MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

Now that the academic year is starting up in earnest, I have been thinking a lot about leadership and how best to serve all of you as your ALL-SIS chair. For the past month, I have spoken with a lot of people in our section, including many of our incoming committee chairs and other volunteers. One of them mentioned her trepidation about stepping into a leadership role, but stated she is willing to try “leading by learning and growing”: not leading by virtue of having learned and grown to some level of achievement or expertise, or even leading in order to learn and grow, but leading through the affirmative act of being out “in front” of one’s peers and mentors. This struck home for me; the idea of leadership as simply being willing to try my best, to make mistakes and move through them (hopefully with a modicum of humility and grace), and to learn and grow though that very public process.

There certainly is a lot of space for learning and growth before all of us right now. We are all navigating the “new normal” of the pandemic-impacted world. We are accessing our reserves of kindness, patience, and empathy, and also applying those concepts to our practice of self-care. Some of us are dealing with the issue of right-sizing our spaces and services for incoming...

FROM THE EDITOR

I am so excited to share the fall newsletter with you! We have an issue packed with lots of great content. Dr. Michele Villagran introduces us to her new column about anything and everything LIS studies. Ben Keele rounds out his discussion of copyright reversion, and Gerard Fowke offers his insights into writing and publishing scholarship. In part one of a four part series, Ed Hart walks us through the steps he took to opening a new academic library. Finally, Sarah Gotschall shares a great piece of a law library annual report, and Julie Crane offers her experience with two online teaching certifications. We also have our standard member news (thanks Marlene and Nina!) and program reviews for the AALL annual meeting. Thank you to everyone who chose to participate! These reviews are meant to serve as a guide for you as you navigate the recorded programming from the annual meeting.

As you peruse this newsletter, please remember that we are always looking for content. The newsletter would not exist without interesting submissions from readers like you. 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, at katie.hanschke@vanderbilt.edu.
classes of students that are much larger than previous cohorts. Many are coping with climate change as it affects our patrons, collections, and spaces, in the forms of weather extremes and disaster planning. And on top of all of that, many of us are renewing our efforts to support social justice and equity/diversity/inclusion drives across our professional realm (ALL-SIS itself, the profession of law librarianship, and the legal field).

At a personal level, I have a lot of areas in which to learn and grow. I will have to learn to delegate things and trust in the processes and people around me to carry projects forward. I am so fortunate to have a wonderful group of committee chairs, vice chairs, and volunteer/members, as well as my colleagues on the Executive Board, to rely on as I learn to curb my own micromanaging tendencies. Other areas of growth for me will include being more experimental and not trying to anticipate every possible consequence of every step; I am going to have to do a little flying by the seat of my pants, be willing to improvise and shift gears rapidly, and be courageous as well as flexible and creative.

It’s a lot. It feels overwhelming sometimes. Yet in the past several weeks—as I have met with the new Executive Board, and discussed plans for the year with the incoming chairs of many of our ALL-SIS committees—I have felt the strength (as well as the wisdom and kindness) of our members and volunteers. Talking and working with colleagues really makes me feel as if we can accomplish anything. We really are better together.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Lisa Goodman and Amanda Watson, who recently completed their terms of service on the Executive Board, but are continuing their service through committees. And I want to thank the continuing and new Board members—Sabrina Sondhi, Shira Megermand, Jane O’Connell, and Benjamin Keele—who (I hope) will bear with me and help me lean in on the grand experiments and adventures this year will bring to us all. //

INTRODUCING NEW FEATURE COLUMN: ‘LIS STUDIES IN THE TRENCHES’ FOCUSED ON LIS ACADEMIC

What do you want to know about library and information science (LIS) studies? Have you ever wondered about best practices in LIS programs, the diversity of courses offered, or wanted to know interesting tidbits from LIS faculty? What about challenges and opportunities within LIS academia? How do different LIS institutions integrate scholarship, teaching, and practice? Do LIS faculty work simultaneously as scholars, teachers, and library professionals? What do LIS folks call themselves? Are all LIS programs iSchools? Is it library and information science or library and information studies? How does information science intersect? These may be some of the questions you have always wondered.

Well, I hope to answer some of these questions! Introducing a new feature column in our newsletter: ‘LIS Studies in the Trenches,’ focused on LIS academia hosted by Dr. Michele A. L. Villagran! This column will feature submissions from anyone focused on LIS academia (i.e., student, non-law librarians, library school faculty, etc.) to offer a wide variety of diverse voices and perspectives from the LIS profession. We welcome content relevant to LIS programs, including best practices, what I wish I learned in my library program, cool tips, etc. Dr. Villagran will work with you on your submission, whether you want to share a fun story or a serious matter that would be of interest to our community. If you are interested in submitting a short, 550-750 word article, please complete the brief article submission form. We will consider content for every Winter, Spring, and Summer issue. //
COPYRIGHT EXPLAINER
A SUCCESSFUL RIGHTS REVERSION

In my last column, I discussed how authors of copyrighted works can seek to reverse transfers of their rights, specifically when a work is no longer being commercially exploited. I used the example of helping my mother obtain the copyright in a book on Swedish knitting she published in 1995. We learned that the small publisher that initially published the book had, through a couple of mergers and acquisitions, been absorbed by the massive Penguin Random House.

At this point, our best option was to pester anyone at Penguin Random House that might have any responsibility for book copyrights, licensing, and permissions. I searched the publisher’s website for these terms and sent a short email explaining that we would like to discuss a rights reversion for her book, along with the book’s title and ISBN. We probably emailed five different addresses. Fortunately, one landed in the right inbox, and we received a reply from a contract specialist. Actually, according to the contract specialist, the company holding copyright in the book had reverted the rights to the author before being acquired by Penguin Random House. My guess is the company released all of its out-of-print books to reduce the recordkeeping work for the acquisition. My mother received no notice of this rights reversion, but Penguin Random House was sure they didn’t own the copyright.

This saved us from any further discussion or negotiations. I had already scanned the book, and we posted it right away to the Internet Archive. All is well.

If we had found that a company still held the copyright and wanted to hold onto it, my mother would have had another option for getting her rights back. The Copyright Act provides for a nonwaivable right to terminate a copyright transfer, but it is not a particularly easy process. Thirty-five years after a copyright transfer, the author (or heirs) has a five-year window to terminate the transfer. The author has to give notice to copyright holder about the termination, and the notice must be provided between two years and ten years from the date the termination become effective. The author also has to record the termination notice with the Copyright Office.

The termination of the transfer process is designed for authors who transferred their copyright and then the work became much more valuable. The termination right gives the author a chance to get the rights back or renegotiate with the copyright holder for a more beneficial deal. This was not a great fit for our circumstances. I was prepared to set a calendar reminder to file a termination notice in 2028 to make the termination effective as early as possible in 2030, but I am relieved to now be able to avoid that. For readers who want to find out more, the Authors Alliance has great resources on rights reversions and terminations of transfer. //
Let’s face it, scholarship can be downright intimidating. Although academic law librarians tend to be intimately familiar with the bibliographic features of journal articles, very few of us are able to truly focus our careers on our own research and writing. Moreover, the whole process—from coming up with an idea and finding collaborators to securing the best venue for publishing your scholarship—can be overwhelming, whether it is your first article or your 500th.

But I am here to tell you take a deep breath. If you dream of seeing your “name in cites” but aren’t quite sure of the best way to make that happen, this article is for you. This is the first of a series that aims to give academic law librarians a practical, step-by-step guide to publishing scholarship. We are going in rough chronological order, so this first entry will cover developing ideas for scholarship.

For many of us, coming up with exciting ideas to explore can be one of the biggest barriers to a more productive scholarly life. I know that more practical concerns about serving patrons tend to fill my workdays, leaving little time for the abstractions of academic discourse.

But don’t fret! These practical concerns can actually be a great jumping-off point for your scholarly work. In library science, scholarly articles often describe projects or initiatives that the authors have implemented in their own libraries. Comparing the goals of a major project to their ultimate outcomes can be extremely helpful to peers who might be considering similar efforts. In addition, using your own experience as a reference point can make new technologies and pedagogical concepts accessible to a broader audience.

When trying to come up with ideas for academic scholarship, it also can help to pay attention to what editors and scholars want from academic writers. Many publishers regularly put out “calls for contribution” that announce upcoming themes and topics of interest. For some writers, responding to a prompt is a more natural mode of communication than starting ‘cold,’ and this strategy can be especially helpful for them. It also has the advantage of ensuring that there is a market for your scholarly efforts. Simply scour your favorite listserv and set up a few on-point Google alerts, and you will soon find yourself with ample grist for your mill.

Finally, aspiring librarian-scholars should take advantage of many groups and events that are geared specifically towards helping them. Some of these are well-known and prestigious within the law librarianship community, such as the Boulder Conference, while others are more casual, such as the Beer and Edits Group (part of PEGA-SIS), but they all provide a forum designed specifically to help their members develop and refine their scholarly output. This strategy is especially helpful when you have already started with the seed of a promising idea that your colleagues can help you nurture and improve.

Of course, those colleagues also make these events a great place to find potential scholarly collaborators, a topic we will address in our next installment. Until then, keep reading, keep writing, and keep looking for connections between your day-to-day practice of librarianship and the opportunity to contribute to the collective body of scholarly knowledge.

---

Opening a New Academic Law Library

Ed Hart
UNT Dallas College of Law

Going from scratch to opening an academic law library that is worthy of accreditation is the mission I have been on for the last eight years. In this column, and three more during the course of the next 12 months, I will look back at our progress and share some thoughts. Fingers crossed and knock on wood, by the end of this series of columns, we will know our success by gaining full accreditation from the American Bar Association.

In August 2013, I started my tenure at the University of North Texas at Dallas College of Law (UNTDCOL) with the short-term goal of opening a functional library for the college, which would open to the inaugural class in twelve months. The year’s work focused on three areas: space, personnel, and collections.

Work was well underway when I arrived. A contractor was renovating the former department store space, which had sat empty for nearly twenty years and was allocated for the college and the library. A wonderful project manager for the University of North Texas System (UNTS) already had a physical library planned out with shelves, study space, study rooms, and service points. Planning had been carried out with input from an unknown library consultant and architects who specialize in educational spaces. Central to those plans was the assumption that the library needed enough shelving for 50,000 volumes, which would leave only enough space for seventy seats scattered across the study space. Weighing the impacts of pending rewrites of the ABA Standards covering collections and the need for study space for the nearly 400 law students the college aimed to enrolled, my one contribution to the physical layout of the library was the request for half the shelving and as many additional seats and study carrels as possible. That wish was fulfilled, if for no other reason than that seats and study carrels were much more affordable than shelves. Construction and installation of furniture was completed by late Spring 2014. So, in the summer of 2014, attention shifted to the two other areas of my work.

The second area was hiring librarians and staff. The college adopted early aspirations with ambition to take advantage of educational technology such as lecture capture, course management systems, and secured assessments. Since it was the foundation of many formative and substantive assessments, I knew who I had to recruit. Jennifer Wondracek is a law librarian and former colleague at the University of Florida, and she can talk tech! For the rest of my librarians and staff, we were able to call upon the resources of the College of Information and Department of Information Science at University of North Texas (UNT), the flagship school of the UNTS. Since the department offers a law librarianship program, then under the direction of Prof. Yvonne Chandler, I was able to hire a recent UNT grad, Jessica Haseltine. While she is a Texas Tech College of Law graduate, the joke was that she, like Jennifer and myself, had taken the Florida bar exam. None of us were admitted to the Texas bar. We are Florida lawyers. Two library specialists were hired; Faria Matin was a recent transplant and recent graduate of an out of state library school. The other hire was Lewis Giles, a current library student at UNT. They quickly adapted to working together, becoming jack-of-all-trades of what would be traditionally different departments in public and technical services. UNTDCOL and I were extremely lucky with all these hires!

The final area was collection development, although it was a concern that occupied much of my mind that whole year. My prior work was in two libraries which strived for deep, rich research collections. Then, there was the proposition of Gordon Russell, former law library director at Charleston School of Law and current director at Lincoln Memorial University, Duncan School of Law, of a minimalist print collection and dependence on electronic access to nearly all needed content. The seed of his idea was that not all law schools needed expensively maintained collections. Thankfully, his and others’ arguments were taking root. The ABA was reconsidering the collection requirements in their law school standards. Maybe the ABA was finally recognizing the impact of the shift to electronic resources? In 2014, Michael
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Opening a New Academic Law Library

Whiteman, then director at Northern Kentucky University, Salmon P. Chase College of Law, published his article “Book Burning in the Twenty-First Century” in Law Library Journal which provides a succinct statement of what the modern academic law library collection should contain. It became, and still is, my bible. With that article, it was easy to draft a collection development policy that my faculty colleagues understood and adopted. We collect in print: Federal statutory materials and administrative code; Supreme Court reports; all materials related to our home jurisdiction, Texas; and such other materials that students and faculty need for instructional purposes. For all other materials, reliable electronic access is acceptable. The key is to be flexible and to meet the current needs of your students and faculty. They are happy, and that happiness is conveyed to the ABA site visitors.

Speaking of ABA site visitors, a funny thing happened. Whiteman would be the librarian on the team sent for our first ABA site visit. But that is a story we can pick up in the next column. //

The Making of a Library Annual Report

A
ter hearing that our law library director wished to start publishing an annual report for the law library, I wondered how many law school libraries publish their own separate annual reports on their websites. Not that many, according to Google. A quick search revealed easily locatable and current annual reports for only about 10 law schools – Boston University, Yale, Cornell, University of New Mexico, Texas Tech, Liberty University, West Virginia University, University of Wisconsin, Temple, and Fordham.

Though I had never considered it prior to being asked to compile one, a publicly available annual report highlighting a library’s activities and accomplishments for the year seemed like an interesting idea, and I wondered if this had been a hot topic in recent years. Further Googling suggested that the golden age of AALL interest in annual reports was 2012 when the subject was explored on the AALL Marketing Tools & Examples website. To assist libraries with marketing themselves, the site provides resources such as The Use of Annual Reports in Law Libraries: an Annotated Bibliography and links to examples of annual reports from 12 law schools, which are still useful today.

To share our library’s experience creating an annual report, I asked Travis Spence, our Head of Technical Services, who is the co-leader of the effort to create the report, to answer some questions about the process.

Thank you, Travis, for agreeing to be interviewed for the blog. Since we have never had a published annual report before this is pretty exciting! What was the inspiration for publication of our first annual report? What will we do with our report, and who is the intended readership?

Technically speaking, this isn’t our first annual report. Our previous Director would write an annual report of the library’s activities, to which I contributed data about the collection and the projects my staff had worked on. Those reports also included goals for the upcoming year. That report was totally internal with the audience being the Dean and College of Law administration.

Our new Director has a different vision for an annual report, unlike the ones we’ve done previously. The audience for the new annual report is much broader. We want it shared with the entire College of Law community, including alumni, as well as potential students and anyone in the broader community with an interest in the College of Law. Ideally, it will also be shared with colleagues at other law schools and throughout the law library profession. It’s really meant to showcase the interesting and innovative things the library is doing and reflect positively on the College of Law as a place that fosters innovation.

cont’d
I suppose there are two big considerations when creating an annual report: what information to include and what format to publish it in. Did you look at reports from any other libraries for inspiration, either format or content wise? We did look a number of reports from other schools, primarily our Director’s previous institution – Yale Law School. But those were more for inspiration than anything else. Each school is different and each school will have a different priorities and different ways to publish their reports. The annual report we’re producing is going to reflect the unique nature of what we do here.

While looking at annual reports from other law libraries, I noticed that they cover a wide variety of different topics. What is our annual report going to include? Everything! Each department of the library is getting at least a page in the annual report to showcase their achievements over the past year. We’ll also have some special features focusing on specific events and people.

What is the process to produce the report? Are specific people or departments in charge of writing different sections? It really is a library-wide effort. Nearly everyone was asked to write something about their area of expertise. We’ve collected those pieces and now are in the process of editing to give the report a cohesive voice.

Are there any parts of the report that you think are going to be particularly interesting to the readership? I think anyone who reads it will find at least one thing that makes them say, “Wow! I didn’t know about that!” We’ve had a lot of interesting projects and things to talk about this year. Some of our projects are things I don’t think most people would think of as traditional library work. People will be surprised to see what all we do and the collaborations we’ve participated in.

I noticed that some reports included what I consider to be rather boring statistics. What kind of statistics, if any, is our report going to contain? Our previous annual reports were data-heavy. With the expanded audience for the new annual report, we’re relying more on story-telling. We want it to be more engaging and most people love a good story. There may be some data included but it will be there to support the story we’re telling.

What publication formats did you consider, and which did you decide to use? Do you have any advice for others selecting a format? We’re going both print and electronic. Our plan is to have a small print run of copies that can be handed out at certain meetings and events. We’ll also have an electronic version available on the website.

Are you collaborating with any other departments at the law school or university? We are collaborating closely with the College of Law Communications and Marketing Department. They have the connections and the expertise needed to get publications looking professional and ready for print. We’re really fortunate that we have people who can help in those areas.

Do you have any advice for other law library who are considering publishing an annual report? Make it a library-wide effort. Everyone will have worked on something important and interesting that should be shared. And if you don’t have in-house talent, make friends with Communications and Marketing professionals.

Thanks so much for answering my questions! I think your answers will be very helpful to folks at other law libraries who might be interested in publishing their own reports. //
During the pandemic, law librarians who teach have had to adjust our classes. This process made many of us more mindful of how we teach. We have become more reflective about our teaching goals, more intentional about our choice of teaching methods, and more aware of the range of ways to assess whether our students are, in fact, achieving our learning objectives.

Inspired in part by my pandemic teaching experiences, I went back to school for the first time in twenty years to earn an Online Certificate in Instructional Design from Georgetown’s Continuing Studies School. I also am currently enrolled in the Canvas Certified Educator (“CCE”) Program for Higher Education. Both programs have helped me to improve my teaching practices.

**Georgetown's Online Instructional Design Certificate Program**

The Georgetown Online Certificate Program in Instructional Design requires completing eight courses taken sequentially over four months. Assignments build toward the goal of creating a new module for an existing online class. Students build their module using Canvas, which is Georgetown’s Learning Management System (“LMS”).

The format of the Georgetown program is asynchronous online; however, students must take classes and complete assignments at specified times in order to progress through the program with a cohort of learners. My cohort had about thirty students, including many professional instructional designers.

The program instructors were also practicing instructional designers. One nice feature of the program was the opportunity to listen to a series of podcasts where the course instructors and some of their colleagues discussed what it is like to work in the instructional design field. Many of these podcasts used an interview format. The conversational tone worked well; it is something I might consider incorporating into my teaching.

Most assignments required students to learn by completing tasks they would encounter in a real-life setting. Not only did we do these weekly hands-on assignments, but we often had to record and share a walkthrough of our work product.

For me, one of the major benefits of the Georgetown program was the ability to see my classmates’ differing approaches to the same assignment. Another unexpected benefit was that I got a lot of practice producing relatively polished presentations with minimal preparation time.

A downside of the Georgetown program is that it teaches students how to become instructional designers rather than how to incorporate good instructional design practices into teaching as an instructor. Thus, the program included materials and exercises relating to the relationship between instructional designers and subject-matter experts that were not useful to me in my current role.

**The Canvas Certified Educator Program**

The Canvas Certified Educator (“CCE”) Program for Higher Education includes six courses: four required courses and two electives. The CCE program covers general instructional design and online teaching practices as well as how to use the Canvas LMS system.

Students can complete each of the six courses in a month; however, they are given six weeks to finish each course based on an assumption that some students will need extra time to finish. Because the new courses start once every six weeks, it takes around nine months to finish the entire CCE program.

Like the Georgetown program, the CCE program consists of asynchronous online courses that allow students to progress through the program with a cohort of learners. As was the case with the Georgetown program, there were about thirty people in my cohort, including many professional instructional designers.

**cont’d**
Conclusion

Besides the obvious similarities between these two programs, there are also some notable differences. For example, the Georgetown program emphasized the role of the instructional designer from a project management perspective—i.e., the Georgetown program covered successive steps in the process of a successful instructional design project.

In contrast, the CCE program emphasized using Canvas and other technological tools to develop a student-centered learning environment. The CCE program required participants to consider, discuss, and create lessons promoting student collaboration, engagement, and autonomy.

Another difference is that, unlike the Georgetown program, the CCE program does not focus on a single project. Instead, each course within the program involves work on a single course-level project.

Finally, it takes substantially longer to complete the CCE program as compared to the Georgetown program. However, the CCE program requires less work on a weekly basis. I estimate I spent around five to eight hours per week on the Georgetown program. Most weeks, I spend three to five hours on the CCE program.

Of course, these are only two of the many available formal certificate programs. On the RIPS Law Librarian Blog, Ashley Ahlbrand has discussed her experience with Indiana University's Instructional Systems Technology Certificate, and Ashley Arrington has written about completing Harvard's Higher Education Teaching Certificate.

I enjoyed both the Georgetown and CCE programs. I would recommend both to people who have the time and resources to learn more about instructional design and online teaching. If anyone has questions about either of these programs, I would love to hear from you. Please feel free to contact me at jtedjeske@kentlaw.iit.edu.
MEMBER NEWS

PROMOTIONS, NEW HIRES, NEW POSITIONS

Rachel Gordon, Associate Director for Public Services at Duke University’s J. Michael Goodson Law Library reports on a new hire. Nor Ortiz started at the Law Library on August 1 in the Research and Instructional Services Librarian position. Nor comes to Duke from the University of North Carolina School of Information and Library Science program.

On July 19 Dana Neacsu became the new Duquesne Center for Legal Information & Allegheny County Law Library (DCLI & ACLL) Director, as well as Associate Professor of Legal Research Skills at Duquesne University School of Law. Previously Dana was a reference librarian and lecturer in law at Columbia Law School, Lecturer at Columbia University, and Adjunct Professor in the Environmental Science Department at Barnard College (from 2000 to 2021).

Benjamin Keele reports that as of July 1, he is the Associate Director, Ruth Lilly Law Library, at the Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law. Previously Ben was a Research and Instructional Services Librarian at IU McKinney.

There’s news from University of Georgia’s Alexander Campbell King Law. Three librarians have recently been promoted:

Stephen Wolfson has been named the Associate Director for Research and Copyright Services. Collections Librarian.

Jessica Ugstad was promoted recently to Collections Management Librarian at the University of Arizona College of Law’s Daniel F. Cracchiolo Law Library. After joining the library in July 2018 as a collection management assistant, she pioneered efforts at the library, on top of her other responsibilities, to promote antiracism and social justice for the law school community by expanding and publicizing our collection in those areas.

Congratulations on your promotion! Thank you for agreeing to answer some questions about your promotion and important social justice work. At AALL conferences and presentations over the years, I have heard some speakers suggest that our profession does an inadequate job of helping staff members meet their career objectives. I am not sure whether this criticism was meant to include members with library science degrees, or just those without them. But anyway, do you have any advice to staff members with degrees who aspire to promotion to librarian at their organizations?

Thank you so much! I am unaware of this criticism specific to AALL but I do know, generally, that staff with Master’s of Library and Information Science (MLIS) degrees are often working in positions that do not require the degree just to get the experience of working in a library setting. The only advice I can share is advice I heard in my very first class of the MLIS program at the School of Information Resources & Library Science, now the University of Arizona School of Information, which was to be open and not pigeonhole yourself into one type of library position. I have been a

cont’d
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researcher, digital project manager, cataloger, project archivist, and now a librarian focused on the collection management of print and electronic resources. I can honestly say that no matter what work I have done over the years it has all been applicable to the work I did moving forward, and each phase contributed to my most recent promotion in ways that I never planned for.

What are some difficulties that staff members might face when they try to be promoted within their organizations? Do you think it might be easier to find librarian jobs at different organizations?

The biggest barrier I faced was the culture of the University of Arizona and, in turn, the Law Library which, who most often are seeking to bring in people outside of the organization for librarian positions. I have never been deterred by the resistance to promote internal staff; I have simply tried to go where the work was interesting and new while remaining in Tucson. I honestly never intended to move away since my entire family is here and I have aging parents. It may be that, because I returned to school as an older student, I began to consider what others may view as limitations, as my assets. I have worked to establish and deepen my ties to Tucson since 2009 through my education and work and the relationships I have formed have been meaningful and provided me with opportunities I could not have foreseen. For other people seeking out librarian positions, I think it depends on the person and the situation. For many, moving and seeking out positions elsewhere may be the best or only option, especially in a city like Tucson with limited positions and with a graduate program graduating new MLIS students every semester. That said, I think promotion should be based on the person’s qualifications and abilities rather than that on antiquated academic culture that may not be applicable to the times we are living in now.

You have been doing a lot of work on social justice and antiracism. How did you get interested in this topic?

I have been involved in activism and social justice work for decades in my personal life. As an undergrad and grad student I took every class I could that focused on social and racial justice and history and women and gender studies. These passions have quite naturally aligned with my work and ethos previously as an archivist, as a Library Collection Management Specialist, and now as a Collection Management Librarian. I am also in the Human Rights Practice Master’s Program at the University of Arizona where I hope to continue my education on how to better serve and bring attention to marginalized and underrepresented topics and people locally and globally.

Tell us about your work in this area for the library!

I began actively selecting and curating the Antiracist and Social Justice (ASJ) Collection and co-curating the Antiracist and Social Justice (ASJ) Resources LibGuide in May 2020 after the murder of George Floyd and the ‘Fed-Up’-risings that followed. I have also had the opportunity to work with members of the Arizona Law faculty, the Agnese Nelms Haury Program, and Navajo Nation Department of Water Resources on a project to digitize their library materials. Additionally, I had the opportunity to collaborate with Law Library colleagues and Arizona Law’s Indigenous People’s Law & Policy Program to develop a standalone collection of Tribal Law resources to help support the students learning in the program. I see all these projects as both professional and personal accomplishments that support my mission to provide access to resources by, for, and about marginalized and underrepresented topics, people, and communities.
What are your future plans for the library in this area?

I have begun conversations with our director and other colleagues about developing a new books location that would have an area focused specifically on highlighting new books from the ASJ Collection. This would provide students easy access to new books on topics such as antiracism, disability justice, immigration rights, Indigenous rights and tribal sovereignty, and women’s rights. I am also hoping to engage more with Arizona Law student groups and the Diversity Committee to determine how we can better serve student needs and expectations via collection development. I am hoping that the allyship conversations that began last year will continue to be a valuable venue for getting input and feedback from the students that I can incorporate into my work updating the library’s Collection Development Policy and as a member of the Strategic Planning Committee.

Another thing I have heard at presentations is that law libraries should take a greater role in DEI (diversity, equity, and inclusion) efforts. Do you have any suggestions for other libraries?

As the co-chair of our own Strategic Planning Committee, I made inclusion, diversity, equity, and allyship (IDEA) my main area of research and contribution for the team. From the environmental scan I conducted for our work, and as part of the research I did for the “Law Libraries Answering the Call: Building Anti-Racism, Diversity, Equity, Inclusion & Social Justice Resources” article I recently wrote for AALL Spectrum, I would say that, though most libraries have developed DEI standards and goals, many have struggled with how to manifest those goals in a tangible way for their patrons. I have made it a priority to curate and promote our collection (e.g. creating our ASJ Resources LibGuide, participating in collection development committees and interest groups, and giving presentations) and to share our book lists and strategies with other libraries to help facilitate collection development for those that do not have the time and/or staff to begin this process from scratch.

You are currently working on a Master’s in Human Rights Practice while working full time! How is that going? What have you learned that is helpful for your current work at the library?

It is going really well. I should be graduating from the program in Spring 2022 after I complete my capstone project. This program has been a huge influence on my work. I have utilized every class to expand on our resources for the ASJ collection and LibGuide. It has better informed my understanding of Human Rights and International Law and has influenced how I manage these resources. I have also been able to share resources from the Law Library with fellow students and my professors which has been a great way to connect and expand on conversations in class discussion and for projects. I feel that my role as a human rights practitioner is to help facilitate learning and knowledge for Arizona Law students wishing to make change in the world and participation in this program has been vital to my understanding of the issues that are happening locally, nationally and on a global scale.

Rachel Evans and Geraldine Kalim have both been promoted to Librarian II. Evans serves as the Metadata Services and Special Collections Librarian. Kalim is the student services librarian.
MEMBER NEWS

Over the summer, the University of Miami Law Library added two Reference Librarians:

Katelyn Golsby started in June 2021. Previously she was a Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of New Mexico Law Library. Katelyn received her JD from the University of Massachusetts School of Law and her MLIS from the University of Arizona, where she was a Fellow in the law librarianship program.

Raphael Jackson-Ortiz started in August 2021. Previously he was a Foreign, Comparative and International Law Librarian at the Inter American University of Puerto Rico School of Law, where he also received his JD. Prior to that, Raphael was a Circulation Librarian at Kentucky State University. He received his MLS from the University of South Florida.

Ingrid Mattson, Director of the Law Library at Cardozo School of Law reports that Anupama Pal has been promoted to Assistant Director of Public Services and Lecturer in Law.

News from the University of South Carolina School of Law Library. Associate Director for Library Operations Rebekah Maxwell reports that they are proud and delighted that Rebecca Plevel has joined their faculty as a Reference Librarian. Rebecca joins them from the University of Arizona where she was a Fellow at the Daniel F. Cracchiolo Law Library at the James E. Rogers College of Law. Before embarking on a career in law librarianship, Rebecca practiced law in Arizona, most recently in Flagstaff, Arizona, for almost 20 years, including as a deputy county attorney, a solo practitioner, and serving in a number of roles in several tribal court systems.

Julie Tedjeske Crane reports that she has recently left Duquesne University to take up the position of Faculty Scholarship and Educational Technology Librarian at IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law Library.

PUBLICATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

Clanitra Stewart Nejdl, Head of Professional Development and Research Services Librarian at the Alyne Queener Massey Law Library at Vanderbilt University, Victoria de la Torre, Researcher at Akerman LLP, and Marcelo Rodriguez, Foreign, Comparative and International Law Librarian at the University of Arizona College of Law Library have co-authored a chapter entitled “Navigating Your Career Goals: Government, Private and Academic Law Librarianship.” The chapter is published in Introduction to Law Librarianship, an open-access law librarianship textbook.

Fred Shapiro, Associate Director for Collections and Special Projects at Yale Law Library, has compiled the New Yale Book of Quotations (Yale University Press). Fred reports that “this is a substantial revision of the Yale Book of Quotations, which was named as the 2nd most essential of all reference books by the Wall Street Journal. The coverage of legal quotations is the most accurate of any quotation book.”
From the librarians at the University of Wisconsin Law School:

**Jarrod Bogucki** published “Cloud Services for Digital Repositories” in the latest edition of ALA’s Library Technology Reports vol. 57, no. 5 (July 2021). Jarrod is the cloud and IT architect at University of Wisconsin Law School and is the lead programmer and systems architect for the UW Law School digital Repository.

**Sunil Rao**, Foreign & International Law Librarian, presented on “The Ins and Outs of India Legal Research: Learning How to Find India Primary and Secondary Law” at the American Association of Law Libraries Virtual Conference July 21, 2021.


**Elizabeth Manriquez**, Scholarly Communications & Reference Librarian, and **Kris Turner**, Assistant Director for Public Services, were co-authors for a chapter on Faculty Services in the newly published Introduction to Law Librarianship open source text. The chapter was co-written by **Michelle Penn** and **TJ Striepe**.

**Zanada Joyner**, Senior Reference Librarian, North Carolina Central University School of Law Library, and **Cas Laskowski**, Technology & Empirical Services Librarian at the University of Arizona College of Law Library are editors of Introduction to Law Librarianship, Pressbooks, 2021, a public domain book.

**HONORS, AWARDS, MILESTONES**

**Clanitra Stewart Nejdl**, Head of Professional Development and Research Services Librarian at the Alyne Queener Massey Law Library at Vanderbilt University, was awarded the 2021 AALL Emerging Leader Award. She was also awarded the 2021 AALL Spectrum Article of the Year Award together with **Edna Lewis**, Reference Librarian at Berkeley Law Library, for their article “Academic Law Libraries & the Early Days of the COVID-19 Pandemic.”

**Jay Tucker** received a 2021 University Staff Recognition Award from UW Madison for his outstanding contributions to the university, especially during the pandemic. Jay is the Stack Manager at UW Law Library.

**Leslie Street**, Clinical Professor of Legal Research and Director of the Wolf Law Library at William and Mary Law School, was recently elected Chair of the Law Libraries Section of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA). The IFLA Law Libraries Section works to provide leadership in the field of global legal information policy, recognizing that equitable and permanent public access to authentic legal information is a necessary requirement for a just and democratic society worldwide. The section’s standing committee currently includes members from Africa, Asia, Europe, Latin America and North America.
MEMBER NEWS

cont’d

RETIEMENTS

Karen Selden, Metadata Services Librarian at the William A. Wise Law Library, University of Colorado Law School, and AALL Executive Board Member (2018-2021), reports: “I will retire from my full-time job at the CU Law Library on October 8, 2021. I joined the Law Library in May 1998 without any idea I’d stay for more than 23 years and create such a wonderful career. I’ve learned so much over that time and worked with so many wonderful colleagues, both at the University of Colorado and in AALL.” Among other things, Karen is looking forward to traveling, reading and volunteer work, including with AALL.

Happy retirement Karen!

Barbara Bintliff has announced that she will be stepping down at the end of this summer as Director of the Tarlton Law Library at the University of Texas in Austin. She will remain on the faculty through the fall semester, and will retire in January.

Barbara has been the Director of the Tarlton Law Library/Jamail Center for Legal Research and the Joseph C. Hutcheson Professor in Law since 2010. Previously she served as the Director of the William A. Wise Law Library and Nicholas Rosenbaum Professor of Law at the University of Colorado.

Barbara has made innumerable contributions to our profession. She served as AALL President from 2001-2002, and served on and chaired many AALL committees. She also served on the boards and committees of several AALL chapters, including Southwestern Association of Law Libraries (SWALL) and the Colorado Association of Law Libraries (CoALL). She has received several Presidential Certificates of Merit and the Frederick Charles Hicks Award from AALL, and in 2012 was elected to the AALL Hall of Fame. Significantly, she was a reporter for the Uniform Law Commission, and was a moving force in drafting UELMA, The Uniform Electronic Legal Material Act, that has already been enacted in 22 states. She has been a speaker, moderator, or panelist for numerous professional conferences, for law school colloquia series and for regional and national groups. Barbara was elected to membership in the American Law Institute in 2001 and the American Bar Foundation in 2011. She chaired the Section on Law Libraries and Legal Information for the AALS in 2011-2012.

Dean Farnsworth at the University of Texas’s School of Law says of Barbara’s contributions to their law school and library: “She has elevated [the Law Library’s] performance, improved its services, and led a great team.... She cares about everyone here -- students, faculty, staff, and alumni -- and is highly knowledgeable about all of those groups. She is full of initiative and ideas. She is a tremendous colleague....She is one of the great library directors in the United States.”

We wish Barbara a happy and fulfilling retirement!

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. //
HELPING STUDENTS FOCUS IN A WORLD ON FIRE:
USING THE SCIENCE OF KEEPING ATTENTION TO
IMPROVE OUR TEACHING IN A DISTRACTING YEAR
AND BEYOND

This live, one-hour session was presented by Alyson Drake, Matthew Flyntz, Kimball Fontein, and Matt Timko. Participants were given an opportunity to learn about the science of attention and distraction as discussed in James Lang’s Distracted: Why Students Can’t Focus and What You Can Do About It, published in 2020. Participants were offered several opportunities to explore these topics through engaging question prompts and interactive online activities. Each presenter provided a summary of the underlying science related to a specific topic, strategies to gain and sustain specific types of attention using the science, and tips and examples describing how to incorporate these strategies into presentations and training sessions in academic and law firm settings.

They began by providing an overview of distraction and its origins. Why can’t we just focus? As the presenters explained, our brains are drawn to novel phenomena and hard-wired to assess new information. Our ancestors needed to be attuned to threats and opportunities in the natural world to survive. The chemical rewards our brains produce when we pay attention to threats (e.g., a wild animal) and opportunities (e.g., a text message) continue to reflect that orientation, and when we design our learning environments, we need to take this into account. In addition, we need to reward the brains of our learners that do all the hard work it takes to ignore distracting phenomena around them. But how do we do this?

To answer this question, the presenters provided summaries of three types of attention relevant to law librarians. Community attention takes advantage of how we are drawn to faces and relationships. This can be cultivated through deliberate engagement with your students by simply learning and using your participants’ names. The presenters also had interesting tips related to graded community building exercises. They were enthusiastic about how we are responsible for cultivating our training and presentation sessions as learning communities. One participant raised the challenging question about how to support community attention during one-off remote training sessions (Answer: Reach out by email or even a phone call. A little one-on-one contact goes a long way).

The presenters discussed curious attention next. Simply put, we are all wired for curiosity. Gaining and sustaining this type of attention is all about using questions. What questions are you asking during your presentation or lesson? What methods are you using to solicit questions? The presenter had the fascinating suggestion to include broad overarching questions in a syllabus. As I understood it, the material you want your students to learn becomes the answer to the question. The tactical use of smaller, specific questions also helps to keep students engaged. You might also prompt students to write their own questions or use pauses.

The last section addressed assessed attention. How can we use assessments, particularly graded assessments, to get our students’ attention? The presenter provided a balanced perspective on motivators that are intrinsic (e.g., this subject fascinates me) versus extrinsic (e.g., I need to do well on this quiz). To help support your students who may respond well to extrinsic motivators, consider using frequent low stakes in-class assessments. These low stakes assessments will also prepare your students for higher stakes assessments. Other strategies were described, but my favorite was an approach to helping students avoid wasting time and effort by using a series of linked questions. A link to a short presentation...
HOW PERSISTENT IDENTIFIERS CAN CHANGE THE IMPACT LANDSCAPE FOR LEGAL SCHOLARSHIP

Julie Tedjeske Crane  
Chicago-Kent School of Law

Persistent identifiers are defined by three characteristics: they name a specific object or person; computers can read and act on them; and they are designed to be long lasting. This presentation focused on two persistent identifiers that are widely used in other disciplines: ORCID iDs (author identifiers) and DOIs (scholarly works identifiers).

Aaron Retten discussed the benefits of persistent identifiers, including improved discoverability of and access to information. DOIs help users locate the publisher’s official version of a work; ORCID iDs help users identify works that authors claim and manage. Both provide better tracking of altmetrics and citation data.

Malikah Hall explained two barriers to adopting persistent identifiers in legal scholarship. First, law review staffs turn over quickly, and many student editors do not understand the benefits of persistent identifiers. Second, the Bluebook does not require the use of DOIs or ORCID iDs in legal citations.

Aaron and Malikah spent much of the presentation discussing several projects undertaken by the Texas A&M Law Library.

ORCID Faculty Presentation and Registration Clinic

Around the time that HeinOnline announced its ORCID integration, the Texas A&M librarians secured time to present on ORCID at a faculty meeting. Faculty were interested and engaged. The librarians held a clinic immediately after the presentation where they registered around sixty percent of the faculty in ORCID (naming a librarian as a trusted individual on the account). They emailed the rest of the faculty to provide an option either to sign up by clicking a button or to request more information via Zoom or an in-person meeting.

Student Publication Project

The next project was to have the law journals assign DOIs to articles on a going-forward basis. Librarians met with the student editors to educate them about identifiers. They also helped the students create proper DOI strings and decide how to include the DOIs in the article layout process. Librarians were available to troubleshoot issues and answer questions regarding how to register DOIs and pay the associated registration fees. The presenters noted that, given the constant turnover of journal staff, the library serves as an alternative stable institutional presence that can help ensure that the journals continue to properly implement the identifiers.

describing this technique was included in the handout.

Once the formal presentation ended, the presenters fielded some great questions and shared a handout with helpful references to related books, including Minds Online by Michelle Miller. This was a fascinating overview of the topics in Lang’s book with clearly described examples. I am really looking forward to delving into Distracted and sharing these topics with colleagues.
THE INS AND OUTS OF INDIA LEGAL RESEARCH:
LEARNING HOW TO FIND INDIA PRIMARY AND
SECONDARY LAW

In a July 21st live virtual program moderated by Mandy Lee (Research and Instructional Services Librarian, Chicago-Kent College of Law) and sponsored by the Foreign, Comparative & International Law Special Interest Section, speakers Sunil Rao (Foreign and International Law Librarian, University of Wisconsin-Madison) and Pushyamitra Veeramachaneni (Outreach and Library Services Law Librarian, Florida International University) offered an excellent overview of the Indian legal system and sources for Indian legal materials. During the first half of the presentation, Veeramachaneni discussed the history of India’s legal system, including references to some sources of historical Indian legal materials, with Rao then describing India’s current legal system, foundational texts and sources, and sources of law both online and in print.

Though India’s current common law and federal systems of government will, in certain respects, ring familiar to U.S. audiences, Veeramachaneni’s discussion of India’s previous legal systems—“ancient,” Islamic, and British—usefully reminded attendees that India’s modern system is derived from a variety of distinct traditions, all of which influenced today’s law. In the ancient period, a series of kings ruled India pursuant to Hindu legal traditions, wherein the courts of the period typically heard disputes between groups, rather than individuals. Secondary sources containing the law of the period, Dharma and Dharma-shastra texts, remain available and have been digitized for electronic access. From the 12th Century India had an Islamic legal system, wherein primary sources of law were the Qur’an and the Sunna of the Prophet Mohammad. British law prevailed from 1600 to 1937, supplanting the primacy of customary law embodied in the earlier systems. Veeramachaneni noted that some digitized versions of sources of law from these earlier periods are available both via free resources such as Indian Kanoon and AsianLII and subscription resources such as HathiTrust and LLMC Digital.

Adding DOIs to Journal Backlogs

The final project was to register DOIs for the backlog of articles in student publications. Texas A&M’s law school is relatively new, so they only had a backlog of around five years. They used two workflows for DOI registration: a web deposit form requiring manual data entry and a batch process requiring technical knowledge of XML. Technical services staff also placed the assigned DOIs on PDFs of the journal articles.

Conclusion

This was an excellent presentation on an important issue. I recently started a new job where promoting faculty scholarship will be part of my responsibilities. As someone who had just a basic knowledge of the topic going into this presentation, I appreciated the presenters’ ability to explain complex and technical information in a way that made it understandable. The Texas A&M librarians did a great job of articulating why the library should play a central role in adopting persistent identifiers in legal scholarship. Those who are interested in learning more may want to read Aaron and Malikah’s short but thorough article on the subject: Aaron Retteen & Malikah Hall, Persistent Identifiers and the Next Generation of Legal Scholarship (February 22, 2021). Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3168863 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3168863. //
Roo then described India’s current legal system, with the Constitution enacted in 1950 serving as governing framework. India consists of twenty-eight states and eight additional territories, with each state/territory forming governments that largely resemble the central government in structure. Local governments further supplement the central and state/territory government’s work. Roo noted that primary sources include not just the Constitution, legislation, and case law but also customary law, as recognized by Article 13 of the Constitution. The most prominent example of India’s current recognition of customary law involves the “personal law system,” embodying Hindu and Muslim practices in family and inheritance law. Lok Adalats are “people’s courts,” handling disputes arising pursuant to and applying customary law. Though, parties can appeal Lok Adalats decisions to a judicial court. Another notable feature of the India legal system is the jurisdiction of its courts, with a single integrated system hearing disputes arising under both federal and state/territorial laws.

In describing where researchers may locate Indian primary law, Roo highlighted several electronic resources. Indian Kanoon is a free resource on the web with intuitive search functions that offers good coverage of Indian case decisions and is one of the better sources for recent decisions; LII of India also provides somewhat less extensive coverage. Roo noted that while Supreme Court and high court case decisions are commonly published online. For district courts, researchers should expect only to locate case status information and select orders, and material generated by subordinate courts or alternative dispute resolution entities is oftentimes unpublished. Institutions seeking more robust commercial tools typically subscribe to either Manupatra or SCC Online. Secondary sources used by scholars and practitioners in India include case law digests, legislative commentaries, journals, encyclopedias, and reform reports, such as those offering recommendations of the Law Commission of India.

In sum, Veeramachaneni and Roo’s presentation provided a clear and well-organized overview of India’s legal system and sources that might serve as a starting point for researchers who seek to understand or locate particular Indian legal sources. It may also be of interest to researchers seeking to broaden their understanding, generally, of non-U.S. legal systems. In addition to their presentation and slides, Veeramachaneni and Roo quite helpfully summarize much of the content they discussed in their presentation in a LibGuide: https://researchguides.library.wisc.edu/aall2021-india, which researchers anticipating future questions involving Indian law would do well to bookmark!

Law student mental health and wellness, a topic of ongoing concern, has a particular resonance as we all dealt with the challenges of Covid this past year and a half, so I was eager to attend this session. It did not disappoint. The session provided three takeaways for me: normalize a discussion about mental health issues facing our students; have librarians, as information gatherers and sharers, learn their law school and university mental health and other support resources (e.g. food insecurity, substance abuse) and make this information easily available to students; and maintain a law library environment that students view as an open, safe and supportive space. The presenters shared this handout, Some Ideas for Supporting Mental Wellness at Your Law School, which provides information for recognizing when a student may be in distress, connecting a student to the appropriate resources, and maintaining an open and supportive library environment.
PROGRAM REVIEWS

THE POWER OF PRESERVATION: ENHANCING ACCESS TO LIBRARY COLLECTIONS THROUGH COPYRIGHT ACT SECTION 108

Programs on libraries and copyright often focus on applying the fair use doctrine. Fair use is very powerful and well worth learning about, but this session discussed a facet of copyright law that has received less attention, Section 108 of the Copyright Act. This section specifically empowers libraries to make copies without infringing copyright. Interlibrary loan and document delivery services largely rely on Section 108. This session covers how Section 108 has been used to help libraries serve researchers during the pandemic and the options Section 108 provides to libraries when preserving items in their collections.

Section 108 allows libraries to make copies of many copyrighted works when the copies are given to researchers for personal study, when copies are made to preserve unpublished works or to replace lost items that cannot be purchased at a fair price. The statute does not shed further light on what is a fair price, but the presenters suggested librarians consider what a library would usually pay for a similar work that is available through the usual purchasing channels (as opposed to a rare book dealer).

The most interesting portion of the session discussed Section 108(h), a provision that allows libraries to make copies, including digital copies, of works that are in the last twenty years of their copyright term and are no longer being commercially exploited. This means that many books published between 1925 (books older than this are in the public domain) and 1945 can be digitized if no commercial use is found. After this session, I added looking for and digitizing pre-1945 books in our collection to my mid-term projects list. Any librarians dealing with copyright will find this session worthwhile. //

The presenters, who included Yale Law School’s Wellness Counselor, noted that stigmas about mental health issues (particularly in the stressful, competitive law school environment) have inhibited an open discussion. In addition, there have been limited campus resources allocated, such as free or low cost counselors and psychologists, to treat students in crisis. However, as we normalize a discussion about mental health awareness, resources and support have increased in many institutions, often in direct response to student advocacy. As librarians, we are in a unique position to be able both to determine what resources are available to our students on our campuses and to share this information whether through libguides, bathroom postings, webpages or in conversations with individual students. By creating welcoming environments both in our one-on-one interactions and in our physical spaces, through comfy chairs and stressbuster activities, we can support our students not only academically but also emotionally.

I particularly liked the tone of this session. Several presenters were candid about how anxiety and depression may have affected them in law school, which created a feeling of openness about discussing mental health. Their real life examples of assisting students in crisis emphasized how librarians as information providers, even though we are not mental health professionals, can still play a crucial role in supporting students’ mental health. //
“What’s in a Name?” was a frank, enjoyable discussion about the importance, especially in the 21st century, of the words used to describe the titles and roles we have as law librarians. But more than that, this panel was really a conversation about the changing vocation of law librarianship. Throughout the presentation, the moderators posed several questions to the audience members, using a poll feature, which was a fun way to keep the audience engaged in the discussion.

The panelists had a variety of backgrounds and offered unique insights into the changing role of the law librarian. However, they each affirmed that they still view themselves as librarians, even if they are not currently working in a library setting or do not have the word “librarian” in their title. Heidi Frotestad Kuehl, Circuit Librarian for the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals, pointed out that even though she has also been a faculty member, researcher, technology specialist, or even the person picking up a busy patron’s trash, she is still fundamentally a librarian. She is still drawn to the heart of the profession, which involves delivering the most comprehensive data to her users that she can. She worries that if we lean too far away from the typical librarian tasks and forget our passion for librarianship, we might lose our grounding and be unable to advocate for resources as effectively. Michael Saint-Onge, Regional Director of Research and Library Services at Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP, pointed out that his library degree was not taken away when he went to work for Lexis for 19 years; he was still teaching, training, and working with legal materials. He just was not in a physical library.

The panelists next discussed the diminishing of the physical library space. The panelists agreed that librarians need to educate people about what we do and to try to separate those activities from where we work – a theme that is highly relevant for librarians that have primarily been working remotely for the last 18 months! Michael asserted that law firm librarians, especially, need to reinsert themselves into the role of information and resources management, even though their physical library spaces are shrinking. Heidi suggested that we think of “space planning,” which often triggers fears of loss of the physical space, as an opportunity to reimagine library services. Colleen Cable, Director at HBR Consulting, has not been tied to a physical space since the beginning of her career, and she discussed the struggle between shedding the library as a place and still viewing ourselves as librarians. She reinforced that we still need to educate users about what we do, no matter what we call ourselves, and that end users in an organization often still look for “librarians” when they need to find something.

The theme of the changing role of librarians led nicely into a discussion of the key traits that managers look for when hiring a librarian and the types of job opportunities that are available in the field. Heidi is always looking for candidates who have experience, drive, tenacity, and enthusiasm, and applicants can sometimes make up for the lack of a JD or MLIS if they have those other qualities. Colleen posited that the sky is the limit for new job opportunities for librarians. Print to digital has opened a new frontier. Similarly, librarians are starting to work in (or take on work from) other departments within their organizations. Librarians also have a role in innovation and filling in gaps at their institutions. For example, Michael suggested that firm librarians could be more involved in knowledge management.

The moderators left the audience with an encouraging message. Librarians constantly bring new skills, traits, and hallmarks into the profession; we do not leave librarianship by engaging in new practices or skills. Librarians are still the “heartbeats” of our institutions, no matter where we work. //

cont’d
This session promised to explore why feedback is important and what makes some forms of feedback more useful than others.

Moderator Katie Brown began the session by acknowledging that giving feedback can make people feel uncomfortable, so many managers might find themselves avoiding providing productive feedback to avoid this discomfort.

She then passed the conversation to Samuel Farkas to get the discussion started. He suggested that the audience abandon the classic feedback sandwich, where criticism is placed between two pieces of praise. Instead, he challenged us to provide radical candor, where the person giving feedback is challenging the receiver to improve and the feedback is given because the person giving the feedback personally cares about the recipient's growth. He went on to suggest that in addition to feedback, which evaluates past performance, we should consider incorporating elements of feedforward, which is forward-looking and seeks to identify and build on areas of strength to improve the overall performance in the future.

In a theme that would be reinforced by each of the speakers, when providing feedback or feedforward, it is important to be honest but do not focus exclusively on the negative. Instead, it is beneficial to build from the student's (or employee's) strengths or phrase feedback to suggest things that can be done to improve behavior.

Among the many useful insights provided by the next speaker, Dyann Margolis, was the truth that people will accept feedback from people they see as having authority. However, that is not always the person we think it should be. She discussed how students might be more responsive to someone they see more like themselves, such as another student who recently did well in the class. If we can identify these experts, we should take advantage of their credibility with our audience and invite them to reinforce the lessons we have been providing.

Greg Lambert, the final speaker, emphasized the importance of feedback being given often and consistently. He discussed that it is important to consider feedback as part of how we manage talent. One consistent trend he has observed in exit interviews is that individuals leave saying they never knew how they were doing at the firm. The reason for this may come from the law professions' culture of focusing only on current and future business while waiting for Human Resources to force feedback in the form of the annual review. Not providing early and consistent feedback and just waiting for a mandate from HR can create an unfair situation where an employee is hearing feedback for the first time during the annual review, which may be tied to promotion or bonuses, and they have not had an opportunity to correct the behavior. Greg then discussed the importance of providing feedback as a way of building resiliency, pointing out that the law is an adversarial system. Even the best lawyers lose from time to time, and junior personnel who may have only known success in their lives must be given appropriate feedback in order to avoid them filling in the blanks themselves. Finally, he made the business case for providing feedback by highlighting data Dr. Larry Richards shared with him; according to Gallup Research, employees who are given feedback based on their strengths are six times more likely to be engaged in their job, and feedback can lower turnover by 15% and can increase profitability by 9%.

In addition to an excellent presentation, this the session provided the community with an extensive list of resources for further study and development, which is available on the conference website. Feedback is a necessary tool for educators and managers. This panel supplied attendees with great techniques to provide more meaningful feedback that will help employees and students succeed.
THE FUNDAMENTALS OF PRODUCTIVE AND EFFECTIVE FEEDBACK FROM THE CLASSROOM TO THE OFFICE

“Clear is kind. Unclear is unkind.” - Brené Brown

Effective feedback is a tough nut to crack. Starting with this Brené Brown quote, the panel at program G1, Katie Brown (moderator), Samuel Farkas, Greg Lambert and Dyann Margolis, provided insight into how to improve providing feedback to students and employees. Pointing out the difficulty of those conversations, the group discussed how and why to move toward having them anyway.

Moving beyond the typical feedback loop or sandwich approach -where negative feedback is “sandwiched” between two pieces of praise)- the panelists highlighted Kim Scott’s “Radical Candor” approach. “Radical Candor” is a management approach focused on caring for employees but also challenging those employees directly with honest feedback. Changing the characterization from feedback to guidance and building a personal relationship of caring with students and employees enables “Radical Candor.”

The panel emphasized focusing on “feedforward” rather than “feedback”. Feedback is passive; feedforward is active, presenting an opportunity for the student to develop and grow. For example, feedforward includes showing students what good results look like. Scaffolding smaller activities to a larger skill allows for peer and self-review. Looking at peers’ work presents another chance for growth.

Further, rather than tell students what they are not doing, reference what the student can focus on and be honest about the student’s current performance. Use language such as “try adding…” rather than focusing on the negative. Flip the conversation so you are no longer pointing out what is going wrong or is missing but instead turn the attention to opportunities to get better.

Finally, do not overlook the importance of the messenger when focusing on the message. The feedback’s messenger must be an expert in the student’s eyes. Think of who is the best person to make the students listen. It might be other students who have taken a course or obtained a job, passed the bar, etc. The same message can be received very differently with the right messenger. Be mindful that the best messenger may not be you, so it is up to you to find that right person.

The panel also discussed feedback in the corporate/law firm context exclusively. Many attorneys say in exit interviews that they did not know where they stood as far as performance and meeting expectations at their firm. These professionals need ongoing feedback. It is a mistake and missed opportunity to rely on only an annual review. Think of feedback as de facto mentorship, helping to retain and develop talent. Currently, there is a strong contest for legal talent, so employers must do all they can to retain employees. Timely feedback can be immediately applied by the recipient, allowing the attorney an opportunity to change their performance and develop in their career. Otherwise, associates or any employee will fill the feedback void with their own thoughts on performance, which can be inaccurate.

Additionally, you must be aware of the recipient’s state of mind when you offer feedback. You need to build a good relationship, so the employee is not defensive. See feedback as assistance to help develop and encourage students and employees. Timely, genuine feedback helps explain where the student or employee is, what the goal is and how to get there. Be sure to give them an opportunity to respond and listen to their response. All students have different life experiences. Meet them where they are, so you can create manageable expectations. However difficult it may be, accept that even if you do all you can, some students and employees will not listen to feedback. All you can do is offer to give help when they need it.

Stephanie J. Farne
Boston College Law Library
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This panel gave great insight into how to deliver effective feedback to students and employees. While the process may not be easy, it is definitely worth it in the long run. As the Bené Brown quote above states, not being clear in feedback, can be very unkind to students and employees looking for guidance to develop and grow as learners and professionals. While it may be a challenging conversation to give honest feedback, with the tips and tools the panel provides, you will be able to develop your skills as an effective teacher, supervisor and mentor. //

THE ROLE OF EMPATHY IN IMPROVING DIVERSITY, EQUITY AND INCLUSION INITIATIVES

Nicholas Norton
Cornell Law Library

In “The Role of Empathy in Improving Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion,” Moderator Tina Ching (University of Oregon), Adriene Lim (University of Maryland), and Ronald Wheeler (Boston University School of Law) had a thought-provoking discussion on the role of empathy in diversity, equity, and inclusion work.

Adriene first highlighted that definitions in this space matter. What do we mean by empathy? Adriene and Ronald offered a few alternative definitions, which included understanding the internal state or thoughts of another, seeing others’ points of view, and cultivating interpersonal understanding. I also liked how Adriene distinguished empathy from more destructive forms of over-empathizing, where we may lose our sense of self and go into despair about another’s situation.

After considering definitions, Adriene and Ronald discussed different strategies to apply this concept into a practice for our daily lives. I particularly appreciated how they did not pretend to have all the answers and encouraged participants to embrace the ambiguity in a topic like this. They encouraged us to not shy away from asking the hard questions that do not have clear cut answers. They did offer helpful advice, however, that they have learned in their own lived experience as librarians. For example, Adriene spoke to the power of literature to help put one into another’s shoes. Ronald offered anecdotes of his experience confronting his own bias while working in libraries in different contexts (rural areas vs urban areas) and how this led to a process of personal reflection and growth. What was clear from their discussion is that working with and being empathetic to a difficult patron for example, requires effort, but can be a rewarding practice. It also requires a level of curiosity about the experiences of others, and that is partly why something like literature can be helpful to see into other’s perspectives.

I felt the moderator and panel participants made the program very balanced by not only offering a theoretical perspective but also very practical ideas for how these concepts have translated into their lives. For example, we can reflect on the ways in which our workflows do and do not offer space for colleagues to share experiences that may be divergent from the majority assumptions of what is the ‘normal’ experience. Librarians from historically excluded populations moreover need space to share on topics that are not just about DEI, also. The panel highlighted how having a more diverse group of people at the table is a great start to get many points of view, but people also need to be allowed to make mistakes and learn together. Creating opportunities for staff to offer feedback and collaborate in these processes also allows colleagues to build emotional intelligence together; a strategy meant to make better, more empathetic leaders in future generations.

The panel also discussed how our institutions may have and likely do have a history of excluding many groups of people. The panel mentioned that these institutions and their history were not our creation and we stepped into these structures that long pre-date us. Thus, as we work to make these spaces more just we must forgive ourselves and others who may be struggling to do the ‘right thing’ given the structures that make that very difficult. That does not mean, however, we should sit back and let the machinations of these institutions continue to harm the marginalized. This idea of forgiveness of ourselves and others was an inspiring call to action. It allows us to focus on reforming and fixing these institutions for the better.
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PROGRAM REVIEWS

WELLNESS AT WORK: MAKING A (LAW LIBRARIAN) LIVING WHILE LIVING A LUMINOUS LIFE

Kerri-Ann Rowe
University of North Carolina
School of Law

I signed up for the session excited to pick up a few new tips about wellness techniques that I could use at work to foster a more “luminous life”. At the same time, though, I was worried that the session would be a re-hash of other similar wellness-focused workshops aimed at teaching mindfulness through breathing techniques and ‘staying in the moment’ that have become quite popular. Fortunately, this session provided original wellness tips and helped me rethink the way I approach my everyday interactions to incorporate mindful techniques.

The program host, Wendy B. Maines, Thomson Reuters Information Management Advisor, framed the session around the idea that wellness is a “holistic concept” and presented the benefits of wellness in the workplace, namely that focusing on wellness can lead to mental agility, openness, and authentic leadership. Throughout the program, Wendy used quick exercises to keep attendees engaged. For example, we did a mindful agility exercise that called on attendees to follow unpredictable prompts with physical actions. Attendees shared their experiences in the Discussion section of the chat box interface (next to the Questions tab) and excitedly commented on what worked for them, what they liked about the exercise, and how well they did with following the prompts.

This was ultimately one of the strengths of the session; attendees were strongly encouraged to answer questions and enter their thoughts and reactions in the Discussion/Questions Box, which led to lively conversations and greater participation. For specific questions, Wendy would then amend the program slides to include the information typed into the Discussion Box and upload them to the session for viewing after the Conference. This future inclusion provided an incentive to view the program again and have another chance to connect with the material even after the live session was completed. Wendy also included links in the materials that could be accessed outside the session to expand upon the presented information.

In addition, Wendy provided attendees with, not homework, but wellness missions, to continue the focus on mindfulness even after the session ended. For example, she provided creative ways to say ‘no’ that attendees were to attempt outside of the session when appropriate. Attendees began to create and share their own takes on her no-tips in the Discussion Box, building upon each other’s responses and offering advice. These wellness missions encouraged discussion among an interested and open participant group with specific discussion prompts and invitations to respond.

I especially enjoyed Wendy’s recommendation to rethink our greetings, advocating open-ended questions instead of the typical ‘how are you?’. The purpose was to get genuinely curious about others, including our coworkers, to foster authentic leadership in ourselves. Wendy provided examples of open-ended greetings then encouraged attendees to write down two questions, one for personal relationships and one for professional relationships that attendees could then choose to share with each other. Questions flooded into the chat to then be included in the slides later. These questions then encouraged responses from other attendees and led to additional conversation on the topic. I appreciated Wendy’s reframing the everyday greeting as a means of authentic leadership and developing curiosity as a new approach to mindfulness. I enjoyed the session and recommend it to anyone looking for wellness techniques to help foster a more “luminous life”.

exclusionary structures (rules, laws, etc.) and not merely on policing each other’s cultural competency. Building personal and interpersonal competency should be part of our individual and collective growth but does not need to monopolize our efforts in this space. I appreciated how this panel acknowledged this set of difficult questions and did a valiant job analyzing this topic from their points of view. //

cont’d

cont’d
I was excited to attend this session as I have heard my legal research students discussing Quick Check on Westlaw but have not yet had the opportunity to investigate it fully. In this session, Benjamin Keele, Katie Labonte, and Susan Nevelow Mart presented their ongoing research into the use of brief analyzers that use artificial intelligence (AI).

First, Susan Nevelow Mart identified the main brief analyzers and the order in which they came onto the market, starting with Casetext’s CARA AI, then Westlaw’s Quick Check, followed by Bloomberg’s Brief Analyzer, and finally Lexis’ Brief Analysis. All of these tools are powered by AI machine learning. Mart argued that they cannot replace human attorneys because machines are not capable of creative problem solving. She also demonstrated that none of these platforms give the same results because they are programmed by different humans who will make different choices when programming the algorithms used by the brief analyzers. These inconsistencies occur from both technical biases, arising from the technical algorithm choices like term proximity or source authoritativeness and viewpoint biases, arising from each platform’s different resources and classification systems. And not only will results vary by platform; they also will vary over time even on the same platform because of constant tweaking of the algorithm.

Next, Katie Labonte and Benjamin Keele explained the scope and methodology of the study, currently taking place, upon which the presentation was based. Working with the four brief analyzers from Casetext, Westlaw, Bloomberg, and Lexis, they used ten research questions to get to ten relevant cases. They downloaded a brief from each of these cases to run through the analyzers and then compared the results to see if the analyzers picked up any relevant case law that was “missed” or not already cited in the brief. They discussed similarities and differences between the results and deliverables on these platforms and showed some examples. The big takeaway for me was the difference among the results in terms of finding those “missing” case authorities. Two hundred and ninety-eight “missing” cases were found on the four platforms and only thirty-one of those two hundred and ninety-eight “missing” cases were found on more than one platform. None of those thirty-one cases were found on all four platforms. Wow!

This first stage of research has confirmed their initial hypothesis that the results of running the same brief through the four analyzers would vary across platforms. The next step is to do further work evaluating which platform gives the most relevant, or helpful, results. This research will be as complicated as it will be illuminating because the researchers will need to make the issue “analyzed” in the brief as specific as possible to prevent the analyzers from taking different perspectives on the issue as well as determine how to account for the human element—the attorney drafting the brief, applying any filters, etc.

The panelists recommend that librarians be clear when teaching how to use these brief analyzers. These are not intended to do the research; rather, they should only be used as a doublecheck on a thoroughly researched and drafted document, which is also the intent stated by the platforms themselves. Thus, for law students, this shouldn’t be introduced until after the law students have a complete document. There was also some discussion as to whether only binding authorities are suggested by the brief analyzers—particularly published cases, and it appears that the platforms may approach that matter differently. Another interesting question was whether running these brief analyzers would be something easily done by firm librarians for attorneys, and the answer was probably not because a downloaded PDF might miss some of the features available electronically, like filtering. The big question of course was which of the brief analyzers...
is the “best”. The panelists said that just isn’t answerable yet. I appreciated their analogy that it was like trying to compare different fruits. A banana and an apple are both fruits, but which is “best” is going to be pretty subjective. It may be that which brief analyzer is “best” depends on the user, but perhaps the presenters will have a better answer to that question after they complete the next stage of their research. Hopefully, we will get an update at the AALL conference next year! //

PRESCIENT PRIVACY AT PLAY: A SPECTRUM OF TERMINOLOGY & TOOLS FOR ADMINISTERING & TEACHING LEGAL TECHNOLOGY

Iantha Haight
BYU Law Library

“...A master class on how to present an interesting conference session.” So said Peter Hook in the chat during this session, and I could not put it better myself. Even if you are not interested in the subject matter of this session, watch it just for the creative way the content was organized and presented. It was brilliant. I put this session at the top of my “must-watch” list because I was intrigued by the description (“Four experts. Three mini games. One virtual game board: digital privacy in law librarianship.”), and it did not disappoint. Both the format and the content on privacy were excellent. This session was about best practices for managing digital privacy at law schools and law firms—a topic we should all pay attention to.

Rachel S. Evans of the University of Georgia (UGA) Law Library moderated and devised the idea for the format of the session, which came to her after many rounds of Mario Party during pandemic lockdowns. The panel benefitted from speakers with a wide variety of firm and academic experience: Andre Davison of Orrick LLP; Stacey L. Rowland from the University of North Carolina School of Law; Jason Tubinis from UGA; and Amanda Watson from the University of Houston (who has firm experience also). The session was organized around three mini games: a Scrabble game, a Random Scenes card game, and a spinner game. The great graphics took this session over the top. There was a digital spinning die and a spinner and the cutest avatars for the panelists. I think many of us were tricked at first into thinking there was a real game going on. If Rachel had kept score for the panelists, I probably would not have realized that the game was fake. Structuring the session around a game had several benefits; first, the game made the session feel like a fun happy hour. Second, it held the audience’s attention wondering what was coming next and kept my eyes glued to the slides instead of wandering over to my email. Finally, the game used a timer to keep things moving and give panelists equal time to share.

Despite the fun format, the content was far from fluff. The panelists discussed serious privacy issues like digital hygiene (Jason), our digital footprints (Stacey), derived data (Andre), and our digital personae (Amanda). Jason urged everyone to check on whether their own accounts have suffered a breach on https://haveibeenpwned.com, which you should do immediately if you have not recently. Andre stressed the need to educate newer attorneys about not sending confidential documents with sensitive information through unsecure channels and the importance of collaborating with internal firm departments to ensure compliance with privacy laws. Amanda shared her strategies for helping staff become comfortable with a new dual authentication system: reassure people their concerns are valid and that it’s good to ask questions; educate about dual authentication and its value; and explain how the dual authentication can protect you. Stacey discussed a teaching activity that she uses as an analogy for metadata; she gives the hypothetical that she is suspected of murder and her students must use a file of information about her activities and movements to construct an alibi. This session was excellent, and I highly recommend watching the recording if you missed it the first time. //

cont’d
BY THE NUMBERS, FOR THE NUMBERS: JUSTIFYING YOUR LIBRARY BUDGET

This panel focused on how numbers can be gathered, used, and presented in support of your library budget—as you can tell by the title—, but the real takeaways of this session were the limitations of data and how relationships play a key role in supporting the library budget. The session was moderated by Cynthia Brown of Littler Mendelson, with panelists Annie Mentkowski of the U. S. Railroad Retirement Board Library, Jessica Panella of the University of Connecticut Law Library, and Michelle Trovillo of BakerHostetler.

The panelists began by emphasizing the importance of determining the story you need to tell before gathering data. There are loads of data out there, but it is just noise if the data does not provide us with the information needed to answer decisionmakers’ questions and concerns. Jessica stressed that data gathering should be proactive, not reactive, and aligned with the strategic goals of your institution. In this vein, all the panelists recommended staying on top of budget numbers and tracking them monthly to avoid surprises or missed payments. Michelle advised that it is always good to leave some cushion in the budget for unanticipated needs and vendor charges. She also recommended keeping explanation sheets to detail any unexpected costs that deviate from the budget. Annie does not use standing orders because the government requires her to plan her budget two years in advance, and standing orders are too unpredictable. The panelists mentioned using data management tools like Excel (especially pivot tables), Research Monitor, Microsoft Power Apps, Power BI, and vendor reports. Jessica emphasized that you do not have to be fancy—Excel or even pen and paper are fine—but it is important to have the skills to maintain your systems over the long term.

When presenting your data to decisionmakers, focus on what they want. Present data in the format they prefer and not what works for you. Annie focuses on the bottom line because that is what her decisionmakers care about, but she keeps more details at hand to respond to their questions. Michelle echoed Annie’s advice, adding that it is important to start with the big picture but have details ready. Michelle also likes to include attorney quotes for context. Jessica stressed the importance of not adding fluff and knowing your data inside and out.

When it comes down to it, justifying library budgets is all about relationships—with decisionmakers, attorney users, other librarians, and even vendors. Annie said that the goodwill she has developed with decisionmakers through the years has been critical to her budgeting because they trust her when she says a particular resource is needed. She also said that she uses vendor reports to understand what is being used, which can contradict what users say they cannot live without. Michelle shared the opposite perspective—that she does not trust vendor reports without input from attorney users. For example, a resource could have a lot of clicks, but the attorney did not find what she needed. Or a news resource may have very few clicks, but the attorneys are relying heavily on the headlines in their news alerts to keep current. Annie and Michelle both rely on discussions with other librarians for information about the value of resources they are considering and urged vendors to be more transparent. Jessica stated that anecdotes can be more effective with decisionmakers than data points and emphasized that soft skills can carry the day. Jessica also recommended looking for opportunities to make allies in other departments, including unexpected places like the facilities department. This program clearly conveyed that budgeting is hard, but the better you know your decisionmakers, your users, their needs, and your data, the more effective you will be. //
PROGRAM REVIEWS

ETHICS OF USING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY IN LEGAL RESEARCH

Artificial intelligence and machine learning continue to permeate legal research, knowledge management, and electronic discovery tools. This session discussed the ethical issues librarians and attorneys are likely to face as they decide which tools to use and how they should use them in their work.

The most important ethical principle is the duty of competence. Attorneys should understand the functions and features of the tools they use, so they can assess the applicable benefits and risks. They need not know all the technical details of how algorithms and artificial intelligence work, but they should grasp the functionalities of tools well enough to use them effectively.

Another ethical concern is the duty of confidentiality. For example, brief analyzer tools allow attorneys to upload copies of potentially confidential material to help with research. The major brief analyzers all have assurances of confidentiality, but attorneys and librarians should be sure to check for these assurances before uploading work product.

The speakers also discussed how different biases can appear in machine learning tools and that attorneys must be aware of and consider risks of bias when using the tools. Computer scientists have developed principles for responsible or accountable algorithms, and legal researchers should watch these developments to help them responsibly use AI-powered tools. This session is worthwhile for librarians teaching and training students and attorneys.

LIBRARY INFRASTRUCTURE 101: TECHNICAL SERVICES’ ROLE IN BUILDING YOUR PUBLIC SERVICE FOUNDATION AND BRIDGES TO PATRON SUCCESS

Today, there are still some individuals working in law libraries who do not know what occurs outside their own role or department. Human nature tends to fill in the gaps and make assumptions when something is not understood. This also can occur in libraries between different departments that do not communicate well and misjudge the value that everyone brings to the Law Library team.

I was already planning to attend the program Library Infrastructure 101: Technical Services’ Role in Building Your Public Service Foundation and Bridges to Patron Success when the opportunity arose to draft a review of the program. Upon brief review of the description of the session and expected takeaways for attendees, I was incredibly excited to learn from the diverse panel about the successful communication channels created between departments at their various institutions. I was also delighted to potentially discover new ways to better advocate for my own tech services team.

The program began promptly, and after cursory introductions, the panelists quickly took on the elephant in the room: all the misconceptions that others have about what specific jobs technical services librarians do. I remember nodding as a panel member discussed experiencing someone describe an acquisitions librarian role as only buying books all day. My reaction comes from my own experience of others regularly misunderstanding our librarian role and telling me, “Oh, I should have been a librarian, so I could sit and read books all day.” Sadly, after listening to the panelists’ experiences and their peers’ perspectives, I believe the misconceptions of what technical services librarians do each day go beyond.
one or two random individuals. Instead, the misunderstanding of their work and value often expands to employees in other departments at the library where they work and university stakeholders. The stories and feelings shared during the program supported this misunderstanding about the significant role technical service employees bring to the day-to-day functionality of the law library. From the beginning of the program, the panelists emphasized the importance of the technical services librarians’ and paraprofessionals’ roles in the library. There was a fantastic discussion both in the chat and amongst the panel about the value attached to the names of things and how the name "technical services" only adds to the misconception and misunderstanding about what individuals in that department do. One person shared how often others believe they are a part of the IT department at the law school. This led to further discussion about the immediate need for naming, or renaming, library departments and individual titles to better reflect what they do and the value they bring to the law library. Some alternative names recommended were Core Operation and Collections Management. For the consistency of this review, I will continue to use the phrase technical services, but I see great value in continuing the renaming discussion.

Another critical topic raised during the program was the "invisibility" of the technical services team. All the panelists at the program expressed the feeling of not always having their value seen by others at the institution. One quote in particular resonated with me; "When I go on vacation is when responsibilities are noticed and missed." Additionally, the panel emphasized that this invisibility is even more present in work performed by paraprofessionals as they are often the most marginalized group of employees in a library and need the strongest advocating from department leadership. A recommendation for combating invisibility is having paraprofessionals provide cross-training for other employees at the library. It is essential to communicate to your paraprofessionals that the cross-training is because they are valuable and important to the library.

Communication was a strong theme throughout the entire program. Still, I want to highlight a few recommendations that the program participants shared that could work well at other libraries. Try to move from talking about tasks and details to a mindset that communicates the work's overall impact on the library functionality. Additionally, it is important for department heads and library leadership to understand and communicate the nuances of the work being performed by those in the departments and to trust their team to know how to complete the work.

Finally, I want to encourage everyone to go back and watch this program as it was rife with essential issues that every library staff member should be thinking about and discussing with their team and stakeholders. //

Mountains To Molehills is a far-ranging program with self-proclaimed “lofty goals” for anyone who works with someone of a different generation than their own. Learning how different generations define terms like “respect,” de-escalating cross-generational conflict, and adapting communication styles to meet the challenge of generational differences are a few of the big topics that were discussed.

The meat of the discussion was prefaced by advice to not attribute every difference in style or attitude to generational identity and to not get bogged down in generational stereotypes. Although people of different generations can have different work styles and viewpoints, these differences also can come from such things as personality, family structure,
and where someone is in their career path.

Communication is key. Styles of communication vary across how much small talk we like during the workday to how we respond to emails. The best way to learn about other people’s preferences is, of course, to ask. That being said, according to the speakers, it also is important to differentiate, in our own minds, what is an expectation we have, and what is simply a preference.

One way that generational differences can be seen is how individuals both respond to others having new ideas and respond to their own new ideas. Can a new idea be implemented to try it out, and if it fails, at least we have all learned something from it? Or, back to expectations versus preferences, can a change not be implemented due to rules outside of our control (such as university procedures, etc.)?

In the final segment, the talk came back to not judging people based on their generation. For example, just because a person is of the Boomer generation, does not mean they don’t know how to use technology, and just because someone is of a younger generation, does not mean they are a technology expert and do not know what they are doing or have direction in their job.

At the end of the presentation was a list of helpful resources on addressing generational conflict. But the presentation was most helpful in showing that although generational differences can be felt in the workplace, they do not have to define us, and that with proper communication, differences in style can open us up to new possibilities.
DIVERSIFYING THE LAW LIBRARY COLLECTION WITH INTENTIONALITY

Nicholas Norton
Cornell Law Library

Diversifying the Collection with Intentionality was a fantastic panel that offered great insight into how to incorporate anti-racism into the collection development workflow. Moderator Nicole P. Dyszlewski from Roger Williams University School of Law began by sharing her own experience with thinking through this process as both a librarian and someone who regularly teaches students. Nicole pointed to both the necessity of a librarian to be knowledgeable about this body of material but also the process by which an instructor would need support to build out curricular needs in this space.

Raquel Gabriel from CUNY School of Law offered insight into the mechanizations of making diversity, equity, and inclusion work a standard part of the collection team workflow. For instance, Raquel described creating specific tags for DEI collections in electronic resource management systems, updating collections policies regularly as part of meeting ABA accreditation requirements, and having a consistent wish list of what to prioritize purchasing down the line when budgets are tight.

Anna Russell from the Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals shared a unique point of view coming from the world of court libraries. While court libraries have different patron populations than academic libraries, they both have a...
relationship to these issues. Anna explored the troubling trend of monopolization in the legal publishing world. As more and more legal publishers consolidate, marginal perspectives will only become more marginalized.

I enjoyed this discussion because it was full of practical takeaways for a collection development team. Small steps like planning out a reverse diversity audit (doing a scan of your collection for specific topics of book award winners) can offer a real deliverable for collection teams in their quest to create a more diverse collection. From there, Nicole mentioned looking at specific topics to get beyond generalized literature. One example that stuck out to me was the idea of first procuring books about a general topic like mass incarceration and then supplementing the collection with books on more specific topics like prison abolition or books written by prisoners themselves. This got me thinking about how we could utilize a similar process for all law school subjects and the very intriguing possibilities that could come out of that. We could use that strategy to find smaller presses or publishers to help counter the monopolization problem Anna pointed out.

One small quibble I had with this session, and Nicole fully acknowledged this, was the lack of representation from law firm libraries. This is not for lack of effort on the panel organizers’ part. Nicole discussed how there are not any law firm librarians who are either knowledgeable enough to speak to this topic or who are collecting actively in this space. Given the very specific context of a law firm, I can see why that would be, but I also am disappointed because I think that, just as Anna represented the perspective from a more limited court—specific context, law firm libraries also need to be thinking about how they approach this work. For example, collections could provide resources for conducting interpersonal cultural competency programming to address microaggressions against clients and staff. I think there is plenty of space for law firms to be in this work, and I encourage those who are (because I am sure they are out there somewhere) to join efforts like those highlighted by the moderator and panelists.

The main takeaway I had from this talk was that anti-racist collection strategies are not meant to be one and done or reactionary practices. Rather, this is an ongoing practice that requires a long-term plan and needs to be incorporated into the institution’s culture. Thankfully, very smart people like Nicole, Raquel, and Anna have done a great job giving us a roadmap to start. We should follow their lead. //
BEYOND SCHOLARSHIP: INNOVATIVE INSTITUTIONAL REPOSITORY COLLECTIONS

Beyond Scholarship, an on-demand session still available to attendees, promotes digitizing distinctive collections and using an institutional repository to provide access to those collections. While many of our institutions use our repositories to promote scholarship, this program reminds us to consider our unique collections that would be well-suited to the broad access of our institutional repositories.

Before even listening to the presentation, the depth of knowledge of the speakers was evident from their collection proposal worksheet handout. The worksheet is a helpful tool for anyone working on a digitization project as it encourages developing a plan of action before undertaking the project itself. From the worksheet covers the various aspects involved in digitizing collections, from the ingest process to long-term sustainability.

Jennifer Robble of Boston University School of Law discussed the Betsy Clark Living Archive. This collection honored a long-time faculty member and contained materials ranging from a unpublished manuscript to a list of speakers at a lecture series held in honor of Clark. The ability to group discrete items collected over time under a larger collection umbrella is one of the distinct advantages of digital collections. As Robble discussed during the live question and answer portion of this presentation, the ability to make content accessible drove the creation of this distinctive collection done to honor a deceased faculty member.

Jessica Chapel and Chris Spraker of Harvard Law School Library focused on Harvard’s collection of audio and transcripts of Looking at the Law, a radio program hosted by Harvard alum Neil Chayet that aired in the Boston area for over 40 years. The unique challenge of working with mixed-format collections, in this case, audio files and corresponding from historical precedents or acts in keeping with those precedents as needed.

During their discussion on advice for new managers, the presenters chatted about moving from being task-oriented to management-focused and finding an appropriate ratio of work to project management. While this is dependent upon the manager, the role, and the needs of the organization, it’s certainly a good reminder to consider the ways in which we delegate tasks, allow those who report to us to thrive in their roles, and demonstrate confidence in people to accomplish things.

Another piece of advice is to provide multiple motivations and rationales. The speakers discussed that individuals may have different motivations. Some are motivated by rational decisions (the head), others by emotion (the heart), and others by being useful, helpful, or needed (the hands) or a combination of multiple motivations. Providing rationales that appeal to people using more than one approach can help build unity among staff.

When it comes to managing up, the speakers also offered the invaluable advice to never let your boss be taken by surprise. Good communication involves relaying information with a clear indication about whether it is something the person merely needs to know or information with which the person needs to interact as well as clearly asking for guidance, approval, or intervention when it is needed.

Especially as many of us return to work environments that have changed innumerably in the last year and half, the speakers stressed the need to be open and transparent as much as possible, to keep things positive, and to build a community of support. Among the skills the presenters encouraged was resiliency. Regardless of what role you play in your organization, we’ve all been called upon to be resilient lately, and listening to an honest conversation about what skills will improve our communications and interactions with those we work with is refreshing.
transcripts, makes this portion of the presentation beneficial to anyone looking to do a large-scale audio digitization project.

Aamir Abdullah and Rebecca Ciota of the University of Colorado School of Law reviewed the process of adding Colorado session laws from 1861 to 2019 to their institutional repository. These two speakers drew attention to a unique stakeholder for this collection, the Colorado government. We frequently consider the stakeholders as within and adjacent to our institution, but as we learned from this portion of the program, looking more broadly at a potential user base may allow us to expand our collections to a wider audience.

Rachel Evans and Savanna Nolan of the University of Georgia provided background on several of their digital collections, specifically their collections of born-digital podcasts which the speakers contrasted with a digital surrogate of a physical exhibit located in the law school. Regarding the podcasts, On Reserve and Speaker Sidebar, the presenters discussed the integration of links to Apple Podcasts in order to make these podcasts easily accessible. Rachel and Savanna also explained the Rotunda Exhibit, a digital exhibit that corresponds to a physical display in the law school. Content from the physical exhibit is supplemented with videos in the digital collection.

In addition to providing ideas for digital repository content driven by special collections housed in the library, the program offered listeners a broad look at the details that go into creating and making such collections available, from the types of institutional repositories used to copyright permissions needed to long-term promotion of a collection. The program is worth a listen for anyone looking to add distinct content to their own institutional repository. //

**THERE AND BACK AGAIN: LIBRARY OUTREACH BEFORE, DURING AND AFTER THE PANDEMIC**

Law librarians have been grappling with how to build outreach while shifting to an online world. The Stanford Law School Library (SLSL) team (Katie Siler, Taryn Marks, Grace Lo and Kay Cadena) shared their recent experience with virtual programming: what worked well, what did not, and how to build upon successful virtual outreach in the transition back to hybrid and in-person service, in, “There and Back Again: Library Outreach Before, During and After the Pandemic”.

Beginning with a description of SLSL outreach efforts pre-pandemic, SLSL librarians discussed the transition to virtual. Highlighting three events and sharing the pros and cons of each, the presenters created an engaging program which met the promised goal to help attendees adapt and adopt the SLSL programs for their own needs.

Pre-pandemic, SLSL, like many libraries, used library displays, relied heavily on free food, and planned outreach casually, with ad hoc cubicle conversations. Once the pandemic impacted the library, outreach programs and planning needed to pivot to virtual.

The first event the group discussed was a library trivia contest presented at a Stanford Law School(SLS) all—hands meeting using Kahoot. SLSL amped up engagement by offering prizes, which were mailed to winners. One of the downsides of using Kahoot in conjunction with Zoom was that the presenter could not see the Zoom Chat and all participants’ microphones were muted, so it felt like presenting to an empty room. Despite this drawback, the trivia was enthusiastically embraced by participants. Going forward, the Kahoot trivia program was so successful it will be used again. In person, the Kahoot questions and results can be projected on a screen, and the presenters can walk around to interact with the audience, distributing the prizes.

At the end of the fall semester, the SLS librarians hosted a “Battle of the Cookbooks”. The library staff selected their
WFH Without Being Remote

“WFH Without Being Remote” was an interesting session on keeping reference transactions fresh, accessible, and relevant while working virtually.

Mark Gediman spoke about competitive intelligence (CI) and tackling reference questions in an efficient manner. He suggested asking the right questions to get as much information as effectively as possible without too much “back-and-forth,” which can lead to frustration.

As an aside, being a fellow “Trekker,” I enjoyed the Star Trek references occasionally sprinkled into his presentation. Knowing if you’re about to be assimilated by the Borg is indeed important information to have!

Caren Luckie talked about staying connected with co-workers, both in the same office, and when you are spread out. Video meetings and Jabber or other text messaging services help people keep in contact.

To stay connected and “keep in front” of the attorneys, Caren recommended attending practice group meetings and CLE presentations (and happy hours!) and keeping your camera on so people can connect a face to a name.

Daisy De Anda gave pointers on the reference interview. She began her presentation by pointing out that for many information professionals, working from home is something we have always done. Librarians can serve audiences in multiple locations and offices, even time zones.

She then spoke of the importance of a positive reference interaction, and gave tips for seeing the clues of reference interactions that are not in person in our WFH world. An example of a clue would be the language of the email or...
messaging interaction; the use of bold letters, all-caps or words like “rush” would indicate that the patron needs a quick response.

Another good example that the presenters used is a spur-of-the-moment request that comes via video chat or messaging, where you are left with some extra questions. In this case, the best practice should include a follow-up email with a few questions about specificity, deadlines, etc.

During the discussion portion at the end, participants emphasized the importance of following up after the end of a reference transaction: to both make sure that the transaction went well and that the patron’s needs were met.

The presenters also talked about the blurring lines of being “at home” but still being “at work” when many people are working from their homes. They discussed the setting of boundaries (even when working within multiple time zones!), so that patrons know you are not available 24/7. A couple of suggestions of how to handle this predicament were to preface requests received over the weekend with “we received your request after our working hours,” and to not forward your work phone to your personal phone during non-work hours.

One positive that Caren Luckie named of working from home is that she feels the library is now seen as more of a service, that patrons come to feel that “you are the library.”

Overall, the program was an empowering look at how to benefit your patrons while working from home. Although the presenters are firm librarians, the ideas are easily transferable to other types of law libraries. //
PROGRAM REVIEWS

In the final portion of the on-demand session, Erik Adams discussed tools that can be used to process data. Erik analogized Excel to a hammer in the old expression that everything looks like a nail to a person with a hammer. While Excel is a useful tool, he argued that other useful tools should be included in a data analytics toolbox. He then introduced the audience to six tools: OpenRefine, a product that helps you to clean data sets; RStudio and Python, which are programming languages that can run statistical operations; Jupyter notebooks that allows the user to create and run programs in a browser that are especially useful for training; and Tableau and Power BI, which provide powerful tools for performing data analytic tasks but can be quite expensive.

The resources provided as part of this program offered excellent hands-on experiences. During the Q&A, the panel reminded attendees that librarians have the skill sets to do data analysis. They encouraged everyone to think deeply about questions, be curious, network for inspiration, and find help when needed. With the tools and insight provided during the three phases of this session, an attendee has been given a good start to explore data analytics more deeply.

NEW SKILLS FOR A REMOTE WORLD: THE EVOLUTION OF TECHNOLOGY COMPETENCE

Julie Randolph
Temple Law Library

Worried about whether your law school is teaching the tech needed to prepare its students for practice? Interested in how firms ensure their attorneys have the tech skills they need? This program provided information on what tech skills other law school librarians are teaching, the tech skills one law firm thinks are important for its lawyers to know, and, happily, reassurance that not every attorney needs to be able to program or explain the intricacies of artificial intelligence to meet their ethical duties.

This was a pre-recorded, on-demand session broken into three distinct portions. Although some on-demand sessions had full transcripts available, this one did not, but the video presentation is captioned.

First, Debbie Ginsberg, Faculty Services Manager at Harvard Law School, spoke on ethics and tech. She emphasized that teaching tech necessarily includes teaching ethics and ran through the model ethical rules that relate to tech competence and law practice. She discussed how she incorporated ethics as she taught tech to her students. I appreciated the emphasis on security issues.

Jenny Wondracek, Director of the Law Library and a Professor of Legal Research and Writing at Capital University Law School, then spoke about tech topics she taught in her course Law Practice Technology, as well as ethical issues the tech implicates. While much of this will be familiar to anyone who has been following recent developments in legal tech, I will be borrowing some of Jenny’s “ripped from the headlines” stories the next time I teach the topic.

The program concluded with Debbie’s interview of Ivan Hemmans, Senior Manager of Technical Development at O’Melveny & Myers LLP, to learn what he and his firm’s recruiters look for in new associates. They want smart problem-solvers; experience in specific technologies is less important than being willing and able to learn. Continual learning is key, and on-demand education is a great tool. (Speaking of which, check out the “Hey Ivan!” YouTube channel where Ivan answers tech questions.) Ivan encouraged law students to master a word processing program, and he gave Microsoft Word’s styles as an example of something lawyers find incredibly useful but often do not know how to use when they start practice. New lawyers also should be conversant with communication technology such as web conferencing.

With regard to remote work, Ivan noted that the technologies attorneys have come to rely on while working remotely likely will be added on top of existing technologies, and going forward, multiple tech types probably will be used for a period until all but one fades away. I particularly liked his final suggestion to go out and learn about tech that interests you even if it’s not immediately useful – you’ll eventually find a way to integrate it into your work.

While this session contained no surprises, it should be of interest to academic law librarians teaching legal technology classes or otherwise involved in getting law students ready to handle the technology needs of law practice.
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DEADLINES FOR THE 2021-2020 ACADEMIC YEAR

We rely on member contributions to keep the ALL-SIS Newsletter going strong. We welcome your comments, questions, and ideas to help make our 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 deadlines for the 2020-2021 academic year will be as follows—

• Winter issue (posts at beginning of January): November 22, 2021
• Spring issue (posts mid-March): February 14, 2022
• Summer issue (posts mid-June): May 23, 2022

GENERAL INFORMATION

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.