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Editor’s note: Rhonda K. Lawrence, Head of Cataloging and Bindery at UCLA Law Library, was awarded the Renee D. Chapman Award at the TS-SIS business meeting during the 96th Annual Meeting of AALL in Seattle, Washington on July 13, 2003. Rhonda was introduced by Melody Lembke, whose remarks follow below. Rhonda’s remarks follow Melody’s introduction.

Melody Lembke:
Many moons ago Rhonda Lawrence became a law cataloger. I shouldn’t say specifically how many moons because sometimes she’s sensitive about years and age, but it was 20! She obviously started UCLA Library School as an infant! She has been Head of Cataloging at UCLA School of Law Library since 1994. Unfortunately, Arthur Rosette, Rhonda’s UCLA Law professor husband, is recovering from pneumonia and couldn’t be here with her.

Rhonda had various and sundry positions prior to finding her calling as a law librarian, one of them was as an English teacher. It was propitious that she brought her writing skills to LA County Law Library. Peter Enyingi and I had been collecting materials, arguing about AACR2, and talking about writing a cataloging manual, but to this day I don’t know if Cataloging Legal Literature would have happened if Rhonda hadn’t arrived. Besides surviving three editions of Cataloging Legal Literature, (and I do mean surviving…we used to sit and make lists of all the things that would happen while we were trying to get an edition together: her house was severely earthquake-damaged and her foot was injured in a car crash to mention just a couple of examples!) Rhonda was a co-editor of the Description and Entry column in Technical Services Law Librarian for many years. Rhonda also completed Module 34 on “Legal Serials” for the CONSER Cataloging manual at the same time she was the AALL MARBI rep. As our representative she lobbied for some of the changes that we’re learning
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First of all, thank you for this opportunity. I have a great deal of respect for the devotion and work of those who have held this position before me, and hope that the same might be said about me by someone down the road. Being active in this section has challenged and rewarded me in the past. Always there have been those who have helped, advised, and, perhaps, tolerated me.

There are four opportunities for comments from the chair each year. This first one will briefly highlight the convention activities, since I know that many of you were unable to attend. We missed you, and hope that you can join us in Boston. The investment in doing so is well worth the return.

Our business meeting was considerably less involved than in many years. With the representative reports moving to the Wednesday afternoon thirty-minute slots, much of the pressure to finish in the time allotted was absent. One indication is that the incoming chair (me) actually had more than 2 or 3 minutes to speak! We heard from Chris on the activities of the section in the convention, received reports from the standing committee chairs, met new chairs, and heard about the joint reception the previous evening. A measure of the success of that activity was that the food lasted longer than in 2002. We are indebted to Innovative Interfaces for their assistance, and to the Sheraton for a fabulous view of the city from the room we used. It is always a great way to renew acquaintances with long-time friends and to kick off the convention activities.

A highlight of the business meeting is the presentation of the Renee D. Chapman award, this year presented by Melody Lembke to Rhonda Lawrence. Rhonda’s activities on behalf of the section and association are well known. She has been an association representative, is a frequent speaker, and is the co-author of Cataloging Legal Literature, a well used text in our libraries. Rhonda exemplifies the characteristics of Renee in her willingness to share what she knows and her inspiration of others to contribute their efforts in projects that benefit us all.

Our thanks are due to those whose terms as officers, chairs, and representatives expired at the annual meeting. Nancy Poehlmann’s position as the chair of the Cataloging and Classification Committee has been filled by Amy Lovell from Duquesne. Frank Richardson, from Los Angeles County Law Library, is replacing Andrea Rabbia as chair of the Serials Committee. Kate Pecarovich has completed her term as a board member at large. Her position will be filled by Jolande Goldberg, from the Library of Congress.

Programs at the conference provided worthwhile information, in rooms that weren’t, for the most part, bone-chilling. We learned about FRBR; looked at a different way to look at our catalogs; covered, again, integrating resources; assessed preservation; learned about Judaic and Islamic classification; revisited licensing agreements; and listened to a question and answer/discussion meeting on managing support staff. We heard our representative reports, and flashed through favorite acquisitions web sites. The more adventurous of us may have even gone to a program that the SIS did not sponsor, though the proximity of the Pike Place market, with its temptations and attractions, probably drew some of us down to the waterfront also. If your convention experience is like mine, there is a tremendous rush of adrenalin, followed by the reality of a desk piled high when work starts again. Trying to keep the enthusiasm alive is a challenge. One way is to be active in this SIS. Volunteer. When the annual survey comes, indicate that you would be willing to serve. If you have an idea for something the SIS can do, tell someone, and work with others on it. Don’t just attend programs. Participate in the process of education. Share what you know. We all can learn from each other. Read this newsletter. It is a fabulous publication, and survey remarks reflect this every year. Every issue has opportunities for personal education and section participation, both of which will benefit you and your employer.

The Education Committee, chaired by Jean Pajerek, is busy reviewing proposals for the August 15 deadline for the Boston meeting. The
committee meeting was very well attended, many ideas were suggested, and the annual meeting committee will have a difficult time deciding between possible topics. We should know in early October what topics are selected. Again, there will be a mixture of 90-, 75-, 60-, and 30-minute programs. When the survey comes out later this year, make sure to indicate your reaction to the half hour programs on Wednesday.

Meeting times in Boston will still have early morning gatherings, but some times in the middle of the day have been allocated for our committees and roundtables to meet. We should be able to avoid some of the situations of the past where three different Technical Services or OBS groups met at the same time, forcing a choice that we may now avoid.

The draft proposal for the TS-SIS strategic plan has been in that status for too long. A review of it shows some ideas that are already accomplished or ongoing, others that are in process, and some that are in limbo. Chris Tarr, Caitlin Robinson, Ellen McGrath, and I will be working this year to produce a final version, together with implementation actions for membership approval. We need the guidance of a living document to help in our planning process, for the convention, and for the other activities we conduct during the year.

I am convinced that one item from the draft can succeed and should be stressed. I have had the opportunity to serve on the program planning committee for the annual meeting of the Mid-America Association of Law Libraries. We would have welcomed a proposal from the SIS to make available a regional program, perhaps even a workshop, on a technical services topic. The SIS annual survey indicates support for regional programming, since many of our members are never able to be away for the time, or seldom can afford the cost, of the annual meeting. Our pre-convention workshops can serve as examples of what we can do. In a smaller and shorter format, they can be provided for a regional meeting. This year we need to make progress with this topic as well.

Finally, a personal note that brings home to me the theme of the Boston convention. After the convention, my wife and I traveled to visit her brother and family in Eastern Washington. Using irrigation from the Columbia River, he raises various grasses in that near desert area. He currently is raising a particular kind of alfalfa to sell to Japanese horse enthusiasts. He also has acreage planted in Sudan grass, the seed of which will go to Saudi Arabia for planting there. We are not alone in recognizing the worldwide aspects of what our activities entail. The final Coffee Talk, the appropriately named convention newspaper, had as its front-page headline “Johnston emphasizes global reach of AALL in 2004.” When we can sit at our technical services terminals and look at the catalogs of libraries across the world, import their information for our use, and provide the same for them, we truly are a global neighborhood. When we search foreign databases, download PDF files from agencies around the world, and make the information available through our home pages or catalogs, we fulfill our duty to our patrons.

As always, if you have a question, a comment, a criticism, or just want to say hi, please contact me. I look forward to this year together, and hope you share my enthusiasm for what we can accomplish.

Gary Vander Meer
gvandermeer@niu.edu

Here in Champaign, Illinois, the fall semester has begun, 1Ls are wandering around the library searching for places to plug in their laptops, and the University of Illinois Marching Band is practicing outside my office window. The time has come to begin another academic year.

I would like to begin by thanking the outgoing members of the OBS-SIS Executive Board: Judy Vaughan-
evaluations for the OBS sponsored programs at the annual meeting and all were well received. Handouts and other program related materials are available on the OBS-SIS website. In addition Anne Meyers has posted the updated committee membership list and minutes from our Business and Board meetings.

If you stopped by the OBS-SIS activities table and grabbed a paperback to read, some candy to munch on (of which, I have to admit, I did a bit more than I should have) and talked with friends you may have entered our drawing. The winner of the book *The Enduring Library* by Michael Gorman was Donna L. Barratt, Technical Services Librarian at Thompson Coburn LLP, St. Louis, MO. Congratulations to Donna and our thanks to everyone who entered the drawing.

Programs for the 2004 Annual Meeting in Boston

The OBS-SIS Education Committee began meeting in February of this year to discuss possible programs for the 2004 AALL Annual Meeting in Boston. Program ideas came from suggestions made by you on the annual membership survey and from emails, phone calls and discussions within the board. The committee came up with six finalized proposals for the Boston meeting while in Seattle. All six were submitted to AALL Headquarters on August 18th.

*Two Stepping with Technology Returns*
*OPAC Usability Assessment: Your Passport to Effective Web Presence*
*Technology Training: How to Get (and Keep) Your Staff Up to Speed*
*Marbi Report (Susan Goldner)*

*E-Resources, Digital Technology and Subscription Data: Update on Emerging Library Standards*

*XML and MARC: Should We Remodel or Build Anew?*

Many thanks to this year’s Education Committee members and the program coordinators: Jack Bissett, Shannon Burchard, Richard Jost, Mary Jane Kelsey, John Nann, Susan Goldner and Stephanie Schmitt.

Work Before the Executive Board

In the coming year the executive board will be dealing with several issues.

The proposed bylaws change introduced for the Seattle meeting was pulled back and will be submitted for a vote at the OBS-SIS business meeting in Boston next year.

We will be continuing a review of the OBS-SIS Handbook, begun by Ellen McGrath and Ismael Gullon, through this coming year.

The section’s finances have become an issue we must address. Gary van der Meer, Chair of the TS-SIS, and I will be looking at ways to save money on TSLL and other joint expenditures. Savings cannot be realized from cost cutting alone. Increasing our membership increases our revenues. We on the Board have been working hard to spread the word about our SIS and to recruit new members. Would you please consider doing this as well? Recommend your SIS to new hires or newer AALL members you meet. An additional SIS membership costs $12.00. Half of this comes directly to our SIS.

Opportunities to Get Involved

The Executive Board will be trying out a new plan for the Education Committee this year. Normally the committee’s role fades after it submits programs for the annual meeting each year. This year OBS-SIS Vice Chair Georgia Briscoe will keep the committee active throughout the year to solicit ideas for programs, listserv discussions, etc. We would like to use the Education Committee and all the committees, frankly, to increase communication with our members. The more we hear from you the better we can serve your needs. Please contact Georgia or any member of the Education Committee with ideas for annual meeting programs, listserv discussions, etc. In addition if you have ideas for education enhancements for the OBS-SIS website, please contact the Education or Web Advisory Committees.

At the OBS-SIS Business meeting a suggestion was made that the SIS form a Task Force or discussion group to review issues relating to OBS and IFLA’s Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR). Brian Striman and Patricia Sayre-McCoy volunteered to be a part of the group. If anyone else would be interested in being part of a FRBR group (or Furry Bear Group, as a member of the audience termed it) send me an email at butterfi@law.uiuc.edu.

Ismael Gullon will be Chair of the Nominations Committee this year. Please let Ismael know of anyone who would make a good candidate. Also, please consider putting your own name forward.

I and the Executive Board look forward to working with all of you in the coming year to make the OBS-SIS the best it can be.

Kevin Butterfield
butterfi@law.uiuc.edu
If you have a garden and a library, you have everything you need.

– Cicero

This year, I will be writing the acquisitions column for TSLL. As a technical services librarian for many years, I have been closely involved with the business of ordering, receiving and paying for library materials. Handling the materials budget and managing the workflow so as to make maximum use of the library’s financial resources is a goal that those who are involved in acquisitions work strive to attain. With hard work and a bit of luck, we close out each fiscal year with feelings of accomplishment and satisfaction. We begin the new one with fresh resolve to keep a keen eye out for ways to stretch library dollars and obtain all the materials that our users need without spending more than our budgets allow. Environmental forces may combine to make the task difficult – budgets are cut, costs go up, publishers merge and part and publications change format, frequency and, sometimes, content. All the while we struggle to keep the whole process going smoothly.

A few years ago, with the encouragement of a friend who is an avid gardener, I started to work in my yard. I began with the naïve notion that I could make my life easier by transforming some lawn spaces that needed regular mowing into areas with attractive shrubbery. As I got into planting and mulching and weeding and watering, I realized that there is no end to the work that needs to be done to cultivate a garden. I also discovered the enormous satisfaction that comes from working in nature and creating an environment of beauty and order. Some may think I am stretching things a bit, but it can be the same with library acquisitions – the work is continuously both challenging and rewarding. There is a seasonal pattern to the year’s activities, but each year brings something different and interesting.

For some of us, the past year brought a plague of locusts. The subscription agent RoweCom/Faxon collapsed and failed to pay publishers the money that libraries such as ours had paid for 2003 journal subscriptions. RoweCom’s parent company, divine, inc., next went bankrupt after diverting $70 million dollars in library payments to fund other company operations. Ebsco has acquired RoweCom’s U.S. and European operations and is working with publishers and libraries to set things right. Sally Morris, Secretary General of the Association of Learned and Professional Society Publishers, a group that represents not-for-profit society and scholarly publishers, says that the publishers are losing a great deal of money as a result of participating in the negotiated deal. AALSP is working with libraries and agents to develop a code of best practices for all parties. We don’t need to worry about how former divine CEO Andrew “Flip” Filipowski is doing — he has bought back some of divine’s assets at auction and has since started a new company and invested in a minor league baseball team.

One of the best parts of library work is sharing experiences with other librarians. If you have information to share or topics you are especially interested in, please email me at: anderjan@law.georgetown.edu. The topics of future columns have yet to be determined and I look forward to hearing what you would like to see covered.

Quick tip:
Bernan has begun printing and offering for sale selected government documents that would otherwise be available only in electronic format. They call them “web prints” and this is an alternative to finding, downloading and printing out the documents yourself.
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I’d like to spend time, over the next few columns, in a dialogue with you about techniques for supporting, encouraging and empowering staff. Let me summarize some of the trends that might cause you to turn some attention to staff management issues, perhaps answering the question, “why do I have to do anything at all?”

We live in work environments where we are increasingly asked to “make do with less.” We in turn, are forced to ask our professionals and support staff to assume and embrace varying, and usually larger workloads. Managers need to be prepared to assist their staff in learning how to “work smarter” in addition to working faster. We are also asking library staff to wear multiple hats. The days are gone when we can afford single-task or narrow-focus experts. We need to be able to move staff around to address the pressing needs of the moment. Traditional boundaries between departments and task assignments are increasingly insupportable in face of the “making do” problem. We need to work with our staff to encourage them to take on new challenges and roles within our organization. These are times that demand proactive, empathetic, and creative staff management.

Another reason for turning attention to your work environment is that we are all hip deep in change (truth to be told, we always have been, but that’s another issue.) Your change pressures may be related to a special project, reductions in funding, the impact of automation or staff turnover. We need to recognize that change plays havoc with established procedures and, that our staffs have a great deal of personal ownership in those procedures. We need to find ways to manage change in order to minimize the effect that is felt by the staff while at the same time encouraging them to become involved in the process and empowered by the opportunities.

The “A” word, automation, also needs to be touched on as a reason for assessing and potentially changing management techniques. Technology has generally served as a great leveler in its impact on library staff. Tasks that were once complicated and relatively high level can now often be performed with a less extensive skill-set. As a result task assignments and responsibilities have changed quite a bit, and responsibilities frequently overlap. The lines between professional and support staff have become and have remained muddy.

OK, so you’re fired up and ready to spend some energy on your staff. What’s the next step? Just as in any important relationship, you need to do some personal work before you can begin to reach out to others. You need to do some investigating...

**Step one:** Assess your personal commitment to addressing the challenges facing your staff. Be as self-aware as possible. Identify your personal management style. Evaluate that style against the backdrop of the challenges facing you and your staff. Would you be willing to change your management style? The goal you want to reach through this assessment is “know thyself.” Steps you might take include:

- Conduct a realistic assessment of your autonomy within the organization
- Evaluate existing communication methods and mechanisms; are they effective; are you willing/able to change them?
- Look at your workload; do you have the time and the desire to work on these issues?
- Soul-search: are you really willing to let your environment change?

If the answers to any of these questions is no, that doesn’t mean that you need to abandon your intention to look at staff management issues, it just means that you need to select solutions that match your management style and level of commitment. Even a small change can make a positive difference for your staff.

**Step two:** Assess the level of institutional support you’re likely to have for making organizational or management style changes. You need to have a clear sense of the parameters that you will be working within and the support that you can expect to receive from your managers. There are two rules you are attempting to follow here: “don’t surprise the boss” and, “don’t set yourself (or your staff) up to fail.” Include in your assessment a hardheaded look at the organizational culture that exists in your library. Is the environment “change friendly?” Have a clear sense of the internal and external strategic directions for your organization. Know, and understand the dynamics that exist between the “key players” that have an impact on your work environment.

**Step three:** Get to know your staff again. If you are committed to making some changes in your work environment, it is very important for you to look at your staff with fresh eyes. Most of us form our opinions about our colleagues shortly after we begin working together. You may not

---

**Practical Suggestions for Supporting, Encouraging and Empowering Staff – The Assessment Steps**

_Caitlin Robinson_

_Untiversity of Iowa_

caitlin-robinson@uiowa.edu
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have recognized changes in personal or professional habits and activities unless they are quite drastic. Incremental change, while powerful, is often less visible. Your goal in this step is to reintroduce yourself to your staff and them to you. The rule you will be attempting to follow here is “abandon pre-judgments.”

During this step, you might consider re-interviewing your staff, using very open ended questions that will encourage them to talk openly about their needs and desires within the workplace. Be aware however, that at least initially some staff may be reluctant to talk very openly. Staff may need to be encouraged to trust that the information that they communicate will be used appropriately.

The last thing that I want to share with you, as you get yourself ready to look at, and work with your environment is the “20-50-30” rule. Price Pritchett, a management consultant, explains that when you launch a change effort, approximately 20% of the people in the organization will be “change friendly”; the next 50% will sit on the fence; and the remaining 30% will resist or work against the initiative. Like all rules, there are times when I take great comfort from it, and times when it moves me to despair. In my experience, however, it is a very accurate assessment of typical reactions to change. As you approach your assessment and, as you look at new staff management techniques, remember that although you are hoping to improve things for your staff, you may meet initial and lingering resistance and you will need to plan ways to address that resistance.

In a later column we’ll talk about what we can do once we’ve completed our assessment steps, some potential practical solutions. I’d love to discuss any of these issues with you via email. You can reach me at caitlin-robinson@uiowa.edu. If there is enough interest, I’ll summarize all postings for one of our relevant lists.
work, expression, and manifestation. It is designed to test existing records. It will soon be available in a Windows format that will be easier to use.

510 Fields (Citation/References Notes) were removed from CONSER records. They were removed because they were not being maintained and the data is now available online from other sources. The 510s for Chemical Abstracts and those with second indicator of 3 or 4, used for rare serial data, will not be removed.

---

**Introductions**

I should begin this article by introducing myself. I am pleased to be able to serve as the new Chair of the OCLC Committee. I have worked in Cataloging and Technical Services departments at several different libraries over the years, and am currently the Director of Information Technology at Mercer University’s Law School, a position I have held since June, 2001. Richard Amelung (Saint Louis University Law Library) approached me at the West Party in Seattle about the possibility of serving as Chair, and I thought it would be a great opportunity to keep my fingers in the cataloging world, as I have become more removed from cataloging in my present position. I look forward to working with all of you this year.

I would like to thank Michael Maben, who has been extremely helpful showing me the ropes, and keeping me informed about my role as chair and the planning for next year’s annual meeting in Boston. His assistance has already been invaluable to me.

**OCLC Committee Open Discussion – Seattle**

The OBS-SIS OCLC Committee met on Sunday, July 13, 2003, at the Sheraton Hotel in downtown Seattle. Over 30 people attended this meeting, including Glenn Patton from OCLC’s headquarters in Dublin, Ohio, and Rick Newell with OCLC’s Western Service Center in Lacey, Washington. Rick Newell was our speaker, and he talked about the new developments with a number of OCLC services, including QuestionPoint, FirstSearch, netLibrary, and ILL. The majority of time, however, was spent discussing Connexion and cataloging. Numerous questions were asked concerning Connexion, CatME, Passport, and the input of integrating resources. If anyone would like a copy of Rick Newell’s slides from his Power Point presentation, please contact Michael Maben at mmaben@indiana.edu.

**Connected to the Future: OCLC’s Connexion – Seattle**

OCLC’s Rick Newell was also the speaker for the OCLC Connexion program, held at the Washington State Convention Center on Wednesday, July 16, 2003. This short 30-minute program was well received with a large attendance. Mr. Newell gave an overview of the Connexion program and OCLC’s reasons for implementing the new cataloging service, migration options for libraries, the use of control headings with Connexion, and OCLC implementation of MARC changes related to integrating resources. OCLC plans to offer quarterly enhancements to both the browser and Windows client interfaces. OCLC’s target schedule for implementation for the Connexion client first release is September/October 2003. CatME will be discontinued sometime after 2004. The discontinuation of Passport is yet to be determined, although libraries will have at least 6 months notice before it is discontinued. You can find feature comparisons and an explanation of migration considerations at http://www.oclc.org/connexion/migrate.

Based on the large attendance at this program, these 30-minute sessions may well prove to be good times for OCLC software demonstrations and overviews at future annual meetings.

**Watch WorldCat Grow**

Thanks to Andrea Rabbia, Technical Services Librarian, Syracuse University College of Law, for sharing the “Watch WorldCat Grow” web site (http://www2.oclc.org/worldcat/) on the OBS-SIS discussion list. Here you can watch as records are added to WorldCat by contributing libraries in real time – it’s fascinating to see how quickly records from all over the world are added to the database.

**Closing**

I again would like to reiterate how much I’m looking forward to working with all of you this coming year. Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns, or if you have any suggestions about topics you’d like to hear more about in this column.
Growing Cranium Geraniums: The Reading-Writing Connection

Do you feel the yearning to write but find yourself bereft of ideas? Maybe it is because you are not reading enough.

Educators have long known that there is an inextricable link between reading and writing. Simply put, persons with good reading skills and habits are usually fluent writers as well. There is little mystery about why this is so. Those who are interested in reading will be exposed to a wide range of ideas. Rampant reading may instill in such people not only a greater awareness of how to write, but more importantly the desire to write—to reflect and then formulate and share one’s own ideas.

So if you are coming up dry in the ideas department, it may be because you are starving your brain. How much time per week do you devote to professional reading? With so much needing to be done at work, it is very easy to neglect. When we need food, our stomachs growl. Unfortunately, there is no brain-growl that tells us when our minds are malnourished, so we must be diligent and make sure we carve out some regular reading time.

Reading, though, is a passive pursuit. Reading in and of itself will not sprout ideas without some action on our part. Here are some practical ways to connect your reading and writing:

Make Writing Personal

Writing can be drudgery when it is only a way for us show our command of spelling, grammar, and sentence structure. What is missing is what real writing is all about—pondering an idea, taking it into our hands and forming something out of it. These ideas could range from the mundane and practical to the visionary and inspirational, encompassing our job responsibilities, our professional beliefs, our dreams of what the library should be. How often, though, do you read a book or article, put it down, and move on to something else without reflecting on what the piece meant to you? If you are like me, it happens a lot. But we are not only failing to get the most out of our reading, but also neglecting an opportunity to gather seeds for our own publications. To help gather those seeds, consider keeping …

A Writer’s Notebook

Keep a notebook handy so that after you have read a book or article, you can jot down your thoughts on, questions about, or objections to what you have just studied while it is still fresh in your memory. It might seem that all that is there is a bunch of disjointed thoughts. It is also possible that only a fraction of what you put into this notebook might make it into a publication one day. However, when you say to yourself, “I have nothing to write about,” this notebook will be proof that the library world is full of pieces waiting to be written. Think of this notebook as a seed bed out of which articles will grow.

Conversations With Colleagues

Don Murray said that writing is like a conversation in which “the self speaks, the other self listens and considers. The self makes, the other self evaluates. The two selves collaborate.” Unless you are a solo librarian, there is probably someone else in your library who is reading the same literature you are. Why not use that other person as the “other self” who considers and evaluates? Bounce your ideas off your colleagues—their perspectives can be invaluable. You may even find a collaborator. Or an encourager. For better or for worse, I always remember what my wonderful history professor told all her graduate students: “If no one else has written on a topic, maybe it is just because no one else has thought of it. Or maybe it is because it is not worth writing about.” If you are concerned about which of these categories your idea falls into, ask some trusted associates.

Publishing Hall of Acclaim (recent publications from technical services law librarians)


The Hall of Acclaim is rather small this issue, which probably means I failed to discover some of your publications. If you have published something recently, please email me so I can include it in future issues.

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:

Annual review of banking law

**Changed to:**
Annual review of banking and financial law
Vol. 22 (2003)- <OCoLC 52087500>

California labor & employment law quarterly
Vol. 5, no. 5 (spring 1987)-v. 16, no. 6 (Nov. 2002) <OCoLC 16931295>

**Changed to:**
California labor & employment law review
Vol. 17, no. 1 (Jan. 2003)- <OCoLC 52125966>

Canadian journal of criminology = Revue canadienne de criminologie

**Changed to:**
Canadian journal of criminology and criminal justice = Revue canadienne de criminologie et justice pénale
Vol. 45, no. 1 (Jan. 2003)- <OCoLC 52124308>

Fiduciary tax return guide -2001 <OCoLC 3782087>

**Changed to:**
Estate & trust income tax return guide for tax year ... 2002- <OCoLC 51650373>

International and comparative environmental law
Vol. 1, issue 1 (fall/winter 2000)-v. 2, issue 1 (winter 2002) <OCoLC 47124235>

**Changed to:**
Sustainable development law & policy
Vol. 2, issue 2 (spring/summer 2002)- <OCoLC 50821997>

The Internet newsletter : legal & business aspects

**Merged with:**
E securities
Vol. 1, no. 1 (Sept. 1998)-v. 5, no. 5 (Jan. 2003) <OCoLC 40099539>

**To form:**
The journal of forensic psychiatry
-v. 13, no. 3 (Dec. 2002) <OCoLC 24379100>

**Changed to:**
The journal of forensic psychiatry & psychology
Vol. 14, no. 1 (Apr. 2003)- <OCoLC 52711229>

The law review of Michigan State University Detroit College of Law
Vol. 1999, no. 1-v. 2003, no. 1 (spring) <OCoLC 43919442>

**Changed to:**
Michigan State DCL law review
Vol. 2003, issue 2 (summer) <OCoLC 52510602>

NAFTA, law and business review of the Americas
Vol. 1, no. 1 (winter 1995)-v. 6, no. 4 (fall 2000) <OCoLC 32824223>

**Changed to:**
Law and business review of the Americas
Vol. 7, no. 1 & 2 (winter/spring 2001)- <OCoLC 52343644>

New crisis (Baltimore, Md.)
Vol. 104, no. 1 (July 1997)-v. 110/2 (Mar./Apr.2003) <OCoLC 39328440>

**Changed to:**
Crisis (Baltimore, Md. : 2003)
Vol. 110/3 (May/June 2003)- <OCoLC 5421458>

Pacific magazine (North ed.)
Vol. 26, no. 1 (Jan. 2001)-v. 27, no. 7 (July 2002) = 145-163 <OCoLC 45710820>

**Merged with:**
Pacific magazine (South ed.)
Vol. 27, no. 1 (Jan. 2001)-

**Ceased with:**
v. 28, no. 7 (July 2002) <OCoLC 46418880>

**To form:**
Islands business (Suva, Fiji : 2002)
Began with v. 28, no. 8 (Aug. 2002) <OCoLC 51453227>

Widener journal of public law

**Changed to:**
Widener law journal
Vol. 12, no. 1 (2003)- <OCoLC 52241793>

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:

China legal change
**Ceased with** 2002 issue no. 16 <OCoLC 45352243>

Journal of international wildlife law and policy
**Ceased with** v. 5, no. 3 (2002) <OCoLC 40652514>

Lawyers’ liability review
**Ceased with** v. 16, no. 12 (Dec. 2002) <OCoLC 15364189>

Tax notes magazine [microform]
**Microfiche reproduction ceased with:** v. 98, no. 5 (Feb. 3, 2003) <OCoLC 34652079>
had unique legal traditions. In stages, England came to dominate the British Isles, and from the start of the 17th until the early 20th centuries, all four countries were ruled by a single monarch and for purposes of international relations were a single country (and except for the Republic of Ireland, still are). However they never had a single legal system (though Wales was close to being totally integrated with England) even during the periods when the parliament in London was charged with legislating for all of them.

Wales and Ireland are part of the common law tradition shared with England and the United States (Louisiana and Puerto Rico excluded) even though one is part of England and the other is for the most part an independent republic. Scotland is basically the junior partner in the United Kingdom with England, but has a totally different legal system derived from Roman law.

England and Wales.

England conquered Wales in the 13th century and in 1536 Wales was merged with England, and for all purposes the Welsh legal system was replaced with the English common law system. Administratively and legally, Wales has been merely a region of England for almost 500 years, even though linguistically, politically and socially it is a distinct country.

From a legal perspective, Wales is a part of England. They have one legal profession and integrated courts. In almost all areas, one law governs England and Wales. One can argue that the Kingdom of “England” is really the Kingdom of “England and Wales”. Statistics are usually compiled for England and Wales together. Wales is less than 20% of the combined kingdom of England and Wales. Few books are published about the law of Wales (except historical works and about the recent developments of administrative and constitutional law), and all discussion of English common law subjects inherently include a discussion of Wales.

Logically, if a book does not go out of its way to discuss Wales, and does not present at least 20% of its material on Wales (under the traditional LCSH 20% rule) as well as indicating a more than to be expected consideration of Welsh materials, I suggest that it isn’t rational to bring out Wales in the subject heading. Any book on the law of England as a whole discusses the law applicable in Wales. It would be better if “—Wales” were used only for works that discuss Welsh law more than can be expected from a typical treatment of English law. This analysis is compatible with formal LC policies, but is not required (nor prohibited) by the Subject Cataloging Manual.

England vs Ireland

Ireland had never been a unified territory when the English crown was recognized (by the Pope, not the Irish) as sovereign over Ireland in the 13th century. While Ireland survived for the most part and most of it is today a sovereign republic, the English did destroy the indigenous Irish legal system, so that today Irish law, especially in areas of private law, is based on English common law. For private law prior to Irish independence (and for Northern Ireland today), there was little Irish literature in the areas governed by common law, and English law books routinely were sold in Ireland. It should be noted that in area of public law and criminal law, there is much “distinctive” about Irish law, but that is usually very clear from the title of the book.

Even at present, I suggest that presence of Irish cases in an English law book should not result is adding a subject heading for Ireland or Northern Ireland unless that author makes a point of mentioning the presences of Irish materials, or unless the Irish materials are at least 20% of the work. Anyone researching Irish law will check English cases, especially prior to Irish independence, and the subdivision “—Ireland” should indicate something uniquely Irish about the work. An author writing
about Irish law (either in the republic or Northern Ireland) usually makes that very clear. It would be a mistake to respond to occasional references to Irish law by adding a subdivision for Ireland.

England vs. Scotland vs. Great Britain

Scotland was totally independent until 1603 when Queen Elizabeth I of England died ending the Tudor dynasty, and the English throne passed to her nearest legitimate relation, King James VI Scotland who became James I of England. For roughly 100 years, England and Scotland had a “union of the crowns”, one king but with separate parliaments and bureaucracies (e.g., in theory, King James of England could have declared war on King James of Scotland, by declaring war on himself). In 1707 Scotland agreed to a merger of parliaments with England thereby creating a single country of “Great Britain”, albeit one with two distinct legal systems. Lawyers and politicians debate whether this merger created a federation albeit with a single parliament as opposed to a unified state with limited regional autonomy for Scotland (such issues are not for catalogers to decide, though until recently subject rules tended to reflect the former while descriptive rules assumed the latter). While its legal system reflects several hundred years of English influence (some would say interference), Scots law is based on Roman law rather than the common law tradition of England, Ireland, Wales and most of the United States and Canada.

Most books on Scots law make it very clear that they are discussing Scots law. However many books on English law say they are writing about “British” law (remember, that’s how we got into this mess to begin with). The list in SCM955 is a good guide of when to be suspicious (if the topic is on the list as one usually governed by English/Scots law, be dubious if the author claims to be writing on British law). Books on Scots law generally cite Scottish courts and statutes whose titles clearly indicate their applicability to Scotland. The absence of citation to Scottish legal sources or of any reference to Scotland should make a cataloger suspicious that book is “English” rather than “British” regardless of what the author or title page assert. Another hint is the presence in the data base of works on the subject with a geographic subdivision for Scotland, e.g. the presence of headings for “[subject]—Scotland” should make one wary that a book on that subject that doesn’t mention Scotland is about England rather than Britain.

Comparative law works get separate headings for England and Scotland, rather than “moving up” to the next broader term “Great Britain.” This is brilliant and CPSO should be complimented. A work comparing England and Scotland is a quite different work than one concerning those areas of law governing Great Britain as a whole. Also, there is no guarantee that “Great Britain” will remain the next highest jurisdiction, since it is quite possible that England and Scotland will end up as separate but equal states of a united Europe (even if they continue to have the same monarch).

What’s next.

The current subject heading rules resolve almost all the issues, and are flexible enough to accommodate any potential political changes, e.g., a breakup of the United Kingdom in conjunction with the European Union evolving into a sovereign federation of which Great Britain, or perhaps England and Scotland separately, will be members. The rules work for all past historical periods, unlike the previous rules which sometimes resulted in anachronisms that made us look silly to users.
access the United States Government Printing Office site at http://www.gpoaccess.gov. Displayed there you will find a site search, an A-Z title listing, resources available by branch, and resources by topic.

To verify or locate international documents, view the official websites of national governments at Northwestern University Library’s Government Publications and Maps page at http://www.library.northwestern.edu/govpub/resource/internat/foreign.html.

**Vendor Resources:**

AcqWeb contains a gold mine of information. The main features include verification tools and resources, a directory of publishers (by alphabet, geography, and subject), associations and organizations, library and information sciences, and reference sources. Find this jewel at http://acqweb.library.vanderbilt.edu/

The AALL Committee on Relations with Information Vendors (CRIV) publishes a valuable Web site (http://www.aallnet.org/committee/criv/) for acquisitions librarians. CRIV provides AALL members with up-to-date information and resources about working efficiently and effectively with publishers. CRIV Tools offers a checklist for negotiating Internet subscriptions, sample letters to vendors, a glossary of publishing terms, how to deal with telemarketers, and much more.

**Receipt of unsolicited materials:**

Tired of receiving materials that you did not request. View the United States Postal Inspection Service Web site, Receipt of Unsolicited Materials, and find out what your options and obligations are for receiving these “gifts.” (http://www.usps.com/websites/depart/inspect/merch.htm)

**Other Resources:**

Two other notable sites viewed are Washburn University’s WashLaw, links to Law Library Catalogs on the web at http://www.washlaw.edu/lawcat/lawcat.html, and Babel Fish Translation, translates a small portion of text—many languages available at http://babel.altavista.com/tr. In addition, other topical areas covered in this 30-minute Web session include resources for out-of-print materials, collection development issues, license agreements, and book review sources.

---

**Connected to the Future: OCLC Connexion**

OCLC Connexion is OCLC’s new cataloging service providing a single entry point to OCLC cataloging. Connexion provides one-stop access to integrated cataloging tools and to WorldCat, the world’s largest online union catalog and bibliographic database.

Passport is old technology and eventually will cease. However, due to slow response time during initial testing of the new Connexion client, Passport’s life has been extended. The new target schedule for Connexion is: Connexion Client first release will be September/October 2003. Passport end-of-life for cataloging is yet to be determined. Libraries will have at least 6 months notice before Passport will expire. Likewise, the Cataloging Microenhancer (CatMe) will disappear sometime after 2004. Libraries will be given 1-year notice before this happens.

There are alternatives to Passport. CatMe and the Connexion browser are available now. The Connexion client will be available soon. The Connexion client will support macros and export capability. The mouse will not be required and spine labeling will be integrated into the Connexion client. The second release of the Connexion client will include functionality for NACO activity and cataloging electronic resources. Later releases will include local files and offline batch functionality. The charges and credits for Connexion are the same as for using Passport or CatMe.

**OCLC Implementation - MARC Bibliographic Changes for Integrating Resources**

OCLC Technical Bulletin 247, issued November 2002 includes changes based on: MARC Bib update 2, MARC bib & authority new data elements technical notice, and MARC code list technical notices & updates.

Phase 1 was implemented Dec. 1, 2002 and includes: Additional values for fixed field elements (Freq, S/L, SrTp) and scope of some variable fields redefined to include both continuing & integrating resources: 022, 222, 247, 310, 321, 362, some notes.

Phase 2 will be implemented sometime in the future but probably not before July 2005. The new bib level affects all levels and OCLC is working on Connexion. Phase 2 will include definition of code i in BLvl and the repeat-ability of 260.
Librarian Challenges Data Dragon and Finds a Golden Future

“Now THAT was exciting,” I thought as I walked out of the 2003 Annual Meeting program C-2, “Envision Tomorrow’s Catalog: a View From Outside the Library.” Discussing it later with colleagues, I was asked “why, what made it so exciting? What does someone from the .com world have to say to us?” Cindy Cunningham, U.S. Catalog Librarian, Amazon.com, turned out to have quite a bit to say that was worth listening to. To begin with, Cindy is a very dynamic speaker who is clearly excited about what she is doing. At base level, it was a stone-treat to hear someone so pumped about the power (and economic advantage) that can be extracted from descriptive cataloging techniques and basic data manipulation. Her presentation put the lie to the erstwhile notion that librarians will become obsolete in the “new” electronic age. Cindy is plying her library school skills in a non-traditional setting and, through those skills, directly leveraging the economic success of her corporation.

More importantly, however, her presentation lays the framework for an opportunity to rethink classical cataloging, building on some e-commerce-related concepts. It presented a starting point for technical services librarians and others to “think outside the box” about alternative access point choices, value-added record content, and alternative indexing, display and retrieval mechanisms. Let’s face it, many of our primary users, be they practitioners, students or faculty, approach our catalogs expecting them to have at least the “look and feel” of a web presence, and increasingly they are demanding actual web-like services. While some of us have slapped a web-based wrapper around our OPACs, there aren’t a lot of us who have altered the nature of the source data, or our basic retrieval mechanisms. Cindy presented some interesting techniques for creating a catalog of the future.

Amazon began building its e-commerce catalog in 1995 with Baker & Taylor as a single data source. They encouraged other data contributions from multiple sources. Others in the book industry shared their concern and in 2000, the ONIX standard was promulgated. ONIX is the “international standard for representing and communicating book industry product information in electronic form.” 1 As the data source contributions increased, reconciliation of the data became an important issue for Amazon staff. They also quickly found that the quality of the data bore a direct relationship to sales, which heightened awareness of the need to identify reliable data providers and to acquire a single authoritative record for each item (“the cataloging record IS the item in e-commerce”). 2 Cunningham and her staff worked out normalization and reconciliation routines that allowed them to mine incoming records, drawing data into that single authoritative representation of the sale item. I refer the reader to Cindy’s PowerPoint presentation, which can be found on the OBS-SIS web site, for a detailed description of these routines, http://www.aallnet.org/sis/obssis/meetings/2003/cunningham.pdf.

Once they had conquered the data dragon, Cindy and her staff turned their attention to making their vision of “tomorrow’s catalog” a reality. She is convinced that “fundamental cataloging concepts will endure.” She, and perhaps more importantly her managers, realize that GIGO (garbage-in-garbage-out) is still an important rule; there is an ongoing need for high quality, reliable data. She is also convinced that there is an ongoing need for experts who can provide the overall vision that controls this data.

While building, and continuing to refine their new catalog, Amazon staff applied several key concepts that present, I believe, some exciting possibilities for new services within library settings.

>>>Subjectivity. Amazon item categories and classifiers are not identified as intrinsic to the item but are driven by marketing concerns. The customers and merchants own Amazon’s “browse categories,” and buying habits can drive product classification. The access points are dynamic, not fixed, and can change over the life of the product listing. This permits e-commerce vendors to offer “people who bought your title, also bought these titles” type services.

>>>Anyone can be a data authority. Contributing data authorities include all key stakeholders, publishers, merchants and customers. Amazon works to create an online environment in which all of these players have the ability to contribute data that enhances access to an item. All “authorities” have the ability (or soon will have) to contribute online corrections. Publisher, merchant and customer contributions are assessed and rated so that reconciliation rules can apply levels of data confidence across multiple sources.

>>>Exponential growth in products. As the variety and number of product lines continue to increase, traditional approaches to cataloging
will be increasingly difficult to support. “More and more we’ll need to rely on on-the-fly categorization and search retrieval rather than laborious and proprietary data record construction.”

Virtual rules!” As the impact of the web continues to grow, the variety of contents will increase. The need for techniques for bridging and providing access paths across the physical and online worlds will be increasingly important.

Basic bibliographic data is not enough. Amazon’s customers and vendors expect graphical images (some moving), sound, warranty data, synopses, table of content data and, comparative ratings. This value added data needs to be linked to, and accessible through, the item description.

How might some of these concepts be applied in a more traditional library setting? Well, as we know, some already are being applied. But, imagine if you will, a new generation of cataloging data that would allow us to offer online reader’s advisory services. For example, “If you found The Professor and the Madman interesting, you might try Caught in the Web of Words.” Imagine too, that some of the necessary data could be mined from anonymous user activity logs. Why couldn’t we include cover art in a new title list? Rather than providing descriptive access to the Supreme Court oral arguments, what if a click would launch the recording?

There are even more challenging questions to consider. Talk about a brave new world, consider the possibilities (and implications) presented if we were to set up shareholder relationships with our library clients that would allow them to contribute value-added data to source cataloging records. Wrap your brain around the concept of an OPAC that would allow users to “rank” the usefulness of an information source? Can (and should) we continue to support creation of full MARC cataloging records, given full text and keyword search capabilities? Our “categories” and “classifiers,” for the most part, continue to be fixed access points that are thesaurus controlled and reconciled at the national authority level. Is this really necessary in an increasingly virtual world? Wow!

Cindy Cunningham is too gracious an individual to throw a gauntlet down before her audience, but I left her presentation feeling as though I had been presented with some direct challenges. What can I do, as a library manager, to leverage the position of my institution to allow us to take full advantage of information age access options? What can I do, as a technical services librarian, to provide my staff with the skills necessary to meet upcoming challenges? What can I do, as automation services coordinator, to insure that my integrated library system is meeting the needs of the web-centric clients? What can I do, as a law librarian and former cataloger, to initiate a non-threatening discussion of these issues? I’ll be thinking about these questions for some time. An immediate answer that comes to mind is to work within TS-SIS and OB-SIS to foster and facilitate an exchange of ideas and expertise on some of the specific ideas that Cindy shared with us. Is anyone interested in an online dialogue on cataloging in the virtual world?

Endnotes
1 http://www.editeur.org/ONIX.html
2 Cindy Cunningham. Presentation C-2. AALL Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA. Sunday, July 13, 4:15 PM.

Integrating Resources--or, “What Do We Do Now That We Have (Almost) What We Wanted?”

Coordinator: Nancy M. Poehlmann, Notre Dame Law School, Kresge Library; Speakers: Richard Amelung, St. Louis University Law Library; Glenn E. Patton, OCLC, Director, WorldCat Content Manager

As we are faced with drowning in the vast sea of new AACR2, rev., rules and modifications, “misonneistic” or fearing change is a term that adequately describes many of today’s catalogers. Fortunately, in these turbulent times, we have sea-worthy comrades such as Richard Amelung and Glenn Patton who assist us in navigating the treacherous waters of Chapter 12. Their descriptions of specific waves of change ameliorate some of our anxieties.

Richard began by demystifying new definitions found in Chapter 12 of AACR2, rev. He explained the scope of this chapter as covering continuing resources, which are items successively issued (i.e. serials) or integrating (e.g., updating loose-leafs, updating web sites). Part of the mystery of this definition is that items no longer have to have numerology to be included in Chapter 12.

Integrating resources are bibliographic resources that are added to or changed and do not remain discrete. These items can be finite or continuing. The finite category, thankfully, catches items that often fall
through the cracks. “Now,” laughingly states Richard as he holds up a copy of CoffeeTalk, “We can catalog newspapers from AALL conventions.”

Continuing resources are bibliographic resources that are issued over time with no predetermined conclusion. This includes serials and ongoing integrating resources such as loose-leaves and web sites.

Catalogers use Chapter 12 in conjunction with other chapters in AACR2, rev. Catalogers may begin at chapter 12 and then refer to the chapter containing the rules for the appropriate resource format. For example if the item is an electronic journal, refer to Chapter 9 for rules specifically applying to the electronic aspects of the journal and chapter 12 for the continuing aspects.

Richard pointed out the specific types of resources that are covered in chapter 12. These include updating loose-leaves, updating web pages, and updating databases. He also noted resources not covered in chapter 12. These being pocket parts; replacement volumes; loose-leaf formats that are not updated or updating is not accomplished through discrete insert; and web pages that are static. A pocket part is discrete, it can be pulled out. All loose-leaves are not updated, being housed in a binder does not qualify it as an integrating resource. A web page that has no information going in or coming out is not a continuing resource.

Examples of titles that are not integrating resources:

- **Collier On Bankruptcy** – This title is updated; however the new material completely replaces what is removed.

- **William and Mary Tax Conference** – This publication is a serial. The contents are issued annually and are housed in a binder for convenience.

- **Missouri Civil Actions 2nd Ed.** – This title is issued in a binder and updated; however the supplementation is discrete. Each revision is pulled out and entirely replaced.

Adele Hallam’s Cataloging Rules For the Description Of Looseleaf Publications, 1989, is integrated into many aspects of AACR2, rev., Chapter 12. Hallam’s publication will serve as a buoy for those familiar with the contents.


OCLC has already implemented several fields that are used with integrated resources. These are:

- 022 – ISSN
- 222 – key title
- 247 – former title
- 310 – current publication frequency
- 321 – former publication frequency
- 362 – dates of publication
- 547 – former title complexity note
- 550 – issuing body note
- 580 – linking entry complexity note.

Fields not yet implemented in OCLC are the repeatable 260 field and the bibliographic level code ‘i’. The code ‘i’ implementation is not expected to be available before July 2005. In the interim he recommends the following coding guide:

- **Use BLvl code ‘m’ (Monographic)** when coding a record for an integrating resource – Do not use code ‘s’ (serial) for an integrating resource
- **Include a serial 006 field to the records you input or replace for integrating resources with the following attributes:**
  - Freq code ‘k’ when appropriate to indicate that an integrating resource is continuously updated
  - Codes “d,” “l,” and “w” in Type of Continuing Resource

OCLC is soliciting input to a couple of questions concerning BLvl ‘i’, Glenn asked the audience, “Should Integrating Resources be retrieved with the same search qualifier as other serials or a separate qualifier?” And he asked, “How should Integrating Resources be identified in displays?” He encouraged librarians to contact him at by email, pattong@oclc.org, or by telephone at 1-800-848-5878, ext. 6371, with comments and concerns.

To help keep our heads above water with these new rules, Glenn recommended three resources for further training.

- **Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program on Cataloging Integrating Resources** <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/scctp/ir-sched.html>

- **Online Training Presentation by the Cataloging Policy Committee of the Online Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc.** <http://ublib.buffalo.edu/libraries/units/cts/olac/capc/ir.ppt>

Is There a Book Doctor in the House?
Assessing Preservation Priorities and Options

Most libraries have a growing number of materials awaiting preservation decisions. Problem books are removed from the stacks to prevent further deterioration and damage, but then get stuck in limbo. Often it’s because there is no staff member qualified to make the necessary preservation decisions. Problem books would typically include items with brittle paper, items whose bindings are falling apart, torn headcaps, textblocks detached from covers, and red rot.

Book doctor Gary Menges, the Preservation Administrator at the University of Washington Libraries, presented ideas for establishing preservation programs as well as dispensing some practical advice on what to do with some of the problems listed above. He quickly reminded everyone that preservation is not just about books, it’s about all the formats held by the library. And also the subformats! He pointed out, for example, that over fifty different video formats were created between 1956-1995! When assessing hardcopy items, consider the different kinds of paper used as well as the type of binding. Be aware that each category of material has its own preservation needs and set of optimal storage requirements, and remember the basic axiom of preservation is that everything deteriorates.

Deterioration can be a result of the item’s inherent qualities in combination with external factors. (Adding to that, sometimes a format is lost because the technology needed to read or play the format is lost. The Microsoft Archives is working to preserve the older technology needed to older versions of its software products, but who but Microsoft has the resources to do that!) Inherent qualities, such as chemical composition will vary from format to format, as will the physical properties that affect deterioration. The inherent qualities of paper manufactured between the mid-19th century and the mid-1990s led to brittle paper problems.

Brittle paper is a well-known example of the deterioration of library materials. In an advanced stage of brittleness the paper flakes and crumbles, leading to the loss of text. Inherent factors leading the paper to become brittle include: the mineral content of the water used in its manufacture (sulfur, chlorine, iron, potassium), residues from chemical bleaches, the replacement of cloth rag pulp (linen cotton pulp paper) with ground wood pulp (whose shorter ground fibers decrease the strength of the paper), and especially, the replacement of gelatin paper sizing with the highly acidic alum rosin sizing. (Sizing was used as a coating on paper to prevent the ink from feathering.)

External factors affecting deterioration may include poor environmental conditions, poor storage conditions, damage from usage, and damage as a result of a disaster (most often water related). There are different ideal storage conditions for each format, which includes ideal temperature and relative humidity ranges. Damage from external factors can include: storing materials in acidic containers, damage caused by use of the item (paper gets torn, long play records get scratched, photographs are damaged by the oils on a person’s hands). Libraries can’t assume that an item added to the library’s collection will be there forever. Preservation seeks a balance between access with long-term retention. Since libraries want their collections to be used, preservation can be viewed as a form of risk management.

What’s involved in preservation?

Assessment. Assessment is necessary because sometimes the problems aren’t apparent. One assessment option is to conduct a preservation needs survey, that can examine the facility, the condition of the collections, the library’s policies and procedures, or anything else that can impact the condition of the collection. Another option is a random sample survey. A random survey could be used to estimate what percentage of the collection is brittle. Another option is an item specific assessment by a conservator to determine what sorts of treatments are possible for the item. Some testing methods include the use of a ph pen or meter to test the acidity of paper, AV strips to test for acetate film, or a CD analyzer to see if data on the disc has been lost.

Emergency preparedness. Keep rolls of plastic to protect bookshelves from water. Create a list of supplies and phone numbers needed in the event of an emergency.

Environmental control. This is the single most important factor libraries can address to assure preservation of a collection. Optimal environmental conditions will vary according to format. For paper materials consider humidity, temperature, and exposure to sunlight - all can trigger chemical or physical reactions that lead to deterioration. Don’t store materials on the floor or near water sources.
Setting preservation priorities:

Consider the following when needed, not because it is no longer format or the content is no longer discarded it should be because the valuable resources to preserve items item may be discarded. Don’t invest first question to ask is whether the When faced with a damaged item, the action is necessary or you’ll lose rate at faster rates (even when not in interiorates but some things deteriorate format (as in the case of an audio photocopied, or migrated to another original is not critical, consider whether the material may be replaced, microfilmed, digitized, post-its as bookmarks, discouraging coffee drinking in the library or at least require spill-proof containers.


Conservation. Preserving the artifact. This is the most expensive kind of preservation activity, so use it selectively. If retention of the original is not critical, consider whether the material may be replaced, microfilmed, digitized, photocopied, or migrated to another format (as in the case of an audio format).

When faced with a damaged item, the first question to ask is whether the item may be discarded. Don’t invest valuable resources to preserve items that are no longer needed! If an item is discarded it should be because the format or the content is no longer needed, not because it is no longer usable. Consider the following when setting preservation priorities:

Degree of urgency. Everything deteriorates but some things deteriorate at faster rates (even when not in use) and then urgency is a factor. So the condition of the item dictates how quickly you need to act. A water-related disaster is urgent. When brittle paper gets to the flaky stage, action is necessary or you’ll lose some of the text. Nitrate film is an unstable format and once deteriorates the process moves rapidly.

Intrinsic value of the item versus the information content of the volume (Such as a book that belonged to a famous judge who wrote annotations in the margins).

Mission of your institution.

Research value of the item.

Collection development policy. Does your library specialize in the subject area of the item?

Significance. Is the collection nationally, regionally, or locally unique?

Uniqueness of the item.

Usage patterns. Heavily used materials will deteriorate more rapidly. Heavily used materials may merit higher priority because of the need to replace the material. Decisions on low use materials may be to defer replacement or even discard the material. Often preservation is driven by the needs of library users.

Has someone else preserved it? If so, it may be lower priority for your library.

What are the costs involved in preservation? According to Library of Congress in 2000, one 300 page book cost $10 to bind and $15 for mass-deacidification. Replacing with a preservation facsimile was cheaper than microfilming, and one of the costlier options was digitization. If preserving an item is feasible as far as resources are concerned, and if its preservation would have a large impact on users, it becomes higher priority.

Mr. Menges then focused on three of the common problems listed in the program description: brittle paper, damaged bindings, and red rot. Preservation decisions for books usually involve the condition of the paper, the condition of the binding, and the condition of the textblock. Options: Discard without replacement. Can it be discarded? The material may be superseded, it may be outdated, the library may own other copies, or it might no longer be relevant to your collection.

If the paper is strong enough and the margins big enough, rebind the item. If the textblock is in good condition, the item may be recased. If the paper is so brittle that it can’t be repaired or rebound, consider replacing the item with a reprint or later edition. How do library patrons “use” the item? If an item is simply read, perhaps the library doesn’t need a hard copy and could consider reformating the item as a microform. Another option is to reformat the item as a photocopy or preservation facsimile by sending it to a commercial vendor who will reproduce the book by scanning the original item. For old leather books with red rot (which is caused by the leather drying out), determine whether the paper will support being rebound. If it will not, consider boxing or wrapping the volumes and returning them to the stacks. Label the box or wrapper “Handle with care! This book is fragile. Please do not place this item in a book drop”. Custom made boxes can also be ordered by companies like CMI (Custom Manufacturing Inc.). Purchasing boxes can be more economical than creating the boxes in-house.

Generally there are no clear right or wrong decisions for any particular item. It depends on your institution’s policies and guidelines, relevance of the item to your collection, level of resources available for preservation, if the item sees low or high use, and whether your staff is trained in preservation. If your library doesn’t have the resources to launch a full preservation program, another option is to implement a “phased” conservation to buy time through a series of preservation treatments. For example, step one of a phased preservation might be to perform an assessment survey to outline steps in a preservation plan. Step two could be to address some of the environmental factors affecting deterioration of the collection.

Mr. Menges concluded his remarks by sharing some strategies for obtaining funding for preservation activities. He suggested that libraries make a case for preservation funding internally by documenting the risks and costs of not addressing the problems. Find out how your institution’s preservation funding
Elisheva Schwartz talked about the other social sciences. Unlike the law, politics, and religion in BP, social and political sciences are not jurisdictionally based. As the program summary states: “...these two topics are not jurisdictionally based, as are most of the titles in libraries. Instead they are international, and incorporate aspects of religious doctrine, history, political science, and other social sciences.”

Judaic and Islamic Classification: Envisioning Access and Order for Legal Topics of International and Nonjurisdictional Scope

As with many catalogers, I find classifying Judaic and Islamic Law resources a real challenge (read struggle), so I have been anxiously following the Library of Congress’ (LC) progress in developing schedules for these areas. I was pleased that the Advanced Cataloging Workshop (annual meeting of the American Association of Law Libraries) included a discussion on this, and that there was also a separate program covering this relevant topic. I found Tuesday’s 90 minute program to be very informative, one that clarified concepts presented at the workshop.

The program panel consisted of Gary L. Vander Meer (coordinator/moderator, Northern Illinois University), Elisheva Schwartz (New York University Law Library), and M. Lesley Wilkins (Harvard Law School). There was also lively help from the audience in the person of Dr. Yolande Goldberg, eminent authority of the LC schedules.

While this is a very complex and evolving area, the biggest hurdle in understanding these topics is that they are not based on jurisdiction. As the program summary states: “…these two topics are not jurisdictionally based, as are most of the titles in libraries. Instead they are international, and incorporate aspects of religious doctrine, history, political science, and other social sciences.”

Ms. Schwartz discussed several options for implementations of the schedules. On a practical note, it’s helpful that KBM 1-523 parallels BM, allowing for flipping of one to the other. KBM numbers 524 on approximates those in the Afro-Asian schedules. Ms. Schwartz concluded with classification examples of several titles.

M. Leslie Wilkins discussed Islamic Law and the implementation of the new KBP subclass. Development of the KBP schedules is a culmination of a five-year project headed by LC’s Dr. Jolande Goldberg in coordination with Harvard University. Ms. Wilkins noted that traditional concerns of Islamic Law include international relations, so Islamic Law, even more than Jewish Law, governs every aspect of life.

Previously, aspects of Islamic Law were scattered throughout the LC schedules; primarily classed with religion in BP, social and political aspects throughout D, H, and J, and frustratingly (as we all know), some not classed at all, or only in local schemes. (As an example on the disparity among call numbers, I searched our consortium’s central catalog for a title recommended by Ms. Wilkins and found call numbers ranging from Hicks class F9, to K165, BP144, and KBL0.)

One of the many positive aspects for scholars is that KBP “incorporates and respects the traditional Muslim approach to Islamic Law”; for librarians this “unites topics and materials previously scattered over several LC classes.”

Ms. Wilkins discussed comparative and parallel classification, using family law as one example for comparative law classification. Implementation of the KBP subclass is occurring now at LC (applied to new items and retrospectively to those with the 050 SaLAW) and over the next few years at Harvard. Ms. Wilkins cautioned that HOLLIS (Harvard) numbers may still reflect the older, temporary schemes. Subject areas we are certain to see an increasing number of resources in are banking, constitutional law, environmental law, and criminal law and practice.

This was an expert and informed panel, and a program of great interest to both catalogers and reference librarians; as such, AALL programming might consider repeating it.
Managing Support Staff in Technical Services

Joseph W. Thomas coordinated and moderated this one-hour question-and-answer session with Anne Myers and Nona Watt. Joe opened the session with a statement of how important management issues are in Technical Services. He explained that the session would have a discussion-like approach, beginning with questions that were sent in to the listserv as starting points. The speakers would not be “oracles” but would start the ball rolling and would allow other points or questions to be brought up by the audience.

**Question 1: What to do when you have trouble motivating staff?**

Anne acknowledged that sometimes with frozen salaries and boring tasks, this could be a challenge. She suggested occasional treats, such as food and informal socializing. Flextime in the summer is another method of rewarding staff. Nona suggested teaching creativity: fostering an environment where people are allowed to be creative and have projects and different work to do, letting staff write procedures and make other contributions, as well as taking computer classes that contribute to the workplace.

**Question 2: What to do with an underperformer?**

Nona said that some people have poor organizational skills and need help from their supervisor to organize their work space. Anne acknowledged that this causes stress for the staff. Performance appraisals helped to formalize the problem in an objective way: documentation helped to change their performance. Give permission to go slow and to do the work accurately.

**Question 3: What to do about a talented person to keep them interested and performing well?**

Nona’s suggestions included: promoting from within, giving special projects to independent workers and asking them to participate in preservation. Anne asks them to write procedures and make other contributions, as well as taking computer classes that contribute to the workplace.

**Question 4: Is it ok for support staff to do professional work, such as meeting with vendors or doing original cataloging?**

Anne said yes, if necessary. Nona added that they need to know that there are aspects to your job that they cannot handle.

**Question 5: Is there a good way to train support staff when there is a lot of turnover?**

Nona said that there should be a set pattern for training and that cross training should cover positions when people are sick or on vacation. Anne found that sometimes some tasks don’t matter. She devised charts and asked people what they knew and then created documentation needed to make decisions.

**Question 6: How should I handle it if internal candidates from Public Services want to go to Technical Services?**

Anne said it was important to know the university rules and to talk to supervisors. It’s important to be careful in union situations and be honest about whether it is a good fit. Nona acknowledged that it could be an uncomfortable situation when multiple staff applies. Joe asked what happens when a person is not detail oriented and is not a good fit? Anne suggested that knowing the policy of your institution is important and being honest with the staff and supervisors. Nona said that we have two requirements: a detail oriented person and getting along with others. The immediate supervisor describes the details of the job and the Head of Technical Services asks the candidate to repeat what the supervisor has told them. The candidate meets with the Director and judges the personality.

**Question/Comment: We give tests to see if person is detail oriented: filing, searching, finding subject headings, how many copies, handwriting and typing. How do others test?**

Anne: Personnel gives a typing test. We also have everyone meet the candidate as a group.

**Question/Comment: Do you look at performance appraisals on internal candidates?**

Anne: We do ask for a number from Personnel.

Nona: We don’t request the performance appraisal but we rely on the supervisor’s recommendation.

**Question/Comment: What do you do when you want to rank someone lower?**

Anne: Establish that you are the new supervisor and run everything past the director. Don’t pull punches.
**Question/Comment:** How do you handle staff who are not involved but who see the problems?

Anne: We explain that we are working with So-and-So and they should bring problems and improvements to the attention of the supervisor. Don’t go into specifics.

**Question/Comment:** How does Summer Flextime work when they are union?

Anne: They still have rules to follow and need the staff to keep to a schedule.

Nona: Flextime is a university benefit year round. Staff still keeps to a schedule.

**Question/Comment:** How do you handle the performance review of a paranoid person?

Joe: This is a psychological problem that affects performance. Outside intervention may be necessary.

Anne: Call Human Resources. Know your limits. Go to the Director.

Nona: There are privacy issues. Be careful whom you talk to.

**Question/Comment:** What about Employee Assistance Programs?

Anne: That can be an important resource. During 9/11, people were referred to EAP and were helped.

Joe thanked everyone for coming and announced that the new management issues columnist for *TSLL* will be Caitlin Robinson.

---

**CONFERENCE REPORT**

**Maximize the OPAC: Is FRBR in Your Future?**

Ellen McGrath  
University at Buffalo, SUNY  
emcgrath@buffalo.edu

The answer to the question in this program’s title is a definite YES! That is, unless you plan to escape the world of standards and live under a rock somewhere. FRBR is the hot catchphrase and all catalogers must know about it if they want to be prepared for the changes coming down the pike. And not only catalogers need to know about FRBR, since its effect upon our online library catalogs will be felt by all library staff and users. So what is FRBR? The acronym stands for Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records and is often spoken as “furbur,” though some refer to it as “furby” in fun.

FRBR represents a radical change in the conceptual approach to mapping relationships between various titles held by libraries. The FRBR model introduces new terminology that will eventually be reflected in the new AACR2 (or AACR3, since it is a BIG change) which is now in the works. FRBR will not arrive tomorrow, since it must be written into the cataloging rules and reflected in the related MARC definitions and that all takes time. But that standards work is currently underway and so FRBR will be in our future, though nobody can say for sure just yet exactly when it will happen.

FRBR is a complex model, so it is important to hear and therefore learn about it gradually and frequently. AALL began to help in this effort by presenting this program during its Annual Meeting in Seattle on July 13, 2003. “Maximize the OPAC: Is FRBR in Your Future?” was very well-attended and the panel presenters on the program are true experts, intimately involved with the implementation of FRBR. Barbara Tillett (Library of Congress Cataloging Policy and Support Office) set the stage conceptually by defining FRBR and its terminology. Vinod Chachra (VTLS Inc.) came next and made it a bit more concrete by showing his company’s interpretation of FRBR as implemented in its Virtua online local system. Then Glenn Patton (OCLC) finished up by speaking about the benefits of FRBR.

Dr. Tillett’s slides are in the handouts book received at AALL registration and they are essential to understanding her presentation and can even stand alone in giving a good overview of FRBR. Mr. Patton had a one page handout that is not in the book and Mr. Chachra did not have a handout, though his examples can be viewed on the VTLS website at: http://www.vtls.com/ (in a box on the left side, click on “Navigating FRBR with Virtua”—viewed August 22, 2003). I was fortunate to be able to attend an almost identical program at the ALA Annual Conference in Toronto on June 22, 2003, called “Don’t Be Dysfunctional: How to Put FRBR in Your Future.” Dr. Tillett’s and Mr. Patton’s handouts from ALA are on the ALCTS website at: http://www.ala.org/Content/NavigationMenu/ALCTS/Continuing_Education2/Presentations/Presentations.htm (viewed August 22, 2003). I strongly urge you to check out all this material on the web, because it is impossible for me to give very much detail in this short report.

FRBR was originally the result of six years of work by an IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations and
help us think about how to serve our displays, thereby serving as a tool to improve online catalog example. The FRBR model then can in families, such as in the GWTW inherent to the entities. Dr. Tillett focuses in on the relationships as distinguished from a different print item level, there can be one print copy an HTML version. And finally, at the original print work, a PDF version, and manifestation level, there can be the edition (different expressions). At the (work), which is realized through the original idea for the novel “Gone With the Wind” (GWTW). example that I first saw of FRBR used of a multi-volume title. The classic manifestation, for example, one piece an “item” is an exemplification of that work or embodiment of that work or expression, and could be thought of as being at the copy level of a title. And an “item” is an exemplification of that manifestation, for example, one piece of a multi-volume title. The classic example that I first saw of FRBR used “Gone With the Wind” (GWTW). There is the original idea for the novel (work), which is realized through the original text, a translation, or a critical edition (different expressions). At the manifestation level, there can be the original print work, a PDF version, and an HTML version. And finally, at the item level, there can be one print copy as distinguished from a different print copy.

This illustrates how the FBRB model focuses in on the relationships inherent to the entities. Dr. Tillett advised that we think of works as being in families, such as in the GWTW example. The FRBR model then can be used to improve online catalog displays, thereby serving as a tool to help us think about how to serve our users better. The bottom line reverts to the timeless Cutter’s Objectives of the Catalog: finding and collocating. FRBR is especially interesting when applied to musical works and expressions. Dr. Tillett offered the statistic that in a sample of the OCLC database, it was estimated that less than 20% of the records in it have more than one manifestation per work. Her slides show some different scenarios and some “FRBR-ized” records. Dr. Tillett also touched upon FRANAR (Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records), which is sort of an extension to the FRBR model that brings in the essential aspect of authority control. But that’s a topic for another whole program, hopefully coming soon to an AALL Annual Meeting.

Mr. Chachra next showed the implementation of FRBR as included in release 41 of VTLS’ Virtua local system. In that release, libraries have the choice to implement FRBR completely, ignore it altogether, or have a mix of some records with FRBR applied and some without. Mr. Chachra described the examples available at the VTLS website. The implementation utilizes a tree structure to show the relationships between records in the Group 1 category: work, expression, manifestation, and item. Different labeled levels display via a split screen method in Virtua. On the staff side, it is a split between the top and bottom of the screen and in the webPAC, it is side by side. A work is cataloged once and then it appears in multiple trees, making use of the 001 and 004 MARC tags to establish the links between related records. The linking is done automatically and recursively.

The rules-based validation routines built into the Virtua system can be changed by each library. Records can be “FRBR-ized” individually or in batches as added or they can be mapped retrospectively. Records that need to be shared in some way with another library or libraries can also be “un-FRBR-ized” for that purpose. According to Mr. Chachra, there were some accidental benefits that became apparent. Library users that are not fussy about what expression they receive of a work can place a hold at a higher level, thus perhaps expediting the process of receiving some version of that work. European libraries are also very pleased at the way FRBR groups titles in multiple languages. Mr. Chachra expressed one of the many benefits of FRBR as being the reduction of the cataloging workload. While that perhaps could be true further down the road, I suspect it would be a little way out considering the major adjustment implementing FRBR would represent in the shorter term.

“What Can FRBR Do for You?” was the title of Glenn Patton’s portion of the program. He characterized FRBR as an opportunity to reacquaint ourselves with the history of cataloging and he spent some time discussing Cutter’s Objectives (1876) and the Paris Principles (1961). While FRBR is viewed as a radical change, Mr. Patton reminded us that it is really just new vocabulary applied to the familiar concepts of finding and collocating. When we moved to online catalogs, there was a lot gained in terms of keyword access to more of the bibliographic record and integrated authority control. But some navigation tools that were present in the card catalog were also lost, namely guide cards and the ease of scanning through large sets of cards quickly.

Relationships can currently be made in our catalogs through the use of
This was an excellent program characterized by well-prepared speakers and great handouts.

Brenna Louzin spoke from the perspective of a law firm branch librarian, who deals with issues of licensing for a single branch as well as licensing within a firm group. She talked about the importance of communication within the firm – knowing your firm culture, respecting any deals made by the firm-wide library director, and articulating special needs for an individual branch. She stressed the need to be frank with vendors about the position of the branch library within the greater firm – when the branch can deal on its own, when the branch must join or encourage enterprise-wide licenses, and other restrictions that a branch librarian might face. In a large firm with multiple offices, a branch often has information needs that are tailored to specialized practices and the librarian must be willing to lobby for those specialized needs. Ms. Louzin provided a lengthy checklist for license negotiation for a branch library.

Among other things, she advised librarians to review their collection development policy and budget before entering negotiations, clarify the geographic scope of the license, define the terms required by the license (e.g. site, seat, number of attorneys), and stay informed about publishers’ financial situation and solvency. Most importantly, she advocated taking a zero-based budgeting approach when considering renewals of electronic licenses.

Lisa Smith-Butler discussed licensing considerations for academic libraries: will the electronic resource replace or complement an existing print subscription, will there be a cost savings, will all patrons have access to the resource, are there hardware or software issues to address, is remote access available? There are collection development issues that are similar to those presented by print products, including evaluating the subject content, full text vs. abstracts, content and date coverage, and frequency of updates. The selection of an electronic resource often involves many individuals within the library. The acquisitions process involves negotiations about type of access (site license vs. limited simultaneous users), type of patron access (law school only, or university community, or greater legal community, or general public), archival access, authentication, remote access, fair use, interlibrary loan, and payment terms. IT staff frequently need to be consulted about a variety of hardware and software issues. Electronic resources need cataloging and/or a web page link. Reference librarians need to train patrons to use the resources, and they might need to develop handouts or other user directions.

Both speakers provided bibliographies and copies of their PowerPoint slides. Anyone who did not attend the annual meeting should borrow or purchase the AALL Meeting handout book to get the full flavor of the content of this program. I highly recommend the handouts and the program tape.
Mary Jane Kelsey of Yale Law School’s Lillian Goldman Library coordinated this program, introduced the speakers, and posed some basic questions that librarians want to be able to answer regarding their e-journal collection: What are we getting? What are the holdings?

The first speaker was Chris Pierard, one of the co-founders of the Serials Solutions data management company, which was founded in 2000 by University of Washington reference librarian Peter McCracken. The company can create a single, comprehensive list of all the electronic serials available at a particular institution. Its Journal Linker product allows users to link from citations in online abstracts and indexes to either the full text of a specific journal article, or to the Web page of the cited electronic journal. Serials Solutions also can provide MARC records for e-journal titles suitable for importing into a library’s online catalog.

Mr. Pierard listed three key ingredients of a successful link resolver service: 1) content provider participation, 2) accurate institutional holdings data, and 3) resolver software that is easy to install and maintain.

1) Content provider participation: Providers have to be clear about their holdings, update schedules, and embargo policies. Article level links aren’t available from all providers. The next best option is journal level links.

2) Accurate institutional holdings data: Accurate data is critical for a link resolver to deliver real value. In other words, garbage in = garbage out. Incorrect ISSN, inaccurate holdings, and outdated bibliographic information can all lead to dead links, time consuming duplicate searches, and ultimately a bad user experience.

Journal title variations are a particularly troublesome area for Serials Solutions. The company uses “title normalization” based on the CONSER MARC record to help resolve difficulties. An in-house cataloger team investigates titles to ensure that they are accurately represented. Once a correct title is identified, its ISSN is added to the record for future reference.

3) Resolver software: When choosing a link resolver product, libraries should ask what they must do to set it up, how quickly it can be installed, and what maintenance is required on their part to keep it current.

Mr. Pierard concluded by remarking that all link resolvers are predicated on the same standard, that all can only offer article-level linking to content providers who have adopted that standard, and that features and functionality are fairly standard among providers. Libraries should look for a product that is easy to install and maintain, and a company that provides good customer service and support.

Nettie Lagace of ExLibris was the second speaker. Her presentation, entitled “Smart Linking with SFX,” began with a general overview of how link resolvers work and why they are superior to traditional linking mechanisms, such as those that link citations in a particular abstracting and indexing source to their target references. Traditional linking is generally controlled by source A&I services, dependent on specific business agreements, limited in scope, non-context sensitive, and hard to maintain.

SFX is a link resolver that relies on OpenURL, a communication information standard. The library subscriber to SFX completes a Knowledge Base Manager matrix to record local holdings. Many elements of configuration and display customization are under local library control. A variety of sources and targets can be linked via SFX, as long as the sources provide an OpenURL and targets have a link-to syntax.

Ms. Lagace concluded with a rundown of the advantages of OpenURL linking. For library users, benefits include desktop delivery of full text when available electronically, expansion of research horizons, and consistency and accuracy of links. Benefits for libraries include central administration of links and e-journal data, local control over what types of links are offered and where they are resolved, optimal use of licensed resources, and satisfied users.

The final speaker for this program was Kimberly Parker, Head of Electronic Collections at Yale University Library. Ms. Parker began with an account of Yale’s e-journal management history, which had resulted in a complex array of too many lists and too many links.

An environment that included twenty-one libraries and more than fifty selectors added to the complexity. To address this problem, an MS SQL database was created locally, and dubbed the Yale Electronic Library (YELMO). YELMO included functionality for batch uploads, global updates, queries for analysis and manipulation, and custom templates.

However, even with YELMO, the library envisioned spending too much time keeping up with e-journals, e-books, Web databases, administrative
The meeting was called to order on Monday July 14, 2003 at 5:15 pm by Mary Jane Kelsey, OBS Chair.

Currently the library exports regularly, using DataLoader software.

Most recently, Yale went live in April 2003 with its e-book collection of more than 14,000 titles. As a future project, Ms. Parker would like to develop a Knowledge Base database of e-books, parallel to the one in place for e-journals.

Questions and answers:

Q: How does a library get started planning for open linking?
A: Check the Web for more information on individual products, including pricing. Then schedule a planning meeting that includes catalogers, reference librarians, systems people, acquisitions staff, and electronic resources librarians.

Q: Will link resolvers make the 856 field obsolete?
A: Maybe for serials, but a library will probably end up with a mix of linking mechanisms.

Final word of caution: Unless your institution has a lot of resources, don’t attempt to do it all yourself. You’ll end up doing a huge amount of tweaking to maintain.

OBS Business Meeting Minutes, 2003 and 2002

I. WELCOME AND CHAIR’S REPORT

Mary Jane thanked the OBS Executive Board for their support during the past year.

Mary Jane requested a moment of silence to honor two past OBS members, Sue Roach and Ellen Rappaport.

Mary Jane reported that her focus this past year was continuing the work begun by Ellen McGrath and Ismael Gullon (past OBS Chairs) in building the infrastructure of OBS. In particular, Mary Jane thanked Ellen and Ismael for updating the procedures manual; the latest addition to the manual are current job descriptions for Executive Board positions and Committee Chairs.

Mary Jane reported that she had several excellent programs for the Seattle meeting and that we were trying to maintain our focus on technology to differentiate ourselves from TS-SIS.

Mary Jane worked with Chris Tarr (TS-SIS Chair) this year on the meeting matrix to avoid any conflicts in meeting schedules. This has worked well in Seattle and should be a bit easier in Boston as there will additional slots for committee meetings (4:15pm – 5:00pm and 5:30pm – 7:00pm).

II. SECRETARY/TREASURER REPORT

The final balance of OBS, per the May 2003 statement from AALL, is $75.84; however, with anticipated expenses for the Seattle meeting, the final balance will be -$191.21. Since the invoices for the Seattle meeting and the money from dues that are credited to OBS will both appear on the September 2003 statement from AALL, there should be sufficient funds to cover the anticipated shortfall.

Discussion ensued on the possibility of publishing TSLL in an electronic format to save money. The OBS share of paying for postage and mailing of TSLL represents the largest percentage of OBS budget expenses, leaving very
little for other activities. Kevin Butterfield, incoming OBS Chair, reported that he would be working with TS-SIS to explore different publishing options for TSLL.

A. A total of 110 ballots were returned for the 2003 election, out of 312 mailed. The new members of the Executive Board for 2003-2004 are:

Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect:
Georgia Briscoe
University of Colorado

Secretary/Treasurer:
Michael Maben
Indiana University

Member-At-Large:
Andrea Rabbia
Syracuse University

The Executive Board thanked Naomi Goodman, Barbara Szalkowski and Julianna Davis for volunteering to be part of the election process this year, as well as the Nominating Committee (Ellen McGrath, Susan Chinoransky, Anna Belle Leiserson) for their efforts in recruiting such a wonderful slate of candidates.

A motion was made and seconded to destroy the ballots.

The minutes of the July 2002 Business meeting were distributed to the members in attendance. A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes without revision.

III. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES

OBS
The OBS representatives (Mary Jane and Judy) talked to over 25 people at this year’s meeting, including many reference librarians.

Alphabet Soup Reception
The Alphabet Soup reception was a great success this year, with over 200 people attending. It was held in the Cirrus Room (at the top of the Sheraton Hotel) and was primarily underwritten by Innovative Interfaces.

Education
A. The Education Committee sponsored the following programs in Seattle:
   - Envisioning Tomorrow’s Catalog: A View From Outside the Library, Program C2 (Sun. July 13, 4:15-5:15), Coordinator: Kevin Butterfield
   - Two Stepping With Technology, Program L3 (Wed. July 16, 2:30-3:00), Coordinator: Janet Hedin
   - MARBI Report — Susan Goldner, (TS-SIS, co-sponsor), Program L4 (Wed. July 16, 2:30-3:00)

B. The Education Committee is scheduled to meet Tuesday, July 15, from 11:45am –1:00pm. There are four program proposals ready to send to AMPC for the Boston Annual Meeting. Proposals can now be sent electronically to AALL.

C. The Career Development Task Force (successor to the PDC) is now in charge of developing a continuing education program for AALL, based on the electronic and paper surveys and the focus groups to be held in Seattle for member input. All future workshops, formerly sponsored by PDC, will now be the responsibility of AMPC. All institutes are temporarily on hold until the new program has been established. Comments on the continuing education needs of members should be sent to Phyllis Marion, Chair of the Career Development Task Force.

Local Systems
The Local Systems meeting attracted approximately 25 people for a discussion on local portals.

OCLC
Over 30 people attended the OCLC Committee meeting on Connexion (which has been delayed for public release due to inadequate response time).

RLIN
The RLIN Committee discussed the upcoming changes to the RLIN technical services interface, including a new telnet client.

Web Advisory
A. The Web Advisory Committee reported that it had been a difficult year due to the instability of the AALL servers during a migration to a new server set-up. At the moment, the server environment seems to be stable again.

B. The Orlando OBS programs are now linked to the website and the Seattle programs will be added as well.

C. Password protection will be provided in the future for biographical data posted on the website for the election of Executive Board members.

Joint Research Grant Committee
(submitted by Eloise Vondruska)
Members of the committee were Eloise Vondruska (Chair), Richard Amelung (Ex-Officio/Advisor), Elizabeth Duncan (representing OBS), Ruth Patterson Funabiki (representing OBS), Rosemary Hahn (representing TS), and Julie Stauffer (representing TS).

The guidelines and application forms for the Joint Research Grant were posted to the OBS and TS discussion lists, the LAW-LIB, and published in the AALL Spectrum. The grant will also be posted in the Seattle AALL...
conference daily newspaper, *Coffee Talk*. No grant applications or inquiries were received.

The JRG committee members will be meeting informally at the AALL 2003 conference to discuss strategies for the grant.

**TSLL report**  
(submitted by Joe Thomas)

For volume 28, we produced one double issue (1/2) and two single issues, printed and mailed for a cost of $4,180. The estimated cost for volume 29 ($5,600) was discussed at this year’s TSLL board meeting. Several board members are in favor of an electronic-only version of TSLL. The chairs of the two SISes will find out the view of their membership. Columnists Richard Vaughan (Acquisitions), Michael Maben (OCLC), and Betty Roeske (Private Law Libraries) are leaving. The search for replacements is under way. Caitlin Robinson is the new columnist for management issues. Many thanks to Linda Tesar, Cindy May, and Martin Wisneski for their work in getting our issues out. And thanks most of all to the columnists and other contributors who are so generous with their ideas and their time.

Mary Jane thanked all the committee chairs and representatives for their past year of service to OBS.

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

**Electronic Balloting & Bylaws**

The SIS Council would like to change the bylaws to allow for electronic balloting for SIS elections. Members were reminded that AALL has to approve all bylaw changes before they are sent out to the membership for voting to ensure that they are consistent with AALL policies.

Since the OBS bylaw changes (distributed to the membership via email and posted on the OBS website) were not approved in advance by AALL, they cannot be voted upon at the Seattle meeting. The proposed changes, plus any new bylaw language related to electronic balloting, will be postponed until the next OBS Business Meeting in Boston.

Kevin Butterfield was installed as the new Chair of OBS. He thanked Mary Jane for her service and presented her with a gift from the OBS membership.

**Chair’s Agenda for 2003-2004**

Kevin reported that he would like to work on increasing the membership of OBS this year and also explore the option of producing TSLL in electronic format. Both of these actions would save money and enable OBS to expand its other activities.

**V. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Website**

Ismael Gullon officially unveiled the new website on behalf of the OBS Board, the Web Advisory Committee, and Anne Myers, the Webmaster, to an enthusiastic reception from the membership.

**CONELL Marketplace**

Judy Vaughan-Sterling reported that bags of candy and OBS literature were distributed at the CONELL meeting. Over 85 people participated in the workshop. There was some further discussion on the changes in programming for the upcoming years as PDC is replaced by the Career Development Task Force.

Meeting adjourned.

**Richard Jost**  
OBS Secretary/Treasurer

---

**Monday, July 22, 2002**  
**Orlando, Florida**

**I. Welcome**

Ismael Gullon, Chair, called the meeting to order and thanked everyone for attending.

He recognized Judy Vaughan-Sterling, who delivered a tribute to Jacqui Paul, former OBS Chair, and requested a moment of silence.

The Secretary/Treasurer report was postponed as the current OBS Secretary/Treasurer (Richard Jost) was not in attendance. The next order of business was the reports of committees and representatives.

**II. Reports of Committees and Representatives**

**A. Website**

Ismael Gullon unveiled the new website on behalf of the OBS Board, the Web Advisory Committee, and Anne Myers, the Webmaster, to an enthusiastic reception from the membership.

**B. CONELL Marketplace**

Judy Vaughan-Sterling reported that bags of candy and OBS literature were distributed at the CONELL meeting.

**C. TS/OBS/CS/RIPS Reception**

Judy Vaughan-Sterling reported that the alphabet soup reception on
Saturday night had 209 attendees. The reception was originally to have been held in the Peabody Hotel, which proved to be too expensive. It was relocated to the Orange County Convention Center, where the costs were still approximately $1000.00 more than last year (report attached).

9. **OBS Activities Table**

Susan Chinoransky reported that the table was set up on Saturday by Ismael Gullon and Judy Vaughan-Sterling. The book raffle was held at 11:30am on Tuesday, July 23, thanks to Judy who had donated the prize. The business cards dropped off for the raffle will be kept for future recruitment. Susan volunteered to pack up the table.

**Technical Services Law Librarian**

Joe Thomas reported that four issues had been published in the last year, for a total cost of $5462.00 ($1.70 per copy). A discussion took place on the ability of OBS to continue to pay for its share of TSLL and Joe reported that TS-SIS will slightly increase their contribution to the production of TSLL. Karen Selden will be the OBS representative to the TSLL Board (along with Corinne Jacox), replacing Ruth Patterson Funabiki. Joe also listed the new columnists for TSLL and thanked Martin Wisneski, Cynthia May and Linda Tesar for their work on loading individual issues of TSLL on the web.

**f. MARBI Report**

Ellen McGrath reported (for Susan Goldner) on the MARBI activities for 2002. The full report can be read at: http://www.aallnet.org/sis/obssis/reports/marbi2002.htm

**G. Education Committee**

Mary Jane Kelsey (Chair) reported that the Education Committee would be meeting on Tuesday at noon to discuss program proposals. The committee has 3 program proposals so far to finalize for submission for the Seattle meeting. Mary Jane also noted that there will be new 30 minute program slots for the Seattle meeting and that OBS may want to propose some program ideas for these sessions.

**II. Local Systems Committee**

George Prager reported that the Local Systems Committee would be meeting on Tuesday and would be hearing a report from Sandy Westfall at Innovative Interfaces on a new product. George also reported that he was working on the Local Systems part of the OBS website and hoped to add new materials.

**J. RLIN Committee**

The Committee did not meet in Orlando.

**k. Web Advisory Committee**

Mary Jane Kelsey (Chair) reported on behalf of Anne Myers, Webmaster, that the committee had been active this year and created a policy that outlines guidelines of the website and the roles and duties of the Webmaster and the Web Advisory Committee. Mary Jane thanked Anne Myers (current Webmaster) and Maria Okonska (former Webmaster) for all their efforts on behalf of OBS.

**l. Joint Research Grant Committee/Research Roundtable**

Brian Striman reported that Chris Long will take over the Research Roundtable for next year. This year the Roundtable had 18 attendees and heard from Paul Healey, Editorial Director of Spectrum.

**III. Secretary/Treasurer Report**

A. A motion was made (Judy Vaughan-Sterling) and seconded (Susan Chinoransky) to approve the minutes of the July 2001 Business Meeting (published in *TSLL*, v. 27, no.2).

6. Election report. The 2002 elections were held in the spring and resulted in the election of Kevin Butterfield as Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect and Ruth Patterson Funabiki as Member-at-Large. For the 2002 election, 116 ballots were received by the deadline of May 1. A motion was made and passed to destroy the ballots. The membership extended its thanks to the Nominations Committee, consisting of Brian Striman (Chair), Cynthia Cicco and Karen Nobbs

C. Finances. The balance in the OBS Treasury as of the May 2002 statement from AALL Headquarters is $466.95. The estimated expenses for the Orlando meeting are $397.29, leaving a total in the OBS Treasury of $69.66.

**IV. AMPC Report**

Brian Striman (OBS-SIS Liaison to AMPC) said that there would be new 30 minute slots at the Seattle AALL Annual Meeting. He urged that OBS submit a wide variety of program topics and lengths (there is no limit to the number of programs that an SIS can submit). Brian would like OBS to rank their proposals for him so that he understands the priorities before AMPC meets in September to select programs for Seattle.
V. New Business

A. The new officers for 2002-2003 were installed.

B. The new OBS Chair (Mary Jane Kelsey) reported that her agenda for the upcoming year would be to maintain the parts of OBS that were working well but also to try to increase our membership and improve our website.

C. Mary Jane Kelsey presented outgoing Chair, Ismael Gullon with a gift in appreciation for his hard work on behalf of OBS for last year.

VI. Adjournment

A motion was made and seconded to adjourn the 2002 Business Meeting.

Minutes taken by Ellen McGrath and prepared for distribution by Richard Jost

Renee Chapman Award 2003

continued from page 1

now: for example, how to code for loose-leaf publications. Rhonda has been a speaker on various AALL programs, but her most recent teaching “gigs” have been as a CONSER Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program trainer and a speaker at the ALA ALCTS AACR2 2002 and 2003 institutes.

Rhonda’s accomplishments exemplify characteristics and behaviors shared with Renee Chapman: eagerness to learn new things and share that knowledge. Her challenging and important activities have kept Rhonda interested in law cataloging and benefited all of us. Like Renee she’s also a very nice person.

Other Rhonda characteristics: she has a great soprano voice, and is a wonderful hostess and traveling companion. She loves the color blue, shopping and chocolate. And she’s not afraid to speak her mind. All characteristics that I appreciate! Well, except for that blue preference.

Rhonda’s parents are very proud of her accomplishments. They regret that they could not be here today to share this moment with her. Rhonda also loves flowers, and this bouquet is given by her parents as a token of their appreciation. In addition to the flowers, Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence have made a $1000 contribution to the AALL Scholarship Fund in Rhonda’s name.

Rhonda could you come forward please: (as I hum “Help me Rhonda” by the Beach Boys) “Well, Rhonda, you caught my eye, and I’ve given you “lots of reasons why, you gotta help” us Rhonda, help us get cataloging done... You did. You helped us all, Rhonda. It is my pleasure to present to you the Technical Services Special Interest Section Renee D. Chapman Award.

Rhonda Lawrence:

Melody, I feel as though you and my parents engaged in a conspiracy! But what a nice surprise and honor. My father is a master gardener, so the flowers that you brought from Pikes Market are very appropriate. And the scholarship donation that they arranged with your help is certainly a wonderful tribute.

Those of you who know me no doubt devotedly wish that I would say that I was speechless after receiving this award [Rhonda draws out a folded, multi-paged speech from behind her jacket], but that wouldn’t be me and I do have a few words to say.

As Jack Benny said “I don’t deserve this award, but I have arthritis and I don’t deserve that either.”

First, I want to thank to Elizabeth Geesey Holmes, Chair, and the other members of the TS-SIS Awards and Grants 2002-2003 Committee for selecting me as this year’s recipient of the Renee D. Chapman Memorial award. I also want to thank the TS SIS Board members for their support as well. There are many talented, and hardworking members of this Section who are as deserving, if not more so, and the Committee had a difficult choice. I am very honored to receive this award, and am joining a very distinguished roster of Chapman award winners. But in case any of you are worried that I will become even more difficult after receiving this award, to paraphrase Fran Lebowitz, “Success won’t spoil me, I’ve always been insufferable.”

This award has special meaning for me in part because I had the pleasure of knowing Renee. As a new member of AALL in 1984, I first met her while she was the Head Cataloging Librarian at the University of Iowa Law Library. We immediately hit it off as we exchanged stories about life in a midwestern college town just south of where I had attended high school.

The summer before she was tragically killed, as we sat eating ice cream sundaes in a replica of a small town ice cream parlor inexplicitly located in our Reno, Nevada Casino convention hotel (that was a major AALL programmatic site selection error) and talked about cataloging, Renee announced that she needed to get me more involved in AALL. Her comment stayed with me over the years—it was so supportive and I was flattered by her attention and her confidence in my abilities. Her early death came as a shock to all of us who had enjoyed her capable and cheerful life—Renee was such a generous and caring person. I only hope that I too will encourage others in their careers as she did in mine.

In addition to Renee, I am grateful to many other people for their encouragement and support over the years.

Luck has always played a great part in my career. In 1982 I was fortunate to interview Richard Iamele, Director of the Los Angeles County Law Library, for a law librarianship class assignment at a time when there had been a long-term cataloging vacancy in the library,
which he then asked me to apply for even after speaking to my instructor, Frank Houdek.

I was then very lucky to begin working with two renowned law catalogers, Peter Enyingi and Melody Lembke—both previous Chapman Award recipients—who needed a third person to help organize and edit a new law cataloging manual that they had long planned to develop.

I was even luckier to discover that I could indeed translate both Hungarian English syntax and Indiana native speech patterns into American cataloging jargon, and was also able to negotiate cataloging disputes when co-author hostilities erupted between the Hungarian and Indiana borders. Melody and Peter provided me with a tremendous education in law cataloging, and I am eternally indebted to them both. In particular I am thankful to Melody for her support in nominating me (again! and again!) for this award.

A few years later I was blessed because several previous candidates for a UCLA law Library cataloging position requiring Chinese language skills did not satisfy the law faculty member specializing in Chinese law, so the search for a UCLA law cataloger was expanded from “requiring” to “preferring” a candidate with those language skills. To this day Kate Pecarovich still calls me the Chinese law cataloger. No doubt it was a coincidence, but that law faculty member left shortly after I was hired.

Two UCLA Law Library Heads of Technical Services, first Adrienne Adan and then Kate, have demonstrated extraordinary patience with the many hours I have devoted to professional activities, and for their support and friendship I have been lucky as well.

In 1994 I was lucky that Ron Watson, a UCLA serials cataloger whom I had known in library school had helped to establish the CONSER program. He was a great friend of Jean Hirons, who as the CONSER coordinator was looking for a law cataloger to write a chapter on cataloging legal serials for the CONSER Cataloging Manual. And lucky for me, Ann Sitkin and John Hostage of the Harvard Law Library helped me to complete the module when it was too long in development.

And once again I was lucky in 1995 when Phyllis Post became pregnant and I was tapped to replace her as the AALL liaison to the MARBI meetings. And I was lucky again last year when Sally Tseng, a Southern California serials cataloger who was organizing the ALA ALCTS AACR2 2002 regional cataloging institutes, asked me to join the ALCTS faculty to talk about the original integrating resource, updating loose-leafs.

Finally, I have been lucky in my last choice of husbands. Arthur Rosett, who hates to eat alone, has endured far too many solitary meals over the years as I have worked late on various projects. I am most thankful for his ongoing support of and respect for my achievements.

Now after listening to my tales of great good fortune, some of you may feel that I am not deserving of this award and may want me to return it. But I’m hoping that my luck will hold just a little longer, and that I will be allowed to leave tonight with this plaque still in my hands. In any case, I am not giving it back!

Thank you all again, I am very honored to receive this award.

---

ALAAALCTS/CCS Report

was read. The subject heading news included:

- establishing specific names for earthquakes, i.e. San Francisco Earthquake, Calif., 1906;
- changing the subdivision –Journeys to –Travel
- adding MARC 781 fields to geographic name authority records which has been held up since that field has still not been implemented for LC staff
- Great Britain, -Wales, -England are all now authorized for law subject headings and the instructions for use are in instruction sheet H955, Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings. There are special instructions for legal topics that apply mainly to England or mainly to Great Britain.

The classification news includes:
- news about the success of ClassWeb
- publication of a new edition of LC Classification Outline
- use of both parentheses and angle brackets in the classification schedules with the parentheses indicating formerly valid but now obsolete numbers and with the angle brackets indicating optional number never used by LC but provided for other libraries
- religious law schedules continue to be developed
- classification practices for Asia calligraphy are being revised

SAC is planning a program for ALA Orlando 2004 dealing with better subject access for Spanish speaking library patrons. SAC’s representative to the committee revising NISO Standard Z39.19 described the work of the committee to review the standard for construction, development and management of monolingual thesauri. SAC’s liaison to the PCC Task Force on Saco Program Development reported on the group’s work to restructure the Saco program to submit new subject heading proposals for inclusion in the Library of Congress Subject Headings.

The Subject Analysis Committee meetings and programs at ALA are always an enjoyable experience and I wish more of you could attend.

Marie Whitfield
Yale Law School
marie.whited@yale.edu
June 20-23, 2003, Toronto, Ontario

The Subject Analysis Committee and its subcommittees met during the American Library Association annual meeting in Toronto. The SAC Subcommittee on Subject Analysis Training Materials is developing PowerPoint slides for its course on assigning subject headings and analyzing bibliographic resources. This course will be given prior to the ALA meeting in Orlando 2004. This will be an excellent course for newer law catalogers prior to learning law subject headings and it will be a wonderful refresher for experienced catalogers. This would make a good pre-conference for law catalogers. There will be training for people to teach the course once the development is finished.

The Subcommittee on Semantic Operability has started a glossary, an inventory of projects and a list of evaluation criteria for the semantic operability projects. (HILT http://hilt.cdlr.strath.ac.uk/ is an example of a semantic operability project) As subcommittee members examine the various projects, they will be looking for:

1. conditions which optimize effectiveness of harmonization, both among the indexing languages of the same type, and among languages of different types
2. simplification of existing languages
3. approaches to integration and harmonization of subject vocabularies used in various metadata standards to achieve effective and efficient resource discovery

The Subcommittee on Subject Reference Structures in Automated Systems presented a panel which highlighted their report and the work of online system vendors to enhance the subject heading reference structures supported by MARC in their integrated library systems. The report makes recommendations for providing access to reference structures and better displays of reference structure and bibliographic records. The draft report is available at http://www.ala.org/Content/ContentGroups/ALCTS1/Cataloging_and_Classification_Section/Committees3/Subject_Analysis/Subject_Relations/Final_Report.htm

The main committee met Sunday morning and Monday afternoon. In addition to reports from the various subcommittees and liaisons, a brief report from the Library of Congress Cataloging Policy and Support Office (continued on page 31)