham University School of Law. Thanks for Madeline Cohen for this news!

Duke’s J. Michael Goodson Law Library has seen a number of exciting changes to its staff over the last several months:

- **Alex Jakubow**, Associate Director for Empirical Research and Data Support Services, joined the Law Library in July 2019. He was previously the Empirical Research Librarian at the University of Virginia School of Law.

- **Jennifer L. Behrens** was appointed the Associate Director for Administration & Scholarship. She had been the Library’s Head of Reference Services since 2011.

- **Rachel Gordon** was appointed the Associate Director for Public Services after four years as the Head of Access and Collection Services.
MEMBER NEWS

PROMOTIONS AND NEW HIRES CONT.

- **Jane Bahnson** was appointed Head of Research and Instruction. She joined Duke Law as a Reference Librarian in 2010.

- **Casandra (Cas) Laskowski** was appointed the Technology and Research Services Librarian. She joined Duke Law as a Reference Librarian in 2016.

- **Wickliffe (Wick) Shreve** was appointed to the new position of Faculty and Scholarly Services Librarian. He joined Duke Law as a Reference Librarian in 2015.

- **Laura Scott** was appointed to a full-time Research Services Librarian position, effective September 2019. She had been a part-time librarian and research faculty member since 2006.

In September, the Jacob Burns Law Library at The George Washington University Law School welcomed **Traci Emerson** as its reference/foreign & international librarian. Prior to joining GW Law, Traci served as a law clerk and associate attorney in the law firm of Woelber & Cole, LLC, in Anchorage, Alaska, and she performed legal and legislative research for the City of St. Paul, Minnesota in its Vendor Outreach Program, Department of Human Rights and Equal Economic Opportunity. Traci received a Master’s in Library and Information Science - Law Librarianship from the University of Washington, a Juris Doctor from the University of St. Thomas School of Law, and a Bachelor of Arts in French Language & Literature from Portland State University. **Leslie Lee** sent us this news—thank you!

cont’d
Heather Simmons has joined the University of Georgia Law Library as Associate Director for Instruction and Access Services. Heather’s last position was Law & Business Reference Librarian and Associate Teaching Professor at the University of Illinois College of Law Library, where she taught 1L Legal Research and Advanced Legal Research – Corporate. Thanks to Carol Watson for letting us know!

Tom Hemstock is starting a new position as Research, Instruction, and Acquisitions Librarian at Albany Law School this fall. Tom was most recently Associate Professor of Legal Research and Reference & Electronic Resources Librarian at the University of New Hampshire Franklin Pierce School of Law.

The Law Library at the University of California, Irvine, has two new law librarians. Thanks to Christina Tsou for the following news:

- Matthew Flyntz became UCI’s Research Law Librarian for Instructional Service in March 2019. In that role, Matt will develop and teach the 1L Legal Research Practicum course as well as the upper-level Advanced Legal Research course.

- Jimmy Pak became UCI’s Research Law Librarian for Technology Services in August 2019. In that role, Jimmy will manage the Law Library’s web presence, blog, research guides, and institutional repository.

The Villanova Law Library at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law is pleased to announce several changes to their Librarians’ positions:

- Mary Cornelius is now Head of Circulation and Reference Librarian
- Mary Jo Heacock is now Head of Cataloging and Government Documents
- Robert Hegadorn is now Foreign, Comparative, and International Law Librarian and Legal Research Instructor
- Lori Strickler Corso is now Head of Staff Development and Legal Research Instructor
- Benjamin Carlson is now Head of Digital Initiatives and Legal Research Instructor

Thanks to Amy Emerson for this news. //

Have something to share with your fellow ALL-SIS members? Send your news along to Marlene (mharmon@law.berkeley.edu) or Nina (nes78@cornell.edu) at any time. //
Program Reviews

HIGHLIGHTS FROM AALL 2019

This year’s annual meeting was filled with insightful programing meant to cater to the professional development needs of a variety of law librarians. Attendees always face the usual dilemma: which program should I attend? Fortunately for you, if you missed a program, the ALL-SIS newsletter offers reviews of select programs from the 2019 Annual Meeting. Use these reviews to determine which of these programs warrant a more substantive review. The recordings can be found on AALL2go at https://www.aallnet.org/annual_meeting/aall-2019-dc/.

Sunday, July 16
(A, B & C Programs)

Opening General Session with Keynote Speaker Jon Hopwood
Sarah Gotschall
University of Arizona College of Law

The current societal obsession with gratitude, mainly the benefits of both feeling it and expressing it, likely arose from the realization that many of life’s undertakings, including work (perhaps especially work) are essentially thankless. Modern life is such that everyone is too busy struggling through the day to have the time or energy to express gratitude toward others. Except for Shon Hopwood! Finally, some gratitude…it is even in the title! “A Law Library Saved My Life.” (Of course, he didn’t say law librarians, but hey, let’s not look our gratitude horse in the mouth…)

Hopwood begins with the story of how his prison’s law library saved his life. After a short and unsuccessful career as a bank robber, he was sentenced to 12 years in prison in 1999. Prison...nope...he didn’t like it...the boredom, the threat of violence, the bad food... After a stint of scrubbing tables, a friend suggested that Hopwood come work with him in the law library. The idea did not appeal to him initially as his knowledge of the law was limited to realizing he broke it. His friend talked him into it, and his journey began. He worked at the law library for six months without peaking inside a law book until that one fine day on June 26, 2000, when federal prisons across the country buzzed with the news of a Supreme Court case which offered the hope of a shorter stay for those wrongly sentenced under the federal sentencing guidelines.

His legal career was born that day, motivated by his dream of getting the heck out of prison earlier. He studied the law intensively for two months, filed his brief (in the wrong court), filed it again, and failed to obtain an earlier release. It did not matter. He enjoyed the effort so much that he started reading law books for fun and assisting his friends in their appeals, including his friend John Fellers. With 18 months of jailhouse lawyer experience under his belt, he prepared a cert petition for the U.S. Supreme Court for his friend that was eventually granted!

The fascinating story continued, culminating in eventual release, a successful legal career, and in his eyes, redemption. All of which he attributes to his prison’s law library. Libraries, books, and librarians gave him freedom (well, just the mental kind...), courage, and confidence. Not only did reading about law expand and engage his mind, it gave him something he apparently needed, a way to help others, which took his mind off himself.

His is not a “I done good” story but uses his vehicle to advocate for his former associates - the huge number of people imprisoned in the U.S.
wants society, the criminal justice system, and the prison system to stop giving up on people and give second chances, pointing out it is in society’s interest to do so since the vast majority of prisoners will return to society one day. He advocates for a more humane system that invests resources in redemption and rehabilitation. He did not question the right or need for society to imprison law-breakers such as himself but wondered if it needs to be for so long and in such hopeless environments that do not prepare inmates for eventual release.

If you missed this interesting and inspiring address, be sure to catch the video recording.

**A1—Virtual Reality in the Law Classroom**

Dan Brackmann
University of South Carolina College of Law

This session by Kenton S. Brice (University of Oklahoma) and Jennifer L. Wondracek (UNT Dallas) demonstrated virtual reality technology and discussed ideas about using it in the classroom. After making a distinction between augmented reality and virtual reality (VR), the presenters traded off throughout the session, each giving their experiences and perspective on various topics.

First, Kenton talked about using VR to create, curate, and display 360 videos and detailed models to take users inside refugee camps and oil fields. Students used it to go back and watch their own courtroom performances. Kenton mused that VR may eventually be used to present evidence at trial. Kenton also discussed the technology he uses which includes expensive headsets and high-end computers, and he noted that many campuses have technology offices where pioneering instructors might find willing assistance (and possibly loaner equipment). He mentioned a broad array of 360 cameras which can be mounted on drones for filming. For content creation software, much of it is free with a .edu email address, or participants can contact him about using OU’s own adaption called Oval.

Jennifer used VR technology for oral argument practices and rendering a fake crime scene, complete with clues to be interacted with in VR. Howev-
A2—There and Back Again: Bringing Law Librarian Skills and Perspective into Nontraditional Jobs
Heather Joy
Chapman University

For those of you unfamiliar with Tolkien’s books about Middle Earth, the title of this program references the adventures of Bilbo Baggins, as recounted in The Hobbit. Lest we miss the laugh, the program opened with a map of the Shire and an amusing metaphor about fighting orcs and being chased by the Nazgul (also known as the economy). The long and short of it is that each of the four panelists has lived an adventurous life in terms of career and can tell you honestly that skills and perspectives travel well; you will never be in want of employment if you’re willing to take the fork in the road.

Justin Abbasi did not plan on working directly for a judge. He went to law school, earned his MLIS, and ended up at a court (and not in the library). Convinced he needed someone with the skills common to librarians, a judge talked Justin into a job, and for the last three years, Justin has been the Judicial Assistant to Justice Gonzales at the Washington State Supreme Court. Justin considers himself an embedded librarian, and the judge his patron. Justin’s flexibility and interpersonal skills are put to good use in handling all the hats he wears. He handles case coordination, chambers management, researching grounds for recusals, Bluebooking, replacing citations as needed, and tracking, which was one of the skills Justice Gonzales specifically hoped to gain by hiring a librarian. Justin’s subject vocabulary, familiarity with sources, and knowledge of legislative history, appellate procedure, and statutory interpretation make him ideal for this unexpected opportunity.

Dawn Smith is the Head of Acquisitions at Yale’s Lillian Goldman Law Library, a job requiring far more qualifications than her first job in which she was “voluntold” into the position of acquisitions librarian with two days of training before being thrown into the deep end. A deep end where she had to sign off on budgets and worried what jail might be like if she made a mistake and ended up bring audited! Dawn got a good handle on the job but took a chance on a more peaceful workplace doing fundraising for an art school, which consisted mainly of competitive intelligence research. Thanks to librarianship, she was comfortable with Lexis, database searching, synthesizing information, systems analysis, and verifying sources. As she applied existing library skills to her new job, she gained others from the new position, including a deep understanding of restricted/endowed funds, mastery of custom reports, and appreciation of donor relations, all of which she applies in her current position as Head of Acquisitions. For example, her collection budget includes restricted funds from donors, and thanks to her last job, she has the knowledge to manage those funds and relationships responsibly.

Tami Carson is back at her alma mater as a Research/Instruction Librarian after spending a stint at Thomson Reuters. This is her “redemption” story. After law school Tami interned at the Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library at the Fowler School of Law at Chapman University, working in technical services, circulation, and reference. After getting her MLIS, geographic restrictions led her to a job as an Academic Account Manager for Westlaw where she practiced skills that translate well to academic law librarianship. For example, she learned about vendor contract structure by working with libraries to help them purchase only what they actually needed. She learned about the vast diversity of librarian roles by interacting both with the staffs of a dozen law libraries and with all the members of the Chicago law librarian community. She trained thousands of students, honing her teaching and reference skills. She practiced learning and synthesizing quickly in order to educate others; one time she had to train IRS employees on tax materials, a subject which she did not enjoy in law school. As the contact for 10,000 law students and hundreds of faculty, she constantly improved her customer service skills and built an in-depth knowledge of the technical back end of Westlaw and TWEN. And in the opposite direction, as a law librarian working...
for a vendor, she brought her perspective to Westlaw and increased their understanding of librarian needs.

Rob Mead had a meandering path to his current position as the State Law Librarian at the Washington State Law Library. Among the positions he mentioned, it was the role of a deputy at the New Mexico independent public defender’s office that offered up the most examples of transferrable skills. With a budget of over $40 million and almost 500 employees, Rob spent a lot of time getting comfortable with numbers. He pointed out that you don’t necessarily have to be good at math; Excel will do the equations for you. From statistics to budgets, every job values the ability to count things and assign meaning to those numbers. He also pointed out that perspectives and contacts can always be valuable, whatever job you are in. As a part of the local legal community in New Mexico, Rob was able to provide invaluable insight to his new boss, who was an outsider from California. Similarly, most jobs require research, a skill librarians have in spades, and his opportunity to advocate (presenting before the Supreme Court) was practice for the advocacy one needs to do in any leadership role in any profession. Management skills are the same and are prized in every profession.

To sum up, as Rob said and these panelists stories illustrate, we are not the hobbit that must stay in the Shire. We can take our skills anywhere.

**GDPR: What Your Library Needs to Know**
Matt Timko
Northern Illinois University College of Law

The Sunday session “GDPR: What Your Library Needs to Know” should be considered by two different attendees: those who wish to learn more about the General Data Protection Regulation, and those who wish to understand what corporate legal departments must consider when interacting with European companies or regulations. The first half was primarily an introduction to the law, with a discussion of the history of the regulations leading to the GDPR and some of the cultural differences between the GDPR and American privacy laws. The second half was a primer on issues that corporate counsels need to evaluate whenever operating internationally. The session concluded with other countries’ attempts to imitate or differentiate from the GDPR.

The first half went into great detail about the evolution of European Union law that led to the GDPR. These explanations were made in comparison with American legal tradition, which differs in substantive and cultural ways from the European model and makes the GDPR and similar regulations somewhat shocking to American audiences. The speakers did a wonderful job highlighting how different standards in Europe led to a law which many Americans have claimed is “un-American,” to which Edward McNicholas, partner at Ropes & Gray and presenter at the session, responded “which is true, because the law is not American.” He made very clear that the term un-American was not meant to be pejorative but rather explanatory since the foundations for the two legal standards and systems are rooted in very different principles.

This was a very fascinating analysis and helped explain some of the angst and issues that American businesses and attorneys have with the GDPR. For starters, while American laws generally are listed in terms of what is proscribed, European laws dictate the specific things that companies are allowed to do and will punish any activity that falls outside of this prescribed list. Similarly, the GDPR allows the European Union to decide what qualifies as legitimate data collection, thereby requiring companies to seek clearance prior to collection; this is contrary to the American system, which allows companies to act first, and then (through litigation) allow the government to decide whether the actions were legitimate. Lastly (though not the final example), the European concept of privacy includes protecting against profiling far more than American systems, which seek to protect an individual’s information, rather than protect against traits shared by individuals.

The second half was far more focused on the corporate counsel perspective and went through...
many of the practices that businesses have implemented to ensure they are complying with European law. As an example, companies must now evaluate their vendor relationships to ensure that the vendors, as third parties with access to user data, also comply. This results in contract language, which used to be a few paragraphs, to documents that now can range from three to five pages. Similarly, companies now employ a data security officer to evaluate the company and third-party practices to ensure that violations of the GDPR are avoided. To complicate or simplify the matter, depending on your point of view, other countries and several American states are seeking to implement a version of GDPR protections.

This session was informationally dense but very fascinating, discussing all points of the GDPR. The beginning is particularly helpful for anyone interested in learning about the basics, while the second half demonstrates the real-world effects and considerations of the regulation, albeit only in the corporate setting. However, it is well worth your time to view the recording, and although the recording will make reference to the session slides (which are not available), it should still be relatively easy to follow along with the discussion.

A4—Finding a Needle in a Stack of Needles: Best Practices for Alerts
Marlene Harmon
UC Berkeley School of Law Library

Alerts—LEXIS, Westlaw, Bloomberg, Law360, Fastcase, Cheetah, etc. all produce an overwhelming number of notifications. How does a librarian, in a law firm, court or academic library, manage them for their lawyers, judges or professors, not to mention for themselves? How does the librarian make sure relevant news is included in this plethora of information? How do you ensure that social media, including Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, etc., are being searched? The answers to these questions, as Abigail Ross, principal at RoFinCo, LLC, quickly informed the audience, is you can’t. The reason the program title includes the phrase “Best Practices for Alerts” is because that is the best librarians can do. As Ross repeatedly told the audience, there is no silver bullet solution to finding that needle in the stack of needles, not yet anyway.

Ross and Gretchen Van Dam, Circuit Librarian at the Library of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit in Chicago, described their best practices in this program.

The approaches taken for taming the flood of email alerts vary by type of library and how much responsibility the library has for handling their lawyer’s, judge’s or professor’s alerts. In my academic law library, we have worked to make everyone, faculty, staff, and librarians, responsible for managing their own email alerts. This is not the case in many other law libraries.

Ross works primarily with law firm libraries, many of whom are responsible for setting up and managing their attorney’s alerts. Her company manages, maintains and reviews alerts and dockets for about twelve law firms. This may include setting up individual passwords, conducting the searches on which alerts are based and deleting alerts when attorneys leave the firm or the alert is otherwise no longer needed. She does this using a spreadsheet for each firm. Some attorneys receive over 3,000 alerts a day, so managing this email bloat is a huge time suck for the librarians who are tasked with doing it. Ross decided there had to be some better solution, so she recently surveyed a number of east coast law firm librarians in the hope that there was. As you know if you have read this far, there is not. Though the survey was conducted with law firm librarians only, the problem really is law library wide. What she found was that many firms assign one person, a member of the library staff or maybe a paralegal, to manage attorney alerts. Ross suggests using a shared master spreadsheet of alerts.

Managing the alerts for a law firm may be a huge time commitment, but there can be positive outcomes for the library and the librarian. Despite the automation and technology that make email alerts possible, human analysis and review are still needed. A skilled information professional will con-
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Gretchen Van Dam, the other program panelist expanded on Ross’s points and discussed what they have done at the Seventh Circuit library. She emphasized the importance of the information professional’s role in keeping track of alerts, of providing “human eyes on alerts”, and the necessity of managing your users’ expectations. As Van Dam explained, “like sands in the hour glass are the alerts in our emails.” You cannot examine every grain of sand on the beach and you cannot read every email alert, and sometimes, a news item is missed. It is also important to consider your employer’s policies and to be aware of any exceptions to full internet access. What spam filters are in place? Are videos blocked?

Van Dam’s library began managing email alerts for their court’s judges ten years ago. Each judge is assigned a librarian who reviews all alerts before they are sent onto the judge. The library had to be cost conscious, and Van Dam suggests using Google alerts, which are free and easy to use, and the alert feature on the services already subscribed to, including Lexis, Westlaw, Bloomberg, Law360, etc. She emphasized not only the importance of the search which produces the alert but also structuring how the alert is received. Her library has used monitoring services, which are especially important for searching social media. This can be expensive. She suggested shopping around and requesting a two week free trial from any service you are considering. She also suggested that the ABA Tech Show is a good source for finding out about and connecting with companies that do alert monitoring. Some companies mentioned during the presentation include Digimind, TalkWalker, NC4, BNA Convergence and Vable.

After a discussion of best practices, suggestions and ideas, we ended not quite where we began; though there is no magic bullet yet and no one source that provides specifically focused alerts from legal news, litigation updates, docket tracking, and social media coverage, there are useful best practices and tools librarians can employ to manage alerts. And though that magic bullet has not arrived yet, Ross reminded us to stay tuned. All the big vendors, Lexis, Westlaw, Bloomberg, are working on this, and they or some smart individuals may soon produce that one-stop-shopping solution for managing the ever expanding universe of alerts.

A6—The Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program: Teaching Legal Bibliography to Change Lives
I-Wei Wang
UC Berkeley School of Law Library

Following closely on the heels of the morning’s keynote address by convicted felon-turned-jailhouse-lawyer-turned-law-professor Shon Hopwood, this program offered a practical and inspiring look at the Inside-Out prison exchange program. Howard University criminology professor Bahiyah Muhammad provided an overview of this 20-year old, now international, program that provides traditional university (“outside”) students and incarcerated (“inside”) students the opportunity to take classes together. Inside Out’s unique model is that of a traditional college course, relocated to a correctional facility, is offered to both groups, with no difference in curriculum, syllabus, requirements, or grading. To balance perspectives, half of the participants are inside, and half of the participants are outside students. The students are chosen from a typically large pool of applications who are required to submit references from their respective institutions and an essay on desired outcomes and prior educational experience.

Muhammad also covered some practical details based on her 10 years’ experience building the program at Howard, which now involves 10 professors.
For example, teaching at a pre-trial holding facility means an inside student pool available for 12-month or shorter periods, leading to high turnover and problems with meeting add/drop deadlines. She plans for this attrition by selecting 25 inside students for a 30-student class, knowing that enrollment will fall to 15 or so—and that even one class day can be transformative for inside students; other faculty address the problem by selecting only those who will be “inside” for the whole semester. Programmatically, she noted, the federal prison setting (with longer term prisoners) may be easier administratively.

Howard University Libraries’ executive director, Rhea Ballard-Thrower, who also provided her perspective, grappled with more logistics, including such familiar tasks as communicating clearly and repeatedly with students regarding the pre-course work and reading as well as less quotidian details like the need to pass a drug test before being allowed in the facility (this ensures, for example, that students in a fall class avoid drug exposure over the summer). For her legal research course, she noted the need to ensure materials required for assignments are accessible to inside students, since access to the prison law library may be limited or an earned privilege; at Howard, the law library holds multiple copies of the main course text to loan to inside students for the whole term. In addition to weekly assignments (handed in by outside students via Blackboard and by inside students in hard copy), Ballard-Thrower’s course incorporates journal entries and concludes with collaborative project presentations by paired inside and outside students. She concluded by echoing Muhammad’s comment that the class can be a transformative experience—for inside students, outside students, and the instructor alike.

A lively round of Q&A followed, including topics such as outreach, recruitment, and selection of students; seating, logistical arrangements, and supporting peer learning between inside and outside students; tips for getting buy-in from law school deans and working with correctional administrative personnel, as well as for developing a volunteer community and starting “baby steps” towards a full course-oriented program. One of the questions came from a county law librarian wondering how—with “no access to students”—non-academic law librarians might work towards building such a program. In addition to the speakers’ helpful input on this issue, the period after the session provided an opportunity for an academic law librarian from the same geographic area to approach the questioner with a proposal to collaborate on starting a program and for a court librarian from an adjacent region to offer contact information for a colleague from the court library in the questioner’s city. This conclusion to the session illustrated the value of the educational programs at the annual meeting, as an opportunity not only to hear from speakers and experts but to be inspired and to connect with colleagues.

B1—Do More With Less: Workplace Efficiency Tools
Lisa Wernke
University of Cincinnati Law Library

“It’s not ok that we all are being asked to do more with less, but that is the reality of the world we are facing today.” - Mari Cheney, Boley Law Library, Lewis & Clark Law School

The purpose of this program is to introduce and discuss tools that the speakers are using currently in their workplace to make things run more efficiently. The speakers for this program were: Mari Cheney, Boley Law Library, Lewis & Clark Law School; Ellen Frentzen, Boston University School of Law; Anna Lawless-Collins, Boston University School of Law; and Meg Kribble, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP.

The first two tools discussed were the workplace, project management boards, KanbanFlow and Trello. KanbanFlow and Trello are both web-based project planning tools. Kanban allows you to create “swimlanes” for project management, but Trello integrates with G-Suite and Slack. KanbanFlow has a free version and a premium version that costs $5.00 a month per user. Trello is completely free to use. Both project management tools...
are customizable and can be cooperative; you can add people to your group or board so that everyone in the organization can see the priority of projects and what is coming up. For both tools, you can make them as simple or complex as needed and set up email reminders about starting projects, finishing tasks, and so on.

Microsoft Outlook and Teams is another good tool that is free if you have Microsoft Office already. Using Outlook calendar and tasks to create reminders, lists, and appointments are an effective way to manage your time since most of us have our Outlook email open throughout the day. Microsoft Teams is a useful tool for collaboration if you have Microsoft Office at your institution. You can create groups in Microsoft Teams to work on specific projects and this will allow everyone to have access to the necessary documents that can be edited and updated.

For academic libraries, LibAnswers is a useful way to track communications. It also can be used to compile statistics and track reference questions that come in and know that they have been answered. As a group, LibAnswers also can be used to track supply requests from other librarians, facility issues that have been reported and taken care of, or to track any other problems that may arise where it is useful to share with all stakeholders.

Quest is a tool that has been used in firm libraries to help the day to day tasks run efficiently. This tool offers the same collaborative feature that previously discussed tools offer, allowing multiple users to log in to see pending requests or tasks. This tool features a timekeeping tab, which is very useful in a firm library for keeping track of billable hours for accounting purposes.

Towards the end of the program the presenters discussed what they called the “efficiency tools grab bag” or random tips that have been proven to increase efficiency.

- The Pomodoro Technique: a time management method where you work in intervals by focusing on a task for 25 minutes or so and then taking a short break.
- Spend less time on email: turn off notifications for incoming emails that break your concentration when working on other tasks. Use search operators to find an email you need.
- OHIO – Only Handle It Once, especially in regards to email. If you can respond right away and clear the email from your inbox, do it. Get rid of any junk mail immediately. An easy way to do this is set a filter or rule to have certain mail go to your junk mail folder.
- Tips for better, more productive meetings: No smartphones to distract people, keep meetings to 15-20 minutes if possible, and end meetings with a to do list and identify people who will be directly responsible for items on the list.

Recommended reading for people interested in learning more about workplace efficiency was provided at the end of the program. Those titles are:

- Digital Minimalism: Choosing a Focused Life in a Noisy World, by Cal Newport
- Extreme Productivity: Boost Your Results, Reduce Your Hours, by Robert Pozen
- SCRUM: The Art of Doing Twice the Work in Half the Time, by Jeff Sutherland and J.J. Sutherland

B3—The Search Committee: An Effective Approach to Diversity, Inclusion and Equity in Library Recruiting
Clanitra Stewart Nejdl
Alyne Queener Massey Law Library, Vanderbilt University

Coordinated and moderated by Dawn Smith, Head of Acquisitions at the Lillian Goldman Law Library at Yale Law School, this session brought together Lisa Goodman (Executive Professor and Law Library Director at the Texas A&M University School of Law Library), Christopher
Bloodworth (Law Librarian at Honigman LLP), and Dr. Michele Villagran (Assistant Professor at the San José State University School of Information) to discuss the recruitment process in law libraries and how issues related to diversity, inclusion, and equity can best be handled during that process. Because each panelist contributed their experiences from a different type of professional perspective, the session provided effective and useful information for a broad audience.

Dr. Villagran, who participated by telephone, shared her background as to why diversity, inclusion, and equity are crucial in the law library recruitment process. First, the law itself requires many of the steps that are taken to ensure that diversity, inclusion, and equity are maintained during the recruitment process. Beyond legal requirements, however, Dr. Villagran pointed out that the law library’s mission (or the mission of the law library’s parent institution) may include directives about or comments related to diversity, inclusion, and equity. Such directives or comments indicate that an inclusive and equitable recruitment process would be in keeping with that organization’s mission and can serve to reflect the organization’s values in these areas. Additionally, Dr. Villagran noted the significant benefits to having a diverse workforce within a law library, including creating a more vibrant workplace and helping to shape the organization’s culture.

Goodman discussed the recruitment process from the academic law library perspective. She provided several valuable suggestions for academic law librarians that are serving on library search committees. One such suggestion is that law libraries create diversity statements to include as part of the job descriptions for library vacancies. Including diversity statements helps confirm to potential candidates that issues surrounding diversity, inclusion, and equity are important to the hiring organization. Another suggestion is to ensure that the makeup of the search committee is diverse and to offer unconscious bias training to the members of the search committee through resources such as Lynda.com. A third suggestion is to make sure that the search committee focuses on objective measures during the search process. This can be accomplished through using objective scoring rubrics for candidates and by redacting any information on the candidate’s application that might lead to bias, assuming that information is not critical to the evaluation of the candidate.

Bloodworth shared his experience serving on law firm librarian search committees. He emphasized that law firms also use statements of diversity as part of their recruiting. For Honigman, the diversity statement focuses on the importance of diversity, inclusion, and equity in three ways: in creating a more satisfying work environment; in aiding the success of the organization; and in benefitting not only the firm’s employees but also its firm’s clients. Bloodworth also suggested three key steps for approaching the law firm librarian recruitment process. First, he recommended assessing which skills and qualifications are most important for the position. Second, the firm should determine what other characteristics, beyond qualifications and credentials, would make a candidate an attractive hire. Finally, he suggested attempting to reduce unconscious bias by asking questions of the candidate that will identify the candidate’s soft skills, such as his or her communication style, work ethic, etc.

Overall, this session allowed the audience to learn from the panelists’ vast experience and expertise on the subject. The session materials, available through AALL2go, contain many other resources for addressing diversity, inclusion, and equity in the hiring process.

B5—Growing Out, Not Climbing Up
Marlene Harmon
UC Berkeley School of Law Library

Speakers: Linda Corbelli, Library Supreme Court of the United States; Kerri Spennicchia, White & Case LLP; Benjamin Keele, Ruth Lilly Law Library, Robert H. McKinney School of Law
This program presented three talented, successful librarians from three different types of law libraries, all of whom chose not to advance their careers by going down the conventional path into library administration. Each discussed their career choices, occasional struggles and the specific strategies they used to grow in their careers in non-management positions.

Linda Corbelli has been at the U.S. Supreme Court Library for over 20 years. She is currently a Research Librarian there. She sounded a theme shared by all three speakers—the importance of finding what you love about your work, “finding your forte” as Linda expressed it, and then figuring out how to make it your work. A love of research was also shared by all three speakers.

Finding your forte, one of Linda’s strategies, often involves some trial and error. Linda worked in several different law libraries before coming to the Supreme Court. She mentioned an “administrative detour,” giving her less time for legal research, which she was most attracted to. She discussed the importance of making yourself available for internal opportunities, seeking out legal research projects. She has found participation in AALL on the regional and local levels to be a good strategy to enhance her skills and to make connections. Linda was actively involved in LLAGNY when she lived in New York and became the editor of Law Library Lights, the Law Librarians’ Society of Washington, D.C.’s newsletter, when she came to Washington, D.C.

Kerri Spennicchia has filled a variety of positions in the law firm of White & Case LLP. She is currently a Research Associate. Like Linda, Kerri figured out what she loved about her job, and found her niche, as she put it, in the research component of it. Kerri emphasized the importance of developing strong relationships with your attorneys and having a good reputation for your work. It also is important to be flexible and adaptable in your role over time. Her strategies include taking deep dives into obscure and difficult research areas and taking on “ugly projects” perhaps abandoned by others. This can open doors to more interactions and relationships with people. The result for Kerri has been the freedom and the time to do the deep research she enjoys.

Whereas Linda and Kerri both seem happy with the career paths and the jobs they have carved out for themselves, Ben Keele from Indiana University’s Ruth Lilly Law Library still seems to be struggling with his choices. As a Research and Instructional Services Librarian, he enjoys the flexibility and the interaction with other researchers his job gives him. In common with Linda and Kerri, Ben feels he is more than just a cog in a wheel in his organization. He lamented the idea that career development for law librarians usually seems to move in the direction of taking on increased administrative duties as well as the lack of mentors for alternate career paths. He sees two components to this problem:

- **The Emotional Component.** It is difficult to think that you are not living up to your own expectations and disappointing the expectations of those who have mentored you. Dealing with the idea that your career in research lacks the status of a career in management is also difficult.
- **The Structural Component.** Though there can be significant non-monetary compensation, a non-administrative career in law librarianship usually means less monetary compensation and advancement.

Ben feels it is important to push back against the concept that management is the only path to career advancement for law librarians. We should be able to choose a career path that is honest to who we are with no apology for that choice. He has done this in his position by seeking out new skills and areas of expertise. He stressed the importance of collaborating with people who teach you new things and to keep learning and growing. We should examine our work and jobs and make our own markers of progress. He suggested we periodically ask ourselves if we are better librarians now than we were five years ago.
As a law librarian who abandoned the administrative career path years ago, I thoroughly enjoyed and appreciated this program.

**C1—Engaging Public Librarians in the Access to Justice Movement: Creating Skills-Based Legal Research Continuing Education Programs**

Jessica Almeida
University of Massachusetts School of Law Library

As a public law librarian, I was very interested in the session “Engaging Public Librarians in the Access to Justice Movement: Creating Skills-Based Legal Research Continuing Education Programs.” With the high rate of self-represented litigants, many public librarians are fielding legal research questions that they do not feel equipped to answer. In Connecticut, the Access to Justice Committee published a report recommending collaboration between law and public librarians to help narrow the access to justice gap. Two Connecticut librarians, Anne Rajotte from the University of Connecticut School of Law Library and Christopher Roy from the Connecticut Judicial Branch Law Libraries, answered the call and developed a program to teach public librarians legal research skills.

Two critical components made their program a success. First, communication was essential. Rajotte and Roy determined the avenues to communicate with public librarians about their needs, specifically using listservs and the state public library commission to get the word out. At first, they created a survey to gather information on what types of questions public librarians receive, what are the common legal subjects in which patrons are interested, what specifically the librarians want to know, and how do they want to learn it. Through the survey results, they found public librarians are interested in a number of topics, including lawyer referral information, the unauthorized practice of law, court forms, and the basics of legal information. The results also found that public librarians are not interested in finding case or statutory law. Finally, the survey also asked the librarians about what kind of training and/or resources would be helpful to them. Overwhelmingly, librarians chose an in-person workshop, a legal self-help guide, and quick reference informational cards.

Armed with the survey information, Rajotte and Roy created an in-person legal reference workshop for public librarians. The workshop focused on basic information about the law and court system, tips on a successful legal reference transaction, how to find credible information online, and making effective referrals. Pulling from legal instruction techniques, the workshop included instruction, role play, and practice. The workshop was scheduled for a half day, with the first half discussing primary sources, giving basic search demonstrations, and modeling how to use the court website. The second half of the workshop focused on practicing answering reference questions and reference interview role playing. These exercises allowed the public librarians to practice common reference questions using the free online resources that were presented in the first half. Working as a team, the public librarians were able to engage with the material, finding useful information and answering common legal reference questions. They were then asked to present their findings to the larger group. The role playing aspect allowed the librarians to build their confidence through sample interview questions. With the help of the instructors, they worked on getting the necessary information from their patron, using the online resources, and knowing when to refer a question. Rajotte and Roy found this to be the most beneficial for the librarians as the role playing allowed them to practice their skills in a low stress environment and ask questions when needed. This also allowed the librarians to discuss with the instructors other questions with which the patrons have come into the library and get advice on how to handle those situations in the future. Participant feedback showed that the public librarians loved the hands-on sections of the workshop and the challenging questions presented.
Overall, I found this session very inspiring and am hoping to work with our local trial court librarians on a similar workshop in the future. The presenters provided a toolkit for creating your own program, which is available on AALLnet at https://community.aallnet.org/viewdocument/engaging-public-librarians-in-the-a.

**C3—Show and Tell: Swag From Libraries Across the Country**
Shannon Kemen
University of Cincinnati Law Library

This session was presented by Cassie DuBay and Donna Wolff from Southern Methodist University, Underwood Law Library. It explained how to market library services through swag or a giveaway and provided very practical and helpful information, which is valuable for librarians in academic, firm and government libraries.

Before the session began, examples of the swag items that the presenters had collected from multiple libraries had been placed on the tables for the audience to review. There was also time after the presentation for the audience to move from table to table and see the different examples of swag, like pencils, mugs, sewing kits, stuffed animals and more.

To begin, the librarians discussed how using promotional items and marketing are often part of a librarian’s job duties by default and can be categorized for many people as “other duties as assigned.” Since, traditionally, it is not a function of most librarian’s jobs, marketing is an area where many librarians lack expertise and, consequently, are not in touch with their primary market—the students. The speakers suggested that the best way to use swag to effectively market your library was to make it user-centric. Ideally swag should both meet the user’s needs and build positive connections between the user and the library. Some examples of swag that could meet these criteria included tech items or office supplies.

The librarians advised that carefully considering the purpose of your swag before purchasing it can help you to avoid unwanted closets full of swag and outright marketing fails, where the swag fails to connect with your students. Before purchasing swag, they also suggested looking around at different vendors and ordering samples of items under consideration from vendors before purchasing them.

When selecting swag, the librarians recommended considering who ultimately would be the recipient of the swag. If you need to distribute swag to all of your students, they suggested purchasing cheaper, all-purpose swag like pens or pencils. If you’re giving swag to select groups, they recommended increasing the price and purchasing a little nicer swag like stuffed animals or phone cases. Finally, if you’re giving swag to special attendees or as a prize to a game winner, the swag should be high end, like an umbrella. Some examples of swag use based on event type include:

- **Orientation or Welcome Back Events:** A kit or water bottle filled with pencils, USB, and post-notes is given to each student.
- **Final Exams:** Students play a plinko game for a chance to win candy or a pencil as a prize.
- **Special or Unique Events:** Sunglasses or graduation toppers are given to each student.

The librarians also addressed using swag on a limited budget or with no budget. On a limited budget, the librarians found that you could get good mileage out of items that had your library name on it plus one additional piece of information, like your library’s hours. Examples of swag that would work well with this method include: business cards, bookmarks, postcards, pencils, stickers, or coasters. Other ideas proposed by the librarians for working with a limited budget included creating an in house production, like making your own poster, or purchasing cheap, fun bulk items, like slap bracelets. For libraries with no marketing budget, the librarians suggested getting creative with dry erase boards and once a week leaving puns for students, open ended questions for students to answer, or a crossword puzzle to fill in. Other ideas included: building book trees or having the library staff create a
C6—Cool Tools
Ramona Collins
Berkeley Law Library

I found the Cool Tools session at this year’s annual meeting very useful and informative, and it was not just because I presented on one of the tools! Nine different people introduced the packed room to nine software tools that solve a wide variety of problems. That only gave us about five minutes each to get our point across, but I did not think that was a bad thing. It forced the speakers to focus on what was most important and not to digress. We heard about the following products:

- **Chatfuel**: a chatbot for Facebook Messenger. Amy Pearce from the University of Wyoming Law Library used Chatfuel to automate the process of answering common questions coming in via the library’s Facebook page. The AI component has some potential, but it seems more geared toward the retail space than law.

- **FindTime**: a tool to schedule meetings across organizations. Austin Williams from North Carolina Central University Law Library uses FindTime with Outlook to schedule meetings without a long email thread. FindTime is similar to Doodle but with the added feature of automatically scheduling the meeting for the first mutually convenient time.

- **Inbox Pause**: an email productivity tool that works with Gmail, Outlook and on the iPhone. Kristina Alayan from Howard University Law Library demonstrated how she took control of her email by scheduling when she would receive notifications – setting them only to come at prescribed times. You can designate certain email addresses that get priority, so you won’t miss the most important emails.

- **Coggle**: a mind-mapping tool. Amanda Watson from the University of Houston Law Library showed how to create a diagram to visually organize information. This could be helpful for visual thinkers overwhelmed by pages full of words.

- **Quick, Draw!**: an AI experiment to see if a neural network can learn to recognize doodling. Emma Babler from the University of Wisconsin, Madison Law Library explained that she uses this tool to show students AI in action. This is an interesting way to crowd-source the building of a training dataset.

- **Shiftboard**: a tool to schedule shifts for various teams of employees. I explained how Shiftboard has helped make setting a schedule for the Berkeley Law Library’s circulation desk a little easier. Shiftboard helps with communication among the circulation team and automates getting a sub to work a shift in cases of illness or travel.

- **Trello**: a project management tool. Susan deMaine from the Ruth Lilly Law Library at IUPUI showed how Trello can help keep track of deadlines and tasks across various projects in different stages with various team members.

- **DoNotPay**: a “robot lawyer” app. Tawnya Plumb from the University of Wyoming Law Library shared her findings from exploring this app’s potential. DoNotPay reportedly has saved people $5 million dollars by disputing parking and traffic tickets. It can also help with government paperwork and getting an appointment at the DMV. Somehow, I do not think it will be taking any lawyer’s job just yet though.

I understand from some colleagues that the Cool Tools session has been structured somewhat differently in past years, with presenters sitting at tables throughout the room available to answer questions during the full hour. With presenters each taking a turn to present to the whole group, some attendees may have missed the beginning expecting to visit tables whenever they arrived. Overall, I think the Cool Tools session was well worth attending.
The clever title got the presentation off to a fine start, nostalgically evoking amusing images of legal research instructors gobbling up hypos, instead of balls, like the hungry hungry hippos of old. For it is true, however many good hypos we have, we hunger for more, more, more.

The presentation, given by Jonathan Diehl of Northwestern IT, Scott Vanderlin of the University of Chicago D’Angelo Law Library, and Clare Willis of Northwestern Pritzker School of Law, naturally started out with a great hypo, which is one that has floated around in many forms over the years. An unfortunate student attending an SBA event had a few too many, and wisely (or so it seemed at the time) decided to sober up while relaxing in the car with the air conditioning and radio blasting only to be...arrested for drunk driving?!

The scenario is easily recognized as a great hypo, but the presenters ask, what makes it, or any hypo, great?

The presenters have cleverly answered this question by boiling it down to three criteria - the three Fs. A great legal research hypo must be functional, familiar, and fascinating.

- **FUNCTIONAL:** The functional criterion means that a hypo must work for whatever you are trying to teach. For example, if you are trying to teach students how to find statutes by topic, you need to have a hypo that involves a statute. If you are trying to demonstrate the usefulness of secondary sources, you need to choose a hypo with useful secondary sources.

- **FAMILIAR:** Next, an effective hypo must involve an area of law that is familiar to the students. Instructors generally have limited time to teach legal research, so it does not make sense to choose an esoteric area of law that requires a lot of explanation before actual research can begin. DUI law is obviously a good choice, since students pick up lots of information over the years on the topic from the news, television shows, and friends. And, any law student who ever drinks has likely spent time reflecting on the need to avoid the negative criminal and civil ramifications of drunk driving.

- **FASCINATING:** The final criteria is that the fact pattern must be interesting to students – in fact, fascinating! Why? Problem based learning is popular in the first place because students are more motivated to learn when they find a subject matter interesting and more engaged with the material when it has practical application in their lives. What is more fascinating than a hypo that involves oneself, a law student, and what is more important than keeping one’s special self out of the harsh clutches of the law?!

If this insight was not useful enough, the presenters offer more in the form of a handout with eight hypos that have been vetted and tested by time. These engaging hypos cover a variety of topics, ranging from unwanted backyard Komodo dragons to a bowling alley employee hamstringed by covenants not to compete. And since the hunger is continuous, the presenters recommend keeping an eye out for hypos, hypos, everywhere, including in the news, podcasts, law review articles, cases, current awareness sources, colleagues, attorney friends, pop culture, and especially, the RIPS-SIS Annual Teach-In Kits, with a new section devoted to hypos to be added next year.

The handout and audio of the presentation are well worth checking out on the 2019 AALL Meeting Presentations website.
D3—I Know It Used to be There: Using Web Archives in Legal Research
Benjamin J. Keele
Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law

Cached copies of online sources have saved me from legal research disasters several times. Representatives from the Internet Archive, Library of Congress web archiving team, and the Perma.cc development team at the Harvard Law Library Innovation Lab discussed features of their respective services and their plans for the future.

The Internet Archive continues to display a voracious appetite for saving content, even in media I would not have thought possible, including television news and radio broadcasts. The two most exciting features to me are a “Save Page Now” feature that saves a time-stamped copy of a web page to the Internet Archive and a tool that compares versions of government websites and highlights changes.

While the Internet Archive’s efforts are expansive and, to some degree, crowdsourced, the Library of Congress’s web archiving program is more selectively curated. The LC collects the websites of Members of Congress, important legal blawgs, state government websites, and international tribunal websites. Many of the collections are embargoed and thus presently accessible only at the Library of Congress; eventually, they will be made freely available online.

Perma.cc is a tool designed to mitigate link rot in scholarly citations. Collecting and accessing time-stamped web captures is user-driven. Perma also has collaboration tools that enable law review editors to share web captures as part of their cite-checking work. The development team is working to capture sites with higher fidelity with the Webrecorder tool. While Perma was initially designed for academic uses, law firms, journalists, nonprofits, and book publishers have adopted it to reduce link rot.

D4—Polishing Your Public Speaking: Beyond Picturing People in Their Underpants
Taryn Marks
Stanford University

In “Polishing Your Public Speaking: Beyond Picturing People in Their Underpants,” Heather Joy, Ashley Sundin, and Andrea Moto provided tips and strategies for improving your public speaking. Throughout the program, they incorporated activities that allowed attendees to practice the skills that the three endorsed.

After purposefully doing a poor introduction and then polling the audience about what they should have done better, the audience was then given the chance to do the “obligatory stranger introduction.” The group gave quick instructions and tips on how to do so, something I very much appreciated. They next provided strategies for public speaking, including tips such as: having a ritual before any public speaking event, memorizing parts of the introduction and the conclusion, pausing, using storytelling, and practicing. They then discussed common pitfalls of public speaking and strategies for overcoming each. For example, we all have filler words that we use. The presenters suggested first figuring out your filler word (ummm, so, like, etc.), either by recording yourself or having a friend listen to you. Then, either practice with a friend and have them make an annoying sound every time you say the filler word or, when you notice yourself using your filler word when public speaking, make a goal to not use the word in the next sentence.

Next, the presenters discussed common problems associated with using technology while presenting, such as internet failures, websites that changed since the last time you used them, or a
faulty connection between the computer and the screen. The primary takeaway was always have multiple backups. Put your presentation in the cloud, email it to yourself, put it on a jump drive, and have a printed copy as a last resort. The secondary takeaway was use technology troubles as an opportunity to demonstrate how prepared you are and how you respond to challenging situations.

Then, we walked through a second activity using the tips and strategies given to us by the presenters. In this one, after a timer started, we were asked a question from a list of questions prepared by the speakers. The questions were simple (your favorite smell and why; if you could be a superhero, what would your power be, etc.) and you had to talk for at least 90 seconds and no more than 2 minutes about the given topic. After modeling the activity, the presenters turned it over to the audience to practice with our tablemates. It was an interesting activity that could be modified across a wide variety of situations, and I encourage you to contact the speakers if you’re interested.

Finally, the presenters discussed tips for different speaking contexts: impromptu public speaking, where you don’t know beforehand that you’ll need to speak; semi-impromptu public speaking, such as interactions at the reference desk or at a planned department meeting, where you know you need to speak but the specific context may not be defined; and planned public speaking, such as presentations. Just recognizing the different contexts can allow you to better plan for them.

Overall, I would recommend first viewing the slides and then, if the slides do not give you enough information, watching the program for additional context (fast forward through the activities). It was an interesting and informative program and definitely provided additional, common-sense information that anyone could use.

D5—Creating an Oral History Program: Capturing History and Building Connections
Lisa Britt Wernke
University of Cincinnati Law Library

The program “Creating an Oral History” began with defining oral histories. “Oral histories are the oldest method of gathering, preserving, and interpreting the voices and memories of people, communities, and participants in past events.” Next, the audience was treated to a few oral history audio clips, so we could get a feel for the interaction between the interviewer and interviewee. Specifically, we heard recordings from the Virginia State Law Library, the SEC Historical Society, and the Tarlton Law Library. It was nice to hear oral histories from a variety of institutions.

The presenters then addressed the fundamental aspects of designing and implementing an oral history program in your library. Step one is to set the parameters for the program. Choosing whom to interview and topics to cover during the interview will help the project run smoothly. When choosing whom to interview, the interviewer should provide some motivation to bring the interviewee on board and having a personal story to share in their own words offers that opportunity. Also, when choosing who to interview and the topic to cover, it is best to look for stories that are not part of a written record that the audience will find compelling. An example of oral history programs in law schools would be to identify longtime professors and ask about their history at the law school, their individual career paths, and what led them to become professors.

Step two of implementing an oral history program is to begin preparing to conduct the interviews. The easiest way to begin is to start with a resume or CV of the interviewee and then research the interviewee by looking for newspaper or new bulletin articles. It is best to talk with the interviewee before conducting the interview, to develop an outline for the discussion. Do you want it to be chronological or more of a conversation between two people? Be aware that most interviews become unscripted, and it is considered disrespectful to
walk into an interview without preparing and knowing the history of the person.

Step three is to determine the format of the finished product. There are several options available, including producing a print version of the interview, an audio version with or without transcripts, or a video of the interview. Regardless of the format that you choose, editing will have to be done to get the very best historical record possible. What do you do if the interviewee wants to edit or “rewrite” their history? It is considered a best practice to let them edit the section of the interview. Keep in mind that an interviewee may agree to the interview only if their interview is sealed for “x” number of years, but that type of request should be agreed upon before the actual interview occurs and not during the editing period.

There are many benefits to recording oral histories, regardless of the format used. Oral histories are a way to “enhance our understanding of the past by illuminating personal experience.” They are a way to memorialize the past of an institution and to document institutional knowledge that would otherwise be lost. Oral histories can also be used to honor an institution and make a connection to the community, whether it is current students, local bench and bar, or alumni of a school. A lot of alumni want to hear more about their school’s history and reconnect with past professors, deans, and other distinguished alumni.

Introducing an oral history program to your institution can be a very rewarding experience, but it also requires a lot of preliminary work before beginning the program. From identifying the goal and mission of your program to deciding how to provide access to the interview, recording an oral history can be a daunting task. Following the steps outlined by the presentation will help you get your program off the ground.

E2—Let’s Get Experiential! Creating Strategic Partnerships to Develop Experiential Simulation Courses
Julie Tedjeske
Duquesne University School of Law

This session provided audience members with information on areas where practicing attorneys struggle, so they could use the information to create simulation courses targeted at improving law students’ research skills. The panel included both a law firm and public law librarian. It was moderated by Alyson Drake, Assistant Director for Operations & Educational Programs for the Law Library at Texas Tech.

The session began with an overview of the ABA’s requirements for simulation courses. After that, the two panelists addressed what they perceived to be the most common weaknesses in the ways practicing attorneys approach legal research.

First, panelist Ryan Methany (Managing Librarian, Legal Education at Los Angeles Law Library) began the discussion by noting that often attorneys have a “Google attitude,” meaning that they will begin their research by typing some keywords into a database to search for case law rather than beginning with a secondary source. He teaches a CLE course on secondary sources in which he has attorneys utilize print secondary sources to solve a research problem, in the hopes of demonstrating the effectiveness of this approach to them.

Second, Methany said that attorneys can sometimes lack proper analytical skills and patience. They would rather click around in a database than sit down and read a case or secondary source. However, deep concentration is necessary to conduct an adequate analysis of a legal problem.

Third, Methany noted that he encounters attorneys who are not skilled in methods of searching for case law beyond simple keyword searching. In other words, they either do not know how to use tools such as Key Numbers, digests, and annotated stat-
utes, or they know how to use these tools but fail to do so.

Fourth, panelist Morgan Wood (Research Analyst at Holland & Knight) stated that summer associates and new attorneys were often too heavily dependent on Westlaw and Lexis. Not only do they lack skills with respect to databases such as Cheetah, HeinOnline, Fastcase, and Bloomberg Law, but they also tend to underutilize free resources such as the Supreme Court website, the websites of federal agencies, and Google Scholar. To counteract this, she often encourages associates to search in a database, such as Casemaker, where they will not incur a charge back to the client. She noted that despite such efforts, younger attorneys still have a much greater comfort level using Lexis and Westlaw.

Wood also noted that younger attorneys also have problems with properly crafting effective searches. Either their searches are too broad, or they are too narrow.

Finally, Wood suggested that the attorneys she works with are often uncomfortable doing anything beyond case law research, including researching statutes and regulations. She often gets questions relating to issues such as how to research a legislative history, how to do a 50-state survey, or how to search for information relating to a party in litigation.

In addition to identifying common research weaknesses, the panelists also provided suggested research hypotheticals that could be utilized in simulation classes to help address each of the identified research weaknesses.

Participants were given a handout that provided (1) a checklist of ABA requirements for experiential simulation courses on one side and (2) a list of the six research problems identified by the panelists, along with the panelists’ suggested hypotheticals, on the other side. The above description is organized to match the organization structure of this handout; the actual presentation was much more of a back and forth exchange between the panelists and the moderator.

After the main presentation, participants worked in small groups to create additional hypothetical exercise ideas.

Overall, the subject matter for the program was not really all that new, but it was designed in such a way as to provide immediately practical guidance. The panelists provided insights into the research habits of practicing attorneys, and they also gave examples of exercises that could be used to address deficiencies in those habits. The audience was encouraged to use these examples as a starting place to develop their own research hypotheticals. On a final note, I appreciated that a fair amount of useful information was presented in a single two-sided handout.

E3—Define Yourself
Cassandra Patterson
Georgia State University College of Law

Presented by Jamie Baker, Lindsey Carpino, Kristina (Kris) Niedringhaus and Gail Warren, Define Yourself was an informational program that focused on developing a professional identity or brand. The presentation began with Kristina (Kris) Niedringhaus introducing attendees to a sample professional identity plan that the speakers prepared. A copy of the plan, along with audio and PowerPoint slides, is available on the AALL 2019 AALL Annual Meeting Recordings communities’ webpage. She talked about the plan as something that can be worked on individually, or something that supervisors or mentors can work through with an employee or mentee. She then laid the foundation for professional identity development.

She explained that professional identity is an approach that originated from medical school and was intended to help medical students to deliber-ately think about themselves as doctors. The concept encourages students to think about what they would want their professional development to look like in a more meaningful way. They can go through...
med school thinking intentionally about what it means to be a doctor and what they want to look like as one. This concept is picking up steam in law schools.

Relating this to law librarianship, this presentation encouraged us to think through these concepts as librarians. What do we want to be known for? What do we want our brand to be? We get so tied into our work that we do not spend time thinking about or working on those questions. Niedringhaus challenged us to think more methodically about those questions and our professional identity. A great way to do that is to create a plan, figure out what we want our professional identity plan to look like and what decisions we need to make to work towards it.

Gail Warren continued the presentation by providing considerations that can help a mentee or employee to create a plan. To develop one’s professional identity, she talked about the importance of assessment and self-reflection. She noted that we often do these two things subconsciously, and she added that when we assess, there is nothing wrong with being deliberate in looking deeper into our strengths and weaknesses.

She described how honesty is important when we do a self-assessment. It will allow us to have respect for our authentic selves. Another important aspect she mentioned is that we may not be able to sustain the relationship in the long term if it does not match our personality or temperament. If it is something that we do but do not enjoy, it probably should not be a part of our brand identity. A great article that further illustrates this point is “Your Professional Decline Is Coming (Much) Sooner Than You Think” by Arthur C. Brooks. In this article, the subjects reflect back over their careers and what they accomplished.

It may not always be easy to find ways to exhibit behaviors that speak to the strength of their employee or mentee. Supervisors also can suggest appropriate leadership responsibilities based on those strengths.

Jamie Baker, the Ginger Law Librarian, presented the next part of the program, which detailed some specific actions that we can take to build our professional identity. She talked about what she did (somewhat unconsciously) to develop her brand identity. It began when she realized that she wanted to establish a presence in the profession. She started this presence by branding across multiple platforms.

She further explained the importance of being consistent when branding across multiple platforms. One example included using the same profile picture, name, cover image, and handle. Next, she talked about how she remained constant by creating a schedule of one blog per day, doing them first thing in the morning, and after time, it became a habit. She would also push news stories. After blogging for a while, the blog shifted to more of a content commentary and analysis on how it impacts the profession.

She became a thought leader in the community. As she developed her brand, she gathered newsletters, set up email alerts, followed experts on Twitter, and set up a blog schedule. Two pieces of advice she left with the audience were to decide what area of expertise we want to identify with and to list the steps we can take to learn about and maintain that identity.

Last, but not least, Lindsey Carpino talked about how she built her brand in a variety of ways. She mentioned that she built it daily on the way she dressed, interactions with colleagues, professional volunteering, her online presence, and being consistent with it all. She then focused on step four of the plan, creating a vision board.

She highlighted that a vision board can be in whatever form we want it to be. It can include our goals, inspirations, quotes, anything that inspires us
(she encouraged us to channel our inner Oprah)! We can look at where we want to go by looking at what we want to be known for, what we think is worth trying, and the ways we can do things for which we have passion without being experts.

This was a great presentation that addressed all levels of professionals. The handout was a beneficial take-away!

**E4—An Eye-Opening Look at the Challenges of Assisting Visually Impaired Patrons with Electronic Legal Research**

I-Wei Wang
UC Berkeley School of Law Library

This program gave a good glimpse at some of the challenges, insights, and rewards of working with a visually impaired patron. Although the title refers to assisting patrons with electronic legal research, the program focused largely on assisting a student with visual impairment in learning and using legal research databases. Centered around their shared experience of working with a specific student over the course of his law school career, the speakers (Rena Seidler, Research & Instructional Services Librarian, and Susan deMaine, Associate Director, both at Indiana University’s Robert H. McKinney School of Law) were able to offer a number of practical tips for librarians preparing to provide such intensive support, or generally interested in improving accessibility and usability of their legal research instructional materials and support.

Some of the key takeaways regarding preparing library services for a specific student who is visually impaired included the importance of early contact with the student to assess needs, early hands-on practice with the same adaptive technologies the student will use, and familiarity with vendor practices and service personnel on accessibility issues. Both speakers also emphasized soft skills, including listening to and understanding the student's needs and challenges; accepting that sometimes it simply is a matter of “it has to take more time” or “accepting the long pauses” to think about how to best to accomplish a task without using visual cues; and getting over one’s own self-consciousness about the use of language (such as expressions using the word “see”).

In terms of general practical advice, the program also identified some product features and resources for users with visual impairments—the helpful, such as HeinOnline’s option for a “Section 508 Accessible” version optimized for screen-reading technology, as well as the less helpful and the downright disastrous. An example of the last category was what should have been a relatively straightforward assignment that—because of the linear way that screen-reader software approaches a resource like regulations.gov—would have taken hours to complete simply because the relevant information (visible on one part of the regulation’s home screen) was interpreted by the screen-reading software as less important than (and therefore not read before) the 134 pages of regulation text embedded in the main reading pane of the page. Other practical tips included avoiding bullet point lists and unnecessary images and the overarching advice to use universal design in instructional materials and in planning assignments, whether or not a student with visual impairment is expected in the class.

Some insights offered were difficult to categorize as specific to the individual with whom Seidler and deMaine worked, as opposed to generalizable principles. For example, on Westlaw, because of the way that filters are findable to the screen-reading program, their student found resources faster if he searched first and then filtered. When he pre-filtered, it became harder to then find and apply the right post-search filters. But whether or not another patron with visual impairment would experience the same issues, the example demonstrates the importance of being flexible and analytical in working with a patron to find out what works best for that individual.

Whether your library is planning services for a specific student or other patron, or simply endeavoring to incorporate accessible design generally, this program is worth a listen.
Dan Brackmann
University of South Carolina College of Law

Since the announcement in February 2018 that U.S. News & World Report planned to publish a scholarly impact ranking based on citation counts found in HeinOnline, many law school deans, library directors, and librarians have emailed, blogged, and fretted about its implications. Information seemed to trickle out slowly and piecemeal, making this session the ideal opportunity to get the major players in a room and ask some questions. Librarians packed the room and the mood was tense, with tinges of anger drifting around the corners.

The folks from Hein opened the session by reviewing both the substance and features of Hein’s Author Profiles and explained how to create and update them either individually or in bulk. From there, discussion moved to the group of professors that approached Hein with the idea to rank schools by their scholarly impact. Hein decided that no one was better situated to collect the data and approached U.S. News about the idea. U.S News will not use Hein’s Scholar Rank; rather U.S. News will simply receive Hein’s raw data and conduct its own analysis.

Hein admitted that this project required devoting significantly more resources to it than they originally anticipated. They acknowledged that their data contains errors, whether caused by improper citations, OCR problems, or indexing errors (e.g., people with the same or similar names or with name variations causing confusion in the system) and are working to correct these problems. They have joined ORCID and plan to use an API to collect citations, which should hopefully include citations not found within their Law Journal Library. Hein’s plans also include developing an administrative dashboard and sending out preliminary information so it can be error checked by law schools.

Robert Morse, of U.S. News, began by acknowledging that legal scholarship exists outside the world of law journals but stressed that the new ranking works at the level of the institution (average citations per tenure-track faculty member) and not the individual author. Moreover, the methodology is not finalized and will evolve over time. He stated that U.S. News had received suggestions to use other databases, but all available databases have limits and problems. In U.S. News’s judgment, HeinOnline is the most complete database available. They will, however, consider comments in constructing their methodology.

Bonnie Shucha (University of Wisconsin Law School) represented the librarian perspective. She observed that the ranking created a lot of work for librarians but had some suggestions. Consistent branding for faculty, using the same photograph, email, ORCID, and Hein Author Profile link all help whittle down errors. She also mentioned ways to compile lists of faculty members’ publications. Regardless of the useful suggestions, significant issues remained. She noted discrepancies between IR, Google Scholar, and Hein content and citation counts, compounding the previously noted citation, OCR, and indexing errors. However, Hein has been responsive and fixed most errors brought to its attention.

Shucha’s presentation concluded with lessons learned, including having an accurate list of your faculty’s alternate names, the need to review the list of works Hein attributes to faculty members, and selective in-depth review of key faculty member’s citation counts. Communication with Hein and with faculty is key. An example checklist is included in the program materials.

Then the session moved to audience questions. Questions included: Did the panel have any idea how much total librarian time had been consumed by this announcement? Did Hein know that many librarians in the room could have told Hein that its data had these faults if asked? Communication about this has thus far been very ad hoc; will there be regular channels of communication?
My favorite question, however, came from a UC Hastings librarian who pointed out that his institution often hires young faculty members who publish a few articles before moving on to more prestigious institutions. He asked Morse who would get credit for works authored while the faculty member was at UC Hastings—Hastings or the faculty member’s later institutions. Morse indicated that the current institution would get credit for all of a faculty member’s publications. This answer seemed at odds with Morse’s previous statement that the ranking would focus on the institution’s productivity and not the individual author’s.

The materials for this session are available on the AALL website and are recommended for anyone interested in the HeinOnline/U.S. News impact ranking. The session did not really get into much detail about the metrics or answer any of the hard questions, but it is a good encapsulation of where the project is right now.

**F2—Assessing Legal Research Competency: Bridging the Gap Between Law School and Practice**

Stephanie Ziegler
Moritz College of Law

The presenters for this program were Nicole Downing, Clinical Assistant Professor of Law and Head of Reference Services at University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; Jennifer Davitt, Chief Librarian at the Louis Loss Library at the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC); Taryn Rucinski, Supervisory Librarian at the U.S. Court of International Trade; and Kelly McGlynn, Supervisor, Research and Knowledge Services at Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP.

Downing opened the presentation by outlining some of the ways she assesses legal research competency in her ALR classes using the Principles & Standards for Legal Research Competency. As someone who also teaches legal research, it was interesting to see the wide variety of assignments and exercises, and I felt reassured that other instructors also use short-answer and multiple choice quizzes in addition to in-class exercises and research memos.

Davitt from the SEC then discussed issues with new students and attorneys working with the SEC. Two issues she focused on were an overreliance on case law (there must be a case out there that perfectly addresses the issue, but the student has not been able to find it yet.) and the need for students to better understand how to ask legal research questions in a competent and professional way. The latter issue has led me to envision a new way to structure my research conferences in my own first-year legal research and writing course in a way for students to practice asking questions in an efficient and professional way, such as they would at a job like this.

Rucinski from the U.S. Court of International Trade discussed the Court’s summer research training program, which includes sessions on such subjects as legislative histories and state law history. She cited issues with student researchers, including a general overestimation of familiarity with databases, especially those that are less focused on during the first year of law school, such as ProQuest and Bloomberg Law.

McGlynn also discussed how they train up their new students, including their use of subject-specific “tours” of resources. She also emphasized the need for critical thinking skills and knowing “when to stop researching.” The latter, of course, is an often-discussed topic among instructors, and hearing that it was such a noticeable issue on the job inspired me to dig deeper into this question with my students.

The varying perspectives at this presentation provided helpful information to anyone involved with students learning legal research. It was enlightening to hear what issues continue to come up with new researchers and the difficulties they often face. As a teacher, I found it especially valuable to hear the perspectives of people with whom my students might eventually work. By seeing the issues new researchers confront in their first jobs, we as teachers can try to head off such issues, so our stu-
students can arrive at these jobs better prepared and ready for a productive and fulfilling professional experience.

**F5—No Regrets: Putting the User into Your Practice with Design Thinking**

Taryn Marks
Stanford University

The session “No Regrets: Putting the User into Your Practice with Design Thinking” started by providing an overview of Congress.gov and some of its new features. The presenters, three of whom work at the Library of Congress, used design thinking when Congress.gov rolled out several years ago, and they continue to use design thinking as they update and modify the platform. Design thinking is the idea that you can improve a product by analyzing how users interact with that product and by determining the users’ motivations in using the product.

Specifically, Congress.gov focuses on two sets of users: the general public and the Capitol Hill users. Through a variety of methods, including surveys, face-to-face feedback sessions, and collaborations with various users, the team collected data on these users and their preferences when searching and using Congress.gov. The best part of the presentation was a flow chart they provided that described agile design thinking (I won’t replicate it here; go to the presentation slides (slide 28) to check it out). Personally, at this point, I wish they had delved a little deeper into this discussion, as I found it interesting and wanted to hear more, but we moved on to an exercise that put the audience members as the design-thinkers.

During the first part of the exercise, we identified our persona, the person who was our user. We were given Post-Its to use in conjunction with a handout; we wrote down attributes of our persona on the Post-Its to apply to the handout. Then, for those who had a partner, you could then move the Post-Its around after discussing it with your partner so that you created a single persona for the team. After creating the persona (an attorney, law student, member of the public, etc.) and identifying their goals, motivations, and challenges, we moved onto creating an empathy map for our persona. There, we again used Post-Its to determine the persona’s thoughts, feelings, actions, and speech and how that persona would respond when seeking information on Congress.gov given their goals and motivations.

Next, we filled out a chart that analyzed how our persona would use Congress.gov to conduct a specific search, view the search results, and browse the legislation. We analyzed both how the persona would use Congress.gov as it is, and how they would like it to be, again based on the persona’s goals and motivations.

I wish that the presenters had given us more information and direction; I found myself rather lost during most of the exercise. That said, I believe this activity could be valuable—they pointed to using it as a way to encourage buy-in, as a way to refine a system, and as a means of examining how a database is actually used—if the instructions and background information were fleshed out more. Watch the first ten minutes of the recording (after that, we did the exercise) and look at the slides and the activity. Additionally, all of the panelists clearly had deep knowledge of this subject, so reaching out to them may also be useful if you would like to pursue using design thinking in your own library.

**F8—Deep Dive: Things You Need to Know Before Moving to a New ILS**

Edward T. Hart
UNT Dallas College of Law

This program came a year too late for me. UNT Dallas selected and implemented a new ILS over the last academic year. There were many touch-and-go moments as the project sometimes went along smoothly and sometimes became so bumpy we feared the whole project would crash. Many of the lessons we learned along the way were ones shared in this program, so you now have the opportunity to listen to this program and follow their handouts and
presentation slides that surely will map a smoother course than ours.

The speakers represented both academic and firm libraries and, most importantly, implementation of different ILSs:

- Robert Bratton, Cataloging Librarian, George Washington University Law Library
- Mary Kate Hunter, Reference/Government Contracts Librarian, George Washington University Law Library
- Jesse A. Lambertson, Head of Cataloging & Metadata, Georgetown Law Library
- Christina Tarr, Head of Cataloging Department, Berkeley Law Library
- Michael Colin Lindsey, Director of Library Web Development, University of California, Berkeley Law Library
- Morgan Wood, Research Analyst, Holland & Knight LLP

The program’s blurb: With the rising cost of ILS system maintenance, more and more libraries are moving toward or considering moving toward a new ILS, one that is less expensive with (or integrating better with) an open source/customizable discovery system. However, there are lots of technical issues one needs to know before jumping into the pool. This program will present the pros and cons of technical issues during and after the data migration and system transition, so that other libraries considering a move may be better prepared for all the challenges and surprises.

The program consisted of three case studies.

One case study was presented by Bratton and Lambertson about the DC area libraries’ migration from 13 ILSs with a shared public catalog to a consortium-run ILS that accommodated 13 separate “zones.” The law libraries were a distinct minority. A public services perspective was shared by Hunter. One key for her was keeping the users informed of the migration and being prepared to educate them on the new approaches for using the new ILS. From both the technical and public sides, the key was cleaning and sorting records before migration. It is best to avoid suffering the “garbage in, garbage out” phenomenon.

The Berkeley case study was focused on their migration from III’s Sierra to TIND, and it offered a perspective of going from the most established law library ILS to a relatively new start-up ILS. The three reasons given for the switch were finances, lack of support from the current vendor, and the desire for a more modern, streamlined system. Once again, the advice was to clean up records in the old system for the cleanest possible transfer. The presenters also suggested working carefully with the new vendor—taking advantage of their on-site support, ticketing system, and the new community of users. Since the new ILS is a new start-up, the Berkeley team is working with the vendor to track development and get them implemented using the ticketing system and follow-up meetings.

The law firm case study was presented by Wood. Lack of use, by both lawyers and librarians, and staleness of the old ILS reflected on the department by casting a shadow over its innovations. Identifying a criteria with 19 points, including costs, MARC records imports, federated searching, mobile access, and training, they considered seven possible ILSs. The one that passed muster was Koha because of its user-friendly public and administrative faces, open source software that allows for customization, and cost effectiveness. Once again, we are reminded that the best approach is to have one’s house in order to migrate over the best possible data. Wood’s firm did not quite follow this advice and spent much time and effort after the fact cleaning up records. Wood also advised that, once the system is up and running, it is important to make it clear to all personnel that they are to use the new platform. No home grown systems, especially paper

cont’d
based, are allowed anymore! Presenting a modern interface with current data has led to more usage by the firm’s lawyers.

It should be noted the program was sponsored by the TS-SIS. BoK Domains: Information Management.

G3—Behind the Bench: Preparing Judicial Clerks and Interns
Ana Isabel Delgado Valentín
Suffolk University Law School

This hour-long panel brought together three panelists with varied professional roles but with one common denominator; they each completed a judicial clerkship or legal internship. Taryn Rucinski, Supervisory Librarian, U.S. Court of International Trade, served as panel moderator, while Bethany Mihalik, Associate, Fish & Richardson P.C., and Sabrina Sondhi, Director of Law Library Administrative Services, Adjunct Professor of Law at Cornell University Law School, participated as panelists. The overall goal of this session was to address the central question of whether the term “prepare to practice” in the law school curriculum is all-encompassing, or is it time for Academia to “step up their game”? To this end, the discussion distinguished how this term typically defines firm preparation rather than judicial preparation and highlighted that the skills needed to prepare and execute well in a judicial clerkship are distinct enough to merit their own curriculum, whether formal or informal.

The first question asked the panel to share their general experience as a judicial clerk or legal intern. Noteworthy, all panelists described the experience as excellent but commented that in many instances they felt confused and as if they didn’t know what they were doing—a feeling to which many of our students often can relate. Following introductions, the panelists shared examples of the research with which they were tasked. As part of the conversation, Bethany highlighted the stark difference between law school and real-life legal research. She compared the at time limited nature of law school level research (e.g. case law, statutes), where the main tasks are somewhat contained, with that of real-life scenarios, where the role of the judicial clerk is to analyze briefs, cite-check, shepardize, think outside of the box, and equip the judge with the best tools available. Conducting legislative research, researching administrative law decisions, visiting the Library of Congress, and liaising with the librarians of the Federal Circuit were some other highlights of the types of legal research tasks they were assigned to complete.

Next, the panelists discussed what type of preparation they received before or during their judicial clerkships. They shared that while in law school they received similar suggestions including “take a federal jurisdiction course,” “learn about the federal courts,” and “take an administrative law course”. Specifically, Taryn commented that having a familial connection, since her sister had previously clerked for the judge with whom she was going to interview, helped her better prepare for the interview process. Similarly, Bethany attributed her success as a clerk to having worked in a firm, where she learned the skills needed to become an efficient researcher, for a year before becoming a law clerk. These stories illustrate the need for Academia to develop a more uniform preparation curriculum, instead of relying on chance or an autodidact student only. With this in mind, the panel provided concrete suggestions on what type of legal research preparation students should partake in to be “practice-ready” for their judicial clerkships. The panel stressed that an ideal training or preparation should not be focused on a specific practice area but rather in skills that will be beneficial across the board. They suggested that a sort of boot camp, to give confidence, if nothing else, could be helpful.

Overall, this program is recommended if you are considering having a more active role in the preparation of judicial clerks and interns within your law school.
**G4—Cards Against Case Law! And Other Ways to Enhance Student Learning and Engagement**

Anne Hudson  
DePaul University, College of Law

As someone who left traditional academic law librarianship years ago to incorporate responsibilities for pre-law programs (Wayne State’s Law Library reports up through the University Library system, which is a somewhat unique but excellent opportunity for their law librarians), I came to AALL now that I am at DePaul to see what new instruction techniques were being used in law school libraries.

Jessica de Perio Wittman, Jordan Jefferson, Tanya Johnson, and Stacia Stein served as the panel of presenters representing U Conn and Yale.

I enjoyed this session since it included both information related to the topic and an opportunity to practice and engage with the materials, which is exactly what I want to do in my own Advanced Legal Research class. The presenters began by defining key terms and how they can be used in teaching legal research. For example, Game Based Learning uses games to teach concepts and skills based on your class learning objectives. The presenters then led us directly into our first “game”.

Using an internet enabled device and going to a Poll Everywhere site, we were given three minutes to do research and provide a case citation in response to a prompt; for example ___ counts as a weapon. There is a Pennsylvania case that held that a spatula can be a weapon. This is a fun exercise but also an excellent teaching device as the instructor would then ask the students what search terms they used and what strategy they used. After several rounds of the game, instructors would have the students compare and contrast which strategies work better in different scenarios.

After the quick introduction to using games in the classroom, we were given some instructions on what makes up a good game. There should be components that include your objective. For example, the game Clue requires you to solve a mystery. The game mechanics should include engagement. Finally, there should be space or a game environment. For example, instructors can use the familiarity of the game Jeopardy. The presenters concluded the section with a reminder to keep accessibility issues in mind to be inclusive. We were then instructed on what the students need from us; rules are key. Students need consistency, or they will call each other out for cheating and unfairness. Time is important as well. A brief time to play brings conflict and excitement, but remember, if every game is a race, you may have some students who cannot keep up. Finally, students need a chance to debrief after a game and get immediate feedback.

The final instruction session before we created our own game was to review whether using games in legal research classes works. The presenters used student surveys, which were generally positive, but of course, included self-assessment. The presenters also were able to use observation in a couple of different ways. Poll Everywhere and Kahoot are tools that allow you to assess student learning and engagement while in the classroom, so they know if students are doing the readings and whether they understand discrete topics or need to have further instruction. Also, at the end of the course, they observed that the students’ final projects included methods that were taught through the use of games. The only negatives that were shared for future consideration were: students always wanted more time; some found the rules to be confusing; and there might have been some unresolved issues of gender bias.

The session concluded with each table being given a ten sided die and a game creation template for the group to use to create a game in 10 minutes. The first roll of the die gave you the learning objective, for example, the value of Shepards, and the second roll of the die gave you the game, for example Twister. After we worked together for 10 minutes, we had table report outs. A few tables got the games 20 questions, Scrabble, and Clue and the learning objectives comparing statutes and regulations, coming up with Search Terms, and using...
Public Records. I think we all agreed that 10 minutes is not enough time, but it was fun and interesting to see how a game could meet fairly standard legal research learning objectives. I am pretty sure we all took away at least one game that we are at least curious about developing for our own classrooms. That makes this a very successful session in my mind. I recommend you all view the recording and download the handouts for much more detail and examples.

H5 – Instruction Zone: Active Learning Showcase
Taryn Marks
Stanford University

When we started the “Instruction Zone: Active Learning Ideas Showcase” and were told that it would be a bit like speed dating, I must admit I was skeptical. The speakers each briefly introduced themselves and had us divide into groups. We then rotated among the five speakers, each of whom demonstrated an active learning activity that they had deployed successfully in their classrooms. Additionally, each person had a half-page-sized handout with an overview of their active learning exercise.

I first visited Taryn Rucinski, who showcased a brainstorming activity that helps students do a variety of preliminary tasks, such as identify the key issue in a hypothetical, list keywords, and find the jurisdiction. First using highlighters, then using a mind-mapping web app, the students are tasked with thinking through the hypothetical and brainstorming different ideas for approaching the initial search.

Next, I moved over to Adam Mackie, who discussed gamification generally, and then demonstrated one of the games that he had adapted for use in the law classroom. First, Adam provided general tips about gamification: start with the aim of what you want students to get out of the game and use a game with which students are already familiar as the starting point. He then demonstrated how he used Wheel of Fortune for agency research. Students first spun a wheel to determine their agency and then spun a second wheel to determine which document/resource they needed to find related to that agency (such as legislation, a guide, etc.). The first student to find a matching document won.

Mandy Lee provided an example of a matrix she had developed that allowed students to compare the features and qualities of specific databases related to litigation analytics. After giving the students a specific judge to research, the students then had to identify whether a variety of databases (Westlaw, Lexis, Bloomberg), contained specific information (such as number of cases, analytics about types of motions, etc.). She then led a discussion of how this matrix could be used in other contexts, such as comparing secondary sources or exploring the differences between an online and print index.

I then moved to Kathryn McRae, who provided examples of fill-in-the-blank notes. After creating lecture notes, Kathryn removed key portions of the notes that students then had to fill in during her lectures (those of you who used BarBri for bar prep will be intimately familiar with this style of learning). She pointed out that this helped because it prevented students from frantically trying to write down everything she had to say, allowed her to highlight the most important points of the lecture, and saved time because instead of writing down complex information on the board, she simply pointed to her notes.

My last station was Stacia Stein. Stacia gave each of us a list of 6 headnotes that she said had just been generated from newly-issued cases. She then provided 5 large post-its, each with a key number and its specific topics. As attorney-editors, we had to assign the headnote to its appropriate key number using stickers that matched the headnote number. It was an excellent introduction to both the complexities of the key number system and the pos-
This session wasn’t recorded, so if you are interested in further information for any of these active learning ideas, I suggest contacting the speaker or the coordinator for those materials. It would be well worth it.

**H6—Maximizing Your Faculty’s Scholarly Impact: Techniques to Increase Findability**

Deborah C. Turkewitz  
Charleston School of Law

Have you ever found yourself at the end of a conference, excited to bring home new ideas, and think you’ve heard all the great ideas you possibly can? Then, you go to one more session on the last morning, and you discover yet another session that is relevant to your position, brimming with explanations, and even more good ideas for you to bring back to your institution! That was my fortunate situation on the last morning of the 2019 AALL Annual Meeting when I attended “Maximizing Your Faculty’s Scholarly Impact.” The presenters, Caroline L. Osborne, West Virginia University College of Law, Carol A. Watson, University of Georgia School of Law, and Thomas J. Striepe, University of Georgia School of Law, offered a program that was well-organized and full of practical take-away ideas for the experienced or new faculty services librarian.

The speakers presented three topics: why we are concerned with scholarly impact; increasing findability; and choosing platforms. We learned we would assess the benefits and drawbacks of social media platforms for faculty scholarship, compare findability techniques, and evaluate strategies to promote faculty scholarship. The presenters also used audience polling to test attendees’ experiences with their concepts; if you didn’t know an answer, you could see you were not alone!

First, Caroline L. Osborne explored “what is scholarly impact” and why we, as librarians, care about it. While faculty know they need to publish for tenure purposes, librarians know citations are important for maintaining an institution’s reputation, facilitating grant writing, and creating a vibrant, intellectually curious faculty and student body. We also are aware of the coming US News and World Report’s survey of scholarly impact and the effect that survey may have on a school’s reputation. Caroline further explained biases of scholarly impact measures; for example, longer term scholars are rewarded in higher impact citation numbers over newer scholars. She emphasized that the role of the librarian is to educate the institution, as well as the individual author, about scholarly impact.

Next, Carole A. Watson described steps that can be taken to increase findability. For example, Google Scholar search and relevancy results can be improved by utilizing effective titles, accurate metadata, and consistent author identification and institution affiliation. She suggests authors avoid funny phrases or puns in titles. Instead, she asserts that using consistent and descriptive keywords in titles, abstracts, and the table of contents will improve search results in search engine page rank and relevancy. Carole explained ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID) and how consistent use can help with an author’s findability. She also explored how using a DOI (Digital Object Identifier) for an article can help with findability. There was some discussion about faculty reluctance to apply for these identifiers and the librarian’s role in educating about the utility of using identifiers consistently. She suggested that if journals and Bluebook citations started to require DOIs and/or ORCIDs, then this battle for consistent identifiers may be resolved.

Finally, Thomas J. Striepe reviewed faculty profiles and explored how much the librarian does, or can do, for the faculty member to create the profile. Thomas suggested listing and linking articles directly from a faculty member’s profile page, using a repository such as BePress and Digital Commons, and creating a SSRN profile, HeinOnline enhanced author profile page, or a Google Scholar profile page. Thomas also suggested some less obvious profiles and ideas to reach a different, wider audience. For example, a LinkedIn profile, Amazon au-
This presentation had many great tips for experienced and new faculty services librarians. Your role in maximizing scholarly impact might vary depending not only on what your institution requires but also individual faculty needs. The session was not recorded, but the presenters’ slides have been posted to the Academic Law Libraries SIS discussion board and https://works.bepress.com/caroline_osborne/23/.

H7—A Peek Behind the Curtain of the U.S. Code
Benjamin Keele
Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law

I have a penchant for YouTube videos that show how a product is made by a factory or a craftsman. They remind me that most products and services we use and depend on are the result of the time, energy, and expertise of many people, most of whom we will never meet.

This session has the same effect on me for a tool I use all the time: the U.S. Code. Ralph Seep and Rob Sukol present on their work in the Office of Law Revision Counsel (OLRC), the office responsible for maintaining the official statutory code. I encourage any librarians who use or teach the U.S. Code to listen to this session, but I will summarize three major points.

First, the process by which the OLRC classifies provisions from newly enacted laws into the appropriate parts of the U.S. Code is both an art and a science. Deciding where a new provision would make the most sense in the Code requires deep familiarity with the Code’s structure and a vision for how the statutes may be changed in future. It almost seems that the U.S. Code is organic, growing and changing in ways the OLRC cannot fully control, but can nudge and shape.

Second, statutory notes are valid provisions of the Code. I consider myself an experienced legal researcher, but somehow, I had not learned until now that the OLRC sometimes decides that statutory language should appear in the Code but not be part of a section. Instead, the language, as little as a clause and as much as an entire Act, is included as a note to a section. For example, the Plain Writing Act of 2010, which requires federal agencies to improve their communications with the public, appears in the Code as a note to 5 USC § 301. In Westlaw, one would have to look under the History tab for 5 USC § 301 to find that enacted language. The USCA Popular Name Table does point one to 5 USC § 301 note. Going forward, I will certainly include statutory notes in my lessons on statutes.

Third, the reenactment of each title into positive law is a worthy project, but one the OLRC never expects to finish. The OLRC has submitted several bill drafts to Congress that would make technical corrections to the Code and collect provisions into a new title, such as Title 56 on Wildlife, for instance. I am disappointed Congress has not moved to enact these proposals that would make the U.S. Code easier to use, but Seep and Sukol say the OLRC had plenty of work to do in the meantime.

This session was a fascinating look into how the U.S. Code is maintained and is well worth the time.

H8—Hot Topic: Distance Learning in Legal Education: The Librarian’s Role in Implementing ABA Standard 306
Julie Tedjeske
Duquesne University School of Law

This session examined the requirements under the new ABA Standard 306 on distance education, which expands the availability of online education in law schools. The speakers described their own experiences with creating academic content in an online environment. The moderator was Emily Janoski-Haehlen, Director of the Law Library and Associate Dean for Academic Af-
First, Simon Canick, Associate Dean for Law Library & Technology of the University of Maryland, spoke about his experience setting up a blended J.D. program at William-Mitchell School of Law (now Mitchell-Hamline School of Law).

Mitchell-Hamline’s blended program required an ABA variance. Approximately half the course work is done online (largely, although not exclusively, asynchronous online), and the other half is done during in-person, intensive sessions on campus. These in-person sessions emphasize group work and include a capstone-like experience. The program launched in 2015, and it was immediately successful.

With respect to the overall development of the project, Canick noted that faculty buy-in can be a significant challenge. He said that, despite changing attitudes, not all faculty are likely to be supportive; however, you just need some people, you don’t need everyone. As support, there is gold-standard research that shows that blended learning is at least as good as traditional in-person teaching methods.

The way that librarians can get involved with online learning is to utilize thoughtful instructional design in their own online classes and then capitalize on their experience to work with faculty members who wish to move their courses online. Not all universities have instructional designers who can provide this sort of expertise to faculty members, so there may be an opportunity for librarians to work collaboratively with faculty.

Next, Sarah Starnes, Assistant Law Librarian at the University of Akron, and Misty Franklin, Assistant Director of Student & Academic Affairs at the University of Akron, discussed Akron’s online classes. Akron has been teaching advanced legal research online for years, but they are just starting to offer an asynchronous online Legal Writing and Research class. This session focused on the Legal Writing and Research class and did not discuss the advanced legal research course.

The online classes at Akron are based on what is known as the Quality Matters framework. Quality Matters provides standards for online learning and blended learning classes. The handouts for this session include a worksheet for course design that is based on the Quality Matters standards.

Quality Matters emphasizes that course design is intended to promote student learning. Thus, it is important to keep learning objectives in mind when creating course content.

The presenters noted that, in designing the course, each weekly module must support one or more of the overall course learning objectives. From there, each activity for the week must be designed to meet one or more learning objectives for that week.

Online courses should be designed to promote three different types of collaboration and interaction: (1) student to student interaction; (2) student to instructor interaction; and (3) student to material interaction.

At Akron, they teach using a variety of instructional methods, including instructor-created videos, CALI lessons, and Lexis Learn modules. They also use discussion boards. The presenters suggested that online teachers should use a variety of different types of content. Having this variety ensures that the students are involved with the material. At Akron, content has staggered deadlines throughout the week.

In terms of preparing videos to include in a learning management system, the general advice was to aim for a series of short videos that are about 7 minutes in length, give or take. The maximum recommended time for a single video was around 20 minutes. The presenters suggested that if you have a longer video, then you can add questions around every 7 minutes to break it up.
At Akron, they embedded their videos with what they call "checkpoint questions." The checkpoint questions are designed in such a way that the viewer must answer the question before he or she can continue with the video. They also have technology to make sure that students do not fast-forward through the lecture, although students can still listen to videos on "chipmunk speed."

Right now at Akron, they do not have a global online gradebook. Nevertheless, the presenters emphasized that it is important that students are able to track their progress so that they are not surprised at the end of the course.

To promote interaction with the students, the Akron class includes optional drop-in sessions where students can meet with the instructor. According to the presenters, these drop-in sessions are fairly well-attended.

Next, the presenters discussed the ABA’s credit hour requirements. First, for each credit awarded, there is a need for 50 minutes of instructional activities and a full two hours of student preparation activities per week. At Akron, they track everything on a spreadsheet. The presenters suggested that having a planned course map will help you justify to the ABA that the minimum hourly requirements are being met. They also noted that any optional activities cannot count towards instructional time.

In terms of what to set forth in the syllabus, the importance of setting boundaries was emphasized. Students need to understand that you cannot be available via email at all times. They also need detailed information on what they need to do and when they need to have it done. For example, if something is due on a particular date, you might need to explain that it is due by midnight. In terms of grading, the presenters suggested online activities may well require more explicit and detailed breakdowns and rubrics.

This was a particularly informative session on a topic that arguably is not getting the amount of attention that it deserves within our profession. It would be great to see online asynchronous classes get something approximating the level of attention that more traditional teaching methods receive in our educational programming efforts, particularly given that recent changes in the ABA’s standards make it likely that online teaching will become much more prevalent in the near future. As was noted by Canick in his remarks, librarians have the opportunity to be at the forefront of adopting these new instructional methods and to then use their knowledge and experience to assist others within the law school in a collaborative manner.

**Poster Session Presentation Period**

Matt Timko  
Northern Illinois University College of Law

The posters, as always, were fascinating and thought provoking. All of the posters were very accessible and understandable, so it was unnecessary to speak with the creators to understand the poster’s content. Of course, the most effective way to understand any content is to ask questions, which is why I attended the poster presentation session on Tuesday, July 16. I was happy, but not at all surprised, to see so many attendees taking advantage of this opportunity, and all of the presenters were thoroughly busy answering questions, clarifying content, or going into more depth about their projects. During the session, Susan David deMaine, Benjamin Keele, and Hannah Alcasid from the Indiana University Ruth Lilly Law Library won the Poster Session Award for their poster, “Stepping up Access to the Indiana Code: Partnering for Increased Access and Preservation.” Take a look at their [poster and award](#), as well as other photos, from the poster session.

As I usually do, I went into the poster presentations with some canned questions, and as usually happens, these questions led to further inquiries I had not previously considered. For instance, with Gonzaga’s community outreach poster, I asked about funding and interest, but then, I was surprised to find out the movies they showed as a part of the program were not legal themed but rather just fun movies for students to unwind. Similarly, Boston University’s poster on activity in the class-
room made my head spin with the possibilities, and I was impressed (and startled) that they had instituted the program in one fell swoop as opposed to piecemeal.

Further demonstrating how important these poster presentations are for creating interest and curiosity, the two most unexpectedly fascinating posters were a reference sheet of SEC filings (from Margaret Prater at the Department of Justice) and research on Municipal Bankruptcy law (from Michelle LaLonde at Wayne State University). I say unexpected because neither of these subject has ever sparked my interest, but the posters were highly fascinating and relevant, to the point that I am keeping information from both posters as reference sources for my own patrons. Finally, a poster that struck close to home, for personal and geographic reasons, was Edward Hart’s (UNT Dallas) poster on the Boy Scouts Law Merit Badge. It was personal as a former cub scout and geographic since my local county law librarian was quoted in the poster!

Unfortunately, the poster session was a lot packed into just one hour. Starting at the very beginning and winding my way through the posters, I found that by the time I was only half way done, I only had ten minutes left, causing me to rush through the remaining posters. Though so many posters had literature, either in the form of print or digital documents available to take, not all of the posters did, which meant the only understanding I had about these projects were confined to the four corners of the poster. While this was plenty of information, the value of the session comes from probing further and getting more nuanced information.

To this end, I would like to see more accompanying information that members can peruse at their leisure. Similarly, though not exclusively, there should be longer sessions. This is, of course, difficult during a conference, where time is at a premium, but with the sheer number of posters, it is a shame to rush through so many rather than fully explore the research and work that our fellow librarians have put into these interesting projects. Finally, and most unfortunately, unlike the sessions at the annual meeting, there are no digital records through AALL covering the posters, either the posters themselves or the session. While there are photos available from the session (see link above), these focus more on the attendees rather than the posters themselves. Understandably, this would be a logistical nightmare, but it would be helpful for attendees or those unable to attend to have an AALL designated webpage to explore the posters more fully, just as we are all able to listen to the sessions we could not attend at the conference.

Better With Science: Strengthening Patron Learning
Julie Randolph
Temple Law Library

This session offered practical tips for, and examples of, instructional methods to help students and patrons retain and apply information, all based on ... science! Presenters Joe Lawson of the Harris County Law Library, Heather Simmons of University of Georgia Law School, and Alyson Drake of Texas Tech University Law School convincingly explained how incorporating scientifically-proven teaching strategies does not necessitate a wholesale overhaul of our teaching but will help our students.

But first, we should understand what we are doing wrong. We have to overcome the false narrative that students already know how to study, practice, and do research; instead, we need to make long-term retention of these skills a goal. To do this, we may need to reconsider how we present information. After all, a person’s limited cognitive load means they only can concentrate on two to three things at a time.

So how do we incorporate this knowledge into our teaching? Joe suggested playing “small ball.” You don’t need to revamp your entire curriculum to make an improvement; instead, implement small changes incorporating these strategies.

The three presenters gave brief descriptions and examples of three strategies to use. Heather
Simmons started out with prediction. Prediction asks learners to make a guess of what will happen next. This engages the student with the material and forges connections in the brain. Pretesting, or even just asking students to write down their thoughts, can accomplish this, but make sure to present the correct answers or information before too much time has passed.

Joe discussed scaffolding, a process which enables someone to achieve beyond what they could unassisted. A basic tenet is that students learn better and can better move past the zone of what they can do on their own when they have social interaction with their teachers, rather than just being lectured at. Per the earlier point about cognitive load limits, teachers should break down instruction into chunks consisting of 2-3 items, demonstrate the skill, and provide support. Support can take several forms, including encouragement, instruction, and further demonstrations but should taper as appropriate for the student.

Finally, retrieval, which has students practice pulling information out of their brains, was covered by Alyson. Done correctly, this strategy aids long-term retention, better organization of knowledge, and boosts higher-order thinking (such as translating a skill from one context to another). One method, spaced retrieval, has had significant buzz. In short, spaced retrieval involves repeatedly learning a piece of information or a skill over time, allowing it to recede a little before being used again. This increases retention because the user works harder to remember the information or skill the subsequent time. Another technique is interleave retrieval, which “sprinkles” previously-learned skills into subsequent teaching and assignments. Overt retrieval, a third technique, makes all students engage by having everyone attempt to retrieve an answer and then write or speak their response (as opposed to the Socratic method, which puts only one person on the spot).

For those accustomed to mass practice (such as cramming for an exam), these retrieval techniques may be frustrating because skill progression moves more slowly. Keep in mind, though, that skills learned in this manner will stick with students much longer. The presenters suggested explaining up front to students what you are doing, so they understand what is happening and why.

Attendees had the opportunity to practice some information retrieval and to consider ways to incorporate the discussed techniques into our current teaching. This was a nice reinforcement of how instructors do not need to overhaul their practices to include these strategies.

Because we are playing “small ball,” I have been able to include some of these ideas into my fall teaching prep without too much angst. For those who want to do a deeper dive into this area, the class materials (available on the AALL website) list three books on teaching and cognitive theory, each of which I found to be quite readable.

Social Media as Primary Sources of Government Information

Kimberly Miller
Syracuse University College of Law

Various parts of government, from public officials to government agencies, are using social media to communicate with the public. As legal researchers, it is important to consider how we can find this information, for what types of research this communication could be used for, and whether the information is accurate and trustworthy. In “Social Media as Primary Sources of Government Information,” Robert Dessau (Voxgov), Diana Owen (Georgetown University), and Jacob Straus (Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress) talked about the different ways the government uses social media.

In this presentation, the speakers use the term primary source to mean original source, not statutes or case law as we in the legal profession typically use the term.

The speakers noted that it is important to differentiate between politicians and agencies. Agencies normally use social media to educate the pub-
lic. Some examples of agencies using social media effectively are NASA, FEMA and the Interior Department (National Parks Service). These agencies use all aspects of social media, including pictures and video, to engage their audience. FEMA even uses social media to help gather information during natural disasters to help them send resources to effected areas quicker. Politicians, on the other hand, use social media to spread a message.

Diana spoke about the challenges of finding specific instances of social media use. One example is the terms of service. Each platform has their own standards for how long information is stored on their platform and how information can be deleted. As a result, Georgetown University and others are starting to archive social media posts. Another resource for social media post may be lobbying and special interest groups that have archived posts on topics of significance to them. While text media can be easy to search, the move to other forms, like video and pictures, highlights the need for better metadata standards to improve search optimization and findability.

During the question period, the speakers were asked about how social media relates to law making and how the courts should look at social media. The speakers pointed out that social media may be a source for legislative intent. With more government documents becoming shorter and formalistic, social media can show what government officials are saying about legislation. The speakers also talked about how politicians may have multiple social media accounts (a personal, an official office, and a campaign) due to ethical regulations on what politicians can say and advertise where.

The presenters also pointed out the importance of the variety of people following politicians on social media. What are the demographics? How many are constituents, lobbyists or members of the media? How are politicians responding to social media? In the past, lobbying groups used to tell people to write or call your Congressman. Is social media replacing this call to action? Traditional public comments are from people with strong opinions, usually negative. With social media, it is easier for people to comment; therefore, opinions tend to range from positive to negative.

Social media has evolved into a major source of news information. This session was a good entree for librarians into future areas of research. If we as a profession take notice and start creating methods for archiving these forms of government communication, searching for this information will be easier in the future.

I5—Just Write It: Embracing Your Inner Author
Edward Hart
UNT Dallas College of Law

Speakers: Jamie Baker, Texas Tech University School of Law Library, Cynthia Brown, Littler Mendelson, Stephen Parks, State Law Library of Mississippi

Program blurb: If you’re not already writing, you can be. If you are already writing, you can do better. If you are an experienced scholar, you may want to reinvigorate your writing routine. Scholarship is vital to our individual growth and to the evolution of our profession. It’s time to forget perfection and start sharing your ideas with your colleagues. Let’s talk about why scholarship is important to librarianship, how to make it part of your regular routine, and the best resources and helpful new tools to make writing fun, manageable, and collaborative.

The core advice from the program is to write, write, and write. Pick your comfort level or aspiration and put pen to paper or start clicking away at your keyboard. You cannot do much else until you have something to share.

Some advice for the beginner is to respond to calls from newsletters and blogs for short pieces about topics. You can pick topics with which you are comfortable since they most likely are ones you face in your daily work. If you repeat this approach, taking different angles and approaches on the same broad topic, you expand your knowledge and share
that knowledge with the profession. Before you know it, you are the expert, and others are citing you or seeking your advice.

Stepping up your efforts, take advantage of the opportunities AALL provides through Spectrum and the Law Library Journal to write more in-depth. You also can seek out opportunities to collaborate with colleagues on these efforts.

I must admit, I am practicing what they preached in the program writing up this review for the ALL-SIS Newsletter. While my aspiration is to author scholarly articles, writing newsletter pieces is a useful exercise that allows me the chance to go through the motions of writing while also sharing this lesson of ‘Just Write It’ with you, the reader. Now it is your turn. What is inside you that you want to share?

BoK Domains: Professionalism + Leadership at Every Level, Teaching + Training //
We rely on member contributions to keep the ALL-SIS Newsletter going strong. We welcome your comments, questions, and ideas to help make this quarterly schedule a reality.

Are you organizing or presenting at an event of interest to your academic law library colleagues? Is your library working on a special project? Have you recently attended a professional development activity and learned something new to share? Or are you just eager to speak out about an issue of concern to academic law librarians?

If you answered “yes” to any of these questions, please contribute! Member News announcements may also be submitted to the column editors, or directly to the ALL-SIS Newsletter Editor.

The remaining submission deadline for the 2018-2019 academic year will be—

- Winter issue (posts at beginning of January): November 18, 2019
- Spring issue: (posts mid-March): February 10, 2020
- Summer issue: (posts mid-June): May 18, 2020

DEADLINES FOR THE 2019-2020 ACADEMIC YEAR

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 1,200 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 encouraged to join.