The start of school is a favorite time of year for me. Reunions with those absent from the summer, new faces of new students to meet, new books, and the eventual change of season from summer to fall all combine into an exciting few weeks.

Just prior to the start of school I received a text from a friend most concerned about me. They forwarded to me the announcement that Coke Zero was no more; to be replaced by a new version of Coke Zero. For those of you who know me well, this was an announcement of considerable concern given my addiction to the beverage.

Several close friends suggested this was an excellent opportunity, an opportunity for me break the habit and drink more water or tea. Others suggested that I stock up immediately with every bottle and can available in Virginia. I think several were willing to stockpile a supply on my behalf. This was a challenge that required a plan, creative thinking, and immediate action. Time was of the essence! I can happily report that the new Coke Zero is acceptable and crisis was averted.

continued on page 2

From the Editor

In addition to our Member News section (pages 16-18) and a report from last fall’s Management Institute (page 2), this issue brings you full coverage of the 2017 AALL Annual Meeting & Conference. Find out about that educational program you missed (Program Reviews, page 9). Contributor John Beatty (page 6) rounds up several conference sessions focused on digital repositories, and shares some post-conference reflections on the summer’s big news—Elsevier’s acquisition of bepress. For those developing papers or articles, Dennis Kim-Prieto has an update on the Boulder Conferences (page 3), the annual pre-conference paper workshop and forum for law librarian/scholars interested in legal pedagogy. And if you’re new to the profession, read ALL-SIS grant recipient Gail MacDonald’s report on CONELL (page 5)—the annual pre-conference networking event for new(er) law librarians—and start making your plans for next year in Baltimore!

As always, contact the Editor, at iwang@law.berkeley.edu, with your feedback, questions, ideas and articles. 😊
My Coke Zero crisis, while real enough for me, is simply an exemplar for the challenges academic libraries and librarians face each day. Each challenge is unique and requires its own solution. Some challenges are more serious than others but each challenge requires a creative approach and librarians excel at creativity.

Imagination, innovation, redefinition, engagement, collaboration, opportunity are the words that come to mind when I think about how librarians face challenge. We embrace imaginative and “out of the box” thinking and solutions. We excel at innovation and redefinition. Opportunity and engagement are natural for us. Collaboration—well, we have that one down pat also.

This fall, I challenge you. Look for the opportunities embedded in every crisis. Seek out invitations to collaborate. Embrace your inner innovator and your imagination. Do this in your own library, within ALL-SIS, or AALL, or your local or regional chapter. Reach deep inside and stretch - just a bit. Might you have time to be a micro contributor? Is it time to write that article for Law Library Journal or Spectrum or the ALL-SIS Newsletter? Might you propose a program for AALL or your local chapter? Stretch to show your inner talents! Embrace your own Coke Zero challenge.

Best of luck with the beginning of school and remember to reach just a bit further this fall.

Caroline 😊

The Managerial Mindset: Highlights from the AALL Management Institute
Anna Lawless-Collins, Boston University School of Law Fineman & Pappas Law Libraries

I was very fortunate to attend this year’s Management Institute thanks to a grant from ALL-SIS. Attendees included people at all points in their careers, from not-yet managers to library directors. As someone who recently transitioned into a managerial role I found the Institute incredibly helpful. Maureen Sullivan ran the Institute—guiding discussions, leading exercises, and providing a plethora of reading material.

One of the first concepts we discussed was the “managerial mindset.” This is a helpful exercise for any manager, and it’s especially helpful if you’re moving into a managerial role where your team is made up of former peers. Each item on the ten-point list was a great starting point for thinking about an aspect of management. Below are five of the points I found particularly salient.

1. Manage your own self-esteem so that you will derive satisfaction from your managerial work, not from the work activities in which you engaged before being promoted to a managerial position. This encompasses the important mental transition of engaging in an entirely new set of skills. Just because I have been a good Collection Development Librarian doesn’t automatically guarantee I’ll be a good manager; further, even if I enjoyed specific tasks and felt I was good at them, my pleasure from work can’t come from those same places any more now that I am a manager. Given the nature of staffing in technical services departments I will always do some of the work outside of managing, but I need to think about the best ways to divide that work up to utilize my team’s skills, and not just base my decisions on what work I enjoy doing.

continued on page 4
Legal research is the analysis, search process, information evaluation, and reasoning necessary to ethically solve problems and provide legal advice. Legal research is integral to lawyers’ professional competence.” This pithy statement was issued by the Eighth Annual Boulder Conference on Legal Information: Scholarship and Teaching, in Chicago, in July 2016. The Boulder Conferences, as they are commonly known, began out of a conversation between Barbara Bintliff, then the director of the Wise Law Library at the University of Colorado (and now the head of the Tarlton Law Library at the University of Texas), and Paul Callister, director of the University of Missouri-Kansas City Law Library, about the need for a forum for newer librarians to develop their scholarship, as well as an organ to address the development of law librarianship or legal research within legal pedagogy. Named for its inaugural location—in Boulder, Colorado, at the University of Colorado—these conferences have been held during the days immediately preceding each of the last nine AALL Annual Meetings. The past several conferences have been run by Susan Nevelow Mart, Director at the Wise Law Library at the University of Colorado.

This conference series has already yielded one book, published by Hein in 2014. This volume, entitled The Boulder Statements on Legal Research: Education: The Intersection of Intellectual and Practical Skills, distills the first four conferences into a unique blend of theory and practice-ready teaching exercises, exemplars, and templates. The book covers topics such as integrating legal research into law school curricula, research by human classification vs. computer algorithms, critical information theory, metacognition, assessment, social networking, and research ethics. It also includes four different types of examples for implementing Boulder’s COACH (Content, and Objectives, Activity, and Checklist) template for legal research instruction. In short, the volume is a comprehensive introduction to the first several conferences and the work that has emerged out of them.

Another product of the Boulder Conferences has been the newly launched Legal Information Review. This journal is simultaneously published online as well as in print (annually), and provides a new forum for law librarians who are pursuing scholarship into the pedagogy and practice of legal research. This is the only journal in our literature that is truly peer-reviewed, in keeping with its origins in the Boulder workshops.

Indeed, both the statements and the new journal are a natural outgrowth of the primary function of the Boulder Conferences: the paper workshop that dominates the event. One and a half days out of the two-and-a-half-day conference are devoted to workshopping paper drafts. Law librarians from law schools, courts, firms, start-ups, and all across the spectrum write and present their papers for feedback from the Conference, and many participants have repeatedly described the quality of the feedback as invaluable.

This year’s conference was extraordinarily productive for those engaged in writing: more than 20 different papers were read, analyzed, and critiqued, to the delight and benefit of everyone involved. This year’s conference was extraordinarily productive for those engaged in writing: more than 20 different papers were read, analyzed, and critiqued, to the delight and benefit of everyone involved. This year’s conference was extraordinarily productive for those engaged in writing: more than 20 different papers were read, analyzed, and critiqued, to the delight and benefit of everyone involved. This year’s conference was extraordinarily productive for those engaged in writing: more than 20 different papers were read, analyzed, and critiqued, to the delight and benefit of everyone involved. This year’s conference was extraordinarily productive for those engaged in writing: more than 20 different papers were read, analyzed, and critiqued, to the delight and benefit of everyone involved. This year’s conference was extraordinarily productive for those engaged in writing: more than 20 different papers were read, analyzed, and critiqued, to the delight and benefit of everyone involved. This year’s conference was extraordinarily productive for those engaged in writing: more than 20 different papers were read, analyzed, and critiqued, to the delight and benefit of everyone involved. This year’s conference was extraordinarily productive for those engaged in writing: more than 20 different papers were read, analyzed, and critiqued, to the delight and benefit of everyone involved.

This is why the Boulder Conferences are of interest to ALL-SIS members. Some of us are in tenure-stream positions that require publication. Others simply want to bring our expertise and our research to add to the body of knowledge. The Boulder Conferences are a vital tool to achieve both of these goals. We invite you, and we urge you, to look at the past work of the Boulder Conferences, available on https://lawlibrary.colorado.edu/boulder-conferences-legal-information-scholarship-and-teaching. And be sure to watch for a Call for Papers this spring, and to submit your work to that call. Boulder is an incredibly valuable event that provides a wealth of feedback to help you improve your own scholarship. 😊
2. **Delegate to enable others to learn and develop their skills and abilities.** Delegate both work activities and the authority to make decisions. This can be challenging for a couple of reasons. First, it’s often faster to just do some work yourself rather than delegate it, train staff on how to do it, and follow up with them to make sure they have adequate support. However, to have a satisfied, challenged team who regularly grow professionally, they need to learn new tasks. It also gives them ownership in the work, which helps the team feel more engaged. The other reason it can be challenging is culture. If a team is not used to being responsible for decision-making, getting them into the habit of it and navigating the different levels of authority needed to make decisions can be a difficult switch. This point reminds me to engage in conversations with my team about next steps, rather than dictating next steps when they ask.

3. **Manage your need to be liked.** Accept that your main responsibility now is to guide and direct the work of others to ensure that their performance is in alignment with the mission and goals of the organization. In moving from peer to manager, my relationship to the people on my team necessarily changed. Suddenly, I was giving performance evaluations to people who had been with the organization longer than I and with whom my primary relationships used to be co-worker and friend. Balancing a positive team dynamic, maintaining and lifting morale, and giving difficult feedback have been challenges. I’ve had to accept that people will not always be happy with me, but will hopefully respect my decisions. I have to hope that my decisions and communication styles will help guide that team dynamic and keep morale up, because just being everyone’s friend is not an option as a manager.

4. **Deal with conflict directly.** Approach it from a problem-solving perspective. No one likes conflict, but in many ways it’s easier to have a direct, difficult conversation than it is to let a problem fester and let resentment build under the surface. If everyone involved keeps in mind that we are all people doing our best, and we all assume that we want a positive resolution to a conflict, we can move forward together and solve the issue. I am very lucky to have a library director who fully supports these conversations and who will work with managers and staff on crafting language and refining exactly what we want to say to help resolve difficult situations.

5. **Take time to recognize and express appreciation for the work of others.** This has always stood out to me as one of the most important things a manager can do. Working somewhere that you feel unappreciated or that the work you’re doing is not valued can really sap an employee’s work ethic and desire to be there. We all depend on our teams and colleagues to help our libraries provide excellent services, and thanking those teams and colleagues costs us nothing while letting them know that we appreciate their work. Providing recognition outside the library—in our situation, to law school administration and faculty—also helps raise the profiles of the individuals working at the library and in turn, raises the profile of the library as a whole.

Keep in mind that these are only half the points on this list, and we discussed this list within the first few minutes of the Institute. Throughout the entire meeting we learned a great deal from Maureen and from each other. As I’m often reminded, problems are best solved by getting a bunch of smart people in a room together. The Management Institute provided just that opportunity—we engaged in thought-provoking discussions and exercises, we talked issues through with each other, and worked on real-life issues we are all currently facing in our libraries. I think it was beneficial to everyone involved, but as a new manager I could not have asked for a better experience. 😊
I was very pleased to attend the AALL Annual Meeting in Austin this year as a 2017 ALL-SIS CONELL Grant recipient. As a first-time attendee to the AALL Annual Meeting and as a new member of AALL, I was very excited to learn about CONELL and the opportunities and experiences it offers to newer law librarians. Prior to my attendance at the annual meeting, many colleagues and other AALL members highly recommended I participate in CONELL, noting it was one of their favorite experiences at the AALL Annual Meeting and a place where many made lifelong friends. In particular, I was enthusiastic about the opportunity to be introduced to other new members of the profession, as well as was eager to learn about AALL and ways to get involved.

In the weeks leading up to CONELL, the 2017 CONELL Committee set up a “CONELL Class of 2017” community on AALLnet. This excellent resource set out what to expect at CONELL, with schedules, tips, and the ability to communicate with other attendees. Attendees who arrived early to Austin also had the option of signing up for a Dutch treat dinner, hosted by an AALL veteran, the night before CONELL. From the moment I arrived at the check-in for CONELL on Saturday morning, I was warmly greeted and introduced to new and current members of AALL. The program started with an introduction from the CONELL Committee Chair, as well as Ronald E. Wheeler Jr., the president of AALL. The President and the Chair were extremely welcoming and set forth the great opportunities and connections available through AALL. Members of the Executive Board also spoke through a question and answer session. Several members remarked that they too had attended CONELL and noted it had sparked their enthusiasm to get involved with AALL.

After this discussion, I and the other attendees learned more about AALL as a whole, from how to volunteer to how to publish in an AALL publication, to ways to submit proposals for future Annual Meetings. The speakers constantly emphasized that even as newer members, many opportunities and resources exist, particularly in regard to mentoring and leadership paths.

I truly realized throughout my time at CONELL that mentoring and building connections are strong assets of AALL. After the introduction to AALL, I attended a speed networking session, which really showcased AALL’s power to help participants connect with other librarians. During this session, CONELL attendees had brief one-on-one discussions with other attendees, as well as CONELL Committee members. I met many wonderful librarians during this time. The session was an excellent opportunity to see that even though AALL is a very large organization, there is still the ability to foster personal connections. This is true even if a librarian is outside of your geographical area or is in a different type of library altogether. I met many wonderful librarians from around the country who gave me unique insights into their libraries. I know these insights will help me reflect and expand on my own approach to my work as an academic law librarian.

After the speed networking session, I attended the CONELL Marketplace, where I was able to learn much more about all of the various special interest sections and organizations and the ways to get involved. At every table I stopped at, I met helpful librarians who were more than happy to answer questions, provide informational resources, and who encouraged me to reach out with questions about anything related to law librarianship. After the Marketplace, attendees enjoyed

---

[M]entoring and building connections are strong assets of AALL.

Recipients of ALL-SIS’s CONELL Grant have the opportunity to report on the event in an article for the Newsletter. For more information on ALL-SIS grants for AALL professional development opportunities like CONELL, see https://www.aallnet.org/sections/all/awards/Criteria.

—Ed.
At the beginning of August, Elsevier announced its acquisition of bepress. This was big and surprising news to the academic law library community. Over one third of ABA-accredited U.S. law schools have an active repository hosted on bepress’s Digital Commons and several others, including my own institution, the University at Buffalo Law School—are currently building their repositories on the platform. Unsurprisingly, reaction to the news has been negative.¹

I recently returned to the legal academy after getting my JD and spending a few years practicing law in Syracuse. A few weeks before Elsevier’s announcement, I attended my first AALL Annual Meeting in several years. One of my tasks as the new faculty scholarship librarian at University of Buffalo is to work as part of a team that is building and populating the school’s Digital Commons repository. Toward that goal, I spent a lot of time at the Annual Meeting attending technology and repository-related programs. Upon reflection, most of the programs I attended fit a theme of librarians transforming their libraries, in part by building their own tools. The bepress acquisition has made this idea even more relevant, and I can’t help but look at my conference experience through this lens.


Building Our Own Tools in the Age of Elsevier
AALL 2017 Through the Lens of the bepress Acquisition
John Beatty, University at Buffalo School of Law


In Digital Repositories, Law Libraries, and the Future of Open Access (session G2 on Tuesday, July 18th at 8:30 a.m.), presenters Carol Watson from the University of Georgia, Gregg Gordon from SSRN, and Corie Dugas from NELLCO discussed the ten-year history of the legal industry’s involvement in digital repositories and the need to think about the next steps. First, Watson summarized the history of law schools and institutional repositories. Although about half of U.S. law schools have an institutional repository and roughly 300 U.S. and international schools have a series on SSRN, there are no standards for open access, interoperability, or metadata. She also discussed the need to communicate the impact of these systems to our constituents. For example, what do the download numbers actually mean? How do downloads translate to impact?

Next, Gordon explained that his view of open access is “about innovation.” He believes the point of open access is to get research into the hands of other researchers before it’s available anywhere else. He sees the job of SSRN and Elsevier as providing a better interface. Elsevier won’t charge for content. The benefit it gets is to look at the connections between researchers,
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and leverage that. When asked about ethical concerns regarding how that research is conducted, he basically dodged the question by stating that Elsevier has “a team that focuses on privacy” and that it would receive no benefit to steer toward an agenda or view.

Finally, Dugas spoke about LawArXiv, which intends to provide a permanent hosting platform for open access research that is owned and maintained by the member institutions. The project is very new and will be shaped by the institutions, in particular the librarians, using it. LawArXiv was started as a reaction to Elsevier’s acquisition of SSRN.

Law Repositories Caucus Meeting and Roundtables

The Law Repositories Caucus roundtables (held on Sunday, July 16th at 12:45 p.m.) featured two sessions and a number of tables, each hosting a different topic. I spent both sessions at the metrics table, where the discussion revolved largely around two subjects: the difficulties involved in collecting citation counts in law, and methods of communicating this information to the faculty and administration.

Several communications ideas were discussed, and my favorite was the school that compiles a quarterly report on all permanent faculty showing SSRN downloads, downloads from the school’s Digital Commons repository, and citations for each faculty member.

Unfortunately, no solutions were forthcoming for the citation count problem. The main issue in citation gathering is that the large bibliometric databases like Web of Science and Scopus don’t collect student-edited law reviews, where the vast majority of law professor scholarship is published, because they are not peer-reviewed. This limits librarians to using labor-intensive tools including Harzing’s Publish or Perish and Plum Analytics (also recently acquired by Elsevier) to gather the data. Because no one tool covers the majority of journals where law professors publish, librarians must spend a lot of time compiling the data from the various tools and weeding out duplicates.

Watson in the Law Library

In Watson in the Law Library (session F6 on Monday, July 17th at 2:00 p.m.), Fastcase CEO Ed Walters and Brian Kuhn, from IBM’s Watson team, explored the idea that information professionals should be building their own AI tools and not merely using them as consumers. AI tools are a collection of algorithms that can understand context and meaning, and can reason, learn, and interact with people or other tools. As Walters explained, the main difference between AI tools and traditional tools is that AI tools can work with unstructured data. Most institutional data is unstructured and, consequently, AI tools are potentially very powerful. He also stated that the current focus on lawyers being replaced by AI tools perpetuates a negative stereotype that is unhelpful. Instead of replacing human intelligence, these tools should be used to augment human intelligence by being applied to “brute force” tasks that are time-consuming.

The presentation focused on two systems, Watson and Fastcase’s AI sandbox, and their potential application to law organizations, particularly law firms. Walters and Kuhn suggested a number of possible projects that could be implemented in law organizations, including workflow tools for companies to evaluate efficiency of outside counsel or for outside counsel to evaluate their own efficiency and billing practices against their clients’ guidelines; analysis tools that could use prospective jurors’ social media accounts to assist in jury selection or use a judge’s previous written decisions to forecast a prospective ruling; and support tools to more efficiently perform pro bono work. The program closed with Walters’ challenge to everyone in the room to start using AI tools to build specialized tools for their own organizations.

Bringing It All Together

Although the perspectives and specifics of each session were different, there were a few big ideas that started to take shape for me while at the conference. Looking at the bepress acquisition in the context of its other recent acquisitions, it appears that Elsevier is attempting to purchase the entire mechanism of scholarly communication. Although SSRN and bepress stress that researchers will continue to have free access to content and that institutions will continue to own
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their own data, it appears that in Elsevier’s world, those institutions will pay Elsevier dearly for access to the mechanisms of scholarly communication. We’ll pay it for our faculty to submit content to journals. We’ll pay it again to publish and host those journals. And we’ll pay it to host the scholarly output of our own faculty.

Looked at in this light, the lack of metadata standards in our repositories may be a problem. How many schools are going to find that they didn’t give enough thought to how their metadata is organized in bepress, and will need to do further work if they wish to migrate to another system in the future? Any such migration is not likely to happen soon. SSRN and Digital Commons are too entrenched for institutions to abandon them in the near future. However, it is time that law librarians as a community start to build alternatives to the tools that Elsevier is purchasing, before we are irreversibly locked in. I think when most of us think about open access, we are also thinking platform-independent. Under the current landscape, it may be necessary to think beyond using open source tools to build repositories, and instead build our own open source scholarly communication infrastructure. An infrastructure that can’t be easily sold because it is owned not by a single entity but by the community. LawArXiv is one such possibility. Shortly after the bepress announcement, LawArXiv stated that it intends to look into replacing other Digital Commons functionality in the future.

But we must think beyond simply looking for a replacement for Digital Commons or other services offered by bepress. We should take up the challenge and start to look at ways we can use AI tools, and other tools, to replace costly services we’re currently buying from vendors, or to build our own tools beyond what vendors are offering. For example, can we build chatbots to assist our patrons when the reference desk is closed? Can we build research and knowledge management tools to support our clinics? Can we build tools to sort through circulation data and other usage statistics to provide meaningful analysis of the disparate numbers provided by vendors?

And yet this is not enough. We must also answer bigger questions. How can we build tools and services owned by the community and what does that look like? How can we forge partnerships between law libraries and non-law libraries to build a scholarly communication infrastructure that is not tied to one vendor? How do we do this with limited resources and continually-shrinking budgets?

a great lunch where I had the pleasure of getting to know better many of the librarians I met during the speed networking session.

After lunch, attendees went on a tour of Austin. The tour was an excellent way to learn more about Austin and see our host city. However, more importantly, it was another chance to form connections with other new law librarians. On the tour, I met even more new members, and was also able to spend time with those I had met earlier in the day. I had a great time taking in the tour with the other attendees in a more informal setting.

For me, at every turn, CONELL offered a wonderful welcome to AALL and its opportunities for involvement, and allowed me to truly get to know many members of the law librarianship profession. I was constantly reminded that mentoring opportunities exist, both formally and informally. Many veteran members encouraged me to contact them upon my return home with any questions I might have. I am excited about getting involved with AALL and staying in touch with the many new members I met and whom I look forward to seeing at future AALL meetings. CONELL was truly an excellent way for me to start my experience as an AALL member and I am very grateful to have been able to attend as a recipient of a 2017 ALL-SIS CONELL Grant.
Program Reviews  
Highlights from AALL 2017  
co-edited by Daniel A. Brackmann, University of South Carolina

It seems like there is always at least one program at AALL that you were curious to see but missed attending in person. The reviews in this section offer quick summaries, highlights of programs—presented by, for, or about academic law librarians—that your ALL-SIS colleagues appreciated. Included are links to helpful resources, and recordings and program materials are now available, with member login, for many sessions. The recordings can be found via AALL2go (http://www.aallnet.org/mm/Education/aall2go/amrecordings/aall2017), and are arranged, like these reviews, by conference day and session number or timeslot.

—Ed.

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

A1 – Minority Teachers: Expectations, Experiences, and Exultations  
Clanitra Stewart Nejdl, Northern Illinois University College of Law

Coordinated and moderated by Raquel J. Gabriel, Assistant Director for Reference and Research Services at the CUNY School of Law Library, this session brought together dynamic law librarians such as Ronald E. Wheeler, Jr. (AALL President and Director of the Fineman and Pappas Law Libraries, Boston University School of Law), Anne Robbins (Acquisitions Librarian, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign School of Law Library), and Sherri Nicole Thomas (Professor of Law Librarianship, University of New Mexico School of Law Library). Each of these individuals shared with the audience the challenges that they have faced both in the classroom and in academia in general as members of different minority groups. The panel also shared strategies about how to thrive as minority teachers in the classroom.

As an introductory exercise, audience members were asked to consider a scenario in which their authority as educators in the classroom was challenged in a way that could be due to their identification with a minority group. After the audience was given time to think about the scenario, each member of the panel addressed how he or she would handle that scenario. It was quite helpful to hear from each of these experienced librarians how he or she would have handled the scenario, and it was surprising to find out that the scenario had actually happened to one member of the panel. Each panelist was able to provide specific tips about handling the scenario, including creating an appropriate classroom environment, having a colleague provide feedback on your teaching, preparing and planning for what happens in the classroom as much as possible beforehand, and maintaining a professional demeanor both inside and outside of the classroom.

After the introductory scenario, each panelist shared how he or she personally identifies as a member of a minority group. The panel represented diversity in several aspects, including racial and ethnic diversity, diversity in physical ability, and diversity in terms of sexual orientation. Each panelist candidly discussed how his or her experiences as a law librarian, and especially as a teaching law librarian, has been influenced by his or her experiences as a member of a minority group. That the panelists were so diverse and so open in sharing their experiences added to the compelling nature of the session and made it feel like a discussion among familiar colleagues.

Another issue addressed by the panel was the level of support for teaching that each member has received at his or her institution. Although the panelists differed in the level of support that each received (from very little support to substantial support), it was clear that each had made the most of the support provided. As an audience member, hearing the panelists’ strategies for growing in their teaching abilities was inspiring and encouraging.

Finally, the panelists addressed what they perceived to be the most difficult things to accomplish as minority teachers. This question provided the opportunity for the audience members to hear continued on page 10
additional candid experiences and advice from the
panelists. Difficulties discussed included a student’s
refusal to complete an assignment, receiving unjust
student evaluations, dealing with unfair perceptions of
ability based on minority status, and fear of potential
negative interactions with students and patrons.

Towards the end of the session, the opportunity
was provided for audience members to discuss the
scenario among themselves and network with fellow
attendees. This was an important opportunity for many
of the audience members to discuss their own
experiences as minority teaching librarians, and as
members of minority groups in general. Time was also
provided for a brief question and answer session.

Between the lively discussion of the panelists and the
equally interesting discussion between audience
members later in the session, this session was one that
— and perhaps should — have lasted past the sixty
minutes allotted. Future AALL annual meetings might
benefit from extended sessions on this topic, and
perhaps even a “deep dive” into these issues,
incorporating more time to hear from panelists and to
share experiences with each other. However, this panel
definitely set a high bar for any such session, as the
practical advice and techniques provided by these
panelists was immeasurably valuable.

A7 – Understanding the Human Element
in Search Algorithms
Benjamin J. Keele, Indiana University Robert H.
McKinney School of Law

Virtually all digital legal research products contain
algorithms to search through information and sort the
results. The conventional view is that when researchers
enter terms and parameters in the database, it produces
relevant results.

Susan Nevelow Mart (University of Colorado)
argues this view incorrectly ignores the powerful role
algorithms play in research systems. Each database’s
algorithms make important choices as they interpret
and complete when interpreting and completing
searches. For example, different algorithms apply
different proximity, classification, and stemming
criteria. Most of these details remain opaque to
researchers, making the algorithms black boxes that
prevent researchers from fully understanding their
research process and results.

To gain a sense of how different algorithms affect
research results, Mart ran identical searches in
Westlaw, Lexis, Advance, Fastcase, Google Scholar,
Ravel Law, and Casetext. She found widely divergent
results in which cases each database offered as most
relevant. I encourage readers to look at Mart’s study
(https://ssrn.com/abstract=2859720) for full details. Mart
found important differences in results not only
between different databases, but also within a single
database over time as vendors adjust the algorithms.
The latter find means researchers might not be able to
replicate results later.

Mart suggests at least three important consequences
of her findings. First, librarians should advocate for
algorithmic transparency by asking vendors to publish
details about how their algorithms interpret searches
and filter and prioritize their results. Mart argues this
can be done in a way that preserves vendors’ trade
secrets. Second, just as librarians may consult multiple
treatises on a topic to see different viewpoints, they
should also consult multiple databases because each
algorithm contains different views of the law and how
to organize it. Finally, Mart’s study offers another way
for librarians to assess research systems’ performance
relative to each other and over time. This session and
companion study are important to librarians who teach
and execute legal research.

B1—Meeting the Legal Information
Needs of Transgender Library Patrons:
Research Findings, Legal Issues &
Cataloging Challenges
Katie Hanschke, North Carolina Central
University School of Law Library

Coming from a library in North Carolina, I found
this session particularly important. As librarians, we
provide services to patrons with a variety of
backgrounds and views. For many, the law library
offers the only access to important legal information.
The program was another reminder of how important
access to that information is, and how law libraries are
continued on page 11
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The latter find means researchers might not be able to
replicate results later.

Mart suggests at least three important consequences
of her findings. First, librarians should advocate for
algorithmic transparency by asking vendors to publish
details about how their algorithms interpret searches
and filter and prioritize their results. Mart argues this
can be done in a way that preserves vendors’ trade
secrets. Second, just as librarians may consult multiple
treatises on a topic to see different viewpoints, they
should also consult multiple databases because each
algorithm contains different views of the law and how
to organize it. Finally, Mart’s study offers another way
for librarians to assess research systems’ performance
relative to each other and over time. This session and
companion study are important to librarians who teach
and execute legal research.
uniquely situated to offer assistance to traditionally politically disadvantaged group.

Moderator Jane Larrington of the University of San Diego began the presentation by introducing the panelists. Lou Weaver of Equality Texas, David Melanson of the University of Texas at Austin, and Spencer D.C. Keralis of the University of North Texas all presented on how law libraries can offer services and provide resources needed by transgender members of their community. Weaver started the discussion by examining the issues facing the transgender community, the appropriate vocabulary to use, and how librarians can be better allies to transgender patrons. This first part should be “required reading” for every librarian. Lou did an excellent job of discussing the issues in detail and conveying the information in a way that was understandable and relatable. Using appropriate vocabulary is vital to making all patrons entering our libraries feel welcome and invited, and the first panelist offered the tools to accomplish that goal.

Next, Keralis discussed the Texas Gender Project. The Project is a survey coupled with a series of focus groups. The results of the study are meant to guide the development of resources on how public libraries can better serve members of the transgender, lesbian, gay and bisexual communities. As public accommodations, libraries serve as an integral resource for members of many diverse communities, and the survey results revealed a substantial gap in terms of training programs on lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender issues offered by public and private libraries in Texas. The next steps for the project include reaching out to public and private K-12 librarians; securing funding for focus groups; scheduling interviews with respondents; publishing a white paper with analysis; and working with the Texas Library Association to coordinate training for all Texas libraries.

The final panelist, Melanson, presented on “Classifying Transgender Topics.” David highlighted the tools for subject analysis of resources, transgender LC subject headings, difficulties surrounding classification, and ways librarians can assist in the enactment of positive changes in library classification systems. David also provided a list of suggested further reading in the slides.

Every librarian should view this presentation. The presenters did an excellent job of conveying the current issues facing the transgender community. They offered insight into appropriate vocabulary and terminology, how law libraries can assist transgender persons, and the current state of library services provided to transgender patrons. Gaining a better understanding of how libraries can serve all the diverse members of our communities is well worth the hour’s time.

B6—Advance Toward Experiential: Create or Retool Your Advanced Legal Research Course to Meet the ABA Experiential Learning Standards
Clianitra Stewart Nejdl, Northern Illinois University College of Law

As law schools consider how to best implement the changes to the American Bar Association Law School Accreditation Standards (“ABA Standards”) related to experiential and simulated learning, academic law libraries have found a unique opportunity to reassert their value and take on an enhanced role in the law school curriculum. This session from the Boston College Law Library provided extensive direction and suggestions on creating legal research courses that can meet these revised standards. There is no doubt as to the usefulness of the information provided, as the Boston College Law Library implemented these steps and strategies to enhance their own legal research courses.

This “deep dive” was coordinated and moderated by Anupama Pal (Legal Information Librarian & Lecturer in Law) and included participation from others. Brian Quinn, Associate Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Experiential Learning, began the session by providing an overview of the changes to legal education standards over the years. This background was particularly useful to those new to legal academia, as it highlighted key documents (such as the ABA’s Task Force on the Future of Legal Education Report and the Carnegie Report) that academic law librarians may wish to read to gain a better understanding of how the current legal curriculum requirements arose. Professor Quinn then discussed
ABA standards 303 and 304 in detail, as well as how Boston College Law Library has begun to address them, which provided important context for the information discussed later in the session.

Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Library and Technical Services Filippa M. Anzalone followed the overview provided by Prof. Quinn by sharing the history of legal research courses at Boston College and the two primary questions that the library staff focused on when attempting to integrate experiential learning in their research classes. These questions were: (1) Why should the goal be to adapt Boston College Law Library’s research classes to become experiential learning courses, and 2) how can Boston College Law Library make the practical changes necessary to meet this goal? These questions are important ones for academic law librarians that provide legal research instruction to consider.

After a brief question and answer session with Prof. Quinn and Prof. Anzalone about additional logistics of how Boston College Law Library revamped its legal research classes, attendees were invited to participate in roundtable discussions. The roundtables, however, were particularly inventive: each station represented a different aspect of creating experiential legal research courses. The stations separately covered obtaining buy-in from stakeholders, developing a course syllabus, creating learning outcomes, types of assessment, pre-class preparation, and in-class exercises. The last station provided the attendees with an opportunity to role-play a conversation about getting buy-in from stakeholders with Prof. Anzalone. In addition to Prof. Anzalone, the discussions at each station were led by Boston College Law Library Education and Reference Law Librarians. These law librarians were Karen Breda (Legal Information Librarian & Lecturer in Law), Sherry Xin Chen (Legal Information Librarian & Lecturer in Law), Laurel Davis (Legal Information Librarian & Lecturer in Law), Mary Ann Neary (Associate Law Librarian for Education & Reference Services), and Joan Shear (Legal Information Librarian & Lecturer in Law).

The roundtables proved to be the most intriguing aspect of the deep dive. Each attendee was able to select the roundtables he or she wished to attend and to switch stations at will. However, as a practical matter, after the first station was selected, an attendee would find himself or herself joining a new station in the middle of a conversation, having possibly missed important information. Nevertheless, the facilitating law librarian at each station was very open to questions from the attendees, so any missed information could be gained later in the roundtable. Additionally, a brief wrap-up by Anupama Pal reiterated key takeaways from each station for those who missed them. Still, each round table was crowded and questions were abundant, so future sessions like this may benefit from having specific time periods for each roundtable and asking attendees to rotate to a new station when that time period ends.

It is worth noting that in addition to the Boston College Law Librarians sharing their expertise with the attendees through the roundtables, they were also willing to email additional information and example documents to the attendees after the conference. This willingness to share information was such a benefit to attendees interested in following in the footsteps of Boston College Law Library and making the legal research courses at their institutions experiential. The professors and librarians from Boston College of Law should be commended for going above and beyond in this way to help other law libraries “advance toward experiential.”

C2—Due Diligence and Competitive Intelligence: The “New” Practice-Ready Skills

Taryn Marks, University of Florida Levin College of Law

The basic takeaway from this program was that lawyers (and students) need to know how to perform competitive intelligence research, and that there should be classes teaching them this skill set. Each presenter did a fine job, although it felt like three mini-presentations rather than one cohesive one—as if each individual presentation had been shoved together with the others because they discussed similar topics.

For those interested in learning the basics of competitive intelligence from a law firm perspective, Kathleen Agno’s (Greenberg Traurig, LLP) short
overview at the beginning of the presentation nicely summarized the goals, tools, and types of research law firms perform when doing competitive intelligence. Her discussion, though, can be skipped by those already familiar with what competitive intelligence means for a law firm.

Moderator Susan Catterall spoke next about developing a competitive intelligence course, describing a class that she had created (but had not yet implemented). Her class had lessons on how to evaluate information resources for accuracy and reliability, how to browse news stories for competitive intelligence information, and how to leverage found information about a company or person to find more information. She also provided a sample assignment and rubric that she would use for her class.

The next speaker, Matt Morrison (Cornell) talked about the Advanced Legal Research in Company Information class that he has taught for several years. Matt provided an excellent overview of how he structured his course, the type of assignments that he gave, and the resources that he emphasized to his students. Matt finds company information using three sources: those outside the company, the company itself, and the company insiders. For each source, he taught his students how and where to conduct research, plus what types of documents usually flowed from that research.

For anyone interested in starting a class related to competitive intelligence or company information, this program will give a nice overview. The most useful aspects of it, though, will likely be the people themselves and the resources and guidance that each would be able to share when contacted individually.

C3—How to Develop a Budget That You and Your Organization Can Live with and Still Achieve Your Strategic Goals
Matt Timko, Northern Illinois University College of Law

Every year, budgetary issues are a top concern for all law libraries, making this session popular with academic and law firm librarians. The session,

presented by Marcia Burris of HBR Consulting and Carissa Vogel of Yeshiva University, made clear that the complexity of budget-making need not be a barrier for those uncomfortable with the process. Their advice is to “get comfortable with the uncomfortable” since creating a budget under financial constraints that still funds adequate (or even improved) services for the patrons is integral to effective law librarianship.

To this end, the practical advice presented was invaluable. Three key takeaways for librarians emerged from this dense and informative session. First, tie all budgetary requests to the parent institution’s (i.e., company, firm, university, etc.) strategic plan while still achieving meaningful gains for the library. This obviously makes the process more complicated, since librarians must go beyond their immediate objectives to determine how and where the library’s goals fit in with the institution’s. The budgetary process already involves this; libraries don’t exist in a vacuum. However, the presenters provided clear examples of ensuring the library’s goals line up with the institution’s goals, including understanding where the institution’s funding comes from, framing requests within a successful template, and assessing and demonstrating successful returns on investment.

Second, uncertainty adds to the stress of budget making. Often, budgets must be determined well before all the variables are present. How much money is available to the institution? How much money will be set aside for the library? How many students will a university need to serve? Even, how many materials will be needed for classes this year? The ambiguity inherent in the budget-making process, which requires specificity, is analogous to hitting a moving target. Luckily, the presenters provided tips for how to predict budgetary trends based on past allocation of resources, current needs, and prospects of available future funds. While they were clear that one size does not fit all, they encouraged attendees to evaluate the data available to better predict the budgetary needs and constraints.

Finally, item-based budgeting is here to stay. The days of broad requests for discretionary spending are gone (for most law libraries). Now, every item must be evaluated financially and pedagogically to justify inclusion in a library budget. This involves many of the same principles as the first two takeaways from the session; an experienced budgeteer might have no

continued on page 14
trouble reading the data and making the case that the library’s budgetary demands are relevant for the current patrons, and aligned with the institution’s broader goals. But for a newer librarian, the session effectively broke down the broader interests into individual items—instead of missing the forest for the trees, focus on one tree at a time to understand the forest.

These considerations may be nothing new for many librarians, but this more rigorous (and tedious) evaluation process gave me, as a new law librarian, mixed feelings and many questions. Would certain librarians become primarily book reviewers to ensure quality? What happens if the institution has its own standards outside of the individual library, or outside of library standards altogether? How can librarians effectively evaluate actual use of resources while maintaining the privacy interests of the patrons? I could not ask these questions since there was unfortunately no time during the session. Regardless, the presentation’s content gave me much to think about and presented me with issues to spot while participating in the budgetary process. I recommend new and experienced librarians alike should check out the recorded session on AALL2go.

**Monday, July 17**

**(D, E & F Programs)**

**D5—Serving Law Students Beyond Traditional Library Hours**

*Tiffany Camp, University of North Carolina*

*Kathrine R. Everett Law Library*

This program consisted of a panel discussion by law librarians representing three libraries with different student demographics and location settings (public vs. private, large school vs. small school, large vs. small and mid-size city). This provided a thoughtful approach as the characteristics and unique attributes of each institution informed what services were best for each library.

**Austin Williams** (North Carolina Central University School of Law Library) laid the foundation for the program by discussing why this topic was chosen. However, before diving into the crux of his presentation, Williams asked each attendee to individually answer three audience questions via the polling software Socrative. The questions were:

- Does your law school provide students with more than one enrollment or scheduling option (e.g. evening or part-time program)?
- Do students have access to the library outside of staffed hours?
- Do you provide and/or market any resources or services to students that they can access outside of the staff hours?

Williams stated that the impetus for the program was ABA Standard 312 which states: “A law school providing more than one enrollment or scheduling option shall ensure that all students have reasonably comparable opportunities for access to the law school’s program of legal education, courses taught by full-time faculty, student services, co-curricular programs, and other educational benefits. Identical opportunities are not required.”

As law schools expand educational opportunities beyond the JD and offer distance education classes among other curricular changes, discussing how the library can support these programs becomes important. Also, in relation to traditional students, increasing academic obligations and personal life considerations necessitate some services outside of the 9-to-5 box. This coincides with student expectations and preferences for on-demand services (like the conveniences provided by other services like Netflix, ATMs, Amazon).

**Carol Bredemeyer** (Northern Kentucky University Chase College of Law Library) provided an overview of how libraries have historically served non-traditional students. In 1988, Bredemeyer wrote a *Law Library Journal* article entitled *Serving the Evening Law Student.* This category encompassed students who had full-time jobs, were not admitted to the day program, were place-bound, and often had a wide diversity of experiences. Bredemeyer relayed her experience at NKU, from its modest beginnings through the changes she has seen in services over the course of more than 30

---

years. She spoke particularly about the internet’s capability of facilitating access to collections and providing services like study room reservations. NKU has also implemented 24/7 library access for students (with some exceptions like winter break), open reserves, security surveillance and the integration of online legal training.

Lastly, Michelle Wu (Georgetown University Law Library) concluded by discussing common issues, solutions and costs associated with providing these services. Before a law library embarks on expanding library services outside of traditional library hours, Wu stressed the importance of information-gathering to ensure that the services are what the students need, and that they fit within the mission, vision, and goals of the institution. Other considerations include the library’s location, culture, and population served. Libraries must also weigh the impact and costs associated with expanded services. Some important considerations include equipment, personnel and security costs.

After all the panelists spoke, group discussions among the attendees followed. The panel prompted each group to think of a resource or service that we would like to make more accessible to students beyond traditional library hours. After group discussions, the panel displayed the responses generated by each group on the projector. This interactive component really enhanced the program by allowing ideas that flowed from the groups to be shared and discussed among all attendees. Although the audience hailed from differing law libraries, many shared common ideas, concerns, and considerations for serving law students beyond traditional library hours and echoed those Wu discussed during her segment (access to the facility, tech support, self-service, and food).

Overall, the presentation raised relevant points to consider when serving and expanding law library services to law students beyond traditional hours. The audio, slide decks, handout, and audience responses for this session are available for review on the AALL website at AALL2go (http://community.aallnet.org/viewdocument/serving-law-students-beyond-traditi).

In this Deep Dive, David Hansen (Duke University), Timothy Gallina (Southern Methodist University), and Leslie Street (Mercer University) described teaching legal research courses in “practice-specific” settings. We often hear of “practice-ready,” “practice-based,” and even “experiential” legal research courses that never stray far from the traditional legal research hypothetical. However, the courses described in this presentation take the logical next step. By focusing on specific topical areas like intellectual property, corporate law, and global or international law, the presenters created classes whose core tasks not only reinforced research skills, but also emulated the research tasks done by an a practitioner in that field.

The program walked participants through all steps, from inception to proposal to assessment to updating a simulation practice-specific course. The program first discussed the proposing and preparing stage of creating such a course. Presenters made several interesting suggestions about content areas and expertise. First, they suggested, try proposing a course in an area with which you are very familiar. For instance, Gallina used to work as a corporate attorney. Now, he teaches corporate legal research. This allows him to construct assignments that mirror the “essential tasks” of a new corporate associate. The presenters realized that this is not always an option, and encouraged attendees working in a less familiar area to seek out practitioners or members of the local bar for assignment review. This ensures assignments and class tasks are similar enough to practice tasks to create a good simulation.

The presenters also suggested picking topics that fit with your institution’s focus. If your school has a copyright clinic, it would make sense to offer an IP legal research course. They stated that students engage with the class, often because they currently have another class in that subject. Different law schools have different curricular focuses and by tying your course to one of them, the course becomes more relevant and more interesting to students.
Nicholas Mignanelli joined the University of Miami Law Library in August 2017 as the Reference/Instructional Services Librarian. Nicholas received his JD from the University of New Hampshire School of Law and his MLIS from the University of Arizona School of Information. His article, The Academic Law Library in the Age of Affiliations: A Case Study of the University of New Hampshire Law Library, was published in the Spring 2017 issue of Law Library Journal. Thanks to Pamela Lucken of Miami for letting us know.

Ariel Erbacher began her two year position as Research Librarian, Cornell Law Library Diversity Fellow, in August. Ariel recently earned her MLIS from the University of Illinois in Urbana–Champaign Information School in 2017. She received a BA in Economics from the University of Chicago, a JD from IIT – Chicago Kent College of Law, and an LLM in Taxation from the same institution, where she graduated with honors. This is Ariel’s first professional library position. Prior to joining Cornell, she was the 2017 Judith M. Wright Fellow at the University of Chicago and a reference associate at Northwestern University Pritzker School of Law. In 2016, she was also the recipient of the Spectrum Scholarship from the American Library Association.

We hear from Joyce Janto of the University of Richmond Law Library that two new librarians have started: “Maureen Moran is our new Reference and Research Services Librarian. Maureen comes to us from the McGeorge School of Law where she was the Instructional Services and Legal Research Librarian. Our second new librarian is Molly Lentz-Meyers who is joining us as our Digital and Archival Collections Librarian. Molly is a recent graduate of McGeorge School of Law and the San Jose State University School of Information.”

Jessica Pierucci has joined UC Irvine Law Library as the Research Law Librarian for Foreign, Comparative, and International Law, a newly created position. Jessica received her JD from UC Irvine and her MLIS from San Jose State University. Thanks to Amy Atchison, UC Irvine’s Associate Law Librarian for Public Services, for this news.

The Kresge Law Library at Notre Dame Law School has a new director, Thomas Mills. He will serve as a librarian and director of the Kresge Law Library. He comes to Notre Dame by way of Cornell University, where he was Director for Collections & Faculty Services and Lecturer in Law. Thanks to Sandra Klein, Kresge’s Associate Librarian for Technical Services, for this item.

Stanford Law School’s Robert Crown Law Library was thrilled to welcome new Access Services Librarian, Will Huggins, to their team this summer. Will comes from the Stanford University Libraries where he served as their Head of Privileges for the past three years. Prior to his time at Stanford, Will was the Head of Access Services at UCLA’s Art Library. Will is excited about joining AALL and the law library community. Thanks to Beth Williams for this news!

Mary Ann Neary, Associate Law Librarian at Boston College Law Library, has let us know that Amy Bruce, formerly Senior Manager of Research Services at Goodwin Procter LLP, joins the Boston College Law Library’s Education and Reference team on September 5, 2017. Amy will be teaching research courses and providing research assistance to faculty and students. We look forward to Amy joining ALL-SIS.
Jodi L. Collova is now the Director of LLM Legal Research and Writing at UC Berkeley School of Law, where she leads an experienced legal research and writing faculty. Jodi earned a JD, cum laude, at the University of Minnesota Law School; a BA, cum laude, in English and Dance from Carleton College; and an MLIS from San Jose State University. Prior to joining Berkeley Law, Jodi was a research librarian at Loyola Law School of Los Angeles, University of San Francisco School of Law, and Golden Gate University School of Law.

Emma Babler has been hired as the new Reference and Technology Librarian at the University of Wisconsin Law School Library. Previously, Emma worked at the UNLV Law Library, where she worked closely with faculty and presented at several conferences. Thanks to Kris Turner, University of Wisconsin, for the news.

Malikah Hall has joined the Dee J. Kelly Law Library at Texas A&M University School of Law as Instructional Assistant Professor and Reference Librarian. Malikah comes to TAMU from Cornell University Law Library, where she was a Research Librarian.

Joyce Janto has edited Guide to Legal Research in Virginia, which was recently released by Virginia CLE Foundation Publications. Joyce also authored the chapter on researching ethics. Fellow ALL-SIS members who worked on the book are:

- Kat Klepfer (formerly University of Richmond, now at Florida State University) co-authored the chapter on statutory research.
- Marie Summerlin Hamm (Regent University) authored the chapter on case research.
- Amy Wharton & Kristen Glover (University of Virginia) co-authored the chapter on local law.
- Caroline Osborne (Washington & Lee University) authored the chapter on legal periodicals, indices, directories, and statistical information.
- Roger Skalbeck (University of Richmond) authored the chapter on Fastcase.
- Jennifer Sekula (College of William & Mary) co-authored the chapter on treatises, manuals, and form books.

Emily Donnellan of Concordia University School of Law, Public Services Librarian & Assistant Professor, has published her first law review article, No Connection: The Issue of Internet on the Reservation, 5 Am. Indian L.J. 346 (2017). Congratulations, Emily!


Anne Klinefelter’s new article, Reader Privacy in Digital Library Collaborations: Signs of Commitment, Opportunities for Improvement, 13 I/S: A Journal of Law & Policy for the Information Society 199 (2016), gauges the state of library use confidentiality by focusing on evidence of librarians’ commitments through recent library association reader privacy statements and guidelines and by looking at the related Google Books and HathiTrust digitization projects to consider how privacy may or may not be protected in these contexts. Anne is Director of the Law Library & Associate Professor of Law at the University of North Carolina.

more Member News on page 18
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**Promotions & Career Milestones**

Congratulations to **Courtney Selby** of the Maurice A. Deane School of Law at Hofstra University Law Library, who has been granted tenure! She is now Associate Dean for Information Services, Director of the Law Library and Associate Professor of Law.

*ALL-SIS Newsletter* also congratulates Advisory Board member **Yasmin Sokkar Harker** for achieving tenure at CUNY School of Law.

**Seton Hall Law School** Library has seen two promotions recently. **Brittany Persson** is now the Head of Public Services, and **Kristina Anderson** has been promoted to Associate Director, Library Technology and Digital Services.

**In June of this year, Dennis Kim-Prieto** was elected Vice-President/President-Elect of the New Jersey Law Librarians Association. This is a three-year commitment, requiring one year of service in the role of Vice-President, one year as President, and one year as Immediate Past President. Then in August, Dennis received a Members-Only Bursary Award from the International Association of Law Libraries to attend their 2017 Annual Conference in Atlanta, Georgia. Dennis is a Reference Librarian at Rutgers Law School.

Becoming a recognized LGBTQ Ally through the Safe Zone Project at the University of Iowa started **Druet Cameron Klugh**, Senior Reference Librarian at the **University of Iowa Law Library**, on her path to certification in the UI’s BUILD program (Building University of Iowa Leadership for Diversity). The BUILD initiative gives faculty and staff “an opportunity to gain strategic knowledge and skills to contribute to a welcoming and inclusive environment” on campus, in classes and in the greater community. As she continues her work in the program, this year Druet’s focus will be on understanding the experiences of specific identity groups and recognizing patterns of marginalization. She is enthusiastic about efforts to promote understanding and inclusion and gave a summary program to her department on the University’s institutional efforts earlier this semester.

**New Hires, cont’d**

**Librarian, and Cornell’s first Diversity Fellow, from 2015 to 2017. She will also serve as the Vice-Chair/Chair Elect and the Head of the Programming committee for PEGA-SIS this year.**

**Thomas Sneed** is the new Associate Professor and Director of the Law Library at Washburn University School of Law. Prior to moving to Washburn, Thomas worked in the law libraries at Ohio State University and Emory University.

As of July 1, 2017, in addition to her existing duties as Reference/Technical Services Librarian, **Susan Giusti** has become Co-Director of the Law Library at **Widener University Commonwealth Law School**.

**Richard Humphrey** celebrated 22 years of service with the Ruth Lilly Law Library of the Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law on August 14, 2017. Richard, a Research/Instructional Services Librarian at Indiana, is currently teaching Legal Research for LLM students and two sections of 1L Legal Research. He’s also a past-president of the Ohio Regional Association of Law Libraries (ORALL) and was editor of the AALL Committee on Relations with Information Vendors (CRIV) Sheet from 1997-2000.

**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. 😊**
The presenters then moved on to creating assignments that mirror the essential research tasks required of someone practicing in a specific area. For instance, in corporate legal research, Gallina uses practitioner based current awareness tools, including traditional database alerts as well as other tools like the New York Times Dealbook, to find assignment subjects. Then he uses these subjects—for example a rumored acquisition—along with his practitioner experience, to create assignments for the students as if they were associates working with an involved firm. One example he gave was a client pitch—he actually required students to research a company involved in a current deal as if they were an associate getting ready to pitch that company. The presenters all gave their own examples of this kind of assignment creation and said that it helped tremendously in building class buy-in and interest.

The presenters also talked about assessment and feedback. They stressed the importance of deciding which topics to assess. Anyone developing this type of class needs to ask themselves questions such as:

- How much will I actually be assessing writing vs. research?
- If I’m interested in process, how can I assess that?
- How can I give meaningful feedback?

The presenters suggested having students write a process memo, not to address their writing skills but so they have to write out their research process and reassess their research efforts. All three presenters suggested that after receiving completed assignments, instructors should give both generalized feedback to the entire class as well individualized feedback to each student.

Overall, the program was well-done and informative. While translating the implementation of a new course to a different institution can often be difficult, the group provided a usable framework for all research instructors. At the very least, this program provided me with a new way to think about experiential and practice based legal research instruction, and how I can incorporate new techniques in my own courses.

In an extremely competitive environment, law schools are constantly searching for ways to distinguish themselves. Perhaps the best way to highlight your law school is through the use of an institutional repository.

This session was not an official AALL program, but bepress, the California-based provider of the leading online repository, Digital Commons, sponsored this panel. The session featured Marci Hoffman, Lecturer in Residence and Associate Director of the Law Library, University of California, Berkeley, School of Law; Julie L. Kimbrough, Clinical Assistant Professor of Law and Deputy Director of the Law Library, University of North Carolina Chapel Hill School of Law; and Jean Pajerek, Director for Information Management, Cornell Law School. The panel was moderated by Casey Busher, bepress Director of Communications.

Hoffman reported that her library took the lead in establishing an institutional repository at Berkeley approximately eight years ago. The repository’s original purpose was hosting Berkeley’s 13 law journals. It subsequently expanded to include other material, including faculty profiles and scholarship, while the school’s communications and IT departments now work with the law library to promote and utilize the repository. Users have downloaded more than seven million times from Berkeley’s repository.

According to Pajerek, Cornell’s 14-year-old repository now includes 6,657 items. Originally designed as a repository for Cornell’s faculty and student scholarship, it expanded to include other material including law reviews, oral histories, and historical theses. She strongly recommended getting
buy-in from the administration and faculty before starting a repository.

Of the schools represented by the speakers, North Carolina has the newest institutional repository. Kimbrough said that the two-year-old repository fits the public mission of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, providing open access to scholarly material. She also emphasized the importance of getting faculty engagement in an institutional repository, providing them with a sense of ownership.

Pajerek noted that she ran her school’s repository by herself for the first eight years. All three reported that their institutional repositories now operate with minimal staffing of one full-time person or FTE. All three panelists commended Hein for the ease of obtaining PDFs of their institution’s law reviews and journals from that company. The institutional repositories at North Carolina and Cornell are funded through the law library budget. The UC Berkeley Law Library uses law school funding to pay for the repository.

Interest in institutional repositories can easily be gauged from the attendance at this session. The room was packed. While extra chairs were brought in from nearby rooms, several individuals still remained standing in the back of the room. The audience members asked numerous questions and seemed genuinely interested in the discussion.

The moderator and presenters deserve accolades for a superior program. Hopefully we will see more presentations on this topic at the 2018 Annual Meeting.

E5—Effective Educational Technology Products for VARK Learning Styles
Allison N. Symulevich, University of North Carolina School of Law

Emma Babler (Reference & Technology Law Librarian, University of Wisconsin) and Eliza Fink (Assistant Professor and Digital Resources & Services Librarian, University of Tennessee) started this session by asking the attendees to take an online VARK questionnaire to find out their learning styles. Were they visual, aural, read/write, or kinesthetic learners? Babler informed the audience that she is a visual learner, and Fink is a kinesthetic learner. I took the quiz, and I am multi-modal, with my highest score as kinesthetic.

Babler and Fink then discussed the evolution of learning and millennial learners. The introductions of the PC and the Internet have had a large impact on learning. Babler and Fink place millennials into two groups: those who grew up learning with books (so prior to Google and Siri) and those who grew up with Google. Like the presenters, I fall into the former group. The latter group includes the students entering law school now, and they think differently than prior generations of learners. The speakers noted that we need to think more like these newer students think to effectively teach them legal skills.

Babler had the audience use the Poll Everywhere website (other similar tools are Socrative and Kahoot) to enter their VARK results using their cellphones. Babler explained that Poll Everywhere engages with students who have their phones with them. She explained that the technology can also provide anonymity for controversial questions or support for rules-based quiz questions.

When audience VARK quiz results were revealed, the word cloud showed that most attendees were read/write learners—results that would also be typical of law school populations in the past. Traditional law school courses, taught using the Socratic method, are taught in a manner in which read/write learners excel. However, the speakers noted that new students are more likely multi-modal learners, meaning one of two different things: (1) those who switch between modes based on whom they are working with, or (2) those who prefer to try all modes before deciding which best fits the situation.

The speakers then went through each VARK learning style, explaining how students of that style learn most effectively, and demonstrating educational technologies that can be employed for that learning style. The law school tool box (lawschooltoolbox.com) has tips for learners of all types. Fink suggested that law librarians encourage students to take the VARK quiz to better prepare for law school and find ways to learn most effectively.

continued on page 21
Here is a list of some of the technologies that Babler and Fink recommended:

**Visual**
- Easel.ly – Free website for making infographics (live demo)
- Quimbee – has courses and quizzes for various subjects in law school (live demo)

**Aural**
- Google Hangouts for group learning and study groups
- Mnemonicgenerator.com (live demo)
- Audacity – a podcast software
- Garage Band App on iOS

**Read/Write**
- PowerNotes (formerly LearnLEO) (live demo)

**Kinesthetic**
- StoryMap (live demo)
- Timeline
- Multi-Modal
- Adobe Spark (Free) – (live demo) – can use it to create videos easily

This presentation was wonderful! I encourage everyone to watch the presentation, available at AALL2go. I have been playing with some of the different technologies that Babler and Fink recommended, and I am enjoying learning these new tools for presenting legal research material. The live demos of these technologies were fantastic because the presenters showed how easy they are to use! It was encouraging that Babler and Fink made infographics, timelines, videos, etc. in a matter of minutes.

---

**Civil Procedure Classes for Self-Represented Litigants**

Are self-represented litigants (SRLs) knowledgeable about civil procedure? Ryan Metheny, Managing Librarian of Legal Education at LA Law Library, thinks not. This is a big problem since approximately 80% of civil filings in California involve at least one SRL. Ryan notes that an understanding of court procedure is necessary for successful litigation, so his library works to increase access to civil justice in Los Angeles by offering Civil Lawsuit Basics, a nine part series of classes covering each phase of civil litigation in California state courts—pleading, defaults, motions, discovery (3 classes), summary judgment, trial, and enforcing judgments.

Ryan realizes that some might ask, “Why law librarians?”—to which he responds, “Who else?” Certainly legal aid organizations and private volunteer attorneys don’t have the time or resources. Law librarians are ideal because we have not only knowledge of the law and how to teach it, but also libraries to teach in and legal research resources to share.

And why in-person classes? He notes the importance of print materials and research guides but also the reality that many SRLs do not effectively use them. For some SRLs, there is no substitute for in-person instruction. The classes are taught quarterly and usually have 8 to 10 students, though at times they have had as many as 40. The librarians enjoy teaching the classes and develop the content themselves which is not burdensome since they just simplify the information in practice guides.

Ryan thinks the classes are a great way to maximize the impact of librarian knowledge while visibly helping to address the access to justice crisis.

**Whither SRLs When the State Law Library Closes?**

What should the public do when the state law library closes? Cynthia Lewis, Associate Professor of Law at the Vermont Law School Library, asked herself this question when she got a call in December of 2014 informing her of the closure of the Vermont state law library. As the only law school in Vermont, Cynthia felt that her library had to look at ways to open up and make the collection and services more available to the public.
What to do? Luckily the library got a small grant to repurpose an area of the library and buy new materials. They converted a closet and outfitted their new space with a standing desk, workstation, and printer/scanner/fax machine. They purchased some Nolo Press books, Vermont materials, and public access Westlaw (and will soon be getting patron access Lexis). Reference services are provided in-person and also through email and the telephone. Their efforts to serve the public have been quite successful, with 647 reference questions answered from January 2016 to April 2017.

**Popping Up to Promote Law Library Services**

Pop-ups are all the rage these days! Karen Westwood, Law Library Director at Hennepin County Law Library, Minnesota, described how her library used the pop-up model to promote her library’s service within a local community in Minneapolis. She explained that pop-ups are usually restaurants, bands, or small stores which appear (pop up!) in a location for a limited time. They have a sense of surprise and whimsy and seem special due to their impermanence. A local public library got a grant to do outreach through pop-ups, and invited the law library to join the effort. The public library decided to focus on an underserved, heavily Somali community. A survey of the community revealed an interest in computer and English literacy training, in part to help understand legal forms. Karen described how the law library participated in six pop-ups which took place at a community center, an international high school, a large apartment building lobby, a mosque, a theater, and an outdoor play area of the same large apartment complex. Karen sat at a table and greeted everyone who walked up with the question, “Did you know that Hennepin County has a law library?” The table was stacked with information about library services and self-help brochures from the ACLU, the attorney general’s office, and the Hennepin County Bar Association. Also available were bookmarks which were definitely not a hit—no one took one! They were all more interested in the public library swag.

Karen deemed the pop-ups a successful way of connecting with the community while promoting library services. Karen attributed the success to having a paid Somali community liaison who recruited local helpers and spread the word about the event with the community. Meeting the community in their space, providing music and swag, and having bright attractive signs also contributed to the popularity of the events.

Karen stressed the importance of being flexible and saying yes to opportunities to get (and stay) involved. She recommended going to all meetings about projects, deferring to public librarians’ expertise, and helping with the public library aspects of the project, even if they don’t directly relate to law libraries.

**Expanding Law Library Visibility by Joining State Library Associations**

Sue Ludington, Assistant Law Librarian at the Washington County Law Library, Oregon, spoke about expanding the visibility of state law libraries through participation in state library associations. She pointed out that every state has an association and that they are often dominated by public librarians. Since many library patrons start their legal research at public libraries, it is important to establish a good relationship with public librarians so they will promote the county law library.

She started with the question of why it is important to join associations. She pointed out that it expands the network of librarians interested in access to justice issues, raises the visibility of public law libraries, involves librarians in political advocacy, and provides librarians with career development and partnership opportunities.

She explained that once you join an association, the next step is to get noticed. It is easy to find a niche among the various divisions, committees, roundtables, interest groups, task forces, etc. There is usually ample opportunity to make an impact by running for office, publishing articles, or taking part in library legislative days. But the best way to make a splash is to be a conference superstar by networking, socializing, tabling, and most importantly, by giving interesting and impactful presentations which will get you and your library noticed.
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Program Reviews—Monday, July 17

F5—Attorney Research Skills: Continuing the Conversation between Law Firm and Academic Law Librarians

Taryn Marks, University of Florida Levin College of Law

There are two big takeaways of this program: First, if you’re interested in partnering with a law librarian in a different type of institution than yours, join the Legal Research Teaching: A Collaboration community on AALLnet, in order to share ideas about teaching legal research and what law school graduates need to know about legal research. Second, propose this program at the regional level, to facilitate conversations like this with those in your geographic area with whom you can partner.

I enjoyed Femi Cadmus’s (Cornell University Law Library), Steven Lastres’s (Debevoise & Plimpton LLP), and Cassie DuBay’s (Southern Methodist University) presentations, which described their collaborations with law librarians from different places. However, you don’t need to listen to their talk to get the most important parts of this program. Their slides nicely summarize the main points of each person’s experiences. One of the best parts of this program—the roundtable discussion—loses much of its power if you just watch the recording, because it’s difficult to hear what people are saying. Moderator Sarah Morris (Greenberg Traurig), though, summarized the discussions and posted a short PDF for those who want to read what was said. I recommend that those interested in partnering with another type of law librarian read through Sarah’s summary (as well as the PowerPoint for this program) to get an idea of what is on the minds of law firm, academic, and court librarians regarding how to best solve the problem of teaching legal research to create practice ready law school graduates.

Overall, don’t watch the video, but definitely make use of the attached materials, available at AALL2go (http://community.aallnet.org/viewdocument/attorney-research-skills-continuin).
single person is responsible for grading all of the student homework. Meg teaches a required 1L pass/fail legal research course offered in the fall that meets weekly for 90 minutes with a final at the end. Taryn’s course spans both 1L semesters, but this one-credit course is only held the first seven weeks of spring and fall semester and also includes five lengthy research assignments. All agreed the amount of grading weighs heavily on their limited time.

The panel questions also afforded each instructor the opportunity to discuss the features most used on his or her respective LMS. Blake uses Lexis Web Courses (an implementation of Blackboard) and commented that the platform is already used in the law school framework. He praised the ability of the LMS to automatically grade assignments over the course of the class and allow students to receive immediate feedback. He encourages his students to alert him to any possible mistakes within this pre-programmed grading process. Other features he enjoys are the PDF guides, sign-up sheets, gradebook analytics, and something called “adaptive release.” This process allows the instructor to set up rules that control when assignments are made available based on a variety factors such as student performance, date, membership in course groups, etc.

Meg uses her university’s system, iCollege, but encouraged instructors to use multiple LMSs to give the students experience in various online environments. She uses peer-grading assignments through Blackboard and Socrative to conduct quizzes. In many ways, her students help shape how the class will be conducted. She often utilizes these other systems to reach out to students “in the moment” and allow them to discuss assignments in an open-ended question box. Meg then uses content from these discussion boards to craft her final exam questions.

Taryn uses Canvas and showed her appreciation for the automated and anonymous grading capabilities. She explained how rubrics can tie into individual questions, and how student learning outcomes can help define modules, required readings, and assignments. Each element of the course becomes an instructional design dream as the learning needs define the assessments, and the assessments shape the needs of the course. She mentioned her excitement for the next update of Canvas which will include regular expression capabilities for quizzes.

In the final section of the program, the attendees got a “hands-on” opportunity to form these regular expressions. A regular expression is a sequence of text used to describe a search pattern similar to how librarians use Boolean searching. Regular expressions allow for more complicated question types such as fill-in-the-blank or short-answer to be graded automatically as the instructor does not have to consider every possible answer. Blake suggested visiting the website Regexpr.com to learn about, build, and test regular expressions. I highly recommended this program for any instructor interested in automating assessment in their legal research courses.

In 2015, Harvard Law Library announced the Caselaw Access Project (CAP), a major caselaw digitization project with Ravel Law. The project scanned Harvard’s print reporters into images and machine-readable files. Adam Ziegler and Anastasia Aizman (Harvard Law Library Innovation Lab) provided an overview of how Harvard scanned its reporters and processed the scans into various data files for later use.

The digitized cases will be accessible with different restrictions depending on the type of user. The general public will be able to search the cases and metadata with a download restriction that prevents bulk downloading while research scholars can obtain bulk downloading privileges. Ravel will provide an API to nonprofit developers and sell access to commercial developers. Complete case data for a state will become completely free after eight years or when a state judiciary moves to publishing its official decisions in digital format.

The CAP only contains information found in the scanned documents’ text. So, for example, a user could find the first use of a word in a Texas decision, but not how often a given set of judges agree with each other. Harvard plans to move to an
enrichment phase in which additional data will be added to the database.

 Librarians interested in computational analysis of cases or free access to caselaw should learn more about the project from this session and by visiting [http://lil.law.harvard.edu/projects/caselaw-access-project/](http://lil.law.harvard.edu/projects/caselaw-access-project/). The presenters emphasized wanting to learn more about how researchers might use this data to help them prioritize future developments. Ravel Law was recently acquired by LexisNexis, which has reaffirmed its agreement with Harvard.

---

**Tuesday, July 18 (G, H & I Programs)**


**Benjamin J. Keele, Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law**

This session examined the next steps law libraries may take regarding institutional repositories (IRs) and open access to legal materials. **Carol Watson** (University of Georgia) noted that law libraries began implementing IRs about 10 years ago, and just under half of academic law libraries in the US have an IR. Faculty scholarship makes up the core of IR collections, but many libraries are expanding to other types of content.

Watson suggests law libraries focus on developing standards to improve interoperability between the many IR platforms available. She also encouraged librarians to expand the genres and formats of content collected in IRs, and to pay more attention to ways to document IR impact and usage.

**Gregg Gordon (SSRN)** spoke about his vision for SSRN after being acquired by Elsevier. He suggested SSRN will help Elsevier move towards greater friendliness to open access. SSRN is also expanding into new disciplines, like biology. This will encourage more dialogue between different fields. He said SSRN wants to improve the user experience of scholarly research. Since Elsevier’s acquisition of bepress had not been announced at the time of the program, it remains to be seen how SSRN, bepress, and Elsevier will ultimately relate to each other.

**Corie Dugas** (NELLCO) discussed LawArXiv. This open-access repository is sponsored by academic law libraries and hosted on the Center for Open Science’s Open Science Framework platform. LawArXiv is owned and operated by the law library community on a nonprofit basis. LawArXiv offers some features that are not yet on other platforms used by libraries, including draft versioning and data hosting. Further improvement is planned, with more information available at [http://lawarxiv.info/](http://lawarxiv.info/).

---

**G5—Guerrilla Marketing: Promoting Your Law Library and Engaging Your Audience with the Tools at Hand**

**Jessica Almeida, University of Massachusetts—Dartmouth School of Law**

This was one of my “must-see” panels for the 2017 AALL conference. Like many libraries short on time and money, our staff is always discussing how to effectively market our law library. So when attending any conference, I make sure to be on the lookout for sessions devoted to unique ways to advertise law library resources, services, and events.

The session kicked off with Heather Holmes, Assistant Librarian at the Harris County Law Library, introducing the speakers and defining guerrilla marketing as an unconventional and inexpensive way to take your message to where your users are. Next, **Scott Vanderlin**, Research and Instructional Librarian at IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law, showed the audience how to embrace the “do-it-yourself” approach to marketing. He showcased many of his own DIY marketing projects, including retro due date slip business cards, librarian biography bookmarks, vintage library cards for alumni, and funny library postcards for students to mail home to friends and family. These were great ways to reach out and provide information to students in a hip and humorous way. Many of the items, such as the alumni library cards and library postcards led to an increase in positive interactions between library staff and students. The last speaker, Joseph Lawson, Deputy Director of the Harris continued on page 26
County Law Library, discussed the marketing campaign his library undertook for the “One Book, One Region” program. He presented the marketing strategy they used, including digital and print marketing materials to promote their events around the book, The Train to Crystal City. Through creativity, technology, and design consistency, they were able to tie all of their marketing efforts together to successfully promote the program.

There were a lot of great takeaways from this session. First, don’t be afraid to get creative. You know your audience, so try something unconventional that hopefully provides great results with minimal effort. Much of the session was devoted to how the panel had used simple but effective ideas to get their audience’s attention. Second, use all the (inexpensive) tools at your disposal. Both speakers used many of the same tools to create their DIY products. The panel discussed the how to use your imagination and resourcefulness (as well as the items you have already available to you) to create interesting and innovative marketing products. Both used basic office supplies like poster board and cardstock to make handouts or displays, and championed the use of a good paper trimmer and x-acto knife. Finally, remember to embrace technology. Computer programs like Publisher and Photoshop, which are found on most office computers, can make your materials look professional. If you are not comfortable with these computer programs, easy-to-follow tutorials can be found on YouTube, Lynda.com, and Adobe TV to make you a pro in no time. As part of the “One Book, One Region” program, the Harris County Law Library also used video software, such as Camtasia and Open Broadcaster Software, to record their events and have them available to watch through their YouTube channel. Finding free images to use in marketing materials was also a topic of conversation; the presenters suggested using websites like adlib.info, flaticon.com, and pixabay.com.

Overall, the session inspired me to be more creative with the materials we had on hand at our library. To prepare for the new academic year, our public services department has used free online software and office supplies to create a more dynamic welcome display for 1Ls. We also worked on creating a new library logo using office software, like Publisher. We then displayed the logo on our new business cards made from leftover cardstock. All this using a little creativity, easy-to-use computer software, a color printer, and a handful of cardstock.

Kenton Brice (Digital Resources Librarian, University of Oklahoma Law Library) explained how his library promotes emerging technologies and why and how other libraries can do so, too. ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct 1.1, Comment 8 specifies that an attorney’s obligation of competence includes familiarity with new technology. 27 out of 50 states have adopted Comment 8, and attorneys are already being sanctioned by judges for their technological incompetence. To ensure that their students practice competently, law schools must train them in emerging technologies, defined by Brice as new technologies that enhance, redefine, or challenge the current delivery of legal services. Examples include artificial intelligence, the internet of things (e.g., Alexa), automated systems, and augmented and virtual reality.

Brice’s presentation focused on virtual reality, the emerging technology that’s always made me most skeptical. Sure, it’s cool, but is it really practical enough...
to justify the cost? Brice identified concrete ways law
students and attorneys can benefit from virtual reality.
Students can immerse themselves in virtual law firm
meetings, depositions, and trials. Attorneys and juries
can physically explore reconstructed crime scenes,
construction defects, and car accidents. At Oklahoma, a
team visiting Brussels recorded the European
Parliament, so now all students can experience it
firsthand. A human rights law professor assigned
students Clouds over Sidra, a virtual reality tour of a
Syrian refugee camp. The school’s Native American
Law Program is reconstructing scenes from the Trail of
Tears.

Brice also identified ways libraries can minimize
costs. Libraries can start cheaply by buying Google
Cardboard, a $15 cardboard box that incorporates
students’ smartphones, and by downloading free or
cheap virtual reality content from SketchFab and
TurboSquid. Librarians can also record their own
content using 360 cameras like the Kodak Pix Pro
SP360 4K, Nikon KeyMission 360, and Ricoh Theta S.
Librarians can also record content using 3D scanners,
like Sense.io, Sweep, FARO Vector, and
Matterport.com Pro2 3D. Brice acknowledged that
high-quality experiences require costly equipment and
technological expertise, but explained that costs can be
minimized by identifying other stakeholders who can
benefit from, and help with, virtual reality technology.
His school’s Oklahoma Virtual Academic Laboratory
(OVAL) contains custom-fabricated virtual reality rigs
that are used not just by the law school but also by the
anthropology, chemistry, construction, and medical
schools. Computer science majors pitch in on
developing content as part of class projects or school
clubs. Brice hopes to partner with the Oklahoma Police
Department, allowing them access to OVAL in
exchange for access to their 360-degree crime scene
photos. After seeing Brice’s presentation, I’m still not
sold on virtual reality for law libraries but I thought
Brice made the strongest case for it that it was possible
to make.

Brice briefly described his library’s other initiatives
to bring technology to law students. After learning that
a majority of lawyers have tablets and 80% of attorneys
with tablets have iPads, the library obtained a grant
that provides every student with an iPad. Students
reported that moot court judges were impressed to see
them make polished TrialPad presentations, while
other schools used easel flip charts. The library also
obtained a $1.5 million grant to renovate book stacks
into the Inasmuch Collaborative Learning Center,
including a new computer lab with dual-screen
monitors and collaborative study rooms with screens
and white boards. Finally, the library offers a
technology training program, teaching 50 to 60 sessions
per year. All students must attend 9 sessions, but most
attend more: over half of the students attend 15 or more
sessions and 10% attend 40 or more sessions. Librarians
spread the tech fundamentals, such as Office and
Adobe Acrobat. For libraries seeking to implement
similar programs, Brice suggests touching base with
the Legal Technology Core Competencies Certification
Coalition.

No matter the program, Brice recommends being
clear and determined about your goals and
knowledgeable about the technology. Don’t be
deterred by skepticism from faculty who have seen
past technology trends come and go but, at the same
time, don’t undermine your credibility by getting
swept up in the hype that accompanies every new
technology. First, make sure that you understand how
the technology works and how it’s useful to attorneys.
Only then should you begin teaching it.

Poster Session Presentations
Katie Hanschke, North Carolina Central School of
Law Library

I love the poster sessions. They always offer a
variety of perspectives, quick access to information,
and the opportunity to explore topics further; they also
are a great way to interact with my fellow librarians on
a range of ideas. This year was no different. Topics
covered ranged from self-directed professional
development to virtual reality. This review will cover a
few of the posters from the poster session, but the
posters themselves are just the beginning of the
information provided. Many offered supplementary
materials, and all of the presenters were more than
willing to discuss the topics in detail outside of the
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annual meeting. As a new element this year, AALL awarded a winning poster.

“Cultivating Culture: The Creation, Fostering, and Ongoing Care of your Organizational Culture” won top prize this year. Elizabeth Clifford and Katie Crandall put together a beautiful poster that discusses the importance of growing and caring for your organization’s culture. The presenters interwove garden imagery with company culture concepts. The poster covers what a culture conversation is, the difference between a culture conversation and strategic planning, steps for growing your organization’s culture, when to have a culture conversation, and sample questions. It presented both an interesting concept and a pretty picture.

“Augmented Reality for Patron Engagement and Experiential Learning” was another interesting poster. It showcased two of the New York Law Institute’s rare books exhibits. The exhibits utilized augmented reality to allow patrons to view rare books in their collections without risking any serious damage to the materials. The exhibits utilized images and text overlays to allow patrons to interact with the rare books by using an app on their phone. Videos created by the New York Law Institute’s reference librarians accompanied the resources displayed in the exhibit, and viewing the images through the app brought figures featured in the volumes to life, showing them waving to exhibit viewers. The poster discussed how the exhibit worked and highlighted how augmented reality might be used to supplement an experiential learning experience. It was a great example of the innovative spirit of law librarians.

Another interesting poster focused on Wikipedia Edit-A-Thons. “Glam It Up with a Wikipedia Edit-A-Thon” highlights the GLAM-WIKI project. According to the poster, the GLAM-WIKI initiative “helps cultural institutions share their resources with the world through collaborative projects with experienced Wikipedia editors.” Utilizing Wikipedia, Wikipedia Commons, Wikisource and Wikidata, the project offers a way to preserve cultural heritage through a well-respected online platform. The poster discusses the importance of Wikipedia, the Wikipedia content standards, the GLAM-WIKI project, instructions on how to host an edit-a-thon and a case study. This poster highlighted the contributions the library can make to preserve cultural history.

Finally, “Beyond the Library: Student Engagement Outside the Law School” discussed planning a library field trip. Kimberly Mattioli utilized her poster to go through how she coordinated a trip for law students to visit the Lilly Library, a rare book and manuscript library at Indiana University at Bloomington. The students saw Patrick Henry’s copy of Blackstone’s Commentaries, a copy of the Declaration of Independence, and law books owned by Abraham Lincoln. The poster offers tips for planning this type of visit and discusses the benefits of conducting library field trips. The poster presented an innovative and unique way to introduce students to historical materials.

These posters are just a few examples of the interesting and unique ideas expressed through the Annual Meeting’s poster sessions. Posters are an ideal format to offer a substantial amount of information in a small package. They offer insights on projects important to teaching, patron services, knowledge management, cataloging, and collection development in a very short time period. Which is why I say again, I love the poster sessions.

H4—Organizational Capacity to Support Empirical Legal Research
Daniel A. Brackmann, University of South Carolina

Stat Wars: The Empirical Strikes Back—A long time ago, in a galaxy far, far away … as a communications graduate student, I took a class in research methodologies. That was the last time I had attended any lecture or discussion on empirical methodologies. So I went into this session not quite knowing what to expect, since my experience put me somewhere above babe-in-the-woods, but well below expert. I hoped for a program to serve as a good refresher of what I had forgotten in the dim mists of 20 years, and as a guide to how my profession connects with empirically-oriented faculty.

The presenters, Jon Ashley and Alex Jakubow, both from the University of Virginia, traded off throughout the presentation, which they divided into three main...
parts: (1) defining empirical legal research (ELR); (2) assessing or creating demand for ELR support services; and 3) providing ELR services in your institution. As they began defining ELR, I ran into what seemed an occasional problem in the presentation—the use of terminology that may not have held meaning for everyone in the audience. For example, the presenters made a point that empirical research is, by definition, “non-normative”—without defining “normative.” So either the audience member must be assumed to already know what normative (and empirical) meant, or the definition remained circular.

From here, the presenters used case studies to demonstrate the lifecycle of an empirical research project from preliminary work, design, and data collection, to data wrangling, analysis, and finally interpretation. The presenters suggested that librarian involvement usually begins with data collection, and indeed, in the cases examined, librarians dominated the stages of data collection and wrangling, while the last two stages often involved more collaboration between faculty and the librarians. They cautioned that the process was often not as linear as the above progression might suggest. Discussion about determining the suitability of a given research project for an empirical approach seemed to be missing.

The next portion of the presentation related to developing support and capacity for an ELR program. After discussing different ways to assess ELR opportunities, the presenters turned to creating and driving demand—including finding other possible uses for existing datasets and demonstrating value added from the work. Necessarily, the creation of this capability requires setting reasonable expectations, both for yourself and for potential patrons, and not trying to stretch too far in the beginning. The discussion here tended to reference “common knowledge” (the data manipulation programs R and Stata for example) which may not have been common knowledge for everyone in the audience.

The biggest obstacles in the presentation for me were the occasional times the presenters dropped into terms of art or jargon. For example, they referred to “regression analysis” which would have meant more had I known what that was. Audience questions at the end also reflected this divergence of base knowledge, with some being much more basic and others being more beginner-level. However, I am confident that attendees at all levels of expertise garnered useful information from this presentation. The program seemed particularly useful as a launching pad for further investigation of this topic, as well as providing context showing how all the parts of an ELR project fit together.

**H6—Don’t Let Me Go: The Rigors of Retention**

*Nina Scholtz, Cornell Law Library*

This one-hour program for academic librarians on meeting the requirements of tenure and other up-or-out processes focused on the experiences of the presenters at three different institutions—Louisiana State (speaker Travis H. Williams and coordinator/moderator Ajaye Bloomstone), University of Pittsburgh—Barco Law Library (speaker Patricia Roncevich), and Texas A&M (speaker Susan T. Phillips). Louisiana State’s tenure requirements for law librarians are quite flexible, with no absolute requirement to do any specific thing. University of Pittsburgh has a single tenure system for librarians and faculty, with requirements for publishing, professional development, and service, but not much specificity in the guidelines. In part because Texas A&M’s law school was previously part of Texas Wesleyan University, in the past 20 years the law librarians have had four different sets of tenure requirements, with the current requirements mandating, among other things, two scholarly articles published in law reviews, and ongoing publishing obligations. While the emphasis was on individual institutions, each speaker included advice for librarians facing a long-term retention requirement.

This program will be of most interest and possibly worthwhile for law librarians who are in the early stages of a career at an institution that has an up-or-out process. Mentors of these librarians might also find the program useful, if they themselves have never had to satisfy a review board. The advice given was generally familiar, but the speakers’ variety of experiences was absorbing.
I2—Digitization is Done—Now What?
Understanding Metadata, Online Delivery, and User Experience
Daniel A. Brackmann, University of South Carolina

The pre-conference materials billed this panel as a discussion of “post-digitization activities” including metadata creation, online format display choices, and user experience, with takeaways repeatedly referring to “best practices.” I came to it expecting a discussion of steps to take once the actual scanning process is complete (and necessarily how to do these post-digitization steps well), and maybe even a more philosophical discussion of a post-digitization world and how to prepare today’s digitization efforts to be compatible with the looming future.

Chelsea Dinsmore, the Director of Digital Support Services from the University of Florida, George A. Smathers Libraries, began by observing that while planning a digitization project is the best way to go, sometimes these initiatives start without advance planning, or get dropped, in process, in a librarian’s lap with little or no warning. She opined that the key to addressing the lack of pre-planning lies in knowing your systems and the applicable standards for your archive. This part of the presentation seemed disconnected from my expectations. If the digitization effort was still in process, than clearly Digitization is Not Done. Further, a librarian abruptly receiving a half-completed project may lack any kind of established systems or standards. This seemed less about digitization already done than about how to proceed with digitization, mid-stream, without pre-planning.

Erik Beck, the Digital Services Librarian from the University of Colorado Law School, then picked up the ball with a systems developer’s perspective on metadata, emphasizing a findable and available digital file. Like Batman, he described creating the metadata that the particular digital collection needs instead of just fitting the metadata system “we already have.” He discussed special digital metadata types and corresponding problems of interoperability with standard library systems originally built around older media types. This fit the program’s billing about post-digitization topics better and offered clear points for novice digitizers to consider.

Jennifer González, from the Law Library of Congress (LLoC), finished off the panel by discussing online display and searching habits. She discussed LLoC’s approach of categorizing patrons into four generic types with different desires, priorities, and search habits. The LLoC then uses these “personas” to design the search and delivery systems for digital collections. She stressed knowing your limits and constraints, designing your quality control with standards and acceptable rates of errors, and “getting across the finish” to actually fully complete a project.

After the speakers, participants broke into small groups to discuss various real or fictionalized digitization projects. This was not recorded and seemed the most at odds with the post-digitization theme, in that the exercise seemed to be more about planning for digitization, not what to do once the digitizing part was complete.

The level of the material presented seemed appropriate to the general audience. However, I do not believe the program imparted the takeaways promised by the pre-conference materials. I do not feel that I can, for example, “describe best practices for presentation formats and discuss the advantages of each format.” The program suggested options to consider, but lacked enough information to meaningfully evaluate them or even best practices generally. The program provided a useful overview of digitization projects, but not necessarily the post-digitization part. I would suggest that an entire panel detailing the persona approach to user-oriented design would be beneficial for future conferences.

16—Organizational Capacity to Support Empirical Legal Research
Ellen Augustiniak, University of California, Irvine

During a conference year when Artificial Intelligence was prominently addressed, this vendor-focused session brought together three representatives from some of the newest names in legal research systems (Ravel Law, now part of LexisNexis, CaseText, and ROSS Intelligence) to talk about how their AI-
using products fit into the evolving legal information ecosystem. The first half of the session was devoted to demonstrations by the vendors, while the coordinator-moderators (Fastcase’s Ed Walters and University of Colorado’s Susan Nevelow Mart) spent the rest of the session exploring unifying themes and answering audience questions about future development.

To start out, the three vendors split the first 30 minutes demonstrating their products. Casetext’s Jake Heller walked the audience through using CARA (Case Analysis Research Assistant), using a neat example of a hypothetical summary judgment motion involving employees of a ride-sharing service. CARA, which won the 2017 Product of the Year award, lets you find relevant cases by uploading a document. CARA’s algorithm analyzes the memo or motion, and lists relevant cases that are absent. Heller’s example made it easy to see how popular this tool would be for litigators and judges, because it’s designed to uncover what’s missing. That is, it’s designed to find important opposing authority, as well as missing supportive authorities. A clerk would be delighted to quickly find a list of cases, sorted by relevance and weight of authority, that highlight important contradictory issues.

Ravel Law’s Daniel Lewis showed some of the groundbreaking visualization tools that Ravel had developed before its acquisition. One of his slides demonstrated the significant differences in outcomes by different federal circuit judges. Lewis also talked about how their new relationship with LexisNexis will lead to more innovative approaches to research.

For the last product, ROSS Intelligence’s Andrew Arruda made the puzzling choice to eschew any screenshots or live demonstrations of the ROSS product, explaining that it was still under development and he didn’t want to give the room (full of information professionals with deep experience in using and promoting evolving products) a misleading impression. Instead, he paired a colorful slide deck with a high-energy pitch that focused on generalities. One specific point that was clear (for anybody unfamiliar with ROSS) is that bankruptcy is an area of focus.

After the vendor demos, coordinator-moderators Mart and Walters addressed some of the themes that Mart has brought attention to recently through related 2017 AALL sessions and her most recent paper (The Algorithm as a Human Artifact: Implications for Legal [Re]Search, available at https://ssrn.com/abstract=2859720). For example, Mart has called for “algorithmic accountability”—that is, more transparency on the part of research product vendors, so that users can be aware of the biases that are baked into search systems. As the research ecosystem moves away from simple pattern-matching (what some law librarians call Boolean searches) and Google-style weighted indexes that depend on complicated, proprietary (but, in the end, human-generated) relevance rankings, and move toward more AI processing, there’s a feeling that we are moving away from being able to provide coherent, credible explanations to clients and students about how we find and choose legal authorities.

During the brief Q&A time that ended the session, Yale law librarian Julie Graves Krishnaswami pushed the vendors to explain more about what they’re going to do with legal data that’s more complicated than judicial opinions. After all, Krishnaswami noted, law librarians have seen so many novel caselaw research tools over the past few years that they seem “passé” at this point. Through audience laughter, each representative acknowledged the kernel of truth in her observation. Ravel Law’s Lewis in particular noted that their new relationship with Lexis gives them access to a great deal of other data to work with, and hinted at upcoming new approaches to regulatory information and related current awareness where the application of AI-based tools in those areas.

(Audio and slides from this session are unavailable because one or more participants declined to allow recording).
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