Two Fortnights in Sheffield: Report on a Law Librarian Exchange

Cindy May
University of Wisconsin—Madison
cmay@facstaff.wisc.edu

In October and November of 2002 I had the golden opportunity to live and work in Sheffield, England, on a "professional development attachment" to the Crookesmoor Library, the law library of the University of Sheffield. This article recounts my experience there and some of the ideas I've brought home. I begin with a little background on the exchange program and on the city of Sheffield itself. Secondly, I give a brief overview of legal education in England and describe the three law libraries I visited. I then highlight the major differences I noted between those three libraries and my own. Next, I summarize what I learned about online catalogs, budget issues, and interlibrary cooperation in the Sheffield area. Finally, I examine the value of this experience both for me and for my institution.

How It All Started

Steve Barkan, University of Wisconsin Law Library Director, visited the University of Sheffield in summer 2001 to set up a law student exchange program. While he was there, Steve met Sheffield’s library director, Michael Hannon. The two of them began to explore the idea of a law library staff exchange between our universities, and their discussion quickly came to fruition when Sheffield’s Academic Liaison Librarian for law and education, Maria Mawson, came to Madison for four weeks in the spring of 2002. My visit to Sheffield in the fall was Wisconsin’s reciprocal half of this first exchange.

Sheffield

Sheffield is a picturesque city just on the eastern edge of the Peak District National Park, probably best known to the American public as the setting for “The Full Monty.” The city has moved well beyond its industrial revolution steel town image, with lots of green space and beautiful public buildings. The people I met there were incredibly friendly, and their hospitality more than made up for the rainy fall weather.

Legal Education

In England, law is an undergraduate major. After graduation, students may opt to continue their education at a vocational law school to prepare themselves for a career in law. England retains the distinction between
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Things in technical services seem to be chugging along smoothly. We’ve assembled a great selection of programs for Seattle, including a workshop on advanced cataloging that was proposed by the Professional Development Committee. We will have more specific information coming out in the June issue of TSLL, but the detailed list is up on the TS website. Check it and see <http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/annualmeeting/2003/>. There are many reasons to come to Seattle this summer! Many thanks to the hardworking Education Committee, chaired by Kathy Winzer, for coming up with so many great programs. Gary Vander Meer has already selected the new chair of the Education Committee, Jean Pajerek. It’s not too early to start thinking about programs for Boston, and it’s not too early to start talking to Jean about what you’re thinking about!

You may also notice that there will be programs until late on Wednesday afternoon. Carol Avery Nicholson had the clever idea of scheduling a number of 30-minute programs on Wednesday. This gave us the opportunity to schedule some nice, short programs on to-the-point topics, but it does mean that for us to benefit from these programs, we’re going to have to stay in Seattle through Wednesday.

By the time you read this, Gary Vander Meer will have tabulated the annual membership survey. One of the questions concerned whether we would be willing to stay later to ease the problem of too many meetings at the same time at the Annual Meeting. One option is for us to make use of the meeting time on Wednesday. We’ve also been working, through the SIS council, on various plans to free up some other times for our meetings, for instance by scheduling meetings against programs. The SIS council presented a response to the Annual Meeting Educational Programming Special Committee’s report that advocated just this. We have yet to hear exactly what will happen, but remain hopeful.

In other news, the Nominations Committee, chaired by Alva Stone, has assembled a terrific slate for the upcoming election. The Awards Committee, chaired by Elizabeth Geesey Holmes, is soliciting nominations for the Chapman award. And we’ve got some great new content (well, as of November) on the TS website, where Pat Turpening has assembled a list of useful preservation resources, and Andrea Rabbia has done the same for Serials.

Happy Spring, and see you in Seattle.

Christina Tarr
ttarr@library.berkeley.edu

Keeping Up Is Hard To Do... Unless You're Connected

Our professional lives are full of the acronyms of technology and standards that were the province of the ultra specialists just yesterday — XML, Z39.50, open URL, FRBR to name a few. Most of us operate in environments where decisions proceed at less than the same lightening speed. So, we are constantly balancing our daily working lives with the effort of understanding the visionaries and what the alphabet soup might do for our online bibliographic systems. In short, we’re on a continual quest for the best service to our users and it’s no easy feat. I have been fortunate in my career to connect with the knowledgeable members of OBS who are unfailingly generous in helping me understand new concepts and systems. I have been able to connect informally by phone and email and formally through TSLL and OBS sponsored and co-sponsored programs. Education is a major aspect of the OBS mission and strategic planning. OBS programs have been a major part of my continuing education. The Education Committee has convened to act on developing the programs for Boston that were preferred by the respondents to the annual survey. (A summary will be found in this issue. Thanks to Kevin Butterfield for...
taking charge of the survey and to all who responded.) I encourage OBS members who have expertise in those areas of popular interest to get involved in the program planning—as consultants, as speakers, or as coordinators. Let’s continue to stay connected.

And the Nominees Are…

I am very pleased to report that the Nominations Committee, Ellen McGrath, Chair with Susan Chinoransky, Anna Belle Leiserson has assembled an outstanding slate for this year’s election.

Vic-Chair/Chair-Elect:
Georgia Briscoe
University of Colorado Law Library

Naomi Goodman
Valparaiso University Law Library

Secretary/Treasurer:
Michael Maben
Indiana University School of Law Library

Barbara Szalkowski, The Fred Parks Law Library, South Texas College of Law

Member-at-Large:
Julianna Davis
University of Mississippi Law Library

Andrea Rabbia
H. Douglas Barclay Law Library, Syracuse University College of Law

The OBS Board is grateful to all of our candidates for their enthusiastic support of OBS and their willingness to contribute their time so that OBS will continue to Communicate, Educate and Connect. Candidates’ information will be available on the OBS website

OBS Contributes to George A. Strait Minority Scholarship

OBS has answered ALL SIS’s call for SIS contribution to the George A. Strait Minority Scholarship. (<Full scholarship details can be found at http://www.aallnet.org/services/strait-br.asp>)
West contributed $150,000 in 2001 to endow the George A. Strait Minority Scholarship with the understanding that AALL would raise another $100,000 for the endowment. While OBS’s contribution is a modest $200 this represents 12% of our current funds and also represents the Board’s endorsement of this worthy fund raising effort. Please consider making a personal donation.

Mary Jane Kelsey
mary.jane.kelsey@yale.edu

A Conversation about Faculty Rush Orders

The Acquisitions Column for this issue was written by guest columnists Kristina Mengeling, Acquisitions Librarian, and Mark Bartlett, Head of Technical Services, of Arizona State University, Ross-Blakley Law Library.

The scene: Tempe, Arizona. Arizona State University, Ross-Blakley Law Library, Room 109-A.

The players: The head of technical services (Mark) and the acquisitions librarian (Kris) sit down for their bimonthly Tuesday a.m. meeting.

The time: It’s a new year, a good time to both reflect and to look ahead. Your players are three years (Mark) and two years (Kris) into their current positions.

Mark: I think we should go over faculty-request rush orders again. What types of titles are we being asked to order?

Kris: I get a lot of standard, in-print monograph requests. I find those are easy to fill. I also get requests for not-yet-published books, out-of-print books, single issues of law reviews and periodicals, and some other things like government agency reports, conference proceedings, and Indian tribal codes.

Mark: That sounds about right. Do you remember the faculty order question we asked you in the interview?

Kris: Was that the one about expediting faculty requests? I think it was one of those long, hypothetical questions.

Mark: The committee loved that, the hot seat question! I think one part of it was “how fast do you think is reasonable for the library to get in a faculty-requested book?”

Kris: Oh, I remember that. I said “next-day air turnaround time” and your faces all lit up. I figured I’d said something right!

Mark: You did. We asked the same questions of all the interviewees and the answers were all over the place…to say the least. One person said, “Oh, well, maybe 4-6 weeks”. BZZZZTTT, WRONG ANSWER!

Kris: When it’s an in-print monograph title, it’s generally easy to fill using an online web source. I order from them rather than rely on our regular monograph vendors. The turnaround time is usually a matter of days. I can track the order online and sometimes the book lists with a 20-30% discount.

Dick Vaughan
Indiana University-Bloomington
rvaughan@indiana.edu
The library credit card sure helps to rush these orders.

Mark: I ran a filled faculty rush orders report at the end of the calendar year. It’s a good thing we code the Innopac order record with the “R” rush order note! I see you’re using either Amazon <www.amazon.com> or Barnes & Noble <www.bn.com> most of the time.

Kris: Amazon is the first place I check when I get a faculty request. When they state “usually ships in 24 hours”, that word “usually” is the great disclaimer. I think it means they don’t have a copy on the shelf, and it’ll take some extra time for them to get a copy and ship it to our library.

Mark: So how is B & N different, then? What are they good for?

Kris: I’ve found they have the more esoteric, scholarly publications and their website actually states what’s in stock at the time. They also have a 1-800 phone number — it’s possible to speak to a human there! I’ve also used Amazon UK <www.amazon.co.uk> for British imprints. It’s worked well.

Mark: And what about those not-yet-published books? Are you still getting these as faculty requests?

Kris: Yes. I think the professors are finding titles listed on the web and in publisher catalogs, even though the book hasn’t been printed yet! I order these directly from the publisher and then I can monitor the availability there. Most of them have websites up.

Mark: Are you still getting some rush orders for out-of-print titles?

Kris: Yes. I’m using a few different web vendors for these — Alibris <www.alibris.com> and Abebooks <www.abebooks.com> are the main ones. I’ve had good results there. Normally I use the library credit card to expedite the order and often I’m in touch with the bookseller directly.

Mark: Okay, I know we’ve had some trouble with single issue periodical and law review orders. How are we doing these now?

Kris: I think we’re getting better at them. It’s always been a hard type of order to fill. Remember when we looked at that three-year Innopac report you ran, the order versus receipt/fill date for the single-issue orders? The time ranged from four days to four months.

Mark: Don’t remind me – it wasn’t very pretty at all!

Kris: That’s for sure. The new faculty single-issue order workflow we finalized this past fall term should improve the situation a lot. I hope we can fill these single issues in two to ten days.

Mark: That sounds good. Refresh my memory... what about that email poll you did with the TS-SIS and LAW-ACQ listservs last term? Any useful responses?

Kris: There were sympathetic ears. I liked this response: “Our library is in the same exact situation as you. Our faculty expect the same turnaround with individual periodical issues, as with the monographs... my practice is to call our periodical vendor and see if the issue is in stock. If it is not in stock there, I call the law review directly. Some of the law reviews have been great and sent stuff next day while others never return phone calls.”

Mark: It sounds like their practice is what we’ve started to do. Didn’t one of the responders say her library doesn’t buy single issues for law faculty, no exceptions?

Kris: Yes, that’s right, but we raised the bar here a long time ago and generally give the faculty what they want. That includes single issues of law reviews and periodicals.

Mark: It’s part of the overall faculty services the library provides. We only get ten or twenty of these orders a year, but each and every one is important!

Kris: Another person said she uses back-run vendors like Alfred Jaeger <http://www.ajaeger.com/> and she’s happy with the turnaround time. Another told me about the non-profit United States Book Exchange <http://www.usbe.com/> and Needs and Offers listserv. I’ll take a closer look at these and see if they are useful.

Mark: Sounds good. What are some of the more esoteric and difficult titles you’re ordering for faculty?

Kris: I’ve had other orders for small press European books, agency reports, conference proceedings, and of course, the Indian tribal codes for Arizona. I order all of these directly.

Mark: What types of problems do you have?
KB, the schedule for religious systems, is closer to completion. The Jewish law, Islamic law and general and comparative religious law schedules are being applied by the catalogers at the Library of Congress. Many proper names and titles have been added to the Jewish and Islamic schedules. Form tables have been added to the canon law schedules. KBX is for some of the smaller religious systems and is still being drafted. All of the 5 religious law schedules will form one volume and will go to the printer in the spring or summer. What has been written is currently available on ClassWeb. Many thanks to Jolande Goldberg for the above information.

Court reports and administrative decisions seem to present problems for a few classifiers and I have mentioned some problems in previous columns. Many of the law schedules have a section in the front of the schedule following laws and codes for court decisions. In some schedules, the type of court is mentioned and in some the name of the court is given, e.g., KF105 lower courts and KNS18.5 Supreme Court of India. These are numbers for decisions of these courts and not for works about the courts. Works about the courts class in either civil procedure, constitutional law, or criminal procedure, depending on the emphasis. The court decision numbers in the front of the schedule are for works containing all types of decisions. If the work just contained criminal law decisions, it would class in the court decisions section of criminal law. Administrative decisions class with the topic being decided not in the number for the agency itself. One needs to watch cataloging copy, especially for serials, to make sure the proper numbers are being assigned. As more law call numbers for serials are being assigned by catalogers not on the Law Team at the Library of Congress, some of the expertise in law classification is being lost.

Please let me know if there are any topics you would like covered in the column.

Endnotes

1 See Dick Vaughan’s article “Customer (e-)service: new kids on the block”, Technical Services Law Librarian, v.27 no. 1 (December 2001) for more information on Abebooks.


3 This short e-poll’s results are available at <http://aallnet.org/mailman/private/ts-sis/2002-October/000696.html> for TS-SIS members, or email kristina.mengeling@asu.edu for a copy.
In my last column I promised to write about the ABA Standards for Approval of Law Schools and the ABA Annual Questionnaire, in particular those issues relating to electronic resources. This is a topic that has generated heated discussion in recent years, especially with respect to quantifying web-based resources for the questionnaire. Naturally I had second thoughts about this as I began to talk to colleagues about the complexity of the issues, but at the very least I would like to present a basic overview of the current situation.

ABA Standard 606 and its interpretations define a law library core collection without prescribing titles or formats. Generally these standards provide broad indicators of what the collection should do:

- meet the research needs of the law school’s students, satisfy the demands of the law school curriculum, and facilitate the education of its students;
- support the teaching, research, and service interests of faculty; and
- serve the school’s special teaching, research, and service objectives.

We have a two-part problem. The first aspect of the problem is how to evaluate the quality of a library’s “collection” of electronic resources as part of the overall measurement of the collection. What do you look at, how does it compare to the print collection, what value do the resources add, and what additional access do they provide? The second half of the problem is how to count the electronic resources for reporting and statistical purposes. What are we counting, how are we counting it, and are libraries being consistent? The ABA questionnaire is the vehicle for the quantitative measurement, but the questions relating to electronic resources (both counting them and paying for them) have generated a great deal of confusion.

Law librarians should know about two recent developments related to the standards and the questionnaire. The first is the work of the Law Libraries Committee of the ABA Section of Legal Education and Admissions to the Bar. The second is the newly formed AALL Standards for Academic Law Libraries Task Force.

The ABA Law Libraries Committee, under the leadership of Judith Wright, recently proposed changes to the ABA Annual Questionnaire that would address some of the concerns about counting and reporting electronic resources in both the Information Resources section of the questionnaire and in the Fiscal section. The Committee had solicited comments on various proposals and had collected feedback from a variety of sources before making their recommendations. If the recommendations are implemented, the Committee hopes to place a greater emphasis on expenditures for electronic resources and to eliminate the confusion caused by questions that require counting of electronic resources. Unfortunately I was unable to learn what action the Questionnaire Committee has taken on these recommendations at the time of this writing, so I will provide more detail about this development in my next column.

The AALL Task Force was created to work cooperatively with the Law Libraries Committee and other relevant groups to review the existing ABA standards and the annual and site evaluation questionnaires. The task force will recommend changes that reflect the changing nature of our collections and the impact that electronic resources have had on collections and services. The Task Force had its first meeting in February 2003, and its final report is due to the AALL Executive Board in November 2004.

I am hopeful that these efforts will help law librarians come to grips with the questions posed by the need to evaluate collections and services in the digital era.
Introduction

I would like to begin by updating my earlier discussion of changes to AACR2 (TSLL v.28, no. 1/2, p. 11-14), especially with regard to integrating resources. I will follow this with some general observations on the impact of the new rules, talk about upcoming changes or possible changes in the cataloging rules, and end with a snapshot of FRBR (Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records) developments at the international level.

When to Make a New Entry for Integrating Resources

I would like to clarify what I wrote in the last issue of TSLL on this topic. Rule 12.2F1b instructs us to change the edition area on the record to reflect the current iteration, if the change doesn’t require a new description, but no guidelines are given as to what changes in an edition statement do require a new description. According to information at the JSC Web site summarizing the outcome of their meeting in York, England, on Sept. 9-11, 2002, the revised rules at one time were going to include an “Appendix of Major Changes.” This information will instead be included in a stand-alone document being drafted by an ALA task force (Joint Steering Committee for Revision of Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules Web site, viewed Feb. 17, 2003: URI: http://www.nlc-bnc.ca/jsc/0209out.html).

Shortly after submitting my article for the December 2002 issue of TSLL, I exchanged emails with Judy Kuhagen at the Library of Congress. She informed me that when it was decided not to include the Appendix of Major Changes in AACR2 Rev. 2002, RI 21.3B “Integrating resources: Updating loose-leafs” was drafted to clarify the conditions under which a new bibliographic description was necessary.

From the RI: “If the edition statement changes, make a new entry … only if there is a new base volume (i.e. an in toto replacement edition) …”

She agreed that it might be helpful if RI 21.3B were revised to include some of the more common problematic situations faced, such as when loose-leaf publishers provide “physical” but not “intellectual” in toto replacement “editions.” It is to be hoped that AACR2 will be revised in the not-too-distant future to include information needed about major and minor changes for this area, among others.

Impact of AACR Rev. 2002

It’s been about two and a half months since AACR Rev. 2002 has been in effect, but I don’t find that the changes to the rules have necessitated too many changes in our records. The major change has been for multipart items and updating loose-leafs which are not yet complete. Rule 1.5B5 now instructs us to give the specific material designation alone (for instance: “v.”, not “5 v;” for incomplete updating loose-leafs (Rule 12.5B1), we use “v. (loose-leaf).” Some law libraries I’m sure were doing this already.

Fields which have been restricted to serials may now be used in large part for integrating resources, such as field 310 (frequency or frequency of updating). I’m finding that most of the time, this information is not available for the resources we are cataloging. The frequency of updating for loose-leafs and legal web sites is often irregular; or if regular, is known only to the publisher. For these integrating resources, we are now adding MARC21 field 006 to express seriality, as we still need to catalog these items as bibliographic level “m” (monographs), until the new bibliographic level “i” is implemented by LC, OCLC, and RLIN, hopefully this summer. Adding the 006 fields has become almost automatic for our cataloging staff. I’d be most interested in hearing from any of you as to any challenges, expected or otherwise, you or your staff have been experiencing with implementing the new rules. I think the real challenges are ahead of us, when the new bibliographic level gets implemented, for those of us who are concerned with correct coding of new resources in both the utilities and in our local catalogs.

Joint Steering Committee for Revision of Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules Web Site

This Web site, is a good source to learn about what types of changes are being considered for the annual revisions of AACR2. Among the ones which piqued my interest: Incorporating FRBR [Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records] into AACR, revising the...
“Rule of three” and other changes to Chapter 21, incorporating authority records into AACR, adding further guidance on multipart items, and further expansion to categories in RI 21.2A2 (minor changes in title proper).

**Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records**

As most of you are doubtless aware, FRBR is one of the hottest subjects, both nationally and internationally, in the cataloguing community. The current text was approved by the Standing Committee of the IFLA Section on Cataloguing in 1997 and published by K.G. Saur in 1998. It’s already been translated into several languages, and is beginning to be incorporated into library school curricula in several European countries (Though I don’t know about the U.S.). There is an English version online at the IFLA site [http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr.htm](http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr.htm). Online catalogs are attempting to incorporate some of its guidelines into their structure, with VTLS most notably having the most success so far.

The IFLA Cataloguing Section’s Working Group on FRBR had its first two meetings in August 2002. Among its rather formidable list of charges: To assist with proposals for incorporating FRBR terminology and concepts into an international cataloguing code, to assist in enhancements of its model, to recommend improvements to existing OPACS, to develop training tools and maintain a bibliography on FRBR, and to generally promote FRBR. Anyone who is interested in following and assisting in the development of FRBR may subscribe to the listserv by sending a subscription request to <frbr@bnf.fr>. Further information on the committee’s work is available at their Web page [http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/wgfrbr/wgfrbr.htm](http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/wgfrbr/wgfrbr.htm).

---

**Z39.50**

Z39.50 was designed to enable communication and the exchange of data between computer systems such as those used to manage library catalogs. This communication could be between a cataloger’s PC (or an OPAC terminal in public use) and the library catalog itself. It could be between two catalogs or a group of catalogs sharing data together. In any case, the purpose was to develop specifications allowing different computer systems to link and exchange data. It is a mature standard that represents the culmination of two decades of thinking and debate about how information retrieval functions can be modeled, standardized, and implemented in a distributed systems environment. The current version of Z39.50 is more properly known as “North American standard ANSI/NISO Z39.50-1995, Information Retrieval (Z39.50): Application Service Definition and Protocol Specification.” This standard was processed and approved for submittal to ANSI by the National Information Standards Organization. It was balloted by the NISO Voting Members (of which AALL is a member) March 29, 2002 - May 13, 2002, and will next be reviewed in 2007.

Determining current versions of the standard can be a bit complicated. According to the introduction, Z39.50-1995 specifies versions 2 and 3 for the Z39.50 service and protocol. The standard Z39.50-200X also specifies versions 2 and 3, and additionally, incorporates many clarifications, amendments, defect corrections, and implementer agreements, all of which have been endorsed by the Z39.50 Implementers Group. Z39.50-1992 specifies version 2 only. Version 2 of Z39.50 is assumed identical to version 1 of Z39.50; thus implementations that support version 2 automatically support version 1. Implementations that support version 3 are required to support version 2 (and thus version 1 as well).

Clifford Lynch points out that, although the historical events leading to the development of Z39.50 are sometimes tracked back to the 1960s, momentum to standardize an information retrieval protocol began to sharpen in the early 1980s with the beginning of the Linked Systems Project, LSP, whose implementation began in 1982, and which became operational in 1985. The participants were the Library of Congress, RLG, and OCLC. The essence of LSP was the Authorities application: the establishment and maintenance of a nationwide database of name authority records. Two application level protocols were developed: Record Transfer and Information Retrieval. The primary function of the authorities application was the transfer of the authority records between systems supported by the Record Transfer protocol. A background function was the intersystem searching of authority.

**The Internet**

Kevin Butterfield
University of Illinois
butterfi@law.uiuc.edu
Both the Record Transfer and information retrieval protocols were developed to support authority record exchange, but were intended to support record exchange and intersystem searching regardless of record type. In 1983 the LSP participants submitted both protocols, Record Transfer and Information Retrieval, for consideration as American National Standards. For Record Transfer, attempts to standardize were eventually abandoned (and ultimately, the Record Transfer protocol itself was replaced by FTP).

There was however substantial interest within the U.S. in standardizing an information retrieval protocol, and the LSP Information Retrieval protocol was submitted to ANSI/NISO, which formed a committee that prepared it for ballot, in 1984, when it was given the designation “Z39.50”, as it is known today. It is a protocol that specifies data structures and interchange rules that allow a client machine (called an “origin” in the standard) to search databases on a server machine (called a “target” in the standard) and retrieve records that are identified as a result of the search.

The formal home of the standard is the Z39.50 Maintenance Agency, hosted by the Library of Congress. Continued development takes place within an informal group of implementers and developers known as the Z39.50 Implementers Group, or ZIG. The work of the ZIG is progressed on an active mailing list, and through two or three face-to-face meetings each year.

The Z39.50 Maintenance Agency maintains a list of implementers on their web site. It is a diverse group made up of digital library projects (such as the California Digital Library) traditional ILS vendors, the British Library and the European Space Agency.

According to the Z39.50 Maintenance Agency website, the name “Z39.50” comes from the fact that the National Information Standards Organization (NISO), the American National Standards Institute (ANSI)-accredited standards development organization serving libraries, publishing and information services, was once the Z39 committee of ANSI. NISO standards are numbered sequentially and Z39.50 is the fiftieth standard developed by NISO.

The future of Z39.50 centers on ZING, “Z39.50-International: Next Generation”. It covers a number of initiatives by Z39.50 implementers to make the intellectual/semantic content of Z39.50 more broadly available and to make Z39.50 more attractive to information providers, developers, vendors, and users, by lowering the barriers to implementation while preserving the existing intellectual contributions of Z39.50 that have accumulated over nearly 20 years.

One of the current ZING initiatives is SRW, the “Search/Retrieve Web Service” protocol, which aims to integrate access to various networked resources, and to promote interoperability between distributed databases, by providing a common utilization framework. SRW is a web-service-based protocol whose underpinnings are formed by bringing together more than 20 years experience from the collective implementers of the Z39.50 Information Retrieval protocol with recent developments in the web technologies arena.

The SRW Initiative, building on Z39.50 along with web technologies, recognizes the importance of Z39.50 (as currently defined and deployed) for business communication, and focuses on getting information to the user. SRW provides semantics for searching databases containing metadata and objects, both text and non-text. Building on Z39.50 semantics enables the creation of gateways to existing Z39.50 systems while reducing the barriers to new information providers, to make their resources available via a standard search and retrieve service.

As a standard, Z39.50 has been with us for a long time. It has become almost ubiquitous in libraries as we regularly transfer data from OCLC to our local ILS, or move records between catalogs within our own consortia. Its applications, however, go well beyond libraries and library automation. With continued support, they may go further yet.

For further information:


The Z39.50 Maintenance Agency
<http://lcweb.loc.gov/z3950/agency/>

Z39.50 for All / Paul Miller (Ariadne, no. 21, April 1999) <http://www.ariadne.ac.uk/issue21/z3950/intro.html>
records can be broken down into the data elements that describe each of these entities. The Library of Congress commissioned a detailed analysis of MARC and its relationship to FRBR and AACR. This analysis includes detailed mapping of MARC fields and subfields to and from FRBR and AACR. It is being used by groups such as MARBI to examine what they do and to inform their decisions.

On another level, FRBR is being used as a new way to look at existing databases by “FRBRizing” them. As one of a number of related projects, OCLC has drawn from their huge database a group of records for fiction which they are using to study FRBR’s possibilities. VTLS, an automation vendor, created a FRBRized catalog which they demonstrated at ALA. In this catalog, data in bibliographic records is separated into work records, expression records, manifestation records and item records. To use the catalog, a patron begins at the work level and bores down to the item that they really want. This demonstration catalog is available at <http://www.vtls.com/frbr>.

I hope this wetted your appetite for an upcoming program at AALL. There you will have an opportunity to hear about FRBR from the experts: Glenn Patton (OCLC), Barbara Tillett (Library of Congress), and Vinod Chachra (VTLS). Tillett was a member of the study group that produced the original report; she and Patton are members of the current IFLA Working Group on FRBR; and Chachra will demonstrate VTLS’s FRBRized catalog. It will be a great opportunity to learn about FRBR.

### MARC Remarks

*Susan Goldner*

*University of Arkansas, Little Rock*

*sgoldner@ualr.edu*

---

**What Does FRBR Mean and Why Should I Care?**

The body of the report analyzes bibliographic information in terms of entities, the attributes of these entities, and the relationships between entities. In this short column, I will only give you very basic, nutshell definitions of the four entities that seem to generate the most discussion: work, expression, manifestation, and item.

A work is “a distinct intellectual or artistic creation”. We can use John Grisham’s *The Firm* as an example of a work. The film version of *The Firm* would be a separate work, because it involved a great deal of distinct creative effort.

An expression is “the intellectual or artistic realization of a work”. *The Firm* has been translated into a variety of languages and has been recorded for listening. Each of these is considered a separate expression, related to each other through the work.

A manifestation is “the physical embodiment of an expression of a work”. Our English text version of *The Firm* has been published in the original hardback, in paperback, and in large-print editions. Each of these is a manifestation.

An item is “a single exemplar of a manifestation”. This entity is the easiest for us to comprehend because it is concrete. It is the piece you have in your hand. We might need to record information about an item if, for example, our copy of *The Firm* was signed by the author.

My brief descriptions of these entities are grossly simplified. The concepts of work and expression are particularly hard to pin down. But our current bibliographic records can be broken down into the data elements that describe each of these entities. The Library of Congress commissioned a detailed analysis of MARC and its relationship to FRBR and AACR. This analysis includes detailed mapping of MARC fields and subfields to and from FRBR and AACR. It is being used by groups such as MARBI to examine what they do and to inform their decisions.

I first heard about FRBR at last summer’s ALA meeting. I must confess that at first, all I could think of was Edna Ferber, because it is pronounced like her last name. But the more it was discussed, the more I realized that FRBR is important because it is likely to affect our cataloging practices for the foreseeable future. That was reinforced during MARBI meetings this January, as FRBR was part of almost every discussion. In this column I will try to give you just a small taste of what it is.

The initials stand for *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*, the title of a report published by IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions) in 1998. It created a “conceptual model” for looking at bibliographic records in relation to users’ needs and expectations. The two objectives of the study are described in the document itself. “The first is to provide a clearly defined, structured framework for relating the data that are recorded in bibliographic records to the needs of the users of those records. The second objective is to recommend a basic level of functionality for records created by national bibliographic agencies.”

I hope this wetted your appetite for an upcoming program at AALL. There you will have an opportunity to hear about FRBR from the experts: Glenn Patton (OCLC), Barbara Tillett (Library of Congress), and Vinod Chachra (VTLS). Tillett was a member of the study group that produced the original report; she and Patton are members of the current IFLA Working Group on FRBR; and Chachra will demonstrate VTLS’s FRBRized catalog. It will be a great opportunity to learn about FRBR.
It seems like it has been such a long time since my last column. In fact, it has—almost six months. When I wrote my last column, the Orlando conference had just ended and I had just started my sabbatical leave. Now, as I write this in late January, it is a very cold Midwestern winter day with snow on the way, and my sabbatical leave is over.

**OCLC Committee Open Discussion—Seattle**

The Seattle meeting is still a number of months away. However, I have been working on our open discussion meeting, and a program on Connexion. The open discussion is currently scheduled for Sunday morning, July 13, and the Connexion program will be on Wednesday afternoon, July 16. Our speaker at both sessions will be Mr. Rick Newell of OCLC’s Western Service Center office. There will be more about these two meetings in the next issue of Technical Services Law Librarian.

**Connexion and the End of Support for Passport for Cataloging**

OCLC ended its support for Passport for cataloging on December 31, 2002. Passport will continue to work for cataloging through 2003, but now we are faced with the final countdown to its demise. As of December 31, 2003, users will be required to have migrated off Passport, except for the ILL, Union List, and Name Address Directory services. These will continue to use Passport until OCLC implements a replacement system.

OCLC continues to enhance and develop Connexion. The OCLC webpage for Connexion(<http://www.oclc.org/connexion>) lists the most recent enhancements and what enhancements are coming next. As of this writing, the webpage lists the enhancements that were completed in November 2002, and what is coming for February 2003 and beyond. In addition, OCLC is planning the release of a Windows client to Connexion. The initial release is planned for the 2nd quarter of 2003 and “includes interactive online functionality along with macros and labels in a Microsoft Windows-based interface”, <http://www.oclc.org/connexion/features/client>. Release 2, which is planned for the 3rd quarter of 2003 “will include additional online functionality for cataloging electronic resources and performing NACO activities.” There will be a 3rd release at the end of 2003 with offline cataloging, local files, batch processing, spell check, text settings, label enhancements, and local accessions list. OCLC states that they will continue to “add enhancements to the client on a quarterly basis.”

My university is waiting for the Windows client before making the switch to Connexion. We will probably switch sometime in the 4th quarter of 2003. The Main Library here at Indiana University, Bloomington collects heavily in Russian, Slavic, and East Asian languages, so the issue with diacritics and special characters is critical. OCLC has continued to enhance the input of diacritics and special characters with the current version of Connexion, but the general opinion of the librarians here is that it is still easier and better in Passport and CatME.

Speaking of diacritics in Connexion, beginning February 16, 2003, diacritics are entered following the character they modify. This change conforms to Unicode standards and general worldwide practice. In addition, those who use Internet Explorer are now able to enter diacritics from a pop-up dialog box, similar to the character box in Passport and CatME.

**Technical Bulletins 246 and 247**

OCLC’s two latest technical bulletins have direct implications for catalogers.

---

**Endnotes**

2FRBR, p. 3.
3FRBR, p. 7.
4FRBR, p. 16
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Technical Bulletin 246 details changes to OCLC’s database enrichment, expanding the number of fields that can be added to enrich a record. Technical Bulletin 247 is a collection of bibliographic record changes, MARC code list changes, and initial article changes. But the most significant section discusses coding practices for integrating resources. These changes are being done in two phases, with the Phase 1 changes having taken effect on December 1, 2002. Phase 2, which involves the activation of code $i$ in the fixed-field element Bibliographic Level (BLvl) to indicate an integrating resource, will not be implemented until July 2003 at the earliest. The technical bulletin details what catalogers are suppose to do during the interim period. Basically we continue to code integrating resources as monographs, but we are to add a serial 006 field. A new frequency code, $k$ for continuously updated, has been defined, along with other specific instructions for the use of serial 006 fields with integrating resources.

Technical Bulletin 247 is a significant bulletin for catalogers, and one that deserves carefully reading.

**Closing**

In closing, I cannot emphasize enough how vital the OCLC website has become for the most up-to-date information about OCLC. It is the first place to go if you have a question. As always, I look forward to hearing from any of you with questions or comments.

---

**Patience, Persistence, and Planning—Preservation Prerequisites and Practicality**

From guest columnist, Sally Wambold, University of Richmond, <wambold@uofrlaw.richmond.edu>

Librarians will not be surprised by the necessity of patience, persistence, and planning for preservation. How could librarians complete the large projects they often undertake without them? These qualities are especially necessary for preservation, one of the key charges technical services librarians must fulfill. But where does practicality come into play in the world of preservation? I have personally heard many people reject or postpone preservation efforts because they are impractical; they cost too much, they take too much time, and there is no one available to do the work. It is my belief (and I suspect that of many of you as well) that there has to be an element of practicality involved in maintaining our collections. Certainly, projects such as deacidification require enormous resources; and these efforts are necessary. Certainly the restoration of rare volumes is time-consuming and labor-intensive. So, what can be practical about preservation?

I will share here some of the experiences of my AALL chapter, the Virginia Association of Law Libraries (VALL). Also, I will present some of the practices that fellow members of TS-SIS sent to me in response to an online query. Any gentle readers who have other techniques to share are encouraged to post and share them on the TS-SIS listserv <ts-sis@aallnet.org>.

Foremost among its efforts to promote preservation, VALL has presented several book repair workshops. The first one was presented at the Virginia Historical Society by the conservators under the direction of Paulette Schwarting, Head of Technical Services. The others have been presented by a VALL member, Chris Watson, who is a book repair volunteer at the Wahab Public Law Library in Virginia Beach, Virginia. The techniques presented at these workshops have been simple and inexpensive. Chris keeps the Wahab books usable with such techniques as double-stitch, which involves gluing with polyvinyl acetate a text block into a binder or book cover. Chris repairs broken books with glue and weights them down until they are dry. CAVEAT: Before attempting such repairs yourself, attend a book repair workshop and feel confident that you know what you are doing! Even practical preservation requires planning and preparation. Chris Watson offers a prime example of practical preservation. He donates his time to Wahab, and he trains others. Volunteerism can help solve the problem of staffing. And Chris seems to derive enormous satisfaction from his work.

Another thing Chris does to promote preservation is to write, with his supervisor, Jill Burr, a column in the VALL newsletter. It is called “Preservation Junction,” and it is very entertaining and useful. For example, in the latest newsletter, he makes some very important resolutions for the health of the library collection:

- I will promptly repair all broken items;
- I will dust my collection;
- I will prepare and practice my emergency plan;
- I will begin digitizing;
- I will employ a commercial bindery for items not repairable in-house;
- I will provide protection from sunlight;
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If you need to justify your attendance at the annual meeting each year, the following is an exciting opportunity.

I have enjoyed my seven years as the Private Law Libraries Technical Services Chair. I will be the President of the Chicago Association of Law Libraries beginning in May. Because of this I have decided that I need to step down as the PLL TS Chair. It was not an easy decision, but one that had to be made.

The responsibilities include:
1. Working with the editor of TSSL to find a Private Law Libraries...

Another project embarked upon by VALL was the assembling of an archival set of the Virginia Reports, the official reporter of the Virginia Supreme Court. VALL libraries donated copies of the Virginia Reports which are housed at the Virginia Historical Society. The Internet was used to solicit the volumes. Efforts have also been made to ensure that Commonwealth of Virginia web sites maintain an archive of information for researchers.

Now, let’s move on to the contributions made in answer to my query on the TS-SIS listserv. First was a very important reminder from Teddy Artz to look for the postings of Pat Turpening from the University of Cincinnati on preservation issues. Pat has a wealth of experience which she generously shares.

MJ Willow from Capital Law raised some important questions about preservation: the lack of money, the lack of training for preservation, and the high cost of saving crumbling books, including the cost of archival boxes. MJ went to a book repair workshop and felt more qualified to do repairs. She further emphasized the point that proper training is the key. And she mentioned the practical solution of pamphlet binders. Capital Law reinforces popular books at the corners and spine. They also bind soft cover books before circulating.

Brian Striman at University of Nebraska-Lincoln College of Law reported that they make simple repairs and send the books back into circulation.


Mark Lambert at South Texas College of Law has a strategy for preventing water damage. He has asked the circulation staff to insure that all books shelved are at least one inch back from the front edge of the shelves and not pushed all the way to the back of each shelf. If this is followed, all books (except on the top shelf which is uncapped) are under the overhanging shelf above. That way, if water comes down from the ceiling, in whatever form (sprinkled or leaked), it only ruins the top shelf of books and the water then cascades down the rest of the shelving to the floor, usually barely touching the rest of the books on the way down. Carolyn Simpson of Bricker & Eckler LLP in Columbus, Ohio, also speaks out for getting training in book repair. (As an aside, these workshops are not necessarily expensive and can be quite practical.)

Jim Mumm of Marquette shared his library’s philosophy of book repair. At Marquette they replace anything that can be replaced. Their main library does most basic repairs for them, although the law library does a few repairs. Finally, they get their paperbacks bound with mylar binding. (I might add that Kapco has a product called Easy Cover II that can be applied inhouse directly onto the paperback cover, if the library is committed to inhouse repair <www.kapcolibrary.com> or 800-791-8965)

In summary, each library must determine what is practical for itself. Inhouse work will not be successful if space is limited and/or if there are not enough staff to do the repairs. However, recruiting a dedicated volunteer or student might be ideal for practical preservation. Finally, many thanks to all the people who contributed ideas for this column. Further ideas are always welcome on the TS-SIS listserv.

Endnotes
RESOLVE TO RESEARCH

I know that it will be spring time when you read this, so I should apologize in advance for foisting a New Year’s resolution piece on you at this time of the year. But as I put pen to paper (actually, fingers to keyboard) this morning, it is a bitterly cold January morning and such things are on my mind. Besides, if you are like me you probably are just now getting serious about your resolutions, if you have not abandoned them altogether.

In a way I am writing this column to myself. (Of course, you are invited to read along too!) It has been a while since I have worked on a research project, so I have resolved to decide upon a topic and submit a draft to a publication by the end of this year. But as a notorious resolution-breaker, I have recognized that I need help in keeping my New Year’s resolutions from becoming New Year’s dissolutions.

Fortunately, I was able to locate a few articles that offered valuable hints on how to do this.1, 2, 3 There were several redundant suggestions in the articles, so I have culled and combined the best ones and given them a research slant. If the desire to publish has been percolating in your brain but you keep putting it off, why not let this be the year that you turn your research reluctance into resolve. Maybe these tips will help you start down the road to writing.

Have concrete goals

Putting your goals and ideas into writing often serves to keep them in the forefront of your thinking. Write down, even if it is only one sentence, what it is you want to achieve by the end of the year and leave it in a prominent place on your desk.

Be specific

Setting a goal is a good first step, but, if it is too vague, it only expresses a desire. What needs to be included in the goal is the means to accomplish it. So if your goal is to publish one article this year, what steps do you need to take to achieve it? The more specific details you can include in your goal, the better. Also, think short-term and long-term. Success breeds further success, so accomplishing short-term goals aids in accomplishing long-term ones. For instance, you might say, “I will spend 2 hours a week doing some preliminary research on this topic until April 30. I will then send my idea for a prospective article to the editor of XYZ Journal by May 15. I will spend an average of 5 hours a week working on the first draft so that it is completed by August 15. After I receive the editor’s comments and deadline for revisions, I will then set aside the necessary time for rewriting the article.”

Liaison with TS-SIS about possible programs and any other issues.

Please contact me if you are interested. Please note except for scheduling the time during the convention, the rest of the time frame can be adapted to fit your schedule.

Thank you for the opportunity to be the Chair.

1996: Job Descriptions and Job Responsibilities (Informal)
1997: Coping with Vendor Change-Representatives from Matthew Bender, CCH and West Group (Formal)
1998: Handling of disks and CDs that come with material - Jayne McQuoid was our guest and discussed her project at Loyola University in Chicago (Informal)
1999: Representatives from LEXIS Publishing discussing branding and accounting issues (Formal)
2000: What we would find useful in a Technical Services Workshop (Informal)
2001: Listserv issues (Informal)
2002: BookWhere (Informal)
momentum and you will force yourself to find the time to finish it. It is the initial inertia that is hardest to overcome.

**Be realistic**

As humans, we all have limits and boundaries. Goals that overwhelm us are not realistic goals. A goal that says, “I want to write one book and three articles this year” may be ambitious but probably has not taken into account the fact that you have other obligations. Little things, you know—like eating and sleeping. This is where we librarians sometimes beat ourselves up, especially those of us who work for law schools. We fall into the trap of comparing our output with that of the teaching faculty despite the fact that most of us work on twelve month contracts and have supervisory and performance duties that they do not have.

**Be flexible**

This dovetails nicely with the above suggestion. If you are like me, you often do not know what your limits are until you see them in the rearview mirror. If you find that your original goal was not realistic, devise a plan that allows you to stay on course, even if it means it will take longer to achieve your goal. A success that takes longer than expected to attain is better than an on-schedule failure.

**Review periodically**

As with any process, a regular examination of our goals every two or three months enables us to stay on course, assess our progress, and readjust if needed. Ask yourself …

× How am I doing? Am I still on course?
× Have circumstances in my life or work changed since I set this goal?
× Is my goal realistic? Specific?
× If not, what can I do to make it so?
× Stay positive

The writing experience can be a frustrating one, so having an “I can do it” attitude is essential. This is where the momentum of success, attaining a series of short-term goals, is crucial. If you feel like you are really getting bogged down, however, recall other times in your life when you have faced obstacles and persevered.

**Value the process**

Sometimes we get so focused on the goal itself that our only gratification is reaching it. If you can find meaning and fulfillment throughout the research and writing process, you will be less likely to run out of gas. When you are doing research, for example, counteract feelings of drudgery by thinking about how much new information you are learning and how great it will be to share it with others. As you are writing and revising, concentrate on how this exercise is improving your writing skills. Even if you make mistakes along the way, think of them as learning opportunities. Take comfort in the knowledge that at least you are “in the arena,” as Teddy Roosevelt would say, and not “with those cold and timid souls who neither know victory nor defeat.”

Here are some publications from our colleagues “in the arena”:


If you have published something recently, let me know about it and I will include it in future columns!

**Endnotes**

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:

**Cal Info/William-Scott guide to the administrative regulations of the states & territories**
7th ed. (June 1998)-8th ed. (June 1999)
*Changed to:* Cal Info guide to the administrative regulations of the states & territories
Vol. 23, no. 1 (Jan. 2003)-
(OCoLC 50655926)

**DePaul business law journal**
(OCoLC 20064809)
*Merged with:* Commercial law journal
Vol. 35, no. 8 (Aug. 1930)-v. 106, no. 4 (winter 2001)
(OCoLC 1654375)
*To form:* DePaul business & commercial law journal
Vol. 1, no. 1 (fall 2002)-
(OCoLC 50872999)

**Family planning perspectives**
(OCoLC 829761)
*Changed to:* Perspectives on sexual and reproductive health
Vol. 34, no. 1 (Jan./Feb. 2002)-
(OCoLC 48897306)

**International and comparative environmental law**
Vol. 1, issue 1 (fall/winter 2000)-v. 2, no. 1 (fall 2001)
*Changed to:* Sustainable development law & policy
Vol. 2, issue 2 (spring/summer 2002)-

**Library systems**
(OCoLC 7484071)
*Changed to:* Smart libraries
Vol. 23, no. 1 (Jan. 2003)-
(OCoLC 50655926)

**Newsletter (American Bar Association. Section of Taxation)**
Vol. 13, no. 1 (fall 1993)-v. 21, no. 4 (summer 2002)
(OCoLC 29239535)
*Changed to:* NewsQuarterly
Vol. 22, no. 1 (fall 2002)-
(OCoLC 50956285)

**Tort & insurance law journal**
Vol. 21, no. 1 (fall 1985)-v. 37, no. 4 (summer 2002)
(OCoLC 12763429)
*Changed to:* Tort trial & insurance practice law journal
Vol. 38, no. 1 (fall 2002)-
(OCoLC 51113437)

**United States. Dept. of Justice Annual report of the Attorney General of the United States**
-1997
(print: OCoLC 2394728; microform: OCoLC 9668133)
*Changed to:* United States. Dept. of Justice Accountability report, U.S. Department of Justice
Vol. 27 (2001)

**United States. Dept. of Justice**
Annual accountability report, U.S. Department of Justice
1998-1999
(print: OCoLC 41970995; microform: OCoLC 50910902)
*Changed to:* United States. Dept. of Justice Accountability report 2001-
(microform: OCoLC 50951118)

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:

**California. Fair Employment and Housing Commission, Precedential decisions**
Ceased (in paper) with:
2000/2002

**Entertainment and sports lawyer (East Lansing, Mich.)**
Ceased with:
v. 4, no. 2 (spring 1999)
(OCoLC 40817957)

**Harvard China review**
Ceased with:
Vol. 2, no. 1 (summer 2000)

**Indonesian law and administration review**
Ceased with:
Vol. 5, no. 2 (1999)

**Intellectual property laws and treaties**
Ceased with:
v. 5, no. 2 (March, 2002)

**Law in Japan = Nihon ho**
Ceased with:
v. 27 (2001)

**Liberty, life, and family**
Ceased with:
v. 4, no. 2 (2000)
(OCoLC 31056293)
We have all come to accept, to a greater or lesser extent, the ideal of standardized cataloging. We all catalog to national standards (as interpreted by the law cataloging community), and share our cataloging with others via bibliographical utilities that are international in scope. Nevertheless, we are all confronted at times by “interesting” records that give us, as law catalogers, pause because of their unusual subject headings — although they may have been done at reputable libraries that should have “known better.” Sometimes this reflects a local practice, which should but often is not reflected in the MARC coding. Often it may represent what a reputable “non-law” library regards as perfectly correct cataloging. In all fairness, if one of us does a perfectly good job cataloging a non-law book the rest of the world might also be somewhat amused. It is important to be aware of these variations, and to take them into account when using copy from another library.

Sometimes, these practices are a result of shelving or “turf” issues. In some libraries, classification determines who routinely gets a specific book, e.g., if the book classes in R or H, it does not go to the law library. This is true of the Library of Congress, both in terms of shelving and custody of materials (with provision for making exceptions), but more importantly, pertaining to cataloging and classification (with no provisions for exceptions). At the Library of Congress, books classing outside of K or JZ are never done by law catalogers though a law cataloger might suggest headings when referring a book to a non-law team. If a record came from a law library, one can reasonably assume it was done by a cataloger experienced in law cataloging, and if a record came from a non-law library, even if classed in “K”, one needs to assume it was cataloged by someone other than a law cataloger, and we should be suspicious about the subject analysis and cataloging.

If a law library needs a non-legal title for its collection, it may need to “force” the book into a “K” call number. The reverse is true for a “legal” title being “stolen” by a non-law library. Many types of literature can arguably class in more than one schedule, and the classification will determine who does the subject analysis, classification, and subject cataloging of the book. While we reasonably can rely on the quality of cataloging of a law book done by a law library, we need to be wary of a law book done by a non-law library, or a non-law book done by a law cataloger.

Sometimes a library uses (or abuses) the classification system to collocate materials that might otherwise be scattered. For example, at NYU Law Library materials published by the European Union or one of its component parts are “forced” into KJE in order to maintain a distinct EU collection. The Library of Congress puts all Congressional hearings in KF25-KF27, and has a collection of core United Nations documents in JZ. Such practices result in non-law books being classified in law numbers.

Law catalogers typically look at materials in different ways than social sciences catalogers. We are focused on jurisdiction; “obsessed” might be a better word. The most critical question any law librarian asks about a book is “what jurisdiction does this apply to?” Social science librarians, and users, often tend to focus on the general concept the author is presenting, rather than the relevant place. A social scientist might look at a book and see a
general work, and regard the U.S.-specific aspects as backdrop for the
general discussion. Law catalogers
looking at the book will see the
directive orientation as critical, and
give it prominence in deciding to class
in KF, and in assigning subject
headings to support the KF number.

A good example is criminology, which
never classes in K. It belongs either in
HV6000+, or with the subject for
forensic studies, e.g. RA for forensic
Medicine. In the United States, the
study of criminology belongs to the
police rather than lawyers (i.e. school
of criminal justice rather than law
schools). In many other countries
criminology, including “criminalistics”
(the science of crime detection), is
included in law school curricula,
especially in countries where
detective work is entrusted to
investigating magistrates. In reality,
American lawyers routinely use these
“criminalistics” and “forensic science”
materials (and therefore, they expect us
to acquire and catalog them). In LCSH
terms, “forensic science” refers to
science and methodology of “Evidence,
Expert”. We’ll probably use “Evidence,
Expert — [jurisdiction]” as a first
subject heading, and a second heading
for the forensic science in question.
However, if the book classes in R, there
will probably be no “law” heading other
than “Medical jurisprudence”, and most
medical catalogers tend not to use
graphic subdivisions (from their
perspective, a corpse is a corpse
regardless of whether it’s a Maryland
corpse or a New York corpse). The
relative lack of emphasis on geographic
subdivision is true of the natural
sciences to even a greater degree than
the social sciences.

While “history” (classes D-E-F) is as
sensitive to geography as law is, in
addition to not understanding the legal
nuances we “adore”, they sometimes
focus on places in a way we find
unacceptable. “True crime” books
(which should class in HV) display most
of these problems as well. Often a trial
will be a frame story for bringing out
the details of the crime, which requires
classing in K (unless one juggles the
headings to leave them in HV). It should
be noted that the use of a public trial to
discuss a crime can reflect the desire to
discuss something that one isn’t
supposed to discuss in public, but
becomes tolerable if discussed as part
of a report of a public trial (this can refer
to lurid sex crimes, not to mention
assorted “political crimes and offenses”
depending on time and place).

A history-oriented cataloger will focus
on a specific place, such as a village or
neighborhood (the book being valuable
for local history collections,
genealogists, etc.). If a book is classed
as a trial, our first heading will always
be the name of the defendant, followed
by “Trials, litigation, etc.”, with the
crime being indicated by the type of
trial. Law catalogers will focus on the
jurisdiction where the trial was held
rather than where the crime occurred.
If the non-law cataloger analyzes the
book, the “criminal’s” (in our parlance,
the defendant’s) name appears, an
additional heading will indicate the type
of crime subdivided by place and the
form subdivision “—Biography”). For
example, the HV cataloger may want to
indicate a “Murder” in Greenwich
Village (a city section brought out by a
secondary 651 heading), but to a KF
cataloger the book is about a “Trials
(Murder)” held either in New York City,
or in New York County (the later being
a heading only law catalogers should
routinely use). The difference is even
clearer in a non-urban situation since
the trial will typically be in the county
seat, while the crime may have occurred
in a smaller, more specific locality; and
in some countries, it is possible to hold
the trial in a place that is quite distant
from the scene of the crime.

Religion catalogers are also very
skeptic of the need to bring out
graphic places, but tend to be more
sensitive to differences within religious
groups (which often requires the use
of 610 headings). Note that the
subdivision “—Religious aspects” is
rarely used with a geographic
subdivision (unless a non-theology
cataloger is using it). In libraries where

Then of course there are the things that
law catalogers do that aren’t 100% “kosher” according to the non-law
cataloging world. We say “Great
Britain” when we mean England
(hopefully this will change soon). The
social science cataloger might have a
book on “Police—England”, but if we
decide the book belongs in “K”, it
becomes “Police—Great Britain.” We
use “Handbooks, manuals, etc.” as a
subfield x to mean what group the book
is intended for, they use it as a subfield
v to indicate what we might call a
treatise. For a book written “for” the
witness (e.g. “How to be professional
forensic expert”), we law catalogers
will create a heading such as “Rented
experts—Handbooks, manuals, etc.” -
a heading a non-law cataloger would
find totally incomprehensible. If a book
is written for “non-lawyers” we assign
“Popular works”, whereas no one else
thinks it remarkable that a target
audience consists of normal people.
For the most part, law cataloging almost
never uses “Case studies”, and many
non-law catalogers don’t realize that
“Cases” refers to litigation, and
that its use with a subfield “x”
refers to books about the
“case-law” as opposed to other
types of law.

The “bottom line” is that when we
encounter (typically in copy cataloging) a record
produced by a non-law library,
regardless of whether the book
should or should not class in
“K”, the subject analysis will
often be unacceptable from
our perspective as law
catalogers. Similarly, when we catalog
non-law materials, especially for a
shared database, we should try to be
sensitive to how their primary users
would want them treated.
January 2003, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

The Subject Analysis Committee and its subcommittees met during ALA midwinter in Philadelphia. The SAC Subcommittee on Subject Analysis Training Materials has finished most of the intellectual component of a basic course in subject heading assignment and has begun to edit the course modules. Part of the course will be given during a panel presentation at ALA in Toronto, and hopefully the course itself will be given prior to ALA in Orlando 2004. It follows the outline developed by the serials cataloging workshops. This will be a worthwhile workshop for all law catalogers to learn, or relearn, the basics of subject analysis. The basic law subject heading presentation given at our basic cataloging institutes will go nicely with the SAC course.

The Subcommittee on Semantic Interoperability is beginning to develop an inventory of known projects and guidelines for evaluating them. The group’s working definition of subject semantic interoperability is “The ability of two or more systems or components to exchange or harmonize cognate subject vocabularies and/or knowledge organization schemes to be used for the purposes of effective and efficient resource discovery without significant loss of lexical or connotative meaning and without special effort by the user.”

The SAC Subcommittee on Subject Reference Structures in Automated Systems is close to finishing its recommendations for the display of reference structure and will present a panel discussion at ALA in Toronto in June.

Items of interest presented at the two main committee meetings were: implementation of KPB for Islamic law on January 20, 2003, the addition of data on form of geographic subdivision in field 781 on the authority records, the addition of field 667 if the heading is not to be used as a geographic subdivision, and the continuation of creating authority records for topical, form and chronological free floating subdivisions.

Lynn El Hoshy, the LC liaison to the committee, reported on the proposed change to the use of the subdivision – Great Britain in law subject heading practice. Previously Great Britain was used for law topics in England and Wales. It was also used for legal works that discussed England, Wales, and Great Britain. With the devolution of Wales, the British librarians felt that it would be better to use all three countries as geographic subdivisions and to use –Great Britain for works discussing all three countries. The CPSO comment period ends March 31, 2003 and Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings instruction sheet H955 will be revised to reflect the new practice once approved. The sheet will include a list of subjects where the law of Scotland differs from Great Britain and Wales.

Law Libraries

The Crookesmoor Library, a branch of the University of Sheffield Library, is housed in the Crookesmoor Building together with the rest of the Department of Law. The library serves 1,250 law students, primarily undergraduates. The Department of Law also offers the one-year conversion course, and the library provides materials for those students in a special room. The library houses a large print collection of primary British, European, and
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solicitors, who deal directly with clients, and barristers, who present cases in court. Solicitor training requires one additional year of school beyond the undergraduate degree, and barrister training requires two. Graduates who did not major in law may proceed to solicitor or barrister training after completion of a one year catch-up course, known as a “conversion” course. Syllabi for all three courses are very practice-oriented and are determined by the bar.

Law Libraries

The Crookesmoor Library, a branch of the University of Sheffield Library, is
Commonwealth materials; legal periodicals and treatises; and a computer area with twenty workstations. The staff consists of 6.5 FTE who work together as a team, sharing reference/circulation desk duties. Evening and weekend staff are rotated in from the main library.

The other university in town, Sheffield Hallam University, is spread over three campuses, each with its own “learning centre.” The Collegiate Learning Centre that I visited covers the subjects of law, history, English, health, psychology, education, and ESL. Currently there are 647 FTE law students and one librarian “law specialist.” The library is open 24/7, with two security guards in attendance at night and multiple video monitors in the entrance area. Students check out their own books at a self-charge machine in the large lobby. While they are waiting, they can entertain themselves by reading a scrolling electronic sign that offers “interesting facts,” the sign and its facts are rented as a package. The library contains over three hundred computers, some dedicated to the catalog and library resources only, others for open use. Some are even keyword-protected for students with disabilities. The print collection of legal materials is quite small; the emphasis is definitely on electronic resources. A small café area with tables and vending machines is located within the library.

The College of Law of England and Wales comprises five branches. The York branch enrolls 600-650 students. The director of all five branch libraries is stationed in London, visiting each library on a rotating basis. All five branches share networking resources, although their print collections are handled independently. Like Sheffield Hallam, York concentrates on electronic resources. The library contains four IT suites (computer labs) with a total of 64 computers. The York branch is essentially maintained by two librarians who have managed to find the time, wedged between acquisitions and cataloging and circulation and reference duties, to create an inviting space with elegant signage and many helpful guides to the collection.

Notable Differences

At all three of these schools, students rely on the library to supply required course readings. As a result, libraries order multiple copies of titles from faculty reading lists. This is economical for the students, but significantly reduces the amount of money available for other purchases.

Another striking difference between academic libraries in Sheffield and those in the U.S. is the absence of student employees. Administrators were surprised at the extent to which the University of Wisconsin has institutionalized student employment, with campus-wide standardized pay scales and a centralized student employment office. They are very enthusiastic about the idea of employing students in Sheffield’s libraries for more efficient use of limited resources, and posed some hard questions (e.g. what to do about no-shows at the circulation desk during exam periods) which I naturally forwarded to my more knowledgeable colleagues back home.

Possibly as a result of a primary clientele of undergraduates, polite reminders about noise abound. I was especially fond of the wording on the sign posted just inside Crookesmoor’s entrance: “Welcome to the library. Please help to maintain Crookesmoor Library as a quiet place for study.” Sheffield Hallam has separate rooms for group study, quiet study, and silent study, with prominent signage. Even the library at York, catering to graduate students, has a designated “silent room.”

Library Catalogs

As Head of Cataloging at Wisconsin, I was especially interested in Sheffield’s cataloging policies and practices. I was surprised to learn that Talis Information Limited serves not only as the source of their automated system, but also as the source of the bibliographic records they use for copy cataloging. Talis is, in effect, their ILS and bibliographic utility rolled into one.

Call numbers include sequence, classification, and suffix. Like Wisconsin, Sheffield’s law library shelves volumes in separate sequences for reference, reserve, periodicals, primary materials, treatises, etc. These sequences are recorded as the first part of the call number. The classification part of the call number is a Dewey Decimal number. Every library I visited in Sheffield uses the Dewey Decimal classification, with the exception of a few of the public library branches that use the “book store” arrangement of books into broad topical areas. The “suffix” part of the call number consists of the first letter of the author’s last name or, if the book lacks an author, the first letter of the title. Obviously, this results in many identical call numbers, but they’re not considered a problem because volumes are uniquely identified by their bar codes.

The University of Sheffield’s OPAC is called Star and can be viewed at http://library.shef.ac.uk/. In addition to author, title, and keyword searches, Star can be used to find out whether a serial is held at any of the nearly one hundred libraries, both on and off campus, which contribute to the Sheffield Union List of Serials.

Sheffield Hallam uses Innovative Interfaces as its ILS. The public library system uses Epixtech (formerly Dynix). Although I was surprised to discover that Epixtech is a non-MARC system, I was impressed by its ability to route new books in different orders of precedence among the library’s 27 branches, so each branch receives its fair share of brand new titles.

The “catalog versus home page” debate concerning access to electronic resources is alive and well in Sheffield. The University of Sheffield relies on its home page almost exclusively. The only electronic resources in the catalog are e-journals, and they are simply linked.
to the e-journal page of the library web site. By contrast, the philosophy at Sheffield Hallam is that access to electronic resources should be through the catalog, and that creating separate lists of electronic resources on the library’s web site would be unjustifiable duplication of effort.

Regardless of system, dedication to high quality cataloging and authority control were evident in every cataloger I met. The Head of Cataloging at the University of Sheffield and I were so immediately congenial that we decided it must have something to do with “cataloger’s wave length.”

**Budgets**

In my discussions with library administrators and in meetings I attended, I was repeatedly struck by the extent to which libraries in England and the USA are facing the same pressing issues, including collection management in the face of steeply rising subscription costs combined with budget and space constraints, fund allocation decisions between print and electronic resources, and electronic licensing restrictions. There were times when I could close my eyes and easily imagine myself at a meeting back home (except for the classy accents, of course). In fact, the University of Sheffield is committed to a zero collection growth policy by 2005, and is planning a new library that will be almost entirely electronic.

To help bridge the gap between needs and resources, librarians in Sheffield have become experts at pursuing grant funding. I read a successful application for a digitization project that was an absolute gem, and saw several innovative public library initiatives brought about entirely through grant funding, including the installation of computers for public Internet access in all branches, computer training for all staff, bookmobile service for disadvantaged groups, and even baby packs for every Sheffield birth.

**Library Cooperation**

The University of Sheffield Library is a member of both RLG and its British equivalent, CURL (Consortium of University Research Libraries). CURL’s union catalog, COPAC, is used as a backup when Star has to be taken down for any reason.

SINTO, the Sheffield Information Organisation, is a partnership of library and information services of all types in South Yorkshire and North Derbyshire with the aim of improving the quality of information services through cooperation, planning and partnership. Crookesmoor Library participates in the SINTO Legal Information Group, which has published a pamphlet entitled “Looking for Legal Information in Sheffield.”

Crookesmoor was also part of the ambitious Case Project <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/case/>, a grant-funded feasibility study to evaluate the possibility of enhancing access to legal research materials through increased collaboration among seven university law libraries in the region. The project experimented with pilot projects for virtual reference service, legal document delivery, consortial purchasing, a union catalog, collection descriptions, a web gateway, a repository of documents relating to information skills law students need, and online tutorials. The two-year project will be completed at the end of February, 2003, and a final report will be submitted by the project manager.

**Outcomes**

On an institutional level, this first exchange represents an enhanced level of interlibrary cooperation and knowledge transfer. As staff at our two libraries get to know one another, there will be a greater willingness to draw on one another’s expertise. We at Wisconsin will have at our fingertips a group of law librarians with a total accumulation of many years of experience in British and European legal research. And likewise our colleagues in Sheffield will be able to call upon us for assistance with U.S. legal research questions. The level of service at both institutions will be raised and strengthened symbiotically.

On a personal level, my visit to Yorkshire was incredibly valuable for my professional growth. I returned to Wisconsin much more knowledgeable about English legal education and the issues faced by law libraries there. I was able to compare and contrast policies and practices in several libraries, and then compare them with those at Wisconsin. I was able to inventory the primary materials in Crookesmoor’s collection, and bring that information back to assist the collection development librarians with decision-making here at home. I developed professional relationships with colleagues whom I can contact should I ever need their help with a reference request, a resource evaluation, or an explanation of policy choices. And I was inspired by the team spirit, positive attitude, and social commitment exhibited by the librarians I met throughout my visit. I returned home with renewed enthusiasm for my job and my library, and that’s got to benefit the library as well as me. I sincerely hope that our two libraries will be able to continue these short-term
The OBS-SIS Membership survey was conducted between January 7 and January 31, 2003. We received 50 responses.

The survey polled the membership regarding programming for the annual meeting, scheduling scenarios for business and committee meetings and the relevance of OBS activities and TSLL to our work. The complete results of the survey have been posted to the OBS-SIS website <http://www.aallnet.org/sis/obssis/>.

According to the results, the most relevant and most well attended program at the Annual meeting in Orlando was “The Catalog vs. the Homepage? Best Practices in Connecting to Online Resources”. All accepted programs for the 2003 Annual Meeting in Seattle received high marks, a testament to the hard work of Mary Jane Kelsey and the 2002 OBS-SIS Education Committee. The following OBS-SIS sponsored programs will be presented at the Annual Meeting in Seattle:

- Connected to the Future: OCLC’s Connexion;
- Envisioning Tomorrow’s Catalog: A View From Outside the Library;
- Open Linking and E-Journal Management: Strategies for Maximizing Your Investment in Electronic Resources Today; and
- Two Stepping With Technology.

Suggested programs for the 2004 Annual Meeting in Boston that received the highest ratings were: Is the end of MARC near? Is XML the successor?; Usability testing for OPAC design; How to stay current on the technological front: Survey of issues and resources for study; Technology training-how to get your staff up to speed: Methods and techniques; Update on implementation of integrating resource application for bibliographic utilities and local systems; and Connecting superseded materials with our OPACs. I’ll be convening the 2003 OBS-SIS Education Committee soon to develop proposals around these ideas. If you have any suggestions or ideas for programs not covered on the survey please let me know!

OBS asked members if scheduling meetings on the final Wednesday of the annual meeting was a reasonable way to manage OBS/TS meeting conflicts. The response was 37-7 in favor.

TSLL remained the most relevant of OBS activities, with annual meeting programming second, and the OBS-SIS co-sponsored AALL Official Representative to MARBI coming in third. As for TSLL specifically, the top five columns ranked as very relevant were 1) Classification 2) Description and entry 3) Subject headings 4) The Internet and 5) OCLC.

“OBS is the BEST!” This was the typical response to our “How are we doing?” questions. The redesigned OBS-SIS website garnered great reviews. This is a tribute to the hard work of Anne Meyers and the Web Advisory Committee.

Finally a big thank you to everyone who volunteered for a committee or to run for an office! Your willingness to participate and to devote time to our SIS is much appreciated!
Dear Miss Manager:

I edit a newsletter for two important sections of an association of law librarians. There are great regular columnists, but other contributors (such as the one on our current issue’s front page) are hard to come by. How can I get members to send in articles?

Sincerely,

Inquisitive in Indiana

Dear Inquisitive:

Nothing could be easier. You are in control of your own solution. What is to prevent you from making a plea in some prominent place in your newsletter, perhaps on that little half page in the back, accompanied by some eye-catching graphic? Let your readers know that you want them to send in short pieces that will be of general interest to the membership of the sections you represent, that you will be glad to discuss article ideas with them, and that they need to pay attention to the deadlines noted on page two. If you take the trouble, you are sure to attract the attention of someone who has an interesting idea to share with colleagues.