RETOOLING YOURSELF FOR WORK IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Do you find yourself overwhelmed by the number of things in front of you that have to be done? Do you find it hard to prioritize and work on the truly important items? Are you faced with interruptions at every turn from e-mail, the phone, patrons, co-workers? Do you ever go home wondering what the heck you got done that day? I don’t mind admitting that all too often I can easily answer “yes” to each of these questions. So I was pleased to settle in for an informative and entertaining hour as Kate Reynolds of the Yale University Sterling Memorial Library gave us a presentation based on Steven Covey’s book, First Things First (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1994).

Ms. Reynolds started off by talking about personal mission. She asked us if we have a clearly defined mission within our institutions. With a better sense of mission we would be able to look at each activity and ask whether those activities are mission critical, supportive of the mission, or neither. Basically, are we being effective? If mission is clearly defined, the compass rather than the clock will govern us. When the clock governs us, we tend to rely on past practices, stick to specific schedules, or work on things that are labeled urgent. When the compass governs us, we work on advancing our mission, choosing tasks that will meet our objectives.

To help illustrate this point, Ms. Reynolds had each of us spend a couple of minutes listing all of the things we’d done at work the week before. We set those lists aside for a moment and looked at the time matrix model that Covey writes about in his book. The matrix has four quadrants called “necessity”, “leadership & quality”, “deception”, and “waste”. After she explained these quadrants, we took our lists and began to insert each task into a quadrant. For many of us it was an eye-opening exercise that showed us how easy it is to be derailed from our missions by the numerous wasteful demands on our time.
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Greetings, fellow OBS-SIS members!

At the end of a very lively but peaceful OBS meeting, Ellen McGrath passed to me the “OBS hat” as a gesture to indicate that I am the new OBS Chair. This occasion brought to memory an incident that took place 12 years ago as I was preparing to attend library school at Florida State University. One of my friends gave me a hat with the emblem “Librarian” because she knew that I would be wearing a new hat once I finished my degree. I have worn several hats during my 11 years tenure as a librarian. I consider it a privilege to be OBS Chair for 2001-2002.

I really appreciate Ellen McGrath for making OBS-SIS a strong, vital and visible SIS. I have been fortunate to work beside her and I am delighted that she will serve OBS this year as past Chair.

I would like to share some of the highlights of OBS-SIS at the 2001 AALL Annual meeting in Minneapolis.

Ellen McGrath and Susan Chinoransky represented OBS-SIS at the CONELL Marketplace on Saturday, July 14th. Ellen and Susan answered questions about membership in OBS and gave out brochures, candy, and extended invitations to the Joint Reception to be held that evening. Both of them were able to network with new public and technical services librarians. Thank you, Ellen and Susan!

The Joint SIS Reception on Saturday, July 14th, which was graciously sponsored by Innovative Interfaces, Inc., was well attended by AALL conferencees. The University of St. Thomas School of Law hosted the reception in their atrium, which was quite spacious and had colorful, provocative murals on its walls and ceiling.

Ellen McGrath and Susan Chinoransky were responsible for setting up the OBS-SIS Activities Table for the opening of the Exhibit Hall on Sunday. The table displayed among the following materials: a copy of the Local Systems Directory, back issues of _TSLL_, OBS brochures, OBS key-tags, paperback books for the book swap, the raffle box for the book, _Doublefold_ by Nicholson Baker, and the beautiful afghan to be won by one of the attendees of the OCLC/WLN Open Discussion. Lawrence Meyer was the lucky winner of _Doublefold_.

Sally Wambold and Ellen McGrath unveiled the OBS Strategic Plan for 2001-2004 with grand fanfare and celebration at the OBS-SIS General Business meeting on Monday, July 16, 2001. The OBS Strategic Planning Committee deserves our congratulations for a job well done. Special thanks to Brian Striman for the party bags which included some fantastic noisemakers that stole the show. For more complete details about the Strategic Plan, check the OBS website at &lt;http://www.aallnet.org/sis/obssis/ &gt;. The new OBS Mission Statement and its Strategic Directions are as follows:

The Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS) of the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) supports and serves its members and the mission of AALL.

OBS provides expertise, leadership and advocacy in the areas of online bibliographic services and automated library systems. Emphasis on all aspects of bibliographic services makes OBS’ resources valuable to all librarians, regardless of position or function. OBS serves its members by facilitating the exchange of information, providing educational programs and materials, promoting leadership, research and publishing opportunities, and ensuring a forum for professional interaction.

Strategic Direction #1: OBS Communicates!

Strategic Direction #2: OBS Educates!

Strategic Direction #3: OBS Connects!

The OCLC/WLN Committee met for its open discussion meeting on Tuesday, July 17th in Minneapolis. The guests were Kay Covert and Donn Hoffmann of OCLC, and Carla Dewey Urban and Virginia Dudley of MINITEX. The discussion covered the developments with CORC, OCLC’s new global strategy, and the migration of Cataloging and Metadata Services to a new interface. Thank you to Michael Maben, Chair, for arranging an informative meeting. At the end of the meeting, a beautiful afghan handcrafted by Susan Chinoransky, OBS Member-at-Large, was raffled and the winner was Deena Frazier (Boston College Law Library). Congratulations Deena!

The Local Systems Committee had an open discussion titled “Enhanced OPACs: Streamlining Access for Patrons” at their meeting on Tuesday, July 17th chaired by Susan Goldner. The discussion focused on access to tables...
of contents and indexes, aggregator’s full text, e-books, e-reserves, multiple bibliographic records, maintaining URLs and proxy servers. George Praeger (New York University Law School) was elected new chair of the Local Systems Committee for 2001-2003.

OBS/TS Research Roundtable met on Sunday, July 15, 2001, with Brian Striman, Coordinator, presiding. Larry Dershem presented an interim report of his project “classification fusion” by providing handouts and giving a brief summary. Mr. Dershem was a 2000 grant recipient from the OBS/TS Joint Research Grant Committee (JRGC). He also talked about the process involved in getting his grant proposal authorized and approved. Corinne Jacox spoke about recent grant recipients and how the Joint Research Grant Committee operates. Ellen McGrath discussed how to write AALL education program proposals and Kevin Butterfield described the general guidelines for application to the AALL Research Committee.

Maria Okonska, OBS Webmaster, called the OBS Web Advisory Committee meeting to order on Monday, July 16, 2001. We discussed further development of the OBS-SIS website. We want the website to continue to be informational but also a strong educational medium. By now the OBS Strategic Plan would have been mounted as well as the MARBI report. It was a very energetic and creative meeting. Georgia Briscoe and Karen Selden will continue to provide the Website of the Month on the OBS listserv starting in September 2001.

The RLIN Committee did not meet this year in Minneapolis but Brian Quigley is the new Chair of the Committee.

OBS-SIS educational programs sponsored and co-sponsored at Minneapolis were attended and well received this year. The OBS Education Committee met on Tuesday, July 17, 2001 and is working very hard in finalizing the programs for next year in Orlando. I really appreciate the input of the Education Committee members: David Byrant, Pat Callahan, Cynthia A. Cicco, Pamela Deemer, Emma Williams, Susan Goldner, Richard Jost, Mary Jane Kelsey, Mary Strouse, and Ellen McGrath, Co-Chair, and Ismael Gullon, Co-Chair.

Here are the program proposals that we are submitting for Orlando 2002.

- Bringing the Back Room Front-and-Center: Connecting Technology and Information in Technical Services to Enhance User Services, Coordinator: Brian Striman
- The Catalog vs. the Homepage? Best Practices in Connecting to Online Resources, Coordinator: Georgia Briscoe
- I Know What You Did Last Summer: A Guide to Virtual Reclassification and Reshelving Blitzes, Coordinator: Mary Jane Kelsey
- “Search Reopened”: How to Hire the Right Technical Services Candidate the First Time Around, Coordinator: Barbara Plante

We are also co-sponsoring with TS-SIS the following program and workshop:

- Publication Patterns: Creating Connections in the Serials World, Coordinator: Andrea Rabbia
- Making Subject Connections: Plugging into the Subject Authority Cooperative Project (SACO), Coordinator: Christina Tarr

During the upcoming year I am planning to focus on the implementation of the new OBS Strategic Plan and enhancing the OBS website as an educational tool.

And remember: OBS Communicates! OBS Educates! OBS Connects!

Ismael Gullon
Mercer University
gullon_i@mercer.edu
I would like to give the membership of the Technical Services SIS who attended the Business Meeting in Minneapolis a standing ovation! You answered the Executive Board’s call for a quorum, and as a result the SIS was able to conduct business. According to the bylaws at the 2001 Business Meeting, 20 percent, or 136 members of the TS-SIS had to be present to have a quorum. At 5:30 pm on July 15 there were exactly 136 TS-SIS members in attendance at the Business Meeting! It was truly wonderful to see all of you at the Business Meeting and throughout the conference.

The primary agenda item for the 2001 TS-SIS Business Meeting was, of course, the proposed changes to the bylaws. The proposed changes resulted from a thorough review of the bylaws by the TS-SIS Bylaws/Handbook committee chaired by Eloise Vondruska. The Executive Board is very grateful to the committee for identifying the necessary corrections, and commends them for a job well done. David Bratman, the 2001/2002 chair of the Bylaws/Handbook committee has presented the proposed changes to the AALL Bylaws committee for approval. The membership will be kept informed of the status of the proposed bylaw changes through the TS listserv.

Also on the agenda for the Business Meeting was the presentation of the Renee Chapman Award for Excellence in Technical Services Librarianship to Reggie Wallen, Assistant Director for Technical Services at Stanford University. Reggie was among the first librarians I met when I first became active in TS-SIS. At that time she was the TS-SIS liaison with AALL Annual Meeting Program Committee. Reggie guided Julie Stauffer, and me through the maze of our first program proposal. She made it all seem so easy! Reggie Wallen and Renee Chapman were friends and colleagues. I think that Renee would be very pleased that her peers had honored her friend Reggie, with an award bearing her name.

On behalf of the TS-SIS Executive Board, I would like to thank Alva Stone, the immediate past chair of TS-SIS, for her hard work and perseverance in getting a quorum at the Business Meeting and juggling all the duties of the chair of a special interest section. Alva’s wonderful sense of humor saved the day many times! I would also like to thank the other officers whose term ended in July: Cindy May (outgoing Member-at-Large), Janet McKinney (past Chair), Joan Liu (outgoing Serials Committee chair), and Chris Long (outgoing Cataloging/Classification Committee chair).

Thanks to the generous support of Innovative Interfaces, Inc., the TS/OBS/CS/RIPS Joint Reception has become the traditional first social gathering for librarians at the conference. This year the Joint Reception was held at the University of St. Thomas Law Library for providing the membership with such a lovely site for the reception. Attendees were given the opportunity to tour library and admire the lovely frescos on the ceiling in Terence Murphy Hall, while they enjoyed the excellent food and the company of their colleagues.

**TS-SIS Objectives for 2001/2002**

Since its creation the Technical Services SIS has been a work in progress. Our SIS is a dynamic organization. We continue to grow and adapt to our ever-changing environment, so with that in mind the TS-SIS will be working on the following initiatives this year:

**Management Committee:** Discussion and work will continue on establishing a new TS-SIS Management Standing Committee based on the initial meeting held in Minneapolis. Annual TS-SIS membership survey responses indicate that there is strong interest in the development of educational programs relating to technical services management issues. Look for more discussion on this topic on the TS listserv and for more information on the web page at [http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/tssis.htm](http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/tssis.htm) If you are interested in management issues and the creation of a new Standing Committee, please contact Jim Mumm, e-mail: jim.mumm@marquette.edu, tel.: (414) 288-5351.

**Strategic Plan:** Discussion and work will continue on the TS-SIS Three-Year Strategic Plan. The membership is invited to review the draft document on the TS-SIS web page at [http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/tssis.htm](http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/tssis.htm). The strategic plan draft was developed by the TS-SIS Strategic Plan Committee chaired by Caitlin Robinson, and by Alva Stone the immediate past Chair of TS-SIS, based on the results of the annual membership survey.
emphasis of the strategic plan is on broad based training, professional networking, and preservation issues in all types, and sizes of law libraries. The Section membership is invited to review the strategic plan draft, and offer input on the draft, as well as, offer possible implementation ideas for the strategic plan via the TS-SIS listserv.

Education Grant: This new grant is available to all TS-SIS members to be used to attend technical services related, AALL-sponsored workshops. The TS-SIS Awards Committee, chaired by Mary Lu Linnane, drafted guidelines and procedures for applying for this grant. The TS-SIS Education Grant was made available for attendance at the AALL Workshop in Washington, DC, “New Perspectives on Law Library Acquisitions and Collection Development” to be held on November 2-3, 2001, at American University. If you are interested in applying for the TS-SIS Education Grant to attend future workshops you will find the application on the TS-SIS web page at <http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/tssis.htm>. If you have any questions regarding the grant, please contact Lorna Tang, the 2001/2002 Chair of the TS-SIS Awards Committee; e-mail: <l-tang@uchicago.edu>, tel.: (773) 702-9619.

Training Initiatives: Planning will begin on developing a series of training materials for “train the trainer” type programs in technical services activities that could be used at the regional, chapter, or individual library level. Planning will also begin in developing or sponsoring web-based continuing education courses for TS practitioners. If you have ideas for possible training program materials, or web-based continuing education programs, or if you would like to be involved in the development of these programs, please contact JoAnn Hounshell, e-mail: <jhounshell@law.northwestern.edu>, tel. (312) 503-7920.

I plan to use the Technical Services Law Librarian newsletter, the TS-SIS listserv and the TS-SIS web page to keep you informed of what is going on in your SIS. I will be asking for volunteers and feedback throughout the year. The SIS needs volunteers to keep it moving forward. If you will volunteer, I will accept your help and put you to work. If you give me feedback, I promise that I will listen and do my very best to ensure that the TS-SIS continues to meet the membership’s professional needs.

JoAnn Hounshell
Northwestern University
jhounshell@law.northwestern.edu

---

The Timberline Experience

**Editorial Note by Jim Mumm**

The Timberline Institute (formerly the Feather River Institute) is comprised of a small group of acquisitions librarians, who get together each year to discuss acquisitions issues in greater depth than can happen in other forums. This year there were at least two law librarians who attended the institute, JoAnn Hounshell and Ann Kolodzey.

We are pleased to have the following report that Ann put together, which describes the different discussions she attended. We are always happy to have people submit articles whenever they attend workshops or other professional development activities. That is, after all, how the strength of our newsletter, as well as our own personal growth is fostered.

**Timberline Acquisitions Institute**

May 19-22, 2001

by Ann Kolodzey (Acquisitions / Serials Librarian, Widener University School of Law)

Librarians, publishers and vendors gathered from May 19-22, 2001 for the Timberline Acquisitions Institute, formerly the Feather River Institute. The planning committee, Richard Brumley, Nancy Slight-Gibney and Scott Smith planned a relatively small (83 participants this year), informal gathering which lent itself to lively discussion of ideas, viewpoints and possibilities. Including non-librarians as participants rather than exhibitors enhanced the communication in all directions.

Frank D’Andraia from the University of Montana spoke about Deregulation and the Academy: Opportunities and Strategies Under the New Rules for Resource Gathering in the keynote address. The advent of e-commerce, the changes in scholarly communication and the deregulation of higher education all affect libraries. Distance learning is skyrocketing, information providers are listed on the stock market and scholars no longer need to go to the library. Virtual universities offer education without overhead cost associated with dorms, gyms, physical libraries or faculty research. They are market sensitive, convenient and flexible. Electronic access to information is leveling the playing field at all levels of education. Libraries will have to adjust to the changing environment by marketing themselves, upgrading
OPACs and Web Pages, expanding special and unique collections and emphasizing staff expertise.

John Webb from Washington State University presented *Collections and Systems: A New Organizational Paradigm for Collection Development*. Changes in library collections require new ideas in collection development. The cooperation of systems people, vendors and teams of librarians is increasingly important to collection development. Mentors in the library profession and vendor exhibits can be good information sources. Being able to wheel and deal has increased importance with the use of expensive aggregator services. The linking of faculty courseware to libraryware also affects collection decisions. Improvements in navigation between the OPAC and specific information on the web is welcome, especially when returning to the OPAC is a click away.

After the morning presentations and lunch, Natalie Schultz from Griffith University in Australia addressed *E-journal Databases - A Long Term Solution?* Databases have been developed to handle electronic information purchases in ways which cannot be handled by the OPAC alone. Pennsylvania State University has developed ERLIC, an Access database, which is available as non-supported shareware. An e-journal database includes information to track information not easily tracked by library online systems, such as approvals, ordering, licensing, renewing, fees, consortial purchasing information and where the content is actually stored. Action notes can be added as ticklers to prompt future action. These databases can be powerful tools in addition to the OPAC to help manage the complexities of electronic information from the technical services point-of-view.

*Evolution of the Supply Chain in Library Bookselling* was covered by a panel. Jackie Coats from the University of Washington, Matt Nauman from Blackwell’s Book Services, Brian Elliott from Alibris, Jeff Dixon from Amazon.com and Robert Rooney from Taylor and Francis shared their unique views in this exciting time of print and electronic possibilities. In the print world with current and projected sales increasing at 5% per year, about 500,000 books are in print, 400,000 are available on special order, 700,000 are listed as out of stock and 40,000,000 are out of print. There are 35,000 e-books today and 500,000 projected for 2005. E-book readers are not good enough yet to be the preferred mode of reading a book, but e-books and on-line ordering of paper books provide speed, ease in ordering and good prices. In summary, paper books are the largest sector of the market today, but as digital files are easier to store, reprints and print-on-demand books are more feasible and the electronic-only format sector will expand especially in the reference market.

Bonnie Allen from Oregon State University moderated a panel which presented *E-Books The Latest Word*. Katharine Phenix, from netLibrary described their web catalog of e-books which emphasizes information rather than reading and heavily supports business and economics information. Links to dictionaries with an audio component for pronunciation and book reviews are included. Information which continues across pages or is inserted in a pocket such as illustrations, tables, genealogical trees or large maps is hard to digitize. Robert Rooney from Taylor and Francis described the bumpy short run for the e-book business in which companies are coming and going. IP concerns for all formats are addressed in contracts with current authors, but old contracts must be must be modified to address new formats. Court cases will no doubt decide tricky cases in this area. Still the largest cost for the publisher is the first edition of a book in any format. Len Liptak described the 3-year old company, ebrary, which taps into the 300 million web-user market with electronic research tools. There is no cost to browse their collection, but downloading a book will incur a charge similar to purchasing a paper book and printing will incur a page charge similar to copying the page of a paper book. Their titles are mainly from academic presses and textbook providers. The MBA content is ready and other information areas will be ready soon. Quality information and security are ebrary’s main concerns.

*Accounting for Access (Costs & Benefits)* was presented by Karen Schmidt and Nancy Slight-Gibney who described some of the complexities of using statistics in the library. Counting the number of patrons in the library, connect time or number of hits for electronic information and circulation for print material, for example, are only indicators of value. Pricing models and formats are changing all the time making it even more difficult to track the past and predict the future. Quantity is not always quality, so statistics must be used carefully.
Karen Rupp-Serrano from the University of Oklahoma addressed Putting Theory into Practice: Needs Analysis. Analyzing syllabi and journal scatter studies are tools which can be used in the academic library to determine acquisition needs. Research needs must be considered in addition to teaching needs. National and local needs need to be identified. Analyzing the collection this way is useful for collection development and new bibliographers.

In Finding the Right Balance: Campus Involvement in the Collection Allocation Process Lisa German and Karen Schmidt from the University of Illinois described improvements to the budgeting process in their library. Hard work and improved communication between faculty, administration and librarians has led to redistribution of budget increases. Across the board budget increases had led to inequities collection development in different subjects. University departments submit proposals and part of each increase is reallocated accordingly.

Bill Fisher from San Jose State University spoke about the Impact of Organizational Structure on Acquisitions and Collection Development Functions. Small groups brainstormed to develop the perfect staff organization. From wrestling with the placement of staff functions which cross the traditional lines of public and technical services, several models emerged. The traditional pyramid structure with a director at the top and departments below seemed appropriate for a large academic library whereas a circle of librarians all reporting to the director in the middle seemed more functional for a smaller library. Finding the perfect organization to staff a library must evolve as functions change.

Discussions continued on the hiking trail, up the ski slopes, in the dining hall and around the lodge. From our varied backgrounds, we found that our mission remains the same, but the means to achieve our goals must change. In the academic library, technical services librarians must be aware of developments in information formats, intellectual property issues, licensing details, patron needs, system limitations, new pricing models and much more. We need new tools to manage electronic media. We need closer communication with public services librarians, patrons, publishers and vendors. We need to be aware of trends and we have many questions to answer. Is the virtual classroom in our future? Will our public services staff need the resources to provide 24/7 virtual reference? Is the public services/technical services divide still meaningful? Will legal information be available globally and if so how can we enhance the worth of our individual libraries? How can we develop unique collections of value beyond our walls? This year only 2 law librarians and one former law librarian attended the Institute, but I would recommend that a few more of us register in the coming years.

In the same way footnotes and bibliographies lead us from article to article in the print world, hyperlinked references guide us from ebook to ebook or article to article in the electronic world. While this type of linking has existed within WESTLAW or LEXIS, it is relatively new to e-journal publishing, where articles cite works published by different vendors, e-journals located in licensed aggregator databases, or print items in library catalogs that do not yet exist in digital formats. Seamless, transparent navigation between citations is difficult to build in this barrier-ridden environment.

As the journal publishing world moves to embrace a fee based article economy these barriers begin to break down. Researchers pursue citations primarily by title or author rather than journal name. This makes direct linking between citations and the referenced work a primary conduit for tracing research. These reference links are being built with Digital Object Identifiers (DOIs). DOIs provide a framework for managing intellectual content, for linking customers with content suppliers, for facilitating electronic commerce, and enabling automated copyright management for all types of media. Using DOIs makes managing intellectual property in a networked environment much easier and more convenient, and allows the construction of automated services and transactions for e-commerce. One of the only full implementations of the DOI system, CrossRef, is now just over a year old.

CrossRef is a collaborative effort of several scholarly publishers. It enables links from reference citations within articles or bibliographies to the content cited by those references regardless of whether the content is located on a different server or published by a different vendor. According to Amy Brand, CrossRef’s Director of Business Development, CrossRef aims to become nothing less than the complete reference-linking backbone for all scholarly literature in electronic form.

A Collaborative Reference Linking Service

Kevin Butterfield
University of Illinois
butterfi@law.uiuc.edu

THE INTERNET
There are no fees for following links enabled by CrossRef. Users clicking on a CrossRef enabled citation will see at least a full bibliographic citation. Access to the abstract and full text article is determined by each publisher’s own access control system. Information on how to acquire an article will be provided (such as by subscription, document delivery, or pay-per-view, etc.). Each participating publisher is free to set their own access standards and conditions. The service is based on a prototype developed by Wiley and Academic Press, and was developed in cooperation with the International DOI Foundation, building on work by the Association of American Publishers (AAP) and the Corporation for National Research Initiatives (CNRI).

Participating publishers have formed the Publishers International Linking Association, Inc. (PILA), a not-for-profit membership corporation managed by an elected Board. PILA is responsible for running the CrossRef service and developing enhancements to the technology.

CrossRef has grown to include 70 leading journal publishers, both commercial and non-profit, with over three million deposited records from 3,875 journals. The system is on track to add between 500,000 and one million new records per year.

Brand describes CrossRef as a process, not a product. Each member creates a DOI incorporating their own DOI prefix for each journal article, tagging it to metadata and a URL. These resulting records are then submitted to the CrossRef metadata database (MDDB) in XML. CrossRef then registers each article DOI and URL in a central DOI directory. Publishers can insert CrossRef links into any of an article’s citations that point to content already registered in the CrossRef system.

The CrossRef system uses open standards and employs a uniform set of rules to accommodate the publishers right to control their business policies and maintain branding, while allowing the researcher to navigate through the widely distributed content of multiple publishers. The rules cover what can be named by a DOI, what types of data can be stored in the DOI System, and the way prefix holders can use DOIs on the web. A researcher clicking on a CrossRef link will be connected to a page on the publisher’s website showing a full bibliographic citation of the article, and, in most cases, the abstract as well. The reader can then access the full-text article. While subscribers can generally go straight to the text, non-subscribed users are presented with options for access.

One problem the system does not yet address for libraries is the appropriate copy issue. This involves directing the user to the local subscription rather than asking them to pay a fee to the publisher for retrieving an article. Resource discovery services must be able to authenticate subscribed or licensed users somewhere in the process and ensure that a given user is accessing as a default the version of an article that their library may have already paid for. While CrossRef is developing a localized linking feature to address this, it will only deal with electronic items. An ideal solution would also allow the library to incorporate references to print and microform collections as well. A system such as the one illustrated by CrossRef that would allow users access to a library’s electronic subscriptions and hooks into the library catalog for print and microform holdings would go far in saving the time of the user.

It does beg the question of how systems like this and the library catalog work together. We typically do not catalog journals at the article level, but it is clear that researchers are used to accessing information at that level and the ejournal marketplace is responding. Will the two systems converge or will one be left behind? While digitization initiatives are gaining speed, their content is not universal. Archiving, incomplete data and other issues also abound. There are issues related to item description as well. Just as cataloging is more than MARC, metadata is more than XML. The MDDB records in systems such as CrossRef may not be up to library cataloging standards. Do they need to be? If viewed as an access system still in its infancy, CrossRef shows a great deal of promise and presents an example of how new economic models for journal publishing are converging with new means of accessing and managing information. It also raises interesting questions of how systems for accessing our hybrid libraries of print and digital information may develop.

For More Information:

Brand, Amy
CrossRef Turns One. D-Lib Magazine (v. 7, no. 5) <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/may01/brand/05brand.html>

CrossRef <http://www.crossref.org>
Digital Object Identifiers <http://www.doi.org>
Dear Miss Manager:

My child’s grade school is having “Career Day”, an opportunity for parents to come in and share information about their professions. I’m assuming this event is intended to spark interest among the children who will then go on to become doctors, mechanics, business owners or whatever. I would love to share with my daughter’s class everything I know about acquisitions and law libraries, but am afraid I will end up speaking after her dentist (who always brings his “Tuffy the Tooth” and hands out cool pink stuff that they can chew to make their mouths look gross.) If I were a children’s librarian, I would have the advantage of being able to bring in something to read to her class, but for some reason I don’t think a passage from “Moore’s Federal Practice” will be overly inspirational to them. Can you please share some ideas for me to help my daughter and her class appreciate the joys of acquisitions and law librarianship?

Going Back to Grade School

Dear Going:

Although “Tuffy the Tooth” is undoubtedly a tough act to follow, and the disadvantage of having nothing for the children to chew on other than some old invoices cannot be overcome, I think you could probably still appeal to most of them, and maybe reach those few who are real librarians in the making. And, really, those few who are likely to want to go into the profession are the ones we want to attract most. So, you should go with our strengths, and throw in what razzle-dazzle there is. You laugh? What razzle dazzle? Well, Moore’s Federal Practice may not get their adrenaline going, but computer games do. You might tell them that one of the hardest games in computers is “finding good information.” Show them a sample search that first of all produces a million hits (“star wars”) and then show them how such a search can be narrowed by adding terms, refining the request, analyzing site quality, etc. If you happen to get to a web site or two with space ships, explosions, or theme music, you will keep your presentation humming. Then you might ask for some favorite book titles. How does a library go about getting a book like that? This could take you out into the web in a different direction. If you could connect to your local system and actually place an order and go through the steps involved, that might prove interesting. Don’t be afraid to go with some of the simple, physical mechanics of the work. Aren’t there many librarians around who were attracted in childhood to the paraphernalia of organization? who longed to have their own files of paper slips, drawers with cards beautifully arranged, charts, stamps, and desks with compartments? Not everyone will thrill to a demonstration of check-in screens, spreadsheets, or a label on a journal. But Miss Manager recalls an ancient memory of seeing a chart of Dewey Decimal numbers explaining the arrangement of library materials and feeling that here was a way to make sense of all this seemingly random stuff. Not everyone will respond as you might wish. But how many of the kids who thrill to Tuffy the Tooth actually go on to become dentists? You will be appealing to those children who already have an attraction to the organizational principles which underlie much of our work. From you they will learn that there is a real, grown-up, interesting, honorable, and necessary profession that will allow them to make a career out of the kinds of things that appeal to them. And what tooth-wielding special effects monger could ask for more?

Dear Miss Manager:

How much work should I do to check the work of the vendors who send us material? This has become a serious problem for us. The two people working in acquisitions in my library seem to be spending more and more time researching what was purchased when and finding proof of payment and evidence of returns and so on and less time ordering and paying the bills. Shouldn’t the vendors be able to keep better track of their own transactions? Am I justified in saying, “We’ve paid you, we’re done with this transaction, YOU figure it out if you’re still having a problem!”

Sincerely,

Mad as a Wet Hen
Dear Hen:

Ah, that insatiable longing to tell off the vendor! How many times have we all fantasized about letting that particularly irksome and unhelpful person at the other end of the line know how we really feel? It is a temptation that you will no doubt give into once in a while in your career for the simple reason that there always seem to be one or two vendors who invite such a reaction and who respond to nothing else. A compilation of horror stories from law libraries alone could fill a whole NUC-sized set, with annual updates. The particular phenomenon you refer to is a common one, and one of the most frustrating. I was sure at the height of the legal publishing merger mania that there was a tacit agreement between the parties that the company with the worst computer system always took over the accounts and the company with the worst customer service took over the phones.

Let us use as our example a company called Poplar. Poplar starts off by sending you a notice that you have a credit of $3,000. You see no indication of that and ask Poplar to explain the source of the credit. Poplar cannot do this because Poplar has taken over two other publishers and all your account information from those publishers was transferred to Poplar by creating new account numbers for the two companies. You now have three account numbers with Poplar. This is the first you knew of this. Can you get every thing transferred to one account? No. Can you have a printout listing which titles are under the separate accounts? No, and actually Poplar needs to set up a fourth account to handle all the publications from the previous three publishers who are now one, so can you please send Poplar a list of everything you are getting from Poplar and from the two other publishers? But, you say, you are getting updates to all those publications, so someone at Poplar must know what you are getting, how come this rep doesn’t? Well, that’s the distribution department. Can’t they provide a list of everything they are sending to this library? No. Why not? They have a different computer system. Can’t they send a printout? No. But Poplar wants you to send Poplar a printout? Yes. At this point, you hang up the phone, you look at your notes and the eight pencils you have broken during this conversation. You contemplate what to do when from today’s mail you receive a notice from Poplar that you owe $5,280 and that if you don’t pay immediately they will stop all shipments. You call customer service and pray that you get someone else. You get someone else. This new person seems friendly, concerned, helpful. She asks you please (if it’s not too much trouble) to send copies of just the last month’s worth of invoices and checks and then all of this can get cleared up. This sounds so hopeful that you spend the time to gather and copy and fax the invoices and the checks. Whew! What a relief. Three days later a collection agency calls. You are a deadbeat. Pay up your Poplar bill. You call Poplar’s customer service number. No record of a fax, no invoices, no checks, impossible that you had such a conversation with anyone because they couldn’t possibly do all that. Yes, you say, and her name was Sue. Sue? Sue works in a different department, she had no authority. Could the costumer service representative get the invoices and checks from Sue? No.....

To those who haven’t worked in this area, such a scenario probably sounds like a wild exaggeration. But everyone in the law acquisitions world has a story (or several) like this, and they could go on quite a bit longer. Your options become: 1) do the research yourself and provide the iron-clad proof of your position; 2) pay whatever they say you owe and hope it all evens out in the end; 3) sever all ties with the company; 4) find one person who will help. Although number 3 is the most tempting and would be the most satisfying, it is the most difficult, especially in the post-merger world. Often your own version of Poplar has at least some publications you can’t do without for some reason, and no one else does. Number 2 has its advantages especially when you consider how much time it will take you and your staff to figure out the details, but it also ensures that the problem will keep coming back until it is fixed. The best thing to do is some combination of numbers 1 and 4. The crucial step is to find someone who will help. Sometimes that is a local representative of the company assigned to your library, although you should be aware that a sales representative is not the same thing as an account representative. You should also be aware that sales representatives sometimes say that they want to handle complaints, but then have trouble doing so. Sometimes it is a person like Sue at the company who understands the problem and can work from the inside to get information moving between departments. But even if you find a person willing to help you out, you will probably have to provide some information to get things moving. But don’t waste too much time on the research until you find the helpful person.

If you can not find anyone to help, don’t forget the wonderful folks at CRIV (the AALL Committee on Relations with Information Vendors). Their website <www.aallnet.org/committee/criv/> offers a number of options when you are stuck, including information on customer service, and a chance to request mediation if things are at a point where resolution looks impossible. Also, ask for help from your colleagues. You are not likely to be the first person to have a bad experience with a particular vendor. The relief of hearing something like; “call this number, ask for Bob, he will take care of your problem” can be almost worth the pain of dealing with a previously uncooperative vendor.
Dear Miss Manager:

Evolutionary psychology clearly demonstrates that women are better at noticing details than men and that men are better at leading the work of other people. In our libraries that means that all the managers of Technical Services departments should be men, and all the catalogers, check-in people, etc. should be women. Why is this obvious truth not universally recognized?

Sincerely,
Darwinian Librarian

Dear You’re No Darwin:

Speaking of evolution, Miss Manager would like to suggest that you crawl back to your cave with the other missing links and work on improving your prehistoric tools. I do not mean to suggest that I have a superior understanding of evolutionary psychology, sociobiology, or any other field outside my area of expertise, but I do recognize a trend when I see it. The trend now is for those with little knowledge of the science behind evolution and psychology and sociology (not to mention library science!) to make bold generalizations derived from popular accounts of these fields. Since there seem to be some tendencies in humans that have strong gender correlations, those who would like to see genders behave in a particular way or adhere to particular ideologically-based sets of expectations adopt some fact or theory (women’s brains work in a detail-oriented way, for example) and extrapolate whole ranges of human conduct from one tiny seed of speculation. If you are a manager you must evaluate workers individually, assessing each person’s strengths and weaknesses as they relate to the work required from that person. Starting off with a generalization that may or may not apply to the actual individual human being in front of you does no good. That would be as unfair as judging all librarians by the opinions of one misguided individual (or by the words of one bloviating columnist, for that matter.)

OBS OCLC/WLN COMMITTEE

Michael Maben
Indiana University
mmaben@indiana.edu

This has been an eventful spring and summer for OCLC news and developments. I attended the Users Council meeting in May where I learned about major changes that are coming to OCLC. Then there were the committee events at the American Association of Law Libraries annual meeting in Minneapolis in July. My column for this issue will focus on these two meetings, along with the changes that are coming soon to OCLC.

OCLC Users Council Meeting
-Dublin, Ohio, May 20-22, 2001

From May 20th through the 22nd, 2001, I attended the OCLC Users Council meeting at OCLC’s headquarters in Dublin, Ohio as the representative of law libraries. It was a fascinating, eye-opening meeting. It was the first time I had ever been in OCLC’s headquarters (I had driven by it a couple of times). If you are ever in the Columbus area, I recommend going out to Dublin to see the place. There are three large buildings, named for three previous presidents of OCLC: Kilgour, Brown, and Smith. The meetings were first in the Kilgour building, and then in the Smith building. The delegates were mostly directors or high-level administrators in either academic or public libraries--there were very few special libraries represented. The head librarian from the National Geographic Society was present, along with several librarians from federal government agency libraries. I was the only law librarian in attendance. I also had the opportunity to meet a number of OCLC administrators, including OCLC president Jay Jordan, Richard Van Orden, and Glenn Patton.

The meetings themselves included several full group sessions, and then smaller interest group discussions. The large group meetings included addresses by Jay Jordan, Users Council President Larry Alford of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and a keynote address by Sarah Thomas of Cornell University. Jay Jordan’s address discussed the past year at OCLC, along with future goals and developments. Larry Alford’s talk was about the Users Council and the changes in governance and collaboration with OCLC’s administration, trustees, and staff. Sarah Thomas’ keynote address was titled “OCLC’s Metadata Strategy and the Catalog as Portal to the Internet.” The basic gist of her address was published in the May/June 2001 issue of the OCLC Newsletter. I would encourage you to read it and give me your reaction.

The small group session I attended was for Collections and Technical Services. This was where I first heard the details of the new interface for cataloging and metadata services that is being developed and implemented. This was the most valuable session I attended at the meeting (more on this topic later in the column). It was very interesting listening to OCLC
talk about their research and future developments that will change the way we do our work on OCLC.

New Interface for Cataloging and Metadata Services

The most important topic that was discussed at the Users Council meeting (from my perspective) was the migration of the OCLC Cataloging and Metadata Services to a single interface. To quote OCLC’s brochure describing this:

“OCLC is developing a new interface for cataloging and metadata services based on innovative browser and Windows technology. This new interface supports OCLC’s strategy to transform WorldCat from a bibliographic database and online union catalog into a globally linked information resource of text, graphics, sound and motion... The new, single interface offers the benefits of a web browser and the versatility of Windows-based software... Enhancements to the new interface will be phased in over several years. At the end of the implementation period, the new interface will replace all OCLC cataloging and metadata interfaces currently in use.”

It is currently projected that the first release of the new interface will be in June 2002. Passport will not be supported by OCLC after December 2002, but it will continue to work with any of the Windows versions up to Windows 2000 until December 31, 2003. After that, Passport will die and either the new interface or CatME must be used. The conversion will be gradual from July 2002 to December 2003, but libraries need to start thinking about it and planning for the change. If you do not have the brochure with its guide and time line for the migration, then I urge you to go to OCLC’s website and print it off. In addition, there is a great deal of additional information about this conversion on the website. The address is: <www.oclc.org/strategy/cataloging>. On the left side of the page there is a box titled “Cataloging and Metadata Services.” This is where the migration brochure is located, along with frequently asked questions and news. There will be much more to talk about on this topic in the coming year.

Committee Meeting and Open Discussion - Minneapolis, Minnesota

The OCLC/WLN Committee met for its open discussion at the AALL annual meeting on Tuesday, July 17th at 7:30 am at the Hilton hotel in downtown Minneapolis. Twenty-nine people got up early that morning and came to the meeting. Our guests were Kay Covert and Donn Hoffmann of OCLC, and Carla Dewey Urban and Virginia Dudley of MINITEX. Kay Covert had made a presentation the previous day at the session discussing CORC. At the committee meeting, she discussed the new OCLC global strategy, the migration of cataloging and metadata to the new interface, and developments with CORC. Much of the subsequent discussion focused on CORC, with many questions and comments concerning frontline, operational issues. Carla Urban commented to me afterwards about the insightful and important questions that were asked by the attendees. In addition, Richard Amelung of St. Louis University Law Library spoke on his role as a member of the Collections and Technical Services Advisory Committee for OCLC. Richard encouraged people to send him comments and suggestions for the committee to present to OCLC. Then at the conclusion of the meeting, a handmade afghan donated by Susan Chinoransky was raffled off to Deena Frazier of the Boston College Law Library. Congratulations Deena, and thank you Susan!

Closing Comments

In closing, I would like to quote Users Council President Larry Alford in his talk to the Users Council delegates, guests, and OCLC administrators and staff on May 21, 2001. He said: “I believe that, in fact, we in libraries fully understand we are in the business of serving the information needs of our faculties, our students, our communities, and the citizens who make up those communities. We as delegates to Users Council are in the business of making sure that the information needs of each and every one of those individuals is represented to OCLC.”

My feeling after that Users Council meeting was that our views as technical services users of OCLC are largely not represented by the Users Council (now Members Council) to OCLC. There seems to be little recognition that we are the ones who helped build the WorldCat database record by record, adhering to standards that provide for clean data and enhance retrieval results. We need to articulate our views and concerns more to our regional networks, to our representatives on the Members Council, and to OCLC staff and administrators. Having Richard Amelung on the OCLC Collections and Technical Services Advisory Committee is an excellent opportunity to promote our specific needs and opinions. We need to communicate with these individuals this coming year.

If you have any comments, suggestions, or discussion items for the OCLC/WLN Committee, please feel free to contact me.
During the coming year the TS/SIS Preservation Committee will be preparing a national plan for the preservation of legal materials. The goal of the Committee is to have a final report prepared by the summer of 2002. The plan will address the following five questions:

1. What do we mean by preservation? What methods do law libraries use to preserve materials?

2. Who is responsible for preserving legal materials?

3. What are we going to preserve?

4. Who decides what we are going to preserve?

5. Who is going to coordinate preservation work among libraries?

One component of preservation planning is the identification of various preservation projects in law libraries. Two such projects are described below.

The Historic State Codes Preservation Project, Edward Bennett Williams Law Library, Georgetown University Law Center.

The following information is taken directly from Georgetown Law Library’s website at <http://www11.georgetown.edu/>.

The Edward Bennett Williams Law Library is carrying out a project to preserve the historic state codes printed between 1840 and 1930 for all fifty states and the District of Columbia. There are two goals for this project: 1) to create a complete preservation collection of historic state codes from 1840-1930, and 2) to provide other libraries the opportunity to acquire these titles so that there are partial or complete preservation collections across the country.

In 1996, the Georgetown Law Library began the project to preserve historic state codes. Due to the nature of the paper used and the often unstable environments in which these books have been stored, the information housed in these books is at risk of being lost. Like other brittle books, these state codes require preservation reformatting in which contents of books are reproduced on a medium that is chemically, physically and technologically stable so that the information will continue to be accessible in several hundred years if stored under appropriate environmental conditions and used carefully. In the beginning, the codes were preservation photocopied by BookLab, Inc. in Austin, Texas, which closed in 1998. The project has since moved to Acme Bookbinding in Charlestown, MA where the codes are being preservation reformatted; pages are digitally imaged and printed on permanent paper (ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992) and then bound to meet Library Binding Institute standards (ANSI/NISO/LBI Z39.78-2000). The collection at Georgetown contains 960 titles, which represents roughly 50% of the state codes identified in Pimsleur’s Checklist of Basic American Legal Publications (1992).

Supporting the efforts to create a complete preservation collection of historic state codes, the Maryland State Law Library, Delaware State Law Library, Washburn University Law Library, Arizona State Law Library, Gordon D. Schaber Law Library (UOP), Florida State University College of Law Library, Arkansas Supreme Court Library, and the University of Arkansas Library have contributed titles to the project. Georgetown encourages other libraries to contribute titles to fill in gaps so that they can preserve as many of these codes as possible.

Because the books are being scanned and the images stored, preservation facsimiles can be printed without having to re-scan the original. As a result, all titles completed in this project will be available for purchase from Acme Bookbinding. The list of titles completed and the list of titles in the pipeline are available on Georgetown’s website. The lists are organized by state and therein by call number, and contain links to the bibliographic records in Georgetown’s online catalog to assist with the identification of titles. Librarians may contact Acme directly if they are interested in any of these titles or have questions.
I have been asked since I had “Rules for PCs” whether I had any suggestions for dealing with IS personnel. Whenever you are dealing with people, there is never an absolute answer that will work for everyone.

Have you ever heard something similar to the following?

Those IS people never return my calls.

Those IS people only show up when I am in the middle of a time sensitive assignment. Their so-called 5 minute fix tied up my PC for hours!!! I missed my deadline.

A user leaves me a message that their PC has an error message. They did not leave me what the message said. When I get down there, they did not write it down and will not let me have access to the machine. They said that they are busy and cannot be interrupted. As long as they stay out of certain programs, they can function. I either have to stay late or come in early. I have better things to do with my time.

In order to resolve the preceding incidences, I have used some of the following suggestions:

1. Request that you have a Department liaison. Work with this person to help them understand the special needs of the Department. Be prepared that this will be a rotating position. If the person is good, they will be transferred to work on other projects. The positive side is that you obviously had an excellent person. You will get an additional opportunity to improve your training skills when you get another liaison.

2. A new person should never be viewed as a negative. The positive side is that they will have a fresh view. They may see ways to improve your setups.

If you have questions about this project or wish to contribute titles not on these lists, please contact Hilary Seo, Project Director and Preservation Librarian at the Edward Bennett Williams Law Library.

**Records and Briefs Preservation Project**, Library, Supreme Court of the United States

- by Diane Simpson, Assistant Librarian for Technical Services/ Special Collections

The Supreme Court of the United States started a project to preserve the early records and briefs of the Court in December, 2000. Preference has been given to the older volumes, from 1832-1900, due to their uniqueness. These volumes are filled with hand drawn maps, charts, graphs, and pictures, some in color. These inserts vary in size from 3 inches by 5 inches to 4 feet by 2 feet. Some of them have been folded, many times in some cases, to fit into the volumes. Through age and use, these volumes are in the early stages of deterioration. The Court has one of the few remaining paper copies and one of the most complete sets still in existence. Most libraries have purchased the microform collection and have discarded the original volumes. Through the use of these microform collections, it has been discovered that many of the inserts were omitted.

The decision was made to have an archival copy made of each volume and its inserts. The project is labor-intensive in its detail, but it contributes to the historic preservation of court documents that is necessary for the work of the Court and public use. As each shipment is returned to the library, the spine title, each page and the placement of each insert in the archival copy is compared to the spine title, pages and inserts in the original volume to ensure accuracy. The original inserts are being unfolded, and placed in labeled polyester sleeves, and will have conservation work done as needed at a later time. The project is being done by the Etherington Conservation Center. A project to digitize the records and briefs of the Court is in the planning stages.

Members of AALL who have thoughts on the development of a national plan for legal materials are encouraged to contact Will Meredith, Chair of the TS/SIS Preservation Committee—or any member of the TS/SIS Preservation Committee. The Committee is very interested in hearing from libraries engaged in particular preservation projects. If your library has embarked on a project that contributes to the overall preservation of legal materials, let us know about it! The members of the 2001/02 TS/SIS Preservation Committee are as follows:

- Will Meredith, Chair (Harvard)
- Chris Anglim (St. Mary’s University)
- Hope Breeze (Duke)
- Katherine Hedin (University of Minnesota)
- Kathryn Fitzhugh (University of Arkansas)
- Kevin Butterfield (University of Illinois)
- Pat Turpening (University of Cincinnati)
- Sally Wambold (University of Richmond)
If they are really new to the department, they will not be getting continually paged. You will have their undivided attention. Enjoy it while you can.

3. Since you will be the continuing person, emphasize to the IS person the need for documentation of what they are doing. You may not totally understand the steps but the IS person certainly should. If they do not have the time, make sure that you that write down what they are doing and why. The why is important because as upgrades are done to a network, there may need to alter how a setup is presently operating. An upgrade may allow for improvements in processing time, etc. The previous documentation that contains the why will help the new person understand what needs to be done.

4. By being the contact person in your department, IS will know one person to contact if they have questions about its applications. You can help them understand the necessity for upgrades. If the application is not creating error messages, they sometimes do not understand the value of an upgrade. Once they understand there is new functionality or new features, they will then schedule the upgrade. If this new functionality may mean less work for them, they will obviously make it a greater priority. One instance we had was that some printers would only print part of a document before producing an error message. An upgrade was suppose to address that issue. By emphasizing fewer printer calls, the upgrade was done that night.

5. Offer to be trained for performing some upgrades that are unique to your department or PC and leave them free for the more complex items. Your institution’s IS Department may not issue the rights to do this. But it will be remembered that you were willing to assist in any way possible.

6. Communicate when someone is out of the office. That computer can be the test one to see the upgrade, fix, etc., really only takes a few minutes or whether problems will be encountered. This way the IS person can have time to diagnose the problems correctly.

7. Maintain a list of your Department’s personnel and your IS liaison’s schedules. This way when emergencies come up you can develop a reasonable compromise on when it can be handled with the least impact to everyone.

8. Communicate what time of the day is the least acceptable for performing upgrades, etc. Then work with everyone to develop a consistent time on when these should be scheduled.

9. When leaving messages, please be precise. IS personnel are rarely at their desks. They are picking up e-mails and voice mails remotely. If you will be away from your desk or cannot be interrupted due to a project, leave that in the message as well as the approximate length of time. This way they will not be coming to see you at an inconvenient time.

Please send me comments on how you resolve them. I will put them in a later column.

Please remember this column is available for anyone to write on what they do in the Private Law Libraries Technical Services area. Anyone wishing to write a column, please let me know. It can be on creating Intranets, websites, etc.

For a future column, I can be reached at: betty.roeske@kmz.com

---

**Research & Publications**

Brian Striman  
University of Nebraska  
bstriman@unl.edu

Where to begin. If you don’t know and want help, you are reading the right column. At the OBS & TS SIS Research Roundtable in July 2001 at the AALL annual meeting in Minneapolis I handed out a “publication kit.” Not scholarly. Nothing fancy. It contained photocopies of some of the best TSLL Research and Publications columns from the past several years. This is now available to you! Free of charge, with the postage and handling waived and costs borne by the University of Nebraska College of Law Schmid Law Library. Let me know by phone or e-mail and I will personally ship you out your copy. When you receive it you won’t take time to read it closely because you’re very busy. But it’s the perfect start to your new “publications” folder. This folder will not be placed in with the rest of your folders in the vertical file cabinet in your office, but instead will be with the rest of the important desk file folders on—your—desk. It stays there a faithful stalwart waiting for the late afternoon when you decide you want to begin researching what it is you’re going to research and publish.

**Some Publication Opportunities**

Need money for your project? Have you heard about ALA’s $25,000 research grant? The American Library Association (ALA) is seeking proposals for the second year for the $25,000 ALA Research Grant to support problem-based research for the profession. The Research Grant is a response to
recommendations made by the Congress on Professional Education (COPE) in April 1999. Research proposals should address one of the following questions recommended by the ALA Committee on Research and Statistics (CORS). In what ways do the services of libraries have a positive impact on the lives of users? What is/should be the role of librarians in adding value to electronic information? Proposals focusing on a specific type of library or a specific type of library service are encouraged, as long as they relate to one of these broad questions. Proposals are due by December 15, 2001, and results will be announced by February 1, 2002. Proposals will be judged by a jury composed of the current chair of CORS, the immediate past chair of CORS and the director of the ALA Office for Research and Statistics (ORS). For more information contact Mary Jo Lynch, Director, ALA Office for Research and Statistics at 800-545-2433, ext. 4273, or e-mail <mlynch@ala.org>. Proposals should be organized according to a list of criteria found at <http://www.ala.org/alaorg/ors/research_grant.html> Also located on the Web page is a payment and reporting schedule and outlines for required reports. Applications must be sent through the mail. Applications received via fax or e-mail will not be accepted. Applicants should send three paper copies of the application to: American Library Association, Office for Research and Statistics, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, IL 60611. An acknowledgment of receipt will be sent within two business days.

Larry Bodine is looking for law firm librarians who would like to write articles about current issues in the library profession. The articles don’t have to be that long — 1,000 words max — and I can get them published on one of the busiest legal web sites on the Internet (no, not the LawMarketing Portal or LLRX, something even bigger.) Please e-mail him directly: Larry Bodine, Law Marketing Portal Operator (Chicago) lbodine@LFMI.com

LIBRES, an electronic, peer-reviewed, international scholarly journal devoted to Library and Information Science Research, is pleased to announce a call for papers for its next and forthcoming issues. LIBRES is a peer-reviewed electronic journal with an editorial board of library and information science scholars. LIBRES communicates scholarly thought in library and information science. Its publication language is English. It is published in March and September. Since 1990, LIBRES has also published non refereed articles, reports, as well as news and discussion of library and information science research, applications, and events. It commenced its peer-reviewed section in 1993. When warranted by the volume and flow of scholarship, special and/or supplementary issues on emergent themes will be distributed. LIBRES has three components: 1) Research and applications ( refereed): peer-reviewed scholarly articles from multiple sub-disciplines of library and information science on such topics as analysis, evaluation, applications (reports of progress ) in libraries, plus other information science research; acting editor, Wendall Sullivan, email: <wps@uic.edu>. 2) News, meetings, essays and opinions (non-refereed); editor, Kerry Smith, email: <kerry@biblio.curtin.edu.au>. 3) Reviews of print and electronic resources and other discussions (non-refereed); editor, Suzanne Milton, email: <smilton@ewu.edu>. LIBRES is based on the principle of subscription to a list, the members of which, when informed of issue information, retrieve articles by email. An ftp archive is also maintained. News on upcoming international conferences is now entirely web-based due to the need to continually update the information. This information can be found at <http://www.curtin.edu.au/curtin/dept/sils/libres/meetings.htm>. You are invited to make a contribution to LIBRES. Please contact the Editor-in-Chief, Kerry Smith, email <kerry@biblio.curtin.edu.au> if you require further information.

Joel Fishman is interested in writing a bibliographical article on historical/biographical articles from Law Library Journal (vols. 1-95) for possible publication in LLJ or at least to place on the LH&RB (Legal History & Rare Books) web site. He has three other librarians lined up and is looking for one or two more to lighten the load of going through 15 to 20 volumes per person and compiling the bibliographical information with a short annotation on the article (possibly reprint the abstract, if there is one). At least one person cannot commit until after September and his timetable is probably by December to have each person’s work done and then compiling it all together. If you are interested please send him an email. If there is a lot of response he will have to figure out how to do this, or he may ask if you will
be willing to work on another project that he has in mind. Contact: Joel Fishman, Ph.D., Asst. Director for Lawyer Services, Duquesne University Center for Legal Information/Allegheny County Law Library, Pittsburgh, PA, 412.350.5727; email: <fishman@duq.edu>

Donna Tuke Heroy <dheroy@compuserve.com> is looking for reviewers for many various publications. Contact one of her colleagues, Pat Blakemore, Review Coordinator at <info@alertpub.com>. Guidelines are available at their website <http://www.alertpub.com>. Many of the publications are legal books.

The last publishing opportunity, at least for this column, is a reminder that if you want to be added to Ellen McGrath’s “publishing opportunities” e-mail announcements, contact her at <emcgrath@acsu.buffalo.edu>. She simply forwards e-mails to you from a one-way distribution list that she maintains. The e-mails are a variety of publishing opportunities and announcements that she finds, and usually subscribers to her list get about 3-5 e-mails per month, sometimes fewer, it just depends what she finds. One of the valuable things about this service (THANK YOU ELLEN!) is that you get her e-mails and they act as reminders to you that opportunities keep coming and can prompt you to getting started.

Recently Published

Congratulations to our colleagues below who made contributions to the literature. If you have, or you know a technical services colleague who has published, e-mail to me about it. I’ll include it in this section.


Notes from a SEAALL/SWALL Program

The notes I took below were from a program I attended called “Getting Published” on April 20, 2001. The program was in conversational format and the speakers discussed the publication process from the perspectives of author, editor and publisher. On the program were Stephen Jordan (Program Coordinator), Kent Olson, Janet Sinder, Dick Spanelli. In order to be concise for this column I will write the various speaker comments as interspersed “tips” and will not attribute specific tips to the various speakers.

♦ Research and/or write on something which you are interested in, excited about: you don’t want to get trapped into writing something that is perhaps “forced” onto you by someone else, so you need to have up your sleeve some ideas that you’re enthused about.

♦ Look at the AALL Research Agenda in the AALL website—you will find topics there that need authors for research and writing.

♦ Always be looking for possible “spin-off” articles that you find in non-law libraries publications.

♦ When you get an idea/s bounce your idea to an editor for some journal or other source. Editors want to hear your ideas and they can route you to a more appropriate source if they can’t handle your idea.
♦ See if there is a need to publish a topic in your field of interest.

♦ AALL’s Professional Development Committee has desktop publishing and every issue of AALL’s SPECTRUM is a great place to start with publishing something.

♦ Consider broadening your horizons as to where to publish, such as on the Internet, or AALL chapter newsletters.

♦ If you are thinking of publishing a book, you want to ask yourself how deep you want your involvement to be: a book takes a long time and many many hours to make it happen.

♦ Do you want remuneration for your work? If you do, don’t figure to quit your day job, as most royalties are not going to buy you that new Harley-Davidson motorcycle you’ve been wanting.

♦ Think about who your audience will be and judge that against the scope of the publication or publisher.

♦ Look at the publisher, their commitment and ability to meet deadlines and what their expectations are concerning the number of copies to be produced.

♦ Think of the timeliness of your topic. If it’s historical, then time is not of the essence, but if the content is time-sensitive, then you need a speedy vehicle to get your work published.

♦ When will you have time to research—make plans ahead of time that make time to do what needs to be accomplished.

♦ Get use to re-writing multiple drafts: it won’t be done until the print is dry.

♦ Meeting deadlines is very important. Look at 78 LLJ 197 for a great article on publishing. Understand the editors’ deadlines and be sure to meet them.

♦ Editors want to make your product look good and want to ensure that the content of your work is understandable for others and that it conveys what you want it to.

♦ Another good article is found in 84 LLJ 617.

♦ Before you submit your first draft to an editor, have several colleagues look at it first, and it’s a good idea to have a non-librarian read it.

♦ Take the time to have proper citations in the proper format.

♦ Editors are desperate for great content! They love a well-constructed article that grabs reader’s attention and that is a useful addition to the literature.

♦ Don’t feel that your article or idea has to result in a long or scholarly publication.

♦ Do you work better co-authoring or going solo? Be sure your co-author has similar work habits and that just ONE of you is the lead person who deals with the editor or publisher.

That’s all I had for notes. Oh, there were no handouts.

**Remaining Residue**

So here’s a distillation of my fading thoughts until the next column. I know most all of you haven’t slept well since our last issue, wondering how my non-survey went in the previous TSLL. Well, it went. Like a small skiff out in the Pacific Ocean floating motionless in the dark, unending, thick fog-bound doldrums, the responses to the survey just sat there… <cough> But, I did receive two responses. That was encouraging a little, and so, stumbling forward in the cold dank on what was the deck, I was able to grope my way to the helm and once again stand tall in faith and shaking off the wetness on my faded yellow hood, I shook my fist in the fog and I proclaimed, in loud voice, “WE SHALL PUBLISH!!”

I will therefore continue future columns in my usual informative, yet oft-times humoristically based style of writing.

The columns will contain a rich mixture of publishing opportunities, tips on research and publishing, and acknowledgements of our colleagues who have heard from the darkness of the deep ocean, the meek and almost imperceptible battle cry of those intrepid wayfarers who cry out “I HAVE PUBLISHED!!”
The following serial title changes were recently identified by the University of San Diego Legal Research Center serials staff and the University of California, Berkeley Law Library cataloging staff:

**Serials**

**ALI-ABA course materials journal**

**Changed to:**
**ALI-ABA business law course materials journal**
Vol. 24, no. 3 (June 2000)-

**Anglo-American law review**
(OCoLC 1481160)

**Changed to:**
**Common law world review**
Vol. 30, no. 1 (2001)-
(OCoLC 46639113)

**Crown Office digest**

** Changed to:**
**Administrative court digest (London, England)**
Feb. 2001-

**Computer law and tax report**
(OCoLC 2247071)

**Changed to:**
**Technology law alert**
Vol. 27, no. 3 (Nov. 2000)-(OCoLC 45295359)

**Directory, juvenile & adult correctional departments, institutions, agencies & paroling authorities (1992)**
1992-2000
(OCoLC 28621620)

**Changed to:**
**Directory of adult and juvenile correctional departments, institutions, agencies, and probation and parole authorities**
62nd ed. (2001)-(OCoLC 47027905)

**The George Washington journal of international law and economics**
(OCoLC 8419381)

**Changed to:**
**The George Washington international law review**
(OCoLC 45787735)

**International review of criminal policy**
(OCoLC 3053641)

**Changed to:**
**Forum on crime and society**
Vol. 1, no. 1 (Feb. 2001)
(OCoLC 46854759)

**International Conference of Building Officials. Uniform building code**
1958-1997
(OCoLC 14907366)

**Merged with:**
(OCoLC 15194269)

**And:**
**Standard building code -1999 ed.**
(OCoLC 5184806)

**To form:**
**International building code 2000-**
(OCoLC 44027250)

**International journal of shipping law**

**Merged with**
**International trade law quarterly [Vol. 1], pt. 1 (Nov. 1997)-[v. 3], pt. 2 (May 2000)**

**To form:**
**Shipping and trade law**
Vol. 1, no. 1 (Sept. 2000)-

**Journal of corporate taxation**
Vol. 1, no. 1 (Spring 1974)-vol. 28, no. 1 (Jan./Feb. 2001)

**Changed to:**
**Corporate taxation (New York, N.Y.)**
Vol. 28, no. 2 (Mar./Apr. 2001)-

**Land and water law review**
(OCoLC 1641266)

**Changed to:**
**Wyoming law review**
Vol. 1, no. 1 (2001)
(OCoLC 45105543)

**The law librarian**
(OCoLC 1437728)

**Changed to:**
**Legal information management**
Vol. 1, no. 1 (spring 2001)
(OCoLC 47251192)

**Marquette sports law journal**
Vol. 1, no. 1 (fall 1990)-v. 10, no. 2 (spring 2000)
(OCoLC 23026085)

**Changed to:**
**Marquette sports law review**
Vol. 11, no. 1 (fall 2000)
(OCoLC 44488544)

**The official guide to U.S. law schools**
(OCoLC 12846144)

**Changed to:**
**Official guide to ABA-approved law schools**
2002 ed.
(OCoLC 46483812)
Race and ethnic ancestry law journal
Changed to:
Washington and Lee race and ethnic ancestry law journal
Vol. 6, issue 1 (Spring 2000)

Report from the Institute for Philosophy & Public Policy
Vol. 10, no. 1 (Winter 1990)-v. 20, no. 4 (Fall 2000)
Changed to:
Philosophy & public policy quarterly
Vol. 21, no. 1 (Winter 2001)-

Robert Schuman Centre annual on European competition law
1996-1997
Changed to:
European competition law annual
1998-

Sloan management review
Vol. 12, no. 1 (fall 1970)-v. 42, no. 1 (fall 2000)
Changed to:
MIT Sloan management review
Vol. 42, no. 2 (winter 2001)-

Survey on client protection funds
1993-1995
(OCoLC 36817852)
Changed to:
Survey of lawyers’ funds for client protection
1996-1998-
(OCoLC 43515881)

Zakon i zhizn
Merged with:
Legea si viata
To form:
Revista nationala de drept
2000, nr. 1 (Octombrie 2000)-

Not a title change: It appears that Shepard’s southwestern reporter citations
(OCoLC 1697170)
Changed to:
Shepard’s southwestern citations
6th ed. (2001)-
(OCoLC 47681349)

However – this is not the case. Read the CRIV gram published here <http://
www.aallnet.org/committee/criv/
mediation/gram2001/081001.htm> to
find out why.

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:

Annual review of population law
(OCoLC 2639777)

Habeas & prison litigation case law update
Ceased with: no. 13 (Sept. 1998)
(OCoLC 35000101)

International lawyers’ newsletter
Ceased with v. 22, no. 6 (Nov./Dec.
2000)
(OCoLC 5996349)

The Jewish lawyer
Apparently ceased with: v. 11, no. 2
(1996)
(OCoLC 10927892)

Law of the internet
Ceased with: 2001 ed.
Replaced by looseleaf publication also
titled: Law of the internet

Library of Congress information bulletin
Ceased publication in paper format with:
v. 59, nos. 8-9 (Aug.-Sept. 2000)
(OCoLC 2566556)
Subsequent issues available online:
Library of Congress information bulletin (Online) at: <http://
www.loc.gov/loc/lcib/>
(OCoLC 2589631)

Villanova journal of law and investment management
Ceased publication in paper format with:
v. 2, no. 1 (spring 2000)
Subsequent issues available online:
Villanova journal of law and investment management (Online) at: <http://
vlsl.will.vill.edu/academics/vjlim/
index.html>

Visa bulletin
Ceased publication in paper format with v. 8, no. 15 (Feb. 2000)
(OCoLC 17596240)
Issues available online: Visa bulletin
(Online) at: <http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/
ERC/visa_bulletin/index.html>
(OCoLC 44285332)

And lastly, thanks to a sharp-eyed reader, a correction to the column in the
v. 26, no. 3/4 (Mar./June 2001) issue:

Revising Rules to Reflect the New Reality: Changing the Definition of Serials in AACR2

Upcoming rule changes that will have a major impact on the cataloging world were the topic of a well-attended program that took place on July 17 at the AALL Annual Meeting in Minneapolis. The program, entitled “Revising Rules to Reflect the New Reality: Changing the Definition of Serials in AACR2,” featured three distinguished speakers: Sara Shatford Layne of UCLA’s Science and Engineering Library, Rhonda Lawrence of UCLA Law Library, and Ann Sitkin of Harvard Law Library.

Sara Shatford Layne introduced the concept of redefining seriality by outlining the historical development of the upcoming changes to AACR2 chapter 12 (“Continuing Resources”) and placing them in a theoretical context. The proposed revisions to chapter 12 are based on a three-pronged model of the bibliographic universe, which has evolved in response to the failure of existing models to adequately describe certain kinds of resources, such as interfilng loose-leaf publications and websites. The suggested three-pronged model categorizes the bibliographic universe by form of issuance, as follows:

Single issuance (Finite)
- Single part monographs (Finite)
- Multipart monographs (Finite, complete when first issued)

Successive issuance (may be Finite or Continuing)
- Multipart monographs (Finite, but incomplete when first issued)
- Newsletters of events, etc. (Finite)
- Serials (Continuing)

Integrating issuance (may be Finite or Continuing)
- Updating loose-leaves (may be Finite or Continuing)
- Databases and websites (may be Finite or Continuing)

Some important conceptual changes introduced in the proposed chapter 12 and related rules include:
- The addition of explicit rules for dealing with changes in each area of the description
- The creation of rules for dealing with change in different ways depending on form of issuance (e.g., serial vs. integrating resource); reintroduction of latest entry cataloging in some instances
- The introduction of concepts of major and minor change; reduction in the number of changes considered major

Catalogers who are accustomed to applying Adele Hallam’s Cataloging Rules for the Description of Looseleaf Publications will find much that is familiar in the treatment of integrating resources in the proposed chapter 12 revision.

Ann Sitkin’s presentation expanded on some of the concepts introduced by Dr. Layne, taking a closer look at new terms that are used in the proposed chapter 12 revision (e.g., “integrating resource,” “bibliographic resource”), and at some specific areas of change in the rules, including the parts that address the basis of the bibliographic description, the chief source of information, title changes, and statements of responsibility. As in Dr. Layne’s presentation, it was stressed that the application of the new rules will depend greatly upon the nature of the resource (in particular, the resource’s form of issuance) being described. Mention was made of the impact of the revised chapter 12 on other chapters of AACR2, notably chapter 21, which addresses the issue of what constitutes major and minor changes in title.

The Joint Steering Committee for Revision of Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules is scheduled to meet and make its final decision on the proposed chapter 12 revision this fall. Publication of the revised chapter 12 and related rules is expected in June 2002.

Rhonda Lawrence addressed the impact that the revision of AACR2 chapter 12 will have on MARC 21. MARBI proposal number 2001-05, “Changes in MARC 21 to Accommodate Seriality,” consists of four separate proposals:
- Define code “i” in Leader/07 for “integrating resource” in the bibliographic format
- Define code “k” in 008/18 and 006/01 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format for resources that are continuously
updated, and in fields 853-855 (captions and pattern), subfield w (frequency) of the MARC 21 Holdings Format

- Rename 008/21 and 006/04 from “Type of serial “ to “Type of serial or integrating resource” and define codes “l” (updating loose-leaf), “d” (database), and “w” (updating website) as values in these fields

- Define code “2” in 008/34 and 006/14 (successive/latest entry indicator) for integrating resources


MARBI proposal number 2001-04, “Making Field 260 Repeatable in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format,” proposes that “Field 260 Publication, Distribution, etc. (Imprint) be made repeatable to accommodate both current and historical publishing information and to provide better access to this information for database managers and library system users. It also proposes definition of subfield 3 ‘Materials specified.’”

According to the proposal, “[t]he earliest known place and publisher would be given in field 260, using first indicator value blank; the data in this field is not changed when the publisher statement on the resource changes. Subsequent changes of place and publisher would be given in sequential 260 fields using first indicator values 2-3.”

MARBI proposal number 2001-04 is available on the Web at: <http://lcweb.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2001/2001-04.html>. At this time, there is no estimated date of implementation for the proposed changes to MARC 21. The timetable for implementation will depend to a large extent upon the ability of library system vendors and the bibliographic utilities to make the necessary changes to their systems to accommodate the revisions.

---

**Where Will It All End? Why Are the Costs of Law Books and Serials Going Up Faster Than My Ability to Pay?**

Many acquisitions librarians have wondered, on law-lib and elsewhere, if steep increases in the cost of law books over the last decade have been the result of publisher mergers. Having heard these complaints and seen examples of the rapidly escalating prices, AALL contracted with economist Mark McCabe to complete an analysis of prices in the law book industry. In this very appropriately titled session, McCabe, on the faculty of the Georgia Institute of Technology, discussed the preliminary results of his research that examined the cost of legal materials over the years 1990-2000. In this study, McCabe’s chief objectives were to examine general prices, the impact of market consolidation, the response of libraries/librarians, and the role of electronic distribution within the law book market. McCabe, is well qualified to undertake such a study for AALL, as he completed a similar price analysis of biomedical journals for the Association of Research Libraries. His research for ARL confirmed that significant price increases had occurred, in many cases a doubling or tripling of subscription rates, and yet library demand for the journals went down only 3% in a ten-year period. Upon beginning his research into the law book market, McCabe wondered if he would see a similar trend.

McCabe’s study of legal publications looked at the price and holdings of 481 legal publications over the decade 1990-2000. The titles selected fell neatly into eight categories: codes, reporters, digests, citators, encyclopedias, loose-leaf services, newsletters, and treatises. At the time of his AALL presentation, McCabe had completed an analysis of 335 titles. Codes, digests, and other unique titles were excluded from his preliminary results. Holdings and usage information was collected from fifty-eight law libraries including representatives from academic, government, and firm libraries. Price information was obtained from the publishers, Georgetown University Law payment records, and Ken Svengalis’ Legal Information Buyers Guide and Reference Manual. The findings shared in this session were very much a work in progress however, his initial conclusions showed that prices in the law book market have doubled in the last ten years while library holdings have remained stable. On average, academic libraries did not respond to the doubling of material prices by canceling titles. In fact there was a small increase in the average number of all 335 titles held by academic libraries in the ten-year period. Meanwhile, findings revealed only a 7% decline in the average number of all 335 titles held at law firm libraries. So, with his preliminary results in, it appears that in spite of an overall doubling in the cost of legal publications, library holdings have remained consistent and that law librarians, similar to their colleagues purchasing biomedical journals, did not cancel titles even as substantial price increases occurred.

McCabe’s study also attempted to assess the impact mergers, i.e. Thomson’s purchase of West in 1996, had on overall prices in the legal publications market. Using a regression analysis and the differences in differences approach, McCabe assigned a unique variable for each title to capture the pre and post
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merger effects in markets. His research showed that the West-Thomson merger was associated with a 22% price increase. In contrast, Reed Elsevier’s major acquisitions in the 1990s of Michie Shepards, and Matthew Bender were not associated with any measurable price impact on the individual products. He commented that various factors may account for merger effects including changes in product costs, demand, or market power. Some of the titles a company owns may have become less valuable. One example of this is Shepard’s citators, which, with their inclusion on Lexis.com, may be less valuable as a print resource now than they were ten years ago.

At the end of his presentation McCabe was asked if law libraries soon should expect a break from major price increases. He responded that prices would continue to increase sharply as long as librarians continue to accommodate the increases within their budget. Librarians acting together and making significant cancellations would force publishers to re-examine their price strategy and slow rising prices. Other comments from the audience discussed the SPARC initiative and if SPARC produced journals would bring down prices in the journal market. McCabe responded that with only ten journals, SPARC’s presence in the market is not significant enough to compete in a major way with commercial publications. The individual SPARC titles may force price competition on a title by title basis, but to have a major effect on pricing there will need to be many, many more journals produced by SPARC.

Overall, Mark McCabe’s presentation proved to be an eye opening study of recent pricing trends in legal books and serials. Quite simply, the discussion of his work in progress was one of the most compelling and significant sessions held in Minneapolis this year. The law library community awaits the final, completed report of this study to be published next year by AALL.

Phyllis Post
Capital University Law Library
ppost@law.capital.edu

PUT A CORC IN IT:
The Cooperative Online Resource Catalog’s Attempt to Control the WWW Information Flow

It has become a cliché to speak of the World Wide Web and the explosion of information contained therein. Librarians continue to struggle with ways to make sense out of the web and give their patrons some direction as they begin their research. Most law library web sites offer a list of frequently consulted links, or provide bookmarks on the public terminals. But these lists can be troublesome and cumbersome to maintain. And when lists of web sites aren’t tied to the catalog, patrons have to consult 2 sources—the catalog and the library’s web site. What librarians need is an easy way to add records for popular and useful web sites to their local catalogs. And it sounds as if that easy way lies with CORC, OCLC’s Cooperative Online Resource Catalog. This program was presented to give attendees an overview of the CORC program as well as insights into how CORC has been used in 3 different academic law libraries.

Kay Covert, a marketing analyst at OCLC was the first speaker and she began by reminding us that library users today have an “I want it now” expectation. She showed us how popular web search engines like Google can often produce an overabundance of information with few tools to distinguish good from bad. Ms. Covert told us that we could make the web more like a library by “selecting” important and useful web sites to catalog as part of our collections. She then went on to describe metadata and the Dublin Core standard for the description of web resources. From here she turned to the CORC program, which she described as a “tool to turn web resources into library resources”. CORC uses automated techniques to “harvest” information from a web site and enter that information into the correct Dublin Core or MARC fields (the user has a choice whether to view Dublin Core or MARC records as the system toggles between the two). CORC also has linked authority control for more efficient name verification. And a user can choose to have OCLC do URL maintenance on the record and notify a library when a link is no longer working properly. Once created, CORC records are also added to WorldCat (OCLC’s bibliographic database) and are available to any OCLC user. An additional interesting feature of CORC is the ability to create pathfinders or “webliographies”. Ms. Covert showed us how the pathfinders can be created from scratch or a CORC member can use one of the pre-existing pathfinders. These pathfinders are added to a library’s web page to aid patrons in their research. Ms. Covert concluded by saying that any OCLC member can log on and begin using CORC immediately. Charges for CORC mirror charges for WorldCat. And non-members can visit the CORC home page for information on joining the program <http://www.oclc.org/corc/>.

The next speaker was Ruth Patterson Funabiki of the University of Idaho Law Library. She gave us the perspective of a small to medium-sized law library that serves a diverse population with a small staff. They are charter members of the CORC program. She told us that many
Idaho documents are only available online, so CORC has been important for providing access to these documents for their patrons. Ms. Funabiki works with her public services librarians to identify sites to catalog. After cataloging a site, she downloads the MARC version. She told us that her current catalog does not support linking from a record to a web site, but they are in the process of migrating to a new system that does support linking. She also told us that her favorite features of CORC are linked authorities, harvesting capabilities, and URL monitoring. From her perspective it’s clear that participating in CORC has been a valuable experience and she encouraged the audience members to join.

The Moritz Law Library at Ohio State University is another CORC participant. Mary Rider of OSU gave a detailed presentation on her library’s experience with CORC. They joined CORC in January 2000 while it was still in its pilot project phase. In describing why they joined CORC, Ms. Rider said that she sees CORC as the prototype for future OCLC developments in web-based cataloging and she wanted to be a part of that effort sooner rather than later. Also she saw CORC as the impetus her library needed to deal with e-resources in a more systematic way—it stimulated their thinking about the process of selection, cataloging, and maintenance of them. In addition, they also considered whether that resource should simultaneously be added to their web page. Ms. Rider gave us a detailed description of their workflow. Web sites are chosen for cataloging by OSU’s reference librarians. A form is filled out and submitted to the Head of Reference for approval. When the request is approved, it is forwarded to Ms. Rider for cataloging. She searches the CORC database; if she finds a matching record it is downloaded, but if no matching record is found she creates one for downloading. Indeed the steps are very familiar to those of us with a cataloging background. As OSU looks to the future, they hope to involve reference librarians more in the process of searching and creating records in CORC. They also want to consider contributing NACO records via CORC. She told us that they add 5-10 records per month to their catalog and that many more web sites are being added to their catalog than to their web page. Ms. Rider concluded by listing numerous benefits of participating in CORC. Some of those benefits include: cooperation between public services and technical services staff, ability to “harvest” a record, URL maintenance, and the ability of patrons to use familiar search strategies to find web resources. Like the speakers before her, she concluded by urging us to join CORC.

Our final speaker gave us the public services perspective of being a CORC participant. Brendan Starkey is a Reference Librarian at Seattle University Law Library and he began by telling us why we need CORC. With CORC we can do a better job of incorporating online resources into our library. He told us that if a library does a good job of cataloging web resources, it will make the OPAC (and by extension the library) the best portal for users. Of course, resources disappear or change and URLs also change. CORC’s URL checker is a partial solution to this dilemma. He also discussed some of the new naming technologies that we will soon see (such as Digital Object Identifier or RealNames) that will also provide stability to these records when they appear in our catalogs. Like Ms. Covert, he argued that commercial search engines can be inefficient and time-consuming, but librarians can offer credible and authoritative information through CORC. He then went on to describe the workflow at Seattle. There, each librarian is responsible for selecting resources (both print and online) for given subject areas. They identify a web resource, catalog it in CORC (or use a pre-existing record), and load it into their local catalog. In addition he told us how selectors create subject-specific research guides (the pathfinders) for their web site.

In conclusion, it is clear that all 4 speakers are enthusiastic about the CORC program and its potential to help librarians make the most of web resources. Like any cooperative program the greater the number of participants, the greater the benefits. Perhaps now is the time for more of us to join the program. If you’d like to learn more, consult some of these web sites that were suggested by our speakers:

CORC home page: <http://www.oclc.org/corc>
CORC users group home page: <http://www.sil.si.edu/staff/CORC-users-group/content.htm>
Brendan Starkey’s presentation: <http://www.law.seattleu.edu/library/starkey/corc.htm>
The ALL-SIS Statistics Roundtable met at AALL on Monday, July 16 at 5:15 p.m. Mila Rush (University of Minnesota) presided over the meeting. Our initial discussion focused on the results of the recent statistics-gathering survey created and distributed by the group in 2000/2001. The purpose of the survey itself was to determine “whether the simplification of the ABA form might leave a vacuum in the types of legitimate parameters that might be useful for academic law libraries to gather and report”.

The survey was distributed to the directors of all law school libraries. Approximately, one-third of those libraries queried responded to the survey.

The survey’s questions as well as a brief summary of the responses are as follows:

1) In addition to the ABA, to whom do you provide statistical reports?

*The vast majority of libraries submit statistics to ARL, IPEDS, and GPO in addition to the ABA.*

2) List statistical measures you do not currently track, but that you think will be useful to gather for various purposes.

3) If you have an integrated library system (ILS), what statistical reports does your ILS automatically generate for you? Please name the ILS.

*Most respondents have ILS systems that can provide reports for circulation transactions, fund accounting and item counts. Many commented though that these reports frequently needed to be “tweaked” in order to be useful when gathering annual statistics. It was suggested that librarians, particularly those using the same ILS systems, coordinate how records are coded so that the results could be of more use when completing the ABA report.*

4) Any comments?

*A common complaint was the inconsistency of definitions across the various questionnaires. Also mentioned was whether or not questionnaires successfully measured a library’s effectiveness of services in any meaningful way.*

5) Name and library (optional, but helpful)

If you would like a more detailed summary of the ALL-SIS Statistics Survey and its results, please e-mail Mila Rush at <m-rush@umn.edu> or phone her at 612-625-0793.

The remainder of the roundtable centered around a discussion of the ABA questionnaire itself. Present at the meeting was Marian Parker (Wake Forest University), a member of the ABA Section of Legal Education Law Libraries Committee. Ms. Parker, along with Michael Chiorazzi (Arizona State University) another member of the committee, reported from the minutes of their most recent meeting.

During the course of their meeting, the committee discussed in detail each of the questions on the current ABA questionnaire to determine whether or not the questions still provided useful information. Given changes in technology, the group also examined the methods for obtaining accurate and meaningful statistics.
The following two questions have been deleted from this year’s questionnaire:

**Question 13.** Does the library have an integrated catalog including acquisitions, serials control, cataloging and circulation?

*The committee felt this question was no longer necessary since virtually all law school libraries have implemented integrated catalogs.*

**Question 19.** Usage (including off-site usage) of online computer assisted legal research systems by faculty, students and staff.

*Given the widespread availability of computers and software throughout law schools, it was felt it would be very difficult to accurately determine exact usage figures.*

In addition:

**Questions 31 and 32** (both deal with the number of seats available to library users) will be referred to Library Directors for discussion.

**Questions 38, 40, and 41** (all dealing with numbers of computer workstations and connection issues) will be further explored in light of the rapid changes in technology (e.g. students using their own computers, wireless connections, etc.).

*Questions pertaining to library expenditures will also be further analyzed.*

Ms. Parker was thanked for her participation in the Roundtable as well as her offer to communicate to the ABA committee some of our concerns with the questionnaire. In the coming weeks, Mila will forward pertinent survey findings, comments, and possible recommendations to the appropriate bodies (i.e. AALL, ABA, and perhaps ARL, various ILS user groups, and the OBS Local Systems committee).

No specific charge was given to the Roundtable this year. They will continue to meet at the annual conference to discuss various issues surrounding the ABA questionnaire as well as statistics-gathering in general. Given the late hour (as well as everyone’s desire to get to the West Reception) the roundtable was adjourned.

---

**Retooling Yourself**

*(continued from page 1)*

So how do we deal with this? Ms. Reynolds defined what a personal mission statement is. It articulates what you are ultimately trying to accomplish in your work/personal life. It’s based on your values, which indicate what matters most deeply to you, give meaning to your work, and shape your decisions and behaviors. It helps determine your priorities. When we review our activities in light of our mission statements we begin to see what absorbs our time but does not produce results. We can identify what keeps us from getting our work done so that we begin to make changes.

As a concrete example of this, Ms. Reynolds described a situation in her office where e-mail was getting out of hand. People would e-mail her with questions that required a response. Ms. Reynolds found that it took more time to compose an e-mail response than it did to leave her office, find the person and answer the question in person. In the process she discovered that personal interaction was restoring/building relationships and made her a better leader. By making the simple change of answering certain types of e-mails in person Ms. Reynolds realized a double benefit: time savings and increased interpersonal contact.

One final illustration of this concept of reorienting ourselves took the form of a demonstration with the program’s moderator, Mary Jane Kelsey. Ms. Reynolds poured a large container of small pebbles into a large bowl. The pebbles represented the many small details of Ms. Kelsey’s job. Ms. Kelsey was then asked to insert some large rocks into the bowl, without causing the pebbles to spill over. The rocks represented big-picture things such as “planning”, “leadership”, “management”, and “vacation”. Well, it was impossible to fit all of those rocks into the bowl with the pebbles. But when the rocks were placed into another bowl first, the pebbles easily fit in and around the rocks without spilling over. The point was that if we focus on the truly important and not the details, everything will fit.

There were several suggestions that came out of this program. Two that were particularly meaningful to me were:

1. **Organize weekly.** Rather than sitting down with a list of daily tasks, I should make an effort to see what projects and programs I can make headway on in a given week. I should identify my goals and take concrete steps to achieve them.

2. **Interruptions happen.** Some are critical, but some are not. I need to give myself permission to ignore or postpone the interruptions that are not critical.

To conclude the program, Ms. Reynolds was able to briefly mention a professional development tool The Professional Mentor. It is a software tool that allows users to assess and upgrade their interpersonal and leadership skills. Users can work at their own pace from their desktops. It certainly sounds interesting and may be something that some of us want to look into further.

But first I’ll be working on my mission statement…  

---

*Technical Services Law Librarian, September, 2001*
From the editor:

September 2001 will be a month, like December 1941, which will always connote a combination of national pain and renewed national purpose. Someone suggested to me that his work in a law library seemed irrelevant in the face of such momentous events. But I think our work, although not on the front lines, is relevant. The rule of law underpins our system of government and our way of life. But the law is not a static thing. Lawyers and legislators and laymen are constantly testing the limits of the law, seeking advantages, seeking improvements, seeking justice. In a free society the law is something that needs constant attention. In providing the resources to make law accessible, we are helping to ensure that American law will flourish in a time of great challenges.

I am grateful for the opportunity to edit *TSLL*, and I am very cognizant of the high expectations this newsletter generates. But I have learned that the editors of this newsletter have had a significant advantage since the beginning: the quality of the content. The material in *TSLL* is generally the kind of solid, practical information that we need in our work, and that makes my job easier, so I wish to thank all of the columnists and contributors. Another thing that makes it easier is that I don’t have to do the hard part — making it look so nice. Credit for that goes to Linda Tesar, the Layout Editor. Cindy May, the Business Manager, and Martin Wisneski, our webmaster, also take on large portions of the work that make the production and distribution of all this information possible. It is a great team, and I recognize my good fortune in having them, along with the TS and OBS Editorial Board Members, behind me.

The December issue will include minutes from all the SIS level meetings at the Minneapolis conference, so if you have committee minutes, business meeting minutes, etc. that you want to include, please send those in by the deadline (Oct. 30.) Also, please feel free to contact me about ideas for articles to include in the newsletter.

*Joe Thomas*

*Notre Dame Law Library*

*thomas.2@nd.edu*