Introducing Miss Manager

Are you plagued by management conundrums? Do you need a gentle nudge to explore new management directions? If so, then write your woes to our newest columnist, Miss Manager. Her advice is timely, yet well-seasoned, firm, but surprisingly gentle. She is prepared (and qualified) to respond to your deepest management fears and dreams. Please feel free to write to her in care of the TSLL editors and join us in welcoming her to the TSLL staff. Modesty prevents Miss Manager from revealing her true identity; she feels maintaining her anonymity will preserve a more decorous atmosphere between advisor and advisee.

-- The Editors

Dear Miss Manager:

For years I’ve been hearing about “workflow”. I know that things move through my Technical Services Department in a particular pattern, and I know that I can map all that out. But after 15 years, I’m not sure if I am doing things as efficiently as possible. We’ve been through innumerable changes in personnel, equipment, and technology, but we’re still set up in pretty much the same pattern we were in when I first started. How do I figure out if my workflow is efficient and how I should change it if it’s not?

Sincerely,
Ill-prepared in Illinois

Dear Ill,

Miss Manager is very sympathetic toward your plight and is sure that you are not alone. How often have we heard others or even caught ourselves saying that we can get rid of that backlog or move those books through more quickly if we just change our workflow? After spending a few years watching staff member Able pass all of the free-standing supplements to Baker and the pocket parts to Charley, we think there is no reason to split these duties up; but we also can’t change that particular pair of tasks without changing the steps before and the steps after. That then requires changing steps outward in both directions until pretty soon we are looking at every task in the department. So, we decide it is time to look at the
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From the Chair

The Beaten Path

It’s time to say so long. Most years, and this is no exception, a little progress is made toward better informing, better organizing, better involving our members. I hope this year we have also taken a step or two toward better understanding and responding to them. In the wake of the Association’s efforts to plan its future, rather than have the future wholly thrust upon it, the OBS Board is attempting to learn some fundamental things about the Section’s membership. We hope this will enable us to ensure that our educational and organizational efforts will be aimed where they are needed, to serve those who, in turn, support them.

This is a good opportunity to express admiration for the thoughts, explorations, and toil of our colleagues who turn out periodic columns and articles. Unlike Chairs, they speak of substantial stuff, ranging from policy to practice, through all the areas in which this rather broadly focused membership work, and they feed us with the ideas and information that help us do our jobs well. They make the going a little easier through some of the thick stuff we encounter now and then.

The Technical Services Law Librarian and its professional sisters are probably the most valuable benefits of membership. OBS and TS together happen to support one of the finer examples.

Also very high in my esteem are the chairs of OBS committees (listed, like the columnists, on page 2). They and their fellows accomplish most of the Section’s work, answering their charges to study and report, and to represent our concerns to the appropriate bodies. How else could we keep up?

Finally, AALL and OBS depend upon the involvement of their members, to learn as we participate, to grow and develop our skills, not only as professionals but also in the organizational work that supports educational programming and development of the profession. These skills can be picked up simply by offering a little time on some project, committee or working group. If you are not in the habit of volunteering within AALL, I urge you to take on one task this year - do some of the legwork, learn in depth about a problem by working on it as a group member, and then next year perhaps, take a little more responsibility. You will find opportunities to learn, contacts for future assistance, satisfaction in serving a grateful lot; and a little exposure couldn’t hurt your career, let’s face it. No special talents? Like the grain in a nice piece of wood when you rub it, your abilities will expose themselves. Take a small job, a little challenge, and do it as well as you can. The world (and AALL) will beat a path to your door.

Thanks for the opportunity to learn and broaden myself, by serving OBS. See you in D.C.

Jack
Bissett
Washington & Lee University
Bissettj@madison.acad.wlu.edu

Chair Column, June 1999

“Term, holidays, term, holidays, til we leave school, then work, work, work, til we die” – C.S. Lewis.

C.S. Lewis’s schoolboy outlook on life from his autobiography Surprised by Joy is funny if you are not trapped in its definition and awful in its accuracy when you are. Most of us in the library profession are in it by choice, and so we don’t have the need to be so cynical about our work lives. I think it is safe to say that people who are smart enough to be librarians are smart enough to engage in more lucrative pursuits, but that there is something about the nature of our occupation that keeps us in it.

Perhaps it is a more humane way to get through life than pure money-getting. Perhaps it is the satisfaction that comes from serving the intellectual needs of our patrons. Those of us in Technical Services are attracted by these and other pleasures; the privilege of putting knowledge to use by ordering it, the ability to master a complex universe of
individual people who provide those services. The SIS is the umbrella under which all of those helpful Technical Services people can gather. We promote the communication of all those ideas, interests, and research by somehow gathering a critical mass of people who are interested in the issues of our work; but it is those individuals who provide the real meat, the thing you can actually use in your job. The SIS is there to connect helper and helpee. So now you should be asking yourself whether you are part of the SIS in that sense. Are you a member who benefits from the help provided in the SIS but who doesn’t give anything back? It is a cliche to say that an organization is only as good as its members, but with a wholly voluntary group like this, it cannot be denied. All of us are “consumers” of the help provided by our membership in TS-SIS; all of us should also be “manufacturers” as well. I think one of our great challenges is to think of new ways to contribute help. While we will always need people to volunteer for committee work or to be on the board, we also need to be creative in thinking of new ways to help out our fellow Technical Services librarians in the legal field. That is, we need to “promote the communication” of any useful ideas to the membership of our SIS. For example, when you scour your favorite specialized listserv archives to decipher some problem you are having with your home operation, and you piece together the solution after sorting out the information dispersed through 8 months of postings, summarize your problem and the solution and post it to the TS listserv – you will be surprised how appreciative at least a handful of people in the same position will be. We must also remember that something as “consumer” oriented as asking a question can be a great contribution. It is often the best way to get a conversation rolling. And, as our survey results indicated, most people who attend the annual meetings prefer the roundtable discussions above any other format. Perhaps we should be better about mimicking roundtables in our online conversations.

Speaking of those who are “manufacturers” of help within the SIS, I would like to thank all of the members who helped us on the board by filling out and sending in your surveys this year. Everyone enjoys finding out what you think, and we certainly take the results seriously. To those returning to their work on the board – incoming Chair Janet McKinney, Treasurer Linda Tesar, and Member-at-Large JoAnn Hounshell – I thank you for your continuing service. To our new Member-at-Large, Cindy May, and our new Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Alva Stone, I wish the best of luck and feel confident that the SIS is being left in very good hands. To Mary Burgos, finishing up her term as Member-at-Large, I am grateful for all her help and support. To the Committee Chairs I am very grateful for your work and for much helpful advice. I would like especially to thank Linda Tesar and Anna Belle Leiserson, editors of Technical Services Law Librarian, for making our association so pleasant, and for bringing the work of the two SISes together so attractively and professionally.

Whether your attitude toward your job is “work, work, work, til you die” or something more positive depends at least partly on your attitude toward your profession. It is one of the purposes of the Technical Services Special Interest Section to keep your professional life positive. Please help us to accomplish that.
In June 1997, the Working Group on Classification Documentation, an offshoot of the TS/SIS Cataloging and Classification Committee, conducted a survey on cataloging documentation. Our aim was to find out who had documentation, what kinds of documentation they had, in both form and content, how useful it was to them, and if they’d be willing to share. The possible uses of the survey data that we envisioned were many. On a most basic level, we thought the information might be interesting, and could possibly support a claim for libraries wishing to create more documentation themselves. On the most hopeful level, we were interested in creating a clearinghouse for useful cataloging documentation. This goal has so far eluded us, but remains an interesting idea.

Number of respondents: 235

1. Type of library:
   Total ......................... 235
   Academic .................... 75
   Private ....................... 88
   State, county, federal ...... 68

2. Approximate size of collection (books and bound serials):
   Under 10,000 ................ 31
   10,000-50,000 ............... 77
   50,000-100,000 ............. 21
   100,000-250,000 ........... 41
   250,000-500,000 .......... 39
   500,000-1,000,000 ..... 11
   Over 1,000,000 ............ 1

3. What is the size of your cataloging staff? (Includes professional, clerical and student FTE)
   Fewer than 1 .............. 29
   Between 1 and 1.75 ....... 87
   Between 2 and 2.75 ....... 36
   Between 3 and 3.5 ......... 16
   Between 4 and 4.75 ......  8
   5 .......................... 5
   Between 6 and 6.25 .......  5
   Between 7 and 7.75 .......  2
   9 .......................... 1
   12 .......................... 2

4. If you use a cataloging utility (such as RLIN, OCLC, WLN) which one do you use?
   OCLC .......................... 115
   RLIN .......................... 30
   WLN .......................... 11
   WWW ..........................  7
   Marcive ......................  3
   ISM ...........................  2
   Librarians Helper ..........  2
   None .........................  69

   Each of the following systems had one user library: Bibliofile, GRC Laserquest, ABN, Supercat, CARL

5. If you use a local automated system (NOTIS, III, etc.), which do you use?
   III ........................... 45
   DataTrek (all) .............. 20
   DataTrek Pro EOSI .......... 16
   Inmagic ..................... 13
   Notis ........................ 13
   Horizon .....................  7
   Personal ....................  7
   SIRSI .......................  6
   DRA ..........................  5
   Dynix ........................  4
   Sydney Plus ................  4
   CARL ........................  2
   DataTrek GLAS ............  2
   Navigator ...................  2
   Pals ........................  2
   SIMA .......................  2
   None .......................  82

   The following systems each had one library user: DBText, Marcive, Bestseller, MSacces, Bibliofile, LDMS, Paradox, FolioViews, UTLS, Techlib+, AskSam

6. What types of cataloging documentation have you developed in your library?
   Job descriptions .......... 105
   Procedure manuals ........ 101
   Memos or short documents  gathered informally ....  97
   Policy documents ..........  80
   Organizational charts .....  38
   Other (please specify) ..  10
   None .......................  79
Some of the “other” documentation listed included: models and examples; a log of OCLC problems; minutes of informal meetings relating to policies and other matters; annual reports; forms, templates; subject heading list; collection inventory; local classification system; LC materials; index cards organized by students in a box; English-Spanish subject heading translation; running list to send to Marcive; list of cards pending

7. In what ways do you use your cataloging documentation?

- Memory aid ........................................ 127
- Record of decisions made ................... 113
- Training tool for new employees .......... 92
- Other (please specify) ............................. 9

Other uses include: training for new procedures and for interns; historical information; guides for administrators; long range planning documents; communications tools between areas; cost analyses; basis for successor should someone leave.

8. How do you imagine cataloging documentation from other libraries would be useful to you?

- As an example of other libraries’ policies and procedures .............. 125
- As a model to use when writing your own documentation .............. 104
- Other (please elaborate) .................................. 15

Other perceived uses include: to see how someone else had dealt with a problem; idea of decisions made in various library types; find better, cheaper ways; general interest; will help us to follow established procedures, since we currently make up some of our own rules; as a source of new work flows and procedures; professional reference tool; not useful.

9. How would you rate the usefulness of your cataloging documentation to your own staff?

- Very useful .......................... 38
- Useful ................................ 146
- Occasionally useful ..................... 51
- Never useful ........................ 3

10. Approximately how often do you review and update cataloging documentation in your library?

- Twice per year ........................ 5
- Once per year ........................ 27
- Once every two years ............. 19
- As needed ........................ 59

11. Who, by position, is responsible for the writing and updating of your cataloging documentation?

NOT COMPILED

12. Please complete the chart below detailing how your cataloging documentation is made available:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of documentation</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Print</th>
<th>LAN</th>
<th>Web</th>
<th>Other (e-mail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job descriptions</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational charts</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy documents</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure manuals</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos or short documents gathered informally</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total documentation</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See question 6 for a list of “other” documentation types.

13. Please list the URLs for any documentation available through the Internet.

In 1997, eight respondents cited web sites. Five of these still seem useful:

- <http://www.uky.edu/Libraries/policies.html>
- <http://www.library.cornell.edu/tsmanual>
- <http://hul.harvard.edu/cmtes/haac/bsp.html>
- <http://ublib.buffalo.edu/libraries/units/law/services/cataloging/newmanual.html>

14. Would you be willing to share your cataloging documentation through some mechanism set up by the Working Group on Cataloging Documentation?

- Yes ....................................... 79

If yes, which documentation do you recommend as being especially useful to other libraries?

Responses vary greatly. By far the most frequently regarded as worth sharing are procedures manuals (18) and cataloging manuals (12). The degree of overlap between these two categories is not clear. The next most frequently cited document is job descriptions (8). Other documents are often very specific to an institution or to a particular system.

15. Would you be willing to share tables of contents of any longer documentation you may have through some mechanism set up by the Working Group?

- Yes ....................................... 19

16. If you do not have any documentation, why not?

- Time constraints .................... 67
- Not needed .......................... 29
- Other ................................. 29
Conclusions

Of the 235 responses, roughly one third came from each category of library, academic, private and federal, state and county. Most, 168, have fewer than 4 employees. 21 have 4 or more. 115 libraries use OCLC, the most popular system by far. The next most popular, “none,” is used by 69 libraries, and RLIN by 30. For local systems, “none” is the most popular with 82 libraries. III comes in second with 45, then DataTrek with 20, and Notis and Inmagic with 13. Most libraries have some form of documentation, and only 79 of 235 libraries state that they have none. The most popular type of documentation is the job description (105), followed by procedure manual (101) and memos (97). Policy documents (80) are also well represented. Of the 156 libraries that have documentation, 146, or almost all, find their documentation useful. 51 find it occasionally useful, and 38 find it very useful. Print, in 1997, was definitely the favorite medium for documentation, with libraries listing 410 print documents, 40 documents on Local Access Networks, and 8 documents available on the World Wide Web. 3 documents were available via another media, most likely e-mail. Of the 235 libraries surveyed, 79 had documentation they were willing to share. Of the 79 libraries that had no documentation, 67 responded that this was due to time constraints, and 29 that it was not needed. (In this, as in other cases above, some libraries clearly answered twice, or libraries that actually have documentation may have been responding here as to why they don’t have more or better documentation.)

Because the results were compiled in a database, it was possible then to manipulate the data to come up with other, more revealing data. Looking at type of documentation produced by type of library, we see that academic libraries are the biggest producers of documentation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of documentation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Federal, State, County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job descriptions</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure manuals</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memos or short documents</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational charts</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy documents</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total documentation</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While library respondents were almost evenly divided among academic, private and federal, state and county libraries, the total documentation produced by academic librarians is more than twice the amount produced by private or federal, state and county librarians. The chart also shows that the bulk of the libraries with no documentation are private libraries.

These results may be a function of library size. Charting type of library by size, we came up with the following table revealing that while most academic library respondents fall into the larger end if the scale (100,000 volumes and up) most private libraries are 50,000 volumes and under, and most federal, state and county libraries tend to cluster in the middle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Federal, State, County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 10,000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-50,000</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-100,000</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000-250,000</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000-500,000</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000-1,000,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also interesting to note that of the 79 libraries with no documentation, 54 are libraries of under 50,000 volumes, and 74 are staffed by fewer than 2 people. Thus it is clear that small libraries and libraries with small staffs are less likely to have documentation than other libraries, and these small libraries are also more likely to be private libraries than either academic or federal, state and county libraries.

Of the 235 libraries responding to our survey, 79 of them responded that they would be willing to share documentation with other libraries. Examining these libraries by the characteristics of type and size of library reveals the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Federal, State, County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 10,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000-50,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000-100,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000-250,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000-500,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000-1,000,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1,000,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not surprisingly, we see that the academic libraries, which have twice as much documentation, are twice as likely to share their documentation. Also, we see that the documentation to share pattern follows the general pattern of survey respondents. Since there are more large academic libraries, they have more documentation to share in the “large library” end of the spectrum. Private libraries have more documentation suitable to small libraries, and federal, state and county libraries fill in the middle range.

Looking at some of the characteristics the documentation libraries are willing to share, we see the following:

Usefulness of documentation

- Very useful .................. 24
- Useful .......................... 32
- Occasionally useful .......... 22
- Never useful .................. 1

Frequency of updating

- Twice per year .................. 3
- Once per year .................... 6
- Once per two years ............. 6
- As needed ....................... 19

Comparing the usefulness figures of the libraries willing to share with the general survey respondents, we see that those willing to share are more likely to find their documentation very useful or useful than those in the general pool. In the general pool, more libraries found their documentation occasionally useful than very useful (51 to 38). Here, those results are reversed. In both the general and the sharing pools, very few libraries (3 and 1) found their documentation never useful. Comparing the frequency figures, it is clear that all respondents prefer to update their documentation as needed rather than on a fixed schedule, with the as needed figure equivalent to the sum of the other possibilities combined.

Our data yield interesting general conclusions, but can perhaps be even more helpful as a resource for libraries seeking examples of particular kinds of documentation. It is very easy to retrieve information regarding particular kinds of cataloging documentation for particular types of libraries, for example documentation for a library using SIRSI, or cataloging procedures for a medium-sized academic library with a 4 person staff. Ideally, we would like to make our database publicly available, but until we do I am very happy to serve as an intermediary. Anyone desiring information on cataloging documentation available for use by other libraries should contact me at: <ctarr@library.berkeley.edu>.

Survey conducted by Christina Tarr and Melinda Davis, Law Library, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, and compiled by Christina Tarr. Working Group On Cataloging Documentation: Melinda Davis, Christina Tarr (co-chairs), Pam Deemer, Katherine Hedin, Elizabeth Geesey Holmes, Ellen McGrath.

ELECTRONIC ORDERING OF MONOGRAPHS

PART II:

Yankee Book Peddler’s GOBI

In Part I of “Electronic Ordering of Monographs” (TSLL vol. 24, no. 3, March 1999, page 11), JoAnn Hounshell wrote about Blackwell’s Collection Manager. Other major book vendors also offer access to their online databases via the Web, and these databases have been used for some time by acquisitions and collection development librarians as bibliographic searching tools. Increasingly, they are being used interactively for ordering and as a source of records for integrated library systems. Publishers and vendors of legal materials have lagged behind in development of their Web sites for these purposes; they should be encouraged to upgrade their databases to make them more useful for acquisitions and collection development, and more compatible with library systems. In this article I will discuss Yankee Book Peddler’s GOBI database and how it interacts with the INNOPAC system.

American University’s Washington College of Law Library established an approval plan for monographs with Yankee Book Peddler (YBP) in January 1995. Each week we receive approximately 25 books on approval and many new-title notification slips in a broad range of LC call numbers, which are distributed to librarians for selection. From these slips, we place orders for about 200 additional monographs per month. As a YBP customer, we have access to GOBI, their Web-based Global Online Bibliographic Information system which allows online searching, selecting, and ordering. GOBI has gone through many upgrades and enhancements in the four years that we have been using it. For the most up to date descriptions of what GOBI offers, I refer you to the their Web site: <http://www.ybp.com/gobi.htm>.

We have been INNOPAC users for over 10 years. As many of you know, this system has also had a number of
enhancements and upgrades over the years and has taken full advantage of the Internet. For example, libraries can use file transfer to obtain invoices for serials from most of the major periodicals vendors, eliminating the need to manually post individual payments. File transfer can also be used to obtain bibliographic and order records for books sent on approval. In order to extend use for firm orders, YBP and Innovative Interfaces worked together to develop GobiLink, which eliminates the need to double key bibliographic and order records for monographs in both GOBI and INNOPAC. GobiLink is now available for other integrated library systems, and INNOPAC will also link with other book vendors.

I will briefly describe how the process works, but again I refer you to both vendors for more detailed information. YBP offers this description of GobiLink:

With GobiLink, librarians can import files of order records into their own system, customized with local data such as purchase order, fund, location, and notes. GobiLink also facilitates overlay of order records with cataloging records, obtained either through OCLC PromptCat or directly from YBP.

GobiLink can also deliver electronic invoicing, and can trigger encumbrance, order, receipt, and payment transactions into the library’s system.

We have two passwords for GOBI, one for searching and selecting, and one for searching, selecting, and ordering. Librarians have the ability to search by author, title, subject, ISBN, LC class, series, or publisher, or to look at bibliographic information for all of the notification slips in each week’s shipment. In addition to the bibliographic data that is found on the notification slips, GOBI records include local history for each title, e.g. whether it has been ordered, shipped and invoiced or, for approval books, returned, as well as the date the book was “handled on approval,” or profiled for our library and/or other libraries. As with Blackwell’s Collection Manager, each record includes a place to mark it for selection, add notes for acquisitions staff, or, in the ordering mode, to add information such as fund code and transmit the order.

After selectors have marked the records for future ordering, acquisitions staff can bring up the selection list in GOBI and place the orders. After the initial search of INNOPAC, all keying is done in GOBI. Even though most of our librarians who do collection development still prefer working with paper notification slips, these slips can be used for pulling up records in GOBI by ISBN and then placing the orders by filling in any local notes and hitting the appropriate key to generate the order. If the library has implemented GobiLink, these orders can be put in a file to transfer standard MARC formatted order confirmations to the INNOPAC using FTP, generating bibliographic and order records in the system. Once the INNOPAC records are created, the library creates a file of the new orders containing the YBP order confirmation number for each order and transfers it back to GOBI with actual purchase order (i.e. order record) numbers attached. These purchase order numbers are then added to the YBP record of the order transaction and are used to link orders with cataloging records sent when the book is shipped, if the library receives cataloging from the book vendor. If a library is using OCLC PromptCat for cataloging, this file would be sent by YBP to OCLC for catalog records. Records are returned to the INNOPAC via GOBI with or without invoice data attached for automatic posting. In order to use the automatic posting feature, the library must have Innovative’s “extended approval plan interface.” This interface was designed to transmit bibliographic, order, and invoice data from book vendors to INNOPAC for books received on approval. GobiLink and similar links between INNOPAC and other book vendors were developed to allow such transfers for firm orders as well as approvals. I believe they allow libraries to take full advantage of the capabilities of both systems and help to save time and increase accuracy in acquisitions procedures.

I will be talking about this and other uses of the Internet in law library serials, acquisitions, and collection development as part of “The Internet in Technical Services: Crossroads of Opportunity,” program K-7, at AALL this summer in Washington, DC. I hope to see many of you there.
Paul Weiss from LC’s CPSO reports that K Tables: Form Division Tables for Law has been published and is available from CDS. LC expects to start using the new tables May 17. The new tables do not apply to KD, KE and KF. There is a conversion table showing the old table numbers and the corresponding new K table numbers. Future editions of the K schedules will include the proper table references. More information about this can be found on the CPSO homepage <http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/>.

Jolande Goldberg from LC’s CPSO will be distributing KBR (History of Canon Law) and the KB partially developed draft outline to her reviewers in Italy for evaluation in early May.

We hope to pass along information from Jolande and others at LC regarding the application of KZ/JZ from time to time. KZ and JZ are works in progress. We have to be alert as to when we can use an existing number and when we should establish a new number. Recently there was a discussion initiated by Barbara Szalkowski concerning where to class a parliamentary law treatise covering several United Nations bodies. There are numbers for rules and procedures for individual bodies but none for several bodies. There are numbers for U.N. bodies (KZ5005.2), for language rules (KZ4999.5), for election law (KZ5004). How do we determine where the work on parliamentary law for several bodies should class? We look for patterns — in the JZ United Nations section, in KJE organizational law, in the K country schedules constitutional law sections. There are similarities in these sections even though they are not exactly the same. KJE has language rules and legislative power under institutions and organs (KJE5305-5307). KZ has language rules under intra-organizational relations not under bodies ((KZ5005.2). KF has rules and procedures numbers under legislative branch. The parliamentary law title should class in a new number in either the KZ5005.2 general works area or after KZ4999.5, the language rules area. We may end up being like the cataloger and the light bulb and have to wait for LC to tell us what to do. We could propose one solution or the other and see if it is accepted or rejected by LC.

Congratulations to Jolande Goldberg
She has been selected to receive the Marta Lange/CQ Award. This award is given annually by the Law and Political Science Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries, a division of the American Library Association (ALA). The award recognizes an academic or law librarian who, through research, other creative activity, or service to the profession, makes distinguished contributions to bibliography and information service in law or political science.

Jolande is being recognized for her development or revision of schedules for law and international relations in the Library of Congress classification system, understanding and consideration of the requirements of many law-related disciplines, especially political science, tireless work within the scholarly and library communities to build support for her work, outreach activities in the United States and abroad, and intelligence, wit, and political skills with which her work has been accomplished.

Most of Jolande’s career at LC has been devoted to development of the law schedules. She wrote the K schedules for Germany, for continental Europe and rewrote France. She went on to write the schedules for Africa, Asia and the Pacific. She recently finished international law and international relations. She is currently working on schedules for religious law, concentrating initially on canon law and Islamic law.
What’s On Our Minds?

Collections have always been at the core of library services. Yet librarians are devoting extraordinary attention to collection development these days, and for good reason. In fact, TS/SIS and ALL/SIS are co-sponsoring a roundtable discussion on collection development at the AALL Annual Meeting, Monday, July 19, 1999, from 4:45 - 6 p.m.; Rachel Pergament of University of Southern California Law Library, and Frank Lee of Latham & Watkins, will introduce key collection development topics, and set the stage for an exciting conversation among attendees.

We are witnessing today a startling transformation in the nature of our library collections and in the ways in which we build and maintain them. A number of factors inform this transformation: the rise of the digital legal information market, a surge in the number of information products on the market, the internationalization of legal practice, the trend toward monopolization in the publishing industry, unprecedented price inflation, far-reaching organizational change in law firms and law libraries, and the unyielding pace of technological development. A survey of recent library science literature and recent conversations with colleagues suggest that librarians have a discernible set of collection development issues on their minds — and their desktops.  

Integrating Electronic Resources into Our Collections

First, librarians have worked remarkably hard to prepare themselves for selecting electronic resources. They have devoted time and resources to training themselves about electronic technology. They have had to learn the criteria for evaluating electronic resources, which include usability and functionality, compatibility with existing local technology, impacts on library services, permitted users and uses, security and authentication, long-term access, and the need for technical staff support. Librarians then have had to integrate these criteria into their existing collection policies. Yet electronic resources also require a reorganization of selection processes, since most digital products call for collective decision-making: subject specialists, public services staff, catalogers, serials/acquisitions staff, attorneys, and technology personnel all need to contribute in order for an electronic selection choice to be successful. Clearly, the preparation for and implementation of electronic selection harbor great personnel and time costs. Moreover, once a selection decision has been made, libraries have to decide how to provide bibliographic access to the resource. This entails developing special bibliographic control policies and procedures. Intellectual control over electronic resources frequently involves new tasks — and labor costs — for cataloging departments, such as verifying URLs.

Choosing the Appropriate Format for an Information Resource

Given a range of media and format choices for many legal information products, librarians need to be able choose the right medium and format for their library context. Librarians must train themselves in the selection criteria for several information formats. Multi-format choices often involve a collective decision-making process, which entails high personnel costs. In addition, such choices can require librarians very carefully to consider economic factors — such as cost-per-use — that played a less significant role in the predominantly print environment.

Meeting the Needs of Remote Patrons

As more and more library patrons require access to information resources from outside the physical walls of the library, librarians need to build collections that meet these patrons’ needs. Licensing electronic resources is often an important part of the answer, but licensing entails many challenges, including pricing, security, technology, and access. Negotiating access to remote physical library collections is often part of the solution, as well.

The Transformation of Librarians’ and Vendors’ Tools

Not only the composition of the collection, but the tools librarians and vendors use to build and maintain the collection, are being altered by technology and other factors. Most publishers offer electronic catalogs or publications lists on their Web sites. Listservs, electronic news sources, and e-mail notification services such as that provided by Amazon.com facilitate title discovery. Via the Internet, libraries can access massive bibliographic databases such as OCLC, RLIN, Books in Print, or Amazon.com, or search other libraries’ online catalogs. New tools such as IndexMaster offer desktop access to specialized bibliographic information. Vendors, too, offer electronic versions of catalogs, as well as approval slip services. Internet-based approval services broaden the collection development conversation in intriguing ways: for example, they permit library patrons to take a more active role in collection development, by allowing them to flag and annotate desired titles. E-mail communication also helps more stakeholders participate in collection building.

Coping with Price Inflation and Cost Consciousness

Law firms, courts, and law schools are all more business-like than ever before. Librarians must justify all of their expenditure decisions, especially those...
and approval vendors, and the division of subject-based collection responsibilities among institutions. In addition, consortial licensing can make electronic resources affordable to many libraries that could not support individual subscriptions. Yet access through a consortium frequently means a loss of control over the selection process, and the necessity of accepting features that do not accommodate the needs of one’s local clientele.

Licensing Issues
Along with the loss of physical control over information products, libraries are increasingly relinquishing the legal control that copyright afforded to purchasers of tangible information resources. Nearly all commercial electronic resources are licensed and not sold. Librarians know well that the rights of subscribers provided by the terms of a licensing agreement can be much narrower than their rights under copyright law. Librarians are training themselves to scrutinize licenses, and to negotiate the most favorable licensing terms with vendors.

Preservation and Archiving Concerns
Long-term access to electronic resources is a signal concern of librarians. CD-ROM technology will likely be superceded in a few years, and electronic resources in proprietary formats have limited lifespans. Given the lack of revenue potential and the high costs of reliable electronic preservation, few commercial publishers or vendors will commit to providing long-term access to their digital products. Library organizations are working diligently to develop standards, policies and procedures for electronic preservation, but they face great obstacles, including intellectual property restrictions and a lack of cooperation from publishers.

The Growing Importance of Foreign & International Resources
In addition to technological innovation, the internationalization of legal practice is contributing mightily to the transformation of law library collections. Attorneys, public patrons, and law school faculty and students increasingly find that their work requires access to legal materials of non-U.S. jurisdictions. Law library collections therefore embrace more foreign and international materials. The price of non-U.S. information resources frequently surpasses that of domestic resources, however. The vast store of free or low-cost non-U.S. legal information available on the Internet represents an invaluable complement to local legal collections, though it also evokes concerns about current and long-term access and intellectual control.

The Interdisciplinarity of Legal Practice
Just as legal collections are growing multi-jurisdictional, so too are they becoming more interdisciplinary. An evermore integrated economy forces attorneys and legal scholars to refer continually to information in subjects such as business, the natural sciences, engineering, and medicine. Librarians must consequently devote scarce funds adding non-legal resources to their collections. Again, free and low-cost Internet resources expand the boundaries of the legal collection, but also possess the drawbacks mentioned above.

Physical Space Constraints
Expanding print and microform holdings and the downsizing of law firms compel law librarians frequently to consider space in selection and collection planning decisions. In some cases, format selection may be driven primarily by the space constraints of the physical library.

These challenges seem daunting indeed. Yet the law library community has employed cooperation and information sharing to meet these challenges astonishingly well in these early days of technological transition. We must continue to share our efforts and our knowledge in order to safeguard our collections, and our role in building and maintaining them, into the new millennium.
Sometimes months or even years pass by without any cataloging questions coming my way. Then all of a sudden there will be a rash of queries. Several came from a fellow California cataloger. Bill Nazarro at the Whittier Law School Library had to catalog a very early California compilation that brought up a question as to the appropriate date of qualifier to use in the uniform title. Naturally it would be a record that had no LC bibliographic or authority records for it, only a record in RLIN with identifier CLCL (hey that’s LACLL!)

Soon after California became a state, a publisher issued a collection of laws from the first years of legislative activity. It, only a record in RLIN with identifier CLCL (hey that’s LACLL!)!

Notes


love to reprint GPO material and send them to libraries (often for a separate charge, of course). Bill had a CCH reprint of a GPO title cross his desk; it made for an interesting choice of title question:

CCH’s reprint of General explanation of tax legislation passed in ... is cataloged under that “official title” (MARC tag 245 00) while the CCH title is tagged: 246 1 Joint Committee on Taxation’s General explanation ... per DCLCSN9834807S. Why wasn’t the official title tagged as a uniform title 130 with CCH’s title tagged 245?

010 sn9834807
245 00 General explanation of tax legislation enacted in ... / $cprepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation.
246 1 $sReprint has title: $aJoint Committee on Taxation’s general explanation of tax legislation enacted in ...
246 1 $sReprint commonly known as: $aBlue book
260 Chicago : $bCCH Inc.,
300 v. : $c23 cm.
310 Annual
580 Originally published: Washington, DC : U.S. G.P.O.,
710 1 United States.$bCongress.$bJoint Committee on Taxation.
710 2 CCH Incorporated.

More details about the publication first. The CCH work has a title page that precedes the GPO title page.

CCH title page:

Joint Committee on Taxation’s General Explanation of Tax Legislation Enacted in the 104th Congress Blue Book

The GPO title page a few pages further inside reads:

GENERAL EXPLANATION OF TAX LEGISLATION ENACTED IN THE 104TH CONGRESS

The basic question is which is the chief source? 1.11A and 1.11B give us the answer. The title of the reprint should be transcribed as the title proper and the title of the original in the note area (now 246). I am not a CONSER cataloger, but there is an example in CONSER Cataloging Manual Module 17, p. 32 that may be misleading. The example there seems to make a note about the reprint title, not the original title.

The next question is whether this record needs a uniform title. 25.3B, 2) which would permit the omission of statements of responsibility that precede the title might be applied. Notice that I say “might.” Uniform title use is I believe an option, not a mandate in this case. The Joint Committee on Taxation isn’t Shakespeare. It is unlikely that we are going to have numerous manifestations of the same work. Although when Bender, RIA, and CCH all issue their versions of new tax laws it sometimes seems like we get hundreds of manifestations! If one used a uniform title, the record would then look something like this.

130 0 General explanation of tax legislation enacted in...
245 00 Joint Committee on Taxation’s general explanation of tax legislation enacted in ...
246 1 $sReprint of: $aGeneral explanation of tax legislation enacted in ...
246 1 $sReprint commonly known as: $aBlue book
260 Chicago : $bCCH Inc.,
300 v. : $c23 cm.
310 Annual
580 Originally published: Washington, DC : U.S. G.P.O.,
710 1 United States.$bCongress.$bJoint Committee on Taxation.
710 2 CCH Incorporated.

Given that collocation is a desirable goal even in online catalogs, I believe I’d keep the 130.

I welcome questions like these from Bill for a couple of reasons. Not only are they intellectually challenging, they provide an opportunity to discuss with LACLL copy catalogers the topic of “appropriate” change to derivative cataloging records. The correct identification of the title proper is an importance one and would for our library constitute a record that should be changed, not merely accepted unedited as copy cataloging.
Defining Metadata

Several years ago I participated in a research group for a NSF funded digital library project. We were tasked with creating an “ontology containing formal definitions of digital library content, services, and licenses along with a registry including metadata to describe collections and agents based on the ontology”. The group, made up of engineering, computer science, and information science faculty and librarians, spent several weeks discussing structures and content from a wide array of perspectives. Our conclusion? Before we could define metadata for our digital library, we needed to define it for ourselves.

Unfortunately, defining metadata has not come easily. Definitions vary depending upon perspective (cataloging vs. computer science) or discipline (humanities text vs. hard sciences). The CC: DA’s Task Force on Metadata has as one of its charges to devise a definition of “metadata” and investigate the interoperability of newly emerging metadata schemes with the cataloging rules (AACR2R) and the USMARC format. They have identified close to twenty separate definitions to date. These range from the simple, “Data about data”, to that given by Arlene Taylor who devotes five chapters in her new book, The Organization of Information, to this topic. Her definition is as follows.

Metadata. An encoded description of an information package (e.g., an AACR2 record encoded with MARC, a Dublin Core record, a GILS record, Etc.); the purpose of metadata is to provide an intermediate level at which choices can be made as to which information packages one wishes to view or search, without having to search massive amounts of irrelevant full text. (p. 246)

Taylor extends her definition to include, as it should, not only descriptive information such as that found in traditional retrieval tools, but also information necessary for the management and preservation of the information package being described (p. 77). This can include such things as the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) Header’s Revision Description (<REVDESC>) or Dublin Core tags such as FORM or RIGHTS which can be used to give basic details about the technical or legal context of a document. Information vital to digital preservation may be added so that future systems would know exactly how to interpret the document itself or migrate the data to a non-obsolete format. The data could also be encapsulated together with all application and system software.

Calls for Comments/Participation

Web Based Ontologies
Netscape is currently building a world ontology to classify web sources. The taxonomy they are building is similar to YAHOO, however:
1. The taxonomy and its instance are public.
2. They are specified in RDF.
3. Netscape is asking for volunteers as editors for entries in the taxonomy and for building the taxonomy.

More information on the Open Directory Project can be found at: <http://directory.netscape.com>

Technical information (including specs in RDF) can be found at: <http://dmoz.org/rdf/>

Dublin Core
A first draft of Encoding Dublin Core Metadata in HTML is available for comments. It was written in response to the need to document current practice while discussion moves forward on data models and XML/RDF encoding. It has been the subject of several rounds of review in the Dublin Core Technical Advisory Committee. This document explains how Dublin Core elements are expressed using the META and LINK tags of HTML. You may find it at: <http://www.ietf.org/internet-drafts/draft-kunze-dchtml-00.txt>

Comments are welcome.

Universal Preservation Format
An important new standard in the preservation of digital media is nearing the completion of its first iteration. Those for whom this could be an important component of their work are urged to download and comment on the papers referred to, notably the “User and Technical Requirements.” There is also a separate bibliography.

You can find these papers at:<http://info.wgbh.org/upf/index.html>

Resource Description Framework
The World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) has released the Resource Description Framework (RDF) Model and Syntax specification as a W3C recommendation, representing cross-industry and expert community agreement on a wide range of features for using and providing metadata on the Web. The full press release and links to resources are available at: <http://www.w3.org/Press/1999/RDF-REC>
required to access it and a description of the original hardware environment.

The Dublin Core is one such method. The Dublin Core is being developed as a generic metadata standard for use by libraries, archives, government, and other publishers of information. The standard was intended to be descriptive, rather than evaluative, and deliberately limited to a small set of elements that would have applicability over a range of types of information resources. Those who are trying to implement the Dublin Core standard have raised a number of issues concerning both the semantics of the metadata (rules for the content of the fields) and the syntax (rules for structuring and expressing the fields themselves). For a progress report on the Dublin Core, read Stuart Weibel’s article “The State of the Dublin Core Metadata Initiative: April 1999” <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/april99/> in the April issue of D-Lib Magazine. You can also attend program B6: Crosswalks to Information Management: Metadata, at the 1999 annual meeting. Erik Jul will discuss metadata in general and the Dublin Core. Eliot Christian of the USGS will join him and speak on the Government Information Locator Service (GILS).

The issues raised by Dublin Core implementers offer an opportunity for technical services librarians to become involved in the creation of these schemes. A number of communities have begun expanding upon the core set by adding elements or attributes specific to their disciplines and local practice. Why not law? OBS/TS members need to consider how to get involved in formulating a common set of tags and a common format for those tags for people and institutions that are providing access to legal information over the Internet.

Many of the concepts behind metadata should sound familiar to Technical Services librarians. While the implementations differ, the principles behind the creation of these systems greatly resemble those of cataloging, acquisitions and preservation. As the methods available for describing information grow beyond MARC, it becomes increasingly apparent that we have a role to play as mediators and creators of an increasingly diverse landscape of descriptive methods.

**OBS OCLC COMMITTEE**

Susan Chinoransky  
George Washington University  
schinoransky@burns.nlc.gwu.edu

---

**Assimilation of WLN Records into WorldCat**

The following is reprinted from a posting on AUTOCAT, sent by Rick Newell of OCLC on April 28. This should help clarify the method of assimilation of WLN records into WorldCat. For more information, see the OCLC/WLN Merger Web Site at http://www.oclc.org/wln

I. Record Matching and Holdings Addition

1. When a record in the WLN database is a national library record and is identified as such by a matching machine algorithm, holdings of WLN libraries will be added to the same national library record in WorldCat.

2. When a WLN Member-contributed record matches an OCLC Member-contributed record in WorldCat and is identified as such by a matching machine algorithm, holdings of WLN libraries will be attached to the matching record in WorldCat.

3. In cases where a WLN Member-contributed record is identified as unique to WorldCat by a machine algorithm, WLN records are being collected for more detailed analyses. After those analyses are completed, records that are not duplicates will be added along with holdings to WorldCat. Where duplicate records are identified, holdings from the WLN Member-contributed records will be added to the appropriate matching record in WorldCat.
II. WLN RID

The WLN RID in the 001 field and the WLN system control number (035) will not be retained in WorldCat records. A separate file containing the OCLC Control Number and matching WLN system control number is being created and maintained as processing proceeds. Therefore, when a bibliographic record is exported from WorldCat, it will not contain the WLN RID or the WLN system control number. However, when libraries order bibliographic records through the OCLC-MARC Subscription Service, the WLN system control number (035) can be added to the bibliographic records via the OCLC control number/WLN system control number matching file.

Submitted by: Sharon M. West, Director of Library Services, OCLC/WLN Pacific Northwest Service Center.

Marquette University Law Library Selected as an OCLC Featured Member Library

I was delighted to see that one of my own law libraries had been selected by OCLC in February as a Featured Member Library: Marquette University Law Library. The site includes several photographs of the library, as well as the library director. I would have liked to have seen a photo of Angelina Joseph, the cataloging librarian! You can get to the Featured Member Web site from the following URL: <http://www.oclc.org/oclc/membership/>

New FirstSearch

FirstSearch is in the process of being redesigned; the new FirstSearch is due to be introduced in August 1999. It will have an improved interface that will be completely different and separate from the existing FirstSearch Web, DOS-based or Electronic Collections Online interfaces. Electronic Collections Online (ECO), a full-text electronic database, will be integrated into the new FirstSearch to provide the flexibility to use the components on the system in a more seamless manner. In addition, administrative control over the access of these components will be more sophisticated. Account administrators will be able to control account characteristics such as: types of access provided to databases; full text, and interlibrary loan; default holdings displays; some settings within the search interface; and many aspects of the FirstSearch interlibrary loan form. For more information on the New FirstSearch, go to the following URL: <http://www.oclc.org/oclc/menu/fs_new.htm>

Bigger (and Better?) Institution Symbols

Because the number of OCLC participating libraries is over 33,000, all possible combinations of three-character institution identification symbols will soon be exhausted. As a result, OCLC will expand its identification symbols to between five and eight characters. Don’t fret, however, only new member and participating libraries will receive a code from the expanded system. Existing codes will be retained. The new codes will be formulated according to a revised scheme. The first two characters will be taken from the USMARC Code List for Countries; the next two characters will come from the name of the institution; the last character will be randomly assigned and will be either alphabetic or numeric.

Like to Teach?

With its success of the past two years, the OCLC Institute is ready to expand in order to reach a more geographically diverse audience. Therefore, OCLC is looking for qualified individuals to teach in its institutes. These individuals should “possess subject or technical expertise in an area of interest to the OCLC Institute and its users, have demonstrated presentation skills and experience, feel a strong dedication to ongoing education and knowledge exchange, share a future vision for knowledge management and want to contribute actively to its realization, and desire opportunities for personal and professional growth.” For more information, go to the following URL: <http://purl.org/oclc/institute/>

If you have an interest in pursuing this opportunity, please contact Erik Jul, associate director, OCLC Institute, at <jul@oclc.org> or 1-800-848-5878.
By the time you read this, the annual meeting in Washington will be imminent. So mark your calendar right now for the OBS/TS Research Roundtable meeting! It is on Sunday morning this year, from 7:30-9:00 AM. The Roundtable meeting time has been moved around every year, but I hope that won’t discourage our regular attendees, as well as all new attendees, from coming. We are a very informal group and we have an interesting discussion each year.

And this year, we have an added attraction! Frank Houdek, editor of Law Library Journal, has graciously agreed to come and speak with us. This column and the Roundtable meeting have often been used to advocate for the submission of more technical services articles to LLJ. Frank agrees and he will be able to discuss this with us in person. This topic came up when I was discussing my own idea for an LLJ article with Frank. So I can personally attest to his high level of interest and excellent suggestions for developing an article. In addition, Corinne Jacox, chair of the OBS/TS Joint Research Grant Committee, will be in attendance to report on the activity of the past year, grant-wise, and to answer any questions about how to apply.

SO COME TO THE ROUND-TABLE MEETING:

- if you want to learn more about and possibly submit something to LLJ;
- if you think you might want to publish (someday, even if not now);
- if you have published and want to share your experiences;
- if you want to find a co-author or refine an idea;
- or whatever—you get the point—just come for the great company and delicious refreshments! Check your program for the location and watch for reminder posts to the various e-lists.

Just a few more details about the joint research grant … don’t forget that the Joint Research Grant Committee is accepting applications until June 15, 1999! I hope you read the reports of the grants awarded last year in this column in the March 1999 issue of TSLL for inspiration. If not, do that right now! And contact Corinne Jacox <cjacox@uo.edu> if you have any questions. But don’t worry if you miss this year’s deadline, there’s always next year!

I have an audiotape from the American Library Association (ALA) annual meeting in June 1998. It is called Publish? Perish the Thought: Kickstarting Your Writing With LITA (LITA is Library & Information Technology Association, a division of ALA). The speakers cover some good points regarding where to publish and how to get started writing, among other things. Let me know if you would like to borrow the tape.

Yes, another plug for the AALL/ Matthew Bender Call for Papers competition! As a member of that Committee, I am thrilled to see some papers with technical services topics were submitted this year. It’s not too early to start planning for next year, so keep this avenue for publishing in mind. The deadline will likely be March 1st or thereabouts. And papers that are not selected as winning ones may be sent to Law Library Journal for consideration. Check AALLNET for more information.

As I write this in April, I am taking a course called “Communicating Effectively,” which is offered to IT workers here at the University at Buffalo. It is a 5-part course, of which I have only attended the first one so far. The focus is upon listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. I assume the parts about writing will be of most interest to the readers of this column, but as our instructor emphasized, writing actually involves all the other skills. Our instructor is Roger Stevenson, an English professor at Canisius College here in Buffalo.

Professor Stevenson has some interesting introductory things to say about writing. The stated focus is on business writing, as the intent of this course is to help our University staff communicate better as they perform in their jobs. But the tips already seem to be universal in terms of writing anything well. The presentation of writing as a process, rather than a product, makes a lot of sense to me. Professor Stevenson’s steps in the process include composing, revising, and editing. He advises us to get everything in our heads down on paper, in great detail. In his words, “stop stopping”—just keep writing whatever occurs to you, even if it’s not really related. It’s better to have a lot to pare down, than the reverse. Revising as a separate step from editing is rather a revelation to me, as I find myself editing constantly (probably the cataloger in me). I’ll try to write a report of the entire course after it concludes in late May.
OUR COLLEAGUES HAVE BEEN BUSY:


Mary Dzurinko led a workshop on library management systems on March 12, 1999, which was sponsored by LLAGNY. Joni Cassidy was a guest commentator.

Margie Axtmann and Melody Lembke contributed to the special feature “Meet My Mentor” section of the Winter 1999 issue of *Law Library Journal*.

Kevin Butterfield is the new “The Internet” contributing editor for *TSL*.


CURRENT PUBLISHING OPPORTUNITIES:

In the February 1999 issue of *The CRIV Sheet*, Richard Humphrey, *CRIV* editor, called for additional writers. Contact him at: <rhumphre@iupui.edu>.

Peter Beck, editor of *AALL Spectrum*, asked in the March and April 1999 issues that those interested in editing the “Chapter News” or “Committee News” column contact him at <pbeck@aall.org>.

The AALL Professional Development Committee is looking for ideas for electronic list discussions, publications, and distance learning. Contact Carol Avery Nicholson <Carol.Nicholson@unc.edu> for more information.

Linda Defendeifer is new columnist for *Against the Grain*, which addresses publishing mergers and acquisitions. Contact her with contributions at: <defendei@law.uiuc.edu> and include the subject line: ATG M&A [mm/yy] (month/year of your message).

A special issue of the *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, entitled “Information Science at the Millenium,” is scheduled to appear at the end of 2000. Contact guest editor, Terrence Brooks, at: <tabrooks@u.washington.edu> if you are interested in contributing.

*Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* is seeking “informed reviewers”. Contact Michael Carpenter, *CCQ*’s book review editor, <lscarp@lsu.edu>.

Papers are being sought for a special issue of *Archives and Museum Informatics*. The topic of the special issue is “Imaging, Visualization and Humanities Research” and the deadline for submission is June 30, 1999. See: <http://www.archimuse.com/publishing/armu.guide.html> or contact: J. Trant, editor-in-chief, <jtrant@archimuse.com>.

For all those planning to attend the North American Serials Interest Group (NASIG) annual conference at Carnegie Mellon in Pittsburgh, June 10-13, 1999, volunteer reporters for the NASIG *Newsletter* have been requested. Reports must be submitted by July 15, 1999. Contact: Maggie Horn <mehorn@csnvax.albany.edu> (As an aside, I attended the NASIG meeting last year in Boulder, CO, and enjoyed it very much. It’s inexpensive (especially if you stay in the dorms) casual, friendly, and extremely informative.)

News items are always needed for the “News From the Field” column of the *Journal of Internet Cataloging*. Contact: Gerry McKiernan <gerrymck@iastate.edu>.

A call for contributors was issued by the editors of *MC Journal: The Journal of Academic Media Librarianship*. See: <http://wings.buffalo.edu/publications/mcjrn1/> or contact: Lori Widzinski, editor, at <widz@acsu.buffalo.edu>. (I believe I have mentioned previously that I am on the editorial board of this journal. Submissions have been down recently and I would strongly encourage anyone thinking of publishing to consider this journal.)

Deadline for the next issue: August 30, 1999.

*VINE*, a journal covering IT applications in libraries and information services, is seeking contributions for a special issue on “Library Management Systems”, with a deadline of June 15, 1999. See: <http://agent.sbu.ac.uk/publications/vineaut.html> or contact: Andrew Cox at <coxam@sbu.ac.uk>.

For those of you who are ALCTS members (Association for Library Collections & Technical Services, a division of the American Library Association), you may want to consider the open invitation issued by *ALCTS Online Newsletter* editor, Dale Swensen. A new column, “Viewpoints,” is being created and it will include “thoughtful essays” on various topics. See: <http://www.alta.org/alccts_news/news/editor.html> for more information. (I would highly recommend reading this newsletter even if you are not a member of ALCTS or ALA. It’s full of reports of what activities general technical services librarians are concerned about and dealing with every day.)

A call for papers for the special millennium issue of *Information Resources Management Journal* has been issued. The deadline of May 1, 1999 for the special issue will have passed by the time you read this, but there is also a need for book reviews and case studies for this journal. See: <http://www.brint.com/irmj.htm> or contact: Yogesh Malhotra at: <ymalhotra@fau.edu>.

And just a general reminder: SIS and chapter newsletters almost always want/need contributions, so contact those editors, either with a specific idea in mind or a willingness to run with an idea they may already have in mind.

I’ll close the way I opened, with a reminder to attend the Research Roundtable meeting in Washington on Sunday, July 18, 1999. LeGrande Fletcher and I are its co-coordinators and we hope to see you there! As always, thank you for reading this column. Please contact me if you have comments or questions.
The following serial title changes were recently identified by the University of San Diego Legal Research Center serials staff and the University of California, Berkeley Law Library cataloging staff:

**Serials**

Christina Tarr  
University of California, Berkeley  
ctarr@library.berkeley.edu

Margaret McDonald  
University of San Diego  
maggiemc@acusd.edu

---

**AsiaLaw**
-v. 10, issue 8 (Oct. 1998)  
(OCoLC 28689996)

With Nov. 1998 issue, **absorbed by:**  
*International financial law review*  
(OCoLC 8442665)

**Asian Pacific American law journal**
Vol. 2, no. 1 (fall 1994)  
(OCoLC 32506284)

**Changed to:**
*UCLA Asian Pacific American law journal*
Vol. 3, no. 1 (fall 1995)-  
(OCoLC 36687123)

**Brandeis journal of family law**
Vol. 36, no. 1 (winter issue 1997-98)  
v. 36, no. 4 (fall issue 1997-98)  
(OCoLC 38983641)

**Changed to:**
*Brandeis law journal*
Vol. 37, no. 1 (fall issue 1998-99)-  
(OCoLC 40966999)

**California. Civil Code.**
*West’s California codes, civil code.* - Compact ed.  
1979-1998  
(OCoLC 4748587)

**Changed to:**
*California. Civil Code.*  
*California civil code.* - Desktop ed.  
1999-  
(OCoLC 40562740)

**California. Code of Civil Procedure.**
*West’s California codes, civil procedure.* - Compact ed.  
1978-1998  
(OCoLC 3702186)

**Changed to:**
*California code of civil procedure.* - Desktop ed.  
1999-  
(OCoLC 40562986)

**California. Corporations Code.**
*West’s California codes, corporations code.* - Compact ed.  
1981-1998  
(OCoLC 7215562)

**Changed to:**
*California. Corporations Code.*  
*California corporations code.* - Desktop ed.  
1999-  
(OCoLC 40562745)

**California. Evidence Code.**
*West’s California codes. Evidence code.* - Compact ed.  
1999-  
(OCoLC 6006315)

**Changed to:**
*California. Evidence Code.*  
*California evidence code.* - Desktop ed.  
1999-  
(OCoLC 40562725)

**California. Penal Code of California.**
*West’s California codes, penal code.* - Compact ed.  
1978-1998  
(OCoLC 3702167)

**Changed to:**
*California. Penal Code of California.*  
*California penal code.* - Desktop ed.  
1999-  
(OCoLC 40562748)

**California. Probate Code.**
*West’s California codes, probate code.* - Compact ed.  
1980-1998  
(OCoLC 6006661)

**Changed to:**
*California. Probate Code.*  
*California probate code.* - Desktop ed.  
1999-  
(OCoLC 40562728)

**California. Uniform Commercial Code.**
*West’s California codes, commercial code.* - Compact ed.  
1990-1998  
(OCoLC 21176880)

**Changed to:**
*California. Uniform Commercial Code.*  
*California commercial code annotated.* - Desktop ed.  
1999-  
(OCoLC 40562764)

**California. West’s California juvenile laws and court rules**  
1990-1998  
(OCoLC 22713421)

**Changed to:**
*California. California juvenile laws and rules*  
1999-  
(OCoLC 40810624)
Clark Boardman Callaghan’s directory of law office management software 1992-1997  
(OCoLC 26116616)  
Changed to:  
West Group’s ... directory of law office management software 1998  
(OCoLC 39697024)  
Changed to:  
Directory of law office management software 1998-  
(OCoLC 39281387)  

Detroit College of Law at Michigan State University  
entertainment & sports law journal  
(OCoLC 35104886)  
Changed to:  
Entertainment and sports lawyer (East Lansing, Mich.) Vol. 4, no. 1 (fall 1998)-  
(OCoLC 40817957)  

Journal of limited liability companies  
(Vol. 1, no. 1 (summer 1994)-v. 5, no. 3 (winter 1998)  
(OCoLC 30385661)  
Merged with:  
Journal of partnership taxation  
Vol. 1, no. 1 (spring 1984)-v. 15, no. 4 (winter 1999)  
(OCoLC 10586016), and:  
Journal of S corporation taxation  
Vol. 1, no. 1 (summer 1989)-v. 10, no. 3 (winter 1999)  
(OCoLC 20025562)  
To form:  
Business entities Jan./Feb. 1999-  
(OCoLC 40808909)  

Law office economics and management  
(OCoLC 1755604)  
Changed to:  
The lawyers competitive edge: the journal of law office economics and management  
Vol. 1, no. 1 (Jan. 1999)-  
(OCoLC 40247981)  

Loyola consumer law reporter  
Vol. 1, no. 1 (fall 1988)-v. 9, no. 4 (1997)  
(OCoLC 18790210)  
Changed to:  
Loyola consumer law review Vol. 10, no. 1 (1998)-  
(OCoLC 38987691)  

RLIN focus  
(OCoLC 27463509)  
Changed to:  
RLG focus  
Issue 35 (Dec. 1998)-  
(OCoLC 40625928)  

(OCoLC 34276347)  
Changed to:  
CSG state directory. Directory I, Elective officials 1998-  
(OCoLC 38543050)  

State leadership directory. Directory II, State legislative leadership, committees & staff 1996-1997  
(OCoLC 34672304)  
Changed to:  
CSG state directory. Directory II, Legislative leadership, committees & staff 1998-  
(OCoLC 39207786)  

(OCoLC 35031978)  
Changed to:  
CSG state directory. Directory III, Administrative officials 1998-  
(OCoLC 39281387)  

Taxation for lawyers  
(OCoLC 27463509)  
Merged with:  
Taxation for accountants  
(OCoLC 1767177)  
To form:  
Practical tax strategies  
Vol. 61, no. 5 (Nov. 1998)-  
(OCoLC 40358195)  

The following serial cessations were identified by the University of San Diego Legal Research Center serials staff and the University of California, Berkeley Law Library acquisitions staff:  

CIS federal register index  
(OCoLC 10139759)  

The corporation journal  
Ceased with: v. 32, no. 14 (fall 1996)  
(OCoLC 1565169)  

The federal labor-management and employee relations consultant  
Ceased with: 98-5 (June 15, 1998)  
(OCoLC 11061386)  

Inter-American legal materials  
Ceased with: v. 8, no. 1-2 (1997)  
(OCoLC 9264568)  

Quarterly (Christian Legal Society)  
Ceased with: v. 18, no. 2 (spring 1997)  
(OCoLC 9012690)
In February 1999 the Library of Congress began coding form subdivisions with the USMARC code $v, a subfield code for subject headings approved some years ago by MARBI. Marie Whited, as AALL’s official representative to the ALA ALCTS/CCS Subject Analysis Committee (SAC), reported on this as an upcoming development in the last issue of TSLL. Now it is a reality, and judging from recent comments posted to AUTOCAT, libraries everywhere that use LC cataloging copy have decided to also implement the $v subfield code. Let’s take a little time to examine how the new code should be used, and answer some questions that have come up. First, it might be useful to read a definition of form data, as described by a SAC Subcommittee, and presented at the “Educational Forum on LCSH and Subfield v,” held last January during the ALA Midwinter meeting:

“Form data are those terms and phrases that designate specific kinds or genres of materials. Materials designated with these terms or phrases may be determined by an examination of:

- their physical character (e.g., videocassettes, photographs, maps, broadsides);
- the particular type of data that they contain (e.g., bibliographies, questionnaires, statistics);
- the arrangement of information within them (e.g., diaries, outlines, indexes);
- the style, technique, purpose, or intended audience (e.g., drama, romances, cartoons, commercials, popular works);
- or a combination of the above (e.g., scores).

A single term may be modified by other terms, in which case the whole phrase is considered to be form data (e.g., aerial photographs, French dictionaries, conversation and phrase books, wind ensemble suites, telephone directories,vellum bound books, science fiction).”

This is a generalized definition, not restricted to LCSH terms, and in fact, it is applicable to form headings as well as form subdivisions. Which brings us to our first question: Is LC going to be using the USMARC 655 tag, instead of 650, for form headings now? (An example of a form heading is “Law reports, digests, etc.”) No, not at this point. Only subject subdivisions are affected by new coding right now.

Apart from using the criteria shown above, are there other ways in which we can determine if a subdivision should be coded as form? Yes, you can use two of the same tools you’ve always used for verifying subject headings. One way is to check in your online version of the LC Subject Authorities. Here you will find new records for subject subdivisions, in 18X fields, with a 680-tagged field explaining how the subdivision is used. If it is a form subdivision, the tag and code will be 185 $v; but if it is considered a topical subdivision, it will be coded as 180 $x. Here is an example of one of the new records, for a form subdivision:

```
010     sh 99001405
040     IEN $b eng $c DLC
005     19990225091848.7
073     H 1140 $z lcsh
185     $v Commercial treaties
480     $x Commerce $v Treaties
585     $v Treaties $w g
680     $i Use as a form subdivision under names of countries, etc., for collections of commercial treaties of those places.
```

Another way to determine if your subdivision is form or topical is to look it up in the Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings (SCM:SH). The Library of Congress has updated the instruction sheets for free-floating subdivisions and for subdivisions controlled by pattern headings. In this manual, subdivisions that once were coded $x (topical) which now should be coded $v (form) have been indicated by a diamond-mark, ♦, to the left of the subdivision. However, by the time you read this, the SCM:SH 1999 Update no. 1 (spring 1999) should have arrived. The diamond-mark designation will no longer be used; instead, you will see the actual subfield code for all listed subdivisions. Here is an example, from SCM:SH 1154.5, for subdivisions used under Legal Topics headings:

```
$v Cases
$x Codification
$x Compliance costs (May Subd Geog)
$x Criminal provisions
$v Digests
$v Forms
$x Interpretation and construction
$x Language
$x Legal research
$x Legislative history
$v Popular works
$x Research (May Subd Geog)
$x Trial practice
```
(The 11th ed. of *Free Floating Subdivisions: An Alphabetical Index* is also being printed with the subfield codes added.) A simple analysis of the above subdivisions should convince us that the form (SV-coded) subdivisions represent what the work is, while the topical ones are used to show what the work is about. But wait, you might say, doesn’t “—Legislative history” represent a particular kind or genre of material (i.e., compilations of texts of acts, public hearings, committee reports, etc.)? Most of the time, yes, the subdivision is used that way. However, LC has announced that, since the subdivision contains the word “history,” they wish to be consistent with the practice being used for “—History” and for “—History and criticism,” which are both being coded as SX topical subdivisions. The SCM:SH 1999 Update no. 1 subsequently shows the “—Legislative history” subdivision with a $x subfield code.

Form subdivisions always come at the end of the LCSH string, right? Not necessarily. There are some reasonable constructions where a topical subdivision must follow the form subdivision, to make the heading unambiguous. A common example is a dictionary (form) which is in a language other than that of the cataloging agency, e.g.:

Law SV Dictionaries SX German.

Both SAC and MARBI addressed this and other special situations when a separate coding for form data was initially proposed. Another question often asked was: what about those times when a term most often used as a form is actually the topic of the work being cataloged? (An example might be: “Law schools—Statistics” for a discussion of statistics about law schools, not a compilation of the actual statistics.) The guideline we are to use is: code the subdivision for its function, not for its wording or its position in the string. LC will be creating two separate authority records for subdivisions that can often be used either way, one coded 180 SX and the other coded 185 SV. There are other instances where the “coding follows function.” In the next example, the second heading clearly deals with treaties as a topic, while the work represented by the first heading actually contains the texts of the treaties:

Indians of North America SV Treaties
Indians of North America SX Treaties SX History

Hmm ... very interesting, but ... does this mean that “—Law and legislation” under topics, and “—Legal status, laws, etc.” under classes of persons or ethnic groups will be coded SX when the work is about the law, but SV when the work contains the text(s) of the law? No. At the moment, LC has decided that these two subdivisions should be coded as SX (topical), which is thought to be the predominant characteristic of works for which the subdivisions have been used. It is possible that LC will consider adding an additional subdivision for form (perhaps “—Sources,” or “—Texts,” or ????) to such headings, when the work consists of or has substantial texts of laws, but LC would like to hear what the AALL suggests on this matter.

(Please consult your reference librarians, and be prepared to discuss this at the TS-SIS cataloging committee and roundtable meetings this summer in Washington. Or, ask the chair of the Cataloging & Classification Committee if there will be a Working Group to study these issues, and volunteer to be a member!)

Why bother? Some catalogers have complained that this creates extra work, but results in no obvious improvements for subject access. This is a shortsighted view. The idea is that, if we provide the means — the SV coding — for the systems designers, then our OPAC’s can be programmed to show the distinction of form/genre data, and new search templates can be developed to make it easier for end-users to access this data. Reference librarians, particularly at public and music libraries, feel that our current state of subject access too often fails for the many patrons who request materials based on form or genre. There is an expectation that academic and other types of special libraries will also benefit from this innovation. And, as one panelist said at the aforementioned Educational Forum, “You are already doing the intellectual work of assigning form; now you have the tool (subfield SV) to designate it.”
SUMMARY OF THIS YEAR’S OBS SURVEY

Brian Striman
University of Nebraska - Lincoln
Bstriman1@unl.edu

General Background
Seventeen percent response. Chocolates as incentive. 314 surveys mailed out—54 returned: 5 firms; 3 county; 1 government military; 1 state; 2 law society libraries; and the rest of the surveys from academics. Job duties of those who responded were: 23 administrators/heads of tech services; 20 catalogers/serials/authority control; 2 collection development; 2 reference; 1 webmaster; and, 5 were a mix of everything. Length of years of librarianship for those responding was: 4 (1-3yrs); 6 (4-6yrs); 3 (7-9yrs); 7 (10-13yrs); 24 (13-19yrs); and 13 (20-50yrs)—the rest didn’t fill in that category. Utility: 38 OCLC/WLN; 7 RLIN; 2 A-G Canada. Database/Local system: 25 Innovative Interfaces; 5 Notis; 4 SIRSI/Unicorn; 2 Endeavor/Voyager; 2 EOS International-Professional; 2 Best Seller; 1 Dynix/Ameritech; 1 DRA; 1 Sydney Plus; 1 Horizon; 1 InMagic; 1 Total Library Computerization.

Investigate Merging With TS SIS
33 Yes, investigate; 14 Don’t investigate; 7 unsure. Summary of comments representing OBS members who want to investigate OBS merger with TS:

Advantages of Merging
⊕ It would save dues money for AALL members who feel the need to have representation in both TS and OBS.
⊕ We would have a stronger, more consistent “track” for educational programs and services, since now it’s difficult to differentiate between OBS and TS topics and services.
⊕ Wouldn’t spread ourselves so thin trying to manage the two similar SIS’s.
⊕ Meeting participants wouldn’t have to give or listen to identical committee reports during the business meetings.
⊕ The “systems aspects” of tech services is so pervasive that we can no longer view it as unique enough to be treated as a separate issue.

Disadvantages of Merging
⊕ We’ve dealt with this two times before and each time membership has voted not to merge with TS. How many times do we have to go down this road?
⊕ It would reduce the resources currently available to members who are not technical services “types” but who are interested in local systems, and other technologies which interface with law libraries.
⊕ It would reduce the number of potential AALL educational programs and services in technical services areas by forcing OBS topics into the larger (more cumbersome?) TS/SIS.
⊕ It would reduce another tech services related “voice” at the SIS Council and for other leadership roles in AALL.
⊕ It would reduce the number of opportunities for tech services and others who may not be tech services librarians (but share online library database activities and interests) to hold an office.
⊕ It would add several more layers to TS/SIS, making meetings even more crowded and business meetings even more pressed for time—it’s already become too full. TS already has too many subgroups.
⊕ It would reduce the total amount of revenue that could be spent on technical services related projects and disbursements for what used to be OBS meetings, special mailings, and educational programs. As a whole, law tech services librarians would lose a certain amount of potential spending money on themselves for professional development if OBS is dissolved—e.g. the shared grant monies for the OBS/TS Joint Research Grant Committee.
⊕ OBS has enough uniqueness to keep it separate from TS.

Idea!! — provide an open forum meeting time for OBS and TS membership at AALL in DC or Philadelphia, for face-to-face discussion the pros and cons of merging. Also, before any merging with TS, we need a pre-determined goal first.

General OBS Comments
♦ OBS should push for more complete system coverage, where circ and reference and administrators can turn to for programs and services that help them keep abreast with system developments.
♦ OBS should be more proactive: things like getting OCLC to FULLY support and implement the rules and guidelines for LC’s Rules for the Description of Loose-Leaf Publications.

OBS AALL Educational Programs
I know you’ve read Janet McKinney’s TS survey results in the March TSLL. There are some program ideas in her list that could fall into the OBS arena. This is not new, in fact each year OBS and TS sponsored programs have had some overlapping topic areas.
Below is a bulleted listing of program ideas in the OBS survey. Each of these ideas will be reviewed and discussed as soon as Brian sends them to Ellen McGrath (the OBS Education Chair). Then we can further make decisions at the OBS Education Committee meeting in DC. If you proposed a possible program, you may be contacted to fine-tune the proposal either before July 17th or sometime during or after the DC annual meeting.

Before listing the actual OBS programs, below are some OBS program “concept” statements that were found. These can be addressed by the OBS Education Committee for some kind of report to the OBS Chair for further discussion by the OBS Executive Board.

Program “Concept” Statements — Big Picture Stuff

- Do we want issue oriented programming that generates debate and proposes solutions, or vocational programming which imparts specific skills to the membership, or both? If we want to focus on vocational programs, then we need more hands-on laboratorv settings rather than podiums and talking heads at annual meetings.
- We should address updating librarians’ MLS degrees. We could look at SLA and ASIS offerings. It would be nice to see a rebirth of research in technical services as one focus as well as balancing the digital and print emphasis.
- OBS needs to have continuing programs on comparisons of local systems. This should be a yearly program with librarians discussing why they chose their new local system or chose to remain with their present system as it moves forward with enhancements. Perhaps a contributor for a TSLL column to keep us up to date on this OBS-related topic. [Striman note: the March/April 1999 issue of Library Systems is devoted to an “Annual Survey of Automated Library System Vendors...” published by Library Technology Reports, ALA — and would be the type of spring-board for a comparison kind of OBS program].
- OBS should consider developing and producing OBS programs which could be used as “packets” for members to use in regional meetings: using videotapes, audiotapes, print outlines, overhead materials, etc. for program road shows. This would be valuable for law librarians who aren’t able to come to the annual AALL meetings.
- The 5 program topics listed in the OBS survey are ranked below with the most desirable as #1 and least as #5:
  #1 Integrating the electronic library; dept. coordination, workflow issues, collection development, choosing electronic resources to catalog, maintenance of URL links, review of contents.
  #2 Maintenance and quality control of the local database while facing constant change, cutbacks, shortages of staff and growing demands of our time away from our duties.
  #3 Multiple versions in the online catalog.
  #4 Adding call numbers from the most recent LCC to OCLC/RLIN bibliographic records.
  #5 Cataloging tools interfacing bibliographic utilities, such as the Cataloger’s Desktop, and FTP to-and-from the local system.

Other OBS Program Ideas — not in any order.

- Core competencies (Phyllis Post is already working on this).
- Integrating the electronic library. — “OBS should put a lot of energy into this.”
- Information Architecture: Phase two—how are libraries doing it? This would be good for AALL in 2000. A follow-up on the Information Architecture program in DC.
- Reclassification of JX: panel of librarians who’ve “done it good.”
- Systems and procedures for small to mid-size law firms.
- Collection development and electronic format: maintenance, cataloging, procedures and policies, and other issues.
- Using the Web to help with collection development.
- OPAC and patron use interface: getting a handle on what’s confusing to patrons who use our OPACs: from reading bibliographic, checkin, course reserve and item records, to using full-text databases and launching to Web sites via the Internet.
- OPAC versus the Homepage.
- Second generation migration problems.
- MFHL MARC format for holdings and data: what is it? who’s using it?
- Migration from one local system to a new one: planning and implementation and evaluation.
- Client-server issues: Z39.50 (this could be addressed by holding a teleconference-type workshop).
- Interlibrary Loan and bib utilities and local systems.
- Database maintenance issues as a result of changes in AACR2rev.
- Automating and developing the OPAC: for small libraries.
- Cataloging issues for non-OCLC libraries.
- Multiple versions: what it means for our patrons and for our online bibliographic system/s.
- Digitalization: developing a digital library collection.
- Systems fulfillment of aims of cataloging rules and OPAC displays.
- Metadata: law library applications: update and other issues such as staffing and standards. Good AALL 2000 follow-up program from the more introductory program that was in DC.
- Electronic library issues: panel of librarians who have developed policies and procedures that work.
- Refreshed introductory cataloging for new law catalogers.

Previously Proposed OBS AALL Programs

9 OBS members reported that they proposed programs in the past 5 years. Brian has their names and will put them in the OBS Chair manual so we can begin to have a listing of “idea generators” who have proposed OBS programs.

Most Pressing Need & How OBS Can Better Serve Its Members — not in any order

- Need a *M*A*S*H* unit version of OBS/TS for law firm libraries.
OBS act as a liason/voice to-and-from the bib utilities.
- OBS be a conduit for highlighting information by siting out important information to share from the overwhelming mass of information about vendors, systems, etc.
- OBS provide a forum for introducing and discussing new trends and issues for online bibliographic services, like an information clearing house.
- Provide contacts with other colleagues.
- I liked this one, so I’ll quote it. “I want standardized, accepted multiple version format and I want it now. We keep kicking this around but it doesn’t seem to be normal or standard. I’m at a loss how to implement this and what MARC tags/fields are involved.”
- Provide more information on capabilities of local systems.
- Give members more information about OPAC design and issues.
- Provide more information on OPAC design and issues.
- Provide more contacts with the higher-ups in OCLC.
- Keep members more informed about changes in technology and better ways to use our local systems.
- Share information via continuing education with members on new trends in metadata, the Web, networking.
- More programs and articles in TSLL about system functions (other than cataloging).

Miss Manager (continued from page 1)

big picture. Where to begin? It is a truth almost universally acknowledged that you must look at the situation in your own library without expecting it to be just like the situations in other libraries; but that is only a partial truth. We in the Technical Services field have been particularly good about sharing our resources no matter what our individual idiosyncrasies: cataloging records from centralized databases (whether cards from LC or electronic records from OCLC or RLIN), how-to manuals passed freely or published on Web pages, or the tell-tale signs of procedures evident in another library’s online catalog. Miss Manager would like to suggest a six-step procedure for analyzing and fixing your workflow (and she does this despite her loathing of the self-help-book-of-the-month approach that it suggests; but observe that Miss Manager is not making any assertions about the efficacy of this procedure for making you wealthy, slender, or alluring).

1. Read what is available in library-related writings on workflow or workplace efficiency. This is unfortunately an imperfectly-defined research area, and it is still tricky to navigate around the terminology. Just as an example, the following titles showed up in a search in the Library Literature database at FirstSearch using the subject term “workflow”:
   - “OCLC and Innovative Interfaces, Inc.: a Passport connection.” (workflow of the authority section at the University of Oregon Library): OCLC Systems & Services v. 11 no2 (“95) p. 16-19.

   “Keep them doggies rollin’” or, Using series authority records to improve cataloging and processing workflow.” (at Trinity University; workshop report from the 1994 NASIG Conference) The Serials Librarian v. 25 no3-4 (“95) p. 277-81.

2. Read what is available in general and business publications on workplace efficiency or workflow. These will not be specifically devoted to libraries, but there may be some good general principles that could be applied to our kind of work. The caveat here is that there will be more chaff and less wheat.

   In both steps 1 and 2, it may be worth posting a question on your favorite technical services listserv to ask whether others have come across particularly helpful articles or books or Web resources on the subject of workflow or workplace efficiency. You may end up with not only a list of helpful resources, but the beginning of a great bibliography on the subject you can share with the rest of us!

3. Theories are fine, of course, but you have to ride the horse you have, not the one you want. Go public with your needs: put out a question on the TS listserv, spell out what your problem is and ask for advice. Look at the Technical Services manuals from other libraries (especially libraries with similar staff sizes and the same ILS) to get new ideas or to “test drive” a procedure you haven’t done before.

4. Get advice from individual colleagues whom you find to be particularly good at some activity. If Adelle is
clearly a very knowledgeable Acquisitions Librarian who seems to have a real handle on dealing with egregious publishing practices, ask for advice. If Bernice’s department puts out 100 more cataloging records per month than yours of the same size, see if Bernice will share some of her secrets with you. Most people will not go out of their way to proclaim their own expertise but are perfectly happy to share it if they are asked.

5. Bring the new ideas home to your Department. Get input first of all from the staff who will be affected by any changes. Ask for their advice (really do ask for advice; don’t give them the impression that you have a done deal in hand and that you are just going through the motions of getting their input).

6. Compile all of the theories and individual suggestions into a definite plan for doing things in your department, that is, write up a new workflow. Then try it. Tinker with it, toss it out and start over, ask for follow up advice, and share your experiences with your colleagues.

Miss Manager is aware of the burden this activity will place on anyone who tries it. The unfortunate truth about looking at workflow or any other big-picture activity is that it must be done in the midst of keeping up with all the individual details that go into the day of a Technical Services Librarian. Even if you were to find a ready-made plan that sounds too good to fail, you will still have to tailor it to the needs of your own library. But if enough of us work on the problem and share our successes and pitfalls, we will make life easier on ourselves and earn the gratitude of future Technical Services managers.

Dear Miss Manager:

I am in a dilemma! I am the head of a Technical Services Department in an academic law library. Six months ago the law school hired a new library director. This was done without input from anybody in Technical Services. The new director is a very prominent scholar, but he doesn’t know very much about the inner workings of the library. He seems to be completely uninterested in the work we do in Technical Services. Morale is low, and our work is beginning to suffer; but no one outside the department seems to care! Do I do something to correct this problem before it gets worse; or do I live with it and not raise any issues that will get us into a worse position?

Sincerely,
Nervous in New England

Dear Nervous,

Before getting to the specifics of your case, Miss Manager would just like to make clear that at least in some law schools things need not have reached this point. That is to say you might have forestalled some of this current difficulty by both giving some input into the decision on a new director and working with the new director soon after he began. Miss Manager is not one to insinuate anything on scant evidence, but is there some fault on your own side here? As a department head you have a responsibility to make it clear that the work your department does is important to the mission of the whole library and the whole law school. If that work is unknown outside your department, who will come to such an understanding spontaneously? One need not go to tacky extremes; one need only engage in an occasional conversation with patrons (law students and professors), have a good working relationship with other library departments and with your director.

It may very well be that your director is an utter ogre and would like to eliminate the whole department and hire trained chimpanzees to do what he assumes must be such unimportant work, in which case you should despair. But, if he is merely ignorant about the value of the work being done in the department, your first attempt should be to educate him. It may not be best to do this with a memo. The written word can sometimes be too sharp, even if sharpness is not meant. Try to discuss the matter with him face-to-face, in a friendly and enthusiastic way. Don’t try to change his mind all at once.

First, introduce him to the idea of the work in Technical Services and its impact on the rest of the library. A nice chart or a sample of some significant statistics, attractively presented, may be in order here; or route him an appropriate article that highlights some significant element in TS that you would like to emphasize. Then ask him to lunch or for a brief (15-minute) meeting to discuss. Never assume an air of superior knowledge in all of this. Remember that you know more about TS than he does, but also remember that esoterica will not impress him. Procedures that will make his library work better will.

Secondly, send him an occasional email (don’t inundate him!) with an interesting web site or with some brief message about a current TS concern. This will help to keep him aware of TS issues as he is going through his day and juggling all the other concerns in his director’s life (which are plenty). Do you have a good working relationship with your Public Services colleagues? If not, that may be an even more fundamental place to begin making the same educative effort. If you do have a good rapport with your reference and circulation friends, induce them to emphasize as subtly as possible the value they place on good TS work. If your director is very public services-oriented, this may make him take notice.

Some people would call all of this “public relations.” Miss Manager eschews that terminology. It has the odor of the advertising agency with all of its reliance on visceral persuasion and duplicity. Miss Manager prefers to think that the honest presentation of facts politely delivered will do much more to earn the true respect of those who are merely unaware of the good work going on in your department.

Dear Miss Manager:

Why is it that you sometimes end your sentences with prepositions? I find this to be grammatically offensive.

Sincerely,
Picayune in Pennsylvania

Dear Picky,

Miss Manager is tempted to reply more pointedly than a well-bred lady should. She will therefore quote Mr. Churchill’s famous rejoinder to a similar complaint directed toward him: “That is the kind of English up with which I will not put.” Besides, if Jane Austen does it, it cannot be wrong. ☞
# OBS & TS at the Crossroads: An AALL Conference Schedule

Looking for some good programs or helpful meetings at the annual meeting? You're in luck. There are plenty! So get out your schedules and make sure you mark the following:

**Saturday, July 17:**
- 4:00-5:00 p.m.  
  TS 1998/1999 Executive Board Meeting
- 4:00-6:00 p.m.  
  OBS 1998/1999 Board Meeting
- 6:00-7:30 p.m.  
  TS/OBS/RIPS/CS-SIS Joint Reception

**Sunday, July 18:**
- 7:30-8:30 a.m.  
  Preservation Committee Meeting
- 7:30-9:00 a.m.  
  OBS/TS Open Research Roundtable
- 11:45-12:45 p.m.  
  TS Education Committee Meeting
- 2:30-3:45 p.m.  
  Crosswalks to Information Management: Metadata — What is it? Who is Using it? How is it Being Used? (Program B-6)
- 4:00-5:00 p.m.  
  Information Architecture for the World Wide Web (Program C-2)
- 5:00-6:15 p.m.  
  TS Business Meeting

**Monday, July 19:**
- 7:00-8:30 a.m.  
  Cataloging and Classification Committee Meeting (TS)
  Local Systems Committee Open Discussion (OBS)
- 7:30-8:30 a.m.  
  Acquisitions Committee Meeting (TS)
- 10:15-11:30 a.m.  
  Preservation at the Crossroads: A Debate Between the Traditional World of Print and the Brave New World of Digital (Program D-7)
- 2:00-3:15 p.m.  
  Loose-leafs at the Crossroads: Redefining Seriality (Program E-7)
- 4:45-6:00 p.m.  
  Collection Development Roundtable (TS)
- 4:45-6:15 p.m.  
  OBS Business Meeting
- 4:45-6:45 p.m.  
  Cataloging and Classification Roundtable (TS)
- 5:45-6:45 p.m.  
  Preservation Roundtable (TS)

**Tuesday, July 20:**
- 7:00-8:30 a.m.  
  OBS 1999/2000 Board Meeting
- 7:30-8:30 a.m.  
  Heads of TS Roundtable (TS)
- 12:45-2:00 p.m.  
  OBS Education Committee
- 1:00-2:00 p.m.  
  Exchange of Duplicates Committee Meeting (TS)
  Serials Committee Meeting (TS)
- 1:00-2:30 p.m.  
  Binding Roundtable (TS)
- 2:15-3:30 p.m.  
  Cataloging A La Carte Part I (Program H-6)
- 3:45-4:45 p.m.  
  Cataloging A La Carte Part II (Program I-6)
- 5:00-6:00 p.m.  
  Acquisitions Roundtable (TS)
  Heads of Cataloging in Large Law Libraries (TS)
  OCLC Committee Open Discussion (OBS)
  RLIN Committee Open Discussion (OBS)
  TSLL Board Meeting

**Wednesday, July 21:**
- 7:30-8:30 a.m.  
  TS 1999/2000 Executive Board Meeting
- 8:30-10:00 a.m.  
  Classifying International Legal Materials by Using Library of Congress Classification (Program J-6)
- 10:15-11:45 a.m.  
  The Smaller Law Library at the Automation Crossroads: Is It Time for an Integrated System? (Program K-3)
  The Internet in Technical Services: Crossroads of Opportunity? (Program K-7)
- 1:30-2:45 p.m.  
  Collection Development Policies for Electronic Format Materials (Program L-5)
**Cataloging**  
Tuesday, July 20, 2:15-4:45 p.m.  
Coordinator: William Benemann  
H-6 & I-6 “Cataloging A La Carte”

**Welcome to the Real World:** For the last two years (at least!) catalogers attending the AALL Annual Meeting have expressed their dissatisfaction with the standard meeting format. It is a challenge for both speakers and listeners to have a productive exchange of information about cataloging minutiae when the presenters are on a raised dais at the end of a chilly, cavernous room, and the attendees are really interested in only one part of a three-speaker panel.

In Washington D.C. this summer, catalogers will have a chance to try out an alternative — actually, they will be able to try out two of four alternatives — in a program called *Cataloging a la Carte*. We will be presenting four small seminars, running concurrently:

**Linking Globally, Coping Locally: an 856 Field Guide**  
(Karen Selden, University of Colorado, and Mary Stouse, Howard University)  
You see 856 fields in cataloging copy. You read about them in the literature. They are discussed at conferences and on electronic mailing lists. But how do you get them to work in your catalog and serve your users? Gear up for some practical advice on how to edit MARC 856 fields to create usable and useful displays of Internet access information for your local catalog. Through discussion and practical exercises, learn about the most commonly used indicators and subfields, hear the latest on recent and proposed changes, and explore the display constraints (and the associated editing implications) imposed by automation vendors. In addition, information about broader policy considerations, link maintenance strategies, and PURLs will be provided.

**Aggregator Aggravation: Cataloging Issues and Challenges of Electronic Serial Aggregators**  
(Jeanne Baker, University of Maryland, Jean Hirons, Library of Congress, and Jean Pajerek, Cornell)  
Your library has just purchased access to a large database of full text journals. The titles are added and dropped and information changes monthly. Now what? What are your options? How can you best provide access to the titles?

**When What They Want Is What It Is: Genre Terms and Subfield V**  
(William Benemann, University of California, Berkeley)  
Can your patrons search for an official gazette when they don’t know its name? Can they separate popular self-help law books from weighty academic treatises? Can they distinguish between a legal bibliography and book about legal bibliography? This seminar will explore the use of 6xx subfield v and genre terms as two ways of providing a new dimension of access to your collection.

**Content vs Carrier: What Are We Trying to Catalog?**  
(Joan Swaneckamp, Yale)  
Is it a CD-ROM? Or is it a serial? Or is it both? And what do you do now? Almost 20 years after the introduction of AACR2 we are still dealing with the conflict between content and physical carrier, and the introduction of electronic formats has only added to the complexity. The seminar will explore the various solutions being considered to make the cataloging code respond to the wide range of materials now entering library collections.

Each seminar will be presented twice on Tuesday, July 20th: first from 2:15 to 3:30, and then again from 3:45 to 4:45. Catalogers will be able to select two items from the menu and join in a small group, intensive exploration of a very specific topic — light on theory, heavy of practical solutions. Bring examples of your worst cataloging nightmares and get the benefit of a hands-on session with the experts.

---

**Tech Services and the Web**  
Wednesday, July 21, 10:15-11:45 a.m.  
Coordinator/Moderator: Janet McKinney  

By now, we’ve developed our lists of favorite Web sites. When I wrote the proposal for this program, I envisioned it being much more than just a demonstration of those favorite sites. While we each might be missing a treasure by being unaware of a particular site, I thought it more important to move beyond that list of favorites to a discussion of how using the Internet has changed what we do in technical services. I wondered if the program attendees and I might learn even better methods of incorporating Internet resources into our daily work. And, I wondered if incorporating the Internet as much as possible into our daily work is really advantageous, or whether we’re just overly enamored with the technology. Pam Deemer, Mary Jane Kelsey, and Marla Schwartz will discuss the Internet in technical services from the cataloging, department head, and acquisitions/serials/collection development points-of-view, respectively.

**Loose-Leafs**  
Monday, July 19, 2:00-3:15 p.m.  
Coordinator: Ann Sitkin  
E-7: “Loose-Leafs at the Crossroads: Redefining Seriality”

The traditional ways we’ve treated serials and monographs are being redefined. Electronic publications are making rethink our traditional bibliographic treatments. The 1997 International Conference on the Principles and Future Development of AACR recommended examining proposals to redefine serials as “ongoing publications.” Come get an update on what this means for traditional and electronic publications.

A roundtable discussion will follow -- from 3:30 to 4:30. This will be a great opportunity for discussion. Come with questions.
Smaller Law Libraries
Wednesday, July 21, 1999, 10:15-11:45 a.m.
Coordinator: John P. Bissett
K-3 “The Smaller Law Library at the Information Crossroads: Is It Time for an Integrated System?”

You want an online library system, but your budget is small and you’re all alone. Is online the best solution? What questions should you ask, and of whom? The library systems market includes a large field of competitors, with widely varying features, capabilities, and prices. Focusing on the right questions is the first hurdle, getting clear reliable answers, the second. A consultant/librarian, Joni Cassidy of Cassidy Cataloging Services, will identify some key questions, suggest directions, and point out pitfalls, and a law firm librarian who has directed automation projects in two libraries, Les Peat, Director at Sullivan and Wooster, will share his perspective on the process and his insights. This program is aimed at librarians in small, possibly one-person libraries, who need some direction toward the questions to address and the resources to explore in planning the move to an ILS, as well as some first-hand guidance from an experienced hand. A roundtable discussion will follow.

Preservation Committee News
Pat Turpening

I have several announcements for those interested in preservation. The Preservation Committee will meet on Sunday July 18 at 7:30 am. We will discuss progress made this year on several projects and make plans for the coming year. Any TS or OBS members, or any other members of AALL for that matter, are welcome to come to the meeting to listen, participate, learn. Don’t stay away because you don’t know very much about preservation or because you don’t have responsibility for it in your library. All you need is an interest in preserving library materials for future users. I welcome any and all!

There is also a Preservation Roundtable scheduled for Monday afternoon, from 5:45-6:45. There is no agenda or planned topic. I would like to invite anyone with specific or general questions about preservation treatments, binding, continuing education in preservation, the best environmental conditions, etc. to come to this roundtable discussion. This is meant to be a forum for exchanging information.

The Preservation Committee has made arrangements for a Tour of the Binding Section of the Library of Congress on Tuesday, 20 July from 1:00 - 2:30 p.m. They are able to accommodate 15-20 people. Two years ago, several members toured the Conservation Lab at LC and found it fascinating. There is no charge for the tour. Please email me <pat.turpening@law.uc.edu> if you are interested in going on this tour and I will contact you via email or the message board at the convention site with details on where we will meet.

I urge you all to come to the program sponsored by the Preservation Committee on Tuesday from 10:15-11:30: Preservation at the Crossroads: A Debate Between the Traditional World of Print and the Brave New World of Digital. Even though “At the Crossroads” is the theme for the entire convention, this phrase is particularly apt for the field of preservation right now. Undoubtedly, you all are aware of initiatives to digitize library collections (maybe your own). Digitizing is a wonderful tool for providing increased access to materials, but can we assume it is also a great tool for preserving the intellectual content? Digitizing may seem like a panacea - greater access and no more need to use those brittle volumes with all that red rot staining our fingers. But, we need to think carefully about decisions to digitize titles and withdraw the originals. The material digitized will need to be constantly migrated to new systems as old ones become obsolete. Will libraries accept that responsibility? In addition, some of the information is lost with each migration. If digitizing is not perfect, though, what other alternatives are there? No one wants to use microfilm and the books are falling apart. These questions and more will be raised and debated during this program. Two very able speakers, Melody Lembke, Technical Services Librarian at the Los Angeles County Law Library, columnist in this newsletter, and well known to many of us, will debate LeeEllen Friedland, a Senior Digital Conversion Specialist in the Preservation Reformatting Division in the Library of Congress. Ed Edmonds, Director of the Loyola University School of Law Library will moderate the debate.
**Metadata**

Sunday, July 18, 2:30-3:45 p.m.
Coordinators: Kevin Butterfield & Terri Saye
B-6 “Crosswalks to Information Management: Metadata — What is it? Who is Using it? How is it Being Used?”

Anyone who has searched the Internet knows the frustration of retrieving large sets of data and the painstaking task of sifting through extraneous information. One of the answers is metadata — structured data about data. This program will answer such questions as: What is metadata? What different metadata schemes are available? How can it make storage and retrieval of information accurate? What does metadata mean for information management in libraries and beyond? Our two speakers are:

Erik Jul, Associate Director, OCLC Institute.
Prior to his current position, Jul was Manager, Market Analysis and Special Projects, Collections & Technical Services Division. He also managed the U.S. Department of Education-funded project, “Building a Catalog of Internet Resources.” A member of the OCLC Office of Research from 1991-93, Mr. Jul managed the Internet Resources project, which was also funded by the U.S. Department of Education. He serves on the editorial boards for LIBRES, Information Technology and Libraries, and the Journal of Internet Cataloging.

A driving force behind GILS, the Government Information Locator Service, Christian has given a new meaning for interoperability also in a global scale. He helped establish this approach in law, policy, standards, and technology at the United States Federal level, building consensus among government agencies and developing key support among libraries and information service organizations and corporations. He is now focused on carrying these ideas to other levels of government and internationally as part of the emergent Global Information Infrastructure.

A roundtable discussion will follow the program.

**Collection Development**

Program
Wednesday, July 21, 1:30-2:45
Coordinator: Carmen Brigandi

Those of us responsible for selecting library materials, know that format selection is getting increasingly difficult. We have never been able to buy everything, so naturally in the electronic age we can’t buy everything in every format. What are our best choices? Come join Diane Klaiber from the award-winning New England Law Library Consortium, Douglas Lind of Georgetown and Bobbie Studwell from Thomas Cooley as they share examples and strategies. Find out how to establish and apply guidelines to select electronic formatted materials and how to write and revise your own collection development policy.

**Roundtable**

You Are Invited to Attend:
**Law Library Collections For the New Millennium: A Collection Development Round Table Discussion** at the 1999 American Association of Law Libraries’ Annual Meeting
Monday, July 19, 4:45-6:00 p.m.
Coordinator: Rob Richards

Come and hear presentations by two collections specialists from private and academic law libraries, and then join in an engaging discussion with colleagues about such issues as:

- Integrating electronic resources into collections, selection practices, and collection development policies;
- Employing new resources from vendors which have changed the way selection or collection development occurs;
- Choosing the right format for a resource depending on factors such as cost, users, physical layouts, etc.

The presenters are:
Frank Lee, Information Services Manager, Latham & Watkins, San Francisco.
Rachel Pergament, Collection Development/ Acquisitions Librarian, University of Southern California Law Library

We look forward to seeing you there!

**III Users**

The Innovative Law Users Group (ILUG) will hold its Annual Meeting/Program on July 17, 1999 in Washington D.C. in the Grand Hyatt (Bulfinch/Renwick Rooms). The meeting will include two member programs, a short presentation by Innovative, and breakout birds-of-a-feather sessions, in addition to a business meeting. Lunch will be served family style at a nearby Oriental restaurant. All law librarians using Innovative as their local system, or librarians interested in Innovative are invited to attend. A registration form is available on the ILUG web page <http://ftp.law.wuacc.edu/ilug/ilug.html>. 
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**Classification**

Wed., July 21, 8:30-10:00 a.m.
Coordinator: Brian Striman
J-6 “Classifying International Legal Materials by Using Library of Congress Classification”

The books you’ve got
On international law,
And classing them makes
Your nerves get raw.

You looks and looks
In LC schedule books
And nothing can be found.
You need some samples
To help you out and
End this merry-go-round.

Fear not dear hearts
For help is here
As program J-6 you’ll read
Through the maze of JZ/KZ
And in some JX we’ll steer.

Sample after sample we discuss
No theory we engage,
Handouts are thick as we together
Flip through page after page.

It’s a JZ/KZ program
With JX re-class on the side,
Marie and Jolande at the front
Each your classification guide.

So bring your coffee, bring your tea
For caffeine you’re sure to need,
No overheads or fancy media used,
Being practical is our creed.

**AALL DC JZ/KZ Educational Program Poem**

Jay Zee Kay Zee Poetry

Please look on page 23 of your AALL DC preliminary program. Read over the program summary and learning outcomes. One special feature of this program will be that you will take home your thick handouts with the notes you took during the program. The handout samples contain actual published examples of international legal materials! Everyone will get a handout and pens will be provided at the door. Please come. This program provides the forum to give law catalogers the real “live” examples they need to help them with their understanding of applying LCC as they catalog.
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