Hail to the Chief!
An interview with the incoming AALL President

Who is that energetic woman with all of those good ideas? How can she sound so upbeat and realistic at the same time? If you’ve ever thought these thoughts while attending a meeting or program at AALL, you may have been seeing Carol Avery Nicholson in action. Whether in her role as a member of the AALL Professional Development Committee sent to a business meeting to drum up interest, as a program presenter imparting a bit of practical knowledge, or as a fellow department head sharing the laments of staffing cutbacks, Carol has been a force in OBS and TS for years. Now she is ready to carry the skills that have made her a great Technical Services librarian to the presidency of AALL. As she prepares to take over as President during the upcoming annual meeting, Carol has agreed to take time to answer some questions for TSLL.

- Joe Thomas, Editor

1. The AALL Presidency most often goes to library directors. Within the past several years two Technical Services librarians (first Margie Axtmann and now you) have been elected. Does this constitute a trend?

I certainly hope so! I think that it certainly reflects the fact that dedication to serving the Association can open doors to new opportunities both for Technical Services librarians and for AALL.

2. Is a Technical Services background a good one for developing the leadership skills needed for running an organization as large and complex as AALL?

I recently completed the process of appointing members to AALL committees and found the organizational and hiring skills that I honed over the years to be very helpful in undertaking this major responsibility. It helps to be detail-oriented when keeping track of so many appointments for such a wide variety of committees and task forces. Also, just as Technical Services work requires skills in a variety of specializations, it is necessary to be informed and involved in a variety of activities at the national level. Technical Services librarians who work directly
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Technical Services Special Interest Section

From the Chair

Special Notice: According to the current Bylaws, Section members are to be notified thirty (30) days in advance of the annual business meeting of any amendments to the bylaws. In the issue of the newsletter there are three (3) proposed amendments to the TS-SIS Bylaws (page 6). These amendments will be presented and discussed at the TS-SIS Business Meeting on July 21 at 5:30 to 6:30 PM. All voting members of the Section are encouraged to attend the business meeting.

It is hard to believe that the 2002 AALL Annual Conference is only a few weeks away! The Annual Conference is a busy time for everyone, and this year there are many exciting TS related events and programs for the members. It is only appropriate that the Annual Conference begin with a party, so mark your calendar for the TS/OBS/RIPS/CS Joint Reception on Saturday, July 20 at 6:00 pm. Thanks to Innovative Interfaces, Inc. generous support, the Joint Reception has become the traditional first social gathering for librarians at the conference.

The Technical Services Special Interest Section is pleased to announce the awarding of the Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award for Outstanding Contributions in Technical Services Law Librarianship to Janis L. Johnston of the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, Albert E. Jenner Memorial Law Library. The Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award for Outstanding Contributions in Technical Services Law Librarianship is presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Law Libraries to an individual or group in recognition of achievement in an area of technical services, for services to the Association, or for outstanding contributions to the professional literature.

Janis Johnston has been an AALL member since 1982 and an active member of the TS-SIS since 1988. She has served in various positions in the local chapters, special interest sections, and the national association. Most recently, Janis was elected as the vice-president/president-elect of the AALL. As colleague said “Janis has taken the Technical Services perspective and shared it with other law librarians through her active participation in Association-level work.” Through her leadership positions in the national and local law library associations, and her publications in the professional journals, she has inspired other law technical services librarians, and has raised the visibility of technical services law librarians.

The award will be made at the Technical Services SIS Business Meeting, Sunday July 21, at 5:30 p.m. Please join with the SIS in honoring Janis Johnston for her leadership and commitment to technical services librarianship.

Be sure to check the final program for the location to the following TS-SIS related events:

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

Sunday, July 21
11:45am to 1pm
• TS-SIS Management Issues Roundtable
2:45 pm to 4 pm
• C2: Publication Patterns: Creating Connections in the Serials World
5:30pm to 6:30pm
• TS-SIS Business Meeting

Monday, July 22
7am to 8am
• TS-SIS Acquisitions Committee Meeting
• TS-SIS Heads of Cataloging in Large Law Libraries Roundtable
6:15pm to 7:15pm
• TS-SIS Serials Committee Meeting

Tuesday, July 23
7am to 8:45 am
• TS-SIS Cataloging and Classification Committee Meeting
• TS-SIS Preservation Committee
12pm to 1:30pm
• TS-SIS Cataloging and Classification Issues Roundtable
• TS-SIS Heads of Technical Services Roundtable
• TS-SIS Preservation and Binding Roundtable
3 pm to 4 pm
• H1: Connecting with Law Publisher by a Licensing Agreement
5:30pm to 6:30pm
• TS-SIS Acquisitions Roundtable
6:30pm to 7:00pm
• TS-SIS TSLL Board Meeting

Wednesday, July 24
7am to 8:45 am
• TS-SIS Executive Board 2002-2003 Meeting
8:45 am to 10:15 am
• J3: How to Avoid ‘Search Reopened (co-sponsored with OBS-SIS)
10:30 am to 11:45 am
• K6: What I Learned About Preservation from Visits to 30 Law Libraries and How It Applies to You.
12:15pm to 1:30pm
• TS-SIS Education Committee Meeting
From the Chair

Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section

It is fascinating to hear about an American family with three generations of Olympians. Jack Shea won two Olympic medals in speed skating in 1932. When the Olympic torch came through Lake Placid, N.Y. on December 29, 2001, he helped carry it at 91 years old. His son, Jim Shea, competed in Nordic combined and cross-country skiing in the 1964 Games. And his grandson, Jim Shea Jr. won a gold medal in skeleton in the 2002 Salt Lake Games. Three generations have been connected through the Winter Olympic Games. Jack Shea was able to pass the torch to his son, Jim and to his grandson, Jim Jr.

OBS is very fortunate to have great librarians as members of OBS-SIS who have connected in the past, in the present and will continue in the future through professional networking, leadership opportunities, research and publication. OBS's third strategic direction in the Strategic Plan is that “OBS Connects.” We can celebrate OBS's great history with those who connected in the past.

Gary, Patricia and Lorraine will be installed as the newest members of the executive board during the TS-SIS Business Meeting on Sunday, July 21 at 5:30 pm to 6:30

It is hard to believe that the year has passed so quickly! My term as TS-SIS chair was an adventure that I have enjoyed. The numerous tasks of the SIS chair were made much easier by the help and advise from the members of the executive board. It has been a great pleasure to work with Christina Tarr, incoming Chair, and I know that she will provide excellent leadership for the SIS.

I have been able to count on Chris for sound advice and recommendations throughout the year. I would like to thank Pam Deemer, Secretary/Treasurer (outgoing) for all of her hard work over the past two years. Pam has been a tremendous help to each chair during her term, her insight and advise have been greatly appreciated.

Angelina Joseph, outgoing Member at Large, has worked tirelessly this year as the chair of the Joint Reception committee. I know from personal experience, how much work and worry goes into planning a reception that the membership will enjoy. As a result of the hard work and persistence of Angelina and her committee, the membership will kick off the annual conference with good food and good company. I especially want to thank Alva Stone, immediate past Chair, for volunteering for the daunting task of rewriting the TS-SIS Handbook. The new handbook will be a valuable resource to future executive board members. I am very grateful to all of the Committee Chairs for their hard work and advise this year. I especially want to thank Joe Thomas, editor of the Technical Services Law Librarian newsletter and the editorial staff, for continuing to publish the most informational newsletter in the association.

Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to serve as your Chair.

Cindy Buhi, Technical Services Librarian at Washington State Attorney General’s Law Library became the second recipient of the TS-SIS Educational Grant in March. Cindy attended the Basic Law Cataloging Workshop on March 1-3, 2002 at John Marshall Law School in Chicago, IL.

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. Remember that additional information, and an application form for the TS-SIS Education Grant can be found at <http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/awards/edgrant/index.htm>.

Congratulations to the newly elected members of the TS-SIS executive board:

Gary Vander Meer (Northern Illinois), Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect
Patricia Sayer McCoy (University of Chicago), Secretary/Treasurer
Lorraine Lorne (University of Arkansas), Member at Large

From the Chair
These pioneers prepared the way for the Section to provide opportunities for professional networking. They did it by providing a forum to exchange ideas and information regarding trends, issues and challenges. Some have served as liaisons with OCLC and RLIN users and their parent organizations while others have been involved in educational program planning. I personally have developed and grown professionally through the networking at OBS.

OBS has provided great opportunities for leadership in the past and the present. Some members have served as officers of the Section while others have served as chairs of Standing Committees. These positions have provided the nurturing atmosphere to gain expertise and to function in a more demanding and challenging role in the AALL organization. During my membership at OBS, two of our members have been elected President of AALL. Even those who have retired and others sitting on the sidelines are cheering the present members and hoping that new leaders will carry the torch in the future.

OBS has provided a fertile ground for research and publications. We are committed to supporting research; therefore, we co-sponsored the Joint Research Grant and Research Roundtable with TS-SIS. Several of our members have published great articles in the Spectrum, and the Law Library Journal. Our lives have been enriched by their published research.

The phrase “OBS connects” is a reality that has been woven in the fabric of its membership.

**OBS Elections results:**

I am pleased to announce the results of the 2002 OBS Election. Our new Vice-Chair/Chair Elect will be Kevin Butterfield and our Member-at-Large will be Ruth Patterson Funabiki. Congratulations to these new OBS officers! Thanks to Eloise Vondruska and Arturo Torres for their willingness to serve as candidates.

**News:**

Brian Quigley, RLIN Chair, has informed me that there will not be an RLIN Committee meeting this year in Orlando due to lack of issues. Please see below for a schedule of OBS Activities in Orlando.

My two objectives as OBS Chair this year were: implementation of the Strategic Plan and enhancing our website. Some aspects of the strategic plan are being fulfilled in a continuous way. We established a new web policy that outlines the duties and role of the webmaster and the Web Advisory Committee. The OCLC Committee has launched its webpage. Thanks to Michael Maben and his committee! We have a new redesign of the OBS website that will be unveiled on July 1, 2002. Thanks to Anne Myers and Anna Belle Leiserson for their outstanding work. I really appreciate the input of the Web Advisory Committee.

This is my final column as OBS Chair. I am definitely indebted to those who have helped me with the operations of OBS. They are: OBS Executive Board: Mary Jane Kelsey, Ellen McGrath, Richard Jost, Susan Chinoransky, Judith A. Vaughan-Sterling. OBS Standing Committee Chairs: Michael Maben, George Prager, Brian Quigley, Brian Striman, Maria Okonska, and Anne Myers. I really appreciate their support and the fond memories. I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Joe Thomas and Linda Tesar for continuing to produce an outstanding newsletter, Technical Services Law Librarian. It has been great to work with JoAnn Hounshell, TS-SIS Chair.

And to Anne Myers, my mentor, who has always been there to encourage, provide insight and guidance. I am grateful to my former library Director, Patricia A. Cervenka for her initial support, and allowing me to be actively involved in OBS, and to Suzanne Cassidy, my current Director, for her understanding and support.

Here are the OBS meetings scheduled for the upcoming meeting in Orlando:

**Saturday, July 20**
- 4:00-6:00 pm • OBS 2001/2002 Executive Board Meeting
- 6:00-7:30 pm • TS/OBS/RIPS/CS Joint Reception

**Sunday, July 21**
- 11:45-1:00 pm • OBS/TS Research Roundtable
- 1:15-2:30 pm • B-3: Rule Maker or Rule Breaker?

**Monday, July 22**
- 7:00-8:00 am • OBS OCLC/WLN Committee Open Discussion
- 2:45-4:00 pm • C2: Publications Patterns: Creating Connections in the Serials World
- 6:15-7:15 pm • OBS Business Meeting

**Tuesday, July 23**
- 12:00-1:30 pm • OBS Education Committee
- 4:15-5:15 pm • I-1: The Catalog vs. the Home Page?
- 5:30-6:30 pm • OBS Local Systems Committee Open Discussion

**Wednesday, July 24**
- 7:00-8:30 am • OBS 2002/2003 Executive Board
- 8:45-10:15 am • J-3: How to Avoid “Search Reopened”: Hire the Right Technical Services Candidate the First Time Around

And remember, OBS Connects!

Ismael Gullon
Mercer University
gullon_i@mercer.edu
In compliance with the TS-SIS Bylaws, Article X, “Notice of proposed amendments shall be mailed to the Section’s voting members or be published in the Section’s newsletter 30 days in advance of the meeting”, the following changes to the bylaws are proposed and will be voted upon during the upcoming TS-SIS business meeting at the annual AALL meeting in Orlando, Florida on Sunday, July 21, 2002 at 5:30 p.m.

This version of the Bylaws contains only those portions that have been recommended for changes, plus annotations. The complete text of the Technical Services Special Interest Section Bylaws can be seen on the Sections web page at <http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/tssis.htm>. A vote to amend the Bylaws will be conducted during the TS-SIS Business Meeting on Sunday, July 21 at 5:30 to 6:30 PM.

**AMENDMENT I.**

*Proposed Amendment to ARTICLE IX, COMMITTEES, Section 1, Standing Committees, paragraph 2.*

To amend ARTICLE IX, Object, by striking the sentence ‘The Committee Chair shall then appoint a cabinet of three (3) members for the Committee with the approval of the Section Chair’ and by striking the phrase ‘The cabinet members and’.

**Explanation of Amendment I:** It has not been the practice of Committee Chairs to appoint cabinets. Striking the language from the Bylaws would reflect common practice within all the Standing Committees in the Section.

If amended the Article will read:

ARTICLE IX, COMMITTEES, Section 1, Standing Committees, paragraph 2

“On application to the Chair of the Section any Section member may become a member of any standing committee. The Chair of the Section shall appoint a Committee Chair for each standing committee. The Committee Chair shall be appointed for terms of two years, and may be reappointed at the expiration of a term. During this term, the committee Chair shall also serve as a member of the Section Executive Board. No officer of this Section may serve as a Chair of a standing committee.”

**AMENDMENT II.**

*Proposed Amendment to ARTICLE X, AMENDMENTS*

To amend ARTICLE X, Object, by striking ‘Thirty (30) days prior to the annual meeting, members will be notified of proposed amendments via mail, or listserv or other electronic means, or published in the Section’s newsletter.’

**Explanation of Amendment II:** The proposed amendment reflects the variety of communication methods available. The proposed amendment allows the Executive Board to select, and use the most effective, and cost efficient method of keeping the membership informed.

If amended the Article will read:

ARTICLE X. AMENDMENTS

These bylaws may be amended at the annual meeting of the Section by a majority of the members present and voting. Thirty (30) days prior to the annual meeting, members will be notified of proposed amendments via mail, or listserv, or other electronic means, or publication in the Section’s newsletter. Any amendment shall take effect after it has been approved by the AALL Executive Board.

**AMENDMENT III.**

*Proposed Amendment to ARTICLE XI, CONDUCT OF AFFAIRS AND PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY*

To amend ARTICLE XI, Object, by striking the phrase ‘Constitution and’.

**Explanation of Amendment III:** The AALL Constitution and Bylaws have been merged into one document. The proposed amendment would reflect the Section’s understanding of the AALL current governing documents.

If amended the Article will read:

ARTICLE XI. CONDUCT OF AFFAIRS AND PARLIAMENTARY AUTHORITY

“The Technical Services Special Interest Section shall conduct its affairs in conformity with the Bylaws of the American Association of Law Libraries. The rules of parliamentary procedure as contained in the most recent edition of *The Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure* shall govern all meetings of the Section.”
E-Distribution: A Scouting Report

Have you ever noticed how law libraries and legal publishers are a lot like baseball teams and cable companies? No? Well, in truth, I never really noticed either, but then I happened to be listening to a news story about the dispute between the New York Yankees and the cable company that distributes the Yankees’ television broadcasts in the New York City area. Without going into any detail (you can listen to the report at: <http://www.marketplace.org/shows/2002/04/10_mpp.html>) the basic dispute revolves around who controls the content (the baseball game) and who controls the distribution (how the broadcast gets into your home). Beginning to sound familiar?

A few days after hearing the broadcast I received a letter from the Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. (BNA) announcing that they were restructuring how law schools access BNA products on Westlaw and Lexis. BNA databases that had previously been available via Westlaw and Lexis, are no longer going to be included as part of a law school’s contract with the two vendors. Instead, schools will have to start paying BNA directly, for access to the data. In announcing the policy change, BNA Publisher and Editor-in-Chief, Gregory C. McCaffery pointed out that BNA received “no revenue or royalty” under their old arrangements with the two online services. To learn more about the details of the new academic program, see the BNA web site: <http://www.bna.com/lawschool/>.

Discussion on several listservs suggests that many librarians were caught off guard by the BNA decision, or were at least surprised by the suddenness of the announcement. Given that the BNA decision falls on the heels of many other information producers (most noticeably many metropolitan city newspapers) removing their data from larger database systems, it really should not surprise any of us. More and more, companies that once paid other businesses to distribute their products (whether the product is electronic data or a physical object) have learned that today’s technologies can allow them to cut the middleman and distribute their products directly. And while this is a relatively new phenomenon, it is a potential that publishers have recognized for years. In fact BNA has been talking about this since at least 1994. It was in 1994 when I happened to interview, then BNA President, William A Beltz. The interview (see, “The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc.: The CRIV Sheet Interview.” 17 The CRIV Sheet no.1-2, pp.9-11; 13-15.) came on the heels of another controversial BNA announcement - their decision to stop publishing state laws and regulations in the paper edition of their Environment Reporter and instead publish them in a new CD-ROM product. As I was ending the interview, I asked Beltz to speculate on the future of the Internet, as it pertained to legal publishing. Quite succinctly he responded that, “It [the Internet] is a delivery system.” and “it is in our interest that our products be delivered efficiently and cost-effectively.”

Law Librarians may disagree with these distribution decisions, or at least want some input before the decision is made, but we should not criticize them simply if our complaint is that they create an inconvenience to us - and believe me, in this particular case, the decision has become an inconvenience in our library. Yet, while I truly believe that the BNA decision will create more work for our library, cause us to pay more money for less information, and will require our patrons to learn yet another information retrieval system, I understand why BNA made the decision and I support their right to distribute their own products.

While the BNA decision didn’t surprise me, I admit I was not as prepared as I should have been. I also understand that BNA is not going to be the last publisher to start its own electronic distribution system, nor will these decisions only affect the academic market. Thus, in retrospect, here are a few quick suggestions on how Acquisitions Librarians can be better prepared for e-distribution changes:

1. Know what databases your patrons are using - talk to your reference people if you don’t have direct access with patrons or the data. If you learn what your patrons use, you can make better decisions about what is the best way to obtain it.

2. Learn what type of electronic access works best for your library. Does your library prefer/require IP range access versus password-protected access? Similarly, learn the basic technical configuration and statistics of your systems so that you’ll have a better understanding of how it will work with any new system being offered by vendors. In other words, know what your library can and can’t handle in terms of accessing electronic distribution. Again, talk with the appropriate people in your organization who can educate you on these matters.

3. Consider how a decision, similar
to the BNA decision, is going to affect your departmental workflow. Now that you are going to pay the publisher directly, will you have to create new payment accounts? What type of billing system will the new distributor offer you and how will it interact with your system? How will their decision affect your budget?

4 Keep abreast of what is going on the legal publishing industry. In addition to publications like The CRIV Sheet (and its corresponding website: <http://www.aallnet.org/committee/criv/>), check out publications like Information Today, Fulltext Sources Online, and Net.Journal Directory. These publications can help you stay aware of what alternatives are being offered. Similarly, visit the major publisher websites to see what they are offering. Most companies will offer you free trial subscriptions to their online services, so if you think there is a chance that a new service is going to become your only source for particular information, go ahead and start investigating the system.

5 Talk. Talk. Talk. Talk to the publishers/distributors who will be the ones who ultimately make the decisions; let them know, in advance, how these types of decisions affect their library customers. Talk to your colleagues at similar libraries; find out how others handle these types of changes. Talk to your colleagues and patrons at your library; these decisions affect all aspects of the library. Get as much input as you can.

Perhaps the most important preparation you can make for these types of changes, is to be prepared to analyze what is being offered. Don’t rush into anything; take the time to study what is being offered and learn what the alternatives are. Finally, don’t be afraid to say “no.” If, after evaluating the new distribution, you discover that the system (or even the information contained within) simply isn’t needed by your library, use the savings to acquire other materials that are needed.

### Classification

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

Classification number. If a previous edition of a work was correctly classified and the number is still valid, assign the same classification number to the new edition. If the number is no longer valid, assign a currently valid number.

Form divisions. If an earlier edition uses a form division Cutter that is no longer valid, do not use that Cutter for a new edition.

Book number. If a work is entered under an author, and either the author or the title changes from one edition to another, maintain the same Cutter number for later editions that was used for previous editions.

Sometimes it is a nuisance to keep editions together since it means getting older editions from the stacks and reclassing them or adapting copy. It is more apt to be a problem with copy cataloging since FASTCAT staff or those staff doing LC copy may not be adept at recognizing editions or willing to do the work to keep editions together. Some of the copy catalogers may be trained just to accept call numbers without class number verification or edition checking.

You (along with your public services staff) must decide if you want to continue keeping editions together as long as the substance of the book is the same or if you no longer care about keeping editions together. If you are keeping your editions together, you must be prepared to update old form numbers for earlier editions.
Before I agreed to become the column editor for Collection Development, I asked about the scope and length of the column. “Whatever you want,” Joe said.

Now what could be better than that? After years of having collection development as only one component of my job, I now have a position devoted to developing a new collection. My work takes me back to the fundamentals of collection development, but it also keeps me on the cutting edge. I've always known that the literature on collection development in law libraries is sparse, but it is discouraging just how little is written about how we create policies, select material, manage our collections, create and monitor budgets, and incorporate new formats and technologies. I have burning questions, and there are few places to turn for answers.

Margaret Maes Axtmann
University of St. Thomas
mmaxtmann@stthomas.edu

Collection Development

My colleagues have always been the best source of help for me, generous with their time and willing to share ideas and information. So this is a column for all of us, a chance to discuss any and all aspects of collection development in law libraries.

I can and will write about the collection development topics that interest me. But I’d also like to write about the things that interest the TSSL readers. What are your burning questions about collection development? If you want to write about them, I’m very open to the idea of guest columnists. If you want me to write about them, send me your ideas. If you’ve tackled a problem and found a solution, contribute your expertise. Call (651-962-4868) or e-mail <mmaxtmann@stthomas.edu> or talk to me at the AALL meeting in Orlando.

It’s a challenging time to be developing the print and electronic information resources our users require. Each type of law library faces those challenges in different ways, but we can all learn from each other. I look forward to exploring the issues with you.

George A. Prager
New York University
pragerg@juris.law.nyu.edu

Description & Entry

I am honored to have been selected as the new Description and Entry Columnist for TSSL. I shall endeavor to be a worthy successor to the distinguished law librarians who have preceded me in this position. Given the ever-faster rate of change in our profession, there should be plenty to write about! While I hope to have a few ideas myself of varying fertility, I’d like to hear from you, the TSSL readers, any questions you may have in this area. I’ll do my best to give you a clear and accurate answer. So please write to me.

Thanks.
Dear Miss Manager:

The director of the law library just came to me and said that his friend, the director of the main library, is being forced to let a particular staff member go, but only for budgetary reasons. My director has suggested (not demanded, although it’s hard to tell the difference) that we hire this staff member from the main library in an empty slot we have. Now comes the mess: I had intended to fill that slot with someone from another department on campus whom I’ve known of for some time, a person I know to be a good worker and very interested in this position. To further complicate things, reliable grapevine communications indicate that the staff person from the main library is a lazy troublemaker who has been having an affair with another department head! Also, this staff person has very little relevant experience. What should I do?

Sick in the South

Dear Sick:

What should you do? First, you should be sure of your information. “Reliable grapevine” sounds nearly oxymoronic. Will you be allowed to interview this person, talk to references, and perform all of the normal checks we have available when we are looking at a potential staff member? If you are not allowed to go through these normal procedures, if you really are forced (either explicitly or implicitly) to hire this person without any reasonable chance to make an assessment, then your situation is dire indeed. If that is the case, you won’t bear any of the responsibility for the disaster that is probably waiting to happen, but you will have to live with its consequences. Unless your director is really completely unreasonable, you should be able to go to him or her and explain why your preferred choice is more qualified, at least on paper, than this recommended person. If you can conduct normal interviews and then present all of the facts clearly to the director, you will have made your case. You should make it clear what your opinion is, why you think the preferred choice is better, and ask the director to justify the decision if something other than your clear choice is required.

Having said all that, we should now acknowledge that some workplaces are filled with politics, and that you must exercise your political skills in a situation like this. You may say you are not a games player, that you don’t participate in these kinds of shenanigans, that you are a department manager in a library, and you have plenty to worry about without also worrying over gossiping and old boys’ networks. Unfortunately, though, the price of working in many places includes taking those sorts of side issues into account. The daily happiness of your staff and the efficient operation of your department often depend more on those kinds of personal issues than they do on direct work-related policy. I can’t tell you from this vantage point whether or not you should become a crusading whistle-blower or a more quietly subversive element in your organization. If this sort of personnel-shuffling is a common practice in your organization, if people frequently get moved rather than fired, if everyone has to take a turn dealing with the troublesome or marginally competent worker from time to time, then perhaps it is your turn not only to absorb this person into your work, but to help break the cycle. If you can bring good work out of this apparently awful employee, you will do the most good for everyone. On the other hand, if you are in a place that is seriously corrupt, a place where favoritism and personal attributes are rewarded capriciously and in defiance of accepted standards, then it may be time to put your foot down. Perhaps you work in a place where these sorts of activities are a rarity, where this may be the first instance of such a thing happening. If that is the case, it may be even more important to stand your ground as much as possible so that the proper precedents may be set.

As in most management decisions, there is no easy answer. So much depends on local circumstances and practices. Management is more art than science. Finally, you should rely on your own good judgment. Fight for the right in this case, but keep in mind the big picture.

Dear Miss Manager:

What should I do about harassing sales representatives? I hardly ever want to speak to these people, but when I do need to, I’d like it to be on my terms, and not whenever one of them happens to need a new pinky ring.

Fed Up in Frisco
Dear Miss Manager:

I am so unhappy with the sales people who come to see me. They don’t seem to know anything about their own products – I have to tell them what they are supposed to cover! – and they treat me like an idiot child. I chewed one out the other day. Just because I look like a stereotypical librarian doesn’t mean I can’t be tough!

Frumpy but Firm

Dear Fed and Frumpy:

Now, let’s not get testy. Sales representatives are like people in any other profession: some provide excellent service, some provide mediocre service, and some are not good at all. Many people suggest that the merging of legal publishers has not been particularly beneficial to the development of strong sales representatives. One often hears the lament of the experienced acquisitions librarian bemoaning the loss of the long-ago days when those unmerged companies employed long-term, loyal, knowledgeable, hands-on sales people; the kind librarians used to name their children after or go on vacation with. Maybe sales people were different back then, or maybe the whole information universe was a cozier operation. Whatever the case may have been, we have to deal with the here and now.

One thing to remember is that being concerned with the bottom line is not a new concept for legal publishers. Those older companies weren’t in the business to lose money either. They determined that the best way to go about building profits involved a particular set of behaviors and they adhered (more or less) to those behaviors. Companies now may have a different outlook, may see profits arising out of a different set of behaviors, and that is their right. Rather than reminisce about the old days, we need to operate within the new universe to our advantage as much as possible.

Advice for customers:

1. Learn as much as you can about the products available for your library. One of the best ways of negotiating with sales people is being able to tell them that you know the score. If you know that there are two other products on the market that do basically the same thing as the one being presented to you, you will be able to concentrate on the details that might make a difference. You should also make sure that you are not being sold something you don’t need. The sales representative may be offering you a great product for ERISA coverage at a great price, but if no one in your organization is working with ERISA, where is the bargain?

2. Be clear about the sales approaches you will accept. This usually works best when you state and maintain a clear rule: for example, we do not commit to anything based on a telemarketing call; we will not accept approval books unless we order them. Let them know whether or not you want them to visit. If you don’t want them to drop by unexpectedly, tell them.

3. Be patient. Not all sales people are treated well be either employers or customers. Some of them may not deserve good treatment, but giving them the benefit of the doubt gives you a chance to start on the right foot. It isn’t the new sales rep’s fault that she is the 3rd representative in 2 years sent by the company. Do your part to make the representative effective for the company so that she can be effective for you.

Advice for sales representatives:

1. Know your products. When you ask someone to spend several hundred or several thousand dollars a year on something, you must be able to articulate what it is about that product that is providing value. If you come into an office to pitch the newest thing, the customer is not happy to hear phrases like “I’m pretty sure it covers that”; the customer is very unimpressed with “I’ll have to get back to you on that”; and the customer will escort you out without further ado if you say, “Just call customer service for that” more than once.

2. Describe your products honestly. When the customer asks, “Does this cover all 50 states?”, please say whether it does or not. Don’t say “yes” when you really mean “it covers a bit more than half”; don’t say “yes” when you really mean “all the ones you are likely to need.” Don’t say “no, but it will cover all 50 by next month” if you really have no idea what the development plans are.

3. Know your customers. Learn from asking them how they want to be contacted, whether they find face-to-face meetings helpful or not, whether they want regular check-ins or prefer to contact you as needed.

4. Be supportive of customer needs. Customers want to be able to go to the company with questions that get answered properly. They want to rely on the company to know how to fix problems. Work within the company as much as possible to help that happen. Let the people in customer service know that what they do affects sales very much. Customers are much happier buying from a company they see as backing up products with good service.

The Annual Meeting is rapidly approaching, and I hope that many of you will be able to attend, especially the OCLC/WLN Committee meeting. The Annual Meeting is one of the highlights of the year professionally for me—I always come away with new ideas and concepts to put into practice, along with having the opportunity to see and speak with many of my colleagues from around the country.

The Committee will meet on Monday, July 22nd, from 7am-8am. The meeting will be at the Orange County Convention Center (it has been moved from the Peabody Hotel). A continental breakfast will be served. Our speaker representing OCLC will be Mr. William Caine of SOLINET out of Atlanta. Mr. Caine will be speaking about OCLC’s transition to the new interface, and he will be available to answer questions you might have about OCLC’s service. If you have any ideas or topics you would like to have discussed, please let me know so that I may suggest them to Mr. Caine in advance. Last year in Minneapolis we had an excellent discussion with much give and take among the OCLC and MINITEX representatives and the attendees. I hope that we will have a similar discussion this year. This is your chance to speak directly with an OCLC representative and to ask those questions that concern you (and probably many others in room). Please make plans to attend. In continuing with last year, there will be a door prize. Unfortunately, it will not be a beautiful handmade afghan donated by Susan Chinoransky (Susan has already gone the extra mile for the committee). If you work for or went to school at one of the four schools that were in the NCAA Final Four basketball tournament (Maryland, Indiana, Oklahoma, and Kansas), you will definitely want to be present. There may be an additional door prize of something chocolate. I will look forward to seeing many of you there.

Migration to the new OCLC interface

The migration to the new interface continues on schedule. According to OCLC, in February CatME was “enhanced again to include a terminal module to allow you to connect to your local system to run macros between CatME and your local system.” OCLC states that with the first release of the new interface “CORC and CatExpress functionality become part of the new interface.” In fact, in the April issue of *Bits and Pieces*, OCLC announced that on June 30, 2002, the new cataloging interface will be introduced and the CORC product name will be retired. June 30th is a Sunday, so for most of us July 1st will be our first look at the new interface. This is exactly 3 weeks before our open discussion meeting in Orlando. I suspect that we will have a lot to talk about at the meeting.

One thing to remember about the new interface is there is a transition time built in to making the switch. Users are not required to cut over on July 1, 2002. Passport will continue to be supported through December of 2002, and Passport will work with the system until December 2003. So the date libraries will be forced off of Passport is January 2004. This gives libraries and users 18 months to make the transition.

I would suggest that you go to OCLC’s website at <www.oclc.org/strategy/cataloging> and review the updated Guide to Migration and the Frequently Asked Questions for the latest information and to refresh your memory as to what it going to happen. This will be the biggest change that most of us have ever seen with OCLC, and we need to be prepared to lead our libraries and staff in making the transition.

Steering by Standards videoconference

As I write this in late April, two of the three scheduled Steering by Standards videoconferences have occurred (the final one is scheduled for May 29th). I have had the opportunity to view both so far. The first two have dealt with open archives and data sharing. The first one was titled “A New Harvest: Revealing Hidden Resources with the Open Archives Metadata Harvesting Protocol” and featured the individual who virtually invented the protocol—Herbert Van de Sompel of the Los Alamos National Laboratory and the British Library. The second session was titled “OAIS [Open Archival Information System] Imperative: Enduring Record or Digital Dust?” and included Donald Sawyer of NASA as the keynote speaker. The final session features Barbara Tillett of the Library of Congress speaking on “Paper Past, Digital Future: Managing Metadata Standards in Transition.”

The sessions have been very interesting and informative. OCLC has gone directly to the experts to talk about these topics. The sessions have included expert practitioners, and the second one had an archivist from the National Archives and Records Administration. Some of what he said resonated with me due to my interest in genealogy and family history, and how NARA makes its data available (things like military service records, pension records, etc.). If you have an
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The attention focused on ZfB increased with the development of a prototype paper-splitting machine. The machine was built by Becker, a German engineering firm, to the specifications of Dr. Wächter. Whereas splitting pages by hand can cost several hundred dollars per page, the one-of-a-kind paper splitting machine can reputedly split, reinforce, and reattach 2000 pages per hour for a cost of about $5 a page. Nevertheless, ZfB continues to tout its machine as a safe and effective means of preserving paper. Although the price is not listed, a news report in the June, 1998 Preservation & Access International Newsletter quoted its price as 2,500,000 DM which translates at today’s exchange rates to over a million dollars U.S. Given that conservators are skeptical of the long term viability of the process, and considering the hefty cost of the equipment, it seems unlikely that automated paper splitting will catch on in this country soon. On the other hand, there are sources who report that ZfB is interested in opening a U.S. branch, possibly in the Boston area, so stay tuned.

The Library of Congress has also utilized ZfB’s paper splitting services. An April 28, 1912 supplement to the New York Times, dedicated to reporting the events surrounding the sinking of the Titanic, was restored to usability through this unusual treatment. Although this machine is being promoted as a way of improving the process by removing human error, the most publicized paper splitting projects have been accomplished by hand. The Center’s most famous paper splitting project to date has been the restoration of Johann Sebastian Bach’s music manuscripts. The manuscripts are in various stages of deterioration resulting from corrosion of the iron gall ink used by Bach. As the ink ages, it is changing to sulfuric acid and literally eating holes in the pages. ZfB is using its paper splitting technology in an attempt to save the endangered manuscripts.

The number is 1-866-709-6252. Send in those corrections! Don’t forget—Monday, July 22nd, 7am-8am, Orange County Convention Center. See you in warm, sunny Florida!

OCLC Committee’s website
The OCLC Committee now has a home on the Web. Please check it out at <www.aallnet.org/sis/obssis> and click on OCLC Committee.

Toll-free number for reporting errors
Finally, OCLC now has a toll-free fax phone number to report errors or changes to records that require proof.
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The agenda at the Research Roundtable for the AALL’s annual meeting in Orlando includes:
- Introductions
- Publishing or research projects colleagues are thinking about doing, or are doing, or have recently done
- Update on the OBS & TS SIS Joint Research Grant Committee (JRGC)
- Handouts of Brian Striman’s Publication “Kit” for anyone who wants one
- Reminders of grant availabilities in AALL for research
- Sharing the results of Larry Dershem’s work that resulted from his grant award last year of the JRGC
- Any other advice or discussions that are raised during the Roundtable discussions
- Chance to meet a potential co-author for that article or book you need to write, or want to write.

Finally, we will need a reporter at the roundtable. This is a good publishing opportunity if you’ve never contributed anything to TSLL, this a good time to jump in, but not get too wet.

Ellen McGrath has volunteered to contribute her notes on a program she recently attended. Thank you so much Ellen! So here’s a fabulous idea, which I’ve mentioned in previous columns: If you have recently attended a program at your institution, or some regional library event, or just read an excellent article or book about research or publishing that you think you’d like to write a review on, PLEASE consider using this R&P column as a vehicle to share your comments and what you learned. Before we get to Ellen’s report, I have a URL to share with you—<www.lita.org/manual/publish.html> — go there and read through the screens. It has some good information about publishing opportunities for you. It also has information that their Publishing and Publications Committee requires of their authors. It’s a good place to start. LITA is Library and Information Technology Association and is a division of the American Library Association. If you are not familiar with it, go to their main homepage and investigate the work they do. It’s amazing! <www.lita.org>

***********************************************************************

A Conference Report
Ellen McGrath
SUNY at Buffalo

The spring conference of the Western New York/Ontario chapter of the ACRL (Association of College and Research Libraries) was held on May 3, 2002 at the beautiful White Oaks Resort and Conference Centre in Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario. It was called “Becoming Visible, Staying Viable: Researching, Publishing, Mentoring.” This program was interesting and inspiring and I was very glad I had taken the opportunity to attend it.

The first speaker was Dr. Gloria Leckie (Faculty of Information and Media Studies, University of Western Ontario) and her presentation was entitled “The Importance of Being Earnest: Librarians and Their Scholarly Role in Academe.” She began by describing the nature of the university where scholarship and learning are important in their own right; advances in knowledge will come through research and study; the university must have control over academic matters; and the faculty are best placed to exert their control through collegial governance structures. To become a member of the professorate requires a long process of acculturation which places emphasis on certain values such as research as the primary focus of the university, an in-depth knowledge of a discipline, awareness of important scholars working in the discipline, and participation in a system of formal and informal scholarly communication.

Dr. Leckie next turned to the question of how academic librarianship differs significantly from other types of librarianship. The reasons for this are reflected in the institutional context: being surrounded by those in pursuit of knowledge; there is a strong sense of institutional history and tradition; and faculty self-governance occurs through the Faculty Senate. The institutional values also have an effect on academic librarians: in-depth knowledge is respected; collegiality and respect for peer judgment is integral; and autonomy, self-governance and academic freedom are highly valued. She pointed out that the acculturation of academic librarians is at odds with that of the non-librarian university faculty. Librarianship is a service profession and as such, stresses the values of professional ethics, a priority on relationships with clients, equity and fairness in the practice of librarianship, and a commitment to equitable access to information. Dr. Leckie characterized academic librarianship as being marginalized, specialization is discouraged. Little original research is required and there is little understanding of the politics of the academic or the librarian within the academy. Ultimately, research is viewed as a burden by the librarian, not as an
Dr. Leckie tracked some historical trends in academic libraries. In the 1980s, she noted declining budgets, downsizing and structural reorganizations, collection constraints, and a decreased staffing complement. This was followed in the 1990s by a spread of personal computers, the arrival of electronic databases and the Internet, and the rise of information literacy instruction. All of these trends resulted in what she characterizes as the repurposing of academic librarians. She posed the question: How do academic librarians perceive themselves? This is where her catchy presentation title came in and she made a comparison to Oscar Wilde’s *The Importance of Being Earnest*. In her view, academic librarians have a dual identity: “Jack” is the consummate professional and “Ernest” is the invisible scholar.

The next question posed was: How do the faculty perceive academic librarians? Dr. Leckie proposed two identities: the older identity (“slaving over a hot reference desk”) or the newer identity (“expert navigator in a sea of electronic resources”). Whichever identity the faculty perceive along that continuum, her conclusion is that academic librarians are not perceived as scholarly colleagues engaged in active research. So what are the barriers to the development of a scholarly identity for academic librarians? A lack of knowledge and confidence, a lack of institutional support, a lack of peer support, and job descriptions and performance reviews. Suggested strategies to deal with these barriers were outlined.

Strategies to bring down the barrier of the lack of knowledge and confidence:
♦ Have in-house workshops on research methodologies
♦ Develop research partnerships with faculty members
♦ Start small—try to get something published

♦ Take a study/research leave
♦ Undertake a Ph.D.

The lack of institutional support was addressed by saying that most faculty collective agreements suggest institutional support through the availability of sabbatical and other leaves. However, the reality for librarians contradicts this:
♦ Librarians do not have flexible working arrangements
♦ Librarians are discouraged from taking sabbatical or study leaves
♦ Librarians are not eligible for internal university research money
♦ Librarians do not have access to research assistants

So how can we overcome these realities and encourage institutional support? There must be a collective rethinking of the roles and responsibilities of academic librarians; we must be clear about terms and terminology when negotiating contracts; we must insist on the same support as for faculty, including sabbaticals and access to research and travel money; we must publicize our scholarly activities within our institutions. Some specific ideas concerning the last point were to establish a colloquium series, participate in research seminars in academic departments, and announce our accomplishments in campus publications.

Strategies to address the lack of peer support are:
♦ Foster an atmosphere of collegiality—work together to identify areas needing further study and to develop research projects
♦ Support colleagues who are eligible for sabbatical or who are attempting to conduct original research
♦ Celebrate the research successes of colleagues
♦ Form a research and discussion group

Dr. Leckie noted the tension between the regulatory vs. reflexive aspects of job descriptions. Regulatory refers to the fact that there is a need to be accountable for ongoing library processes and work. This contrasts with the reflexive aspect, which focuses on time to read, study, learn, and contribute to the knowledge of the discipline. The tension between prescribed time vs. flexible time is accompanied by a tension between the authoritarian vs. mentoring aspects of the performance review for librarians. The authoritarian calls for a policing of performance based on certain prescribed indicators, while the mentoring strives to foster and support an interest in research. Dr. Leckie encourages a movement toward a more reflexive and mentoring model and she suggests a few ways to achieve this. We should move toward more generic job descriptions for faculty librarians, in which the specific components of positions are downplayed and emphasis is given to research and service. The activities of individual librarians can be examined to see if there are duties that could be rotated and thus taken out of individual job descriptions. More should be left to the individual discretion of the librarian. We should strengthen expectations for scholarship and service and support that through appropriate performance reviews. Mentoring committees should be set up for new academic librarians. It should be made a strategic priority for librarians to take a greater role in campus governance and politics.

There are many advantages to be gained if changes can be made to the
scholarly identity and role of academic librarians:

♦ It will add knowledge to the discipline of library and information studies
♦ It will contribute to the solution of real pedagogical problems in higher education
♦ It will increase the visibility of academic librarians as colleagues and partners in the academy
♦ It will increase job satisfaction for librarians (This point was supported by research results listed by Dr. Leckie: librarians with faculty status were the most satisfied; librarians at institutions where the faculty status model was the most rigorous, were the most satisfied; librarians who were involved in a collegial model of governance were the most satisfied.)

The second session was a panel discussion moderated by Amanda Wakaruk (York University). The panelists were Inga Barnello (Le Moyne College), journal editor of College & Undergraduate Libraries; Rea Devakos (Gerstein Science Information Centre, University of Toronto), a librarian who conducts original research; Carroll Klein, managing editor of Wilfrid Laurier University Press; and Cathy Matthews (Ryerson University), a librarian who has been awarded numerous research grants.

In answer to the moderator’s first question How do you develop research ideas? there were many good suggestions. Be curious about things, read the literature, let your daily decision-making events produce ideas, collaborate with others, force yourself to reflect, go back for another degree, let your need to achieve tenure motivate you, follow your passion, attend conferences and read electronic lists. The discussion flowed on to many other topics. Collaboration or partnering is often actually sought out by an editor. In co-authoring situations the shared expertise and skill sets can be very advantageous. One panelist specifically described the process that she feels works well for co-authors: chunk the paper into parts and divide up the research and writing; have one person do the “slaughterhouse” edit (first edit, putting the chunks together, not focused on grammar, etc.); integrate changes and solicit comments; have a different person do the second edit; integrate changes and solicit comments; then do the final, “finesse” edit. She described the process as “read—write—consult.” Ms. Matthews focused on grants. She said it is necessary to do your homework in advance. Find out what grants are out there and what other grants the funding body has awarded. Be thorough in your proposal, detail all costs, and complete all paperwork carefully. Ms. Barnello, speaking in her role as a library journal editor, said she does sometimes get unsolicited submissions that are very well done. But she prefers to have the author contact her in advance so that the author doesn’t waste time or tailor the submission to her journal’s style unnecessarily. Ms. Barnello said she rejects a submission most often because the topic has already been handled recently. Other reasons are that the article is not substantive enough (“too fluffy”) or that the writing is poorly done. She will work with the author if she feels the piece is salvageable.

There was a discussion about just getting started and writer’s block. It was acknowledged that everyone has problems getting going and has a level of anxiety about writing. Suggestions were to block out a time period every day, even if only for 30 minutes or so. More than one panelist emphasized just getting something, anything down on paper. Let it flow and capture it all, even if you think you might end up cutting it later. Don’t try to make it perfect when you are starting. In terms of writer’s block, some ideas were to set it aside for a day or two (but not for too long), focus on the issues you are blocked on and build a “to do” list around them, schedule small periods of time and force yourself to work on it, and consult a colleague if you are really stuck. Of course you cannot expect someone else to do your work for you, but if it is a really tough part you are stuck on, a fresh perspective may help. One of the panelists pointed out that research is basically about project management and active learning, skills that come naturally to librarians.

The final session speakers were Michael Cook and Angela Horne and their presentation was called “Mentoring Matters: The Re-Invention of the Cornell University Library Mentorship Program.” They described their program at Cornell in detail, focusing on the pros and cons and how the program is being tweaked so that it will be more successful. Their presentation and mentoring bibliography is available on the web at: <http://www.library.cornell.edu/pdc/Mentor.html> so I will not go into detail here. I will focus instead on some of the points they made that particularly struck me. It is essential to profile both the mentor and mentee thoroughly and to make sure that they are matched carefully based on both their expectations. It is important to follow-up with mentors and mentees, in order to determine why the match was successful or not. It is not a one-way match; mentors can get a great deal out of the relationship too. Cornell’s current program is for librarians new to Cornell. However they are considering...
extending the program to librarians that have been there a while, but need slightly different mentoring through the mid to late stages of the tenure process.

Much of what I have reported should sound somewhat familiar to regular readers of this column and to those who have attended the OBS/TS Research Roundtable. But I feel it is always helpful to be re-energized by hearing it again and in fresh ways. The mentoring piece may not be as familiar, but it too is an integral part of the big “Research & Publications” picture. I am thinking about mentoring a lot these days as I begin to train our new cataloger, who has faculty status, and as I embark on a dialogue with my newly-matched mentee, courtesy of the AALL Mentoring Committee. One other point that lingered with me after this conference was the mention of the importance of reflection by a number of the speakers. I think that is one of my biggest challenges: How do I make the time for reflection? It is so essential to problem-solving in our daily tasks, as well as in the process of choosing a topic, doing research into it, and then writing about it. Yet I don’t think I am alone when I say that I feel rushed much of the time and it is the reflection part of my day that usually gets short shrift. Do you have any ideas about this? If so, I would love to hear them <emcgrath@buffalo.edu>—thanks!

---

**AACR2 to Expand Seriality at Last!**

After five years of meetings, papers, discussion and votes, we expect to see a new revision of AACR2 this summer which will make major changes in how we catalog serials. This TSLL column has presented some of the changes as they’ve developed.

Descriptive cataloging rules will change. We’ll see new rules on when to make a new bibliographic record — some kinds of title changes will no longer require a new bibliographic record, resulting in fewer new bib records. This will result in fewer holdings statements, and less clutter in our catalogs. And some relief to our cataloging workload. Hallam’s special rules for cataloging loose-leaf services will be part of mainstream AACR2. The principles of cataloging an integrating loose-leaf service will also be applied to integrating web sites.

We will have some new MARC values, and some new uses of existing MARC tags. These MARC changes will have to be added to our online catalog programs, either by the system vendor or by someone in your library, depending on what changes your software allows you to make.

We hope to provide some preparation for all of these changes by offering an informal session during AALL 2002 in Orlando, during the Cataloging and Classification Roundtable time slot, on Tuesday, July 23, 2002, from noon to 1:30 p.m. Since this isn’t a formal AALL program, it will be listed in the published program only as the Roundtable.

We are very grateful to Nancy Poehlmann, Chair of the Cataloging and Classification Committee for making this time available. I’m also very pleased to thank Richard Ameling, who has taught cataloging, for agreeing to speak about the cataloging aspects, and Susan Goldner, AALL’s representative to MARBI (which determines changes to MARC tags), for agreeing to speak about the changes to MARC tags to accommodate these revisions.

---

**Serial Issues**

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

---

**NISO Survey on Information about Electronic Resources**

In April and May, NISO conducted a survey seeking information about how libraries were communicating information about their electronic resources to other organizations such as subscription agents, document delivery services, link resolution services, and aggregators. The survey included single electronic titles and groups of titles received from aggregator services. The survey asked in what format holdings were being transmitted. The survey was also attempting to ascertain what kinds of standard identifiers are being used. For example, ISSN or ISBN for titles, Standard Address Number, OCLC symbol or National Union Catalog symbol for library. NISO expects to make the results available on its website <www.niso.org> in June.
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:

**Albany Law environmental outlook**
-v. 2, issue 2 (Fall 2000)
**Changed to:**
Albany Law environmental outlook journal
Vol. 6, issue 1 (fall 2001)-

**Countdown 2000**
**Changed to:**
Update 2000 (Charlottesville, Va.)
**Ceased with:**

**Dickinson journal of international law**
Vol. 2, no. 2 (spring 1984)-v. 19, no. 3 (spring 2001)
(OCoLC 11761337)
**Changed to:**
Penn State international law review
Vol. 20, no. 1 (fall 2001)- (OCoLC 49210199)

**FICC quarterly**
Vol. 50, no. 1 (fall 1999)-v. 51, no. 4 (summer 2001)
(OCoLC 44558588)
**Changed to:**
FDCC quarterly
Vol. 52, no. 1 (fall 2001)- (OCoLC 49410122)

**Jury verdicts weekly**
-v. 45, no. 50 (Dec. 14, 2001)
**Changed to:**
California jury verdicts weekly
Vol. 1, no. 1 (January 7, 2002)-

**Tulsa law journal**
Vol. 1, no. 1 (Jan. 1964)-v. 36, no. 4 (summer 2001)
(OCoLC 1767838)
**Changed to:**
Tulsa law review
Vol. 37, no. 1 (fall 2001)-(OCoLC 48844050)

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:

**The California lobbyists/PACs directory**
**Ceased in paper:** 2000.

**Case commentaries and briefs**
**Ceased with:** v. 21, no. 4 (Apr. 2001)

**Construction law and business**
**Ceased with:** v. 1, no. 4 (fall 2000)

**Droit de l’informatique et des telecoms = Computer & telecoms law review**
**Ceased with:** 1999/4

**European Court monitor**
**Ceased with:** no. 22 (1999)

**Foreign policy bulletin (Washington, D.C.). Foreign policy bulletin**
**Ceased with:** v. 11, no. 5/6 (Sept./Dec. 2000)

**Islamic and comparative law review**
**Ceased with:** v. 15/16 (1995 & 1996)
(OCoLC 27301956)

**Japan quarterly (Asahi Sinbunsha). Japan quarterly**
**Ceased with:** no. 26 (1999)

**Journal of reprints for antitrust law and economics**
**Ceased with:** v. 29, no. 2 (2000)

**LC classification, additions and changes**
(OCoLC 28590161)
**Ceased in paper format with:** list 284 (Oct.-Dec. 2001)
Subsequent issues available online: Library of Congress classification weekly lists List 1 (Jan. 2, 2002)-(OCoLC 49398438)

**Litigation docket**
(OCoLC 34727368)
**Ceased in paper format with:** v. 6, no. 4 (summer 2001)
Subsequent issues available only online: Litigation docket (Online) (OCoLC 49040110)

**Post-Soviet media law and policy newsletter**
**Ceased with:** no. 56 (1999)

“Materials that can be previously found in the Newsletter are available on the new Communications Law in Transition: A Newsletter available at: <http:// pcmlp.socleg.ox.ac.uk/transition/>"

**Rechtshistorisches Journal**
**Ceased with:** v. 20 (2001)

**Translex : transnational law exchange**
**Ceased with:** v. 2, no. 6 (March 2000)

**WTO focus**
**Ceased in paper with:** No. 52 (Mar.-April 2001)
Available on-line at: <http:// www.wto.org/english/res_e/ focus_e/ focus_e.htm>

**Year 2000 law bulletin**
**Ceased with:** v. 3, issue 6 (Aug. 2000)
Most law catalogers are old enough to remember a time when documents were routinely produced by a mechanical keyboard causing a piece of metal in the shape of a letter to make an impression through an inked ribbon. Some of us remember when mail was hand delivered twice daily, seven days a week, or when telephones had rotary dials and were attached to walls. Even for those of us who don’t remember, the world is full of change.

At present anything to do with computers is still “new” — at least in the legal realm. Authors write books on “Internet and law” or “Computers and law” as if they were discrete subjects. If it were not for the newness of the subject, this would make no more sense than “books and the law” or “human existence and the law.” At some point legal research via computerized tools will become the norm, and we will no longer need to bring out in subject headings that computerized tools are used, just as we no longer need to bring out that printed books are being used for our research (though a library in the 15th century might have considered that to be significant). At some point contracts that exist as data files encrypted by secure electronic signatures will be considered normal, and written contracts will be considered quaint, along with oral contracts attested to by witnesses or contracts bearing a wax seal impressed by signet rings.

Compared to other librarians, law subject catalogers have to deal with those changes in unique ways since the legal community is unusually conservative by nature. We are in a profession based on deliberate use of anachronisms. Anglo-American lawyers claim to be medieval squires while “Civil” lawyers pretend to think like they are wearing togas. Law, almost by definition, extrapolates from a known paradigm to cover a new situation. Environmental law has its roots in the regulation of tanneries. Labor law was once the law of “Master and servant” (emphasis was on the former). All of the laws on using the internet for commercial transaction (“Electronic commerce—Law and legislation”) had their origin in the laws governing non-electronic means of engaging in commerce (“Commercial law”). Litigation on the status of web domains deal with legal principles derived from the law of heraldry and paternalistic medieval trade policy.

Following the usual way we catalogers deal with controversy, we will follow whatever the authors do (what in polite company is called “literary warrant”). If they say they are writing a book on “Electronic commerce” or on “computerized” legal research, we will probably respect their judgment and await the day when the editor at the sole surviving law publisher tells the author that he/she is revealing their age, since all commerce (or research, or contracts, or signatures) is electronic.

Of course we can look to what authors use in their title and base subject headings on the latest “buzz words”. Unfortunately, legal terminology is no less susceptible to the whims of fashion than that of any other field, though the fashions vary. Isn’t “Information superhighway—Law and legislation” a really meaningful heading? Does anyone talk like that anymore? It is interesting to note that during the last two years, most of the books cataloged by the Library of Congress with “Information superhighway” in the title have been law books, suggesting that the phrase is still used by lawyers but not by anyone else anymore.

Computer subject headings meander quickly, much faster than (to choose another LCSH fiasco) a Colored can turn into an Afro-American and into an African American, while never being Black. When first established as a subject heading by law catalogers “Data protection” was an inherently legal heading based on the European “Datenschutz” dealing with privacy and access, and having a strong civil rights flavor to it—and dating back 30 years (before the “net” and the PC, i.e. before modern civilization). By the 1990s, in English, data protection began to include things like making backups and not playing with magnets while computing, and the heading was kidnapped by the computer science catalogers, necessitating establishing “Data protection—Law and legislation” with a reference structure indicating it isn’t the legal aspects of what had become a computer science heading.

Some specific headings have evolved in an interesting way. At one time “Information storage and retrieval systems” were a generic term for any sort of computerized gizmo (and “artificial intelligence” was one of the less believable ideas among science fiction writers). The subject heading “Information storage and retrieval systems—Law” now refers to...
large data base systems, but is no longer being used for any computerized system. Two subject subdivisions have evolved “Automation” and “Data processing”, with the later suggesting a process than can be automated (e.g. judicial decision making, law office management), whereas virtually any legal heading can take “Data processing”. Of course the automation of any system depends on data processing, and the computerized processing of data by definition is based on automation. If normal hierarchal rules applied, they might be “related terms” but probably one would be “used for” for the other.

Some terms become broader over time. “Telematics” is defined as “computer assisted communications” which at this point includes virtually all communications other than penmanship or human speech. It might be a great “broadest” term for many books on the “techie” side of computer law (since it doesn’t involve content). The term is used in European law books, and by non-lawyers, but hasn’t made it into the titles of American law books in a big way. At this point “internet” seems to be merging with “telematics,” though “internet” includes discussion of the content whereas “telematics” implies just the technical vehicle. “Computer networks” once meant bunches of computers working together, but today most computers are networked, and at the same time all communications networks are computerized.

“Smart cards” shows the problem in reverse. Originally they were add-ons to computers that had built-in programmable elements (able to process data independent of the host computer), but increasingly one sees the term used as an overall “catch all” for hand-held “money” cards such as stored-value, debit or credit cards. From a legal perspective these are all different beasts: credit cards are loans, debit cards are an alternative to paper checks, stored-value cards are bearer instruments but to a real person these cards are often indistinguishable (except for a techie who thinks that smart cards are toys to insert into the back of a computer). At LC, the business catalogers use the term one way and the computer catalogers use it another way, and for the most part, law catalogers try to avoid using it.

This is probably a “lose-lose” situations for law catalogers. The legal profession is based on creative anachronism and applies ancient rules to ultra-modern problems, so we’re stuck translating for Tudor and Claudian wannabees trying to explain things to a world run by geeks and nerds.

BASIC stands for Book and Serial Industry Communications, a standards forum of the Book Industry Study Group (BISG), which is supported by publishers, librarians, booksellers, wholesalers, book manufacturers and book suppliers. For over 25 years, these industry parties have worked to develop standards which would facilitate computer-to-computer ordering and fulfillment. Four years ago, BISAC and SISAC (the Book and the Serial Industry Systems Advisory Committees) merged to form BASIC. AALL had sent a liaison to SISAC and continues to send one to BASIC. As the current BASIC liaison, I plan to share developments with you and to represent the needs of the law community to BASIC.

BASIC is involved with formats for electronic data interchange (EDI), used in electronic ordering and claiming. Is your library using electronic ordering or claiming? Do you need to send additional data that you can’t send now?

SISAC helped develop the NISO standard Z39.56-1996, the Serial Item and Contribution Identifier (SICI). It is a character string — based on the ISSN — which can identify a particular issue and article of a serial. It can also be expressed as a barcode, to facilitate automated checkin. The SISAC bar code standard is due for its five-year review; SISAC will review it and provide input to NISO. Unfortunately, SISAC bar codes have not generally appeared on law serials. The obvious barrier is the lack of ISSNs. How can we improve this, to facilitate automated serials checkin?

In association with other international groups, BISG maintains the Online Information Exchange standard (ONIX) in the United States. In other words, BISG is involved with developing changes to the standard with input from appropriate parties. ONIX refers to an XML format in which publishers distribute electronic information about their publications to wholesale, retail and e-tail booksellers. ONIX contains not only bibliographic information long familiar to libraries (metadata), but also tables of contents, pictures of book jackets, reviews, information about
authors, and purchasing information. The format was originally developed to provide data to electronic retailers such as Amazon.com. Library patrons seemed to respond to Amazon’s catalog, so some library system vendors are now offering similar enrichment for opacs. If your law library is using an opac that provides this kind of information, does it work for the law titles? Is there any ONIX data out there, for us? Can the ONIX data be matched effectively to our bibliographic records?

Currently, ONIX formats are being developed for serials, which could perform alerting functions, such as when an issue has been mailed or when an e-journal issue has been posted. This should allow us to claim missed issues promptly, and lessen premature claims. Like ONIX for books, ONIX for serials could carry tables of contents.

One of the most visible changes that BASIC is involved with is the proposed expansion of the ISBN. The need to accommodate vast numbers and kinds of electronic publications is driving this expansion. All our library systems will eventually have to accommodate this longer number.

Since many of us live with automated library systems, we know that we are affected by bibliographic standards. Here is another group of standards that, less visibly, affect the way we operate. Let’s get involved with their development, so they can accommodate the needs of law libraries.

---

2002 OBS Membership Survey Results

Mary Jane Kelsey,
OBS Vice Chair/Chair Elect

Summary:
I received 51 responses which isn’t a great sample, but I think it gives us some indication of what interests OBS members and what they expect OBS to contribute to their professional lives. Considering the small size of the sample, it’s not very meaningful to report percentages. However, generalizing from the responses it is clear that respondents find that OBS programs, TSLL and MARBI representation are highly relevant to their jobs. The Joint Reception at AALL is also very popular with members.

Website:
Respondents responded to what they liked about the Website (a tribute to Web Advisory Committee, Maria Okonsa former Chair and Anne Myers, Interim Chair.) Respondents also shared a number of thoughtful suggestions for improvements.

LIKE
* well organized
* uncluttered and direct access to information resources
* clearly laid out, easy to negotiate, minimum load time
* it brings together many useful resources under one umbrella
* everything
* lots of links
* neat, easy-to-navigate design
* clear, precise, to the point
* TSLL available in HTML format for quick retrieval
* I really like everything about the site. It’s greatly improved, easy to read and navigate. I wouldn’t change anything. OBS has done a great job!
* concise and easy to use format
* easy to find information about the section; well organized
* I like the fact that information is easily accessible
* clean design—very straightforward
* good organization, clarity, MARBI info
* clear layout
* it is updated frequently now and people work to make it even more useful. This survey is the best design to date
* clean design, easy navigation
* well organized and contains relevant information
* everything
* it all looks worthwhile
* user friendly approach

CHANGE
* want more timely news
* specify background color so that it does not default to my Windows system colors
* change colors—blue and white are depressing
* add a site map, so that I can see what is under each category
* make TSLL searchable (full text)
* don’t change anything
* right now change nothing, I can find what I need
* would be useful to have links to and from the Research Grants and Workshops
* I wouldn’t exactly change anything, but I would continue to have committees discussing the design
of the site and the needs of the membership. Out of that work would come change

★ perhaps more educational content for the membership on automation or internet issues. This would be a way of supplementing TSLL. We could introduce issues in the quarterly columns and then have a forum on the website to further more in depth information

★ maybe the design could be updated a bit. More importantly, could there be some sort of hot topics section that might spark discussion between annual meetings? A link could be sent from and email message that would go to the membership. That would also remind us about the page. It’s easy for some of us to forget it’s there

★ change nothing

★ There needs to be a link to it from the AALL sections page. Last time I looked there was not one (nor for TS/SIS) some tutorial programs in the OBS web page

Programming

Minneapolis OBS programs

More respondents DIDN’T attend than did notwithstanding the fact that programs ranked as very relevant to their jobs. The reason is unclear—possibly the respondents didn’t come to Minneapolis at all (I didn’t ask that question) or other programming or meetings competed for their time and interest.

For the Orlando meeting, roughly 2/3 of the respondents plan to attend the OBS sponsored programs. All of the programs were ranked very relevant. So, we’re on the right track.

Potential Seattle programs in order of popularity

★ Update on implementation of integrating resource application for bibliographic utilities and local systems

★ Leadership in technical services: librarians who have experimented with new systems and products

★ Is the end of MARC near? Is XML the successor?

★ Managing knowledge assets with tools like JAKE, SFX, Serials Solutions, Innovative’s MAP, etc.

★ How to stay current on the technological front. Survey of the issues and resources for study

★ Technology training— how to get your staff up to speed. Methods and techniques. This was tied with Ø

★ How to reach the modern law student and make the library the place they think of to get a question answered

[A note: The Education Committee has begun to meet via email to start the process of developing these ideas into program proposals, TSLL articles, or informal round tables or poster sessions during the slots given to us for some of our committee meetings. Please contact any of the members with your thoughts.]

Education Committee:

Cindi Buhi <CindyB3@atg.wa.gov>; Kevin Butterfield <butterfi@law.uiuc.edu>; Pat Callahan <pcallaha@law.upenn.edu>; Susan Chinoransky <schinoransky@burns.nlc.gwu.edu>; Cindy Cicco <cicco@law.pitt.edu>; Ruth Patterson Funabiki <funabiki@uidaho.edu>; Ismael Gullon <gullon_j@mercer.edu> Janet Ann Hedin <hedinj@law.msu.edu>; Richard Jost <rmjost@u.washington.edu>; Mary Jane Kelsey <mary.jane.kelsey@yale.edu>, Chair; Ellen McGrath <emcgrath@acsu.buffalo.edu>; Catlin Robinson <caitlin-robinson@uiowa.edu>; Mary M. Strouse <strouse@law.edu>

TSLL Columns

The columns rated most relevant (3) are listed here in order by the number of “3” responses.

CLASSIFICATION
DESC & ENTRY
MARC
SUBJECT HEADINGS
SERIALS
OCLC
MISS MANAGER
INTERNET
ACQ
COLLDEV
RLIN
RESEARCH & PUB
PRESERVATION

Volunteerism

It is gratifying that OBS members are willing to contribute their time to running our SIS — 6 volunteered to run for office and 24 offered to work on one or more committees.
I received 102 responses. With 614 members of TS, that’s a 16.6% response rate, which is a fairly good rate as these things go. 100 people responded online, and 2 by fax. For the first time, surveys were distributed only via the TS website, and that seemed to work well. Thanks very much to Martin Wisneski, who put the survey up on the web.

The first questions dealt with programs at the annual meetings. As programs ranked second highest of all the section’s activities, we know programs are important to our membership. Below I have listed the Minneapolis programs by the most relevance points they received. Respondents ranked them on a scale of 1 (not relevant) to 3 (very relevant). The ranking is partially, but not completely, a function of how many people attended the program — if every respondent had attended a program and given it a 3, it would have scored 306. A less-well-attended but highly relevant program could outscore a well-attended, but less relevant program.

Revising Rules to Reflect the New Reality: Changing the Definition of Serials in AACR2: 154
Implementing the MARC 21 Format for Holdings Data: The New Frontier in Technical Services: 141
New Roles for Catalogers: Subject Access to the Web: 114
Cataloger’s Dilemma: When and How to Use Law Uniform Titles: 108
Everything Old is New Again: Second (or Third) Generation System Migration (OBS-SIS co-sponsor): 72
Workshop: Managing Technical Services: 70
What You Don’t Know Can Hurt You: Essential Technical Services Knowledge for Public Services Librarians: 61

These are the ranking for the upcoming Orlando programs (again, the highest possible ranking would be 306):
Publication Patterns: Creating Connections in the Serials World: 180
How to Avoid ‘Search Reopened’ and Hire the Right Technical Services Candidate the First Time Around?: 158
Connecting with a Law Publisher by a Licensing Agreement? What am I Supposed to Do?: 133
What I Learned about Preservation from Visits to 30 Law Libraries and How it Applies to You: 115

These are the rankings from the programs proposed for Seattle (2003): Highest possible ranking would be 306.

A program on management issues: 233
A one or two day workshop on serials cataloging, offered in conjunction with the Program for Cooperative Cataloging’s Serials Cataloguing Cooperative Training Program (See http://lcweb.loc.gov/acq/conserv/scctp/schedule.html for details): 219
Basic: 13 Advanced: 59
A program on applying subject headings: 208
A program on the application of the new religious law schedules: 199
A one or two day workshop on serial MARC holdings: 196
People are interested in programs on management issues, on new developments that will affect how we do our jobs, and in practical programs on parts of our job that are a little tricky. Clearly, a lot of us are catalogers, so we should remember, in looking at these numbers, that numbers aren’t everything. If a preservation program is ranked lower, it isn’t necessarily less important, just important to fewer people.

The next section of the survey queried respondents on how relevant they rated certain TS-SIS activities. The highest possible score in this section would be a 3.

Technical Service Law Librarian (quarterly newsletter): 2.82
TS-SIS sponsored educational programs at AALL annual meeting: 2.61
TS-SIS Electronic list: 2.42
TS-SIS sponsored and cosponsored Official Representatives to CC:DA, SAC, MARBI, BASIC Committees: 2.41
TS-SIS sponsored educational workshops preceding annual meeting: 2.35
TS-SIS Website: 2.30
Joint Reception at AALL Annual Meeting: 2.20
Rene Chapman Award for Outstanding Contributions in Technical Services Law Librarianship: 2.17
TS-SIS/HQ sponsored continuing education workshops given around the country, not in conjunction with annual meeting: 2.16
Distance learning is a great idea, but what kind of support can we expect from AALL to fund the technology and development? It’s a lot to expect as a volunteer effort initiated by SIS members and exceeds the skill level of most of us to design.

With the emphasis on training, I think we may need to reorganize our committees to some extent. At the moment, the Education Committee works primarily on programs. Perhaps someone should be trying to develop a long-term education strategy? On the order of the beginning, intermediate, and advanced cataloging programs offered in sequence. Perhaps other educational workshops have the same set of requirements. (Serials, for example.)

We asked people to give advice and comment on the strategic plan. The plan is available on the TS website at: <http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/strategic/draft/index.htm>. The goals were listed as:

1. Broad-based training,
2. Professional networking, and
3. Securing the acquisition and preservation of information resources.

Comments included:

I think that the training programs around the country coupled with the Ed grant is an excellent way to accomplish #1 (as well as #2 to some extent). Another idea is to sponsor more limited duration electronic discussion lists (e.g. like the TS in the 21st century discussion)

I think the web-based clearinghouse (networking, strategy 3) is a fantastic idea. I would be willing to do a fair amount of grunt work for this and similar projects.

What TS is doing now is definitely needed and worthwhile. What I need as a head of technical services in a larger law library in which I don’t do cataloging any longer and am involved in acquisitions only to some extent is not often addressed, though. I need to be able to talk with people about overall workflow issues. I’ll think more about this and try to expand on it at some point. While specifics about cataloging rules, MARC formats, etc. are very important, they aren’t what I need. Does the TS Education Committee ever look at the programs offered by ALA?

Distance learning is a great idea, but what kind of support can we expect from AALL to fund the technology and development? It’s a lot to expect as a volunteer effort initiated by SIS members and exceeds the skill level of most of us to design.

With the emphasis on training, I think we may need to reorganize our committees to some extent. At the moment, the Education Committee works primarily on programs. Perhaps someone should be trying to develop a long-term education strategy? On the order of the beginning, intermediate, and advanced cataloging programs offered in sequence. Perhaps other educational workshops have the same set of requirements. (Serials, for example.)

We asked people to give advice and comment on the strategic plan. The plan is available on the TS website at: <http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/strategic/draft/index.htm>. The goals were listed as:

1. Broad-based training,
2. Professional networking, and
3. Securing the acquisition and preservation of information resources.

Comments included:

I think that the training programs around the country coupled with the Ed grant is an excellent way to accomplish #1 (as well as #2 to some extent). Another idea is to sponsor more limited duration electronic discussion lists (e.g. like the TS in the 21st century discussion)

I think the web-based clearinghouse (networking, strategy 3) is a fantastic idea. I would be willing to do a fair amount of grunt work for this and similar projects.

What TS is doing now is definitely needed and worthwhile. What I need as a head of technical services in a larger law library in which I don’t do cataloging any longer and am involved in acquisitions only to some extent is not often addressed, though. I need to be able to talk with people about overall workflow issues. I’ll think more about this and try to expand on it at some point. While specifics about cataloging rules, MARC formats, etc. are very important, they aren’t what I need. Does the TS Education Committee ever look at the programs offered by ALA?
* Continue to consider the various levels of experience within the SIS when planning education programs. As there is increased use of online catalogs, think about annual meeting programs and TSLL articles covering this area.

* Again, I benefit from the information you share, but cannot attend meetings or contribute myself. Thank you.

* I am a senior librarian. Most of the programs, etc., are too basic and just don’t interest me. I would be interested in more opportunities for meeting with my colleagues who are at a more advanced level.

* TS-SIS is a great group. The electronic list is a tool that relieves the sense of isolation that many law catalogers experience. Law cataloging is different, and the list shows us that two (or many) heads are better than one.

* Offer more training workshops at annual AALL meetings

* I think TS-SIS does a great job keeping us informed and providing representatives on the various national and international committees

* What ever happened to the management committee idea? I attended a preliminary meeting in Minneapolis and haven’t seen anything on the listserv nor been contacted. I thought it was a great idea; heads of tech services aren’t really being served in the SIS [Editor’s note: There will be a Management Roundtable in Orlando.]

* Continue to work hard to get cataloging programs accepted at the annual meeting.

* Continue practical programs and workshops at AALL. Revisit important and challenging topics periodically. Use TSLL and our list to explain/discuss issues and developments. And, again, thank you.

* I want TS SIS to lobby the AALL Board for a change in how our program selection and scheduling, and our committee meeting scheduling, is done. I want us to be able to choose our own programs without needing approval or coordination with a general program committee. I want us to be able to schedule committee meetings in regular 8-5 program times lots, not just before or after program time slots. I want AALL to abandon its no conflict rule that prohibits us from being able to hold important discussion groups or committee meetings opposite programs that have nothing to do with us. I want the 7:00 am committee time slot banned. We need to look at the ALA ALCTS model to create a more flexible situation for our training needs in Tech Services.

* I’m thoroughly frustrated right now at the fact that no program on AACR2 revision was planned for Orlando.

* I wonder how many Tech Services and technical people attend AALL? Is there information about that? Do these AALL members attend OTHER conferences instead? What is the ratio of tech services and technical programs to public service-related topics, and how does this compare to the ratio of technical and tech services attendees?

* The speed of changes in today’s technology doesn’t allow leisurely program planning. ALA’s LITA recognizes this, and is very flexible about program planning schedules. It is possible to plan a LITA program in a six-month time frame. AALL should find a way to allow for this, beyond the single “hot-topics” program.

Volunteerism:

Forty-four respondents offered to serve as a TS officer or committee member.

All in all, it seems that TS-SIS is doing a good job of meeting the needs of its members. TSLL is our most important service, and many members who are unable to come to meeting expressed their appreciation for it. Programs at the annual meeting are also very important. Members would like more management programs, more programs on hot topics, and more flexibility in scheduling programs and meetings. We also got valuable feedback on the strategic plan.

Thanks to everyone who participated!

Christina Tarr
Vice Chair, TS-SIS
Tarrc@law.berkeley.edu
5. Why should OBS or TS members attend the annual meetings of AALL?

The Annual Meeting provides a great opportunity to attend (and develop) educational programs; to have face-to-face committee meetings; visit with vendors and see new products; and to interact informally with colleagues from near and far. And at the Seattle Annual Meeting there will be an opportunity to develop and/or attend new 30-minute educational programs. All of these activities constitute learning opportunities that are more closely related to our work as law librarians than any other experience and are essential for broadening our horizons beyond the daily work that we do and the professional reading we try to squeeze into our busy lives. Besides, it’s a great opportunity to learn new ways to maximize our potential and contemplate/anticipate the future. (Need I mention how much fun it is?)

8. What kind of help would you like to get from your OBS and TS colleagues during your presidency?

Everyone benefits from fresh ideas and the willingness to pursue them. Of course I really appreciate positive and enthusiastic responses and support and look forward to a great turnout for the Annual Meeting and other AALL educational programs (as well as proposing and fulfilling those programs.) Also, support for CRIV, the Price Index, and Government Relations committees at the chapter level are just a few of the areas where Technical Services librarians can make a special contribution.

9. What have been some of your favorite or most memorable experiences in AALL?

I developed lasting friendships at the Basic Cataloging Institute in 1985, which preceded my first Annual Meeting. Since then I have always enjoyed the challenge of attending programs and committee meetings by day, and Dance SIS meetings by night.

10. TSLL’s interview with Margie Axtmann revealed a predilection for chocolate on her part. Do you have any particular craving we can exploit to influence you?

I prefer nuts in my chocolate.
I would like to take this opportunity at the end of the volume to inform our readers of several important developments and to relate a few interesting facts.

On the development side, I am pleased to announce that we have two new columnists: George Prager will be writing our “Description and Entry” column, and Margaret Maes Axtmann will be handling “Collection Development.” [See their introductory comments on page 9.] These slots have been empty for some time, and we are looking forward to having those areas covered once again. Also, Regina Wallen has stepped down as one of the “Classification” co-columnists and will be replaced by Beth Holmes; and Aaron Kupperman’s efforts as “Subject Headings” columnist will be shared with a new co-columnist, Elisha Schwartz. We welcome the new members and say good-bye to our departing friends with gratitude for work well done.

Another development is a potential change in the “Structures and Policies” document of TSLL. If you are surprised to learn that TSLL has formal structures and policies, I expect that you are not alone. But, indeed, they exist and they have been in effect (if not always adhered to) since 1989. During the past several months, I have been reviewing them and coming up with some recommendations for changes. These recommendations will be discussed by the TSLL board and then submitted to the OBS and TS Chairs and Vice Chairs for their action.

Also of interest to TSLL readers is one of the grants from the OBS/TS Joint Research Grant Committee. Brian Striman, chair of that committee, offers an interim progress report for the TSLL Indexing Project:

“Susan Goldner and Lorraine Lorne were awarded a grant from the OBS/TS Joint Research Grant last year so they could purchase software to enable them to index the TSLL. After looking at some software programs, they chose SYDEX, and then have done research on indexing and guidelines from NISO, as well as examining various thesauri for the project. They expect to request an extension on the grant deadline and will write a full interim report for appropriate Orlando business meeting reports.”

Now for the interesting facts:

Fact One: I have the easy job around here. Think about it. There are columnists who write all kinds of interesting and useful content, and there are other people who contribute timely and pertinent articles. They send them to me. I send them to Linda Tesar, who makes them look beautiful; she sends them to Cindy May, who prints them and mails them, and who takes care of subscriptions and costs; and then Martin Wisneski transforms them into perfectly integrated Web versions.

Fact Two: I know I have the easy part, and I am extremely grateful to all the people who do the hard parts: the columnists, the contributors, the rest of the TSLL staff. I would also like to thank OBS Chair Ismael Gullon and TS Chair JoAnn Houshell. They have been a pleasure to work with and have been very helpful in keeping the information from the two SISes flowing in. I look forward to working with Mary Jane Kelsey and Christina Tarr in the upcoming volume of TSLL.

We have collected a gaggle of reporters to cover the OBS and TS sessions at the annual meeting. All of you who have agreed to cover a meeting, please remember that I would like to receive your reports and/or minutes by the next TSLL deadline (August 15.) I hope to see many of you in Orlando.

Thanks for the feedback I’ve received during my first year as editor. I enjoy hearing from you. Please contact me with any questions, comments, or ideas for pieces.

- Joe Thomas
A message from the AALL Mentoring Committee

Are you contemplating a career change and need advice? Do you have a wealth of experience that you would like to share with others? Would you like to increase your networking opportunities? Do you feel uncertain about attending your first AALL conference? Would you like an opportunity to give back to the law librarian community? If these thoughts sound familiar then the Mentoring Committee encourages you to participate in the 2002 Mentoring Project as either a mentor or mentee.

The purpose of the Mentor Project is three-fold: to provide an informal, personal source of information for newer members; to provide an avenue by which experienced law librarians may meet promising new members of the profession; and to provide a network for members who are contemplating a move to another type of library.

The Mentor Project is open to librarians from all types of libraries. Each participant will be assigned to a member whose profile matches, as closely as possible, his or her request. Applications will be reviewed by the Committee on Mentoring, Retention, and CONELL, which includes representatives from a wide range of employer categories.

If you are interested in participating, please visit our website at <http://www.aallnet.org/committee/mentoring/mentor_project.html> and submit your mentor or mentee application by June 1, 2002, but interested mentors and mentees can submit applications after that up until July 1 and we will try to match applicants if we are able. Please also take a moment to review our selection of articles and tips on mentoring. We look forward to hearing from you.