Janis Johnston has had a remarkable career in law librarianship – in a municipal law library, in academic law libraries as a serials librarian, as the head of a technical services department, an associate director, and now director of the Albert E. Jenner, Jr. Memorial Law Library at the University of Illinois. She has also had a remarkable career within AALL, most recently as treasurer of the association and now as its Vice President/President Elect. But her roots are in technical services. She is a past chair of the TS-SIS and has coordinated workshops, participated in an array of educational programs, and has written articles for our enlightenment. She has helped to steer us along in the troublesome and changing ways of our work. Last year the TS-SIS recognized Janis’s contributions by naming her the recipient of the Renee Chapman Award. As she is about to begin her year as President of AALL, I took the opportunity to ask her a few questions.

1. You became a director of an academic law library after beginning your career in Technical Services. Do you think your T.S. background has given you an advantage as a director?

Absolutely! Technical services is where you develop financial and personnel management skills. Most public services positions don’t entail much budgetary responsibility nor extensive personnel management, but every director has to know how to do those things. I think it is a lot easier to become a director or associate director with technical services experience behind you than having to learn those things on the job.

Every director does have to understand reference, circulation and collection development as well, but those management skills developed in technical services really make a difference.

2. You were Treasurer of AALL for three years, and now you are Vice President/President Elect – based on that experience, what would you say is the place of Technical Services in the law library community?

Technical services is recognized as an integral part of law librarianship. When TS-SIS and OB-SIS speak, the Executive Board listens. It listens because these
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Dear Fellow OBSers,

I had a cousin, rest her soul, who was famous for saying, “Thank God we never have to face a room full of all the potatoes we have to peel in a lifetime.” As I prepare to pass the OBS ball cap to Kevin Butterfield, I reflect that we’ve had a lot of potatoes to deal with this year. The economic downturn meant budget crunches or at least belt tightening for almost all of our libraries. For months we listened to rumors of war. Finally, this April we watched war in real time on television. Throughout the year we’ve persevered one day at a time with the help of family, friends and professional colleagues. I hope next year will be a better one for all of us and that we continue to connect with and support each other professionally through OBS.

OBS Election Results

I am delighted to report the results of the 2003 OBS Election:

Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect
Georgia Briscoe (University of Colorado Law Library)

Secretary/Treasurer
Michael Maben (Indiana University School of Law Library)

Member-at-Large
Andrea Rabbia (Syracuse University College of Law Library)

Congratulations to these new OBS officers! OBS is in good hands. And a hearty thank you to Naomi Goodman, Barbara Szalkowski, and Julianna Davis who graciously agreed to serve as candidates.

Meeting Schedules

One of my objectives as OBS Chair this year was to improve our annual meeting schedule by eliminating meetings at 7 a.m. and minimizing the conflicts with TS meetings. TS Chair, Chris Tarr, and I worked for many hours last fall to put the Seattle schedule together. I think you’ll find that we’ve made progress. The roster for the Boston meeting should be even better as we will have the option of scheduling against some programming slots. Here are the OBS meetings scheduled for the upcoming Seattle conference.

Saturday, July 12
3:00-4:00 p.m.
❖ OBS Web Advisory Committee
4:00-5:30 p.m.
❖ OBS 2002/2003 Executive Board Meeting
6:00-7:30 p.m.
❖ TS/OBS/RIPS/CS Joint Reception

Sunday, July 13
11:45 a.m. - 1:15 p.m.
❖ OBS/TS Research Roundtable
❖ RLIN Committee Open Discussion
❖ OCLC Committee Open Discussion
5:30 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.
❖ Local Systems Committee Open Discussion

Monday, July 14
5:15 p.m. - 6:15 p.m.
❖ OBS Business Meeting

Tuesday, July 15
11:45 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
❖ OBS Education Committee Meeting

Wednesday, July 16
7:30 a.m. - 8:45 a.m.
❖ OBS 2003/2004 Executive Board Meeting

Open Discussion Agendas

Pat Callahan, substituting for RLIN Committee Chair Brian Quigley, will preside over the RLIN Committee Open Discussion. Karen Smith-Yoshimura from the Research Libraries Group will discuss the upcoming changes in RLG’s technical services infrastructure. As well as describing the changes, data mapping issues and their implications for your workflow, Karen is eager to hear your opinions and suggestions while the software and documentation are still in development. PASS command will no longer be used, so for some of you there will be new strategies for getting RLIN records into your systems and maintaining your records in RLIN. Please note that the changes in RLIN ILL will not be covered in this discussion.

Michael Maben will chair the OCLC Open Discussion. Rick Newell of OCLC’s Western Service Center will discuss “What’s New At OCLC” and will be available to answer questions and respond to any discussion about OCLC services. Among the topics of discussion will be Connexion and the client interface to OCLC Connexion coming in June 2003.

George Prager hadn’t set the discussion topic as I prepared this letter, but he promises “a lively discussion of issues of current interest.”

OBS Sponsored Programs

To help you plan for the Annual Meeting, let me remind you of the following OBS sponsored programs:
Sunday, July 13
4:15-5:15
C-2. Envisioning Tomorrow’s Catalog: A View From Outside the Library—Coordinator and Moderator, Kevin Butterfield. Speaker, Cindy Cunningham, amazon.com

Monday, July 15
10:15-11:45
G-5. Open Linking and E-Journal Management: Strategies for Maximizing Your Investment in Electronic Resources Today—Coordinator and Moderator, Mary Jane Kelsey. Speakers, Nettie Legace, Ex Libris (USA) Inc., Kim Parker, Yale University; Chris Pierard, Serials Solutions

Wednesday, July 16
1:45-2:15
K-4. Connected to the Future: OCLC’s Connexion—Coordinator and Moderator, Michael Maben. Speaker, Rick Newell, OCLC Western Service Center

From the Chair

I’m writing this a scant month from our Seattle meeting, and I see that my first aim — to have an array of good programs available to Technical Services members — has been met. One workshop, six standard programs, and three of the new 30 minute mini-programs sponsored by Technical Services, alone or in conjunction with other SISs, were selected by the Annual Meeting Program Selection Committee. The workshop (actually sponsored by the Professional Development Committee, and not TS), Advanced Cataloging for Law Librarians, required preregistration. From what I have heard, it sounds like a lot of us are signed up, and I will see you there at 8:30 on Friday morning!

The other programs include:

A-4. Maximizing the OPAC: Is FRBR in your future? (Sunday, July 13, 10:00-11:30), cosponsored with OBS;
C-2. Envision tomorrow’s catalog: a view from outside the library (Sunday, July 13, 4:15-5:15), sponsored by OBS and cosponsored by TS;
E-1. Integrating Resources, or What do we do now that we have (almost) what we wanted? (Monday, July 14, 10:15-11:30);
F-5. Is there a book doctor in the house? Assessing preservation priorities and options (Monday, July 14, 4:15-5:15);
H-2. Judaic and Islamic classification: Envisioning access and order for legal topics of international and nonjurisdictional scope (Tuesday, July 15, 2:15-3:45);
H-5. Negotiating license agreements revisited (Tuesday, July 15, 2:15-3:45);
J-4. Managing support staff in Technical Services (Wed., July 16, 9:00-10:00).

Those are the regular programs. The following are the special new 30 minute programs, and I hope you are planning to stay until Wednesday afternoon to attend them:

K-6. 30 Sites in 30 minutes: Favorite Acquisitions Web Sites (Wed., July 16, 21:45-2:15);
L-4. MARBI Report: What’s the latest on MARC standards (Wed., July 16,
2:30-3:00), sponsored by OBS and cosponsored by TS, AND last but not least,

M-1. What’s happening at ALA: Reports from the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) and the Subject Analysis Committee (SAC), (Wed., July 16, 3:15-3:45)

Other programs, not sponsored by TS, but which look interesting include:

B-3. Analog Media: Maximum preservation for today and tomorrow (Sunday, July 13, 1:30-2:45);
D-3. Electronic archives and partnerships: preserving government information for tomorrow (Monday, July 14 9:00-10:00);
G-5. Open linking and e-journal management: strategies for maximizing your investment in electronic resources today (Tuesday, July 15, 10:15-11:45);
G-6. Maximize preservation efforts today, envision continued access to legal information tomorrow: a national agenda for preserving legal information (Tuesday, July 15, 10:15-11:45).

It looks like a very full slate.

Also, don’t forget the alphabet soup reception, Saturday night, July 12, from 6:00-7:30 at the Sheraton, and the TS Business meeting, Sunday, July 13, from 5:30 to 6:30. (See the TS website http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/annualmeeting/2003/ for a concise listing of TS meetings and programs.) And please remember to stop by the TS table in the exhibit hall! JoAnne Hounshell found some special trinkets to help you remember your trip to Seattle, and who knows, there may even be candy!

In other news, it has been a great pleasure serving as your chair for a year. The highlights of the year include, first of all, coming up with such a great slate of programs for Seattle, for which I’d like to thank the Education Chair, Kathy Winzer, and the very hardworking Education Committee. I’d like to remind you to bring all your program ideas for next year to Seattle to discuss with next year’s Education Chair, Jean Pajerek, at the Education Committee meeting, which will be held Wednesday, from 12:00-1:30. Other highlights include drafting the Technical Services response to the Annual Meeting Educational Programming Special Committee’s report on the scheduling problems at the annual meeting. There has been no official response to our request for more flexibility in scheduling our meetings, but indications are good that our concerns were heard, and that we have some amount of autonomy as soon as Boston, 2004.

I’d like to announce that TS donated $1,000 to the campaign to endow the George Strait Minority Scholarship. The scholarship is currently awarded to two college graduates annually. When it is fully endowed, the income generated from the endowment will provide a permanent funding source, allowing AALL to award two to four Strait Scholarships per year. TS members are also encouraged to contribute individually to this very worthy cause. In addition, I’d like to note with sadness the passing of a brave woman and a great serials librarian, Ellen Rappoport. To commemorate what she meant to us, the Board has decided to donate a sum of $200.00 to the American Cancer Society.

Finally, TS awarded four scholarships to attend the Advanced Cataloging Workshop this year. The recipients are Christy Ryan, Elaine Bradshaw, Julie Kremer and Akram Sadeghi Pari. Thanks for Elizabeth Geesey Holmes and the Awards Committee for their hard work in selecting them, and selecting as well our Rene Chapman Award winner for 2003, Rhonda K. Lawrence! Cataloging Legal Literature and so much more!

Christina Tarr
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Our life is frittered away by detail... Simplify, simplify, simplify! Henry David Thoreau

In Margie Axtmann’s last Collection Development column (v.28 no.3, March 2003) she discussed the complexities law libraries face as they attempt to keep statistical track of electronic purchases. In this, my last TSLL column, I’d like to address another complexity of electronic resources – keeping track of individual database access policies. Like most law libraries over the past ten years, our library has acquired a variety of electronic products. From dedicated line database services to web databases, from CD-ROMs to e-journals, our library has purchased its share of electronic resources; each with a unique license agreement dictating who and how the data can be accessed. Initially, keeping track of this information was pretty straight forward, but as products have evolved from one format to another and as we have...
increased the number of e-products we own/lease, keeping track of just what we are allowed to do with the data has grown problematic.

Truthfully, the problem I associate with keeping track of this data may simply be a reflection of my lack of record keeping skills. Annual payments for these services require annual FY files for each payment. As a result, if we have subscribed to a service for five years, we have five files containing information about the service. In addition we may, or may not, have a separate file containing a contract or some sort of license agreement. This would be no problem if the information in the files was never needed, but at least once a year someone in the library asks, “how many concurrent users are allowed to use this database,” or “do we access the database via IP or password” (“and by the way, just what is the password for that database.”) I have always been able to locate the needed information, but not before spending more time than I have digging through an always growing amount of paper.

It has been clear to me for several years that I need to pull this information together, into one easily accessible file, but I’ve just never gotten around to it. Then, a few months ago, our University Library sent out a spreadsheet they wanted all the system libraries to complete, documenting which electronic resources were available in each library. Their purpose was to create a list of “commonly held databases.” As an independent library, we were not obligated to participate in the list, but I liked the format of the spreadsheet and so I used it as a template for compiling a list of our own databases.

The spreadsheet, as received from our Main Library, included the following data fields: Database Name, Publisher, Vendor/Consortium, Purchase Order Number, Cost this FY, Renewal Date, Number of Users, and Access (IP or Password). I then added data fields for, Password, Vendor Account Number, Tech-Support Telephone Number, and Contract on File (Y/N).

The completed spreadsheet allows me to quickly access the basic information I am most frequently asked. Each time we renew a subscription we update the spreadsheet as needed and file any contract revisions in a separate lease agreement file. It is not a revolutionary tool, by any means, and I suspect many of you have created similar lists (even if just on paper), but it makes a huge difference when someone asks for the data. And while Thoreau wasn’t, I am sure, addressing law librarians, his message stands true. Creating simple solutions to complex issues can make a world of difference as we try not to fritter away our always shrinking time.


Picking up on my topic from the last issue, I am happy to report on some upcoming changes to the ABA Annual Questionnaire. The ABA Law Libraries Committee made several recommendations that were approved by the Questionnaire Committee for the 2003-2004 Annual Questionnaire. Among the changes are two that are particularly important to all of us who have followed the debate on reporting electronic resources.

The first set of changes is in the Annual Questionnaire, Part III – Library, Section 1 – Information Resources.

a. Question 3 formerly asked for the “Number of Web-based products to which the library subscribes.” That question and its related definition will be deleted from the next questionnaire.

b. Question 4 asked for “Other non-book titles (including CD-ROM titles).” The parenthetical phrase will be deleted from that question, and the definition of non-book titles now reads: “Include in this category manuscripts, photographs, audiocassettes, videotapes, CD-ROM, and DVD titles. Do not include electronic or web-based titles or products.”

The second set of changes is in the Annual Questionnaire, Part IV – Fiscal, Section G – Library Operations. Because the change in Part III means we won’t be counting electronic resources, Questions 1, 2, and 3 in Part IV will be revised to give libraries an opportunity to report their expenditures for electronic resources. The following questions ask for annual expenditures:

a. Question 1 – Serial subscriptions (print & microform)

b. Question 2 – Electronic resources (include expenditures for all digital resources, DVDs, CD-ROMS, web based resources, such as LegalTrac, BNA or CCH Web versions, Lexis/Nexis, Westlaw, CALII, LSN, NetLibrary, etc. and contributions or payments to consortiums or the University Library) (do not include payments for bibliographic services)

c. Question 3 – Other non serial library information resources (include all resources not reported in G.1 or G.2)

Finally, if you are going to the Annual Meeting in Seattle, don’t forget to attend program H-2: Judaic and Islamic Classification: Envisioning Access and Order for Legal Topics of International and Nonjurisdictional Scope. Elisheva Schwarz of New York University Law Library and Lesley Wilkins of Harvard University will be discussing the new religious law schedules. This session will include a brief overview of the schedule development process followed by a hands-on practicum. It is geared to both reference and technical services librarians with responsibility for Judaic and Islamic law, so invite your public services colleagues to attend as well. If you can’t make it to Seattle consider purchasing and listening to the tape!
These revisions to the Questionnaire shift the emphasis on electronic resources from counting titles to reporting expenditures. While that may not be a perfect way to evaluate the strength of a library collection, at least the new questions are clearer and easier to answer. The Law Libraries Committee will continue to explore methods of counting and reporting electronic resources, and it is likely that we will see more changes to the Questionnaire in the future.

When I set out to explore the topic of electronic resources, my main purpose was to find tools to measure the quality of a law library’s collection and services. The ABA Standards for Approval of Law Schools provide general guidelines and some benchmarks, but they are not particularly helpful for evaluating an established library. The summary reports produced from the ABA Annual Questionnaire help a library to see how it compares to other institutions, but that is more of a quantitative measure than a qualitative one.

Now, after talking with dozens of law librarians, I find myself wondering whether new evaluation tools are really needed. There is some value in having minimum collection standards and basic bibliographies for topical, jurisdictional or interdisciplinary collections. Such tools make it possible to establish and maintain core and specialized collections. But ultimately every library must evaluate how well it is meeting the needs of its particular clientele and supporting the programs of its parent institution.

Collection assessment is not just about owning x number of volumes or the specific titles on a list. It is also about having the staff and services in place to make those resources accessible and usable. It is about regular consultation with library users to keep up with trends in research. And it is about balancing user needs and expectations with declining budgets.

If a statistical tool existed that could measure all those elements, I would be first in line to buy it and use it. In the absence of such a tool, the ABA Annual Questionnaire provides academic law libraries with an adequate framework for statistical reporting and comparative evaluation. It has been challenging to find the right questions to ask about electronic resources, but the latest revisions are a step in the right direction.

Kudos to the committee members who worked on these revisions, and thanks to Judith Wright for providing the detailed information for this column. Having a little advance warning about the changes should make it easier for all of us to be prepared for the 2003 Annual Questionnaire. Happy counting!

---

**DESCRIPTION & ENTRY**

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

---

On May 1-2 of this year, I attended the Program for Cooperative Cataloging’s BIBCO Operations Committee Meeting at the Library of Congress. This meeting is held jointly with the CONSER Operations Committee Meeting. I will discuss below selected topics from the meeting, which I think may be of broad interest.

### A. Cataloging of Integrating Resources

At the meeting, several PCC policy decisions were made concerning the cataloging of integrating resources (IR), most notably:

1. **Full form of title and acronym or initialism in the chief source of information**
   
   Always record the acronym/initialism as other title information, and always give it as a title added entry. A new Library of Congress rule interpretation (LCRI) for 12.1E1 will be drafted to this effect, synchronizing the rules for serials and integrating resources. Currently, AACR only says to transcribe other title information for IRs if considered to be important.

2. **Recording frequency and regularity of IRs in fixed fields:**
   
   Recording frequency is mandatory, but recording regularity will be optional.

3. **Order of notes in IR records:**
   
   AACR order is to be preferred, but not mandatory. This compromise came about primarily because BIBCO catalogers follow AACR2 order for notes, but CONSER catalogers input notes in numerical order. Both groups will be updating records for integrating resources. To “lay the matter to rest”, CPSO [Library of Congress’ Cataloging Policy and Support Office] issued a draft RI on May 19 regarding note order in all formats: “Prefer the order of notes as specified in the rules unless there are mitigating circumstances that result in a different order…” <http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/lcri1_7b.html>.

---
B. Integrating Resources Manual and Training Course

1. The second draft of an integrating resources manual has been developed by a PCC task group chaired by Alice Jacobs from the National Library of Medicine. The manual, slightly more than 100 pages, is in the process of final revision, and should be available in finished form by the ALA Annual Meeting in June, 2003, and subsequently posted on the PCC website.

2. The Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program (SCCTP) has recently completed the development of its Integrating Resources Cataloging Workshop. The workshop will be offered in 2 simultaneous sessions on June 20, 2003, as an ALA pre-conference in Toronto. Future workshops will follow in different locations.

C. Implementation of Bibliographic Level Code “i” and Record Distribution

1. Implementation by OCLC, RLIN, and LC

OCLC announced that they would not be able to implement code “i” for integrating resources until their online union catalog had completed a smooth transition to the Oracle platform—at least another two years. They are understandably reluctant to implement code “i” both on Connexion and on Passport, given the latter’s imminent demise. While their decision makes a great deal of sense, it means that we will have at least two more years of “legacy records” to deal with when the implementation finally occurs.

RLIN implemented code “i” on December 13, 2002 for use in its MAP, MDF, REC, SCO, SER, and VIM files. For non-textual integrating resources, users are free to add non-PCC records to RLIN using for integrating resources using bib level “i” (RLIN BLT/02 “i”), or to continue to use BLT/02 “m”. For textual integrating resources, the national policy will be to catalog textual integrating resources as monographs, until OCLC and LC can implement this new bibliographic level. <Further OCLC information: http://www.oclc.org/technicalbulletins/247/#1; RLG information on changes at URI: http://www.rlg.org/marcupdate02.html>

2. Record Distribution: Pre-code “i”:

Until code “i” has been implemented by OCLC and LC, LC records for integrating resources will be distributed based upon type of record value (books, sound recordings, etc.).

3. Post Code “i” Implementation:

Once code “i” has been implemented, IR records will be distributed with records for serials. It has still not been decided whether non-LC PCC records for integrating resources will be distributed to both utilities along with LC records. If non-LC PCC records for IRs are to be distributed, a Library of Congress control number (010) will be assigned, and a (possibly different?) authentication code in the 042 field will be needed to identify the records.

4. Updating of IR Records:

Both BIBCO libraries with National OCLC enhance authorization and CONSER libraries will be authorized to create and replace PCC records for integrating resources with code “i”.

Updating and possible distribution of the substantial number of “legacy records” created for ongoing integrating resources cataloged prior to the eventual implementation of code “i” remains problematic.


D. Proposed Changes to AACR

Judy Kuhagen (CPSO), reported on major actions at the April 23-25, 2003 meeting of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC). Those of most interest to law catalogers include:

1. Multipart monographs

Currently, AACR 21.2B2 and 21.3A2 instruct us to change the entry for a multipart monograph whenever it is determined that a title proper or responsible person/corporate body appearing on later parts of the bibliographic resource has become predominant. JSC has approved revision of the above rules to remove the concept of predominance, and to base the entry on the first or earliest available part. This is in accordance with current LC/PCC policy for both bibliographic records and series authority records as a whole. (Intended publication date for revisions: 2004 Update)

Addition of Change Rules?

LC’s proposal to add rules for treating change in data elements of multipart items is still under discussion.

2. Specific characteristics of electronic resources

a. Area 3: “Type and Extent of Resource Area” (Marc 21 tag 256)

This area currently allows only “Electronic data”, “Electronic program(s)”, or a combination of the two. While it’s required in cataloging done according to AACR2, it’s not used by LC or in CONSER records, and the information given there is generally available elsewhere in more useful form in the records for Internet resources. The JSC has agreed to its removal from Chapter 9.

b. Provisional agreement to add option to record extent statement in area 5: “Physical Description Area” (MARC 21 “300” field) for remote access electronic resources.

Area 5 is not being used currently for the description of Internet resources. If this proposal is implemented, records for ongoing Internet resources could use the appropriate standard material designation given in section .5B in most part I chapters of AACR2 (maps, scores, etc.).
c. Inclusion of URNs (Uniform Resource Names) in Chapter 9

The JSC will consider whether to combine area 8 (“Standard number and Terms of Availability Area”) with other “important” numbers in AACR .7B19. An URN would be included as an example.

The W3C Web site defines a Uniform resource name as: “An URI [Uniform record identifier] that has an institutional commitment to persistence, availability, etc. Note that this sort of URI may also be a URL. See, for example, PURLs.” For more information, see URI: http://www.w3.org/Addressing/.

3. Incorporating FRBR (Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records) terminology into AACR

a. “Bibliographic resource” will be used throughout as the generic word for overall resource.

b. The FRBR terminology will be incorporated and used in a consistent manner throughout AACR, in stages. First, in areas 2, 3, 6, and maybe 4 of Part I, and in Part II, primarily Chapter 21 (which will also be undergoing a general revision).

c. Definitions of “work”, “expression”, and “manifestation” will be added to AACR’s glossary, along with a revised definition of “item” (if deemed necessary).

4. Incorporating Authority Control into AACR

Based on an outline approved by JSC, LC will start drafting rules for a new section of AACR, possibly Part III? Chapters 23-26 dealing with cross references would be moved to this section.

E. What Monographic Catalogers Need to Know About AACR2 Revision 2002

A useful list of the most significant changes in AACR relating to monographic series and multipart items has been compiled for possible inclusion in the BIBCO Training Manual. It is available at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/doc3a_03.

F. Proposed Projects for BIBCO Libraries: Participation in Electronic CIP and Dewey

David Bucknam (CIP division), John P. Celli (chief, CIP division), and Dennis McGovern (Acting head of Dewey Decimal Division), gave an overview of the Cataloging in Publication Program. Currently, non-governmental BIBCO libraries do not participate in this program. The Library of Congress is encouraging BIBCO libraries to consider participating in the CIP program, especially Electronic CIP. A library might work in a specific subject area or subject areas, or instead deal with all publications of the local university and other press or presses. Turnaround for the cataloging for E-CIP participants would need to be very rapid, generally within 48 hours. During the discussion which followed the presentations, it was asked what would be the incentive for libraries to take on this additional activity, aside from the not inconsiderable motive of assisting the Library of Congress in a worthwhile endeavor. Unfortunately, the logistics at this time would preclude participating libraries getting free copies of the items themselves. The thought at LC is that if other libraries could assist in taking on some of the responsibility of CIP cataloging, it would free resources there for other cataloging activities to which they are presently unable to give as much time as they would like. Participation by BIBCO libraries which use the Dewey classification would also be desirable, given the large number of libraries which use the system. There are however, few libraries in the BIBCO program which use this classification system (about six). Personally, while I think it would definitely be worthwhile to participate in the project (if it gets off the ground), it would be rather a difficult undertaking for most law libraries, given their small number of cataloging staff, to commit themselves to taking on another “rush” operation on a long term basis. General information on the E-CIP program is available at URI: http://cip.loc.gov/cip/ecip1.html.
G. “Parallel” Records in OCLC

With the exception of dual English and French records for the same bibliographic resource from the National Library of Canada, OCLC does not currently allow “duplicate” records in the same format for the same bibliographic resource. If a PCC library finds a record which doesn’t have English as its cataloging language (a record with 040 subfield “b” with a foreign language code), it is supposed to delete the foreign language code and to change the description into English. As more and more libraries from non-English speaking countries are adding records to OCLC and joining PCC programs, the stipulation against “duplicate” records will become more and more of a concern. For instance, several Mexican libraries have recently started a NACO Mexican funnel and are also contributing bibliographic records to OCLC. It seems counterproductive at best for a cataloger in an English speaking country to change a perfectly good record which happens to have its notes and other descriptive elements in a foreign language from that language into English, rather than to add an English language record for that same resource. There was a great degree of support at the meeting for the PCC to urge OCLC to reconsider its policy. The prevailing opinion was that it would be better to consider these as “parallel” records, rather than “duplicate” records. Some preexisting or new linking field would be useful to link the records to each other. The OCLC representative at the meeting said that OCLC had been considering a change in policy in this area, and would discuss this matter at their upcoming Members’ Council meeting.

H. FRBR and FRANAR

1. FRBR Presentation by Barbara Tillett

Barbara Tillett, chief of CPSO, was one of the original consultants who developed the conceptual model of FRBR for IFLA. She gave a lucid presentation on Thursday afternoon, with illustrations from her presentation in early April at an ALCTS Institute in San Jose on Metadata and AACR. She anticipates that FRBR terminology may be completely integrated into our cataloging code (renamed AACR3?) by about 2006.) Her ALCTS presentation is available at URL: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/doc4_frbr.

2. CONSER FRBR Task Force on Continuing Resources

FRBR was also discussed during the Friday afternoon joint BIBCO/CONSER meeting, unfortunately without the presence of Barbara Tillett.

Everett Allgood, New York University, chair of the Task Force, gave a summary of the activities of various groups working with FRBR. The general difficulties of applying FRBR as it currently exists to continuing resources, especially serials, were discussed. As Everett noted, most of the examples in FRBR are for music or literary resources, and few examples are given for serials and integrating resources. Areas of particular difficulty for incorporating serials into the FRBR construct:


FRBR favors construction of uniform titles at the expression level. In general, uniform titles, particularly for serials, have been used to create citations at the manifestation level, rather than the expression level. For example: the standard material designation (SMD) “Online” is often used as a qualifier in uniform titles, to distinguish the online manifestation of a bibliographic resource from its print manifestation. If FRBR is to be accepted as a proper framework for AACR and other cataloging codes, then this practice will need to be revisited.

b. Serial title change? New work or new expression?

There was much discussion at the meeting on the difficulty of deciding when a serial title change represents a new “expression”, and when it represents a new work. Which

attributes belong to a work, which to an expression?

It seems apparent that FRBR needs to be fine tuned, to account more thoroughly for seriality. I gave a brief description in my last column on the body which is responsible for FRBR revisions, the IFLA Working Group on FRBR. (Text of FRBR is available online at URL: http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/index.pdf)

3. IFLA Working Group on FRANAR (Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records)

Established in April 1999, with Glenn Patton of OCLC as its chair, this group has three distinct charges:

1. To define the functional requirements of authority records, continuing the work initiated by FRBR.

2. To study the feasibility and use of an International Standard Authority Data Number (ISADN).

3. To act as the official IFLA liaison to, and cooperate with other interested parties concerning authority files.


Everett’s report, which also discusses FRANAR, is available online at http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/FRBR.pdf.

The complete BIBCO OpCo meeting agenda may be found at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/opcoagenda03.html.

Postscript: The official summary of the BIBCO Operations Committee meeting is now available at the BIBCO Web site <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/opco03.html>.
Defining the term “authenticity” as it applies to digital resources or electronic records has been a growth industry of late. A number of library organizations have grappled with the concept. The Council on Library and Information Resources issues a recent report stating that term can mean different things to a law librarian, an archivist, or a rare book librarian. The term can apply differently to published and unpublished materials. Behind any definition of the term authenticity lie assumptions about the meaning and significance of content, fixity, consistency of reference, provenance and context.

Before coming back to law libraries I spent time working at a large unnamed Midwestern university’s e-text center. A portion of my time was spent creating headers (metadata) for e-texts the library had downloaded from places like Project Gutenberg. In some cases, a great deal of effort was put into documenting the provenance of the original document the e-text was scanned from. More often, however, more effort was placed into the tagging of the text than into its descriptive metadata. This made the process of creating a header similar to that of upgrading a very sparse MARC record by using a text with no title page, cover or other front matter. Often we could not determine what text was scanned to create the digital version or if only one edition had been used.

These were primarily humanities texts. In law, many of our assumptions regarding authenticity of legal materials flow from procedural matters. We call something the authentic code of the state based upon who issues or publishes it or because the relevant legislative or official bodies have declared it the “authentic” copy. Provenance is a key factor in our determinations. Ultimately, though, the process is grounded in trust.

When we are in doubt about the authenticity of a digital version, we can often fall back to the print version as a means of comparison. This can no longer be considered a long term solution. As electronic publishing and distribution of information continues to grow and to be seen as a cheaper alternative to print that fall back print copy begins to appear less and less. Determining a clear definition of authenticity is essential for both technical and public service librarians. As we attempt to acquire, catalog and preserve digital/electronic legal materials, knowing that we have the “authentic” version cataloged and preserved or that we are delivering to our clients the “authentic” statute or code cite should be as seamless as it is in the print environment. These issues need to be settled before users can feel confident in creating and relying upon digital information.

The issues relating to authenticity, trust and security of digital records and electronic publications have been discussed at length over the last few years. Perhaps we need to begin a dialogue among law librarians as well to determine what our definition of “authenticity” should be?

The following are two recent reports covering this topic that are worthy of review.


On January 24, 2000, CLIR convened a group of experts from different domains of the information resources community to address the question: What is an authentic digital object? To prepare for the discussion, five individuals were asked to write position papers that identify the attributes that define authentic digital data over time.

The authors were Charles T. Cullen (Newberry Library), Peter B. Hirtle (Cornell Institute for Digital Collections), David Levy (University of Washington), Clifford Lynch (Coalition for Networked Information) and Jeff Rothenberg (RAND Corporation).

The Cullen article is interesting in it use of legal history examples, especially regarding the papers of John Marshall. Cullen also describes an authentication strategy proposed by Andy Hopper of Cambridge University. In this scenario librarians would act as “trusted third parties” to authenticate materials for researchers.

David Levy’s recent work has attempted to answer the question, “What is a document?” The essay included here as well as his recent book “Scrolling Forward: Making Sense of Documents in the Digital Age” are both good reads.


The following description is from the InterPARES website.
The InterPARES (International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems) Project is a major international research initiative in which archival scholars, computer engineering scholars, national archival institutions and private industry representatives are collaborating to develop the theoretical and methodological knowledge required for the long-term preservation of the authenticity of records created in electronic systems. The InterPARES Project is based in the School of Library, Archival and Information Studies at the University of British Columbia. The first phase of the project, InterPARES 1, began in 1999 and was concluded in 2001. It focused on the preservation of the authenticity of records that are no longer needed by the creating body to fulfill its own mission or purposes. This phase has produced conceptual requirements for authenticity and models of the processes of selection and preservation of authentic electronic records.

The Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) has granted a second phase of the InterPARES Project. InterPARES 2: Experiential, Interactive and Dynamic Records began on January 1, 2002 and will continue until December 31, 2006. Although based on the findings of the original InterPARES Project, InterPARES 2 is dramatically innovative in several ways:

1. it will address issues of reliability and accuracy in addition to issues of authenticity, where InterPARES 1 was only concerned with authenticity;
2. it will address them throughout the records’ life-cycle (from creation to permanent preservation), where InterPARES 1 was concerned with non-current records destined to permanent preservation;
3. it will focus on records produced in new digital environments, experiential, dynamic, and interactive, where InterPARES 1 was concerned with records generated in databases and document management systems; and its object will be records resulting from artistic, scientific and government activities; whereas InterPARES 1 was concerned with records resulting from administrative and legal activities.

---

**MARC Remarks**

**MARC Miscellany**

Susan Goldner
University of Arkansas, Little Rock
sgoldner@ualr.edu

**2003 MARC Format Update**

Changes to MARC 21, which were published in October 2002, were implemented by OCLC in May 2003, with release of Technical Bulletin 249. See <www.oclc.org/techbulletins/249/>. Please note that since I am not an RLIN user, I am unable to report on their plans.

Field 247 is renamed and redefined. In the past, it was only used for pre-AACR2 latest entry cataloging. With the changed rules for integrating resources, the field has been renamed, Former Title. “A former title proper. Use when one cataloging record represents several titles associated with an entity.” This is one change we will put to use for both loose-leafs and electronic resources.

As a sign of the times, a URL (uniform resource identifier) may now be added to several bibliographic notes, including Restrictions on Access Note (field 506), System Details Note (field 538), and Terms Governing Use and Reproduction Note (field 540). A URL is authorized for authority records in Source Data Found (field 670), but the Library of Congress does not yet want them used in LC, NACO or SACO records.

The second indicator of the Other Index Term – Genre/Form (field 655) has been changed to mirror the codes used in other subject fields. Take Library of Congress Subject Headings for genre/form as an example:

- Old practice: 655 #7 ...$2 lcsh
- New practice: 655 #0 ...

For the most part, these changes are not dramatic ones. Several of them respond to needs of the archival community, so if you catalog archival material you should take a look at them. A number of the changes reflect the new use of ‘electronic resource’ in place of ‘computer file’ and ‘continuing resource’ in place of ‘serial’.

**Non-Filing Characters**

In February of this year, the Library of Congress implemented changes to the method of counting non-filing characters. See <http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/nonfil.html>. The changes are in response to clarification included when MARC 21 was first published. Both OCLC and RLIN indicate that they can handle these new conventions and still handle the old methods. If your
local system supports these new conventions, you should now follow them for current cataloging.

Here is an excerpt from the LC document, which describes the change much better than I could.

“This change applies when definite or indefinite articles are present and the first filing word following the article begins with a character modified by a diacritic. ...

“Count the article, diacritics associated with the article, any blank space, an alif, an ayn, or any mark of punctuation preceding the first filing character. Do *not* count a diacritic associated with the first filing character...

“Old practice: 245 13 $aL’été ...

“New practice: 245 12 $aL’été ...

Please visit the cited document for a complete description with more examples. Those of us with few foreign language materials in our collections, will be little affected by this change.

FRBR and OCLC

An article titled “The Concept of a Work in WorldCat: An Application of FRBR” by Rick Bennett, Brian F. Lavoie and Edward T. O’Neill was published in *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services*, 27:1 (Spring 2003) and is available at <http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/archive/2003/lavoie_frbr.pdf>. The abstract appearing with the article says:

“This paper explores the concept of a work in WorldCat, the OCLC Online Union Catalog, using the hierarchy of bibliographic entities defined in the *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR)* report. A methodology is described for constructing a sample of works by applying the FRBR model to randomly selected WorldCat records. This sample is used to estimate the number of works in WorldCat, and describe some of their key characteristics. Results suggest that the majority of benefits associated with applying FRBR to WorldCat could be obtained by concentrating on a relatively small number of complex works.”

In a few pages it gives a good description of FRBR, describes how it was tested against a portion of the OCLC database, and draws conclusions from the test.

...MARC at AALL in Seattle

If FRBR interests you, make sure you attend the Program A-4 on Sunday morning, July 13, in Seattle. Kathy Winzer has lined up a great group of speakers, so don’t miss it.

Also, check out the new 30-minute slots on Wednesday afternoon. As Program L-4, I will give my MARBI report and have some time for any discussion it might generate. Since it has its own slot in the schedule, don’t expect the MARBI report during business or committee meetings. I’m sure that none of you will miss having to hear it more than once.

Putting MARC to Good Use

Last week I spent a couple of days learning how to write load tables for my local system (Innovative Interfaces). Figuring out all the details of loading records either makes you appreciate or hate the MARC format. Maybe a little of both. Without it, none of the things we do with our local systems would be possible. Just like a great many things in life, every once in a while we need to stop and be thankful for something we take for granted.

The Seattle conference is rapidly approaching, and I hope that many of you will be there. I am looking forward to some of my favorite things in Seattle—Ivar’s restaurant on the waterfront, the bakery in the Pike Place Market, the University District and the University of Washington campus (my library school alma mater), and my favorite American League baseball team, the Seattle Mariners. There are two committee events I would like to highlight for Seattle.

OCLC Committee Open Discussion—Seattle

The OCLC Committee will meet on Sunday, July 13 from 11:45 to 1:15. Our guest speaker will be Mr. Rick Newell of OCLC’s Western Service Center office. Mr. Newell will speak on what is new at OCLC and will be available for questions and discussion.

Connected to the Future: OCLC’s Connexion

This program will be on Wednesday, July 16 from 1:45 to 2:15. Mr. Rick Newell will be the speaker at this program as well. This is one of the new 30 minute programs for this conference. With
Continued Developments with Connexion

OCLC continues to enhance Connexion, and the initial release of the Windows client interface is scheduled for June, 2003. Release 2 is still scheduled for the 3rd quarter of 2003, and release 3 later on (no definite date so far). OCLC’s website contains a Connexion client preview at www.oclc.org/connexion/documentation/client preview. This document is very valuable in preparing us for the client and is something that we should all examine before the Seattle conference. The document contains an overview of the hardware and software requirements, screen shots and descriptions of searching WorldCat, editing and creating records, and future enhancements. For all the latest up-to-date information about Connexion, go to OCLC’s website at www.oclc.org/connexion.

Technical Bulletins

In the March Bits and Pieces newsletter, OCLC announced that they were discontinuing the distribution of printed copies of the technical bulletins. Technical bulletins 248 and 249 were the first ones affected by this change. OCLC makes all current technical bulletins available on their website in both PDF and HTML formats at www.oclc.org/technicalbulletins/. In addition, OCLC announces the availability of new technical bulletins on three of their discussion lists: OCLC-Cat, DOCUpdate-l, and Techbul-l. As OCLC moves away from the distribution of printed documentation (making libraries go to the website and print it off), these lists are valuable for notification of new documentation. I subscribe to OCLC-Cat and DOC Update-l, and I recommend that all libraries at a minimum subscribe to the latter.

Of the two new technical bulletins, TB248 details changes to ILL, while TB249 contains numerous MARC format changes. At least one error was discovered by a user in TB249, and OCLC has issued a revision.

Autocat Discussion about OCLC and “Record Nabbing”

As I was preparing this column in late April, a discussion arose on Autocat concerning usage of OCLC-derived records by nonmember libraries. There was a presentation and discussion about this issue at the February 2003 Members Council meeting. The presentation was done by Gary Houk, OCLC Vice President of Cataloging and Metadata Services. The slides of his presentation are available at: www.oclc.org/oclc/feb03/ppt/GaryHouk_NonMemberUsetFiles/frame.htm. OCLC’s concern is for “record nabbing,” which Houk defined as “the unauthorized downloading of OCLC member cataloging records from library OPAC’s by all types of libraries from all corners of the world.” So the idea is not the unauthorized use of OCLC records from WorldCat, but rather the unauthorized “nabbing” of OCLC-derived records in member libraries OPACs.

One characteristic of virtually any discussion of OCLC on Autocat is one of extreme hostility towards OCLC by some of the participants. This discussion was no exception. People took issue with OCLC’s pricing as forcing libraries to engage in record nabbing. Many people questioned who really owns the records, if the records are under copyright protection, contract issues between OCLC and the library, and the like. Others slammed OCLC’s non-profit status and how it evidently took a special act of the Ohio Legislature to maintain that status (having seen OCLC’s facilities in Dublin, Ohio, I can attest to the fact that they are bringing in a lot of money). One individual even accused OCLC of being a Ponzi scheme.

In defense of OCLC, people pointed out that OCLC eliminates the need (usually) of searching multiple sources. The value of the resource sharing was cited by some people. Others pointed out that for the whole thing to work, OCLC had to have income. Finally some pointed out that this was just a discussion point in the Members Council meeting.

As I view this, I do not think that there is much OCLC can do about record nabbing. OCLC has a document titled “Guidelines for the Use and Transfer of OCLC-Derived Records” <www.oclc.org/oclc/uc/3478.htm> The guidelines and background information in the document is well worth examining. However, the naïveté of some of the postings amazed me. A number of these people have probably never worked in the for-profit world. I agree that libraries are in the sharing business, but in order for us function with an efficient shared arrangement like OCLC, it needs to charge and make some money.

I was tempted to weigh in on Autocat concerning this issue, but then I decided to stay out of the discussion. What I wanted to say to Autocat was that we should not depend on the Members Council to represent our interests. The Members Council, in spite of its name, represents the interests of directors, not technical services. We need to make our views known on our own, because the Members Council will probably not do it for us.

Conclusion

I do want to urge you to come to our Committee’s open discussion and the program on Connexion if you attend the conference in Seattle. I hope to see many of you there.

This is my final column as the chair of the OCLC Committee. It has been a pleasure researching and writing these columns for the past three years, and I look forward to reading my successor’s columns.
What is Your Preservation IQ?

Katherine Hedin
University of Minnesota
k-hedi@tc.umn.edu

Hope Breeze
Duke University
breeze@law.duke.edu

How much do you know about preservation issues? These questions represent various areas of the field. Some are easy, some a little tricky. Go ahead. Test your preservation IQ. Maybe you know more than you think.

1. What is the best means for preserving the information in brittle books?
   A. Microfilm it.
   B. Digitize it.
   C. Give it to Nicholson Baker.
   D. All three are equally acceptable.

2. Why do books become brittle?
   A. Chemicals used to produce paper may cause them to become acidic.
   B. Pages are likely made from unpurified wood pulp which is weaker and more vulnerable.
   C. Environmental pollutants accelerate deterioration.
   D. All of the above.

3. A library preservation assessment would include:
   A) Examining climate conditions in collection areas.
   B) Assessing fire protection programs.
   C) Interviewing those responsible for book repair.
   D) Asking housekeepers what vacuum cleaners they use.
   E) All of the above.
   F) A through C only.

4. Mold can only grow on books when:
   A. The temperature is above 70°
   B. Books that already contain mold spores are introduced into the collection.
   C. There is enough moisture present.
   D. All of the above.

5. Standards for library binding are developed by:
   A. Library Binding Institute.
   C. Northeast Document Conservation Center
   D. NEH Division of Preservation and Access.

6. You should never shelve a book:
   A. On its spine.
   B. On a shelf that is not as tall as the book.
   C. On its fore-edge.
   D. Lying flat.

7. A cardinal rule of book repair is:
   A. Pressure sensitive tape is our friend.
   B. It’s best not to attempt repair until the book is too damaged for normal use.
   C. Even the simplest procedures require a high level of formal education and training.
   D. If you don’t know what you’re doing, it’s better to do nothing.

8. To increase the life of videocassette tapes:
   A. They should be stored vertically, or in an upright position.
   B. They should only be rewound just before playing.
   C. They should not be stored near tele-vision sets.
   D. All of the above.

9. For the greatest protection to books, shelving should:
   A. Be well lighted, preferably by direct sunlight.
   B. Be constructed of polyurethane coated wood.
   C. Allow at least a 3 inch distance from the bottom shelf to the floor.
   D. All of the above.

10. The best way to break-in a new book is by:
    A. Opening to the center of the book and forcing it open until it pops.
    B. Opening from either end a few pages at a time and pressing along the inner margins.
    C. Opening to the center, placing face down, and pressing on the spine.
    D. Books should not be broken-in.

ANSWERS:

1. A. Mr. Baker would likely not agree, but preservation experts generally contend that reformating is necessary to preserve the information in brittle books. Microfilming continues to be the most stable and reliable means for long-term preservation.

2. D. All three are contributors to embrittlement.

3. E. Once again, all of the above. A good preservation assessment
examines any activity or condition that may affect the well-being of the library collection, including how housekeepers clean. Vacuum cleaners that fail to filter small particles tend to create dust problems.

4. C. This is a tricky question. The word “only” is key to the answer. Warmer temperatures are conducive to mold growth, although mold can grow in temperatures as low as 40 degrees. Mold spores can be introduced in a variety of ways, and it is highly likely they are already there waiting for enough moisture to allow them to flourish.

5. A. The Library Binding Institute was established in 1935 and works to promote high standards within the field of bookbinding.

6. C. You may have been tempted by answer B. Ideally, shelves are adjusted to accommodate taller books, but in practice, this is not always possible. It is okay in this case to shelve the book spine down, but never fore-edge down. The text block of a book on its fore-edge has no support and its weight may cause it to separate from the spine.

7. D. Many a book has been irreparably damaged by a well-meaning librarian using flawed repair techniques.

8. D. If you break all these rules in storing your personal collection, you are not alone. Nevertheless, you should avoid laying videocassettes on their sides since this may allow the tape to sag away from the hub. Tapes should never be stored half played and its best not to rewind, since playing leaves a more even tension. If you must rewind, use a machine that allows rewinding at a slow speed. Tapes should not be stored near magnetic fields, and that includes televisions.

9. C. Pipes burst. Water pools. Anything on or near the floor gets wet. A and B are wrong. Wooden shelving is not recommended because it emits harmful gases and no coating or sealant will completely block this. Well lighted shelves are people friendly but not book friendly. For more discussion of lighting and books, see the preservation column in TSLL, vol. 28, no. 1/2.

10. B. Actually, breaking in books is a good thing. It preserves the strength and elasticity of the book for years.

* Nicolson Baker is the author of Double Fold: Libraries and the Assault on Paper, 2001, in which he accuses librarians of exaggerating the brittle paper problem and thus destroying printed books and newspapers in an effort to reformat them.

** An older, but still worthy, discussion of what things cause paper to deteriorate can be found in Paper and its Preservation: Environmental Controls, Oct. 1983 (rev.). This paper was published by the Library of Congress Preservation Office as its Preservation Leaflet No. 2 and distributed through the GPO depository program.

I hope you are planning to attend the Research Roundtable in Seattle. It is scheduled for Sunday, July 13 from 11:45 a.m.-1:15 p.m. It will be a time to learn about projects that some of your colleagues are working on or contemplating, as well as a chance to share your own ambitions or accomplishments. Hopefully enough sparks will fly (in a good way) that one will kindle your imagination!

We will also hear a report from Susan Goldner on the progress of the TSLL indexing project that she and Virginia Bryant are working on. This project, by the way, received an OBS/TS Joint Research Grant. Yes, even in these lean times there is research funding out there! You can learn more about how to apply for the JRG at: http://www.aallnet.org/sis/obssis/research/researchinfo.htm.

Ellen McGrath has graciously contributed the following guest column on technical services aspects of the AALL Research Agenda, which we will also discuss at the Research Roundtable. In this same vein, if you have attended a research-oriented conference program or even just read a great article or book on research, let me extend an open invitation to you to be a guest columnist as well.

AALL Research Agenda: Focus on Technical Services

Ellen McGrath
University at Buffalo
emcgrath@buffalo.edu

I confess—I hadn’t really given a lot of thought to the AALL Research Agenda. I read it when the Association
announced it in its current version a while ago (September 2000). And I remember being impressed with it. In my opinion, an awful lot of information was presented concisely, but in a broad enough way that left plenty of room for interpretation. Then last year, I was appointed to the AALL Research Committee and so the Agenda reappeared on my radar, with a whole new emphasis.

First, let me say just a little about the Research Committee. Here is its charge: This committee reviews and proposes changes to the Association’s Research Agenda, works within the Association and with other library associations to encourage research, and administers the Association’s research grant program by reviewing applications, making awards and monitoring research activities.

At present, Kumar Percy is Chair of the Research Committee. Its other members are: Scott Childs, Kevin Gray, Edwin Greenlee, Paul Healey, Ellen McGrath, Grace Mills, and James Duggan (AALL Executive Board liaison). Its website is at: http://www.aallnet.org/committee/research/.

I was honored to be appointed to the Research Committee, but also a bit overwhelmed. After all, its charge is pretty huge and sort of two-pronged: (1) monitoring the Research Agenda and encouraging research, and (2) reviewing research grant applications, deciding who to give the grants to, and making sure the activities funded actually take place on schedule. The second group of activities is more straightforward than the first. And it’s great to be able to assist in the process of actually giving out money!

By contrast, monitoring the Research Agenda and encouraging research are less tangible tasks and therefore difficult in a different way. But they are essential building blocks from a very practical point of view, in order to make sure that there are applications for the Committee to review. Funding these research grants after all, is one of the major methods of accomplishing the Research Agenda. As to the encouragement of research, the OBS and TS SISs have been strong, long-term contributors to that effort on a number of fronts: by sponsoring the OBS/T.S Research Roundtable each year at the AALL Annual Meeting, by establishing the OBS/T.S Joint Research Grant Committee and awarding grants, and by running this “Research & Publications” column in TSL.

Since OBS and TS are doing such an excellent job of emphasizing the importance of research and have worked it into the very fabric of their organizations, I will simply applaud those efforts and urge them to keep it up! My goal in this article is to focus more specifically on the AALL Research Agenda as it relates to technical services. My hope is that some of the topics will grab your attention and then you will decide to research and publish in those areas. And if that does happen, don’t forget that the AALL research grants and the OBS/T.S joint research grants exist to help fund your work.

The Agenda is quite wide-ranging and it covers seven pages when printed out. It is divided into six major categories:

- The profession of law librarianship
- Law library patrons
- Law library services
- Legal research and bibliography
- Legal information resources
- Law library facilities

Technical services is an integral part of the law library, so it is true that everything in the AALL Research Agenda ultimately affects and/or is affected by technical services. But technical services librarians have specific skills and knowledge that they could bring to bear on certain parts of the Agenda that are most directly related to, and could actually affect the manner in which they perform their daily work. I realize that the line between “traditional” technical vs. public services functions is blurring all the time and that is a good thing. But I will focus rather specifically here on the following areas: acquisitions, cataloging, collection development, preservation, and serials. And I will try to highlight those portions of the Agenda, as best I can. I’ll even underline some terms to show why I included the points I did.

The Profession of Law Librarianship

This entire section obviously directly affects technical services librarians, since we are all members of the profession. So I won’t record each point separately here. This section is quite detailed and covers a lot of ground: decision-making climate, job descriptions, evaluations, motivation, principles, mentoring, culture, leadership, education, training, status, advancement, professional organizations, salaries, etc. These are all important areas that affect all types of law librarians, including technical services librarians. If research into these areas was undertaken, some of the results might be somewhat different for technical services librarians vs. other types of librarians, but much of it would be the same. I encourage everyone to read this section carefully.
The challenge that occurred to me when reading it was how to design an effective research approach to these rather abstract topics.

**Law Library Services**

Many of the points in this section generally refer to methods of measuring and evaluating the needs of our users and then adjusting our services appropriately to meet those needs. This is of course a major challenge in any area of a law library. But this section also contains some specific points that encompass technical services issues.

- Can legal resources on the Internet be adequately classified and cataloged? Should they be?
- How can the full range of resources available electronically, including audio, video, graphics, animation, text, etc., be incorporated into and described in a single cataloging record? How can adequate access and retrieval mechanisms be built into the cataloging record? Will cataloging records need to change from text to a more graphical representation? What are the implications of this kind of change? What happens to unindexed/uncataloged materials?
- Can standards for description, access, encoding and transmission of digital resources be developed that would allow for uniform comparisons and knowledgeable selection? How can law librarians or AALL persuade legal information producers to adopt open, non-proprietary standards?
- What is the potential impact of direct publisher-end user relationships on law libraries?

**Legal Information Resources**

- How can consortium agreements be forged between public and private, for-profit and not-for-profit libraries, to maximize leverage in buying/acquiring information resources? How can the individual members of the consortium retain sufficient independence while benefiting from the consensual agreements?
- What is a “legal document” in the electronic age? How does this new genre impact publishing, access, control, preservation and the use of the document in a legal proceeding?
- How can we best communicate with information producers to ensure that they provide legal information in the best appropriate format for end users, rather than in the most cost-effective format for production or the “format of the moment”? What are we doing as a profession to influence information resource research and development?
- What standards and guidelines should be developed for the organization and delivery of information and services in an evolving print and electronic environment? Can these standards and guidelines apply to a purely electronic collection (whether virtual or not), or must there be differing standards to recognize the different formats and organizational models?
- How do cancellations of materials affect library service in law libraries? What are the long-term impacts of write-for-order programs and cancellations of materials produced by targeted publishers? What are the long-term implications of canceling print copies of publications because the information is available online? Are there different considerations if the information is available for free on the Internet or only available through commercial providers?

**Law Library Facilities**

- How does the arrangement of the library and its collection of resources influence the patron’s choice of resource? How does it influence the librarian’s choice of resources?
- Would it be feasible to unify all the law library catalogs, either in the U.S., in North America, or worldwide? Can databases and websites be incorporated into this unified law library catalog?

As you can see, the Research Agenda contains a number of questions relevant to technical services librarians. Now that we know this, we need to turn these questions into specific research projects that will yield some answers. This process will not be easy by any means. And there will need to be interim steps, where portions of these questions are fleshed out into a whole series of even more specific questions, which will then result in focused research problems to be investigated, documented, and shared.

My intent in presenting this information was not to provide answers to the interesting and challenging questions posed in the AALL Research Agenda, for that is a huge task that can only be tackled through the efforts and input of many law librarians. I simply hoped to help technical services librarians focus in on these questions and perhaps to open up a dialog about them. Fortunately, OBS, TS, and AALL already have mechanisms in place that make undertaking such a process of communication and research relatively easy, namely this column, the OBS/TS Research Roundtable, and the OBS/TS and AALL research grants. In making use of these opportunities, we can help each other to find the answers to these questions, as well as to determine new questions, since the Research Agenda is always evolving.
It is noteworthy that the last five AALL presidents
have all had strong ties to technical services.
I'll now be the third of the last five AALL
presidents to have very strong ties to technical
services. I think that says volumes about the
reputation of technical services law librarians.

3. Will your presidency have a
particular theme or focus?
I have two themes for the upcoming
year. The slogan for the Boston Annual
Meeting & Conference is “Boston to
Bombay: The World of Legal
Information.” Law Librarianship has
gone “global” and that concept will
show up in the Boston educational
programs, in several Spectrum Member
Briefings and at other venues throughout the year.

As a former AALL treasurer, my second
“theme” shouldn’t surprise anyone. I
want to focus some effort on insuring the
long-term financial health of AALL. I am commissioning two special
committees that will have a financial focus. The first one will lay the
groundwork for an AALL planned
financing program. Such programs are
very common in many associations, and I
think we have many members who
would be interested in adding a
contribution to AALL in their estate
plans.

The other special committee will have the task of identifying foundations and
other granting entities who might be
willing to contribute to our advocacy
efforts on information policy. For
example the McArthur Foundation
made a significant gift to ALA last year
for their advocacy program. There is
so much more we need to do in this
area, but additional funding will be
needed. I believe there are foundations
that will support AALL’s advocacy
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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:

Eastern European newsletter
(OCoLC 36346853)
Absorbed by:
European newsletter (Bicester, England)
(Beginning with 2003, issue 1 (Feb. 2003))
(OCoLC 36460648)

Hybrid (Philadelphia, Pa.)
Vol. 1, no. 1 (spring 1993)-v. 5 (spring 2000)
(OCoLC 29490135)

Changed to:

Journal of Law and Social Change
Vol. 6 (2002)-
(OCoLC 52159051)

Legal studies (Society of Public Teachers of Law)
Vol. 1, no. 1 (1981)-v. 21, no. 4 (Nov. 2001)
(OCoLC 7708936)

Changed to:
Legal studies (Society of Legal Scholars)
Vol. 22, no. 1 (Mar. 2002)-
(OCoLC 49630791)

Russian & East European finance and trade
Vol. 28, no. 1 (spring 1992)-v. 38, no. 3
(May-June 2002)
(OCoLC 25215976)

Changed to:
Emerging markets finance & trade
Vol. 38, no. 4 (July-Aug. 2002)-
(OCoLC 50011727)

South Carolina environmental law journal
Vol. 1, no. 1 (winter 1991)-v. 10 (summer 2002)
(OCoLC 25226076)

Changed to:
Southeastern environmental law journal
Vol. 11, no. 1 (fall 2002)-
(OCoLC 51933687)

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:

Law practice quarterly
Ceased in print with: v. 2, no. 4 (Dec. 2001)
(OCoLC 43649010)
Subsequent issues only issued online via ABA web site

Library currents
Ceased with: v. 19, no. 12 (Dec. 2002)
(OCoLC 10151361)

Tax angles
Ceased with: v. 28, no. 7 (July 2002)
(OCoLC 521886)
efforts; we just need to find them.

4. How do you think Technical Services work will develop in a more global era?

I think the more globally connected we become, the more we will need to collaborate with technical services law librarians throughout the world. Some of our colleagues in our largest academic, national, and major firm law libraries have developed great expertise in acquiring legal materials from around the globe, but most of us haven’t that knowledge. We need to build our global technical services network to make acquisitions and cataloging an efficient process whether you work in Cleveland or Cairo. Maybe an “International Law Technical Services Summit” is in our future.

5. What can members of OBS and TS expect from attending the annual meetings of AALL?

What can they expect? Three things I think: great continuing education, opportunities to network with professional colleagues and time to celebrate with friends the accomplishments of our profession.

6. How can members of TS and OBS help you in your year as President?

Come to Seattle and come to Boston. That would be a good start! Let me know what you think and what you need. Be supportive when I goof and be enthusiastic when I get something right. And come join me for a great evening of fun at the closing gala in Boston!

7. Demographic reports indicate that librarianship is a “graying” profession. This trend seems especially notable in Technical Services – how can we encourage young people to enter our field?

Well, I’d like to think that only my hairdresser knows for sure, but yes, we aren’t getting any younger. This is something our profession faces and it is troubling. I have started having conversations whenever I meet with law librarians on what we can do to make our profession and association more attractive to a younger generation. I think we need to spend some time learning about the values, aspirations and ambitions of the next generation. Hopefully, that understanding will make it easier for us to recruit new colleagues, and to know how we will need to change to accommodate a new generation just as our predecessors changed to accommodate us.

8. What have been some of your favorite AALL moments?

Hum...interesting...almost all of them involve eating and drinking with friends! The locations change, but it is working with and enjoying the company of my AALL colleagues at annual meetings across the country that are the highlights for me. Exploring the great Mexican cuisine of San Diego; the closing banquet in New Orleans; the Alphabet Soup SIS receptions on the Saturday night of so many meetings; not tripping the first time I went up the stairs to sit at the head table at a closing banquet.

But I have to say that receiving the Renee Chapman Memorial Award last year was truly my favorite AALL moment. I was very moved to be honored in this way.

9. Some past AALL Presidents have indicated that chocolate would go a long way toward pleasing them, but I understand that you prefer luggage. What’s a poor TS librarian to do?

Ah, you know me too well! I do have this thing about luggage - “the right bag for every trip” is my motto! Looking for perfect luggage does tie nicely with my other passion - shopping! However, in lieu of luggage, I will go along with my predecessors. Chocolate will always do!

The TS-SIS annual survey was conducted in early February. The 88 respondents answered questions and provided comments about annual convention programs, the SIS, Technical Services Law Librarian (TSLL), the SIS website, and had the opportunity to volunteer for committee assignments, offices, and TSLL assignments.

Stripped of the mathematical calculations, the overall impression is one of satisfaction, with many very positive comments about particular activities, and some concerns. What we do we do well. We can do more, and members provided valuable suggestions that have been passed on to committee chairs and other board members.

The first section dealt with programs at the Orlando conference, upcoming programs in Seattle, and proposals for Boston programming. The Orlando program which most respondents indicated they attended was “Publication Patterns.” The program ranked most relevant by attendees was “How to Avoid ‘Search Reopened’ and
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Hire the Right Technical Services Candidate the First Time Around.” As
will be seen in the balance of this report, managerial issues are a significant
concern of those responding to the survey. If indications about attendance
are any indicator, those allocating
rooms for Seattle programs will need
large facilities for the programs on
“Integrating Resources” and
“Managing Support Staff in Technical
Services.” Over sixty of the respondents
indicated they would attend each of
these programs. These two were also
the highest ranked on the relevancy
scale. Also high ranked were the
programs on FRBR and “What’s
Happening at ALA: CC:DA and SAC
Reports.” Suggestions for the Boston
conference were based on topics
submitted to the Education Committee
and ones generated in its Wednesday
meeting last year. None had the
relevancy averages of the Seattle
programs, and the highest rated one
was the proposal on the recent AACR2
rules revisions. The written comments
about Boston proposals comprised the
most extensive comments of the survey,
and will be passed on to the Education
Committee chair, Jean Pajerek. The
rotating schedule of cataloging
workshops has the advanced
cataloging workshop this year, and so
a basic cataloging workshop is next.
The suggestion that these, or other
programs, be offered in regional
locations, not only affiliated with the
annual conference, was put forward.

More than one comment was made
throughout the survey about the time
and money commitments that cause
individuals to be unable to attend the
entire conference, let alone a workshop
before or after in addition to the days
of the conference.

The next section of the survey involved
the SIS activities and products. TSLL
received the highest marks on
relevancy, closely followed by the
educational programs at the annual
meeting. The electronic list also was
well supported. Lowest ranked were
the promotional giveaways and the TS-SIS
brochure. Grouped closely together,
with an average between 2.0 and 2.5 on
the 3-point scale, were the relevance of
the website, official representatives,
pre-conference workshops, and the
joint reception. Written comments near
the end of the survey on how the
section could better serve members
expanded on the marks received here.
One comment supported regionally
provided educational programs, noting
that “Many grass-roots catalogers and
TS supervisors will never be able to
attend a national conference.” Perhaps
one suggestion would be to work with
regional associations to provide a
program at their annual conferences.
Another comment praised the
importance of the roundtables at the
annual meeting, noting that they can
be more important than programs. The
ongoing work on providing more time
for SIS meetings becomes more
important when one realizes how many
ways we receive information at the
convention that is relevant to our jobs.

The next section of the survey solicited
written comments about the TS website
and asked members to indicate what
was liked and what changes would be
desirable. Positive comments noted
the ease of use and ready availability of
information sought. Access to TSLL,
the survey, and useful information also
were noted. Improvements suggested
included notifying members of changes
via the e-mail list, since not everyone
regularly checks the site. This kind of
reminder could also build the value of
the site itself. As the site grows, one
member suggested grouping content
“to create a clearer presentation.” As is
ture of any web product, balance is an
issue, with some members asking for a
more visually interesting appearance,
and others liking “its clean,
straightforward look.” Comments have
been forwarded to the board and the
webmaster, Martin Wisneski, whose
work also elicited several positive
comments. Five individuals indicated
they were willing to create/maintain web
content. Their names have also been
forwarded.

The next section dealt with Technical
Services Law Librarian, the section
newsletter published with the On-Line
Bibliographic Services SIS, under the
editorial direction of Joe Thomas. It is
clear from both the numerical
evaluations and the written comments
that TSLL is an incredibly valuable
part of the SIS activity. The Serials Issues
and Serials columns were the highest
ranked, with Classification, Description
& Entry and the Internet columns also
ranked high. One respondent called it
“the most wonderful benefit I receive
from being a member of the SIS. It is
consistently timely, full of cutting edge
information, written by knowledgeable
and experienced TS librarians.” The
delay in publishing the first issue of the
current volume was a concern, because
of the value of what is published. One
suggestion was to make a PDF version
of the newsletter available. One can
access this already, from the general line
for TSLL on the website, rather than
from the individual issue entries. For
those of us whose copy becomes the
library copy, this does make saving or
annotating individual articles easier.

Again, comments have been passed on
to the editor and the SIS board.

The next section came from the OBS
survey (one might say brazenly lifted),
in conjunction with the movement to
expand the time available for meetings
that we value but have difficulty
scheduling and attending. One possible
way to expand the available slots is to
allow us to schedule committee
meetings or other activity at the same
time as business meetings of the “Type
of Library” organizations, such as ALL
or SCCLL. Thirty respondents
indicated that they attend at least one
of these meetings, 37 rarely do so, and
14 indicated that they attend
sometimes. As to the possibility of
holding committee meetings on
Wednesday, 65 indicated support, 12
said no. Comments from both groups
indicated concern for the length of the
conference already and stressed that
morning meetings on Wednesday
could work. One respondent noted that
the attendance at the Wednesday
afternoon 30-minute programs could
give some indication of the possibility
of moving meetings to Wednesday
morning.
Comments on the SIS strategic plan dealt most with the need for training. Mounting material on the website, regional training programs, and having the plan serve as a base for our conference proposals were all suggested. The suggestion that the plan needs to be completed and implemented was also made.

Comments about how TS could serve its members better have been worked into previous areas of this report. Specifically here, though, were comments about increased communication from the board, perhaps through the e-mail list, about section activities. Also addressed were the work we do with other SISs by way of joint committees and liaisons. While we are a distinct part of the overall association, we are not exclusively so, and our joint activities in the past have served us well. The interdependence of the various parts of the association is evident when we see TS librarians serving at all levels of the association, and see how involved the more than 600 of us are.

The final area of the survey dealt with volunteering. Perhaps this area should be the first thing one can answer when filling out the survey. Volunteering is something we do despite the demands on our time, and because we recognize the value—to ourselves and to the SIS. Thanks are expressed to the several who indicated a willingness to serve on committees. These names have been forwarded to committee chairs, along with a note about those who volunteered for more than one committee. Only seven individuals indicated a willingness to run for an elective office, most for member at large, and two respondents indicated a willingness to be more involved with TSLL. Again, thanks to those who did so. Arm-twisting phone calls will be coming up.

Thank you to those who participated in the survey. I encourage more of you to do so. The ideas we express help each other and make us better librarians.

Gary L. Vander Meer
Vice-Chair, Chair Elect

From the Editor

Another year of TSLL has passed, and I would like to take this opportunity to say two things. First, I would like to say I’m sorry for the delay in getting some of the issues to press. I could offer you a half page of excuses, but I trust in the understanding of all of you who have busy lives. Secondly, and more importantly, I would like to extend my sincere thanks to the people who make this newsletter possible. I am always a little embarrassed when someone extends a compliment to me about TSLL because I feel like I’m getting the benefit of the credit when it actually belongs mostly to those who provide the true value, and by that I mean our columnists and other contributors. Just look through this or any other issue, and you will be impressed by the depth of knowledge represented there. That we have people willing to take the time and trouble to share their insights is a testament to the quality of the profession we represent.

Speaking of those willing members, I have some good news and some bad news. First the bad. Richard Vaughan who has so ably served as our Acquisitions columnist for the past several years has written his last column (although I hope not his last contribution) in this issue. Michael Maben is stepping down as Chair of the OBS OCLC Committee because of his selection as Secretary/Treasurer of OBS, so he will also be relinquishing his OCLC column duties. Similarly, Betty Roeseke is stepping down as Chair of the TS committee of the Private Law Libraries SIS and will not be writing the private law libraries column for TS any longer. The search for replacements is under way, but I would like to express my gratitude to these stalwarts of TSLL for all of their contributions.

We were all deeply saddened to learn of the death of Ellen Rappaport who had been writing our “Serial Issues” column. She was a great contributor to this newsletter and a truly devoted law librarian.

In the good news category, Caitlin Robinson of the University of Iowa will be our new “Management” columnist as of the next volume. We welcome Caitlin to the ranks of our great columnists and look forward to her insights on this important topic.

I would especially like to thank again (and it can’t be done too often or with too much emphasis) the people who really make this newsletter work: Linda Tesar for layout and design (because I can objectively assert that this is the best-looking newsletter put out by any AALL group); Cindy May for her work as Business Manager, which means she is responsible for getting it printed, distributed, and keeping track of all the subscriptions, saving all of you from the disastrous consequences of me being in charge of all that; and Martin Wisneski, our webmaster, and the person who gets the issues up and available online – it doesn’t just happen by magic.

Finally, thanks to Mary Jane Kelsey, OBS Chair and Christina Tarr, TS Chair for their contributions both to the SISes and to TSLL. The Chairs help to bring focus and guidance to our organizations, and that is reflected in their columns and the whole newsletter. I look forward to a new year working with new Chairs Gary Vander Meer (TS) and Kevin Butterfield (OBS).
Rhonda Lawrence is the Head of Cataloging at the UCLA School of Law, Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library. She is an expert educator in the specialized world of law cataloging and an active member of AALL and the Technical Services SIS. Her many contributions to the field include:

- Co-authoring all three editions of Cataloging Legal Literature
- Primary author of “Module 34 for legal serials” for the CONSER Cataloging Manual, 1999.
- Serving as AALL representative to ALA ALCTS/MARBI, -2001.
- Faculty member for the 1992 Santa Clara Cataloging Institute
- Faculty member for several 2-3 day serials cataloging workshops for CONSER Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program.
- Speaker for many AALL Annual meeting programs

Please join the committee in congratulating Rhonda!

Elizabeth Geesey Holmes, Chair
TS-SIS Awards and Grants Committee
2002/2003