



# TECHNICAL SERVICES LAW LIBRARIAN

Volume 30 No. 1  
September, 2004

<http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/tsll/tsll.htm>  
ISSN: 0195-4857

## INSIDE:

### *From the Officers:*

OBS-SIS Chair.....	5
TS-SIS Chair.....	3

### *Conference Reports:*

Preservation Committee.....	20
Research Roundtable.....	19
Selected Educational Programs....	21

### *Minutes:*

OBS Business Meeting.....	15
TS Business Meeting.....	16

### *Columns:*

Collection Development.....	6
From the Editor.....	1
The Internet.....	7
MARC Remarks.....	9
Preservation.....	10
Private Law Libraries.....	11
Research & Publications.....	12
Serials.....	13
Subject Headings.....	14

## Push vs. Pull: TSSL Formats, Finances, and Functions

*From the Editor*

This publication is tradition-rich. It is also the key resource we use in order to learn and share technical information, to communicate news about colleagues, to provide a forum for creative thinking, and as a vehicle for our educational programs and numerous committee activities, making us better professionals in every sense of the word. That's quite a lengthy sentence, but this is more than a newsletter for us. It is our professional emblem. It is both a working tool, and a source of pride.

In its print format, TSSL comes to you in your mailboxes delivered by US mail. This is called a "push publication" because it's pushed to you. The electronic versions of TSSL, managed by Martin Wisneski, is referred to as a "pull publication," meaning you have to go to the publication and pull it from a remote server, so you can read it on your screen online, or to make a printout of it.

It is my sense that the vast majority of our readership prefers receiving TSSL in its high quality print version as a push publication. In Boston, I learned that TSSL is a publication that has lasting value. In this regard, I also learned that for those who make printouts of TSSL off the Web, there are preservation issues regarding "toner-on-paper" that you may want to read about ([www.loc.gov/preserv/care/photocpy.html](http://www.loc.gov/preserv/care/photocpy.html)).

Nearly everyone uses and enjoys having TSSL available in PDF and HTML via the web. Martin Wisneski announces the availability of the electronic version of the latest TSSL issue on various discussion lists. There is no mechanism in place to "push" the electronic version to everyone's email accounts. In order to do that, it would mean maintaining a subscriber list. There would be problems with many "filtered" email programs not able to accept attachments that large, making the concept of a "push" electronic publication problematic.

The cost for production and mailing of four print issues of TSSL is about \$5,200. No SIS can afford to underwrite this amount based solely on a percentage of membership dues. Therefore, the TSSL Board and staff are investigating some revenue supporting options for the print product. Watch for updates on the OBS and TS discussion lists.

—Brian D. Striman, Editor

*Newsletter of the Technical Services Special Interest Section and the  
On-Line Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section of the American Association of Law Libraries*

## TSSL Staff

### Editor:

Brian Striman  
University of Nebraska  
bstriman@unl.edu

### Business Manager:

Cindy May  
University of Wisconsin  
clmay@facstaff.wisc.edu

### Layout & Design:

Julie R. Stauffer  
University of Chicago  
j-stauffer@uchicago.edu

### Webmaster:

Martin E. Wisneski  
Washburn University  
Martin.wisneski@washburn.edu

### Contributing Editors:

#### Acquisitions:

Janice Anderson

#### Classification:

Beth Holmes  
Marie Whited

#### Collection Development

Margaret Maes Axtmann

#### Description & Entry:

George Prager

#### The Internet:

Kevin Butterfield

#### Management:

Caitlin Robinson

#### MARC Remarks:

Susan Goldner

#### OCLC:

Darcy Jones

#### Preservation:

Sally Wambold

#### Private Law Libraries:

Mary Rose  
Donna Rosinski

#### Research and Publications:

Chris Long

#### Serials:

Margaret McDonald  
Christina Tarr

#### Serial Issues:

vacancy

#### Subject Headings:

Aaron Kuperman

### Editorial Board SIS

#### Representatives:

##### OBS-SIS:

Shannon Burchard (2003-2004)  
U. of San Francisco  
Mary Strouse (2004-2005)  
Catholic U. of America

##### TS-SIS:

Margaret Perrin (2003-2005)  
New York Law School  
Susan Goldner (2004-2006)  
U. of Arkansas-Little Rock

## 2003-2004 Officers and Committee Chairs

### OBS-SIS

#### Chair:

Georgia Briscoe  
University of Colorado

#### Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect:

Richard Jost  
University of Washington

#### Secretary/Treasurer:

Michael Maben (2003-2005)  
Indiana University

#### Members-at-Large:

Andrea Rabbia (2003-2005)  
Syracuse University  
Caitlin Robinson (2004-2006)  
University of Iowa

#### Education Committee:

Richard Jost  
University of Washington

#### Local System Committee:

Corinne Jacox (2001-2003)  
Creighton University

#### Nominating Committee:

Mary Jane Kelsey  
Yale Law School

#### OCLC Committee:

Darcy Jones  
Mercer University

#### RLIN Committee:

Virginia Bryant  
George Washington University

#### Web Advisory Committee:

Shannon Burchard  
University of San Francisco Law  
Library

### TS-SIS

#### Chair:

Cindy May  
University of Wisconsin

#### Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect:

Karen Douglas  
Duke University

#### Secretary/Treasurer:

Chris Long  
Indiana University, Indianapolis

#### Members-at-Large:

Jolande Goldberg (2003-2005)  
Library of Congress  
Brian Striman (2004-2006)  
University of Nebraska

#### Acquisitions Committee:

Diane Altimari  
Nova Southeastern University

#### Awards Committee:

Janice Shull  
Louisiana Supreme Court

#### Cataloging & Classification Committee:

Amy Lovell  
Duquesne University

#### Joint Research Grant Committee

Eloise Vondruska  
Northwestern University

#### Nominating Committee:

Chris Tarr  
University of California, Berkeley

#### Preservation Committee:

Patricia K. Turpening  
University of Cincinnati

#### Program/Education Committee:

Michael Maben  
Indiana University, Bloomington

#### Serials Committee:

Frank Richardson  
Los Angeles County Law Library

### Publication Schedule

Issues are published quarterly in March,  
June, September, and December.

#### Deadlines:

V.30:no.2(Dec. 2004).....31 Oct. 2004  
V.30:no.3(Mar.2005).....31 Jan. 2005  
V.30:no.4(Jun.2005).....30 Apr. 2005  
V.31:no.1(Sept. 2005).....31 Aug. 2005

### TSSL EDITORIAL POLICY

*Technical Services Law Librarian* (ISSN 0195-4857) is an official publication of the Technical Services Special Interest Section and the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section of the American Association of Law Libraries. It carries reports or summaries of the convention meetings and other programs of OBS-SIS and TS-SIS, acts as the vehicle of communication for the SIS committee activities, and carries current awareness and short implementation reports. Prospective authors should contact the editors for style information.

Statements and opinions of the authors are theirs alone and do not necessarily reflect those of AALL, TS-SIS, OBS-SIS, or the *TSSL* Editorial Board.

Subscriptions: Provided as a benefit of membership to Sections members. Non-member subscriptions: Domestic: \$20.00; Foreign: \$30.00. Contact the *TSSL* Business Manager or the American Association of Law Libraries.

# T echnical Services Special Interest Section

Many thanks for affording me the opportunity to serve as your chair this year. It's already proving to be challenging, invigorating, and even fun sometimes. In this column, I'll highlight Boston annual meeting activities for those of you who weren't there. I hope many of you will be able to find a way to attend next year's meeting in San Antonio despite the difficult economy. There's absolutely nothing like hanging around with a couple thousand law librarians to energize ourselves and revive our professional commitment and pride. Really.

The joint reception on Saturday evening was a great success, and our thanks go out once more to Innovative Interfaces for their faithful sponsorship. Thanks also to Lorraine Lorne and her Joint Reception Committee for organizing this annual event. It's a wonderful venue for meeting old acquaintances and making new ones.

Our TS-SIS activities table in the exhibit area featured the TS-SIS brochure, a number of brochures and flyers from the Library of Congress, display copies of TSSL issues, giveaway mini-notepads with our logo, and tie-dyed badge lanyards. Thanks to Jolande Goldberg for organizing the table, and to Ann Sitkin and Gary Vander Meer for storing, transporting, and installing the TS-SIS traveling backdrop.

Our business meeting began with a report from Chair Gary Vander Meer. He announced that AALL has instituted a dues increase for the coming year, which will result in a modest gain of \$1.50 per SIS member, so TS-SIS now will receive \$7.50 out of each member's AALL annual dues. Gary also reported on the demise of the Professional Development Committee, which was unable to become self-sustaining. The AALL leadership plans a one-year analysis and summit to decide on future

directions for continuing education activities. Meanwhile, Don Arndt, SIS Council Chair, will coordinate email discussion forums formerly administered by the PDC.

AALL is sponsoring VIPs (Valuable Invited Participants) for next year's meeting. Each SIS may invite up to two individuals to the meeting, and AALL will cover their registration. The SIS will be responsible for their other expenses.

An SIS Council report has convinced us that electronic elections are the way to go. But before TS-SIS can move our elections to electronic format, we need to change our by-laws. Gary and I will be working on that this year, so the by-laws changes can be duly voted upon and amended. If the changes are approved, we hope to go electronic for the 2006 TS-SIS elections.

After Gary's report, the TS-SIS committee chairs reported on their activities throughout the past year. These were followed by a brief report on the annual membership survey. A summary of the survey results was sent out on the TS-SIS electronic discussion list in February. The Executive Board pays a lot of attention to survey results when determining policy and program priorities, so please be sure to complete and return your survey when it arrives in your email this coming year. It's so easy to do now online, so no excuses!

The annual survey once again showed TSSL as our members' number one priority. TSSL's retiring editors, Joe Thomas and Linda Tesar, were presented with framed certificates and Borders Book Store gift certificates. Their hard work and dedication produced a newsletter that was a joy to read. Our new editor, Brian Striman, reported on the high cost of printing and distributing the newsletter. During the coming

year, Brian will be investigating ways to save money, including sponsorship, advertising, going electronic, or offering readers a choice between print and electronic formats, with the possibility that the print format will be available only as a paid subscription. Please contact Brian with your thoughts on this. Later in the conference, Julie Stauffer volunteered to become TSSL's new layout editor. Welcome, Julie!

This year's prestigious Renee D. Chapman award was presented to Pat Turpening, Head of Preservation and Archives at the University Of Cincinnati College Of Law's Marx Law Library. Pat has dedicated herself to preservation issues for many years, and has been largely responsible for getting preservation on the radar screens of AALL and its members. Her unflagging enthusiasm and down-to-earth approach have inspired many of us to return home and lobby for more attention to conservation and preservation in our libraries.

I'd like to thank everyone whose term of office expired at the end of the Boston meeting. Thanks to Pat Sayre-McCoy for her term as Secretary/Treasurer, and to Lorraine Lorne for her two years as a Member-at-Large on the Executive Board. Lorraine was in charge of the activities table in Seattle and the joint reception in Boston. Thanks to Beth Holmes for chairing the Awards Committee, and to Alva Stone for chairing the Nominations Committee. A special thank you to Jean Pajerek for chairing the Boston Program/Education Committee, which is extremely labor intensive, especially during the weeks between the annual meeting and the deadline for program submission in mid-August. Thanks also to JoAnn Hounshell for her term as our representative to the TSSL Editorial Board, and to Susan Goldner for being Representative to MARBI.

---

Members who are continuing in office include: Gary Vander Meer, our new "Past Chair," Jolande Goldberg in her second year as a Member-at-Large on the Executive Board, Diane Altimari as Acquisitions Committee Chair, Amy Lovell as Cataloging and Classification Committee Chair, Pat Turpening as Preservation Committee Chair, Frank Richardson as Serials Committee Chair, Eloise Vondruska as Joint Research Grant Committee Chair, and Peggy Perrin, serving her second year as one of our representatives on the TSSL Board. Kathy Winzer will continue as our representative to ALA's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) and Marie Whited will continue as our representative to ALA's Subject Analysis Committee (SAC). And last but not least, Martin Wisneski remains our Webmaster, and Betty Roeske our electronic discussion forum administrator.

Finally, a grand welcome to our new officers, chairs, and representatives: Karen Douglas as Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, Chris Long as Secretary/Treasurer, Brian Striman as the new Member at Large, Michael Maben as Program/Education Committee Chair, Chris Tarr as Nominations Committee Chair, Susan Goldner as our new representative on the TSSL Board, and Karen Selden as our new MARBI representative. Kathy Winzer has volunteered to chair a small "AACR3" committee to provide input on law cataloging issues to the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) for Revision of Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR). Ann Sitkin and John Hostage have agreed to serve on the committee. We're still looking for volunteers for the Joint Research Grant Committee, so if you're interested, please contact me or Eloise Vondruska right away.

In Boston, TS-SIS sponsored a day-and-a-half preconference workshop on cataloging integrating resources. We also sponsored programs on dealing with foreign publishers, the future of AACR, and cost-cutting in technical services departments, as well as our regular CC:DA and SAC representative

reports. This year the MARBI report was sponsored by OBS-SIS, because TS-SIS had hit the limit on the number of programs it could submit. There were also many fine programs that our SIS didn't sponsor, but that were well worth attending not just for their relevance to our jobs, but for their capacity to expand our horizons and keep us aware of what is happening in the wider world of law librarianship. As always, meetings play an important role in our convention experience. This year, there was a great deal of lively discussion on the subject of inherently legal subject headings at the Cataloging and Classification Committee's meeting and at its Cataloging Issues Roundtable.

Just weeks before the Democratic National Convention, the atmosphere in Boston was electric, and who knew what famous figures might be met on a walk down the Freedom Trail, or up Beacon Hill, or through the hotel lobby. Men in Black were as ubiquitous as mosquitoes in Wisconsin.

Our Program/Education Committee Chair for the San Antonio meeting is Michael Maben. In August, the Committee submitted proposals for programs on uniform titles, space planning, loose-leaf services, how to conduct a library preservation survey, electronic serials management, professional advancement within technical services, EDI, library statistics reporting for the ABA and AALS, FRBR (Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records), and more. They also submitted a proposal for a preconference workshop on subject cataloging using LCSH. Submitting a proposal can be difficult and time-consuming; Michael and everyone who worked on this year's submissions deserve our gratitude. I should be able to report on which proposals have been accepted for San Antonio in the next issue of TSSL.

The TS-SIS Board was asked to send a memorandum to the Annual Meeting Program Committee asking that the Committee approve our highest priority program proposals, allow

more conference time for meetings, and schedule our representatives' reports earlier in the conference. At the direction of the Board and with a lot of help and advice, I drafted the memo and sent it in. I've already discussed it with AALL President Tory Trotta, and hope to see some concrete results in the San Antonio schedule.

The TS-SIS Board voted to approve \$500 to help fund a research proposal that Chris Long submitted to the Joint Research Grant Committee. He'll be researching citation practices in the higher courts of Indiana.

TS-SIS is considering renewing its representation at meetings of the National Information Standards Organization (NISO). AALL is already a voting member of NISO, so I'm trying to find out whether someone is already appointed to monitor NISO activities, or whether AALL would be willing to sponsor a TS-SIS representative. If anyone has any information about this, please let me know.

Our Section's Three-Year Strategic Plan's July 2001 draft is posted on our Web site. Karen Douglas has volunteered (thank you Karen!) to work with me on revising and updating the plan. We could use some help. Please contact Karen or me if you're willing to join us.

The words "thanks" and "help" appear over and over in this column. We are a volunteer organization. A volunteer receives experience, satisfaction, and gratitude in lieu of a paycheck. There are so many opportunities for so many varieties of talent. Please step forward and offer your services to TS-SIS in whichever capacity seems most your cup of tea. Or let me know what you're interested in, and we'll try to find a good fit. Please feel free to contact me anytime at [clmay@wisc.edu](mailto:clmay@wisc.edu) about Section business or activities.

*Cindy May  
University of Wisconsin  
[clmay@wisc.edu](mailto:clmay@wisc.edu)*

# Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section

It is indeed an honor to be chosen by one's peers for a leadership position in one's chosen profession. It can also be challenging to fit these new responsibilities into an already busy work and home life. However, having donned the OBS ball cap of responsibility and respect at the OBS Business Meeting in Boston, I thank my colleagues for this special opportunity and I will do my best to fill the big shoes my predecessors left for me.

Speaking of big shoes, I must first give my sincere thanks to Kevin Butterfield, Past Chair of OBS--who probably wears a size 12 shoe! Kevin led our OBS through the past year culminating in the AALL Annual Meeting in Boston with a Technical Services Librarian's careful attention to detail and a baseball fan's dedication. The smooth sailing for OBS was also due to the hard work of Michael Maben (Secretary/Treasurer), Mary Jane Kelsey (Past Chair), Anne Myers (Web Spinner Supreme), Ruth Unalike (Member-at-Large) and Andrea Rabbi (Member-at-Large) plus numerous committee chairs.

Four departing OBS leaders deserve special recognition for their past work. Anne Myers, (a.k.a. she who wears the

crown) has moved into the inner circle of AALL as a member of the Executive Board. She is the person responsible for creating what some AALL members think is the best SIS Website. Anne made the site easy to use and always current. She leaves it in the good hands of Shannon Burchard.

Ruth Funabiki, who has served her two-year term as Member-at-Large, performed her tasks with precision. She updated the OBS brochure. Most recently, Ruth managed the OBS SIS table at the AALL Annual Meeting in Boston, and, as usual the OBS paperback book swap was a hit. Eighty-seven entries were received in the OBS raffle. The winner was Anna R. Muszynski of the Boston office of Edwards & Angell.

Mary Jane Kelsey also steps off the Board after three years of exemplary service. I'm always thrilled to be able to work with Mary Jane because she is one of the cutting edge librarians in our neck of the law library woods.

Last but not least is my favorite office neighbor, Karen Selden, who has completed her two years on the TSSL Advisory Board for OBS. Karen also deserves many thanks for taking over the very well received OBS Website of the Month and for her work on AALL's "Cataloging and Intranet Access to Electronic Resources Special Committee." Karen's new professional task is MARBI Representative. And, she still manages to get the cataloging cranked out each month.

At our annual meeting in Boston, OBS members had the possibility of ten OBS meetings or functions to attend. I want to especially thank those who attended the early morning meetings, sans food due to our financial straits (more on that later). This was especially challenging

to those from the West Coast, where attending a meeting at 7am in Boston is the equivalent of 4am in San Francisco. And those ten meetings do not include the four OBS sponsored programs. Coordinators of the OBS programs deserve a special round of applause: Mary Jane Kelsey, Kevin Butterfield, John Nann, and Susan Goldner.

Other news from our Boston OBS meetings is that the bylaws changes were approved. Richard Jost, OBS Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, will oversee yet another round of changes to the OBS bylaws in the coming year to accommodate electronic elections. Thanks very much Richard.

Our Section's biggest challenge is the OBS financial situation. Our treasury was reading negative when I accepted the OBS Chair in Boston. As a person who avoids debt at nearly all costs, I'm hoping you will all please renew your SIS memberships to restore our coffers. Membership is just \$14, of which the section keeps \$7. The OBS board voted to cease funding TSSL for one year until we can get back on our financial feet. This coincides nicely with the new TSSL editor's plans to investigate new methods of funding our excellent newsletter. I'm sure you can read more news directly from Brian Striman on this topic elsewhere in the newsletter.

In the past year, as OBS Vice-Chair, I chaired the OBS Education Committee. We have proposed five programs for the Annual Meeting in San Antonio. This year, the committee decided to sponsor a "big name systems librarian." Of course, a "big name" requires big bucks, so we are recommending Roy Tennant, User Services Architect of California Digital Library, as a Plenary Speaker. If Roy is accepted as a plenary speaker, our first priority proposal will be an



---

OBS sponsored program by Roy on the Top Ten Trends in Library Systems.

Finally, anytime one takes over a new leadership position, it is good to review what the organization is about. So let's remind ourselves by reading from our Website, "OBS focuses on all aspects of the various national and local bibliographic utilities. These include public access to bibliographic data online, acquisitions sub-systems, mail message systems, and integration of circulation systems with the online bibliographic data. The Section:

1. Facilitates the exchange of information on the choice

and installation of local and national online bibliographic systems,

2. Provides opportunities for its members to share ideas for more effective and efficient use of their systems,
3. Monitors the products and services of the online systems, and
4. Communicates concerns of law libraries to the systems and networks."

Georgia Briscoe  
University of Colorado  
Briscoe@colorado.edu

---

## Optimism and Success Stories

## COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

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

*My last collection development column talked about coping with changes in the legal publishing industry and my pessimism about managing our collections and budgets effectively. At the end of the column I suggested that we need to discuss these challenges with each other if we are going to continue to meet them. I invited readers to share their thoughts about responding to changes in legal publishing and pricing. Here are your tips and success stories.*

This isn't necessarily a success story in the sense that you mean, but it has proved to be a highly successful coping strategy. We've set up codes in our Innovative checkin records for loose-leaf titles which we have canceled. At the time of cancellation, the director decides if he wants to withdraw immediately, keep on the shelf for a specific period of time and then withdraw, or review at a specific time in the future. Our codes are set up so we do this process in the summer, so everything that was coded "Withdraw summer 2004" is pulled. I run a list of everything that was coded "Review summer 2004" and those titles are checked by collection development staff. Some will be withdrawn, some replaced, and some coded to keep longer. When the summer is over, the codes for that year are redefined. We have codes out to 2008. Nothing is canceled and allowed to sit indefinitely on the shelf without review.

– Lysa Hall, Willamette University Law Library

When a publisher gets too big and has too many different division[s] with 102 people from each division calling me, I demand an "account overseer," for lack of a better word. I get someone to be the intermediary between me and all of the various divisions. This helps to keep the many calls down and has someone screen appropriate products and services before the offers reach my desk. There is a lot of care and feeding that goes into dealing with the 'overseer,' but it pays off.

– Jaye Lapachet, Coblentz, Patch, Duffy & Bass LLP

Although I don't think these techniques are particularly successful or original, here are a few examples of what we are doing to hold down costs on our print subscriptions:

- ✦ When two sets of pocket parts are issued for a title in one year (e.g. AmJur Pleading and Practice Forms), return 2d set;
- ✦ When softbound "tables" or "indexes" volumes are republished each year, keep one every two or three years;
- ✦ Take a hard look at "extras" that are included in a subscription (e.g. the Factbook that is included in the Proof of Facts set);
- ✦ I often call publishers to see if they will offer a "government discount." I'm sometimes successful.  
– Anita Anderson, Office of the Attorney General,  
Minnesota

Here's what we're starting to do:

- ✦ Doing write-for-order on West and Lexis looseleafs every 2 or 3 years;
- ✦ Considering for cancellation the West General Digest and other state digests already covered by a regional digest (I know some will think – why do you even have them?);
- ✦ Considering every database, professional journal publication, and in general every bill and supplement that arrives. We're cutting a lot of things we really don't need. Somehow, these got started years ago and they just kept coming.  
– Anonymous, mid-sized academic law library

Much like the leveraged buyout/junk bond activity of the 80's and 90's ... a mega-corporation can buy a legal publisher that has a great, dependable reputation and then turn around and start cranking out over-priced garbage trading on the

---

good name of the publisher they have acquired. Why I don't see that as pessimistic is that it will only work for a while. ... My impression is that that has been the overall arc of legal publishing – it started off as a service industry (where looseleaf updates were meant to keep you up to date) and is now seen as the reliable cash cow in a much larger non-legal enterprise (where looseleaf updates are literally a license to print money). That's why I was so impressed that Cornell cancelled all its Elsevier titles right across the board – just when publishers think they have you right where they want you ... the librarians shoot right back. ... Our response, not their behavior, is what gives me reason for optimism.

– Anonymous, small academic law library

*Thanks to those who took the time to send their comments. I am more hopeful that we can all find some practical coping mechanisms if we continue to share our ideas and philosophies. Working with publishers is a two-way street. If we want them to be responsive to our concerns, we need to voice those concerns. Talk to your service representatives, talk to publishing executives. Help them to understand the decisions you have to make to support your users and manage your budgets. And keep those ideas coming – I'll continue to publish tips from readers whenever I receive them.*

---

## THE INTERNET

### Studying the Cost of Electronic Journals

Kevin Butterfield  
Marshall-Wythe Law Library  
College of William and Mary  
klbut2@wm.edu

---

We are all in the midst of moving substantial parts of our collections from print to electronic format. Those organizations that had long subscribed only to print versions of journals are, in increasing numbers, licensing electronic versions in addition to, or in replacement of the print counterpart. What effects will this transition have on library operations and on non-subscription expenditures?

In June 2004 the Council on Library and Information Resources released the results of a study conducted by Roger C. Schoenfeld, Donald W. King, Ann Okerson, and Eileen Gifford Fenton. The study, titled [The Nonsubscription Side of Periodicals: Changes in Library Operations and Costs between Print and Electronic Formats](#), tests the hypothesis that libraries save money when switching periodical subscriptions from print to electronic format. The authors collected data on staff activities and costs from 11 U.S. academic libraries. They then performed a life-cycle analysis to study the longer-term cost implications of the transition. I have summarized the findings from the study below and included portions of the author's analysis. The full report is available online in PDF at: [http://www.](http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/reports.html)

[clir.org/pubs/reports/reports.html](http://www.clir.org/pubs/reports/reports.html)

The study focused on serials and, within that category, periodicals. Nonsubscription costs relating to staff time were also measured. These costs included physical processing, stacks maintenance, circulation, reference, user support, preservation, collection development, negotiations and licensing, subscription processing receipt and check-in, routing, cataloging and linking. Cost categories excluded from the study included cost of electronic infrastructure and interlibrary lending and support.

Library collections and operations stand to change significantly as a result of the transition. At all but the largest academic libraries, collection sizes in the electronic format are significantly larger than they ever were for print. Notably different activities are required to manage and maintain an electronic collection. Staff-compensation profiles for the formats vary as well.

The authors' life-cycle analysis divided the costs for print and electronic formats as they exist today into one-time (often first-year) and annually recurring costs. For the average title in each format, they

added 25 years' worth of recurring costs to the one-time costs. This yielded the average nonsubscription cost for a given title over an estimated total life span. While this time period was arbitrary, it was essential that a sufficiently long period be used to highlight the long-term implications of the format choice.

The authors' findings suggest that nonsubscription costs are lower, on a per-title basis, in electronic, rather than in print format. The per-title effect is more pronounced at smaller libraries, mainly because they license relatively large collections of electronic titles in comparison to the size of their existing print collections. Relative to collection size, however, the cost benefits of the electronic format exist across the board.

Some costs that are borne by libraries or publishers for the print format may be borne by another party in the electronic format. The authors point to the cost of day-to-day storage of the information resource is one example: Publishers, rather than libraries, generally provide for the server storage of electronic periodicals. In addition, some costs that are borne by libraries for the

---

print format, most notably the cost of archiving, have not yet been taken on by either party for the electronic format. There is as yet no archiving solution for electronic periodicals, so it is not possible to calculate the costs or determine how they will be borne. Given the complexity of the problem and unanswered questions such as these, the objective of this study was to offer a set of conclusions that will help inform the transition rather than to provide the final word on system-wide cost shifts.

Although much remains uncertain, the authors state with confidence that the failure to resolve the issue of responsibility for archiving has hindered the transition to electronic journals. If archiving is to be achieved, it must be paid for. While it is unclear whether libraries alone will be able to fund archiving, the cost advantages that this study finds may constitute the most likely source of library funding for this purpose and may therefore present an opportunity for the library community to shape the archiving solutions that eventually emerge. If these cost advantages can be realized by individual libraries and used to stimulate the implementation of archiving solutions, they might expedite electronic access to appropriate resources and the accompanying advantages to scholarship even if, net of archiving, the format transition were

to be cost-neutral.

In terms of breadth and depth, the amount of work to ensure the long-term availability of electronic periodicals does not match that of the print format. Storage and maintenance of electronic collections have become the work of the publisher and are largely paid for by licensing fees, even if long term archival responsibility has not yet been assigned.

The per-title cost differentials were modeled under a variety of assumptions in order to determine their likely implications on individual libraries. While many of the cost implications will depend on local conditions, initiatives, and management practices, the likely outcome of the transition for many libraries will be reduced non-subscription costs for periodicals. In the long run, some libraries may benefit significantly, although there are important short-term management challenges to be considered. The potential savings are not, however, on the scale that some enthusiasts have imagined. Moreover, any dollar-for-dollar comparison of the two formats is complicated by several shifts in system-wide costs.

The study raises some interesting questions regarding the long term effects of electronic journals and licensing. Many of the changes that the

authors predict have already come to pass. Fewer issues to check in, lowered binding costs can be realized if the print counterparts to the electronic journals are discontinued. The discontinuation of print subscriptions is a large assumption in calculating the cost savings. In addition the major problem predicted that of who will take long term archiving and preservation responsibility for the data, vendors, publishers, or libraries, is still to be resolved.

Analysis of these shifting relationships and responsibilities is crucial to the future of our organizations. Archiving and preservation of digital information should not be left in a grey area or subject to the changing needs of a vendor's bottom line. The issues addressed in this report are ripe for study in law libraries, both academic and private. The authors intentionally omitted law libraries from the study on those campuses that had them (Suffolk University, George Mason University, Cornell University, New York University, University of Pittsburgh and Yale University). The authors also omitted loose-leaf titles and monographic series from their analysis. Perhaps someone would like to apply for an OBS & TS SIS Joint Research Grant, or an AALL Research grant to study if the study's results hold true within law libraries?





## MARC REMARKS

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

Let me start my last column by saying that I have really enjoyed my three years as your MARBI Representative. It was an honor to represent you at the MARC table. It was also a great exercise to keep my aging mind agile. If you are ever offered the opportunity to serve, I strongly advise that you accept. Now, I am pleased to put the job into Karen Selden's very capable hands.

### MARBI Report 2003-2004

The full MARBI Report is available on the TS and OBS Web sites. Here is an overview.

Although there were fewer MARBI proposals and discussion papers than normal this year and none of them affects legal materials specifically, most do have an impact on our catalogs. The current relative stability in the formats seems to stem from the fact that harmonization with Britain is complete and there have been no recent, major changes in the cataloging rules. We can anticipate more activity in the future as work continues with FRBR and begins on AACR3.

A large issue looming on the horizon is adoption of the Unicode character set repertoire in MARC 21. Unicode was created with the intent of handling all of the world's languages. It has become the standard to follow, helped by its adoption by Microsoft, Sun (Java), and other software companies. Since not all MARC systems will be able to convert to Unicode at the same time, methods for sharing data between MARC8, the current repertoire, and Unicode have to be developed. This year MARBI considered one report and one discussion paper related to this issue. An aspect of interest to law

librarians is that the § and the ¶ are in Unicode but not in MARC8.

Proposals expanded the ability to link data contained in separate fields and created coding to identify private acquisitions information that should not be shared outside the originating library. The only discussion paper that has not yet resulted in a proposal was one dealing with the non-uniqueness of ISBNs and LCCNs. Developing a new means of coding inaccurate standard numbers is very important since non-unique ones can result in records being erroneously deleted by our systems.

The remaining proposals dealt with records for 19<sup>th</sup> Century books, music, stamps, and U.S. Copyright Office data. Each is one more sign that the use of the MARC format by groups outside of normal library cataloging continues to increase as other communities realize the value of sharing data through a standard format. It is interesting that this is happening at the same time that people are debating the value of MARC in an XML world.

The meeting agendas, with links to the full proposals or discussion papers are available at the MARC21 Developments page (<http://www.loc.gov/marc/development.html>).

### Other MARC News

*Understanding MARC Authority Records*, 2nd ed. was just published by the Library of Congress.

MODS, the MARC companion for digital material, has been revised. MADS, its authority counterpart, is available for review.

Starting in January, publishers will put

13 digit ISBNs in material. This means that the Library of Congress will start adding them to records in October. Both the 13 digit number and the 10 digit number will appear in material and in MARC records. They will either be placed in multiple 020 fields or in multiple \$a in a single 020 (LC was still undecided). RLG expects to implement this in October. OCLC will not be able to fully implement it soon, but will put the 13 digit ISBN in a 024 field and index it as a standard number in the interim.

Diane Hillman is chair of the CONSER Publication Pattern Initiative Task Force to Explore the Use of a Universal Holdings Record, a super-record. The idea is to create a national holdings record pulling together all the linked records for a publication. It would be created from existing MARC records and give the complete history of a serial in one place. It would not replace our successive entry records but would work along with them. It could be used for an OPAC display that would simplify all of the serial title changes and formats available. It could make inclusion of aggregator records in your catalogs more useful and possibly eliminate the need for serial finding aids outside of the catalog.

The MARC Format Interest Group is creating a Web site. It will have links to working projects and (possibly) library documentation and training materials. Once it is up, you should be able to find a link to it on this ALCTS page (<http://www.ala.org/ala/alcts/divisiongroups/ig/ig.htm>).

The relatively recent advent of digital preservation seemed to herald the ultimate in preservation. Then reports followed that digitally preserved materials were not readable on hardware newer than that on which the materials were created. How can this conundrum be addressed? Program G-5 at the AALL Annual Meeting in Boston spoke to this concern. Entitled "Legal Information Microform Materials: the Gold Standard for Legal Collections, Research, and Preservation," this program explained the value of microforms over other formats. Troy Johnson and John Pedini were the presenters. They began by giving two examples of digital titles no longer accessible on their original hardware: Used and Rare by Lawrence and Nancy Goldstone (an electronic book) and The Road Ahead by Bill Gates (a CD-ROM). They explained that the "gold standard" refers to long term storage, long term availability, and easy accessibility.

John Pedini went on to describe his library, the Social Law Library, which has 450,000 volumes. Thirty-five percent of these volumes are on microforms. This affords the library much more space. The Social Law Library provides electronic retrieval of the microforms and the librarians take it for granted that they will help the users with the microforms. Benefits of microforms are:

- \* they are analog
- \* they will last 500 years
- \* they are linked to high quality print or electronic finding aids easy to use and to download

There is a wealth of material on microforms. The Law Library Microform Consortium (LLMC) has

over 7,000 titles and over 95,000 volumes on microforms. Another vendor, William S. Hein, has published over 300 legal periodicals on microforms, plus Law Books Recommended, the Federal Register, state session laws, not to mention superseded state codes. CIS has published a huge number of congressional hearings on microfiche (one of the most frequently consulted microfiche sets in this author's library). Inter Documentation Company in the Netherlands has published The Grotius Collection, English Legal Sources, English Legal Manuscripts, and International Law collections on microfiche.

Microforms are created for use or for preservation. The concept of dark archive was then introduced. A dark archive is only for preservation, a fail-safe during disaster. Items in a dark archive are not used and there should be multiple copies in multiple locations. One copy can run into problems. There are also light archives of microforms only. They are accessible and easy to use in contrast to the dark archives. To establish the gold standard, it is necessary to convert digital materials into microform quickly. In order to accomplish this, librarians must know what is available in microform (to avoid duplication).

At this point, the speaker mentioned the Legal Information Preservation Alliance (LIPA) and the need for a national inventory of holdings from major libraries. (More information on LIPA was presented in Program H-6, Exploring the New World of Digital Preservation Initiatives, moderated by Terry Martin, and featuring Stephen Chapman, Nancy McGovern, and MacKenzie Smith.) LIPA seeks to

take positive action to preserve legal materials.

How can we access microforms and also interface with digital materials? LLMC offers both digital and analog titles, which allows the use of either format or a microfiche backup. The Kodak i9600 writes digital to fiche, for about \$80,000; more information is found at <http://www.kodak.com/US/en/dpq/site/TKX/name/demoi9600Capture>. Another Kodak machine, the i7300 Scanner, writes to a cartridge to use with a personal computer. Fiche can also be digitized on demand. (See [http://www.promarktech.com/imaging/micrographics/kodak/i7300\\_scanner.htm](http://www.promarktech.com/imaging/micrographics/kodak/i7300_scanner.htm))

Finally, John Pedini mentioned the MicroSp3000, which is a microfilm scanner/printer that converts microfilm into paper copies with the quality of a scanner, but you have to hook it up to a printer. So, it is, in effect, a scanner and a printer. He highly recommended this device.

This program demonstrated the value of microforms and the interrelationship between analog and digital as it relates to preservation. Fascinating was the introduction of the machines that can convert between analog and digital. Kudos go to both Mr. Johnson and to Mr. Pedini for presenting an informative and well-prepared program.



---

It's back!

## PRIVATE LAW LIBRARIES

Mary Rose  
Bryan Cave LL  
mary.rose@bryancave.com

Donna Rosinski  
Cassidy Cataloguing Services, Inc.  
donna@cassidy.com

---

Welcome to the revival of the "Private Law Libraries" column!

After a two-year hiatus, it is our humble ambition to take up where Betty Roeske left off and continue this unique forum for thoughts and musings (rants?) about technical services in private law libraries. Betty is a hard act to follow, but we are hoping that the fact that there are two of us will make up for any individual shortcomings!

The plan right now is that we will switch off and write columns for alternate issues of TSL. For this issue, we'll just introduce ourselves and invite you to send any ideas for topics you'd like us to address.

### Mary Rose introduction

I had the great pleasure of attending my first AALL conference in Boston just this past July. I met several of you there: Gary Vander Meer, Brian Striman, John Hostage, Ann Sitkin, Amy Lovell, Richard Amelung, Joni Cassidy, Jolande Goldberg, Rhonda Lawrence, and many others. And now I am writing a TSL column! I have quickly learned that Brian is a very persuasive and persistent man.

I am the Cataloging Librarian at Bryan Cave LLP (aka "BC"). BC's practice areas include business/transactional law, industry practice, litigation, and tax law, with offices located worldwide. As the Cataloging Librarian, I catalog for the nine offices that have libraries (eight in the U.S. and one in London). Cataloging for such a geographically distributed library has its challenges! I work at the BC headquarters in St. Louis, Missouri.

Being a cataloger, I'll definitely focus some of my columns on cataloging

concerns. I know that my situation in such a large firm isn't typical of many private law librarians, but then is there really such a thing as "normal?" I am hoping to tap into the expertise of my colleagues here at BC and write some columns about other technical services concerns, like acquisitions, collection management, and database management.

At the request of my editor, I'll end my section with some personal data. I actually live an idyllic life in Illinois, just across the Mississippi River from St. Louis, with my husband, dog, and two cats.

### Donna Rosinski introduction

Writing for a publication over whose articles I have often exclaimed, "These people are brilliant!", is intimidating. I will attempt to convey my thoughts regarding technical services and their impact on private law libraries with clarity, and will hope to occasionally hit, "Brilliant!"

I began my career in law libraries at Shea & Gould in 1989. Since then, I have worked for vendors as a customer support representative for a library automation software package. I also had the pleasure of working at the Fordham University Law Library for six years before I took a couple of years off to raise my son. I currently work as a cataloger for Cassidy Cataloguing Services, Inc., a cataloging vendor that provides partial or full technical services work for private law and corporate libraries, as well as performing retrospective conversions and other special projects. Through Cassidy, I work for many private libraries. By working with each library, I have learned new skills as well as improved my existing skills that I can apply to all. Creative solutions

that conform to the rules that we all try to follow are the order of the day when working for private libraries. Books on twenty different floors? No problem! Shelve attractive law books out of call number order? Hmm, could we discuss that?

As for my personal data, I live with my husband and son in a lovely suburban area of New Jersey. (Yes, New Jersey really can be lovely!) We have a gorgeous betta fish named "Tom" as a pet.

### Until next time...

Now you know who we are. We're (naively?) excited about writing this column! Be sure to send us your column ideas and check our spot out in the next few issues.



---

# RESEARCH & PUBLICATIONS

Jesse Holden  
Robert Crown Law Library-Stanford University

---



Every year at the Annual Meeting, the *AALL LexisNexis™ Call for Papers Competition* culminates in a program called “Writing for Fame and Fortune.” Now, I am not sure how much fame or fortune there is in the land of library publishing, but that title is certainly more likely to attract an audience than “Writing for Obscurity and Poverty.” It is not totally baseless, either, since there is a modicum of fame involved (the winners’ names are listed in the final program) and the cash award is \$750, which, if not a fortune, is still nothing to sneeze at. So on Monday afternoon of the conference, I returned to the convention center after an abbreviated tour of the Freedom Trail to listen to advice from this year’s winners, Roy Balleste, Katherine Coolidge, Mary Rumsey, and April Schwartz. Let me share a few of the tips I learned from them and from Frank Houdek.

## What Should I Write About?

Ah yes, the \$64,000 question. Where do you draw inspiration from? Mary Rumsey said that she writes about things that annoy her. She notices trends while working on the reference desk, circumstances that frustrate patrons and librarians alike, and her writing is often a search to resolve those problems. Frank Houdek suggested that authors choose topics that they are passionate about and that they themselves would like to read about. If you are interested in a subject, chances are that other people are too. Even if no one else is interested in it, though, your impassioned discussion of it may win converts.

## Writing for Professional Journals

Houdek shared several tips ...

### *Consider all possible venues*

While being published in the preeminent journals of our field is a worthy goal, there are many other options available. Chapter and SIS newsletters are always looking for contributions.

### *Think about your audience*

Do this even before you begin to write. Decide who you are writing for—it is a general audience, a group of experts, or somewhere in between?

### *Writing styles*

There is no right or wrong writing style. Use your own voice and do not affect mannerisms. Write with clarity, imagination, and creativity, but do not be so creative that you confuse the reader.

### *Organize your paper well*

A well-written article has three main parts—an introduction, the body, and the conclusion. In the introduction, immediately tell the audience what your topic is. You need to convince the reader to continue reading within the first paragraph. The body of the article should contain not only a description of the problem or situation, but also analysis. Most manuscripts have two or three points that the author considers important. Provide evidence to support your position. It is okay to express your opinion—in fact, readers want to know what your opinion is. A common error is to make a point once and never revisit it. Use the conclusion to summarize the two or three main points of your article. Do not bring up brand new ideas in the conclusion. Everything in the conclusion should reiterate what you have already said.

### *Find a critic*

Have other people check your work before submitting it. Find someone

whose opinion you respect and encourage them to be honest with you.

### *Working with an editor*

Expect to revise your paper. Read a few articles in your targeted journal to understand its tenor. Know what the journal’s citation style is.

## How Do I Stay Motivated and Focused?

Houdek re-emphasized the need for passion. If you are passionate about the subject, that passion will sustain you when obstacles present themselves. Some of the winners pointed out that having a deadline helped them stay focused. One person indicated that her institution’s expectation of scholarship kept her motivated. Another found it helpful to set the work aside from time to time to gain a fresh perspective of it.

## More Advice From the Winners

- Do not rush the process.
- If you have an idea, get started on the project and build momentum.
- Keep in mind that this is a way to contribute to your profession and develop skills for yourself.

## Hall of Acclaim

Rabbia, Andrea. 2004. Redesigning Technical Services in an Academic Law Library. In *Innovative Redesign and Reorganization of Library Technical Services: Paths for the Future and Case Studies*, ed. Bradford Lee Eden, 411-433. Westport, Conn.: Libraries Unlimited, 2004.

If you have published something recently, please let me know so that I can include you in future Halls of Acclaim!



Christina Tarr  
University of California, Berkeley  
ctarr@library.berkeley.edu

Margaret McDonald  
University of San Diego  
maggiemc@sandiego.edu

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:

*ACCA docket*  
-v. 21, no. 8 (Sept. 2003)  
(OCOLC14713345)

**Changed to:**  
*ACC docket*  
Vol. 21, no. 9 (Oct. 2003)-  
(OCOLC53010144)

*ATLA advocate*  
Vol. 9, no. 6 (Oct. 1983)-v. 30, no. 2  
(Mar. 2004)  
(OCOLC10030128)

**Absorbed by:**  
*Trial (Boston, Mass.)*  
Beginning in summer 2004, includes information formerly included in *ATLA advocate*  
(OCOLC1767746)

*Bankruptcy developments journal*  
Vol. 1, no. 1 (1984)-v. 20, no. 1 (fall 2003)  
(OCOLC11404836)

**Changed to:**  
*Emory bankruptcy developments journal*  
Vol. 20, no. 2 (spring 2004)-  
(OCOLC55756372)

*Blast (Chicago, Ill.)*  
No. 88 (Jan. 1994)-no. 128 (Mar. 2004)  
(OCOLC29819464)

**Changed to:**

*The scitech lawyer*  
Vol. 1, issue 1 (summer 2004)-  
(OCOLC55065588)

*Law and policy in international business*  
Vol. 1, no. 1 (winter 1969)-v. 34, no. 4  
(summer 2003)  
(OCOLC1755578)

**Changed to:**  
*Georgetown journal of international law*  
Vol. 35, no. 1 (fall 2003)-  
(OCOLC55022895)

*Loyola University New Orleans School of Law intellectual property & high technology journal*  
3:1 (winter 2000)-3:2 (summer 2001)  
(OCOLC47631801)

**Changed to:**  
*Loyola law and technology annual*  
Vol. 4, no. 1 (2003/2004)-  
(OCOLC55647516)

*Michigan State DCL law review*  
Vol. 2003, issue 2 (summer)-v. 2003, issue 3 (fall)  
(OCOLC52510602)

**Changed to:**  
*Michigan State law review*  
Vol. 2003, issue 4 (winter)-  
(OCOLC55656066)

*Michigan State University-DCL journal of international law*  
Vol. 8, issue 2 (summer 1999)-v. 11, issue 3 (fall 2002)  
(OCOLC44417623)

**Changed to:**  
*Michigan State journal of international law*  
Vol. 12, issue 1 (2003)-  
(OCOLC56058501)

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:

*International law & trade perspective*  
**Ceased with:** v. 29, no. 11/12 (Nov.-Dec. 2003)  
(OCOLC16521136)

*State & local taxes weekly*  
**Ceased in paper with:** v. 15, no. 29  
(July 12, 2004)  
(OCOLC 22142579)

Subsequent issues available online only via RIA Checkpoint database or by e-mail distribution from RIA

And the latest member of the bibliographic undead –

We reported the following title as ceased in the March 2003 issue, and it has now resumed publication:

*Pattern jury instructions (civil cases)*  
Reported as ceased with 1999;  
Resumed with 2004  
(OCOLC25481232)

There are several free-floating subdivisions involving the word — *aspects*. These subdivisions were probably not used, or even allowed, for law headings until relatively recently, but over time the subdivisions became “free floating” under all topics, and therefore “legal” (as in “authorized”) for law headings. They play a role similar (but inverse) to *Law and legislation* in that they transform a law heading into a “non-law heading”. While classification is rarely affected (under the dictum that “aspects of a topic class with the topic” — except when they don’t), they can be useful for law catalogers in distinguishing materials of interest to traditional legal researchers (i.e. what you can use in writing a brief) from tangential materials primarily of interest to professors rather than advocates.

*Widget industry—Ruritania* is for a work about the widget business in Ruritania. It is an “economics” heading. *Widget industry—Law and legislation—Ruritania* is for a law book about the industry. If you add —*Economic aspects* to the heading you get the unwieldy heading *Widget industry—Law and legislation—Economic aspects—Ruritania* indicating a book about the economic aspects of the law of the Widget industry in Ruritania but you are able to indicate the book is neither a conventional book on the widget industry (primarily of interest to the economics department or the business school), not a book on the legal status of the industry.

Several such free-floaters are available: *Economic aspects*, *Social aspects*, *Political aspects* and *Psychological aspects*. Basically, they announce that the book, even if being sufficiently “legal” to class in K” and to be of interest to academic lawyers, is about some social scientist looking at the legal

aspects of the topic indicated in the \$a of the 650. This isn’t a book you’ll probably want to use in writing a brief, and it probably is also of interest to people outside the law school.

*Economic aspects* and *Political aspects* allow for geographic subdivision. Therefore the correct heading is *TOPIC—Law and legislation—Economic aspects—PLACE*. *Social aspects* and *Psychological aspects* do not take geographic subdivisions, and for those headings the correct order is *TOPIC—Law and legislation—PLACE—Social aspects*. The reasoning for having the two patterns is presumably found in the filing of card catalogues (heh—we’re LAW librarians, we should be used to living with profound anachronisms). If you are into post-coordinated searching, the difference isn’t significant. Remember the rule: the geographic subdivision goes after the last topical subdivision that accepts a geographic subdivision, followed by those subdivisions that do not accept geographic subdivisions.

All four of the social science “aspects” have parallel forms when used after class of persons: —*Economic conditions*, —*Politics and government*, —*Social conditions* and —*Psychology*. However the insertion of a “legal subdivision” changes a class of persons into a topic. Thus, *Women—PLACE—ECONOMIC CONDITIONS* and *Women—Legal status, laws, etc.—PLACE* are valid, but an economic analysis of the laws on women become *Women—Legal status, laws, etc.—ECONOMIC ASPECTS—PLACE*.

There are some “aspects” that a law cataloger would often feel inclined to use, that we can’t. One is —*Environmental aspects* which, like —*Law and legislation* is not a full

fledged “free-floating” subdivision. It can only be used as a free-floater in specific situations. Therefore we can not use —*Law and legislation—Environmental aspects* even if that is what the work is about. For a book on the environmental aspects of a legal topic, we will need to double the non-law heading (which may have a subdivision for —*Environmental aspects* if authorized for the \$a heading) with the heading *Environment law*. Therefore, a book on the environmental impact of contract law which is logically *Contracts—Environmental aspects* ends up with a heading for *Contracts* and one for *Environmental law*.

While the subdivision —*Moral and ethical aspects* is a free-floater under any “non-ethical” topic (I assume law qualifies as non-ethical if not amoral), —*Religious aspects* is probably the most significant “aspect” we can’t use as a free-floater after legal headings.

*Law—Religious aspects* becomes *Religion and law* (except when Roman law is involved in which case one can use the established heading *Roman law—Religious aspects*). Several clearly legal headings do accept —*Religious aspects* as a non-free-floating subdivision, including *Civil rights*, *Human rights*, *Natural law* and most interestingly of all *Separation (Law)*. Since the latter is a specific domestic relations concept, rather than something more general, one might be able to use *Separation (Law)—Religious aspects* as a pattern for adding —*Religious aspects* at least to domestic relations headings, however that heading was proposed for a CIP and used only once in the ten years it has been authorized, and never by a law cataloger, and its validity is questionable. For a book on the

---

religious aspects of a legal institution, one should “double” the secular legal heading with a religious non-legal heading. Note that in accordance with Subject Cataloging Manual H1998, there is never a geographic subdivision used with a —*Religious aspects* subdivision.

The various “aspects” are mildly confusing since the rules governing them still show their origins in the pre-automation era of cataloging. They are a useful tool to distinguish law books that are about the law (that might be citable as authority or at least used to find authorities) from materials about

the legal system that may be of limited use in convincing a judge what the law is. In addition, they link the discipline whose aspects are being discussed to legal literature that may be of mutual interest to social scientists and scholars of the legal system.

---

## Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section Business Meeting

## MINUTES

July 12, 2004  
Boston, Massachusetts

The OBS business meeting was called to order on Monday, July 12, 2004 at 5:15pm by Kevin Butterfield, OBS Chair.

### Secretary/Treasurer Report—Michael Maben

The minutes for the 2003 business meeting in Seattle were published in the *Technical Services Law Librarian*, vol. 29, no. 1, September 2003. There were no corrections or changes, and the minutes were approved.

Election results: 310 ballots were sent out, with 123 returned. Two ballots were invalidated for arriving after the deadline. Richard Jost was elected Vice-chair/Chair-Elect and Caitlin Robinson was elected Member-at-Large. A motion was made to destroy the ballots and the motion was approved. Michael then thanked the nominating committee of Ismael Gullon, Corinne Jacox, and Barbara Szalkowski for their work, and for all the candidates who were willing to run.

Financial report: OBS had \$831.70 at the end of April, 2003. We received \$1890.00 in dues in 2003. Through the end of April 2004 our expenses were \$2947.45, leaving us with a balance of a negative \$225.75. Our expenses for the *Technical Services Law Librarian* are the single largest expense, and the board is looking at what to do concerning this problem.

**Chair Report**—Kevin Butterfield  
Kevin reported on the SIS Council meeting. There will be a \$3.00 dues increase for SIS memberships, with the SIS’s received \$1.50 of that. The AALL Professional Development Committee has ceased to exist. Its desktop learning series will be handled by *Spectrum*, and the SIS’s will handle the electronic list discussions. The meeting matrix for San Antonio will be the same as in Boston.

The AALL Executive Board will experiment with electronic voting next year, with the SIS’s switching to it after that (assuming it goes well). Richard will look at revising our bylaws to allow for electronic voting.

There have also been some problems with our mailing list with some members being dropped. We need to make sure this does not happen, particularly if we do move to electronic voting.

### Reports of Committees and Representatives

CONNELL: Kevin reported that it went well.

OBS Table in Activities Area: Ruth Funabiki reported that it was going okay. We have our paperback exchange again this year, and we are raffling off President Clinton’s autobiography.

TS/OBS/RIPS/CS Reception: Andrea Rabbia reported that it went well.

Education Committee: Georgia Briscoe

reported. Six program proposals will be submitted. Roy Tennant or Marshall Keyes will be submitted as a speaker, with TS as a co-sponsor. The other programs are Federated Searching (#2), Table of Contents enhancements (#3), Electronic Routing (#4), Z39.50 (#5), and the MARBI report (#6).

Local Systems Committee: Corinne Jacox reported. The committee is looking to compile a new Law Library systems directory. It will not be printed but available as an electronic document.

OCLC Committee: Darcy Jones was absent. Barbara Szalkowski reported that the room was full to hear Chris Grabenstatter of OCLC speak about Connexion and other developments at OCLC.

RLIN Committee: Virginia Bryant submitted the report electronically. The committee updated their web page last fall, and they heard from RLG representative Nancy Elkington at their meeting on Sunday.

Web Advisory Committee: Anne Myers reported. Anne is stepping down as the webmaster and Shannon Burchard is taking it over. Our webpage has been cited by other SIS’s as an example of an excellent SIS webpage. The members present then thanked Anne for all her work as webmaster.

Joint Research Grant Committee: Eloise Vondruska submitted the report

---

electronically. One grant application was submitted, and the committee recommended funding. At the OBS board meeting, the board approved funding the mailing and copying costs. The board felt it could not do more because of OBS's poor financial condition.

*Technical Services Law Librarian:* Joe Thomas and Brian Striman reported. Joe stated that the June issue is out and that he has now completed his service as editor. The members thanked Joe for his work as the editor. Brian then spoke about the challenges, issues, and changes coming to *TSL*. Kevin will start back up with the Internet column. There are a number of new columnists, including one for the Private Law Libraries column. Brian does not plan any major changes to the graphics. Financial issues continue to predominate, and Brian asked if we should switch from a "push" product (one which shows up in your mailbox) to a "pull" product (where you have to go out and get it from a website). Also there are preservation and archival issues. It is possible that we have a

commercial publisher take it on as a sponsorship. Brian will look at a number of options and issues. Kevin then added the discussion from the OBS board meeting on Saturday, and that the board will consider at its meeting on Wednesday to not support *TSL* financially, at least temporarily.

#### **Bylaws Changes**

The proposed bylaws changes were approved by the AALL Bylaws Committee and mailed out to the OBS members in early June. Kevin presented the changes to meeting. There was no discussion and Anne Myers made a motion to amend the bylaws as recommended. The motion was seconded by Barbara Szalkowski. The motion was then approved.

#### **Installation of Incoming Board Members and Incoming Chair's Agenda**

Kevin then passed the OBS hat to Georgia. Georgia thanked Kevin for his work and presented him with a gift certificate to the Dugout Memories website. Georgia also thanked Anne,

Joe, and Ruth for their service to OBS.

Georgia spoke about the coming year and the issues she wants to focus on: finances, bylaws revisions, and the strategic plan.

#### **Announcements**

Kevin announced that he had card for Ellen McGrath since she was ill and not able to attend the annual meeting. Kevin invited the attendees to sign the card at the conclusion of the business meeting.

Anne spoke about her work on the AALL Executive Board. The Board will be looking at strategic plans and ideas for that. Anne will be running a list discussion on this topic.

The meeting adjourned at 6:02pm.

*Respectfully submitted,  
Michael Maben  
OBS Secretary/Treasurer*

---

## **Technical Services Special Interest Section Business Meeting**

### **MINUTES**

July 11, 2004  
Boston, Mass.

Called to order: 5:30 p.m.

#### **I. Executive Officer Reports**

##### **A. Chair reports**

1. There will be an SIS dues increase next year from \$12.00 to \$15.00. The SISs' share will also increase from \$6.00 to \$7.50.
2. The Professional Development Committee no longer exists. It was formed to produce programming and not cost the Association money. While the first goal was accomplished, the second one was not. The programs were well received, but didn't break even on

costs. This year the purposes of the Committee will be reviewed. It was suggested to the SIS Council that the SISs temporarily take over the Spectrum desktop learning series, but they felt this wasn't their purpose and declined. The SISs will advertise the availability of AALL list-serv discussion topics and anyone who wants to propose a topic can contact SIS Council Chair, Don Arndt directly. The SISs will publicize any list serv discussions that are approved.

3. A.V.I.P. (Valuable Invited Participants) Program for the SISs, just like the one for the Chapters, has been approved. Each SIS may invite two VIPs and the Association will pay for their registration. The SISs will pay

- travel, food and lodging expenses.
4. Next year the AALL Board elections will be done electronically. The Computer Services SIS held electronic elections this year and felt they were successful. When AALL feels their electronic voting is acceptable, and there are no problems with ballot duplication or voting fraud, they will support electronic balloting for individual SISs. Some SISs, TS-SIS included, will need to amend their by-laws to allow this, since our by-laws state that the ballots will be printed and mailed. There will be a committee later this year to examine this.
5. The meeting matrix for the 2005 conference in San Antonio, Texas, will be identical to this year's. There

will be more time allotted to the SISs for their meetings and fewer program slots. There will be fewer program slots because there is not as much room for large meetings as there is in Boston.

#### B. Secretary/Treasurer's report

1. The guestimated balance as of July 10, 2004 is \$12,180.89. This includes checks written since the latest financial statement from HQ was printed April 30, 2004.

#### C. Member at Large reports

1. The Senior Member-at-Large, Lorraine Lorne, reported on the Alphabet Soup Reception. We received \$5,000 from Innovative to help cover the costs of the reception and spent \$5,500. The four SISs taking part will split the remaining cost. This year's reception cost more than last year's because it took place in a hotel and we had to pay the hotel prices. Venues away from the hotels cost less.
2. The Junior Member-at-Large, Jolande Goldberg, reported on the Activities Table in the Exhibits area which has a copy of the newly revised and published KF schedule from the Library of Congress and members are encouraged to take a look at it.

### II. **Standing Committee Reports**

#### A. Acquisitions Committee - Diane Altimari

The Committee has some programs they are developing for the 2005 conference. They discussed pricing and BNA issues. Anyone interested in planning a program for next year is invited to attend the Acquisitions Education Committee meeting, Monday, July 12, at 7:00 a.m.

#### B. Cataloging and Classification Committee - Amy Lovell

There are two programs of interest to catalogers at this conference, the program on FRBR on Monday, July 12 and the one on Islamic law on Wednesday, July 14. The Task Force on Replacement Volumes has completed its report and submitted it. There will

be a report on it at the Cataloging and Classification Issues Roundtable on Tuesday, July 13.

#### C. Preservation Committee - Pat Turpening

Sally Wambold surveyed a number of law libraries on their preservation projects. Sally's report indicates some confusion about what constitutes preservation, such as rebinding and digitizing. Pat Turpening has the details. There was a tour of Harvard's Preservation Department during this year's conference. Only 12 spaces were available and they filled up quickly.

D. Serials Committee - Frank Richardson was not present and did not submit a report.

### III. **Report on the TS-SIS members survey**

The TS-SIS members survey was sent out via email in February 2004. The responses were very low, only 87 members (13%) replied. This makes it hard to draw conclusions about the information since it cannot be seen as representing the majority of the members. This survey is used for program planning and evaluating member services. The summary report was issued in March 2004 and rated the Seattle programs and areas of interest for future programs. The TSSL columns were also included in the survey and were rated by the respondents.

### IV. **Other SIS Activity Reports**

#### A. Listserv - Betty Roeske

There were two recurring problems with the listserv software this year. The first one caused the server to block up and disconnect users. This required the server to be rebooted. The second problem involved names being mistakenly deleted or added to the listserv mailing list when it was rebooted. This resulted in some people being unable to send messages via the listserv until Betty readded them. HQ does not know what is causing these problems, so they may still happen. Anyone who feels the response time is

too slow or who cannot post to the TS-SIS mailing list should contact Betty. She will notify HQ.

B. Website - Martin Wisneski, the webmaster, was not at the conference. Brian Striman delivered an informal report from discussions that arose from people who were there in the website meeting room. Brian will contact Martin concerning a few new ideas to discuss with the TS Board—it was suggested that there be a "New Catalogers" button added to the website to link new catalogers with SIS information and TS members willing to be contacted via email to assist with problems or questions. There were questions about why this should be provided only for new catalogers and it was explained that this was just a starting point and other buttons could be added for other tech services areas. This button could also serve as an entry point for conference guidance. A TS-SIS blog was also suggested for "sensitive or dumb" (exact quote not my words—PSM) issues a new person might feel uncomfortable asking her/his supervisor.

#### C. Duplicate Exchange Report - Bonnie Geldmacher

341 libraries participated in the Duplicates Exchange this year, earning \$1,230 for TS-SIS. Since all the communication is done via email, there are no expenses for this group.

#### D. Education Committee Report - Jean Pajerek

Three workshops were proposed for this year and one, Integrating Resources Cataloging, was accepted. Eleven program proposals were submitted, which is one too many, so OSB-SIS agreed to sponsor one of them. There were four TS-SIS sponsored programs this year. The Education Committee for the 2005 meeting will meet Wed., July 14 at noon for anyone who is interested. The new chair is Michael Maben.

E. Nominating Committee - chair not present so no report.

### V. **TSSL Report**

---

Brian Striman is the new editor. Joe Thomas and Linda Tesar are no longer TS editors and were sent off with framed certificates and Border's gift certificates in honor of their efforts. Brian is looking for a replacement for layout editor. The other staff members and columnists will remain the same. There are no sudden changes planned for TSSL, but Brian is examining the columns and columnists to see what is best for the readers. Some columns will be reinstated. Brian discussed the idea of TSSL becoming electronic only, as many other publications are. It would save TS-SIS money spent on printing and mailing them, but unlike other SIS newsletters, TSSL is kept as a reference tool by many members and having them in print makes using them easier. There is also the issue of archival copies. The Council of Newsletter Editors (CONE), will discuss this and other common concerns the newsletter editors have. Brian also had a get-well card for Ellen McGrath at the TS-SIS table in the Activities area. She is ill and unable to attend the meeting,

#### **VI. TS/OBS SIS Joint Research Grant Committee Report - Eloise Vondruska**

There was one grant request submitted this year. The submitter asked for \$1,000, half of which would come from TS-SIS and half from OBS-SIS. The Joint Committee recommended that the request be fully funded and the TS-SIS board voted to spend the \$500.00 for our share of the grant. OBS-SIS cannot afford the other \$500.00 of the grant but will contribute something. The request is now to go back to the requester to see if he can accept the lower amount of the grant.

#### **VII. Grants and Awards Committee Report - Chris Long**

8 workshop grants were awarded this year for \$195.00 each, for a total of \$1,560.00.

The Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award was awarded to Pat Turpening, in recognition of her many years

working on preservation issues for the SIS. She has been on the Preservation Committee for 21 years, served as chair and has been active in many other preservation activities.

#### **VIII. Other Business**

##### Mentoring Committee

TS-SIS had created a Mentoring Committee in 2000 under Mary Burgos, but it is not currently active. There have been 15 mentors and 14 protégées participating. Some TS-SIS members are also involved in the AALL Mentoring Program, but there are problems with it. Not all TS-SIS mentors are matched up with a technical services protégée which makes the relationship less useful than planned. Should we reactivate the TS-SIS program?

##### Strategic Plan

There were two drafts of this plan, originally Caitlin Robinson had the first draft and then the second official draft was posted on the webpage. TS-SIS is in compliance with the goals of the second draft and we need to work on a new plan, beginning in 2004 we need a group to volunteer for the next three year plan to begin in 2005.

##### BASIC representative

AALL currently lacks a representative to BASIC and it had been suggested that the BASIC representative position be unfilled and we add a NISO representative. AALL had a NISO representative, and Gary isn't sure why there isn't one now. AALL is still considered a NISO member though and TS-SIS will discuss reactivating this representative position with the AALL Board.

##### George Strait Minority Scholarship Fund

Last year, TS-SIS donated \$1,000 to this fund and the Board recommends that we do the same this year. AALL also wants to discuss fund-raising. Members are invited to the next TS-SIS Board meeting, Wed., July 14, to discuss these issues.

Hope Breeze retired earlier this year

and is now employed by the Legal Information Preservation Alliance (LIPA). LIPA is a law library partnership to advance preservation in law libraries. Hope has been asked to gather data on library and corporation preservation activities. She will send out a survey shortly, end of July or early August, and libraries are requested to respond to it.

##### Next Year's Program

Each SIS is guaranteed one program slot on Sunday. SISs can now submit more than 10 program proposals, which was the limit last year. The AALL Education Committee is looking for programs that tie into the Core Competencies. There is still disagreement about the No-Conflict times since many members think it makes other times too crowded. Last year in Seattle, there were 30 minute programs allowed during the "No-Conflict" times. Send your comments on this issue to the AALL 2005 Program Committee.

Rhonda Lawrence asked to be added to the Board agenda on Wednesday to discuss writing to AALL about programming slots and SIS meeting times.

##### New Positions

Cindy May, Chair  
Karen Douglas, Vice-Chair/Chair Elect  
Chris Long, Secretary/Treasurer  
Brian Striman, Member-at-Large  
Richard Jost, AALL AMPC representative to TS-SIS

Adjourned: 6:40 p.m.

*Respectfully submitted,  
Pat Sayre McCoy, Secretary/  
Treasurer, 2003-2004*



---

## OBS-SIS & TS-SIS Research Roundtable Report

Jesse Holden  
Robert Crown Law Library-Stanford  
University

---

The meeting began about 11:45 on Tuesday July 13th, and was attended, at least in part, by 12 section members and 3 speakers. Chris Long opened the meeting with a short introduction, after which other attendees introduced themselves.

The first speaker, Diana Jaque, discussed her book review section in *Law Library Journal*, focusing on the process of reviewing and the content that is expected in published reviews. Reviews for *LLJ*, because of their scholarly bent, tend to be longer than the more pragmatic reviews in publications like *Publishers Weekly*. The review process begins with volunteers choosing a title from a list based on their interest or expertise. The writing of the review is a dialog between Jaque, the reviewer, and *LLJ* editor Frank Houdek. Besides length, which averages 800-1,000 words, Jaque and Houdek look at style and content. The content must cover a range of points including the description of a book's audience, authority of the authors, scope and accuracy of the coverage, its organization and index, documentation and citations, and preservation issues. Jaque concluded by naming other library publications that accept reviews, including *Legal Information Alert*, *Against the Grain*, and *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly*. She also mentioned that to balance the reviews, she is especially looking for reviewers from technical services, firms, and court libraries. Finally, no JD is required to be a reviewer.

Houdek, the next speaker, addressed review essays for *LLJ*. While no set length is fixed for this type of essay, they average about 3,000 words. Such essays tend to either present a pro/con stance on arguments made in the book or detailed analysis by someone who is particularly interested in the topic. While such essays are sometimes "promoted" from the pool of regular reviews, ideas for a topic can be submitted by phone or e-mail directly to Houdek. Also, fully written essays can be submitted as well. The review essays are looked at "just like any other article that comes along," receiving no less consideration than other types, and could provide a good way to "get into a topic." Houdek encouraged potential authors to find topics that interest them and not get discouraged about the editing process or even rejection, because articles in *LLJ* depend on those who are willing to write and submit. He stressed his commitment to "work hard with authors where there is not good representation" from a given perspective or on a certain topic. He emphasized that one can "always find a reason to hold back," so suggested "writing small" by focusing one's scope or writing "in pieces," and starting with submissions to newsletters or web sites.

The third speaker, Nancy Babb, presented the process of creating a writers' retreat for librarians at SUNY Buffalo. Babb detailed the step-by-step approach she and some of her colleagues at Buffalo took to address both the writing aspect of

the tenure process and the perception of librarians as professionals in the campus community. By starting with a small group of librarians who met at lunch to share and hone their ideas and writing technique, they were able to plan an off-campus retreat with support of the administration. The support included full release time and generous funding.

There was a suggestion from the Roundtable, enthusiastically seconded by several others, that Babb submit this as a proposal for a full program at a future meeting. It was unanimous that this project would be useful to librarians at many institutions and that the amount of documentation Babb had available could help start similar workshops elsewhere.

The Roundtable brainstormed ideas for finding time to write, including keeping a notebook, keeping a list of ideas in a Word document on a PC desktop, or simply closing the door to one's room.

Due to a lack of time, discussion of the Joint Research Grant was cut short, but information is available at <http://www.aallnet.org/sis/obsis/research/researchinfo.htm>. The final item on the agenda was a drawing for a copy of the book *The Librarian's Guide to Writing for Publication* by Rachel Singer Gordon, which was won by Jesse Holden.



---

# Preservation Committee Report

*Pat Turpening, Chair  
University of Cincinnati  
Pat.turpening@law.uc.edu*

---

The Preservation Committee has begun its twenty-second year with a very successful week in Boston.

Early Monday morning, thirteen of us met for our annual meeting. Liaisons from the Committee to the Government Relations SIS, the Academic Law Libraries SIS, and the Committee on Relations with Information Vendors reported on their actions to help promote our Committee with these groups with an interest in preservation. The lone liaison coming from another group was Marjorie Crawford, representing ALL-SIS. She has been informing that SIS of areas we can address together. Ways to increase the membership of the Committee were tossed around and discussed. Suggestions included our having a presence at CONELL, and adding material about preservation at the TS table in the activities area. Sally Wambold reported on her project to uncover preservation projects being undertaken at law libraries; she received about eight responses. Hope Breeze, a former member of this Committee, talked about the similar but broader project being done this year by the Legal Information Preservation Alliance (LIPA).

Ann Nez and Sally Wambold will take a fresh look at an earlier project concerning chapters' needs for preservation information. Joe Thomas volunteered to update the preservation section of TechLinks at the TS web site. Six committee members will contact library groups such as the Canadian Association of Law Libraries and the Special Libraries Association to determine their activities, publications, and programs on preservation and how the applicable committees are organized.

Will Meredith reported on the proceedings of the LIPA meeting in Boston. As stated earlier, Hope Breeze has been hired by LIPA to conduct

a survey of law libraries on their preservation-related projects. A three-member team from OCLC is producing a White Paper which will address trends in law library preservation and digital preservation. Nominations were taken for a five-member Executive Committee. Minutes of the LIPA meeting and a list of members can be found at [www.aallnet.org/committee/LIPA](http://www.aallnet.org/committee/LIPA).

As far as program planning for San Antonio, my idea of proposing a panel presentation with several Preservation Committee members sharing their experiences using "Assessing Preservation: A Self-Survey Guide," published by the Northeast Document Conservation Center received the most interest. I agreed to write the proposal for submission. Seven members will survey our collections over the course of the year with common deadlines.

Later on Monday morning, the Preservation and Binding Roundtable was extremely well attended with a full house of thirty one. We had two special guests: Ann Russell, Director of the Northeast Document Conservation Center, and Jan Merrill-Oldham, Malloy-Rabinowicz Preservation Librarian in Harvard University. Ann filled us in on some of the high profile conservation jobs recently undertaken at NEDCC. They include the Lewis and Clark journals, family papers of George and Martha Washington, and the wall of artifacts placed at Ground Zero. Their web site, [www.nedcc.org](http://www.nedcc.org), receives 2 million hits per year. Most of their publications are full-text online, including Preservation 101, a course on the subject. There is more emphasis on disaster preparedness and recovery since the 9-11 disaster events. That is because cultural organizations should be looked at first in emergency situations. Alliances between and among them are essential. NEDCC is looking into alternatives to one-

day workshops to train experienced librarians. Internationally, NEDCC has been working for ten years in the former Soviet republics and has started to examine Hemingway's papers in Cuba which had been neglected for forty years. The popular program "To Film or to Scan" was presented at the National Library of Bosnia.

Jan told us about a new online pamphlet produced by the Image Permanence Institute which she described as "very well done" and recommended it for our use. The pamphlet is called "Media Storage Quick Reference" and is available at [www.rit.edu](http://www.rit.edu). The Preservation Department of Harvard is involved in every project in the University that deals with physical objects; there is a strong commitment to the physical object. Harvard has increased its number of conservators from one to ten in recent years in order to better care for its collections. There is a conservation community at Harvard that didn't exist before.

Will Meredith hosted a Tuesday afternoon tour of Harvard Law's Preservation Department for those who had registered. We met the staff members who do repair work on the circulating collections, bindery prep, and researching of titles in need of treatment. The Library also is actively sending books for mass deacidification treatment, about 100 books every two weeks. A large freezer in the Department is used to freeze-dry books damaged in water leaks.



---

# Selected Educational Programs Report

Deborah Dennison  
Case Western Reserve University Law Library  
Dsd2@po.cwru.edu

## “If it doesn’t get done in Technical Services, it doesn’t get done”<sup>1</sup>

Considering everything done in Technical Services – from acquisitions and cataloging, to end processing, binding, and preservation, not to mention the myriad of traditional library functions dependent upon Technical Services, the above quote really resonated with me. It also caused me to reflect on the importance of attending our annual meetings. For Technical Services in particular, we generally are fortunate to have a wide range of programming on the theoretical level as well as the practical. In addition to advancing our knowledge in the field, meeting with colleagues is inspiring and promotes our professional development. Rarely in our respective libraries do we have the opportunity to talk about what we in Technical Services do – let’s face it; not many of our coworkers are concerned about *how* a resource is added to the online catalog, for example. Often before a conference I have second thoughts about attending – too busy, too expensive, are there really going to be good programs? But unfailingly; there are good programs, new ideas, and creative approaches: professionally I find it a very positive experience. In turn, I think our individual libraries benefit from our renewed spirit of professionalism.

Specifically, this article summarizes Technical Services programs I attended. All the programs I attended were worthwhile, and I gleaned something from every session. Uncharacteristic of my typical reading tastes, I am even reading a book on XML that I learned about in one of the programs.<sup>2</sup>

Of the following four reviews, two are from programs sponsored by our Technical Services SIS; two others are included for their relevance to Technical Services. For those programs I could not attend, perhaps other reviewers

might contribute reviews in the next issue.

## New Horizons: the future of AACR

This was a very ambitious program, very informative, and quite a lot of information to absorb. So much information, in fact, that I strongly recommend purchasing the program CD. If you have managed to keep abreast of the JSC (Joint Steering Committee) and related task forces, you are aware there is a plethora of related reading material as well.<sup>3</sup> The presentations centered around the changes to AACR with AACR3 looming. Presenters were John Hostage (Harvard Law), Jennifer Bowen (University of Rochester), and Dr. Barbara Tillett (CPSO- Library of Congress). John Hostage began with an explanation of what areas in AACR will be affected and when; Jennifer Bowen discussed FRBR and its application to AACR; Dr. Tillett presented a brief history of cataloging principles/rules as a lead-in to specific AACR3 changes.

As John Hostage discussed, AACR3’s expected publication date is 2007. The JSC focus now is to resolve inconsistencies across part I of AACR2. Major changes will include new introductions, reorganization of Part I, reexaminations of GMDs/SMDs, authorship and the “rule of three”, authority control, and incorporation of FRBR terminology.

Jennifer Bowen began with a very succinct, articulate FRBR review, indicating FRBR’s significance for library catalogs, and explaining (continued explanations bear repeating) concepts of expression, manifestation, etc. As noted above, the JSC is incorporating FRBR into the new AACR. Interestingly, Jennifer related that committee members tried hands-on work to catalog “expressions”, but most found that this was not feasible. The explanation was that libraries do not operate in this way (beginning

with expressions); libraries operate by purchasing and then cataloging a manifestation. The exception was with music catalogers, who found they could catalog expressions. The reasoning was that the performance is the expression, and that all recordings could be linked to the performance. Work continues on cataloging expressions. Not incidentally, the term “collocation” is often discussed relative to FRBR (relationships); therefore Jennifer spent some time explaining necessary revisions to chapter 25 (uniform titles).

Dr. Tillett stated that the goal of the AACR3 revision is to “simplify, clarify, and update the world’s most used ... standard for bibliographic description and access.” After a concise history of cataloging rules, Dr. Tillett described the FRBR model, and then covered strategic plans for AACR. She gave an overview of the current structure, and described proposed changes.

This was a very cohesive program; presenters are experts in the field, and their talks complemented and elaborated on various aspects of each others’ presentations. There were few queries to the panel after the presentation; presumably, we have a lot to mull over before we can ask specific questions of the experts.

## What Else Do You Cut When You Are Already Cut to the Core of Technical Services?

The program was presented as a lively play with James Heller (College of William & Mary Law) as a library director, Jean Pajerek (Cornell University Law) as the newly hired head of Technical Services, and coordinator/moderator Alan Keely (Wake Forest) as the “voice”. The scenario is that of a new Head of Technical Services, who is walking into a library facing

---

continued budget cuts, and as such, she and the director discuss various ways of operating under such fiscal restraints. Whether a product of our lean economy or not, many libraries are also having to negotiate a somewhat changed management structure, and relationship (i.e., between the library and the law school) than in previous years. This program successfully summarized the current milieu, offered some practical solutions (and counter points), as well as stressed the importance of long term planning and the importance of public relations.

The “actors” discussed the importance of identifying one’s clientele and prioritizing resources accordingly. For example, if a library’s primary clientele is faculty/students, followed by the university community, and lastly by practitioners, budget cuts would necessitate cutting the practitioner material first. Resources, such as updates for treatises, might be candidates for cancellation. The “director” talked about retaining the old treatises on the shelf, and canceling updates for those available on the web. The caveat is to communicate with the library subject specialists (reference librarians) before making such cuts. Although many libraries in a university setting are distinct from one another, the panel advocated (and law libraries are beginning to do) developing a stronger relationship with the main library. In discussing ways to promote library services, a not-to-be overlooked opportunity is to create a great annual report.

With changes in accounting and automation, it is becoming most important to understand the work flow in the library and fully detail staff functions. For managers, this can be an opportunity to better allocate resources. For example, automated serial check-in might free up the serials assistant to do learn other library skills. The panel discussed working with staff to alleviate the fear and mind-set of resisting change.

The panelists discussed using the

“SWOT” analysis (internal factors: Strength, Weakness; external factors: Opportunity, Threat) as a way to think clearly about an organization’s direction. With dynamics in information such as they are, libraries must identify the trends that are really occurring: funds will be cut, ascendancy of digitization will continue, the library profession is aging, and there are fewer Technical Services people.

Although this scenario was built around Technical Services, the issues discussed had a much broader application, and were applicable to the entire library operation.

### **ABA Statistics: Tackling Topical Questions – 2004 Update**

Ideally, this program is to be an annual forum, although it is a little difficult for a large audience to participate in a dialog. (A suggestion, time permitting, might be breaking up into round tables centered about a particular issue after the panel presentation to encourage more discussion/brain storming.) Nonetheless, the attentive audience was composed of those interested in the philosophical basis of why we collect statistics as well as those struggling with the hands-on practicalities of collecting and reporting statistics.

Ajaye Bloomstone (Louisiana State University) served as the program coordinator/moderator, for the panel consisting of Pauline Aranas (UCLA Law), Darin Fox, and Leonette Williams (both, University of Southern California).

Leonette humorously proposed a multiple choice questionnaire for directors, asking such things as “is your library any good?”, and number of non-book titles (“more than 10,000”). She went on to discuss seriously some problematic areas, such as the “quantity of web-based titles”, where the range of answers rendered the question meaningless.

Discussions centered about *the use* of statistics. For example, widely

thought to be a strong correlation to higher rankings in *U.S. News and World Report*, in actuality the total number of library volumes barely factors.

Better alternatives to using “number of volumes” as an indicator of a library’s “value” were discussed. One suggestion might be to use expenditure ratios (e.g., resources spent on faculty, students). Interestingly, when factored on this model, the top five law schools differed considerably with the top five *U.S. News* schools. Relevant to ongoing difficulties in accounting for electronic serials, might libraries just track expenditures?

Pauline addressed concerns from the ABA library committee. The ABA standards govern how a library should operate, so one purpose of the annual questionnaire is that it serves as a snapshot of the school. One member of the audience commented later that a more meaningful comparison might be a something as simple as a checked list of resources among schools; e.g.; do you have BNA, Lexis, Westlaw, etc.

Automated integrated systems have certainly facilitated statistical reporting, but librarians and systems people must continue their work together. For multiple reasons, including disparity in counting aggregated electronic databases, Internet, and consortium resources; and physical space issues in libraries; questions remain about not only how and what is counted, but why. Indeed, this discussion will continue.

### **XML & MARC: Should We Remodel or Build Anew**

Coordinator Kevin Butterfield (William & Mary) and Kevin Clarke (Stanford) put together a very informative program. Kevin Clark, formerly a cataloger, now a systems developer/programmer, clearly articulated complex concepts of XML, its importance, and how XML might integrate with AACR and MARC data.

Kevin discussed the Medlane Project (Stanford’s Lane Medical Library),

for which he is a systems developer. The project was initially started as an experiment in response to observing that users were reluctant to search multiple systems, and wanted to do digital, single searching. The system they developed utilized XML to integrate online with traditional resources; going further, XML now functions in many of the daily Technical Services activities as well.<sup>4</sup>

XML (extensible markup language) is a Meta mark up language; it is a system for tagging information in order to describe, organize, and access it, and like MARC, is a transmission format. In discussing differences between XML and MARC, Kevin described MARC as an 'isolated information silo'; among other things, MARC is library specific, does not have a single display, is list-oriented, and requires software in order to be read. The important distinction between the two formats is that while both are good for storing information, XML is good for retrieval.

In discussing additional problems with MARC, the question was put forth – is MARC dead? Kevin answered with a qualified “no – but might we consider alternatives?” Kevin succinctly described a host of alternatives, including MARCXML (standard for literally representing MARC in XML); MODS (metadata object description) and MADS (metadata authority description); Dublin Core; and FRBR and XOBIS.

Kevin clearly outlined essential points about metadata and the links to cataloging concepts. One questioner asked how catalogers' functions (as part of the Medlane Project) are different. Kevin said (paraphrase) that these enhancements/changes occur at the systems level, so in many ways catalogers' jobs are the same. Obviously these are complex terms to grasp, but clearly this is the direction information systems are going. As such, it is a good idea that we familiarize ourselves with the basic ideas.

[Special “thank you” to Deb Dennison who authored all these conference reports for TSSL. It was pretty much last minute “yes, please do” from me to her, as I forgot to request special reports as an email posting on the OBS and TS electronic discussion lists] -- editor.

#### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Quote from program: *What Else Do You Cut When You Are Already Cut to the Core of Technical Services?*, B-3.

<sup>2</sup> Dick R. Miller & Kevin Clarke, *Putting XML to work in the library* (2003); referenced in program: XML & MARC: Should We Remodel or Build Anew, H-3.

<sup>3</sup> See <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/docs.html#logical> for JSC and Tom Delsey reports

<sup>4</sup> This link includes a history of the project as well as information about and/or links on XML, XML/MARC, XOBIS, etc. <http://laneweb.stanford.edu:2380/wiki/medlane/overview>





---

TECHNICAL SERVICES LAW LIBRARIAN  
c/o Cynthia May  
University of Wisconsin Law Library  
975 Bascom Mall  
Madison, WI 53706-1399

Nonprofit Org.  
U.S. Postage  
PAID  
Permit No. 658  
Madison, WI