What’s New in Z39.71-1999?

Holdings Standards for Bibliographic Items, Z39.71-1999, was published last year. What changes will result for serials holdings statements? How is 71 different from its predecessors Z39.44 for serials and Z39.57 for non-serials?

History:
The first United States holdings standard Z39.42-1980 American National Standard for Serial Holdings Statements at the Summary Level was developed in the late ’70s. The committee that drafted 42 collected boxes and boxes of printed serials union lists and, based on common practice in those lists, derived principles of what had generally worked well. The aim of 42 was to guide ILL borrowers, not to provide full inventory control of local serials. Users of OCLC’s new interlibrary loan module felt the need to know more for a serial than its location — they needed to know which parts of the serial were held. When OCLC implemented Z39.42 in early 1980, it became, for an ANSI/NISO standard, a bestseller!

42 defined holdings standards for serials at the volume level as “summary holdings” (Level 3). It also allowed a holdings statement with minimal information: the optional Level 2 statement provided no volume information, only coded hints about roughly how much you held, whether you were still receiving the title, and whether you kept all or a limited part of what you received.

Z39.44-1986, Serial Holdings Statements, responded to the need for fully enumerated holdings, and defined both summary level (Level 3) and detailed level (Level 4) holdings for serials. OCLC union listing still allowed only summary-level holdings statements and eventually implemented Z39.44. Automated checkin systems and online public access catalogs were appearing; several systems used Z39.44. A few years later, Z39.57-1989, Holdings Statements for Non-serial Items, was approved. In approach, it resembled 44, but to treat non-serial extent-of-holdings, it developed new categories: Name of Unit and Extent of Unit.

Because NISO standards must be reviewed after five years, in 1991 NISO... (continued on page 29)
1999-2000 Officers and Committee Chairs

OBS-SIS

Chair:
Brian Striman
University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect:
Ellen McGrath
SUNY Buffalo

Secretary/Treasurer:
Cynthia Cicco
University of Pittsburgh

Members-at-Large:
Marla Schwartz
American University
Georgia Briscoe
University of Colorado

Education Committee:
Ellen McGrath
SUNY Buffalo

Local System Committee:
Susan Goldner
Univ. of Arkansas - Little Rock

Nominations Committee:
Arturo Lopez Torres
Gonzaga University

OCLC Committee:
Susan Chinoransky
George Washington University

RLIN Committee:
Anne Myers
Boston University

Web Advisory Committee:
Sarah Andeen
Superior Court of Arizona

TS-SIS

Chair:
Janet McKinney
Shook, Hardy & Bacon, LLP

Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect:
Alva T. Stone
Florida State University

Secretary/Treasurer:
Linda Tesar
Vanderbilt University

Members-at-Large:
JoAnn Hounshell
Northwestern University
Cynthia May
University of Wisconsin

Acquisitions Committee:
Carmen Brigandi
California Western School of Law

Awards Committee:
Jean Pajerek
Cornell University

Cataloging & Classification Committee:
Chris Long
Indiana University

Education Committee:
Pat Sayre-McCoy
University of Chicago

Exchange of Duplicates Committee:
Kristina Kuhlman
Georgetown

Joint Research Grant Committee
Corinne Jacox
Barry University of Orlando

Preservation Committee:
Pat Turpening
University of Cincinnati
College of Law

Serials Committee:
Joan Liu
New York University

Publication Schedule

Issues are published quarterly in
March, June, September, and December.

Deadlines:
V.26:no.3(Mar. 2001).......31 Jan. 2001
V.26:no.4(June 2001)......30 April 2001

Technical Services Law Librarian (ISSN 0195-4857) is an official publication of the Technical Services Special Interest Section and the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section of the American Association of Law Libraries. It carries reports or summaries of the convention meetings and other programs of OBS-SIS and TS-SIS, acts as the vehicle of communication for the SIS committee activities, and carries current awareness and short implementation reports. Prospective authors should contact the editors for style information.

Statements and opinions of the authors are theirs alone and do not necessarily reflect those of AALL, TS-SIS, OBS-SIS, or the TSLL Editorial Board.

Subscriptions: Provided as a benefit of membership to Sections members. Non-member subscriptions: Domestic: $10.00; Foreign: $15.00. Contact the TSLL Business Manager or the American Association of Law Libraries.
From the Chair

Gitch-yer programs—PROGRAMS!! Getyer programs here! Ideas that is. I know you can get them. You need to gitcher program ideas to the Education Committee Chair who is Ismael Gullon. Your ideas may be rough and only a few words or two, but the most important idea about your idea is to get it to your OBS Education Committee—the people who can help develop the idea into something more “concrete” (construction-lingo; we often use this kind of talk when discussing how to “build” good education program offerings). The Education Committee is composed of Ismael Gullon, Ellen McGrath, Anna Belle Leiserson, Mary Jane Kelsey, Richard Jost and Pam Deemer. Many thanks to these volunteers for helping with OBS programs for AALL 2001.

It’s the responsibility of the Education Committee to solicit and receive, review, prioritize, polish, and submit all OBS-sponsored programs for the next year’s AALL annual meeting. The Committee chair submits the program proposals they’ve worked on to Headquarters and they do this after Ellen McGrath (AMPSC’s representative to the OBS, TS and Micrographics/Audio-visual SISs) reviews them with the Committee’s recommendations as to priorities.

OBS election results!! Ismael Gullon is our new Vice-Chair/Chair Elect and this also makes him the Education Committee Chair. New OBS Member-at-Large Susan Chinoransky was also elected. Susan has been our OCLC Committee Chair and contributing regularly to her column in TSLL. Thank you Susan for keeping us updated on OCLC goings-on.

Which bring us to the next important bit of news—that Michael Maben (Indiana/Bloomington) has graciously agreed to become the new OCLC Committee chair after the Philadelphia meeting when current chair, Susan Chinoransky, will step into her new role as OBS Member-at-Large.

AALL Philadelphia and OBS things to remember:
There will not be an RLIN Committee meeting this year. OBS’s RLIN Committee Chair Anne Myers polled OBS members to see if there were any “hot topics” to cover that would merit an RLIN Committee meeting at Philadelphia. Based on member feedback, it was decided that the RLIN Committee would not meet this summer. Anne and others who attend the RLG member meeting on Saturday will report back via TSLL about the discussion then.

Also, please remember to come visit the OBS table if you’ll be in Philadelphia. We will again sponsor the book-swap and will have some OBS key tags as a promotional effort, which will be available also at the CONELL Marketplace. We also have mailed one OBS key tag to Susan Chinoransky for the OBS time capsule. Georgia Briscoe, Diana Osbaldiston and Marla Schwartz have been great at getting these OBS promotional activities from the idea stage to the center stage.

Update on OBS’s Strategic Planning Committee:
Sally Wambold (ain’t she great?!) has volunteered to chair this committee. Members are: Sally Wambold, Pat Callahan, Karin Den Bleyker, LaJean Humphries, Janet Hedin, Becky Lutkenhaus, Ellen McGrath and Brian Striman. We will meet with Gail Warren while at AALL on July 17 from 7:00-10:30 and Gail will help us get jump-started. We really appreciate Gail’s time and talents to help us get underway and we also appreciate Pat Callahan and the Biddle Law Library (U. Penn) for agreeing to host the Committee at their library!

OBS Nominations Committee for this upcoming year is Brian Striman (Chair), Sue Roach and Pam Deemer. Thank you to Sue and Pam for volunteering to help me later this fall as we begin our work in preparation for the OBS slate of candidates that needs to be set for January 2001. For our dear readers of TSLL, please consider being on the OBS ballot next year. Being an officer is an important and fun activity to contribute to professionally.

Law Library Systems Directory
The OBS-sponsored publication titled Law Library Systems Directory will be undergoing a dynamic transformation for the next edition. Carol Avery Nicholson, her volunteer helpers and the publisher want to improve the directory by broadening its scope and making the contents and timely delivery of this valuable information for
One of the things I worried about when I moved into the Chair position was writing this column. Joe Thomas’ columns were excellent, and I thought I would have trouble thinking of topics as well as having enough to say about them to fill more than a couple of inches’ column space. It turns out that I didn’t need to worry on that score, at least, because I had ideas for each one. Until now. I’ve been searching for inspiration for several weeks, and no light bulbs have lit above my head. Co-editor (and friend) Linda tells me that I’m getting close to the “we’re waiting on you” deadline. So, I’ll try a buckshot approach and touch on a couple of topics.

Last July, I certainly didn’t expect to be in a different position at the end of my tenure as Chair. And I certainly wouldn’t have expected it to be in a position that isn’t traditionally technical services. Life happens, right? Have any of you wondered how an academic acquisitions/serials/government documents librarian could possibly be qualified for a private computer services librarian position? I did, too. What I learned is that several of my skills have transferred to my new position. Many of you may have learned HTML and put it to use creating Web pages for your department or library. My first exposure to HTML was keeping up a faculty member’s Web site while the customers more useful in today’s environment. Things they are looking at are how to get the survey out to users electronically and the best, most timely way to publish the results electronically. Carol needs your feedback on what kinds of information is important. Carol tried posting the newest survey on the discussion list and its attachment didn’t work, so please contact her directly to have her send you the survey. Please, please fill this out and return it to her. We are also hoping to get the survey mounted on the OBS Web site and are working on that. We’ll let folks know via our various discussion lists as new info develops. To contact Carol:

Carol Avery Nicholson  
Assistant Director for Bibliographic and Collection Resources  
Kathrine R. Everett Law Library  
CB# 3385  
Chapel Hill, NC 27599  
Tel: 919/962-1199  
<Carol_Nicholson@unc.edu>  
Fax: 919/962-2294.

Oh yes— and— Carol could use more helpers; more long-term participation type helpers— contact her if you want more info if you’re thinking of volunteering. Thank you!

This leads me to my final string of TSLL printed words as your OBS Chair. I hope you’ve enjoyed reading my columns over the past year. As your Chair I’ve had some successes and some things (mostly strategic planning and major revisions to our OBS Web pages) that I wanted to have completed, but didn’t. As the months flew by there have been so many colleagues who’ve helped me “run” OBS, that I want to publicly thank them. These are people to whom I turned for help and/or who’ve just stepped in to help! Here are the names: Ellen McGrath, Jack Bissett, Cindy Cicco, Anne Myers, Georgia Briscoe, Anna Belle Leiserson, Linda Tesar, Ismael Gullon, Susan Chinoranski, Michael Maben, Pat Callahan, Kevin Butterfield, Susan Goldner, Sally Wambold, Arturo Lopez Torres, Sue Roach, Maria Okonska, Janet McKinney, Corinne Jacox, Alva Stone, Marla Schwartz, JoAnne Hounshell, Diana Osboldiston, Becky Lutkenhaus, Janet Hedin, Karin Den Bleyker, LaJean Humphries, Chris Long, Rosemary Hahn, Richard Jost, Sarah Andeen, Ruth Patterson Funabiki and (Pam Reisinger, Steve Ligda and Rachel Shaevel from AALL Headquarters). I’m looking forward to seeing as many of my friends and colleagues as I can when in Philadelphia. I will miss those who cannot come.
Electronic Services Librarian at UMKC was on vacation. Eventually, I took over updating that site and then created a site for government documents. My firm’s library has an internal reference Web site, of which I’m now the Webmaster. Additionally, I believe my experience in technical services serves me well as I look at reorganizing the site.

Our firm just recently broadened its contract with OCLC to including full cataloging and the interlibrary loan subsystem. Later in the year we will be upgrading our library system, and I will serve as the system manager in that process. My technical services experience has been and will be beneficial with these endeavors.

In my new position, I serve as the liaison between the library and vendors of electronic services. Making contact with vendors is nothing new to me; in fact, I already knew all of our local reps. At UMKC, I regularly served a shift at the reference desk. I do that now, as well, and my director told me that she sees my position as providing a bridge between “public” and “technical” services. Finally, part of my new job is to review and recommend electronic products. That’s right, collection development. Technical services.

I’m truly not trying to toot my own horn with this recitation. My point is to show that the skills learned in technical services work at times may seem very specific to a task (and that’s true in many cases), but they also are broader than we often realize. And that’s a wonderful thing to recognize when thinking about the future of libraries in general and of technical services librarians in particular! However, it’s important – no, it’s incumbent on you to develop your skills and knowledge.

I will probably do this at the annual business meeting (Sunday, July 16, 4:00 pm), but I need to recognize some people in this column so every member has an opportunity to read it. More than once since becoming Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, I’ve put out a “desperation” message on the TS listserv, and often they were answered right away. My first words of thanks go to those persons, because they smoothed the way for me and the Section. Thanks to Joe Thomas for setting such an excellent example of Chairpersonship. Thanks to Linda Tesar for her two years of service as Secretary/Treasurer. You’re great! The Members-at-Large for both my years on the Board have involved themselves in the work of the association, going beyond the all-important task of planning the “alphabet soup” reception at the annual meeting. Thanks to Mary Burgos, Joann Hounshell, and Cindy May. Alva, thanks for keeping me on my toes. I have the feeling you’re going to set this Section afire! I appreciate our committee Chairs and members, particularly – Carmen Brigandi, Melinda Davis, Joe Hinger, Kristine Kuhlman, Melody Lemke, Joan Liu, Chris Long, Jean Pajerek, Pat Turpening, and Gary Vander Meer. I have to single out Nonie Watt for serving two consecutive years as Nominating Committee Chair, a difficult task under any circumstances, and one that she did very well.

Jack Bissett, former Chair of our sister Section, OBS, did a great job serving all of us Section Chairs as SIS Council Chair. The person in this position attends AALL Board meetings, representing the Sections to the Board, and helps us succeed in our positions. If you’re thinking about increasing your experience in the Association, remember this position if you’re nominated for a position within the section.

Anna Belle and Linda – you’ve really helped us to show off in more ways than one. Your skills, creativity, willingness to serve, and humor could help form a paradigm of the qualities of technical services librarians.

I apologize to anyone I failed to include. It was completely by accident if I did. I’m guessing that if I asked all of my predecessors in the position of TS-SIS Chair, they’d all say they didn’t accomplish everything they’d hoped to in their year as Chair. I didn’t either. But I hope I at least got the ball rolling on some issues, and I plan to continue contributing next year as Past Chair. The Technical Services Special Interest Section is a vibrant and important organization, and I’m proud to have served it and you, its members. Alva – you go, girl!
I had to go back and peruse the TSLL issues I edited in order to refresh my memory for this article. Pack rat that I am, I still had each of the issues and could find them easily. Am I the only one who has kept them all? As I paged through the issues, Barbra Streisand’s song “Memories” immediately began going through my mind. Talk about going back in time! Does anyone remember that Margie Axtmann was chair of OBS-SIS? That Brian Striman won the contest for creating the TS-SIS logo? Or that Brian also was in charge of selling those TS t-shirts and buttons? I reviewed the names of the section officers and TSLL columnists. Sadly, some have retired or are no longer with us. Some thankfully are still with us and, believe it or not, still TSLL columnists! It’s wonderful to still see Melody’s, Rhonda’s, Alva’s and Reggie’s names on the list of TSLL staff. Certainly they deserve some kind of award for sticking with this for so long.  I was also struck by how TSLL has, in some respects, changed and in some ways has remained the same. Obviously, the physical format has changed. It’s larger, the typeface is much easier to read, and it has illustrations nicely breaking up the text of the articles. Like some of the other editors working in an earlier era, articles were submitted to me on paper. If the correct typeface wasn’t used, I had to retype the article. Then I suffered through the time-consuming task of “cutting and pasting” the issue together. What I wouldn’t have given for today’s software and computers! My issues had 8 columns, the current version has 10. So, it has grown in size. But the columns and reports of the sections’ activities are still providing great, up-to-date information. It remains, in my opinion, the best and most informative section newsletter in AALL.

Unfortunately, I don’t remember exactly how I came to be the editor. I probably volunteered for the job. I was also the business manager, so I did everything: preparing the issues, getting it printed and sent to subscribers, sending out renewals, taking in the money and maintaining the subscription list. It was a lot of work. But I do remember how proud I was to be the editor of such a fine publication. It wasn’t very difficult as the columnists were so great about sending in their copy by the deadlines. I loved being the first one to read the articles!

We made a few changes during my editorship. I began placing the highlights of each issue on the front cover and moved (continued on page 20)
2001 PROGRAM PLANNING BEGINS WITH YOU!

Ellen McGrath
University at Buffalo

Now is the time for you to start planning your program proposal for the 2001 AALL annual meeting in Minneapolis! I know we probably won’t even have attended this year’s meeting in Philadelphia yet by the time you read this. But in order to maximize your meeting experience this year, you must go into it with your plan already begun. Let me get specific. You should sit down with the preliminary program for Philadelphia’s meeting now. You need to plan ahead as to which educational programs and which meetings you will be attending anyway, right? So why not kill two birds? As you’re going through and reading the program titles and descriptions that interest you, think about which could use some follow-up treatment next year. And think about what current topics of interest to you are not in the Philadelphia program.

Maybe you have attended another meeting recently and there were interesting topics and dynamic speakers that stuck in your mind. Or you caught an electronic list discussion about an unfamiliar topic you would like to pursue. Or you browsed a conference program but you were unable to attend. There are so many tantalizing conferences these days, in my opinion. It is impossible to get to all of them. So if AALL is the one meeting you do attend on a fairly regular basis, it’s up to you to make sure there are quality educational programs of interest to you presented there. After all, if a topic interests you, chances are good it will also interest some of your colleagues. Think outside your comfort zone and learn about something new by planning a program on it!

So now you have your notes jotted down about interesting new and follow-up topics, plus some names of stimulating speakers. What do you do now? You go to AALLNET and pull off the 2001 Program Planners Handbook. It looks sort of intimidating at first because it is rather long. But a lot of it is examples and the actual proposal forms. And the text reads very quickly and is packed with how-to information on constructing your proposal and excellent tips on making it a strong one. When you do start to fill in your ideas on the proposal form, you will probably have gaps. Perhaps you are not so good at dreaming up a catchy program title or you are unsure of what format the program should follow or you would like another speaker, but just cannot think of anyone. Don’t worry—help is on the way!

The very next thing you should do is contact an SIS. I am assuming that if you are reading this newsletter, you have some connection to technical services. So your idea may have a technical services slant. In that case, it is wise to look to the OBS or TS SIS’s for help with your proposal. Both SIS’s may end up co-sponsoring your proposal in the long run, but it is easier to work with one SIS at this early stage of development. OBS and TS each have an Education Committee already in place just waiting for input such as yours. The Chair of the OBS Education Committee is Ismael Gullon and the chair of the TS Education Committee is Patricia Sayre-McCoy. So you have an easy way to get some helpful input on your program idea. Don’t wait! Even if you plan to attend the annual meeting in Philadelphia in July. Contact the OBS or TS Education Committee Chair before then. A lot of discussion can take place via e-mail, telephone, and/or fax in June and early July. Then you can best use the face-to-face contact in Philadelphia to work out especially difficult problems or to put the final touches on your proposal or locate possible speakers. Informal meetings can help you do this, but the OBS and TS Education Committee meetings provide an excellent place to get some great feedback from a group. Here are the details:

- OBS Education Committee Meeting, Tuesday, July 18, 2000, 12:15-1:30 PM
- TS Education Committee Meeting, Wednesday, July 19, 2000, 12:30-1:30 PM

And also of interest:
- 2001 Annual Meeting Program Selection Committee (AMPSC) Open Forum, Monday, July 17, 2000, 5:00-6:00 PM

The Open Forum will be of help if you have any general questions about filling out the proposal form or about the process by which proposals are chosen. I am a member of the 2001 AMPSC, and as such, I will be present at all the meetings I have listed above to assist in any way I can. Be sure to check your final program for room assignments for these meetings.

Sound good so far? For further help on choosing a topic, read the description of the theme for the Minneapolis meeting “2001: New Realities, New Roles” in the Program Planners Handbook. Now this is pretty general and open to interpretation, which is true of most conference themes and appropriately so. But tracks within the overall theme have also been chosen. These tracks have been developed for those proposing programs as well as for those who will ultimately attend those programs. The 2001 AMPSC, chaired by Kathie Sullivan, met in Chicago this past February and we brainstormed for a full day and a half. While we were focussing on the theme and the tracks, lots of ideas were mentioned, all of which were recorded and listed under one or more of the tracks. The hope is that these purposely general ideas may be of some help in your program.
proposal process. I haven’t listed everything here, but rather tried to focus on the technical services and general interest concepts. (Please see the sidebar.) I have added a few more that have occurred to me since February. Some ideas are listed under more than one track.

These are just some ideas. It is up to you to put them into focus and create a good program proposal between now and August 14, 2000, the deadline for proposals. That is plenty of time, but only if you get started right now!

Proposals by an individual are of course welcome. I have stressed the SIS route to submitting a proposal because the SIS’s are very aware of the fact that their members value good programming and the SIS’s play a big role in bringing that about. In addition, a high percentage of proposals submitted by SIS’s are accepted each year. This is not just because they are submitted by SIS’s. It reflects the fact that these proposals have already gone through a review process conducted by SIS members committed to providing their colleagues with high quality educational programs at the annual meeting. Many minds and suggestions do make for stronger proposals. And there is an additional benefit. Say your proposal is accepted, if it has already endured some scrutiny, it may not require much more tweaking as it moves along to fruition. I know this from personal experience. I followed all the advice that I have laid out here for you last year and my proposal was accepted!

A few years ago there was an AALL annual meeting that lacked programs of direct relevance to technical services librarians. OBS and TS have been working very hard to prevent that from happening again. I think the results of that hard work are evident. Last year in Washington, almost every time slot had a program of direct interest to technical services librarians. And the same looks to be true in Philadelphia. Let’s make sure that we repeat this happy situation in Minneapolis next year. But this can’t happen without your help. Strong proposals must be put forward. So get to work on your program proposal for 2001 right now! 

---

**AMPSC Tracks 2001**

**Agents of Change**
- Technology leadership
- Implementing new systems
- Internet/Intranet
- Depository library program
- Telecommuting
- Collection rebalancing
- Being an agent of change when you are burned out
- Pricing of legal publications
- New job descriptions and performance measures
- Vendors
- Authentication
- Preservation of online information
- Proactivity
- Leadership roles in parent organizations
- Licensing issues
- Enhancing the OPAC
- Testing of new system features
- Digitization of collections

**Globalization**
- Collection development issues
- Acquisition of foreign and international material
- Vendors
- Cataloging issues (reclass of foreign and international collections, new LCC KB schedule)
- Harmonization of MARC formats
- Revision of AACR

**Practitioner’s Toolkit**
- Managing federal depository program
- Cataloging and authority control issues, tools, resources
- Acquisitions and serials issues, tools, resources
- Staff/management relations
- Negotiating contracts
- Collection development
- Web page design
- Cataloging Internet resources
- XML
- CORC
- Personnel issues
- Information overload
- Aggregators
- Budget
- Annual report
- Linkchecking software
- Vendors
- Document delivery/ILL

**Reinventing Law Librarianship**
- What will the law library of the future look like?
- Career plateauing
- Licensing vs. ownership
- Librarian as publisher
- Time management/multitasking
- Collection rebalancing
- Quality of life/worklife
- Career development
- Burnout/stress management
- Changing roles
- Shrinking space
- Shrinking budgets
- Reinventing the OPAC

**Partnership**
- Mentoring
- Coalitions/consortia (working together)
- Creative ways for librarians and vendors to work together
- Blurring of boundaries
- Training/cross training/empowerment
- Working with management/administration and with IS people
- Coping with different/difficult personalities and work styles
- Depository program
- Changing nature of legal publications
The Complications of Electronic Communications in Negotiations

Recently I have wondered if e-mail has made my professional life easier or just more complicated. Increasingly, my interactions with vendors and publishers are conducted electronically rather than over the phone or in person. My attempts to contact someone by telephone often lead to playing voice mail tag. I have discovered that if I sit at my desk all day, my phone never rings. On the other hand, if I am constantly in and out of my office, the phone seems to ring off the hook. Rarely do I place a call that a live person picks up on the other end. When someone actually does answer the phone, I am so startled that I forget why I called! At the same time, it seems that my electronic correspondence is generating equally unsatisfactory results.

I have noticed that in-person communications with vendor or publisher representatives is happening less frequently. To be fair, I may be responsible for this trend in my library. I insist that account representatives make appointments to see me, and strongly discourage drop-in visits to the point of refusing to see them. I am too busy to just drop what I am doing to accommodate an account representative that just “happened to be on this side of town”.

Most significantly, I have noticed how the communication medium I use influences the information results I receive. I read an article on the subject by Harvard Business School professor Kathleen Valley who has been studying the effects of electronic communications on negotiations. According to Professor Valley it is not our imagination, people really do behave differently when using e-mail than in face to face contact or even in telephone conversations. Individuals are less likely to fully disclose information when they are communicating through e-mail. In face to face contact, we instinctively share more information. It is easier for us to gauge one another’s response and receptiveness to ideas during personal contact. Whereas, e-mail communication can be distorted. The information or idea can be exaggerated, it can be incomplete or, the person who received the e-mail can misinterpret the intent of the message. It is even more difficult to know what questions need to be asked or what information should be shared when using e-mail.

I encountered this recently in an attempt to establish a deposit account with a document delivery service. I initiated contact with the company with a telephone call, and I got as far as the account representative’s voice mail. The account representative responded to my voice mail. The voice mail message said that the account representative was out of the office for several days, but would check e-mail daily. According to the voice mail message, e-mail was the most efficient means of communication. I efficiently sent an e-mail to request information regarding the document delivery service, and instructions on how to establish a deposit account. An e-mail reply gave me a URL to read about the service and told me that a form was also on that site to set up a deposit account. This exchange took place over a two-week period without me ever speaking to the account representative. Since the Web page actually had several forms to establish different types of accounts, and since I was not sure which form to submit, I decided that a verbal conversation had to happen rather than continue with the e-mail conversation. This turned out to be just as frustrating, because the account representative only answered the question that I asked, seemed to be rushed and failed to volunteer pertinent information. I spent another two weeks placing telephone calls and sending follow-up e-mail messages. Since the account representative had assisted many other libraries in establishing deposit accounts for the document delivery service, I expected more proactive assistance than what I received. During the whole episode I kept thinking that if we were dealing with one another face to face, the negotiations would have gone so much more smoothly and would not have taken a month to complete.

Another aspect of using electronic communication is that an e-mail message is emotionless and can even “sound” rude. E-mail makes it much more difficult to reach an agreement effectively. The message or the intent of the message can easily be misinterpreted. When we negotiate face to face it is much more likely that we will come to a mutually beneficial agreement. Ironically, instead of e-mail encouraging communications it actually creates a barrier to communicating. Electronic negotiations tend to work better if we have already established some level of rapport with the other person. This generally requires a face to face meeting with the other person or at the very least a telephone conversation. When e-mail is the only communication medium used, it is very hard to establish the level of rapport that can develop from a face to face meeting. There is less likelihood that there will be any “getting to know one another” conversation or small talk. Using e-mail cuts through the warm fuzzy social part at the beginning of negotiations and gets us right down to business.
So why do we even attempt to use e-mail for business communication? Because it is a more efficient method of communication. There are no travel costs, no time lost scheduling and holding meetings, and there is no voice mail tag. E-mail allows us to communicate almost anonymously and at our convenience. We just have to be willing to acknowledge and accept that we lose some of the benefits from one on one or even telephone communication. We also need to know under what circumstance using electronic communication is not the best medium to use for negotiating. Your institution’s practices and procedures may govern this.

Once e-mail negotiating has begun, it is important to follow your instincts if you are not satisfied with the results. If you ask a question and feel that you are not receiving a satisfactory response, stop typing, turn away from the mouse pad, and make a telephone call. It might require that you make several telephone calls before you reach a real person, but once they know that you are persistent, they will return the call.


---

**Classification**

Marie E. Whited
Yale Law School
marie.whited@yale.edu


Go to KZ and you find the following references:

“For diplomatic service and consular service, see JZ1400+”

“For consular laws, codes, consular documents, etc., see the appropriate K subclasses”

“Scope of international relations. Diplomacy. Diplomatic and consular service, see JZ1400+”

Off to JZ and you find the following:

“Consuls. The consular service
For consular courts and procedure, see the appropriate jurisdiction in class K subclasses, e. g. KK3693, Courts of special jurisdiction
For consular laws (codes) governing the consular service, including privileges and immunities, consular jurisdiction, etc., see the appropriate jurisdiction in class K subclasses, e. g. KK5445+, The foreign service

JZ1440+ is the section for diplomatic and consular service in general and for particular countries. Remember JZ is for international relations not for international law. There is nothing in KZ so go to K. Looking up the word consular in K in Classification Plus you find numbers for consular courts and for consular functions in the case of conflict of laws regarding succession upon death. The country schedules have numbers for foreign service. I find nothing for the consular law.

---

**KBR and KBU**

Draft copies of KBR (History of Canon law) and KBU (Law of the Roman Catholic Church. Holy See) are available on the homepage of the Library of Congress Cataloging Policy and Support Office <http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/kbr_kbu.html>. Please send comments to Dr. Jolande Goldberg by June 30 <jgol@loc.gov>. Her other address information is available on the homepage.
In the previous issue of TSLL, the last two sentences of the Classification column were omitted. The final paragraph should have read:

It is now 2000 and the K schedules are almost done. Jolande is busy finishing the religious law schedules. It will be wonderful to have them done. Here is hoping that in the next twenty-five years we sharpen our classification skills and continue to share our K expertise.

Our apologies go to Marie Whited for the inadvertent omission.

The Editors

**Correction to Vol. 25, No. 3**
(March 2000) page 16

In the previous issue of TSLL, the last two sentences of the Classification column were omitted. The final paragraph should have read:

It is now 2000 and the K schedules are almost done. Jolande is busy finishing the religious law schedules. It will be wonderful to have them done. Here is hoping that in the next twenty-five years we sharpen our classification skills and continue to share our K expertise.

Our apologies go to Marie Whited for the inadvertent omission.

The Editors
Acquisitions lists, or as they were once known, accessions lists, have been keeping track of their new books. The purpose of this article is not a history of acquisitions lists, so I will not quote any scholarly article on the earliest known law library acquisitions lists. Historically speaking, i.e. pre-Internet, acquisitions lists were distributed in paper to alert people to new additions to the library collection. But acquisitions lists have recently been in our news. As you may have noted in a recent past issue of the Technical Services Law Librarian, Catalog of Current Legal Titles has ceased publication. This was an amalgam of acquisitions lists from sixty libraries, primarily academic law libraries, as well as a smattering of others. In addition, in recognition of the trend by libraries to post acquisitions lists on their web site, AcqWeb now has a section devoted to links to these lists. The purpose of this article then is to look at what these lists are, how they are organized and used, and some recommendations for the future.

Despite the tendency of some librarians to save everything, these little critters are meant to be tossed ... at least eventually. That is because they show what is new in the library. When you have an old list of new titles, you are really stretching the purpose of archiving information. Recent acquisitions lists can give you a sense of the kind of books the library is adding to its collection. In an academic law library, a new faculty member may request lists for the past year. Acquisitions lists are also provided to ABA or AALS inspectors for this same reason.

The real audience for an acquisitions list is the library’s patrons. The list advertises the newest additions to the collection. As such they should be as user-friendly as possible. My favorite list was one prepared at a nearby law school which was alphabetical by title, and individually typed (not computer-generated). It was visually attractive and it was as brief as such a list could be. I read it cover-to-cover monthly.

Collection development librarians tend to use acquisitions lists for several purposes. First, it can be used as a safety net to catch titles that might be missed otherwise; secondly, it can be used as a tool to browse additions to other comparable libraries; and thirdly, it can be used as a first-line tool for selection. The late, great Catalog of Current Legal Titles which was a mega-acquisitions list had a section called “Hot Sheets” which was a wonderful acquisitions tool. Titles acquired by at least twenty-five percent of the contributing libraries appeared there.

As you might expect, acquisitions lists are now posted to the Web. This is the most recent development in the long history of this standard tool. The quality of acquisitions lists on the Web varies enormously. Nowadays the lists are frequently computer-generated and just as frequently include everything added during the dates of coverage. Ugh. If this isn’t the kiss of death in readership, then arranging the list by subject, especially when titles are listed multiple times, will be. Why? The subjects used are either terms devised in-house and applied with little consistency and foresight, thus making them one more place for your eyes to dwell rather than a shortcut to the bibliographic information provided. Or, they are LC subject headings, terms of art which are not likely to be known by the average catalog user. Finally, while some printed lists were arranged by subjects, it was easier to scan a printed page than a computer screen.

Another feature of some internet lists that make them difficult to navigate is the need to hyperlink to a full entry to see sufficient bibliographic information to truly understand what you are looking at, then jump back to the list to continue, rather than be able to scroll through either the short list or the full entries. This limitation can be the result of using a canned list function that comes with library catalog software. Will future releases improve the situation? I certainly hope so. To my mind, the perfect Web acquisitions list would be alphabetical by title; it would be edited for its readership to eliminate material that should be cataloged but should not be included on an acquisitions list; it would also be browsable both at the short title and full title versions.

Despite their drawbacks, acquisitions lists should be a familiar tool to all collection development librarians. While I have yet to find a comprehensive directory of law library acquisitions lists on the Web, I would be glad to see one. Several law library Web sites have short lists of links to other acquisitions lists. One potential mega-list is available on AcqWeb at www.library.vanderbilt.edu/law/acqslaw.html. I would hope that librarians reading this article would send Anna Belle Leiserson, the Webmaster of AcqWeb, an e-mail giving the URL for acquisitions lists posted at their library Web site. Her e-mail address listed on the contact page of AcqWeb is: a.leiserson@vanderbilt.edu.

Since a compulsive nature is one of the personality traits that seems to be highly desirable for collection development, I am sure many of us will continue reading these acquisitions lists whether or not they reach perfection.
E-Books

What if, instead of his e-book *Riding the Bullet*, Stephen King had published the definitive work on constitutional law? A new e-book that all of our attorneys, faculty and clients wanted immediately. Would we be equipped to handle the demand?

I agree the odds of King publishing such a work are slim, but it does raise the issue of how e-books fit into the flow of technical services. Stephen King published his latest work, *Riding the Bullet*, in electronic form. Barnes & Noble then developed an e-book center on its Web site to both market the text and the technology needed to view it. This resulted in a boost for the e-book industry and greater visibility for the technology.

While e-books may seem new, electronic texts have been with us for some time. Centers at Virginia, Michigan and Brown as well as the Oxford Text Archive and Project Gutenberg have long produced encoded electronic texts. These were directed at scholarly research, primarily in the humanities and social sciences. They were and are not as portable. That changed with the advent of e-book readers, devices that people can use to download and carry away texts. Previously a PC and/or an SGML viewer may have been needed to read the texts. Now it is possible to take your e-book to the beach, assuming you have enough batteries. E-books also now have a greater potential to penetrate mass, trade and textbook markets.

How do you read an e-book? Portability is the key attraction. While you can carry a printed book just about anywhere, bringing your PC or laptop along is not always convenient. Rocket eBook, SoftBook Reader and EB Dedicated Reader are three alternatives for reading e-books. Prices range from $199.00 to $1,600.00 each, weight from 22 oz. to 2.9 lbs., and battery life from five to twenty hours. In most cases, purchasing the reader entitles the user to access that company’s library of e-books, but not always to share those e-books amongst other readers. Glassbook Reader and Microsoft Reader are software programs designed to turn your laptop, PC or hand-held device into an e-book reader. They focus on content rather than equipment. The number of titles available through each device is limited in both variety and accessibility. The underlying economic model has more in common with pay-per-view entertainment than traditional book selling.

One way of insuring widespread acceptance of e-books is by standardizing their development. Two organizations are currently looking at ways of doing this. The Open eBook Forum (OEBF) is an association of hardware and software companies, publishers and users of electronic books and related organizations. Its goals are to establish common specifications for electronic book systems, applications and products that will benefit creators of content, makers of reading systems and, most importantly, consumers, helping to catalyze the adoption of electronic books; to encourage the broad acceptance of these specifications on a worldwide basis among members of the Forum, related industries and the public; and to increase awareness and acceptance of the emerging electronic publishing industry. Members of the forum range from netLibrary and Microsoft to IBM, Brown University, Time-Warner, NIST, McGraw-Hill, and Adobe Systems, Inc. The primary technical achievement of the OEBF has been the creation of the Open eBook Publication Structure specification. This specification for e-book file and format structure rests on HTML and XML, the languages used to create information for Web sites. The Open eBook Publication Structure specifies e-book file format and structure; in other words, it ensures that content can be viewed on any reading system which is OEB-compliant — as long as the owner of the reading system has the right to read the content on that reading system. The specification incorporates features that ensure that content can be made accessible to persons with disabilities.

The Electronic Book Exchange (EBX) Working Group is an organization of companies and individuals developing a standard for protecting copyright in electronic books and for distributing electronic books among publishers, distributors, retailers, libraries, and consumers. The draft EBX specification accommodates a variety of content formats for electronic books, including Open eBook Publication Structure and Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF). The EBX system defines the way in
which e-books are distributed from publishers to booksellers and distributors, from booksellers to consumers, between consumers, and between consumers and libraries. It describes the basic requirements of e-book reading devices and the e-books themselves. It also describes how these components interact to form a comprehensive copyright protection system that both protects the intellectual property of authors and publishers as well as describes the capabilities required by consumers.

How does the e-book development affect technical services? As with most digital library developments, it is not the technology itself, but the logistics surrounding its implementation that can cause the most headaches. The current relationship between the e-book supplier and the e-book reader is one to one. This poses a problem for libraries that wish to circulate the same text to multiple readers. A great advantage to e-books would be allowing multiple users concurrent access, but the industry has not yet come to grips with the licensing issues associated with this. There is also a subtler element. As e-book publishers begin marketing their libraries directly to consumers, where does the library fall in the relationship? Do we become kiosks where patrons come to download texts or will publishers bypass libraries entirely? Alternatively, as authors market their works more directly, where do publishers fall?

Cataloging e-books is not as thorny an issue as it would have been a few years ago. We have enough experience describing Web sites and databases now to approach cataloging e-books with confidence. The big issue to think about is licensing and acquisition. This is an area where TS librarians should take a long look and a strong role. In most cases, the e-book industry has not considered libraries. NetLibrary is one exception. Innovative Interfaces recently announced a partnership with NetLibrary. Under this agreement, Innovative Interfaces will enhance its Innopac and Millennium library automation systems to help manage the integration of NetLibrary’s e-books into library collections. Innovative will write software notifying a library about new NetLibrary e-books as they become available and enabling processing of payment for books the library selects. This system will include record-keeping and statistics features to assist the library in tracking these purchases. For one aspect of this joint project, Innovative will develop a specialized acquisitions interface to accommodate NetLibrary’s e-books and business processes. Innovative will be developing and testing these enhancements through June 2000, with expected release of the software to customers by fall 2000. NetLibrary is currently investigating partnerships with other LIS vendors as well. Such partnerships are one way of integrating the texts into our existing TS workflow.

A quick search on Netlibrary for the subject “Law” brought back 286 titles ranging from Dennis Coyle’s *Property Rights and the Constitution* to the *Civil Code of the Russian Federation*. Rocket eBook and SoftBook were developing lengthy lists of titles, but did not have many legal texts available.

For Further Information

“NetLibrary, Innovative Interfaces to Cooperate in Adding E-Books to Library Collections” by Marshall Breeding
<http://www.infotoday.com/newsbreaks/nb000313-2.htm>

“The E-Book Marketplace”
*Library Journal*, v. 125, no. 7(April 15, 2000) p. 44

NetLibrary
<http://www.netlibrary.com>

The Open eBook Initiative
<http://www.openebook.org>

Open eBook Publication Structure
<http://www.openebook.org/specification.htm>

The EBX Working Group
<http://www.ebxwg.org/>

“Electronic Books: To E or not to E, That is the Question”
by Stephanie Ardito
*Searcher*, v.8, no. 4 (April 2000) p.28
Dear Miss Manager:  

I am too embarrassed almost to write this. I am a technical services librarian in an academic library, and I am deathly afraid of technology. I don’t mean the typical end-user version of technology – I can surf the Web well enough and send email and type up a document. But anything having to do with messing with machines or making sure a program is set up properly just puts me in a tizzy. What can I do?

Sincerely,  

Technophobe  

Dear Phobe:  

Miss Manager is tempted to wag her finger at you and say, “Stop being so mousey.” But she will resist. She understands that not everyone is constitutionally suited to be confident about overcoming difficulties. What you have is akin to the condition known well to many librarians with humanities backgrounds: math anxiety. Your interests are not particularly technical (in the computing/automation/engineering sense of that word, not to be confused with its cataloging/acquisitions/serials sense.) So you naturally found yourself wary about performing some technical function early in your career. Perhaps you were asked to coordinate the arrival of the new OCLC terminal, or to figure out uses for the departmental PC (back when there may have been only one) and you resisted or passed on the work to someone else. Since you did not handle that initial experience with much aplomb, you found succeeding chances to work with technical issues less appealing still; for, not only had you performed the original assignment with no distinction, you gave up the opportunity to train yourself to some extent in the technical area. With each new opportunity (and those opportunities have come fast and furious in the last 15 years) you fell farther behind, so that now your circa 1985 technical skills (typing at a keyboard, boolean searching, perhaps even loading paper into a dot matrix printer) are all you have when your director comes to you and says that you will be the person to coordinate the selection, evaluation, and initialization of a new integrated library system. By now you’ve never so much as adjusted a parameter. It was all you could do to learn how to italicize in your word processing program.

One advantage you have, one that has been building over the years, and has, in fact, allowed you to perform technical services functions without being overly technical yourself, is the staffing of separate computer services units within law libraries (or within those libraries’ parent institutions.) Some technical services librarians have not had to learn how to set up networks and deal with the installation of crash-prone operating systems. Other technical services librarians were the first ones in the building to learn computing skills and went off to become systems people. Every library with enough history has a different story to explain its technological development, and every technical services librarian has faced a set of circumstances which have required him or her to either hone technical skills or to pass technical work on to someone else. Most of us fall somewhere in between.

So, on the one hand, you can take comfort in the fact that you have operated for a long time without much technical ability (presumably you are doing well enough otherwise.) You are like the driver of a car in 2000 vs. the driver of 1920. In 1920 you not only needed to know how to drive, but also how to tinker with engines and patch tires. In 2000 you can just drive and let others worry about the details of automotive engineering. On the other hand, if you leave all technical work for others to do, you will have less understanding of the capabilities of the systems and machines available to you. You will be less capable of imaginative
uses of your resources, less likely to respond to needs with a clear sense of possibilities. This is an issue that could lead to the separation of our profession along the library science/information science front, but that would not serve us well in the long run. Just as it is necessary for those who concentrate on the technical side of things to understand what is important about cataloging and acquisitions and serials practices, it is just as important for the well trained cataloger or acquisitions or serials librarian – or technical services manager – to understand technology issues. That doesn’t mean that every person who works in a law library technical services unit must be fully conversant with every detail of the computing universe. But it does mean that those librarians who do not work to understand their own systems as well as they can, who don’t know what sorts of programs are available to their patrons and how they might be using them, who don’t themselves learn to tinker with programs and settings and parameters will be less effective in the services they are providing.

But how do you go about repairing the neglect of your technological education? There is no easy road to this. There is no single book to be read or day-long workshop to attend that will give to you what it has taken others years to achieve. Don’t sell yourself short, though. You may have more on the ball than you realize. The “meager” skills you have acknowledged – surfing the Web and writing documents – could entail any level of ability. You will certainly be an amateur in some ways, but you should build on the things you can do. Take your word processing program for example. Explore it, go into the settings and experiment, write some macros, then edit them, then write more complicated macros. What does this have to do with anything, you might ask. It is helping you to develop technology habits. You should then go to other things more directly related to your work. Does your library have an online catalog? Does the ILS allow you to make many changes locally? Are you at all familiar with its inner workings? Are there manuals you can look through? Set yourself the task of making some improvement you have needed for a long time a reality. You will no doubt need to bring in systems experts at some point in a course of action like this, but just learning to explain your needs to them and finding out why something can or cannot be done, or why it must be done in a different way, will materially increase your computing intelligence. Sign up for classes, read books and articles with a more technical slant than you usually want, learn how to use a database program, write up a simple Web page – in short, practice. Practice being the kind of person who works with computers, and someday that’s just who you will be.

Dear Miss Manager:
I am a recent library school graduate who has just been hired by a large law firm as a technical services librarian. I am one of four librarians in the firm, and the other three have all been in the field quite a while. I particularly admire the head librarian, who not only seems to know everything there is to know about research, but also keeps up with technology, substantive law, and the concerns of my own area. My question is, how do I become like her? What is the appropriate route to managerial excellence?

Sincerely,
Wanna-be

Dear Wanna:
Miss Manager is so pleased to hear from you! The advice-giving world is very much like technical services work sometimes; i.e., we generally hear only the complaints. It is very encouraging to hear about your excellent situation and the great opportunity it is offering you. For that is my advice in a very small nutshell for a person in your position: don’t neglect this opportunity. And what is the opportunity you have? You have the chance to 1) observe the work, the daily habits, the style of an accomplished, professional manager over an extended period; 2) assess the way other experienced professionals interact with a superior manager and with each other; and 3) start thinking about management early in your career. Not everyone who becomes a technical services manager in a law library is necessarily happy about it or good at it. People get into positions in all callings by accident or unusual circumstances. It is much more preferable to pursue a goal because you are attracted to it. So, watch and learn, first of all. A good manager will teach you every day
by helping you to do what you are supposed to do. Be observant. When she elicits good work from you, try to understand why it happens. Most of it will be because of your own good qualities as a worker, but some of it will have to do with the way she represented the work to you and guided your performance. Watch her public dealings with everyone in her department. How does she treat her colleagues? What things does she do to encourage, reprimand, praise in an appropriate way? Talk to her. If you demonstrate a real willingness to learn, she will be flattered and eager to discuss management issues with you.

Perhaps even more important than the good educational opportunities your current position affords are your own work habits and performance. If you show all the interest in the world in moving up to a managerial position but don’t work for it, you will either not get it or not be prepared for it when you do. A good manager like any good employee is the kind of person who shows up every day, who doesn’t have a string of excuses always at hand to explain away failures, who treats other workers fairly, and who puts in a good day’s work. In addition to these general qualities, a manager looks at the bigger picture, notices interconnections between workers and units, is ready to consider a better way of doing things, and is able to deal with a variety of personality types. Not all of these skills can be obtained easily. Some people come by them naturally, others force themselves to learn them. In your case, you should remember that you are early in your career and can’t learn everything at once. Your great fortune is to have a potential mentor at this early stage. But it is up to you to take proper advantage of this chance.

Dear Miss Manager:

I was recently accused of behaving in an “ungentlemanly” way. What can that mean in this day and age, and why should I give a rat’s patootie?

Sincerely,

Proud to be Crude

Dear Crude:

You are just trying to provoke Miss Manager, aren’t you? That in itself demonstrates your ungentlemanlike personality quite clearly enough. The technical meaning of “gentleman” long ago lost its exclusive connection with a particular kind of person from a particular class and came to refer to those qualities thought to be appropriate to such a person, namely politeness, integrity, and a tendency to behave well. You may find it more to your liking to behave impolitely, without integrity, and crudely. But in the workplace especially, where good manners serve the important function of maintaining a comfortable atmosphere surrounding people who might not otherwise choose each other’s company, crudeness and impolite behavior will make you hard to work with for at least some people. If you don’t care, then I hope for your sake that you don’t offend the wrong people. But it seems likely that you will sooner or later.
For my final column, I would like to recap some of the major activities and accomplishments of OCLC in the past two years. Certainly, this is not so much an exhaustive listing as it is my own impressions of this unique organization, so forgive me if I’ve missed something obvious.

In May of 1998, Jay Jordan was named the new president and CEO of OCLC, succeeding K. Wayne Smith, who served in that capacity from 1989-March 1998. With Jordan has come a new and more global vision for the organization. OCLC has greatly expanded its coverage to include an ever-increasing number of members in countries outside the United States on several continents.

An emphasis in research has shifted to the development of products that marry OCLC’s unique databases to the World Wide Web. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the remodeling of FirstSearch and the development of the CORC Project. In my institution, WorldCat is among the many databases available to the students through FirstSearch; they are encouraged to use it, particularly when checking citations for law review. As for CORC, it seems a little slower to get off the ground with the law community. I counted only four law school libraries among its participants, and no law firms. Certainly, having the Library of Congress and GPO contribute bibliographic records for electronic resources is a great boon, and I hope that this project realizes its full potential with practical applications to the library world.

In late 1998, negotiations between OCLC and WLN began; they officially merged on January 1, 1999. “The move toward a merger developed because of a growing realization by both WLN and OCLC that an increasing number of libraries were using the services of both organizations and that a carefully thought-out merger might best serve the needs of all of our libraries,” said Paul McCarthy, president and CEO of WLN. The infusion of WLN’s high quality records has improved the product of the OCLC databases immeasurably.

The OCLC Institute has developed into a wonderful source of continuing education for knowledge management professionals (in other words, us). The courses charge librarians to look at our profession in a new way and help to empower us to direct the manner in which our professional futures are formed to better fit (and perhaps lead) the organization of the digital world of the 21st century. I encourage everyone to attend an OCLC institute.

What can I say about Y2K? It certainly had the potential to wreak havoc on all of our computer applications, not to mention the millions of other non-compliant computer-related functions in our everyday lives. Many people spent great amounts of time upgrading systems for compliance; outdated systems were scrapped. We went home for New Year’s with more than a little concern about what we would find upon our return. I personally bought two gallons of water and a case of granola bars, just in case. Due to the hard work of our computer professionals, the catastrophe was averted, and work goes on at its usual frenetic pace.

I would like to remind everyone of the excellence of the OCLC Web site. It is a one-stop shop for information on all aspects of OCLC. You can find the home page at: <http://www.oclc.org/oclc/menu/home1.htm>.

It has been a pleasure researching OCLC for these columns for the past two years. I look forward to reading my successor’s articles.
OBS/TS Research Roundtable

Come to the ninth annual OBS/TS Research Roundtable on Sunday, July 18th! Bring your lunch and we’ll provide the drinks at the Marriott Hotel from 11:45am to 1:00pm. (Check the conference schedule for the exact room location.) Chris Long (Indiana University - Indianapolis, <clong@iupui.edu>) and Becky Lutkenhaus (Drake University, <rebecca.lutkenhaus@drake.edu>) host this year’s informal roundtable for you technical services law librarians interested in research and publication ideas, issues and information. Brian Striman (University of Nebraska-Lincoln, <bstriman@unl.edu>), outgoing OBS Chair and founder of the Research Roundtable, and Corinne Jacox (Barry University of Orlando, <cjacox@mail.barry.edu>), Chair of the OBS/TS Joint Research Grants Committee, plan on attending also.

Writing Advice

A recent ALPSP survey shows that resume building and personal recognition is increasing as a motivation for professional writing. Two-thirds of 3,000 authors surveyed “agree that the purpose of scholarly publishing does seem to be changing. It is seen as moving away from knowledge dissemination to the building of an author’s curriculum vitae/resumé or reputation.” The survey summary further states, “The main objective for publishing … remains communication with the author’s peers. Enhancing career prospects is the second most common reason, followed by gaining personal prestige and funding for future work. Direct financial reward was only given as a reason by a tiny minority of respondents.” Alma Swan, What Authors Really Want: The ALPSP Author Survey 1999 [Preliminary Report], <http://www.alpsp.org.uk/swan.pdf>, summarizing What Authors Want: The ALPSP Research Study on the Motivations and Concerns of Contributors to Learned Journals (Falmouth, Great Britain: Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers, 1999).

The survey also examined where authors publish. “When authors are considering which journal to submit to, there is a range of factors which are of importance. First among these is the reputation of the journal. Its impact factor, international reach and the coverage by abstracting and indexing services follow, very close together. The journal’s circulation, subject coverage and publication speed were also cited by a substantial number of respondents.”

As an aside, a recent complementary work to the authors survey is Betsy Lerner’s The Forest For The Trees: An Editor’s Advice To Writers (NY: Riverhead Books, 2000). Ms. Lerner critically explains from an experienced editor’s perspective how to improve one’s writing.

More advice on writing may be found at:


A Guide to Indispensable Writing Resources <http://www.quintcareers.com/writing>

Guide to Grammar and Writing <http://go.to/grammar>

William Strunk, Jr.’s The Elements of Style <http://www.bartleby.com/141/index.html>

Promotion & Tenure

On a completely different topic, I’d like to share some statistics on TS/OBS members seeking tenure. Combined results from the TS-SIS and OBS-SIS 1999/2000 membership surveys show that 20% of the 178 respondents are in tenure-track positions, and 75% of them already have tenure. Of those in tenure-track positions, 56% require (or required) research and publication while 83% require(d) professional involvement to obtain tenure. Outside of tenure-track positions, 19% require research and publication, and 46% require professional involvement for promotion or salary increases. Finally, 43% (of those not in tenure-track jobs) have been promoted to the top of their possible ranks. In other words, achieving tenure based on scholarly publishing is a current concern for relatively few of us, and most TS/OBS members are past that point in their careers.
For those seeking guidance on tenure issues, I’d suggest the following:


CASE Tenure: Bibliography <http://www.case.org/flshfils/tenubib.htm>

ARL, AAUP and the American Council of Learned Societies. *The Specialized Scholarly Monograph in Crisis, or How Can I Get Tenure if You Won’t Publish My Book?* (Summary, presentations, and papers from last September’s conference of the same name, sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies, the Association of American University Presses and the Association of Research Libraries.) <http://www.arl.org/scomm/epub/program.html>

The Chronicle of Higher Education “Issues In Depth: Tenure and Labor Relations in Academe” (compilation of links to CHE articles; requires a paid subscription) <http://chronicle.com/indepth/labor>

Come Join the Research Roundtable

Finally, come to the OBS/TS Research Roundtable at the AALL conference! It’s an excellent support group and network of those interested in research and writing (including anyone required to write for promotion or tenure).

TSLL’s History

(continued from page 6)

the list of section officers and TSLL staff to the inside front cover. Jean Pajerek at Cornell became the first columnist for the “Serials Title Changes & Cessations” column. Caitlin Robinson from the University of Iowa and Susanne Nevin from the University of Minnesota began an “Automation” column.

I must admit I cringed just a little bit when I saw that I used the term, “telefax”. It made me feel somewhat like a dinosaur. I also noticed that the August, 1987 issue had an article from Susanne Nevin at the University of Minnesota describing how their catalogers coped with a delay in getting their NOTIS software and terminals. We are still trying to figure out what to do when our system is down for maintenance or software upgrades!

In summary, serving as editor of *TSLL* was a wonderful experience. It was the beginning of my becoming very active in TS and OBS-SIS. I met some wonderful and talented people whom I still consider to be my friends as well as colleagues today.
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:

**Amnesty action**  
- Vol. 23, no. 4 (fall 1999)  
**Changed to:**  
Amnesty now  
Vol. 24, no. 1 (winter 2000)-

- 1996  
**Changed to:**  
Public safety (Sacramento, Calif).  
Public safety ... creating a safer California  
1997-

**Circles** (Buffalo, N.Y.)  
**Changed to:**  
The Buffalo women’s law journal  
Vol. 7 (spring 1999)-

Council of Europe. Parliamentary Assembly. *Texts adopted by the Assembly = Textes adoptes par l’Assemblee*  
**Changed to:**  
1999/1 (Jan. 1999)-

**The economic and budget outlook**  
Fiscal years 1986-1990-  
fiscal years 2000-2009  
(OCoLC 19764726)  
**Changed to:**  
The budget and economic outlook  
Fiscal years 2001-2010-  
(OCoLC 43485470)

*Looking ahead* (Chicago, Ill.: 1995)  
Vol. 27, no. 1 (Sept.-Oct. 1995)-v. 30, no. 6 (July/Aug. 1999)  
(OCoLC 34022463)  
**Changed to:**  
*Trends* (Chicago, Ill.: 1999)  
Vol. 31, no. 1 (Sept./Oct. 1999)-  
(OCoLC 42635260)

**Minnesota rules of court**  
- 1999  
(OCoLC 1757729)  
**Split into:**  
*Minnesota rules of court. Federal*  
2000-  
(OCoLC 43592534)  
and:  
*Minnesota rules of court. State*  
2000-  
(OCoLC 43592602)

Natural resources, energy, and environmental law  
(OCoLC 19567865)  
**Changed to:**  
*Environment, energy, and resources law*  
16 (1999)-  
(OCoLC 43853615)

**New York state bar journal**  
(OCoLC 1760205 : paper version)  
(OCoLC 16879010 : microfiche version)  
**Changed to:**  
Journal (New York State Bar Association)  
Vol. 72, no. 1 (Jan. 2000)-  
(OCoLC 43545509 : paper version)  
(OCoLC 43699365 : microfiche version)

**Revista juridica del Peru**  
Ano 1, no. 1 (enero-abr. 1950)-ano 48, no. 17 (oct.-dic. 1998)  
**Changed to:**  
Revista peruana de jurisprudencia  
Ano 1, no. 1 (agosto 1999)-

**Washington University journal of urban and contemporary law**  
**Changed to:**  
Washington University journal of law and policy  
Vol. 1 (1999)-

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:

**Andean newsletter**  
Ceased publication  
Last issue: no. 141 (1998) ?
Philadelphia: The Librarians Are Coming ...

Local Systems Committee Open Discussion: “Alpha & Beta Testing”

The Local Systems Committee of OBS/SIS is pleased to announce an informal “program” at AALL. You are invited to come to their Open Discussion at 11:45am. on Wednesday, July 19, 2000. Learn why Adrian White recommends the beta experience as a result of beta testing Innovative’s Millennium Circulation and Serials at Howard University. Find out from Regina Wallen how Stanford University handled alpha testing of SIRSI’s Serials and Acquisitions modules. Join in a discussion about the relationship between libraries and their system vendors. This is your chance to learn about system testing, ask questions, and share your opinions. Anyone with an interest in the topic is invited. You are welcome to bring your lunch.
Saturday, July 15:

9:00-4:00 p.m.  Electronic Licensing Agreements (Workshop W2)
4:00-5:00 p.m.  TS 1999/2000 Executive Board Meeting
4:00-6:00 p.m.  OBS 1999/2000 Executive Board Meeting
6:00-7:30 p.m.  TS/OBS/RIPS/CS-SIS Joint Reception

Sunday, July 16:

11:45-1:00 p.m. OBS/TS Research Roundtable
1:00-2:00 p.m.  How Will the Law Library Work in a Paperless World? The Impact of Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) on Library Management (Program B-1)
2:15-3:45 p.m.  The Alphabet Soup of Cooperative Cataloging: Leading Through Participation in NACO, Saco, BIBCO and CONSER (Program C-1)
4:00-5:00 p.m.  TS Business Meeting
5:00-6:00 p.m.  OBS Business Meeting

Monday, July 17:

7:00-8:30 a.m.  TS Cataloging & Classification Committee Meeting
7:30-8:30 a.m.  TS Acquisitions Committee Meeting
7:30-8:30 a.m.  TS Preservation Committee Meeting
10:15-11:45 a.m. Instant Gratification! The Z39.50 Gateway to Searching and Cataloging and ILL (Program D-3)
5:00-6:00 p.m.  OCLC/WLN Committee Open Discussion
5:00-6:00 p.m.  2001 Annual Meeting Program Selection Committee Open Forum
5:00-6:00 p.m.  TSLL Board Meeting
5:15-6:15 p.m.  TS Serials Committee Meeting

Tuesday, July 18:

7:30-8:30 a.m.  TS Heads of Technical Services Roundtable
10:45-12:15 p.m. Core Competencies for Support Staff: Librarians as Departmental Leaders (Program G-5)
10:45-12:15 p.m. Gateways Through the Vendor Maze: Using Technology – and other Tricks – to Manage Legal Publishers (Program G-6)
10:45-12:15 p.m. Religious Law in a Secular Setting: A Cataloging and Classification Approach (Program G-7)
12:15-1:30 p.m.  OBS Education Committee
12:15-1:30 p.m.  TS Preservation & Binding Roundtable
12:30-1:30 p.m.  TS Cataloging & Classification Issues Roundtable
3:45-5:15 p.m.  The Text Encoding Initiative and Legal Electronic Texts (Program I-3)
5:15-6:15 p.m.  TS Heads of Cataloging in Large Law Libraries
5:30-6:30 p.m.  TS Acquisitions Roundtable

Wednesday, July 19:

7:30-8:45 a.m.  OBS 2000/2001 Executive Board Meeting
7:30-8:30 a.m.  TS 2000/2001 Executive Board Meeting
11:45-1:00 p.m. OBS Local Systems Committee Open Discussion
12:30-1:30 p.m.  TS Education Committee Meeting
2:00-3:00 p.m.  What I like, Who Has It and Can I Have It? An Update on Library Integrated Systems (Program K-7)
3:15-4:15 p.m.  Acquisition and Control of Electronic Legal Resources in the 21st Century (Program L-4)
How Will the Law Library Work in a Paperless World: The Impact of Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) on Library Management (Program B-1); Coordinator: Joan Liu. Date & Time: Sunday, July 16, 1:00-2:00 p.m.

Libraries and vendors can now exchange orders, invoices, and claims over the Internet. These exciting developments are made possible by EDI, Electronic Data Interchange, a technology that performs exchange of business data in standardized electronic format between systems. EDI has greatly improved the efficiency and quality of library services. However, it is still unfamiliar to the majority of law libraries. What impact will it have on a law library’s management when acquisition and serials processes occur in a paperless environment? An information specialist and EDI expert will review the latest developments on the technical integrity of all EDI standards. A law librarian will present her research on this technology. A subscription agent will share his knowledge of incorporating EDI messages into the Library of Kansas State University, the first library to load annual serial invoices via the EDI interface.

The Alphabet Soup of Cooperative Cataloging: Leading Through Participation in NACO, SACO, BIBCO, and CONSER (Program C-1) Coordinator/moderator: Ellen McGrath. Date & Time: Sunday, July 16, 2:15-3:45 p.m.

Tight budgets and staff shortages make cooperative cataloging efforts essential. Unrealized cooperative work exists in many of our local systems. Why not share it? In the past, only major research libraries could afford to contribute “authoritative” records to shared national files. The Library of Congress now enlists all types of libraries to join in its cooperative work. The expertise law catalogers possess in dealing with certain types of bibliographic and authority records would have a great impact on these cooperative efforts. This program will assist law librarians in assessing the value of PCC component programs with regard to work taking place in their library. Speakers will present an overview of the PCC and how its component parts fit together. They will discuss training, the impact on daily workflow, and the benefits to be gained both by users of our library catalogs and by law catalogers.

Instant Gratification! The Z39.50 Gateway to Searching, Cataloging and ILL (Program D-3) Coordinator/moderator/speaker: Mary Jane Kelsey Date & Time: Monday, July 17, 10:15-11:45 AM

Z39.50 offers enhanced user service and technical processing. Speakers represent various parts of the Z39.50 world: librarians using Z39.50, representatives of major target databases and ILS developers. The speakers will address the function of the attribute settings, interesting uses for Z39.50 such as simultaneous searches on multiple databases, instantaneous acquisition of bib records, instantaneous generation of ILL requests, and the standardization issues yet to be resolved in the application of Z39.50. This program will address the likely result of various search strategies against LC, OCLC, and RLIN databases. The audience will be asked to react to the question, “Are there ethical problems associated with the ability to acquire MARC records from any database with a Z39.50 server?”

Core Competencies for Support Staff: Librarians as Departmental Leaders (Program G-5) Coordinator/speaker: Phyllis Post. Date & Time: Tuesday, July 18, 10:45 a.m.-12:15 p.m.

An OBS-SIS task force, in recognition that the principles of core competencies are applicable to law library staff at all levels, not just law librarians, wrote sample core competencies for support staff in both technical and public services. These core competencies describe basic tasks that all support staff are expected to carry out in their daily work. Selected examples include being able to recognize how bibliographic information is presented, how library systems operate, and how legal materials are organized. Librarians who are managers can use these core competencies to be more effective leaders in their departments as they hire, train, and evaluate support staff. Speakers will include members of the OBS task force who wrote the sample core competencies being presented. The program will conclude with a practical, real-life example of writing and using core competencies from a librarian who has done so.

Gateways Through the Vendor Maze: Using Technology – and other Tricks – to Manage Legal Publishers (Program G-6) Coordinator: Sheri H. Lewis. Date & Time: Tuesday, July 18, 10:45 a.m.-12:15 p.m.

The increasingly complicated world of legal publishing has created a maze for law librarians who develop their collections and acquire library materials. Technology resources are available to better navigate this maze in providing information, gateways for communication and time-saving procedures. Recognized acquisitions and collection development specialists and speakers from the Committee on Relations with Information Vendors (CRIV) will cover the most useful librarian-created technology resources, including CRIV electronic resources and electronic products and services made available by vendors. They will also discuss the issues that arise when interacting with legal vendors and customer service departments.
Religious Law in a Secular Setting: A Cataloging and Classification Approach (Program G-7) Coordinator/moderator: Patricia Sayre-McCoy. Date & Time: Tuesday, July 18, 10:45 a.m.-12:15 p.m.

This program will address several concerns with the new Theological Law classification, KB, currently in development at the Library of Congress. The program will explain the development of the KB schedules and their relationship to the former religious law sections of the B schedules. The speakers will examine what constitutes religious law and how to determine which classification schedule to use, and they will compare religious legal systems to state-based legal systems. They will also discuss subject headings related to religious law. Examples of actual cataloging will be presented.

The Text Encoding Initiative and Electronic Legal Texts (Program I-3) Coordinator/speaker: Kevin Butterfield. Date & Time: Tuesday, July 18, 3:45-5:15 p.m.

The Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) is an international project to develop guidelines for the preparation and interchange of electronic texts for scholarly research. Since the beginning of the TEI project, the need for standardized encoding practices has become critical as the need to use and, most importantly, reuse electronic text has increased for both research and industry. The growing diversity of applications for electronic texts include natural language processing, scholarly editions, information retrieval, hypertext, electronic publishing, various forms of historical analysis, and lexicography. The central objective of the TEI ensures that any text created can be used for any number of these applications and for more, as yet not fully understood, purposes. The speaker(s) will introduce the TEI and its metadata component, the TEI Header, and discuss methods, tools, and issues surrounding the production of electronic versions of primary legal texts that will support academic research and legal practice applications.

What I Like, Who Has It and Can I Have It? An Update on Library Integrated Systems (Program K-7) Coordinator: F. Tim Knight. Date & Time: Wednesday, July 19, 2:00-3:00 p.m.

Keeping informed of innovations and trends in the fast-paced world of integrated library systems is not easy. The constant give and take between the needs and demands of your users and staff and changes in the field affect the use and implementation of your library’s system. Is your vendor setting trends or reacting to them? Is your vendor receptive to your enhancement requests? What features do other library systems offer and what are some of the problems they are dealing with? Two nationally known library automation experts/practicing consultants will assess and compare existing library systems and answer questions about the latest trends and developments. This program will take participants beyond their own systems, enabling them to make better decisions when negotiating with vendors for changes to their existing systems or dealing with system migration or new purchase situations.

Acquisition and Control of Electronic Legal Resources in the 21st Century (Program L-4) Coordinator/moderator: Joyce Manno Janto. Date & Time: Wednesday, July 19, 3:15-4:15 p.m.

Law librarians have been struggling with the format transfer of serials from printing to digital. How does the library acquire and track these virtual resources? After the license agreement is signed, how do you manage licenses and contracts of those resources? Should electronic serials be controlled through local systems, and how would that be accomplished? How do you maintain the library holding statement for the serials that the library doesn’t physically own? What does the digital environment demand for technical services librarians and support staff? Two knowledgeable specialists will illustrate trends in legal serials development and provide strategies for the acquisition and quality control of electronic serials in the law library.

TS/OBS/CS/RIPS Joint Reception 2000

The Technical Services, Online Bibliographic Services, Computing Services, and Research Instruction & Patron Services Special Interest Sections cordially invite you to a Joint Reception to be held on Saturday, July 15, 2000 from 6-7:30 PM at the Marriott Hotel. Please check your final program for the room location. The reception is sponsored by Innovative Interfaces, Inc.
I want to sincerely thank those OBS-SIS members who took the time to complete this year’s survey and return it to me. You know who you are and OBS is appreciative of your willingness to share your thoughts! The bad news is, many more OBS members neglected to return their survey. I mailed out 304 surveys, but only 47 were completed and returned—a mere 15% return rate!

I realize that not making the survey available on the Web may have contributed to this poor response. I felt it was more important to get the survey out on time, so that the results could be used in a timely manner. Hopefully, the 2000/2001 OBS survey will be on the Web. All elected OBS officers and committee chairs are always happy to hear your comments about the Section. But once a year, you have a valuable opportunity to be reminded to speak up when you receive your membership survey. So please take advantage of it!

Just the facts …

The results of the survey (as always) were quite interesting, even to some of the seemingly mundane, factual questions. For example, following the name and address lines, there was a space for “areas of responsibility” and these were the responses:

- Technical services
- Administration
- Database management/maintenance/administration
- Cataloging
- Acquisitions
- Serials
- Accounts payable
- Reference
- Loose-leaf filing
- Collection development
- Selection
- Records management
- Materials processing
- Systems
- Coverage of circulation desk
- Preservation
- Classification
- Reclassification
- Shelfreading
- Government documents
- Middle management
- Managing
- Editing
- Binding
- Authority work/control
- Planning
- Coordinating
- Personnel
- Project management
- IS liaison
- Webmaster
- Consortial
- Director/associate dean
- Liaison to faculty
- Reserve
- Correspondence
- Writing documentation
- Attending meetings
- Training
- Supervision
- Problem management
- Acquisitions, serials, reference, etc. But I was pleased to see the laundry list of answers. It helps illustrate that OBS attracts a wide variety of members and that its members are extremely versatile!

On a less wide-ranging note, 41 use OCLC as their bibliographic utility, while 4 use RLIN, and one, AG Canada. Local system usage is more varied, as a result of the greater number of choices: Innovative Interfaces (23), NOTIS (6), Sirsi (4), Voyager (2), DRA (2), Horizon (1), CARL (1), Best Seller (1), Dynix (1), EOS (2), Other (1), don’t have (or left blank) (4). Four responded that they are in the process of migrating to another system.

In terms of the type of library, we work in: Academic (40), Firm (4), County (1), Corporate (1), Federal/Military (1), Law society (1). And we are quite the experienced bunch! Years spent in service in law libraries: 1-3 (3), 4-6 (4), 7-9 (4), 10-13 (5), 13-19 (19), 20+ (11). Seventy-four percent of those who responded have 10 or more years of experience in law libraries! I suspect this reflects the fact that many of us who have been around a while tend to be more involved and thus more likely to respond to the survey. I hope it doesn’t mean most of us are on the verge of burnout!
What kind of OBS services do you need now?

In answer to this question, the responses ranged from the very general (“Everything”) to the very specific (encouraging OCLC to simplify its search strategy). Some were very honest and said they were not sure what OBS services they needed or that they had just joined OBS, so didn’t know yet. Others reemphasized the importance of this newsletter (Technical Services Law Librarian), educational programs (both at AALL annual and locally), committee meetings, roundtables, and discussion lists. Current information about local systems, the bibliographic utilities, and technology were requested by a number of people. One person mentioned mentoring as a needed service.

What is your most pressing continuing need from OBS?

There were a lot of good responses to this question, so I’ll list them as is, just removing some of the duplication:

1. State of the art technology reviews; strategic direction/evolution in the profession and in technical services
2. Assisting in program selection for AALL
3. What we should be doing to be proactive with electronic resources
4. Merger issue
5. Comparison of local integrated systems
6. Information received at the committee meetings during annual meeting
7. Collegial support and training information
8. Keeping up to date
9. Continuing education—library automation, contacts with colleagues
10. Information on OCLC and its future direction

OBS programs and projects

Some rather specific program topics were listed and respondents were asked to rank them on a scale from 1 (no interest, remove from list) to 5 (hot topic, definitely should be done). In order of interest level, the results are:

Topic: Integrating the electronic library (department coordination, workflow issues, collection development, choosing electronic resources to catalog, who maintains URL links, etc.)

- 17 respondents felt this was a hot topic and a program should be done. Those who volunteered to coordinate or assist with such a program will most likely be contacted by Ismael Gullon, OBS Education Chair, sometime soon! One respondent mentioned e-books and netLibrary.com as aspects of this topic.

Topic: Maintenance and quality control of the local database while facing constant change, cutbacks, shortages of staff and growing demands on our time away from those duties and responsibilities

- 14 respondents were very interested in this topic. Volunteers are also likely to be contacted.

Topic: Automated cataloging tools (e.g., Catalogers Desktop, Classification Plus)

- 17 expressed average interest in this topic and there were volunteers to assist in planning this program, though none to coordinate it. This topic might lend itself to an article in TSLL instead.

Topic: Multiple versions in the online catalog. Update and options; what are others doing?

- 12 expressed average interest in this topic. One said that she had submitted a program proposal on this topic in the past, but it had not been chosen. This could also be a good TSLL article or program. It would be important with either approach that both the technical and public services perspectives be covered. One of the problems with this topic is that there has been no real resolution on this on the national front, though some CONSER guidelines on electronic resources now exist. Nevertheless, a description of how other libraries are dealing with multiple versions could be very helpful. Aggregator titles were mentioned as an aspect of this topic by one respondent. Another suggested a list of which libraries use a multiple versions approach and which do not would be helpful. It might be possible to incorporate this question into the next version of the Law Library Systems Directory.

Topic: Client-server issues and Z39.50

- 12 expressed average interest in this topic. A few people commented that there is a Z39.50 program scheduled for this 2000 annual meeting, so another may not be necessary in 2001. A report in TSLL on this year’s program could be helpful to those who will not be in Philadelphia.

Topic: Adding call numbers from the newer LCC law schedules to OCLC and/or RLIN bibliographic records

- 13 expressed minimal interest in this topic. Two respondents said that they do this on a regular basis, so perhaps either or both could contribute a piece to TSLL on this topic. One respondent mentioned that this should be approached as an OCLC Enhance project. Perhaps a TSLL article about which law libraries are Enhance libraries and what it takes to become one would also be useful.

New program ideas

OBS members offered some excellent suggestions for program planning:

- Status of OCLC CORC project
- Technical services staff involvement in creating and maintaining the law library’s Web page
- ILL (local systems and OCLC)
- Staff training issues in system upgrades or migrations
- Controlling the online system’s indexing (What changes can you make? What do you need to know in order to make changes? Can you add a new index?)
When asked about TSLL, people seemed very satisfied for the most part:

• It is a very informative newsletter that I read from cover to cover. Great job to the editors and columnists.
• Keep up the top-notch work.
• Fabulous newsletter!
• It’s perfect.

There were a few specific suggestions for topics to be covered in the future in TSLL:

• How to hire good technical services librarians.
• Articles like “How we do it” covering new processes, functions. The editors could identify topics (e.g. table of contents, designing Web catalog interfaces) and solicit contributors.
• I’m always looking for better, faster shortcut ways to enhance, maintain online system—practical how to’s as opposed to theoretical; simple tricks as opposed to complex solutions.

Final general member quotes
OBS members were helpful in delivering positive reinforcement, as well as ideas for further improvement:

• I am no longer directly responsible for technical services; however, I try to stay aware of what’s going on. OBS helps me do that. Thank you.
• As someone whose access to OBS has been limited and at a distance (and may continue to be so), I have to say that OBS makes little impact in my life. Moving OBS down to the grass roots of the chapters in the form of programs made available to local chapters, on site or phone consulting help and the like would be stellar and valuable services. Would like to be more active but my time is limited. Opportunity would need to be more than fluff and something I could handle without going on the road (or significant enough to justify firm funding).
• Although I am relatively new to the profession … I am still very willing to become involved and serve the SIS. Just let me know how I can help! (Don’t worry, OBS has already taken this person up on this offer!)
• I think the people who have been running this Section have done a very fine job over all the years I can recall.
• The communication within OBS is continually improving. There is so much enthusiasm! One of the greatest needs is involving as many people as possible. Recruiting new members is also important.
• I would like to see OBS spend some of its money to support the expense of bringing in experts outside the law library world. Graphic design of information (making effective training manuals and OPAC tutorials), how to make good presentations (many of us have the occupational requirement to do so, but no training and many are expected to present at professional meetings as part of professional development).
• I enjoy being part of OBS. OBS sponsored programs are timely and informative. I am very pleased with this Section.
• Great leadership!
• I like OBS for the chance to be on the OCLC Committee and the contact it provides with OCLC and other OCLC member libraries.
• I appreciate the work of the Section and this survey.
• Keep visibility of TS librarians high.
• I have appreciated the ongoing efforts of OBS to provide interfaces with online utilities and think the work of the Local Systems Committee (i.e. their Directory) is very worthwhile.

Committee assignments
The membership survey also contained portions describing the structure of OBS and asking for volunteers to run for office and/or to serve on various committees. I have compiled lists of all those volunteers. You should be notified of your committee assignment sometime in June, hopefully by the time you are reading this. As a reminder, all OBS committee and roundtable meetings during the AALL annual meeting are open to all. OBS simply makes these committee assignments in order to give the chair of each committee a core of volunteers that can assist him/her during planning throughout the year. I was very pleased at the number of volunteers. Even
commissioned a draft of a holdings standard to replace both 44 and 57, Proposed American National Standard Holdings Statements for Bibliographic Items, Z39.71-199X. It was voted on by the NISO community but was not approved. In 1994, a committee was appointed to look at the 1991 draft, and to resolve the problems identified in the 1991 ballot. Soon after they began their work, the international standard for serial and non-serial holdings at the summary level, ISO 10324, Holdings statements — Summary Level, became available. Since NISO encourages compatibility with relevant international standards, the committee started a new draft of Z39.71 based on ISO 10324, adding rules for detailed-level holdings.

Scope of Z39.71-1999:
According to the abstract at the beginning of 71, it covers the following:

- It defines display requirements — how a holdings statement should look.
- It defines display requirements for holdings statements which indicate what is held in your library, or in a shared collection of a group of libraries. It can be used in a regional union list or in your local catalog.
- It defines display requirements for holdings statements for bibliographic items — anything which you can describe bibliographically, by cataloging rules.
- It defines display requirements for holdings statements for bibliographic items in any physical or electronic medium. This includes electronic resources. These were not included in past standards which covered only entities in “any physical medium” (57) or “serials in all physical forms” (44).
- It covers electronic resources . . . under [an institution’s] control or available under other arrangements. “Under an institution’s control” means resources in your library — a CD-ROM in the back of a book, or a CD-ROM or database file on a local server. “Available under other arrangements” further encompasses any file on a remote server, reached through the Internet or other means, including aggregators’ collections of e-journals. This is obviously a concept new in 71. In the mid-1980s, electronic databases were far less important to library collections than they are today, and were more separate — few libraries tried to include them in catalogs. Only recently, with full-text journal databases that resemble and may substitute for printed journals, have we felt a strong need to show holdings for electronic databases.
- It can be used for both manual and automated means of recording holdings, ranging from a handwritten or typed list to a database, perhaps formatted with MARC tags, in a computer.

The committee that wrote 71 was very aware of the number of holdings statements already in existence: more than seven million union listing holdings statements in OCLC and an unknown quantity in other regional lists and in local catalogs. It was important to keep those statements valid and usable, while establishing rules for new developments. Therefore, much of 71 is similar to its predecessors, and holdings statements created under earlier Z39 standards remain valid.

though our survey response was low, it is clear that those who did respond want to be very active in OBS!

2001 program planning
It is clear from the survey responses that members value OBS’ efforts in providing quality education programs at the AALL annual meeting. Some were even willing to offer new ideas for programs and OBS will follow up on these. OBS is sponsoring or co-sponsoring seven programs this July in Philadelphia. OBS needs your help to make sure that programs of interest to OBS members are offered in 2001 in Minneapolis. If you have an idea for a program proposal, please contact Ismael Gullon, OBS Education Chair, myself, or any member of the OBS Executive Board. Even if you don’t have an idea, but you want to be involved with putting on a program, contact OBS. Sometimes ideas are available, but coordinators are needed. It’s a great way to get involved and to make sure programs you want to attend are presented!

We hear you, but don’t stop talking!
I just want to close by saying that OBS takes your survey responses very seriously. The annual survey is an opportunity for you to speak your piece as an OBS member. But OBS wants to hear what you have to say whenever it occurs to you and OBS recognizes that members’ needs do change over time. Speak up on the OBS-SIS electronic list or call or e-mail any of the members of the OBS Executive Board. We want to know what’s on your mind and how OBS can serve you better!
Changes to Terminology:
Z39.71 defines roughly the same six data areas as its predecessors, some with different names. The holdings statement must be linked to an Item Identification Area. This more general term comes from Z39.57; 42 and 44 holdings statements were linked to a “Serials Identification Area.”

The note area, formerly called “Local Notes” now has a broader term: Holdings Note Area, since all holding information is local.

Changes to Data Elements:
The General Holdings Area is now optional; it had always been required in the past. Looking back at the OCLC union listing experience, the committee recognized that many interlibrary loan users did not understand the coded data, and that many groups chose the option to suppress the coded data in printed lists. Back in 1980, the General Holdings Data Area of 42 was intended to provide hints about how much was held in a Level 2 statement which didn’t provide specific volume or year information. Over the years, it was found that most OCLC union list holdings statements did include volume/year information, so that the coded hints of Level 2 weren’t needed. When the standard is used in a local system, volume/year information will almost always be present.

If you still use the General Holdings Area, some of its codes have changed. 44 and 57 distinguished between summary and detailed holdings statements. Type of Unit Designator in 71 no longer makes that distinction because “summary/detailed” isn’t very meaningful for non-serial titles. If a computer system needs to know, the MARC Format distinguishes summary from detailed level. Instead, 71 uses those same Type of Unit Designator codes to distinguish the Basic Bibliographic Unit from a Secondary Bibliographic Unit such as a supplement or an index. This distinction may be useful to law libraries.

The Physical Form Designator in 71 now uses all the codes defined for the MARC Bibliographic Format 007 first two positions, rather than just some of them. This increases the number of formats you can identify. Since the MARC Bibliographic Format adds new formats when they develop, holdings statements will automatically be able to identify new formats without needing to change the standard.

The Acquisitions Status Designator successfully combines the serial and non-serial values of 44 and 57; the values don’t clash.

One change to the Retention Designator brings the terminology up to date: “retained until replaced by microform” is now “retained until replaced by microform, or other preservation format.”

The Extent of Holdings Area merged the serial and non-serial categories. In addition to Enumeration and Chronology, you now can use Extent of Unit [5 microfiches], Name of Unit (“Appendix” or “Charter” chap.1-74] and a Specific Extent Note in angle brackets [“Decisions” 1 v. <in binder>].

Captions, such as volume, Band, part, number, side (for a long-playing record), are “recommended but optional” in 71. In 42, they were forbidden, in 44 they were required in a detailed Level 4 statement, and required if available in a summary Level 3 statement. In 44, captions were to be repeated at both ends of a range.

A non-gap break is a break in numbering or chronology “caused by unpublished parts or discontinuity in the publisher’s sequential designations,” and indicated by a semicolon. A semicolon can be used to indicate a change or other peculiarity in the method of numbering [no.1-no.8;v.3:no.1-]. It was very important in 42 when captions were forbidden, but is less necessary when you can record captions. In 71, it is now optional to report a non-gap break.

71 allows two styles, without preference, of display of Enumeration and Chronology: separate [v.1-8 1990-1998] and adjacent [v.1(1990)-v.8(1998)]. 42 allowed only the separate style. 44 allowed both separate and adjacent styles for summary level statements, but required the adjacent style for detailed statements. In calling the adjacent style “Option A,” 44 seemed to prefer it. Although 57 is the
non-serial standard, it has instructions for enumeration in serial secondary bibliographic units (for example, an annual supplement to a monograph). Like 44, 57 allowed adjacent or separate styles for summary holdings statements, but required the adjacent style for its detailed statements.

Our automated systems may force you to use the separate style. At the present time, if you are fully coding holdings statements in the MARC Format, you must use the separate style because the 863/4/5 tags do not allow you to repeat enumeration or chronology subfields. You can code an adjacent holdings statement in the free-text MARC Textual Holdings 866/7/8 field.

Chronology, when displayed separately in 42 and 44, was not surrounded by parentheses, although the adjacent display used parentheses. 71 allows parentheses to surround chronology in a separate display. You, your consortium, or your system can decide whether or not to use parentheses to identify chronology.

New in 71 is the mixed-level holdings statement, which allows you to code part of the run of a serial at summary Level 3, and part at detailed Level 4. This facilitates conversion of older manual holdings records, which may not have enough information for a detailed holdings statement. You can then start to record the current or recent volume at detailed Level 4, perhaps automatically updated by a serials check-in system.

71 allows an open detailed Level 4 holdings statement, which allows an easily-understood compressed holdings statement that doesn’t require maintenance. [v.5:no.1(1986:Jan.- ). In 44, only summary Level 3 statements could be open; it seemed to have been assumed that a detailed Level 4 statement would be closed, kept current by an automatic check-in system. This was harder to do than expected, and is only now becoming fairly prevalent.

In 71, new series is to be recorded as new ser. rather than n.s., and it is to be separated from the next level caption by a colon [new ser.:v.1:no.1]. The longer abbreviation brings it into compliance with AACR2’s Appendix B. The use of the colon and the longer abbreviation may be difficult to implement in some online check-in systems.

71 clarifies the use of punctuation which appears on a volume and is also part of the standard’s punctuation scheme. One example is the hyphen, which represents a range of volumes in a compressed holdings statement, but may also appear as enumeration such as title 24:section 1-1 to section 16-1613. 71 allows you to use the hyphen in the middle of such enumeration and also allows the use of “to” if it clarifies the holdings statement.

In 44, you were required to record alternate numbering [v.1-v.3=no.1- no.36]. It is optional in 71 to record an alternate numbering scheme. The MARC format does allow coding of alternate numbering, but some check-in systems may not allow it at this time.

Alphabetic characters in enumeration [v.348 [beta]] were to be romanized in 44 and 57. Looking forward to future developments in coding non-roman alphabets in library systems, 71 makes romanization optional.

Some titles are published with non-Gregorian dates (calendars other than the one we generally use in the United States). Both 71 and 44 require you, in summary Level 3 statements, to convert the dates to recognizable Gregorian years. New in 71 is the ability to record the non-Gregorian date — if it can be only one of two Gregorian dates — as “5757 [1996 or 1997],” rather than with a question mark. In 44 we would have recorded 5757 as “199?” which was less exact.

What about multiple versions? Where do you put holdings for a microform version of a journal, or an electronic journal? The standard’s rules haven’t changed, but cataloging rules are beginning to affect this. We are told very clearly in 71: “This standard allows for the inclusion of information about bibliographic items in different physical and/or electronic media within a single holdings statement when only one applicable item identifier exists (for example, because only a single bibliographic record was created.)” “Separate holdings statements are required when materials are described in two or more bibliographic records.” AACR2R still requires separate bibliographic records for microforms and print serials. But the 1996 “CONSER Single Record Option” for online serials allows you to use one bibliographic record for a serial in both print and electronic formats. If you have one bibliographic record, you have one item identifier, and you can have one holdings statement for both formats. In practice, you may want to create two holdings statements attached to one bibliographic record.  

Note: Ellen Rappaport was co-chair of NISO Standards Committee SC AL which developed Z39.71-1999.
From the Construction Zone:

As this 25th year of TSLL draws to a close, we catch our breath and are awed by another fact-filled volume, which speaks so clearly to the dedication and quality of our profession. Thank you, thank you to all of our columnists, contributors, and chairs. You are the life-blood of TSLL. A special, heart-felt thanks goes to those who are moving on. Alva Stone, who for many years has written the excellent and very popular “Subject Headings” column, is becoming chair of TS-SIS. And our first-rate, finger-on-the-pulse Acquisitions team will change as JoAnn Hounshell moves to vice-chair of TS-SIS and Marla Schwartz becomes chair of the ALA ALCTS Serials Section. Susan Chinoranksy, our favorite and devoted OCLC Committee Chair, is switching to OBS member-at-large. Congratulations to all of you! We will miss you.
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