Editor’s note: Michael Maben, Cataloging Librarian at Indiana University-Bloomington Law Library takes us inside the OCLC world. His OCLC/WLN column for this is an example of good reporting that gives us a look into the workings of one of the biggest players in the technical services world.

There have been several developments with OCLC that I would like to discuss in my column for the December issue of Technical Services Law Librarian, including a conversation I had with the executive vice president and chief operating officer of OCLC.

OCLC and Oracle

On July 17th, OCLC issued a press release announcing their decision to adopt Oracle database technology as the new platform for WorldCat. Jay Jordan actually announced this decision at the President’s luncheon at ALA in June, and he discussed the decision in his column in the OCLC Newsletter, July/August 2001. This is a significant decision for OCLC. They will be discontinuing their proprietary software that has powered the database since its inception, and replacing it with an “off-the-shelf” software.

On October 17th I had the opportunity to chat with Don Muccino of OCLC about this decision. Mr. Muccino is OCLC’s executive vice president and chief operating officer. He is the individual in charge of the day-to-day operations at OCLC. He graciously took time out of his busy schedule to talk to me about the decision to adopt the Oracle database technology. He was clearly very excited about the change, and had many good things to tell me. I prefaced the conversation by telling him about the OCLC Committee and how the majority of us use OCLC for cataloging, acquisitions, and interlibrary loan, mostly in an academic setting. I told him that my main reason for wanting to talk to him was to address how this change was going to affect the way we do our work. After talking to Mr. Muccino, reading the various press releases and columns, and viewing the President’s luncheon from ALA on videotape, it is apparent that OCLC’s switch from proprietary software to Oracle is going to be eclipsed by much more dramatic changes. Mr.
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Does anyone remember the song *Turn! Turn! Turn!* by the Byrds? Those of a certain generation remember Pete Seeger’s adaptation of the words from the *Book of Ecclesiastes*. To jog your memory (and for those who never heard of the Byrds or Pete Seeger) the lyrics begin:

To everything – turn, turn, turn.
There is a season – turn, turn, turn.
And a time for every purpose under heaven.

Since September 11, these lyrics are running continuously through my head. As much as our personal and work lives have changed, the cycle continues and many of the routine tasks remain. This is the season of planning for the 2002 AALL Conference in Orlando. Here is a tentative schedule of TS-SIS events for July 20 through July 23. Working with Ismael Gullon, chair of the OBS-SIS and the committee chairs in each SIS, every effort was made to keep conflicts between the two Sections to a minimum. Please note that a new roundtable has been added to the TS-SIS schedule for 2002 for TS-SIS Management Issues. The creation of a new roundtable was based on the attendance at the Management Ad Hoc Group meeting facilitated by Jim Mumm in Minneapolis. It is hoped that this roundtable will help foster discussion among library types and library departments on management issues that we all encounter.

**Saturday, July 20**
- 4pm to 6pm
  - 2001/2002 Executive Board Meeting
- 6pm to 7:30pm
  - TS/OBS/RIPS/CIS-SIS Joint Reception

**Sunday, July 21**
- 11:45am to 1pm
  - Management Issues Roundtable

**Monday, July 22**
- 7am to 8am
  - Acquisitions Committee Meeting
  - Heads of Cataloging in Large Law Libraries Roundtable
- 7:30pm to 6:30pm
  - Business Meeting

**Tuesday, July 23**
- 7am to 8:45 am
  - Cataloging and Classification Committee Meeting
  - Preservation Committee
- 12pm to 1:30pm
  - Cataloging and Classification Issues Roundtable
  - Heads of Technical Services Roundtable
  - Preservation and Binding Roundtable
- 5:30pm to 6:30pm
  - Acquisitions Roundtable

**Wednesday, July 24**
- 7am to 8:45 am
  - 2002/2003 Executive Board Meeting
- 12:15pm to 1:30pm
  - Education Committee Meeting

**Program Proposals**
Due to the events of September 11, the Annual Meeting Program Committee had to postpone their discussions on the selection of educational programs for the next annual meeting. The final decision on educational programming for Orlando was announced in early November. The TS-SIS educational programs for 2002 are:

- **Publication Patterns: Creating Connections in the Serials World**, Andrea Rabbia, coordinator
- **Connecting with Law Publisher by a Licensing Agreement**, Lorna Tang, coordinator
- **How to Avoid 'Search Reopened,'** (co-sponsored with OBS-SIS), Barbara Plante, coordinator
- **What I Learned About Preservation**, Pat Turpening, coordinator

An enormous amount of work goes into developing, coordinating, and presenting an educational program. I would like to thank Patricia Sayre-McCoy and all those who submitted program proposals.

**TS-SIS Education Grant Recipient**
I am pleased to announce that Wendy Medvetz, from the Capital University Law Library, is the first recipient of the TS-SIS Education Grant. She has been the acquisitions/serials librarian at the Capital University Law Library since April 2001. In her nomination letter, her supervisor said that Wendy “is someone who has the potential to make great contributions.” Wendy used the grant to attend the *New Perspectives in Law Library Acquisitions and Collection Development Workshop* held at the American University School of Law in Washington, DC, November 2-3, 2001.

The purpose of the TS-SIS Education Grant is to provide financial assistance to librarians who might not otherwise be able to attend an AALL-sponsored workshop due to limited financial resources. Funds are provided by TS-SIS primarily from dues, and are a benefit of membership in both AALL and the TS-SIS. Grants issued are to support attendance at technical services related AALL sponsored educational workshops. This can include programs on issues covering cataloging, preservation, acquisitions
Greetings Fellow OBS Members:

One of the most enjoyable activities I engaged in this past summer was white water rafting at the Ocoee River, the site of the 1996 Olympics White water Canoe/Kayak Event. Our Ocoee Adventure Center guide introduced himself and immediately started communicating with us. He asked us several questions and then demonstrated the basics of white water rafting, which included paddle forward, paddle backward, hit deck, etc. After his explanation of the safety guidelines, we ventured into what seemed to us uncharted waters. He continued communicating with us through the exciting 5 miles downstream. He told us when we were approaching “Big Bertha” and “Washing Machine” rapids so that we could “hit deck” and we literally “hit deck” (a.k.a. seat on the bottom of the raft) And then we were surfing which was even more thrilling. Our white water rafting trip was a “success” because our Ocoee Adventure Center guide communicated!

Communication is essential for an organization to thrive! The first strategic direction of OBS Strategic Plan is that OBS communicates. How well is OBS communicating with its members? As you know OBS unveiled and distributed its Strategic Plan for 2001-2004 at the OBS General Business Meeting in Minneapolis. I hope you had a chance to read it. It has been mounted on the OBS website (We have publicized the plan in the AALL Spectrum).

One of the best ways to communicate with each other is having all 300 plus OBS members present at the meeting. We are able to accomplish this task by participating in “absentia” through the annual membership survey. Mary Jane Kelsey, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect will conduct the annual membership survey via the OBS website this fall. It is imperative that we hear from you through the survey. This is your golden opportunity to communicate and share with OBS your concerns, comments, suggestions and insights.

The OBS listserv will be repopulated this fall. We use this medium to share news and current awareness information. We want to maintain an atmosphere in which interaction can flourish. You will see the “Website of the Month” posted soon, among many things. We will also keep you informed as the website is updated. Members are encouraged to post news items or questions. Please do not un-subscribe!

JoAnn Hounshell
Northwestern University
jhounshell@law.northwestern.edu
The listserv aim is to serve as our monthly staff meeting.

OBS has taken the initiative to submit news briefs to be published in the Spectrum. This is a great way to keep members informed and make an impact in the Association, but also to attract and recruit new members to OBS. This is our public relations medium. You may have heard the statement “Communication is an art” and it is. That’s why the OBS Executive Board is always available to listen to your complaints and also your suggestions, insights and ideas.

And we communicate from this column, “From the Chair” in TSLL, which provides a general overview of OBS activities and its accomplishments. It also records OBS’s great history. Our goal is to keep the channels of communication open but you must recognize that it is in your power to avoid communication breakdown. Help us to communicate in a clear, precise and concise way.

Last, but not least, here are the program proposals accepted for Orlando 2002.

♦ The Catalog vs. the Homepage? Best Practices in Connecting to Online Resources, Coordinator: Georgia Briscoe

♦ Rule Maker or Rule Breaker? A Reference’s Guide to Better Acquisitions, Coordinator: Dick Vaughan, Indiana University-Bloomington, RVAUGHAN@INDIANA.EDU

Despite my tendency to dismiss most new legal vendor services as mere marketing ploys, I must admit that I’ve been pleasantly surprised over the past few years with some of the new customer service “e-services.” West’s online filing instructions make my life easier at least once a month. Hein’s Hein-subs-l listserv has not only helped me lower the number of claims I send out, but also keeps me informed of title changes and publication delays. Anderson Publishing’s online Directory of Law Reviews, although not as up-to-date as I would like, has helped me effortlessly locate proper addresses for law reviews, and almost all the major players now offer web ordering. To these you can add a growing number of services offered by vendors who have made their reputation outside the world of law libraries (Academic Book Center’s BookBag database and Swets/Blackwells DatataswetsConnect database come to mind.) And now, even companies who have made their reputation in the world of retail Internet book selling are beginning to offer their services to libraries.

Clearly, law libraries will never be the main market for these new services, but they do offer legal acquisitions librarians another tool for their toolbox. I’ll leave it to others to “review” these services, but let me mention a few that I have found particularly helpful over the past few months.

The first of these new “e-services” comes from a company that we all know - Amazon.com. If you are like me, you’ve probably used Amazon to acquire some of those non law items that your normal legal vendors just don’t handle, or can’t quickly obtain (i.e., the Dean needs that new John Grisham novel to take on vacation.) Our library has been fortunate because we have had access to a library credit card and so placing the order was relatively easy (provided we successfully convinced Amazon that the University was a tax-free institution.) I’ve learned in conversations with many other librarians, however, that many law libraries don’t have credit cards and, as a result, often end up using a personal card or look elsewhere for the title. This all recently changed when Amazon introduced a “corporate accounts” division.

By opening a corporate account, libraries are able to order materials without having to use a credit card. Instead, they are invoiced for the order just like any other library jobber. In addition, purchase order numbers can be used and tax exempt institutions can establish tax-free accounts. Multiple buyers, which you designate, can use the account to place, modify, and track current and past orders. Along with this come all of the regular “features” of Amazon shopping.

Applying for the account, online, takes only a few minutes (I was placing my
first order within 30 minutes of completing the application.) More information about Amazon’s corporate accounts, as well as the application form, can be found via a link on Amazon’s home page <http://www.amazon.com>.

Another useful new tool that I’ve discovered is the Advanced Book Exchange’s abelibrary.com website. Originally developed in 1996, as an online database containing the inventories of Out-of-Print and Rare Book Dealers, ABE’s database now contains more than 30 million titles from dealers all over the world. I’ve been using ABE’s regular website (abebooks.com) for several years for my personal OP book purchases, and have also occasionally used the site to purchased materials for our library. Again, however, the problem has been in paying for the material. In the past, once you found what you were looking for in the ABE database you had to work with the dealer to arrange the purchase. This could mean everything from negotiating the price to working out a payment plan. Most of the dealers are very small businesses and, understandably, require prepayment and many will not accept credit cards.

With the debut of abelibrary.com <http://www.abelibrary.com> in September, however, ABE has created a service designed specifically for use by libraries. This new service allows libraries to establish an account that allows them to place orders without having to pay up front. In the new service, once a desired title is found, the library need only click a button to purchase it. ABE then contacts the dealer and makes the actual purchase. The dealer sends the book directly to the library, while an e-mail invoice is sent from ABE. Another nice feature is the ability to create online “want lists” which will automatically notify you when a needed title is loaded into the database. An online glossary of the terminology used to describe the physical condition of OP materials will also help newbies translate OP citations.

Most law libraries will probably not use a service like this often, but with materials going out-of-print sooner and sooner it can be a powerful tool when you need to obtain a title that is no longer available from traditional sources. I can only imagine how helpful this type of service could be to an organization just starting, or expanding, a library. While a user is obviously limited by the titles dealers enter into the database, I’ve had surprisingly good luck locating legal related materials that our library was lacking. I’ve been particularly comforted by knowing that the inventories of standard legal OP dealers like Meyer Boswell Books and The Lawbook Exchange are contained in the database. Another reassuring feature is ABE’s creation of a Library Advisory Group (which I have joined) whose purpose is to increase communication between librarians and the ABE development team, and thus produce a site that meets the needs of library acquisitions departments.

I’m a little hesitant to mention one more new service, because it is really more of a product than a service. Still, some libraries may already have access to it and others may at least benefit by being aware of its existence. ProQuest’s Digital Dissertations is a new version of the old UMI Dissertation Abstracts. What makes the new version so different is that in addition to the traditional abstract of the dissertation, one is now able to view/print the first 24 pages of all dissertations published since 1997. In addition to the old paper and microform order options, you can now order a growing number of dissertations (approximately 100,000 right now) as .PDF files. This means you can have the needed dissertation in your library, within minutes of placing the order.

The downside of all of this is that the service is currently only available to institutions who are willing to pay a huge subscription fee based on the number of Ph. D.’s their school produces. If your library is a law school library within a larger institution, however, you may already have access. To find out, just visit Digital Dissertations home page <http://wwwlib.umi.com/dissertations/> . I did speak with a ProQuest representative who indicated the company is looking into creating a method for individuals (and individual libraries), who are not part of a larger institution, to access the system. Right now, any individual can do limited searching and place a credit card order for a paper copy at the company’s sister site, Dissertation Express <http://wwwlib.umi.com/dxweb/gateway>.

So there you go - three new e-services that might not help you on a daily basis, but three services that can help you obtain some of those hard-to-find items, faster and easier than ever before. If you have found some particularly good new electronic services, let us know.
Table KF6 and as you scroll down, the instructions appear near the top of legislation. The modification and reports and .A49 Comparative local between (.A2) Congressional hearings modifications are for state materials Nos.)) is modified by Table KF9. The Table KF6 (Table of Form Divisions (1 I would like to remind catalogers that eventually. will be added to the schedule comment. The romanized Arabic terms posted to the CPSO hompage for December. At that time it will be Class Web. The printed version will take longer. This is a fairly complex schedule conversion, there will be an in-house trial run. At some point LC would like to add the romanized Hebrew terms. The schedule will eventually be on Class Web. The printed version will take longer. This is a fairly complex schedule and there are also changes being make in BM. Dr. Goldberg did not give us a timetable for publication but it will be in Class Web once that comes up. Jewish law (KBM) is posted on the CPSO homepage <http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpsol/> for comment. LC is converting it to the online form. Dr. Goldberg reports that so far the comments have been favorable. After conversion, there will be an in-house trial run. At some point LC would like to add the romanized Hebrew terms. The schedule will eventually be on Class Web. The printed version will take longer. This is a fairly complex schedule and there are also changes being make in BM. Dr. Goldberg did not give us a timetable for publication but it will be in Class Web once that comes up.

Islamic law (KBP) will be ready for review by the Islamic law staff at Harvard Law School in late November or December. At that time it will be posted to the CPSO hompage for comment. The romanized Arabic terms will be added to the schedule eventually.

I would like to remind catalogers that Table KF6 (Table of Form Divisions (1 Nos.)) is modified by Table KF9. The modifications are for state materials between (.A2) Congressional hearings and reports and .A49 Comparative local legislation. The modification instructions appear near the top of Table KF6 and as you scroll down, the note disappears. Consequently, the modification note is forgotten. It would be better if there could be a link next to each caption that would take you to the state modifications.

Catalogers have asked me about reclassing by finding call numbers online and loading them into their local records. You can contract out the call number part of the reclassification project. I will call that machine reclass. Reclassification completely by hand can be expensive and takes many people or many years. There are actually quite a few items in the LC database with K call numbers now. LC did reclassification in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s. The United States federal materials and the state materials up into the states starting with “New” were done. Kdz, Kg-Kh has been in use since early 1980’s; K since the 1970’s; Kd since the early 1970’s. There are lots of items at LC with call numbers from these schedules. I would suggest that anyone start their reclassification project by finding a way to get the call numbers from LC into their local records. The next step would be to find call numbers from other law libraries. Of course, you have to be careful that you find LC K numbers and not “look alike K” LC call numbers. Some libraries used class letters from old LC tentative lists of country K letters and these lists were withdrawn in the mid 1970’s. Libraries have always had their own exceptions regarding certain call numbers.

Classed together series can be troublesome no matter if you decide to keep together after reclass or if you decide to split during reclass. If you do them by machine, the records will need a careful manual review. How do you tell a machine that these records should all get the same basic call number? If you decide to split, how do you tell the machine not to find call numbers for these records with no. or vol. in the call number field?.

Serials continuations need to be identified so that you can manually review to make sure each title gets the same call number when appropriate. The old practice of binding two titles in one physical volume will cause problems when using the machine reclass method. Manual review may be needed so that each title receives the same call number.

Editions generally have the same call number but different dates. Do you want to keep your editions together? It is something we have always done but when authors and titles change is it worth the effort?

When you bring call numbers from other libraries into your system, you bring in their shelflist and their cutter practices. You can’t tell if the other library used the LC cutter table or Cutter-Sanborn table. Do you want to bother getting the reclassed titles in shelflist order? If you decide not to shelflist, what do you do with your newly acquired titles? Do you mind if the authors are not in

KL-KWX should be available in the next issue of Classification Plus. Hopefully Class Web will be available in the late fall or early winter.

I would like to remind catalogers that Table KF6 (Table of Form Divisions (1 Nos.)) is modified by Table KF9. The modifications are for state materials between (.A2) Congressional hearings and reports and .A49 Comparative local legislation. The modification instructions appear near the top of Table KF6 and as you scroll down, the note disappears. Consequently, the modification note is forgotten. It would be better if there could be a link next to each caption that would take you to the state modifications.

Catalogers have asked me about reclassing by finding call numbers online and loading them into their local records. You can contract out the call number part of the reclassification project. I will call that machine reclass. Reclassification completely by hand can be expensive and takes many people or many years. There are actually quite a few items in the LC database with K call numbers now. LC did reclassification in the late 1960’s and early 1970’s. The United States federal materials and the state materials up into the states starting with “New” were done. Kdz, Kg-Kh has been in use since early 1980’s; K since the 1970’s; Kd since the early 1970’s. There are lots of items at LC with call numbers from these schedules. I would suggest that anyone start their reclassification project by finding a way to get the call numbers from LC into their local records. The next step would be to find call numbers from other law libraries. Of course, you have to be careful that you find LC K numbers and not “look alike K” LC call numbers. Some libraries used class letters from old LC tentative lists of country K letters and these lists were withdrawn in the mid 1970’s. Libraries have always had their own exceptions regarding certain call numbers.

Classed together series can be troublesome no matter if you decide to keep together after reclass or if you decide to split during reclass. If you do them by machine, the records will need a careful manual review. How do you tell a machine that these records should all get the same basic call number? If you decide to split, how do you tell the machine not to find call numbers for these records with no. or vol. in the call number field?.

Serials continuations need to be identified so that you can manually review to make sure each title gets the same call number when appropriate. The old practice of binding two titles in one physical volume will cause problems when using the machine reclass method. Manual review may be needed so that each title receives the same call number.

Editions generally have the same call number but different dates. Do you want to keep your editions together? It is something we have always done but when authors and titles change is it worth the effort?

When you bring call numbers from other libraries into your system, you bring in their shelflist and their cutter practices. You can’t tell if the other library used the LC cutter table or Cutter-Sanborn table. Do you want to bother getting the reclassed titles in shelflist order? If you decide not to shelflist, what do you do with your newly acquired titles? Do you mind if the authors are not in
The Web Characterization Project conducts an annual Web sample to analyze trends in the size and content of the Web. Analysis based on the sample is publicly available. OCLC obtains the sample by creating a list of randomly generated IP addresses, and then attempting to connect to each address to identify the presence of public Web services. If a web service is identified, harvesting software captures the site and stores it for future analysis.

Statistics begin with 1998 and cover a wide range of areas. The project notes that the overall number of web sites has grown from 2,851,000 in 1998 to 8,745,000 in 2001. The number of unique web sites has grown from 2,636,000 in 1998 to 8,443,000 in 2001. According to OCLC, it is not uncommon for the same public Web site to be duplicated at multiple IP addresses - e.g., for server load balancing. To ensure that each unique Web site has the same probability of being selected for the sample, OCLC adopted the following rule: if a site is located at multiple IP addresses, the site is retained in the sample only if the numerically lowest IP address is in the sample. Several diagnostic tests were developed to assist in identifying sites with multiple IP addresses.

Overall the number of web sites grew 457% from 1997-2001, but the annual growth reported by the project is slowing. The number of sites on the web only grew by 18% in 2000-2001. This compares to an annual average growth rate of 68% each year from 1997 through 1999.

The projects statistics also bear out the dominance of the United States on the web in their country of origin and language statistics. The United States is the country of origin for 47% of the web sites surveyed in 2001. The categories “Unknown” and “Others” together make up 33% of the sites surveyed. After these, the closest finisher is Germany at 5%. In 1999, the numbers for the United States were about the same at 46%, but the “Unknown” and “Others” combined percentage was only 26%. These numbers support the idea that provenance is continuing to be difficult to prove on the web. In OCLC's sample, the country of origin refers to the geographical location of the organization or individual responsible for the intellectual content of the Web site - in other words, the entity that “published” the Web site. The country of origin applies to the publisher of the site, not the content.

The languages used to express the textual content of the site are also surveyed by OCLC. Note that more than one language may be used. English continues to dominate in 2001 as the language used on 73% of web sites. The second place language is German at 7%.

The project also tracks economic activity on the web. The classes of economic activity used are taken from the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). The highest percentage belongs to the Others and Unknown categories which combine for 18.7%. 15.5% of the economic activity involves Information, 14.2% Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services, 12.8% Other Services (except public administration), 11.8% retail trade, 8.5% manufacturing, 6.6% education services, and so on. The category of economic activity applied by OCLC is one that best characterizes the organization or individual publishing the Web site. Typically, this categorization will take the form of the industry to which the Web site publisher belongs, but also includes not-for-profit economic activity as well (e.g., households, professional societies, etc.). OCLC’s categorization applies to the publisher of the site, not the content.

The top fifty referred sites are also tracked. Microsoft is at the head of the list that ranks the public Web sites most frequently linked to from other public Web sites (based on the 2001 sample of public Web sites). Search engines and commercial sites dominate the category. A few newspapers (New York Times, Washington Post and USA Today) along with news services such as CNN also made the list. There were no libraries or educational institutions listed.
These statistics can be read a number of ways. The meaning I take from them is that what was once explosive growth has now slowed. The emphasis would seem to be on refinement and consolidation now rather than new construction. We are still trying to catalog, acquire and provide access to moving targets when we deal with the web and we have always known that content on the web evolves and that our descriptions must evolve with it.

I found OCLC’s statistics interesting after reading an article by Timothy C. Craven, a Professor in the Faculty of Information and Media Studies, The University of Western Ontario. Craven’s article, “Changes in Metatag Descriptions Over Time,” studied how web sites containing descriptive metadata changed over a period of time and whether or not this descriptive metadata adapted to the new content of the pages.

Craven asserts that, unlike scholarly articles and other traditional published documents, Web pages are frequently dynamic, subject to regular, or irregular, updating. Thus, authors of Web pages may benefit from assistance, not only with the initial creation of metatag descriptions, but also with the revision of these descriptions as pages evolve and are revised over time.

One question raised by Craven regarding such revision is how often it is in fact required. A Web page may be revised frequently, and yet its overall description may remain entirely valid and in no need of further attention. A possible indication of the frequency with which Web page descriptions should be revised is the frequency with which the web sites themselves are in fact revised.

Craven began his study by collecting sets of web pages. Each set was divided into two categories: those having metatag descriptions in the summer of 2000 and those not having metatag descriptions at that time. The pages were then revisited a year later, to determine the types of changes that might have taken place: what proportion had lost descriptions, what proportion had gained descriptions, and what changes had been made to descriptions. When a requested page was returned, specially designed software logged data that included the metatag description and the URL.

Overall, Craven observed no indication from the present research of either a net decline or a net increase in the use of metatag descriptions, at least over the time period covered. Craven hypothesizes that various possible developments might cause a disturbance in this apparent steady state: changes in search engine policies; addition of metatag display to browsing software; the advent of page editing software that makes metatags more prominent or assists in their creation; inclusion of the metatag description as a required element in HTML, the omission of which would be flagged by validation services; supplanting of present metatag descriptions by another kind of meta data, such as Dublin Core or by external descriptions generated by commercial indexing services. In terms of updating descriptions, about one third of the changes in descriptions observed involved major rewriting, but about two thirds involved lesser modifications.

For Further Information
OCLC’s Web Characterization Project <http://wcp.oclc.org>


---

**Preservation**

**Vinegar Syndrome**

If someone asked whether your old microfilm smells, would you be offended? Maybe. On the other hand, if you are concerned about the long term retention of your library’s microfilm, it would be prudent to find out if it smells. Microfilm collections that contain acetate film likely suffer from what is called “vinegar syndrome”. Cellulose acetate microfilm, produced between 1923 and 1970, was especially popular during the 1930’s and 1940’s. Thought to be a safe, nonflammable material that would last centuries, it was developed to replace nitrate based film, notorious for its flammability. Unfortunately for acetate film owners, longevity is not one of it’s strong suits, and as it degrades it releases a vinegar smell.

Moisture is the culprit. Acetate film can’t live without it and can’t live with it. In order to remain supple and work properly, acetate film requires some amount of moisture. If the film is too dry it could break when handled or used in film readers. On the other hand, moisture in the acetate film reacts with the acetate ions contained within it to form acetic acid. As this chemical reaction occurs, the film base shrinks and the film becomes warped. Eventually it will be too warped to be useful. In highly humid environments acetate film will absorb more moisture and deterioration will occur more rapidly.

How might you know if you have acetate microfilm? The vinegar smell is
one way, but don’t breathe too deeply. The gas that is emitted from the film as it degrades is a health hazard. Although it’s not clear what level of health hazard is involved, consider this: the occupational use of methylene chloride, an organic solvent used in the production of triacetate film base, is now closely regulated by OSHA as a suspected carcinogen. If the smell is not present, look at the edge of the film. Acetate film is dark along the edges as opposed to polyester film that is transparent. Acetate film also tears easily, whereas polyester does not.

Libraries that own the U.S. Supreme Court briefs and records produced by the University of Chicago on microfilm during the 1930s and 1940s, have acetate film.

If you think that your library has acetate microfilm you can determine its acidity using a product called A-D strips. These paper strips were developed by the Image Permanence Institute for the purpose of detecting and measuring the extent of acetate film deterioration. The strips are placed inside closed containers of film where they will change color in the presence of acidic vapor. They provide to libraries the means for diagnosing not only the presence of acidity but also the level. As the concentration of acetic acid intensifies, the strips change from blue to green to yellow. The Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences was so impressed with A-D strips that it honored the invention with one of its Technical Achievement Awards in 1997. A-D strips are available from IPI and preservation supply vendors, such as University Products.

Although the chemical reaction that produces “vinegar syndrome” cannot be stopped, proper storage can slow the degradation. If your acetate microfilm smells like vinegar but is not yet warped, there are things you can do to hinder the degradation process. First and foremost, the temperature and relative humidity (RH) of the storage area must be regulated. According to IPI, acetate film stored at room temperature and moderate RH will begin to deteriorate in 50 years. The lower the temperature, the longer the film will last. A cold environment, less than 50° F., is ideal, but not usually practical for high use collections. Cool temperatures, below 72° F., will also extend the life of acetate film. A cool, non-fluctuating temperature and a moderate RH (20% to 50%) will serve to lessen the rate of deterioration.

Since vinegar syndrome is autocatalytic, acetate film will last longer if it is allowed to breathe. Closing the film away in containers that do not allow the gases to escape leaves the film to stew in its own juices and shortens its life. While this may seem easy to accomplish, it is complicated by the need to protect people and other film. If the acetate film is allowed to breathe, it should be stored in a well-ventilated area and away from healthy, non-acetate film. While it is not clear whether healthy film is in grave danger if stored near acidic film, it is best to be safe and segregate them. Containers should also be chemically inert. Some preservationists recommend using MicroChamber® enclosures, a product containing zeolite molecular traps that absorb pollutants.

In 1938, prior to the 1939-40 New York World’s Fair, Westinghouse buried a 5000 year time capsule. Much of the capsule contains newspapers and books reproduced on the best microfilm technology could offer at that time, acetate based microfilm. It’s a safe bet that when the capsule is opened it will not reveal as much about the early 20th century as was intended.

For more information about vinegar syndrome, there are two good articles in American Cinematographer, June 1996: Attack of the Vinegar Syndrome, and Film Preservation: A Practical Guide. The first is also on the web at: <http://capital.net/com/jaytp/VINEGAR.HTM>.


For information on A-D strips, see the IPI web site at: <http://www.nit.edu/~661www1/>.

---

**Private Law Libraries**

Betty Roeske
Katten Muchin Zavis
betty. roeske@kmz.com

I have had some positive comments about my previous column on how to develop your in-house Automation Technical Support. The question that arose from this was how do you deal with outside Technical Support personnel? When you call in a problem, the knowledge level of these personnel can vary. How do you deal with these different levels of expertise?

I have learned over the years how to resolve most of the basic problems that result in error messages from various programs. This means when I do call in a problem, I explain that I have tried all of the basic low end troubleshooting.

What I mean by low end troubleshooting is:
1. Reboot the PC and only access that program.

2. If an error message does not occur, try various combinations of whatever else was open on the desktop when the error occurred. This helps determine whether there is a conflict between two programs.

3. If the error message only occurs certain times of day, investigate what else is running on the network, etc. that could create the error messages.

4. Check for corrupt files.

5. Delete and reinstall. If the problem still occurs, Technical Support needs to be included in this.

Before contacting outside Technical Support, verify what your rights are to *.ini files, etc. If you are restricted as a computer user in your organization, you will need to either have a member of the Automation Department with you or they will have to make the call. When dealing with Technical Support personnel, patience is a necessity. You can spend hours troubleshooting the problem.

I think the worse that I can remember was 8 hours of troubleshooting over the course of a week. Then it was discovered that the vendor had given me the wrong installation password. It was a demo password that had expired. After I installed the proper password, there were no additional error messages.

My mental rule is fifteen minutes for dealing with the first person that I get on the phone:

1. Once I explain what error messages occurred and what I have tried, I wait for their response. If they act like they are reading a prepared script and want me to repeat the steps that I did, I ask politely for a higher Technical Support person. I emphasize that it is not a reflection insisting until they agree to transfer me.

2. If the person is not available, I leave a voice mail indicating when I am available. This is especially important if you are in different time zones to avoid return calls either before or after your designated work hours.

3. When the person and I connect, I re-explain the problem in the event that not all information was given to the person. Then we can do additional troubleshooting of the software.

4. Once we believe we have the problem resolved, I keep the person on the line until I reboot. I always verify that the fix is permanent.

For those of you that indicated at the Conference that you would like to contribute to this column, please let me know when you like to do so. Guest columnists are encouraged. You can contact me at betty.roeske@kmz.com

Research & Publications

Brian Striman
University of Nebraska
bstriman@unl.edu

Writing is an intellectual pursuit.

The cry of “We Shall Publish” that I wrote in the March TSLL Research and Publications column has been heard. Evidence to that fact can be found on the front cover of the October 2001 issue of AALL Spectrum. The front cover headliner reads “Trends in Technical Services: Electronic Resources, Creative Innovative Opportunities and Challenges,” with the lead article “Going Paperless: The Trend in Acquisitions” by JoAnn Hounshell (Head of Acquisitions at Northwestern), and the next article “From Automated Classification to XML: Trends in Cataloging” by Eloise M. Vondruska (Associate Director for Bibliographic Services, also at Northwestern). You may also be interested to know that Naomi Goodman (Technical Services Librarian at Valparaiso University) is the Spectrum’s “Chapter News” column editor.

One of the services I’d like this column to perform is to build a platform of colleague names and what they are thinking about publishing, what they are currently working on, and what publishing they have recently manifested. I say “manifested” because publishing is more than bringing out your intellectual pursuit via paper format to your colleagues.

Let’s expand our scope of what we think of as what constitutes “publishing.” In technical services we might still be thinking that publishing is what professional colleagues research and/or write about, involving some topic that results in a paper format article or book. We might still be thinking that to
get something published means hours outside our jobs that are spent researching and making outlines and sending drafts to editors and having the drafts re-written several times and anxieties and frustrations that it will just never get done. So... we just don’t even get started. Publishing is seen in our minds as this thing out there we’d just as soon not tackle. Many of you may have to publish as part of fulfillment of responsibilities needed for promotion and tenure. Well, I’m here to tell you that, although that certainly can be true, it is just as true that publishing is also any tangible contribution you have made which results in shared information to an audience and which promotes, influences and contributes to the body of “literature.” I’d like to urge you to consider the words “any tangible contribution” as also encompassing in-house, or local (your greater institution or city), or state, or regional, or national, or even international publishing efforts.

Once we have expanded our scope of what constitutes publishing, it’s amazing how the barriers that once prevented you from wanting to publish are removed. In previous TSLL Research and Publishing columns we have published many tips on how to get started publishing and tips on where to get published. In this column and future columns I will strive to give you concrete topic ideas that flow across my desk (that’s before the concrete ideas harden – old construction joke). And speaking of construction, writing is a lot like construction, only you are the project manager. The project manager assembles the various elements together, and using time lines, looking at design layouts and eventually looking at blueprints, you determine the project is a good one— worthy of spending time and money to complete your published product. The construction workers are also you when you actually sit down and begin writing sentences. The materials you use are words, the computer and keyboard, e-mail, or the fax machine. Some till use envelopes and postage stamps. After the project’s completed and you see the final product “out there” you (hopefully) are excited to see it published in its final form. Most likely you want to get some kind of recognition for it. Right?

My e-mail address is at the top of this column. I encourage you to send me a quick e-mail anytime you publish something. Anything. I mean it! If you have recently given a presentation to some group and have made handouts or used a software application program slide show, or recently mounted some substantial documents on your web site with things like your mission statement, or some bibliography, or some new creative special service or activity you or your department has begun which you’ve documented and made available to the public eye. Let me know. I’d like to include your name and contribution to this column for your colleagues to read about.

I’ve noticed in past TSLL Research and Publishing columns that information is provided to guide the reader to publishing resources. Oftentimes it’s just a citation. The expectation is that you will then go seek out those resources when the time to start publishing is at hand. Perhaps that expectation isn’t a good one. So, I will attempt to cull out actual concepts from the content of the citation to include in this column. That way you can just read about it more in detail within the column itself. I know how difficult it is to go out and seek those citations, read through them, digest them and then use them in your pursuit to write. For example in the previous TSLL issue I gave reference to a great article in Law Library Journal (78 LLJ 197). The article, “Commentary: Writing is Good for You and You Forget the Pain” by Nancy Carol Carter. The article is a condensed version of remarks she gave for an AALL educational program at the 78th annual meeting in New York. It’s a nice four-page article. In it she touches on areas that we can find helpful for this column. Below, I have taken snippets from her article (I encourage you to read the whole thing).

*Why Write?* [It] “will broaden your knowledge and understanding of a topic.” It “will ensure your grasp of the subject.” It will “separate yourself from the rest of the crowd.” It can provide “professional recognition, increased job opportunities, and invitations to speak at programs.” “Also, researching and writing an article will make you a better librarian in an unexpected way. You will be better able to relate to the needs of the researchers your library serves if you use your library for your own writing projects.” “Remember, every written work need not be a literary masterpiece. A good, solid piece of writing that imparts useful information can be a real contribution.”

*Finding time to write.* “Time to write is a mythical concept; you might just as well believe in unicorns and the golden fleece. You must take time to write. Notice that I did not say make time to write. Making time implies that through some clever juggling of your calendar, there will be time to write. For most of us, taking time to write means imposing a draining and time-consuming activity over an already busy life. Expect to invest some evenings and weekends. Expect to feel some frustration as other important activities suffer when you take time to write.”

*Getting started.* “Selecting a topic can be daunting. “... consider writing about matters that interest you as a practicing librarian. Don’t overlook the obvious. A quick example: when Golden Gate Law Library decided to create a fee-based membership plan, I realized that an article on this useful subject should be written for LLJ. Once committed to writing, you become more attuned to picking up likely topics. Conversations with other librarians and lawyers or a reference question can spark ideas for articles.” “.... Once you have a topic in mind, make a commitment to someone— your joint author or an editor, for example.” “.... The key to getting started writing is to realize that a first draft is nothing but a vehicle for capturing some initial thoughts and ideas. Every writing book will tell you...
that nothing slows down the writing process so much as attempting to write a last draft first.” Nancy Carol Carter’s article also talks about “The Working Environment as a Factor in Productivity,” “Getting Edited” and “Capitalizing on Your Effort” which I will not include here.

In addition to the points made in *Getting started*, above, I would like to emphasize the fact that AALL is actively, aggressively seeking proposals and submissions through its Publication Program. The AALL Publications Committee welcomes proposals for new publications. You can visit their web presence at: <http://www.aallnet.org/committee/publications/>. There, you can learn more about their activities and you can contact them electronically with questions, ideas and comments.

**Topic ideas.**
Contact Joe Thomas <thomas.2@nd.edu> for an idea that I have been mulling over the past several months, about beginning a new *TSLL* regular column “Technology Trends in Technical Services.” I don’t have time to write up a proposal for the *TSLL* Editorial Board for my idea, but I think one of you reading this could do it. Joe will be happy to discuss the concept and see if it’s worthy as a regular column, or if it should first begin as a ‘guest editor’ article series to see how it’s received. Contact me if you are wondering more about the content and goal of this would be. [editor’s note: Please contact me about this or any other ideas for long-term columns or one-time reports. – JT]

Other topic ideas that come to my mind, might be:
* Overcoming inherent weaknesses in your OPAC. [a “how we did it” kind of article]
* What it’s like working in technical services and having to work some hours on reference.
* Classifying audio-visual materials in your library.
* Security and safety issues in the mail room operations.
* How you dealt with start-up issues for a new service you’ve begun, such as a new acquisitions list mounted on your OPAC; or, beginning a new approval plan (such as with Yankee Book Peddler).
* How you deal with complex publications that “rotate” from one location to another when new editions arrive at your library.
* Ways you’ve sped up cataloging production, or serials check in, or mail sorting.
* How you’ve integrated your acquisitions functions with other institutional departments who perform other budgeting activities.
* How you’ve deviated from using straight Library of Congress Classification scheme to better fit your collection organization for your institutional needs.
* Collection development changes in your library and how you’ve problem solved with those changes.
* New preservation techniques you’ve found successful and others that have failed.
* The process of preparing tech services annual reports.
* Statistics snafu’s you’ve been dealing with throughout the years.
* Your experience in building your folders for annual promotions and/ or the tenure process for your position in technical services.

Next column I hope to begin some nuts and bolts about the research process.

That wraps up another column. Coming in to work on this column on a beautiful autumn Saturday morning was not easy for me. Imagine all the extra work our *TSLL* editors and contributors and the rest of the *TSLL* volunteers do to get this fine publication published! They all deserve our thanks and praise!! <insert applause>

*TSLL* is our greatest vehicle for communication with each other I believe. The extra work is all worth it.

---

**Serial Issues**

*Serials Meetings Galore!*  

Ellen C. Rappaport  
Albany Law School  
erapp@mail.als.edu

---

Ellen C. Rappaport  
Albany Law School  
erapp@mail.als.edu

What a treat was this summer’s ALA conference for a serialist: I attended serials meetings for four days! I began with the LITA preconference: “The Future of Serials Control: Implementation of the MARC21 Holdings Format.” It introduced the audience of librarians and system vendors to the *Holdings Format*, and to its application in serials control systems. The CONSER Publication Pattern Initiative was discussed, and use of its records was demonstrated. System vendors played an important role in the program, as they do in the Publication Pattern Initiative, because the Publication Pattern database will be useful only if our serials control systems can load, export and use its data, and if their systems facilitate contributions to that database. System vendors spoke frankly about what their systems can and cannot do today with this data.
This program was followed up the next day by a discussion of “What does a system vendor mean when he states that his system is ‘in compliance with the MARC Holdings Format?’” at the MARC Formats Interest Group (MFIG) meeting. Out of this meeting and the Publication Pattern Task Force meeting came a draft paper to help us evaluate systems’ use of the MARC Holdings Format. Just as we had to learn to evaluate what a system vendor meant 20 years about by “fully MARC compliant,” referring then to bibliographic records, we now must develop similar questions — benchmarks — for the use of the MARC Holdings Format. That paper by now should be posted on the CONSER web site, for broader discussion.

* * * * *

The Publication Pattern Initiative database is growing. By June it had reached its stated goal of more than 1,000 pattern records input by participants, in addition to the 40,000 records loaded from Harvard data in February 2001. Input is continuing. In addition, members of the Publication Pattern Task Force are assessing the pilot project, recommending changes to the Holdings Format, and considering efficient workflow patterns for this data.

The Publication Patterns Task Force meeting considered the concept and use of Universal Holdings Data. This refers to a pattern-and-holdings record (in the MARC Holdings Format, of course) which represents the entire run of the publication and the publication patterns during the run of the title. The pattern fields (853/854/855) would express all the pattern changes of the title — showing changes in enumeration, chronology and frequency. The holdings fields (863/864/865) would express all the parts of the title, similar to a bibliographic 362 field, but expressed in the MARC Holdings Format, probably in Z39.71 style. The concept of a Universal Holdings Data Record is also a draft paper which should by now be posted on the CONSER web site, for broader discussion.

News just reached me at this writing of a program about the Publication Pattern Initiative for AALL 2002: “Publication Patterns: Creating Connections in the Serials World.” More information about this next time.

* * * * *

Jean Pajerek’s article in the September 2001 issue of TSLL reported on two MARBI papers which were passed in June 2001, dealing with changes to the MARC21 Bibliographic Format which will allow implementation of the proposed changes to AACR2, expected in June 2002. We need to begin to discuss these changes with our system vendors, because all will need to be implemented by some time next year; some are significant changes.

Proposal 2001-04 made field 260 (imprint) repeatable for resources that change over time, so that earliest, current and intervening publishing information can be included in the record. The earliest place/publisher are important to identify the title; later changes are important for checking (Is this the right record?) and claiming (Who publishes this now?). In the past, we’ve put this information into notes, which were enough for 3 x 5 cards, but usually can’t be retrieved in an OPAC.

Now we must think about — and discuss with our system vendors — how we want this additional place and publisher information displayed in our OPACs, and in our serials control systems. The dates for the earlier and intervening titles will be stored in $3; how do we want to display them? The proposal, available at lcweb.loc.gov/marc, suggests some possible displays.

Proposal 2001-05 added the new code “i” for “integrating resource” to “s” (serial) and “m” (monograph). An integrating resource is one that is changed by means of updates that do not remain discrete and are integrated into the whole. They may be finite or may be continuing. Examples are updating loose-leaves and updating web sites.

Proposal 2001-05 added a new frequency code to the bibliographic and holdings formats: “K” for continuously updated — more frequently than daily. An example is the OCLC database. Also added were the codes “l” (updating loose-leaf), “d” (database) and w (updating web site), added to existing codes of “m” (monographic series), “n” (newspaper) and “p” (periodical). Lastly the code “z” (integrated entry) was added to the Successive/Latest entry code. Code “z” will be used for integrating resources according to revised AACR2 Chapter 12, and for electronic serials that do not retain their earlier title. They will be given their most recent title, with earlier titles in 247 fields — yes, the old “247” is being revived, with a new application.

All of these changes will affect our OPACs and our serials control systems. We must think about what fields should display, field labels in the OPAC, which categories are retrieved if we ask for periodical titles or specify serials, how we will index and display 247 fields. Will we re-catalog all our loose-leaves with code “i” and if not, how will newly cataloged loose-leaves display with old ones?

Back in the early ’70s it took four or more years for the Library of Congress, the embryonic CONSER, and librarians to move from latest to successive entry cataloging. And this time we have a new player involved — our system vendors. We must be activists in our user groups, so that our systems are ready for the new fields and values in MARC bib records. We have some early warning this time; I hope we can make changes more quickly than last time.

The Publications Pattern Task Force has attempted to involve system vendors and the utilities in the development of the MARC Holdings Format and the pattern database. Most of the major system vendors have participated in meetings and surveys of the Task Force, and in the LITA Pre-conference in June. Perhaps this can be a model for similar discussions about changes to the MARC Bibliographic Format.
In addition to the two proposals, MARBI and its audience discussed five serials discussion papers, DP07 through DP11. MARBI discussion papers precede MARBI proposals. These grew out of the Publication Pattern Initiative’s experience with using the Holdings Format. These five discussion papers are now on the MARBI web site , All but DP07 are expected to become formal proposals which will be on the MARBI web site before ALA’s midwinter meeting in January 2002. The discussion papers recommend enhancements to the Holdings Format which will allow us more refined and accurate prediction patterns, some of which will be particularly useful to legal continuations.

* * * * *

One topic pervaded the meetings I attended at ALA Midwinter 2001 — the re-use of metadata. For several years now, the common plaint has been that we librarians can’t make the best use of the Web because we can’t keep up with its growth. And with the apparent shortage of catalogers, this problem may extend to our more traditional forms of material, too. Shared cataloging may no longer be enough.

Roughly speaking, metadata is identifying and descriptive information about any resource. Our traditional form of metadata is the catalog record. The term has been used recently for identifying information about electronic resources. Metadata usually pertains to information in machine-readable form, which can be copied, transmitted, edited and re-coded, for example from HTML to MARC.

AACR2 defined three levels of cataloging in 1978. MARC21 defines eight encoding levels (Leader, position 17), from Full level to Minimal level and also Prepublication level, a preliminary record. The Core Record definition, initially developed by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) in 1996 identifies descriptive elements, access points and control fields which must be present in a core-level record. Although not all elements may be present, those which are present in a full record should be as good as those in a full record, following cataloging rules and with appropriate authority work. A study to investigate “the cataloging community’s response to the concept of the core record” was conducted this year. <www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/coretudeprop.html> In addition, a study of users’ perspectives on the core record for books <www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/modelcfinal.pdf> suggested that “in general, the set of required elements in the Core record meets users’ needs quite well. All elements that users identified as most useful are required elements in the Core Record Standard.” However, the users in this pilot study were less successful identifying a particular version of a title, with both Core and Full records. “This suggests that users need a record structure that is easier to use and to understand than the current structure, yet one that still supports sophisticated user tasks.” This was a pilot study toward further development of standards for the Core Record. The report indicated many places where further research should be done. For serials, CONSER defines three levels of records: minimal, core and full.

We began to accept less-than-full bibliographic records because we had to. We’ve been sharing the workload since the Library of Congress first issued printed cards about 100 years ago. Machine-readable bibliographic records and OCLC allowed thousands of catalogers around the world to contribute to the shared cataloging endeavor. But even the most minimal-level record requires a human cataloger, and we’re not keeping up. Here are some of the proposed solutions I heard at Midwinter:
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participating, it could then be returned in HTML, giving them better data to use for marketing on their Web pages.

Ms. Reynolds reported on a small study comparing NSDP bibliographic data supplied by publishers with the final AACR2 cataloging. She found that the publishers’ data was about 75% correct, and could have been judged better than that. Two important fields — title (245) and numeric/chronological designation (362) were not counted as correct when the publishers’ data didn’t match AACR2 format. The information was correct, but the format wasn’t. Ms. Reynolds suggested that we could use this data if our cataloging rules conformed more closely to common practice, such as more capitalization in the 245 field. A detailed version of this presentation can be found in Ms. Reynolds’ paper at lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/bibcontrol/reynolds.html.

Records communicated in the ONIX format (Online Information Exchange), created by publishers for their use, are being used for marketing on such Websites as Barnes and Noble, Borders and Amazon. As an executive for Barnes and Noble pointed out during an ALA Midwinter 2001 program sponsored by NISO and BASIC (Book And Serial Industry Communications — formerly BISAC and SISAC), online book customers need more than the minimal bibliographic information in BIP. In the store, a sales person can help the customer to understand BIP listings. Furthermore, the customer can pull the book off the shelf and scan the summary on the jacket, the table of contents, the author’s biography, and can even read a chapter or two. He knows how big the book is, and what kind of illustrations it has. ONIX has been developed to code this expanded description in XML, and has been mapped to MARC21. Like MARC, ONIX is a coding system which enables records from many sources to be transmitted and re-used. <www.editeur.org/onix.html> <www.loc.gov/marc/onix2marc.html>.

During the Midwinter 2001 NISO/BASIC program, Sally McCallum of the Library of Congress stated that while ONIX records are created by and for booksellers, libraries can benefit from them, too. In addition to the bibliographic data, ONIX records contain marketing information that library records don’t now have: target audience, subject information, rights information, additional information about dimensions including weight, supplier and discount information. As Ms. Reynolds proposed, Ms. McCallum is working with the Association of American Publishers, Inc. to find ways to make these records more useful for libraries.

One LC project reported in LC Cataloging Newsline [v. 9, no. 13 (Nov. 2001)] has extracted table of contents data from ONIX records. A programmer at the Library of Congress has developed a program that scanned a file of ONIX records to produce over 10,000 records for tables of contents, now posted on the Internet. LC will add 856 fields to the related bib records, then will redistribute the records, with 856 links to this TOC file, through the Cataloging Distribution Service.

ONIX is now for books, but committees are being established to define coding for e-books and video. And first steps have been taken to include serials in ONIX. After surveying librarians, publishers, serials agents, system vendors and standards bodies, its developers have proposed that serials information include “shipping data” which records when a specific issue has been sent out by the publisher. This is very useful data for claiming; the ONIX standard could make it more readily available.

ALA’s ACLTS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) has formed a Task Force on ONIX International, charged to evaluate the relationship between library metadata such as AACR2 and MARC21 and the ONIX International standard. The Task Force will also identify the issues involved in using ONIX International metadata in AACR2 cataloging records. It will prepare discussion papers and rule revision proposals as needed, and will monitor projects that use ONIX International. It presented an interim report to CC:DA in June 2001, and will present a final report at ALA’s Midwinter meeting in 2002. The interim report and other information are on the Task Force’s Web page at <www.al.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/tf-onix1.html>.

The CONSER-at-Large meeting at ALA in June discussed possible new approaches to CONSER membership. One CONSER opportunity for law librarians would be Enhance Membership, the most minimal level of participation, in which one maintains existing records, dealing with title changes and cessations. CONSER is examining its training requirements and its quotas (minimum number of records you’re required to improve, to remain a CONSER member). An Enhance Member must contribute a minimum of 75 transactions per year. A group of libraries can work together in a “funnel project” to achieve this minimum. For example, a funnel project is being organized among theological libraries. Is this something the AALL’s OBS-SIS might want to explore?

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:

**ACTEC notes**  
Vol. 16, no. 1 (summer 1990)-v. 26, no. 4 (spring 2001)  
(OCoLC 22193198)  
**Changed to:**  
ACTEC journal  
Vol. 27, no. 1 (summer 2001)-  
(OCoLC 47638942)

**Amicus journal**  
Vol. 2, no. 1 (summer 1980)-v. 23, no. 2 (summer 2001)  
(OCoLC 6567953)  
**Changed to:**  
Onearth (Natural Resources Defense Council)  
Vol. 23, no. 3 (fall 2001)-  
(OCoLC 48069487)

**Annual survey of American law**  
1942-1999, issue 4  
(OCoLC 2069008)  
**Changed to:**  
New York University annual survey of American law  
Vol. 57, issue 1 (2000)-  
(OCoLC 47197486)

**Der Amtsvormund**  
**Changed to:**  
Das Jugendamt  
74. Jahrg., 1 (Jan. 2001)-

**Journal of corporate taxation**  
Vol. 1 (spring 1974)-v. 27, no. 3 (autumn 2000)  
(OCoLC 1793612)  
**Changed to:**  
Corporate taxation (Warren, Gorham & Lamont, inc.)  
Vol. 27, no. 4 (Oct. 2000)-  
(OCoLC 46726215)

**Journal of taxation of exempt organizations**  
Vol. 1, no. 1 (spring 1989)-v. 12, no. 6 (May-June 2001)  
(OCoLC 19288930)  
**Changed to:**  
Taxation of exempts  
Vol. 13, no. 1 (July/Aug. 2001)-  
(OCoLC 47234973)

**Life insurance fact book**  
1946-1998  
(OCoLC 2315293)  
**Changed to:**  
ACLI life insurance fact book  
1999  
(OCoLC 43079651)  
**Changed to:**  
Life insurers fact book  
2000-  
(OCoLC 45617397)

**Year-end tax strategies**  
1991-2000  
(OCoLC 31469387)  
**Changed to:**  
Tax planning strategies  
2001-2002 ed.-  
(OCoLC 48061324)

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:

**Beyond law = Mas alla del derecho**  
**Ceased with** v. 7, no. 22 (June 2000)?  
(OCoLC 24051236)

**The journal of intellectual property**  
Vol. 1, no. 1 (spring 1999)  
**Ceased in paper format;** subsequent issues only available online:  
Journal of intellectual property (Online)  
(OCoLC 44198786)

**Villanova journal of law and investment management**  
Vol. 1, no. 1 (winter 1999)-v. 2, no. 1 (spring 2000)  
(OCoLC 40701980)  
**Ceased in paper format;** subsequent issues only available online:  
Villanova journal of law and investment management (Online)  
(OCoLC 46993341)

**Weekly compilation of Presidential documents**  
**Ceased in paper format with** Vol. 1, no. 1 (Aug. 2, 1965)-v. 36, no. 43 (Oct. 30, 2000); subsequently searchable only online at GPO Access web site:  
Weekly compilation of Presidential documents (Online)  
(OCoLC 41609591)
Inside OCLC
(continued from page 1)

Muccino told me that this was thought through long and hard by OCLC, and that relational database management systems have advanced dramatically in the past decade. It was clear to OCLC that it was time to make a switch, since they wanted to move WorldCat to a relational database with “access [to] abstracts, full text, images and sound files as well as bibliographic and location information.” [Jay Jordan, OCLC Newsletter, July/August 2001, p. 3]. Mr. Muccino stated that the text handling capability was the most important factor, and that Oracle excelled at this. This change will enable OCLC to reduce operating costs as well. Right now, there are four images of WorldCat maintained by OCLC (four copies each of 48,000,000 bibliographic records alone–try doing the math!). This will enable them to reduce that number while consolidating systems used for the different services. Also the new system will support UNICODE and IFLA standards, which will make it possible for OCLC to store records for all written languages in the vernacular. This means that, for example, a record in Russian will be stored in Cyrillic rather than having to be romanized.

My conversation with Don Muccino was an excellent opportunity to discuss OCLC services with the OCLC administration. In my column for the September issue of Technical Services Law Librarian, I said that we need to articulate our views as technical services users to OCLC. Mr. Muccino gave me that opportunity, and I am very thankful to him for his willingness to chat with me.

OCLC President’s Luncheon - American Library Association Conference

In my discussion of the decision to adopt Oracle, I referred to Jay Jordan’s announcement at the President’s luncheon at the ALA conference in June. I viewed the videotape of this luncheon–OCLC has copies available through ILL. There were a number of significant points made during the presentation, and it had an interesting visual demonstration of what we will be seeing from OCLC in the near future. It was gratifying to hear William Crowe, chairman of the OCLC Board of Trustees, acknowledge the work catalogers have done to build the WorldCat database “keystroke by keystroke.” This was one of the criticisms I had of the Users (now Members) Council meeting I attended last May–I felt that our work was not acknowledged and in fact was disparaged by different individuals. So it was gratifying to hear the chairman of the Board of Trustees recognize our contribution. Bill Crowe also discussed other issues the board has faced, including the new strategy and governance. He stated that OCLC will remain non-profit (“a .org, and not a .com”), and that OCLC will become more welcoming to all libraries worldwide. He reiterated OCLC’s mission as furthering access to the world’s information and reducing library costs.

After Bill Crowe spoke, Larry Alford took the podium as the outgoing president of the Users Council. He reported on the changes to the OCLC charter approved by the Users Council, and other activities of the Council. After Larry Alford, Jay Jordan was introduced with the theme music to the movie 2001: A Space Odyssey. He spoke about the highlights of the past year, including cataloging, CatExpress, CORC, interlibrary loan, and First Search. He then looked to the future, stating that in cataloging, there will be new automated tools available to capture data earlier and better. In three years, he said that WorldCat will contain links to digital objects in addition to bibliographic holdings. There were frequent demonstrations on a screen of what was envisioned. He also stated that there would be more cooperation between reference and resource sharing through portals and other methods, interweaving libraries and the web. There will also be digital collection management and preservation services. Close to the end of his talk, he announced the end of the proprietary software and the new database management system being purchased from Oracle.

The tape of the luncheon lasts less than one hour. If you are interested, I would recommend borrowing the tape from OCLC.

Interlibrary Loan Web Interface

OCLC has introduced a new web interface for the current ILL service. OCLC states that it “is designed to reduce training time for new and student staff and provide a resource for infrequent users.” There are enhanced features of the new interface not available on the traditional system. However, there are certain functions that do not work on the new interface, including the referral function and editing Name Address Directory records.

New Interface for Cataloging and Metadata Services

OCLC’s projected time line for conversion to the new Cataloging and Metadata interface has not changed since my last column. OCLC’s website is the place to go for the most up-to-date information about the conversion: <www.oclc.org/services/collections> The first major release of the new interface is scheduled to occur in July, 2002.

Closing Comments

One thing that has struck me this autumn is that in spite of OCLC’s enormous size and leadership in library automation, it really does view its mission as one of service to its members. According to OCLC’s 1999/2000 annual report, on June 30, 2000, OCLC had $236.8 million in assets and a corporate equity of $125.9 million. Having seen the headquarters in Dublin, Ohio, I can testify to the fact that OCLC is a big organization. And yet, the chief operating officer took the time to talk to me about the change in the database management software. I think that we are fortunate to have a partner who is responsive to our questions and concerns. Now if we could just get a few technical services people on the Members Council...
Online Bibliographic Services SIS
Annual Business Meeting

July 16, 2001

Ellen McGrath, Chair, called the meeting to order. She thanked Brian Striman, Georgia Briscoe, and Cindy Cicco for their work on the Executive Board during the past 2 years.

Secretary/Treasurer report: Cindy Cicco asked for approval of the minutes from our last business meeting which were published in *TSSL* v.26:no.2. The motion carried. She reported that for the fiscal year which began on October 1, 1999, our balance was $6,475.58. Our income in FY00 was $2,913.73 and our expenses were $6,877.46, leaving a balance of $2,511.85. Thus far in fiscal year 2001, our income is $285.61 and expenses are $885.90, leaving a balance of $1,911.56. This report does not include TSSL expenses for last year as headquarters has not yet charged us for them. Our new Treasurer will be working closely with TS-SIS’ treasurer to ensure these charges are properly applied by headquarters in the future. Ellen asked for a motion to approve the Treasurer’s report. The motion was seconded and carried.

We mailed 338 ballots, of which 120 were returned. This is a 35.5% return rate. Mary Jane Kelsey was elected Vice-Chair/Chair Elect, Richard M. Jost was elected Secretary/Treasurer, and Judy Vaughan-Sterling was elected Member-at-Large. Cindy thanked the Nominating Committee, chaired by Jack Bissell as well as all the candidates. She asked for permission to destroy the ballots. The motion carried.

Reports of Committees and Representatives:

Strategic Planning Committee: Sally Wambold introduced our Strategic Plan 2001-2004. She recapped the assistance Gail Warren gave them during the past year. She thanked Ellen McGrath for her support and good advice during the Committee’s work. Sally recognized the members of her committee for their contributions to the plan: Pat Callahan, Janet Ann Hedin, Karin den Bleyker, Rebecca Lutkenhaus, Susan Roach, Mila Rush, Brian Striman, and Ismael Gullon and LaJean Humphries, for their work on the committee.

Brian Striman described the many drafts the committee went through before arriving at the final plan. Ellen described the plan as a contract with the members. She thanked Brian Striman for contributing the party bags for our celebration.

Conell: Susan Chinoransky reported that our participation in the Conell SIS fair was successful and attracted many newer AALL members interested in our SIS.

Alphabet Soup Joint Reception: Susan Chinoransky reported that it was a successful event with an abundance of food in spite of the lack of a microphone.

OBS Table: Susan Chinoransky reported that the traffic at the table was busy this year. The *Double Fold* book drawing will be held on Tuesday at 2 p.m. The winner does not need to be present to win the drawing.

TSLL: Linda Tesar reported the editors had published 3 issues during the past year. They still need columnists for the Collection Development and Description & Entry columns. Members should contact the new editor, Joe Thomas, if they are interested in becoming either of these column editors. The new editor’s goals are to revise *TSLL’s* Structure & Policy document and add webmaster and layout manager positions to the *TSLL* Board. She thanked OBS on behalf of herself and Anna Belle Leiserson for the opportunity to edit the newsletter.

Local Systems Committee: Susan Goldner announced their meeting would be held from 4:15 to 6:15 p.m. on Tuesday. The discussion topic will be ways people are enhancing their OPACs.

OCLC Committee: Michael Maben announced their meeting would be from 7:30 to 8:45 on Tuesday. MINITEX and OCLC staff will attend the meeting. The Committee will also continue the CORC discussion. He reported on his attendance at the OCLC Users Council meeting in May.

RLIN Committee: Ellen McGrath read a report from Anne Myers, Committee Chair. The RLIN Committee will become inactive for an unspecified period of time since the issues RLIN normally considers are no longer pressing and are more appropriately considered by the Local Systems Committee. Brian Quigley from the University of Texas has agreed to serve as Chair for the purpose of sharing RLIN information through *TSSL*. The Committee will re-evaluate it’s need to exist during the coming year.

Research Roundtable: Brian Striman, Coordinator, reported that 22 people attended the discussion this year. Kevin Butterfield spoke on how to get published. The Roundtable’s minutes will be in the next issue of *TSSL*.

Education Committee: Ellen McGrath reported for the Committee. Ellen and Ismael Gullon will be co-chairing the committee for the next year. She reviewed the reasons for having co-chairs instead of one chairperson [for this year]. The Committee will be meeting at 12:15 on Tuesday. She told the members the Committee had many
good ideas for programs for Orlando. Next year SIS's will be limited to 6 program proposals to fill a total of 53 program slots. The deadline for program proposals is August 17th.

Web Advisory Committee: Maria Okonska has been the Chairperson this past year. She created a new web page and tried to keep it up-to-date. She will be redesigning it further during the next year. If anyone has ideas for the website, please contact Maria.

Joint Research Grant Committee: Corrine Jacox reported that the Committee gave Larry Dershem an extension until December 15th to complete his research. Susan Goldner and Lorraine Lorne have been awarded this year’s grant. They are using the grant money to purchase software to index TSLL. Corrine announced that information for applying for the grant is on the OBS website. Next year the chair will be Brian Striman.

MARBI Representative: Ellen announced that Rhonda Lawrence’s report is available at the OBS table. Copies were also provided to members in attendance at the business meeting. Ellen thanked Rhonda for her service as MARBI representative. Susan Goldner has been appointed as the next MARBI representative.

New Business:

Installation of New Board Members: Ellen McGrath indicated her goals for the past year were communication and strategic planning. She thanked the membership for their work in helping her achieve her goals for OBS during the past year. New board members Mary Jane Kelsey, Richard Jost, and Judy Vaughn-Sterling were introduced. The transition to Ismael as Chair then took place.

Announcements:

Ismael Gullon announced his goal for the next year is to implement the Strategic Plan. There were no additional announcements. Ismael presented a gift to Ellen on behalf of the membership in appreciation for her hard work as Chair.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia A. Cicco
Secretary/Treasurer
cicco@law.pitt.edu

Technical Services SIS
Annual Business Meeting

Minneapolis, Minnesota
July 15, 2001

I. Call to Order

A quorum being present, a motion to deal first with the proposed amendments to the Bylaws was passed. The proposals had previously been published in TSLL and mailed out with the election ballots. The Chair, Alva Stone read the proposed amendments and Eloise Vondruska, the Chair of the Bylaws and Handbook Committee, explained the reasoning behind them.

A. Because the members had no comments, the first proposed amendment to Article II, dealing with the object of the TS-SIS, immediately was approved.

B. The second amendment (Article IV, Section 2), concerning what constitutes a quorum, engendered more discussion. A motion was made to amend the amendment to read 5% of membership instead of twenty (20) members, but was not seconded. Another motion to amend the amendment to read thirty (30) members passed, and then the amendment itself passed.

C. Members also moved to amend the third proposed amendment (Article VII, Section 2), Candidates, to read “AALL newsletter”, instead of “Spectrum”, and “newsletter for TS-SIS”, instead of “TSLL”. This motion was approved as was the amendment itself.

D. The remaining previously published proposed amendments were passed quickly, as the members had no comments or further amendments to the amendments.

E. Minutes of Business Meeting in Philadelphia, 2000 were approved.

II. Executive Officer Reports:

A. Alva Stone (Chair): Alva thanked all who have served the TS-SIS and helped

B. JoAnn Hounshell (Vice-Chair for 2000-2001/Chair Elect for 2001-2002): Of the 625 copies of the annual survey mailed, 104 (17%) responses have been received and applied to the Section’s strategic plan. Her focus, based on the strategic plan, for the upcoming year will be training, networking, projects and member participation. She listed how the Section may achieve these goals: a series of training materials, train the trainer workshops, web-based courses, and assistance and support through educational grants. Either the
percentage of SIS dues actually going to the SIS ($6 out of $12) should be increased or the SISs will have to ask Headquarters to raise the dues to $14.

C. Pam Deemer (Secretary/Treasurer): Chris Tarr is the newly elected Vice-Chair for 2001-2002/Chair Elect for 2002-2003 and Kathleen Pecarovich is the newly elected Member-at-Large for 2001-2003. Projected balance as of 5/30/2001 is $13,251, but expenses for the AALL annual meeting have not been figured in, and the Section was charged the full bill for TSLL, instead of 61 percent. We shall not know the income from dues for the year until September.

D. Cindy May (Member-at-Large): TS-SIS participated in the reception held at the St. Thomas Law School at 6:00 p.m. on July 14, 2001. 250-300 people attended, and the food never ran out! She thanked the membership, the sponsor, Innovative Interfaces, Ed Edmonds, and helpers, Mila Rush, Susan Chinoransky, and Matthew Wright. Plaques and chocolates were given to the ex-editors of TSLL, Linda Tesar and Anna Belle Leiserson.

E. Angelina Joseph (Member-at-Large): She announced that the TS-SIS table was up in the exhibit area and that six to seven more volunteers were needed to sit at the table. Angelina asked people to see her if they wished to volunteer.

III. Standing Committee Reports:

A. Karen Douglas (Acquisitions Committee): AALL approved the proposal for the workshop “New Perspectives on Law Library Acquisitions and Collection Development,” and it will be on the road Nov. 2-3, 2001 at the American University College of Law in Washington, D.C. Two proposals worked on by Acquisitions committee members were accepted for this annual meeting. As usual, there will be an Acquisitions Roundtable.

B. Chris Long (Cataloging and Classification Committee): Library of Congress approved the England vs. Great Britain proposal. Reports from the official representative of CC:DA, MARBI, and SAC will be given at the C & C Committee meeting. Discussion will follow at the Roundtable.

C. Kristina Tryon (Exchange of Duplicates): Kristina gave an explanation of what the Committee does: provide a means of getting rid of a library’s un-needed duplicate volumes. Income of almost $1500 came from the activity of 51 members.

D. Will Meredith (Preservation Committee): The Committee’s program proposal was not accepted this year. It is still researching what to include in planning for the AALL national preservation plan for legal materials as called for in the AALL strategic plan. He announced this year’s annual meeting time for the Binding and Preservation Roundtable.

E. Andrea Rabbia (Serials Committee): Andrea, the incoming Chair of this Committee, announced the time of this year’s Serials Committee meeting. [She filled in for Joan Liu, but could not give a full report because of e-mail problems.]

IV. Other Committee Reports

A. Mary Lu Linnane (Awards Committee): Mary Lu described the Renee Chapman Award before announcing the recipient of this year’s. The award was presented to Reggie Wallen, who then reminisced about her experiences with Renee Chapman and thanked past recipients of the award and others for their example and for their mentoring and support.

B. Eloise Vondruska (Bylaws and Handbook Committee): Eloise thanked her Bylaws and Handbook Committee for their work. The incoming Chair of the TS-SIS Bylaws and Handbook Committee, David Bratman, will send the amendments, which were just approved by the membership, to the AALL Bylaws Committee for the final approval, once the Secretary/Treasurer writes them up and sends them to him.

C. Alva for Pat Sayre-McCoy (Education Committee): Alva thanked the Committee on Pat’s behalf. Out of 10 program and 2 workshop proposals, 7 programs and 1 workshop were approved for the 20001 annual meeting. Although the SACO workshop was approved, it was cancelled due to lack of a financially feasible number of attendees. Next year there will be only 53 slots for programs, instead of the 76 this year. Each SIS will be limited to 6 proposals, and proposals from individuals are not encouraged. There will be more plenary sessions. Alva announced the time for the Education Committee’s meeting. The SISs have suggested elimination of the no-conflict hours for the exhibits and that committee meetings and roundtables also take place at the same time as the education programs. Pat Sayre-McCoy and JoAnn Hounshell will be in charge of the Committee for next year.

D. Corinne Jacox (Joint OBS/TS Grants Committee): Last year Larry Dershem received a grant of $1000 (split 50/50) for work on the web version of the LC classification schedules. This year a grant of $790, to be split 50/50 between OBS & TS, has been given to Susan Goldner and Lorraine Lorne to index TSLL. Information on research grants is on the TS-SIS and OBS-SIS web sites. Brian Striman will be the Chair in the coming year.

E. Betty Roeske (Listserv Manager): Different software is now used for the listserv. Members should check their e-mail addresses on AALLNET and e-mail Betty if they have an address change. She announced the time of a roundtable for listserv managers to take place at this year’s meeting.

F. Rhonda Lawrence (MARBI): Using a chicken shaped egg timer to keep herself from going overtime, Rhonda informed us that MARBI approved Proposal 2001-05, changes in MARC 21 to accommodate seriality (to handle integrating resources such as loose-leaves and web sites). MARBI also gave the nod to Proposal 2001-04, repeatable 260s. She stated her full report will be
available at the Cataloging and Classification Committee meeting and that there would be a seriality program and roundtable concerning the changes. After effectively completing 2 three-year terms, this is Rhonda’s last year. Susan Goldner will be our future representative.

G. Mary Burgos (Mentoring Program): 15 mentors and 14 people requesting mentoring signed up for the Mentoring Program. Needs: a survey of the results, Mentoring Program form revision, and an additional “matchmaker.”

H. Carmen Brigandi (Nominations Committee): She gave thanks to her Committee for helping choose candidates.

I. Caitlin Robinson (Strategic Planning Committee): The Executive Board reviewed the first draft of the strategic plan last year and decided a membership survey was needed before another draft could be composed. The strategic plan was redesigned with the results of the annual survey of membership in mind. This year’s draft is briefer and a number of strategies have been changed. It will be a 3 year plan instead of a 5 year one. A draft of the plan was handed out at the business meeting. There may be more revisions.

J. Linda Tesar (TSSL): Costing $4125.35 for printing and mailing, 3 issues went out this year. Joe Thomas will take over editing TSSL. It was announced that updates to TSSL policies would be discussed at the TSSL Board meeting. Linda thanked TS-SIS and OBS-SIS for the plagues and chocolate given to her and Anna Belle Leiserson at the “Alphabet Soup” reception on Saturday.

K. Martin Wisneski (Webmaster): AALL gave some guidelines to webmasters during a special session for them at this annual meeting. In addition to the handout provided at this business meeting, the strategic plan will be available for reading on the TS-SIS website. Any suggestions for improvement of the site can be made to Martin or any member of the TS-SIS Executive Board.

V. New Business:
A. The Executive Board has budgeted $1500 for educational grant awards to AALL sponsored workshops. Such a grant may be awarded for attendance at the acquisitions and collection development workshop in Washington, D.C. on November 2-3. The deadline for application for a grant for that workshop is August 2, 2001. Grants for various workshops will be given as needed and until the $1500 has been dispensed.

B. Jim Mumm proposed the formation of a technical services management committee. He said he would lead a discussion with those interested immediately after this business meeting in the same room.

VI. Installation of new Chair:
After her official installation as Chair of the TS-SIS, JoAnn thanked everyone for responding to the plea to attend the business meeting in order to have a quorum. She also thanked Alva Stone.

VII. Announcements
A. Anne Sitkin reminded everyone of the basic law cataloging workshop she, Richard Amelung, Janice Leichter, and Marie Whited will be giving in September 21-23, 2001 in Chicago.

B. The AALL program gave the correct room number for E-6, Put a CORC in it. The room the announcement on the TS-SIS list gave was incorrect.

Respectfully submitted
Pam Deemer
Secretary/Treasurer
liped@law.emory.edu
way that no matter what the management level a person is, that person may be interested. The committee’s work may even appeal to some outside the TS-SIS. Although the committee would address issues unique to technical services, many issues could cover areas outside that area. In response to the worry that the committee may create competition for programs with other TS SIS committees, Alva Stone responded that the survey showed membership wants more management programs. The committee should not have any more expenses than any other TS-SIS committee. Jim will look at other committee charges, consult with the others who expressed interest, and develop a committee charge to suggest to TS Chair, JoAnn so that she may create an ad hoc committee. If the committee proves viable, it may become a standing committee later. Jim will send the suggested charge to JoAnn by December 15, 2001.

III. Committee Reports:

A. Will Meredith (Preservation): The Preservation Committee met in Minneapolis. Their charge from AALL is still being studied. They are developing a program proposal, which may actually become more of an ongoing exhibit-type thing. They are thinking of a film festival of films related to preservation. Perhaps Hein could sponsor it.

B. Karen Douglas (Acquisitions): The Acquisitions Committee met on July 16 and discussed the upcoming “road show”, New Perspectives in Acquisitions and Collection Development” to take place Nov. 2 &3, 2001. The Committee also considered using the world wide web as an acquisitions tool and the other an elementary program on vendor relations. Karen also reported that Jim Mumm was going to lead the Acquisitions Roundtable in a discussion of best practices in acquisitions towards a way to standardize those practices. Jim will send Karen the results. The question arose, is this a future project that could use a research grant?

C. Nancy Poehlmann (Cataloging & Classification): Chris Long announced at the Cataloging and Classification Committee meeting that the Library of Congress had approved using Great Britain after 1536 and England, Scotland, Wales prior to 1536. Our representatives to SAC, CC:DA, and MARBI gave their reports. Jolande Goldberg could not attend AALL this year, but Chris reported for her that KBM and KBP were being finalized and would go to the web pilot site. LC is reclassifying titles to KBR and KBU titles to determine if they truly work. The Administration Subcommittee is concerning itself with paraprofessionals. The focus of the Inherently Legal Subjects Subcommittee did not pan out. New volunteers for that subcommittee were asked to sign up for it. The attendees again expressed interest for more cataloging a la carte programs, perhaps something on classification. Because dissatisfaction was expressed that more training programs could not be planned as part of the annual meeting, Chris asked those interested in finding alternative means of training sign up for a subcommittee. The Executive Board suggested more web-based courses, regional programs, institutes, and workshops and having speakers come to discussion groups/roundtables at the AALL The annual meeting.

D. Andrea Rabbia (Serials): The Serials Committee met and discussed AALL representation to NASIG and SISAC. There was talk of instead of having a SISAC representative, having a NASIG one. Everyone agreed NASIG representation was a good idea, but no one wanted to serve. The Committee is working on two program proposals, 1) publications patterns in the MARC record and how to use them and 2) Integrating resources. Paddy Satzer has agreed to take charge of the Exchange of Duplicates [now] Subcommittee. JoAnn reminded that there was no limit to the number of persons who may be on a committee and that all committees are open meetings.

E. Alva Stone (Immediate Past Chair): Alva asked if the Board would approve her purchasing Sturgis’ Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure. JoAnn replied she has a copy that she will donate to the SIS after her term, if it is still current. Alva reassured the Board that according to the rules, the quorum rule is effective at the time of a meeting and is not applied retrospectively. Apparently the OBS strategic plan is a long one, like our original strategic plan. If the Board approves the strategic plan and the membership is advised of the strategic plan, it is not necessary to put the plan to the vote of the membership.

F. JoAnn Hounshell (Chair) speaking about the Bylaws and Handbook Committee: JoAnn has appointed David Bratman to be the new Chair. Pam will send him a copy of the proposed and membership approved bylaws to send to the AALL Bylaws Committee for final approval. When that committee has approved the amendments, he will then send them to Martin to update the Bylaws section on the web.

G. Angelina Joseph (Member-at-Large): Angelina asked for volunteers for the TS-SIS table in the exhibit hall and got some. Brochures about the Section, the Mentoring Project, and the basic law cataloging institute were picked up by people. Alva Stone provided the bulletin board display. She will bring it to next year’s annual meeting in Orlando as well. Angelina has consented to handle next year’s “alphabet soup” reception. This year was the first time the reception was not held in a hotel or conference center. The multi-SIS committee discovered food

1. Karen Douglas, Acquisitions Committee Chairperson, called the meeting to order. Attendees identified themselves, their libraries, and their titles. Everyone enjoyed noting the great number of titles with slashes in the group, e.g. Head of Technical Services/Acquisitions Librarian.

2. "New Perspectives on Law Library Acquisitions and Collection Development Workshop" - Cynthia Aninao reported that the AALL Professional Development Committee accepted the proposal drafted by her, Lisa Arm, Carmen Brigandi, Mary Moore, Sandy Sadow, and Dick Vaughan. It will be held on Friday, November 2, and Saturday, November 3 at American University College of Law in Washington, D.C. The speakers are Chris Graesser, JoAnn Hounshell, Janis Johnston, Phyllis Marion, and Jim Mumm. Although a West Coast location is tentatively planned for next year, the possibility of a Midwest location was requested. Lorna Tang announced that grants for the workshop are available and the application deadline is August 2.

3. Program Ideas for 2002 Annual Meeting - Two ideas will be developed and submitted.

   - Website ordering: components of a successful site, favorite websites. Margie Axtmann suggested this could also be a publication topic. Karen Douglas will work on a program proposal with another member.

   - ABCs of Acquisitions: tips for beginning acquisitions law librarians, what knowledge is needed to work with vendors, moving from a general library to a law library, acquisitions fundamental practices and ethics. Lisa Arm and Ajaye Bloomstone will work on this proposal.

Respectfully submitted,
Cynthia Aninao
University of Cincinnati Law Library
cynthia.aninao@law.uc.edu
I. Report of the Chair

Chris Long reported that there were no changes to the agenda. He also reported that Library of Congress accepted the report of the Task Force on Great Britain vs. England. For works after 1536, use Great Britain for works on the law of England and Wales. The Task Force’s recommendations will be implemented in 2001 Update No. 2 of the Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings.

Regina Wallen was chosen as the recipient of the 2001 Chapman Award on July 15, 2001.

Margot McLaren from the University of La Verne Law Library has been designated as the secretary for the meeting minutes.

II. Liaison Reports:

SAC: Melody Lemke reported that the Subcommittee on Metadata and Subject Analysis submitted its annual report to SAC (Subject Analysis Committee) and the report will be posted on SAC’s website at <http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/sac/msafinalreport.html>. A new subcommittee on fiction guidelines was formed at SAC. Melody mentioned that name authority work could be as much a challenge as subject headings reference structures. The Subcommittee on Subject Reference Structures in Automated Systems identified issues associated with reference structures in the automated environment. These issues will be explored and the final result will be in a position paper that will guide system designers in presenting syndetic structures effectively. SAC/ALCTS Subcommittees are looking at bibliographic control of web resources to get some direction.

CC:DA: Bill Benemann reported that a 12th Task Force-Task Force on Alpha Prototype was added. Chapter 12 (Serials) of AACR2 is being revised to accommodate seriality. There will be many changes made to Chapter 12 to include integrating resources and loose-leaf publications. Since the changes will be drastic, there will be training sessions for catalogers. Bill mentioned that Jean Hirons has asked someone to revise Hallam. The overall theme is harmonization. Cataloging in a global environment will eliminate conflicts; however, an international code has not been developed yet. There will be more records coming from other cataloging communities in other countries, but there will not be much change in copy cataloging. CC:DA will look at the entire AACR2.

MARBI: Rhonda Lawrence reported that UK seems to be willing to accept MARC21, and more countries are signing on to MARC21 format. Records will be more easily shared and will agree on what content is to go in what field. There will be changes in the coding of records and the 260 field for serials will be repeatable to trace the history of the publisher and place of publication. No date has been given yet to implement the repeatable 260 field. The 2001 DPO5 discussion paper will be posted on Technical Services website and will be published in the TSLL Newsletter. Rhonda recommends signing up for the MARC listserv. Susan Goldner will be the new MARB representative.

III. Update on Religious Law Schedules

Chris Long read a brief report from Jolande Goldberg that indicated it was too early this year to do programs on religious law schedules. Classification schedules for KBM (Jewish law) and KBP (Islamic law) will be posted on the web site soon.

IV. Administration

Judy Vaughan-Sterling reported that preparing a copy cataloging manual is problematic. She suggested a sharing procedures manual for cataloging. “Understanding MARC Formats” is available on the web, and OCLC offers various cataloging workshops (such as coding MARC tags, CORC, etc.).

V. Inherently Legal Subject Headings

The subcommittee is making suggestions to Library of Congress on what is or what is not inherently legal, and that cross-references should be made. Marie Whited pointed out that there is problem with pattern heading in law subject headings and “Legal status” as a free-floating subject heading is questionable. She also mentioned that some us do not have extensive legal experience. Marie urges SACO proposals. Rhonda suggested making a list of legal subject headings.
and submitting them to Library of Congress as committee members. She also emphasized the importance of having local subject authority files in the OPAC system.

VI. Program Planning for 2002

The theme for 2002 is “Creating Connections”, and Tim Knight from the Law Society of Upper Canada is the technical services person on next year’s Annual Meeting Program Committee.

VII. Suggested Technical Services Programs for 2002

- Religious law schedules
- Subject Headings workshop with SACO element in it
- Inherently legal subject headings
- Roundtable could be used for cataloging practice exercises

Need hand on training and exercises (2-3 hour period)
- Cataloging a la carte should include descriptive cataloging electronic resources
- Do a follow up on Uniform Titles workshops
- Need more special serials cataloging training sessions (includes MARC coding)
- One day cataloging workshop on electronic serials
- Chair of TS SIS to present to the AALL Board back-to-back training sessions for Technical Services
- Follow ALA model-have control of our own situation. It was suggested that we contact AALL’s Education Committee
- Create a formal task force to address the issue of cataloging training and present it as a written document to the AALL Board

VII. Other Business

Rhonda mentioned that CONSER has a serials co-op training program which is regional, and that ALA and PCC are giving some cataloging training programs, including serials cataloging.

There is a PCC Task Force on Integrating Resources which is looking for law catalogers’ participation (this would include updating records as well).

Nancy Poehlmann has been elected as the new Chair.

Submitted by Margot McLaren
mclarenm@ulv.edu

Cataloging & Classification Issues Roundtable

July 17, 2001

A large number of people (55 signed in) joined in a lively discussion session in Room 201 A-B of the Minneapolis Convention Center. The open-ended format of the roundtable led the group to explore a wide range of topics.

Whether or not libraries retained 856s in records for U.S. government publications was discussed first. All the respondents indicated that they retained the 856s. This led into further conversation regarding how many libraries shared bibliographic records with other libraries in their institutions. A fair number of participants indicated that they did so.

The CORC program that was presented earlier in the conference sparked a number of discussion points …

- Is the “quick and dirty” record that is generated good enough? At least one CORC participant indicated that the record was deemed useful by their public services staff.
- Are there any RLIN libraries participating in CORC. No one seemed to know of any.
- Why are some law libraries not doing CORC cataloging? The general consensus was that there was no push to so from the public services staff in their libraries.
- Wake Forest University is working on developing a common interface for their catalog and their Web page.

Other subjects that were discussed included …

- Genre headings for electronic resources
- Pinyin conversions
- Web clearinghouse of copy cataloging procedures

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Long
Indiana University School of Law—Indianapolis
The OBS Local Systems Committee met on Tuesday, July 17, at 5:15 pm. At least thirty people attended the meeting. This was a record number for recent years. As participants introduced themselves, Alan Keely (Wake Forest University Professional Center Library) kept track of the systems that people had and reported that there were 17 with Innovative systems and 10 with other systems. By acclamation, George Prager (New York University Law School) was elected Chair for the next two years.

The meeting was billed as an open discussion entitled Enhanced OPACs: Streamlining Access for the Patron. The discussion focused on access to tables of contents and indexes, aggregator’s full text, e-books, and e-reserves. It also touched on the question of multiple versions, maintaining URLs and proxy servers. This report includes many of the specifics that were discussed, since these might be useful to librarians who were not able to attend the meeting.

Five of the libraries indicated that they were providing access to table of contents or indexes through their bibliographic records. The products involved are Indexmaster and BNA. Librarians complained about BNA’s inadequate authority control. All the libraries using these products are frustrated by the cut-and-paste method of adding the URLs to the records. Alan Keely said that he talked to Indexmaster about providing a batch of MARC records with only ISBN and URL fields. It would be very helpful, because it could be used by some systems to overlay otherwise protected records. But, the vendor may not have the capability to do this.

Providing bibliographic links to fee-based full text presents very similar problems. Eight of the libraries represented are currently doing this. The vendors involved include Hein, Matthew Bender, RIA, and CCH. None of the vendors produce cataloging for libraries to buy. Many of the individual products were cataloged by libraries and are shared on the utilities. We can help each other by continuing to do this. But shared cataloging does not solve the problem of knowing when titles are added or removed from a service. Alan Keely is planning to talk to Hein about cooperating with them to provide cataloging for HeinOnline. CCH presents an additional problem, because they do not offer the ability to link to an individual title, just to link to a particular “service”.

E-books were not considered a big issue by the law libraries present. One library is providing access to NetLibrary resources. Only three of the libraries had any form of electronic reserves. Other libraries want to do it, but are prevented by concerns over copyright issues. A number of the libraries make faculty exams available electronically.

There was some discussion about whether libraries use one or multiple bibliographic records for the various versions of a title. The practice varies from library to library. In particular, we talked about Internet titles that libraries print and bind (usually government documents). Several libraries currently create two records for this material: one for the Web site and one for the reproduction. This is time consuming, however. Susan Goldner (UALR William H. Bowen School of Law) catalogs the Web site and attaches an item record for the print version.

The other maintenance issue that all of these enhancements to the OPAC cause is the need to keep URLs updated. Susan Chinoransky (George Washington University) said that they are happy with the Innovative product, WAM, which they run monthly. Ellen McGrath (University at Buffalo) said that her campus uses LinkBot once a week and is pleased with the results. People have found that the GPO Purls are very reliable and can be ignored when they appear on URL reports.

A number of libraries use proxy servers to allow their patrons off-campus access to fee-based electronic resources. Heather Buckwalter (Creighton Law Library) is very pleased with EZProxy, the software they are using.

The meeting ended with talk about possible programs for next year. Two topics were of particular interest. The first is the relation between the library web page and the OPAC. Now, most libraries seem to be cataloging everything linked to from the library’s home page and from subject lists or pathfinders found there. The second potential topic is that we are being asked to do more with fewer staff since all of the things discussed during this meeting are new activities. This topic could be included in a program on coordinating the workflow of electronic resources.

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 pm.

Susan Goldner
OBS Local Systems Committee Chair
July 23, 2001
TS:SIS Serials Committee

Monday, 7/16/01
5:15-6:15 PM

Attendees: Andrea Rabbia (Chair), Stephanie Schmitt, George Sweeney, Viji Nittor, Paddy Satzer, Yuezeng Shen, Ting James, Teresa Odam, Mark Bartlett, Diana Jaque, Lysa Hall, Peggy Perrin, Sanja Zgonjanin, Rachel Hollis, Margaret Cianfarini, Craig Lealang, Michael D. Brown, Amy Lovell.


2. Establishing an AALL representative to NASIG. The majority in attendance believes that it is important for AALL to have a representative to NASIG; currently we do not. There was discussion about discontinuing representation to SISAC, due to the changing nature of that group, and replacing it with NASIG representation. Most felt NASIG was a better choice (if a choice has to be made).

3. Ideas for serials topics, programs, presenters at next year’s annual meeting:
   - Integrating resources - loose-leaves, multiple 260s, coding, variable fields, retrospective, how affects searching catalog. Possible joint program?
   - Publication patterns (OCLC-MARC 891)

4. Merging Exchange Committee with Serials Committee. Paddy Satzer graciously volunteered to administer the Exchange and Duplicates program. Andrea suggested that Paddy contact the former committee chair, Christina Tryon, for details on administering the Exchange and Duplicates program.

Submitted by:
Andrea Rabbia
Syracuse University College of Law
arrabbia@law.syr.edu