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My First AALL Annual Meeting

Dawn Smith
2005 TS-SIS VIP Guest

It was a wonderful surprise when I received the unbelievable news that I would be attending the AALL annual meeting in San Antonio, this year as the Technical Services VIP Guest. As a library student in the SLIS Masters program at the University of North Texas, I had set a goal to pursue law librarianship from day one of my enrollment; however, having had very little experience as an active law librarian, I was a little bit unsure of what I was really getting myself into. During my course work in graduate school I expressed an interest in the technical services facet of law librarianship to my academic advisor Dr. Yvonne Chandler, and with her help I was able to perform a portion of my practicum requirement at an academic law library in the technical services department. At the time of the conference I was in the last semester of graduate school and I had already begun my search for employment in the law library profession. I was primarily excited to get the opportunity to go to the Annual Meeting because being on a college student “budget” the probability of my getting to attend the annual meeting was looking pretty slim. But monetary concerns aside, I was also excited about getting the chance to attend because I knew that I would get the opportunity to meet lots of new people within the profession who could give me their first hand perspective of the law library profession.

The combination of attending my first AALL meeting and being a VIP Guest made for an awesome experience, which I know that I will never forget. I left for San Antonio on Friday, July 15, 2005, and while on the flight from Dallas to San Antonio I tried to figure out what programs I really wanted to attend, but I couldn’t make up my mind. There was so much being offered at the conference and the plane ride was only 35 minutes long. I arrived at the registration desk in the Exhibit Hall in tow with five other law librarians that I had met on the shuttle from the airport, and when they saw the VIP Guest printed on my name badge high-lighted in yellow, everyone around me began asking what type of VIP I was; from that moment on my annual meeting was off and running a full day before half of the membership had arrived for the conference. The entire time I was in San Antonio I was treated like a true VIP. I was treated to lunch and dinners from continued on page 49
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From the Chair

I am excited to serve as Chair of TS-SIS during the centennial year of AALL, a time when we are “Pioneering for Change.” We certainly have had our share of changes in recent times. With this issue we will begin our first full volume of issues that are available in electronic format only. The first electronic issue was volume 30 no. 3 (March, 2005). This is an exciting change that will allow us to retain a large amount of money in our budget that we can direct toward even more changes.

We also look forward to our first electronic elections in the coming year.

Annual meeting programming has undergone a major change. Starting with the 2006 St. Louis meeting, we will be able to schedule SIS programming, committee meetings and roundtables opposite any AALL educational programming. This was one of the recommendations of the TS-SIS Ad-Hoc Committee on Annual Meeting Programming, the brainchild of our immediate past chair Cindy May. Jolande Goldberg and Reggie Wallen ably chaired this committee. This is the first of many changes expected in the annual meeting in the coming years. It is my hope that with this more flexible scheduling that we can eliminate some of the dreaded 7:00am committee meetings. I don’t know about you, but I’m tired of getting up every morning before the birds wake up to go to early meetings. I’ve been unable to attend the meetings of the Dancing SIS because I’m afraid I’ll oversleep and miss the Executive Board Meeting. One must make choices, you know.

Cindy May, Gary Vander Meer and I worked on a new Strategic Plan for TS-SIS that was approved by the TS-SIS Executive Board. You can see a copy of it on the TS-SIS website.

For those of you who were unable to attend, here are some highlights of the San Antonio meeting.

The joint reception was very well attended. Thanks once again to Innovative Interfaces for their generous sponsorship. Jolande Goldberg and the Joint Reception committee created a lovely atmosphere with beautiful flowers and delicious food.

This year, for the first time since I can remember, the TS-SIS activities table was staffed every hour that the exhibit hall was open, thanks to Brian Striman and his aggressive recruiting campaign. We had lots of traffic at the table, due in part to the large supply of chocolate that Brian provided for the table and the lovely hand-made quilts donated and made by Sue Burkhart, and the scarf hand-knit by Katrina Piechnik that were raffled off. Well done, Brian!!

At our business meeting, Cindy introduced our AALL VIP (Valuable Invited Participant) recent library school graduate, Dawn Smith. This is the first year that an SIS was allowed to invite a VIP. Instead of inviting judges and law school professors, TS-SIS decided to invite a recent library school grad. We are very concerned that not enough new librarians are interested in technical services. We thought that this behind the scenes look at technical services might inspire one of them to consider it as their specialty and spread the word to others. Within the next 10 years or so, large numbers of us, me included, will be ready to retire. We want to have young librarians to take our place. You will hear more about Dawn Smith in this issue as she contributes an article about her experiences as our VIP.

At our business meeting we also amended our by-laws to allow for electronic voting.

We held our first ever New Catalogers Roundtable this year. The attendance was split between new catalogers and experienced catalogers who were there to answer questions.

This year’s Renee D. Chapman award was presented to Ann Sitkin, of Harvard University, who has long been an expert on law cataloging. Marie Whited, who nominated her for the award, made remarks about Ann’s distinguished career.

In San Antonio, tech services librarians were able to attend programs on preservation, career advancement, core collections, trends in library systems and a workshop on Subject Cataloging with LC Subject headings. Additional programs covering EDI, ABA Statistics, FRBR and the OPAC and Electronic Resources Management, which weren’t selected by the AMPC, were put on by TS-SIS. Despite a less prominent listing in the meeting program, these sessions were well attended and provided more programming options for tech services librarians.

I’d like to thank all of our departing officers, committee chairs and representatives for their dedicated service to TS-SIS: Member-at-Large Jolande Goldberg, who also served as co-chair of the Ad-Hoc Committee on Annual Meeting Programming; Janice Shull, chair of the Awards Committee; Amy Lovell, chair of the Cataloging & Classification Committee; Chris Tarr, chair of the Nominating Committee, Eloise Vondruska for several years of service as chair of the Joint Research Grant Committee; Michael Maben, chair of the Program/Education Committee; Frank Richardson, chair of the Serials Committee, and Karen Selden who was our MARBI rep.

I am looking forward to working with those who are continuing on: Chris Long, Secretary-Treasurer; Brian Striman, Member-at-Large; Cindy May, Past Chair; Lorna Tang, Acquisitions Committee chair; and Pat Turpening, Preservation Committee chair.
I’d like to welcome aboard new officers, committee chairs and representatives: Rhonda Lawrence, Vice Chair/Chair-elect; Janice Anderson, Member-at-Large; Karen Nuckolls, Cataloging & Classification Committee chair; Carol Avery Nicholson, Serials Committee chair; Virginia Bryant, Nominations Committee chair; Pam Deemer, Awards Committee chair; Caitlin Robinson, Joint Research Committee chair and George Prager, MARBI representative.

We have big plans for TS-SIS during the Centennial Year. I have served as chair of the Education Committee for the 2006 St. Louis meeting. Thanks to all committee members for your hard work!! From now on it will be the job of the vice chair/chair-elect to serve as chair of the Education Committee. We have submitted 6 program proposals and 1 workshop proposal to the AMPC this year. We opted for quality rather than quantity. Our program proposals cover technical services department reorganization; a preview of RDA, the new cataloging rules replacing AACR2; changing technical services librarians into digital librarians; assessing the financial viability of your vendor; reminiscences by long-time members of TS-SIS as part of the centennial celebration; and the new tribal law classification (co-sponsored with the Native Peoples Law Caucus). We have proposed a full-day workshop on writing a preservation plan for your library. I should be able to let you know which proposals were chosen in my next column.

I want to work on implementing our new strategic plan. I will be actively soliciting volunteers. You can help me fulfill one of our strategic directions by volunteering, especially if you have never volunteered before. We are looking for fresh ideas to carry us forward into AALL’s next 100 years. I’m counting on you!

Karen Douglas
Duke University Law Library

---

**Online Bibliographic Services**

**Special Interest Section**

I feel like one of the pilgrims who climbed a mountain seeking wisdom, only to find that someone else had already been there and planted a flag. Those of you who know Georgia Briscoe already know that climbing mountains is just one of the hobbies that she pursues in her free time, in addition to having a busy job as Associate Director and Head of Technical Services at the University of Colorado Law Library. Following her in a leadership position is always a challenge, as she leaves everything in such good shape that there seems like nothing to do! I do want to thank her for her service to OBS and I look forward to her wise counsel on the OBS Board as past chair.

Another OBS member deserving recognition for service to OBS is departing Secretary/Treasurer Michael Maben. Michael is able to capture the essence of board meeting and business meeting discussions (which don’t always seem nearly as clear when they are in progress!) in his notes and chart (without panic!) our financial ups and downs. He will be succeeded in this position by Kathy Faust from Northwestern School of Law, who I am sure will do a great job.

Andrea Rabbia will also be leaving her post as Member-at-Large after a two-year term. Andrea did a great job setting up the OBS activities table this year in San Antonio, stocking it with many paperback novels for our annual book exchange from her own library. She also set up the raffle for this year’s book prize, which was won by Glenn Mae Owens of Appalachian School of Law. Andrea will be succeeded by Stephanie Schmitt from Yale University as the new Member-at-Large.

Another new member of the OBS Board is Susan Goldner from the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, recently elected as Vice Chair/Chair-Elect. Susan has been an active member of OBS, participating in many Annual Meeting programs, serving as the MARBI representative and recently as the Council of Chapter Presidents Chair. Many of us know Susan, and her work through the indexing project that she has been working on for TSLL, a valuable tool that will benefit the entire membership.

San Antonio was an invigorating meeting for many of us, with numerous OBS programs from which to choose. We began the meeting with the OBS sponsorship of one of the plenary speakers, Roy Tennant, from the California Digital Library and a columnist for Library Journal. His speech, “Building the Libraries Our Users Deserve,” was very well attended and presented a range of provocative themes that challenged our common assumptions about libraries and patrons. If you did not get a chance to hear the speech, a written copy of the speech and the slides are on the OBS website. In addition to the plenary speech, Roy also gave a program later that same day on the “Top Trends in Library Systems,” an interesting overview of current technology and new technology developments.

One of the most stimulating OBS programs was “Nabbing vs. Sharing: Z39.50 and the Ethics of Directly Importing MARC Records” (coordinated by Georgia Briscoe) with Barbara Bintliff from the University of Colorado and Blair Kauffman from Yale University. The program engendered a lively discussion and many questions.
Because of the importance of this issue to OBS members, Pat Callahan from the University of Pennsylvania, has agreed to chair an informal task force to research this issue further and report back to OBS members for further discussion.

Other OBS programs in San Antonio included “The ABCs of TOCs: Enhancing Your OPAC with Tables of Contents” (coordinated by Karen Selden) and “Federated Searching and OpenURL” (coordinated by Eloise Vondruska). Both programs were well attended and attracted a wide range of participants. In addition, OBS sponsored the OCLC Committee Open Discussion, the RLIN Committee Open Discussion, the Local Systems Committee Open Discussion and co-sponsored the OBS-SIS & TS-SIS Research Roundtable.

We also conducted our Annual Business Meeting in San Antonio, as well as board meetings for the incoming and outgoing OBS Executive Boards. I wanted to share with you some of the highlights from these meetings:

• Sally Wambold is spearheading our efforts to have OBS participation in the AALL Centennial Variety Show, which will be a part of the Annual Meeting in St. Louis.

• Kevin Butterfield reported that the OBS Strategic Plan Committee survey of the membership had been distributed, and the results will be compiled and reported in early autumn.

• AALL will be hosting an education summit in Chicago this September with the goal of developing professional programs outside of the Annual Meeting. Each chapter and SIS will get to send a representative to this summit.

The Business Meeting also provided OBS with the opportunity to revise our bylaws. As many of you are aware, AALL has made electronic voting possible for all the chapters and SIS’s, a feature that will help save quite a bit of time and money for our organization. The bylaw changes that we passed will allow electronic voting in the future as well as allow us to nominate only one candidate per office. This is important to a small group like ours and will help us maintain a roster of people who are willing to serve as officers. We also passed a bylaw amendment to eliminate most fixed dates from our bylaws to allow greater flexibility in scheduling. Some members felt that the dates would help keep us on track throughout the year, so to remedy the concern of not having specific dates in the bylaws, we will be establishing an annual calendar as part of our Procedures Manual to help set dates for important OBS-related activities.

The OBS Education Committee also met in San Antonio and developed a roster of programs to propose for the St. Louis meeting. As usual, we hope that OBS will be well represented on the program schedule and offer a variety of programs geared to our members. The program proposals include a workshop on cataloging serials, a program on a beta version of a Google search appliance, a proposal on voice recognition software, a program on open source ILS software, and a program on RSS feeds and the integration of outside resources in the catalog. An important change that was implemented this year at the Annual Meeting was the ability for SIS’s and chapters to sponsor programs not accepted by the Annual Meeting Program Committee (AMPC). In San Antonio, the timeframe allotted for these programs was limited to mornings; in St. Louis, the non-AMPC programs will be able to be offered throughout most of the Annual Meeting (although each SIS will be responsible for the budget for non-AMPC programs).

On the financial front, OBS has been in deficit spending for much of last year. Hopefully, by the time you are reading this, we will have recovered our financial footing with the expected dues revenue. With TSLL now being published electronically and the availability of electronic voting, we should be in better financial condition next year, as we shall have eliminated two of the major sources of expenses for our section. Hopefully, we will be able to build up our reserves again for the future.

As you can see, OBS has had a very active summer! I want to thank all participants for their involvement with the activities of this section. I look forward to working with each of you in the upcoming year.

Richard Jost  
University of Washington

Just Like Starting Over ... the New Year Brings a Few Changes

“I think why is a wonderful word” —Ted Williams

I have packed up my bags, cleaned out the closets, tucked the cat under my arm and made the long, “cross-column” move from the Internet Column to the Acquisitions Column for TSLL. Not that I get to leave the Internet behind. It seems to follow me wherever I move, like a single minded telemarketer or reruns of Magnum PI, it flows through everything we do as technical services librarians. Particularly in our acquisitions work. It has made things easier and harder, simpler and more frustrating. In a nutshell it brought about change. The measure of us, as professionals, is how we deal with and incorporate these changes into our work.
These changes hit home with me when I moved to Virginia last year. Besides learning to say “Commonwealth of …” instead of “State of …” and remembering to tell wait staff to please please please not put cole slaw on my barbeque sandwiches, I was presented with the challenge of deciphering a new state procurement code, stewarding the implementation of a new campus accounting system, and being forced to employ a statewide electronic purchasing system that was better suited for buying toner cartridges than books or dealing with database subscriptions, hoping with these changes provided a great opportunity to use Ted William’s wonderful word … “why”?

Why? That is what I’d like to address in the coming year through this column. Let’s spend some time discussing why we do things the way we do, why vendors do things the way they do, do we and/or they need to change and, if so, how best we should go about it. Asking why doesn’t mean that we are doing something the wrong way, but it is good, from time to time, to consider our approaches. Who knows, this ex-Hoosier may even sort out his issues with cole slaw.

If you have ideas to share or topics for this column that you would like to see written about, please contact me at klbut2@wm.edu. I look forward to hearing from you.

In addition, I am the Chair of AALL’s Committee on Relations with Information Vendors (CRIV) for 2005-2006. I hope that I can share that experience through this column and that I hear from all of you regarding ways that CRIV can better serve our needs. CRIV will be working closely with AALL’s Fair Business Practices Guide Implementation Task Force in the coming year to flesh out procedures for putting the Guide into practice. Kay Todd will be chairing that Task Force. In addition the AALL Executive Board approved a special committee, to be chaired by Janis Johnston, at their July meeting. This group’s charge is to figure out how to integrate and coordinate the various vendor related activities that AALL is now engaged in. These include CRIV activities, the Fair Business Practices Guide (and its Implementation Task Force), the Electronic Licensing Principles, and Project Counter. All these activities overlap in a way that may be confusing for AALL members and vendors. It is our hope that we can create a cohesive system that can represent the needs of all AALL members.

Everyone’s input will be appreciated as these groups move forward with their work. Please contact myself, Kay or Janis if you have ideas to share.

---

**Description & Entry**

George A. Prager
New York University Law School Library

In this issue, I would like to discuss recent changes in the cataloging treatment of the European Union, the 2005 update to AACR2, recent and proposed changes to the Library of Congress Rule Interpretations, and the availability of an important new publication, Functional Requirements for Authority Records.

**European Union**

In December 2004, the Library of Congress cancelled the subject authority record for the European Union, and replaced it with a new name authority record (n 2004153355), changing its coding as a topical subject heading (MARC authorities 150) to a corporate name heading (MARC authorities 110). This is a fairly significant change for law catalogers. At this point, there are comparatively few affected records, as the change was relatively recent, and was not well publicized by LC (although it was mentioned by John Hostage on the TS-SIS discussion list on March 18, 2005).

Here are some of the new ways in which this heading may be used. Only selected parts of each authority record are given.

1. As an initial element in a heading or cross-reference for a treaty between the European Union and one or two other intergovernmental organizations, national governments, etc.

   a. As an initial entry element of a bilateral or trilateral treaty heading (AACR 21.25B1, LCRI 21.35B, AACR25.16B1).

      Example: no2005027055:
      110 2 European Union. $t Treaties, etc. $g Switzerland. $d 1999 June 21

   b. As a cross-reference on a treaty heading (RI 26.4B)

      Example: no2005027055:
      130 0 Interregional Framework Cooperation Agreement between the European Community and its Member States, of One Part, and the Southern Common Market …

      410 2 European Union. $t Treaties, etc. $g MERCOSUR, $d 1995 Dec. 15

2. As a see also reference on the heading for a treaty (LCRI 26.4C)

   Example: no2005021045

   130 0 Treaty Establishing a Constitution for Europe $d (2004)

   510 2 European Union

   The see also reference is made here because the treaty is
one between member countries within an international intergovernmental body. (The RI also calls for a see also reference from the name of the intergovernmental organization, when the treaty, etc., is the result of an unnamed meeting of an international intergovernmental body).

3. As part of the heading for a subordinate body, or as part of a cross-reference for the same

a. As the first element in the heading for a subordinate body entered subordinately (according to the guidelines in AACR/LCRI 24.12-24.13).
   Example: nb2005002339:
   110 2 European Union. $b Scientific and Technical Research Committee

b. As a parenthetical qualifier in the heading or in a cross-reference for an independently entered subordinate body (AACR/LCRI 24.4C)

c. As the first element in a cross reference for an independently entered subordinate entity (AACR 26.3A7).
   Example of “b” and “c”: (nr2005004088)
   110 2 Fundamental Rights Agency (European Union)
   410 2 European Union. $b Fundamental Rights Agency
   (Since “European Union” is still not to be used as a jurisdictional geographic entity, the coding in the 410 above uses 410 1$e indicator “2”, not “1”).

2005 Update to the 2002 AACR2

The 2005 update to the 2002 AACR2 was issued this summer, and implemented by the Library of Congress on August 1 of this year. As AACR2 is due to be replaced in 2008 or thereabouts by a new cataloging code (first called AACR3, renamed in 2005: RDA : Resource Description and Access), changes to the current code are purposefully being kept to a minimum. Here are some of the more significant changes in the 2005 update. The Library of Congress Cataloging Policy and Support Office (CPSO) offers a slightly more detailed explanation of the changes at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/2005upd.html; last modified July 11, 2005; viewed Aug. 25, 2005). A complete list of the changes is given in the beginning of the update packet as “Checklist 2005 Update.”

1. Colored illustrations (AACR2 2.5C3 & App. D):

   The Glossary definition of “colored illustration” has been changed. In addition to black and white, “shades of grey are not to be considered colours.”

   When illustrations are colored according to the new definition, we no longer need to note that detail in the physical description area, unless it is considered to be important (as in the description of rare books).

2. Capitalization Rules (AACR App. A)

   a. Corporate names with unusual capitalization (App. A.2A1) are now to be established according to the capitalization practices of the corporate body. Formerly, names spelled without an initial capital letter (e.g. “eBay”) or with a capital letter or letters following a lower case letter or letters (e.g., netViz Corporation), were regularized in accordance with the normal rules of capitalization for the language of the body.

   b. Words beginning the Title and Statement of Responsibility Area. (A.4):

      Titles beginning with a compound word where the first element is normally uncapitalized will now leave the first element of the compound term unchanged, and capitalize the first letter of the second term (e.g. “e-commerce” will be transcribed “e-Commerce” when it begins a title). Titles beginning with Internet addresses, if not capitalized on the resource, are not to be capitalized either (e.g., www.jurisdiction.com).

   c. Single and multiple letters used as words or parts of compounds (A.30A).

      When compound terms appear outside the Title and Statement of Responsibility Area with single or multiple letters capitalized, follow the capitalization as found (e.g., “e-commerce”, U-Boat”, and “X-ray”).

Recent Major Revisions in the Library of Congress Rule Interpretations [LCRIs]

1. Headings for Indian Tribes Recognized by the U.S. Government as Legal Entities

   Until recently, names of Native American tribes have been established as corporate name headings (110) on name authority records, following the rules of entry for governments (AACR 24.3E). Names of Native American tribes have been treated as national governments in AACR2R (21.35 footnote 10; Cataloging Legal Literature, 3rd ed., p. A-32.) As such, they may enter into treaties with the United States government. Headings for treaties between a Native American tribe or tribes and the Federal government are formulated according to the normal rules for treaties (as given in AACR/LCRI 21.35 and AACR 25.16). Codes and collections of laws of Native American tribes have been established similarly to the headings for American states. General formula for codes: [Name of tribe]. St Laws, etc. (Compiled statutes : date of compilation); see generally, LCRI 25.15A1; example in Cataloging Legal Literature, 3rd ed., p. 390, fig. 15A1 c-4).

   Tribes will now be tagged as 151 (jurisdictional geographic name) on name authority records, rather than 110 (corporate name). These names may be used as jurisdictions when needed in cataloging (coded as 110 1_, and also may be used as geographic subdivisions, subdivided directly. So, for the first time, there will be subject headings such as: Law Sz Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation
of Montana. Subject subdivision practice will be given in field “781” of authority records. Currently, there are over 500 officially recognized tribes within the continental U.S. alone. When establishing headings for an Indian tribe, the form of name given in the Federal Register is regarded as authoritative.

Some of the Native American name headings originally established as corporate body headings will need to be revised to conform to the authoritative heading. Also, many headings for subordinate and related Indian government agencies will need to be revised, as they are now to be established according to AACR 24.17-18, the rules for subordinate governmental bodies. Even when the heading for a directly entered subordinate Indian government agency remains the same, cross references from the name of the agency as subordinate to the name of the tribe will result in many changes to the name authority records. The Library of Congress will be undertaking a special project to change the existing headings to conform to the new practice, and will be revising all relevant documentation. The original list of headings published Dec. 5, 2003, entitled: Indian Entities Recognized and Eligible to Receive Services from the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs is available on the CPSO website at [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/biaind.html](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/biaind.html). It is important to note that this practice applies only to entities recognized by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. For Canadian First Nations, new entities will be established as corporate names per the practice of Library and Archives Canada [LAC] (NACO trainers’ notes, rev. Aug. 2005).

Several records have already been updated in the name authority file. A good example of a changed heading for a subordinate Indian government agency called for by the new policy is n 86054516 (only 1xx & 4xx shown here):

110 1 Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho. $b Tribal Executive Committee
410 1 Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee $w nne [former form of heading]

For the above heading, subordinate entry is now required as per AACR 24.18 type 6, “A legislative body”. (Under earlier policy, the rules for entry of subordinate non-governmental bodies would apply: AACR 24.13-14, and “Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee” would have been entered directly).

When the resource being cataloged has as its subject a Native American reservation as a geographic entity, not a tribal entity, subject cataloging conventions will apply, and these place names will continue to be established as subject headings through the Subject Authority Cooperative Program [SACO], also tagged 151.


2. Implementation of Two-Heading Policy for Government-Designated Parks, Forests, etc.

In recognition of the fact that headings are sometimes needed for “the administrative entities that manage or oversee” government-designated parks, forests, etc., CPSO has implemented a “two-heading policy.” As in the past, headings for the geographic entities should be established through the SACO Program as subjects, tagged 151, usually with a geographic qualifier. Now headings may also be established as needed for main or added entries for the corporate entities in the name authority file, tagged 110, with the qualifier (Agency).

About 50 existing name headings for national parks and forests will need to be revised with the qualifier “(Agency),” and will be retagged as “110.” If necessary, a parallel subject heading will be created, tagged 151 with a geographic qualifier.

LCRI 24.1 and other relevant documentation in the Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings will be revised. (CPSO memo at [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/parks2.htm](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/parks2.htm); NACO trainers’ notes on Parks, forests, etc., Aug. 2005)

**Proposed Changes to the LCRI**

1. Retention of Initial Diacritical Marks on Capital Letters in French, Spanish, and Portuguese

**LCRI 1.0G** (dating from 1982) instructs us not to transcribe or add accent marks over letters that are transcribed in their capitalized form, including name headings, in any manifestations published after 1801 in the above languages. This policy was originally in alignment with the policy of the National Library of Canada (now known as Library and Archives Canada, or “LAC”). LAC has changed its policy with regard to French language manifestations, and requested LC to conform to that change. CPSO is proposing to cancel this LCRI, and to allow catalogers to add these diacritics when they are absent, based on their knowledge of the language (AACR2 1.0G and 22.1D). The deadline for comments was August 12, 2005. Up to now [August 26, 2005], no further action has been taken by CPSP. I’m strongly in favor of this LCRI being cancelled, and AACR2 be followed instead, both from the point of view of the user, and from a personal viewpoint as someone who creates name authority records for names in these languages. CPSO’s proposal is given in full at [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/accents.html](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/accents.html); last updated July 14, 2005; viewed Aug. 26, 2005.

2. Draft Revision of LCRI 26.3B-C on See Also References

In mid May 2005, CPSP issued a draft revision of this LCRI, modernizing the terminology of the LCRI, restating current policy in several areas, and offering two new changes in policy. As of late August 2005, the proposed changes have not been incorporated into the Cataloger’s Desktop. The most significant changes are the following:

**a. Modernization of language of the RI:** Phrases such as “machine readable,” or “automated authority file,”
and “search also under” have been eliminated from the LCRI.

b. Earlier/later references for conference names: Catalogers are no longer required to automatically make see also references for every earlier and later name of a conference. “This guidance eliminates the need to make “one-way” see also references that file together and provide a cluttered display with little additional access.”

c. Elimination of one-way see also references for heads of states: The unrevised LCRI calls for a corporate name see also reference (MARC 510) to be made on the personal name record for the head of state in his official capacity (e.g., on the authority record for Clinton, George, Sd 1739-1812 (n 86125388), a see also reference is given for: New York (State). Sb Governor (1777-1795 : Clinton). But the current practice is not to add a reciprocal see also reference on the record for the corporate heading to the personal heading. (e.g., the record for: New York (State). Sb Governor (1777-1795 : Clinton) (n 86125389) does not have a personal name see also reference (MARC 500) for: Clinton, George, Sd 1739-1812. The draft LCRI now instructs us to create reciprocal see also references to connect headings for heads of state, ecclesiastical officials, etc., to the corresponding official heading.

I’m in favor of this revision, as it normalizes the practices for heads of state, and should also assist users of the catalog. Full text of the draft LCRI with explanatory memorandum may be found at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/26_3bc.htm; last updated May 17, 2005. (Usually the information is added to a “670” note on the authority record, but the heading remains the same). A major reason for this policy is to avoid unnecessary database maintenance, maintenance which would be fairly onerous for any libraries not subscribing to an automated authority updating service, or for libraries with OPACs lacking global update capability. Also, authority records are not indeed to be detailed biographical accounts. However, patrons and sometimes public services staff are often puzzled when they see authority records for famous persons who have died, but who remain “bibliographically undead,” for example: John Paul II, Pope, 1920-

A lively debate ensued on various discussion lists on the pros and cons of the intended change in policy. It was also discussed at our TS-SIS Cataloging and Classification Roundtable meeting on July 21, 2005. CPSO intends to make a change in policy, and will be issuing an announcement and posting a summary of the earlier discussions and their analysis, once they determine what the revisions should be. It will then be posted “for a 30-day comment period with implementation of the new policies to follow shortly thereafter.” View the posting at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/pndates.html; last updated Aug. 8, 2005; viewed Aug. 26, 2005.

Functional Requirements for Authority Records


RSS: Blogs, Readers, Feeds and New Acquisitions Lists

These few words initiate my first Internet column for the Technical Services Law Librarian. I am delighted with the opportunity to focus periodically on the multifaceted nature of evolving technologies. Inspired by previous Internet columns, I send kudos to Kevin Butterfield for enlightening us with his many insights on this topic for the past several years.

Managing information is a challenge and many librarians are inundated with swarms of data about things that they may not be sure are worth their attention. The tools we use to sort, filter and control information are numerous, but even they can become overwhelming and difficult to use, especially when there are more options than time to explore and experiment. There are several current tools that are remarkably adaptable to meet information control needs. They are not burdensome and can become a pleasure to use. I intend to explore many of them along with other relevant topics in this column.

Very few of us have time to maintain professional awareness...
on every topic, standard, and tool on the market. We do our best to follow what someone mentioned in an article or program about a new standard or protocol or software tool that would be beneficial in the library environment. Often our knowledge remains at the level of curiosity rather than mastery and too little knowledge ends up further frustrating our understanding and ability to apply the things we learn. Many librarians have decided to channel their focus into publicly available resources such as blogs and social bookmark collections (like *Furl* [http://www.furl.net](http://www.furl.net) and *Del.icio.us* [http://del.icio.us/](http://del.icio.us/)) and into a blending of these two types of resources in the form of linkblogs. These services may be subscribed to and monitored in a manner that promotes organized thought and structure using Real Simple Syndication: RSS.

Blogs are a significant part of the information world. According to *PubSub* [http://www.pubsub.com/](http://www.pubsub.com/), they monitor 14.7 million blogs, with over 10 million of them declared active. There is a blog for most topics with a growing number of them specifically dealing with aspects of our work as technical services law librarians.


Or do you enjoy reading what Lawrence Lessig has to say about cyberspace law? His blog is found at [http://www.lessig.org/blog/](http://www.lessig.org/blog/)

But did I say that there are nearly 15 million blogs? Yes! And I have already declared that we are inundated with information. Yet, there are options that enable selectivity in our attempts to maintain professional awareness through blogs. If OCLC can handle a billion records [http://www.oclc.org/news/releases/200517.htm](http://www.oclc.org/news/releases/200517.htm) and if librarians can still determine what to select for our collections, then it is not too bold to state that we can tap into the information provided by 15 million blogs. RSS is the key.

Really Simple Syndication is a protocol that enables the aggregation of information. RSS presents the data in XML in a manner that is standardized for sharing. An RSS file is called a *feed*. A website or blog often provides a feed of its information as a link so that the information may be easily gathered and read through an RSS reader, email client, portal, or web browser.

RSS readers are tools that manage your subscriptions to RSS feeds and display the information from the feeds to you, often in categories that you set up yourself for better organization. Whether you create an account with an online RSS reader or download software to install a local application on your computer, by using an RSS reader you may subscribe to a feed and read and store the gathered information at your leisure. Many readers also provide a database of blog feeds whereby you may search for and locate information specific to your subject needs. *Bloglines* [http://www.bloglines.com/](http://www.bloglines.com/) and *My Yahoo!* [http://my.yahoo.com/s/rss-faq.html](http://my.yahoo.com/s/rss-faq.html) are two of the most popular RSS readers. The *Wikipedia* has a list of online aggregators (readers) available at [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_news_aggregators](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_news_aggregators)

Regarding feeds, in the RSS protocol, metatags (or labels) are assigned to information data so that tools and applications may interpret the data. Here is an example of the RSS feed from the header information of the *Lessig Blog* [http://www.lessig.org/blog/index.xml](http://www.lessig.org/blog/index.xml) slightly edited for simplicity:

```xml
<?xml version="1.0" encoding="iso-8859-1" ?>
<rss version="2.0">
  <channel>
    <title>Lessig Blog</title>
    <link>http://www.lessig.org/blog/</link>
    <description>Lessig’s blog.</description>
    <language>en-us</language>
  </channel>
</rss>
```

From this set of metadata information we learn the following:

- The feed is provided using XML version 1.0 and RSS version 2.0.
- The title of the blog is Lessig Blog.
- The URL to link to the blog is [http://www.lessig.org/blog/](http://www.lessig.org/blog/).
- The Creative Commons license Lessig chose is the Commons Deed Attribution 2.0 (http://www.creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/).
- The description states that this is Lessig’s blog.
- And finally, the language used is English (US).

Of course, it is not necessary to know enough about the RSS protocol to create an RSS feed on your own. If a blog or a website hosted at your library does not have the technology resources to automatically create the RSS feed, there are services available, like Feedburner [http://www.feedburner.com/](http://www.feedburner.com/) that can create it for you. These services are called *feeders*. The created feed, or the RSS XML file for a particular site, is what is aggregated using a *reader*.

So what about applicability to our work as librarians? How are libraries using this technology? Just as *The Washington Post* sends out news feeds about the Supreme Court nomination process, so may your library send out feeds about whatever you deem relevant to your research community: hours, table
of contents journal feeds, litigation coverage, job postings, new acquisitions, new electronic resources, personnel news, event publicity, etc. A good example of a practical application of an RSS service is found at The University of Louisville Libraries where they have been providing RSS feeds for their new acquisitions lists since 2003 http://www.library.louisville.edu/users/mopurc01/rss/index.asp The technology is spreading and it is having a great impact on how we provide and organize information and use the Internet.

If this topic has piqued your interest, check out these three blogs: RSS in Government http://www.rssgov.com/ RSS4LIB: Innovative Ways Libraries Use RSS http://blogs.fletcher.tufts.edu/rss4lib/ and Law Lib Tech http://www.lawlibtech.com/ which has an excellent series of tutorials on RSS technology. You may also find the blog site RSS at Harvard Law http://blogs.law.harvard.edu/tech/rss useful. In addition, ask your library system vendor about integrated RSS feeds sent out to your patrons directly from your ILS catalog. This is the next big thing for OPACs.

**Recommended Reading:**

---

**MARC Remarks**

George A. Prager
New York University Law School Library

I am very pleased to have been selected as the new AALL Representative to MARBI, and thus the new MARC REMARKS columnist. I commend the work of my excellent predecessor, Karen Selden. I will do my best in this position.

For the next few issues of TSLL, I will be wearing two hats, as I am also finishing my term as the Description and Entry columnist. I have already enlisted the assistance of an able colleague to be a “guest co-columnist” for at least one other issue, and I have others in mind to assist me with the remainder. So, I hope not to slight either column at the expense of the other!

Please let me know if you have any concerns, ideas, etc., which I should bring up at the next MARBI meeting (ALA Midwinter 2006). That’s it for now.

**ALA/ALICTA/LITA/RUSA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee**
Karen Selden
University of Colorado

The January 2005 and June 2005 MARBI meetings continued the trend of fewer proposals and discussion papers than normal. A total of nine proposals, one discussion paper, and two Library of Congress reports were presented during the two sets of meetings. Most of the 2005 proposals involved changes to the bibliographic formats, although one involved the classification format, and one involved the holdings format. The lone discussion paper resulted in a formal proposal for the addition of subfields for relator terms/codes for subject access to images in the bibliographic format, which was passed with some revisions. One of the two proposals that failed to pass proposed defining a new subfield for non-unique or non-applicable ISBNs or LCCNs in fields 020 and 010, respectively. Instead of defining this new subfield, the committee asked the Library of Congress to refine the definition of subfield z for these fields to include these types of ISBNs and LCCNs.

Adoption of the Unicode character set in MARC 21 continues to be a topic of discussion. The Unicode character set is of particular interest to law librarians because the section (§) and paragraph (¶) symbols are available in Unicode, but not in MARC-8, which is the current character set used in MARC 21 records. Many technical issues remain to be resolved in the transition from the use of the MARC-8 character set to the use of Unicode. One of the Library of Congress reports addressed some of these issues, and resulted in a motion to disallow the use of the few non-standard Unicode characters in MARC21 records. The motion passed unanimously. In addition, it was noted that the Library of Congress has created a “Unicode-MARC” electronic discussion list (marc-unicode@loc.gov), which is devoted to the technical aspects of implementing Unicode in MARC21 records.

The other Library of Congress report addressed another continuing topic of discussion, which is the impact of FRBR on the MARC 21 bibliographic, authority, and holdings formats. Other business included the decision of the MARBI Chair to create a MARBI Task Force to review and make comments on the forthcoming drafts of RDA: Resource Description and Access (the cataloging rules revision formerly known as AACR3). A joint meeting of CC:DA (ALA’s Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access) and MARBI to address the potential MARC21 implications of RDA will be scheduled during a future ALA conference.

Of interest to all catalogers is the announcement that the Automation Vendor Information Advisory Committee (AVIAC) plans to submit a proposal to MARBI in January 2006 for the creation of a separate subfield for 13 digit ISBNs in the 020 field of bibliographic records.
OCLC Committee Report

At the OBS SIS OCLC Committee’s AALL meeting in San Antonio, OCLC’s Bob Van Volkenburg’s update engaged the attention of those of us who had decided to attend, despite the allure of the San Antonio Riverwalk’s sights, food, and margaritas. Mr. Van Volkenburg gave us a Connexion update and view of OCLC’s cataloging future directions. In addition, he fielded some pointed questions.

Mr. Van Volkenburg first noted that the major OCLC accomplishment was the retirement of Passport and CATME in June and the completion of the migration to Connexion. Other June activities included: fixing and adding final actions to the Connexion Client; records with dual interfaces for CKJ and Arabic (script and Romanization appear on the same record); validation, editing capabilities, and replace in Connexion; WebDewey/Abridged WebDewey; and Z39.50 cataloging.

He showed slides of examples of other developments available now or in the works:

1. Web-based Connexion statistics are now available at no charge at http://www.stats.oclc.org/cusp/nav

2. Version 1.40 of the Connexion client is now available and contains spell checking (with three dictionaries, one each U.S. English, Canadian English and British English), offline validation, local file sorting, local accessions listing, batch searching and processing enhancements, access to WebDewey, access to OCLC usage statistics, Chinese (simplified and traditional) and Japanese interfaces, support for Hebrew, Cyrillic, and Greek script cataloging, and access to the Chinese name authority file.

3. Upcoming enhancements, Connexion client 1.5 (release date in November) and beyond, will contain drop down lists for fixed field elements, extraction of metadata from websites, population of fields from other records, Unicode export, and ISBN-13 handling.

More Connexion information may be found at http://www.oclc.org/connexion/default.htm.

Browser and/or client tutorials are at http://www.oclc.org/support/training/connexion.

Connexion documentation may be found at http://www.oclc.org/connexion/support/default.htm.

Mr. Van Volkenburg described the future cataloging environment as consisting of fewer catalogers, reduced budgets, little growth in print materials acquisitions, and increasing e-resources. He also stated that OCLC hoped to deliver more, automatically, by partnering with major material providers and building on the success of PromptCat and Cataloging Partners, pushing cataloging further into ordering, and exploring RFID and other technologies. He added that OCLC was growing globally by having records with non-Roman scripts and multilingual interfaces. Adding Unicode and XML export is upcoming.

When he began to discuss metadata for e-content, the librarians became the most vocal. The OCLC pilot project underway to work with commercial providers and libraries, OCLC’s development of automated metadata generation, and OCLC’s investigation of appropriate views of WorldCat didn’t cause as much comment as did the question of inputting holdings on online resources. One argument was, since the resources are not physical and they can’t be borrowed, why bother? This argument was countered with the fact that, while records for free databases may not need holdings posted, many online resources may be viewed only in particular libraries because of fees and contracts. People may want to go to those particular libraries to use the resources. Based on the holdings display, a small library can advise going to a larger library which could afford the subscription fee for a particular database with a limited subscription use.

Touching upon new formats caused the most pointed criticism as law librarians have been waiting for several years for the implementation of type “i” for integrating resources, and no movement of OCLC has been seen for its implementation, despite the approval by MARBI of adding “i” near the start of the millennium. Mr. Van Volkenburg could not give us any satisfaction on any sort of date or discussions at OCLC. Talks with ILS vendors are crucial, but he did not seem to know whether OCLC had conferred with any particular ones. We were emphatic that integrating resources were a major part of law collections and that using type “m” for monographs and 006s to catalog them was a clumsy way of handling them.

An updated list of quick references is available from OCLC, for products ranging from FirstSearch to Connexion. These quick references are all available in HTML and/or PDF format on the OCLC Web site, http://www.oclc.org/default.htm. You may also request a no-charge copy of any quick reference on the list by sending an e-mail to orders@oclc.org.

The National Library of Education in Copenhagen, Denmark contributed the 61,000,000th record to WorldCat on July 16, 2005.
A Missed Opportunity, But …

Inputting the simple search “book preservation” in Google led me to “The Changing Book,” a website describing a 4-day program held July 22-25, 2005 in Iowa City. It would have been a fabulous way to follow the San Antonio AALL Annual Meeting. As luck would have it, I made this serendipitous discovery about two weeks after the program was over! “The Changing Book” was held at the University of Iowa, where one of our leading law libraries is located. Co-sponsors of the meeting included the University of Iowa Libraries, the Library Binding Service, Preservation Technologies, the University of Iowa Center for the Book, and the State Historical Society of Iowa. Additional support came from the Iowa Conservation and Preservation Consortium, Library Binding Institute, Etherington Conservation Services/ LexiconDS, Metal Edge, Inc., and the Heckman Bindery.

Over 20 speakers were on the program. Mary Lynn Ritzenthaler, Chief of the Document Conservation Laboratory at the National Archives and Records Administration, was one of the keynote speakers. The other keynote speaker was John Dean, Cornell University’s Preservation and Conservation Librarian. Southeastern law librarians are probably familiar with the speaker Don Etherington who is President of the Etherington Conservation Center in North Carolina. A representative to the program from Virginia is Christopher Clarkson who teaches in the Rare Book School at the University of Virginia and who is also working independently in Oxford. Mr. Clarkson worked to salvage books damaged in the flood in Florence in 1966. Also, the Head of the Preservation Department at Yale University Library, the Chief Conservator for Special Collections in the Harvard University Libraries, and the Assistant Director for Access & Preservation at the Michigan State University Libraries were on the program. (You see why I wished I had found this site in May!!!) Intriguing titles filled the program: “The Book and Equivalents,” “E-miles to Go and Promises to Keep,” “The Kennicott Bible: A Description of its Illumination and Conservation Problems” tantalize us further. Add to this the tent show with poster sessions and demonstrations and vendor displays. And that is not all; there were printing tours, book store tours, bindery tours … The website address is http://www.lib.uiowa.edu/book2005.

Why am I torturing myself and describing a meeting to you that I could not attend? There are several reasons. The Changing Book website contains brief bios of the speakers. These bios are fascinating, and they might provide resource people and institutions where we might go for answers to our preservation questions. Maybe Iowa will do this again and some of us will be able to go! Our consciousness is raised now. We might not miss the next program. Also, I called Iowa and talked with one of the people who organized the program. A book or CD-ROM is forthcoming so that the proceedings will be documented. I made another call to the person who will actually oversee the proceedings. Depending on when I hear from her, the information about the proceedings might be in the next column or in a message on the OBS and TS discussion lists.

Finally, I would welcome notice of future preservation events so that I could put them in my column. All of us, I believe, do not want the “big ones” to get away!

Your Key to a Successful Automated System

The most important tool you have when you are developing an automated library system is your MARC load table. Know it, love it, and it will take care of you. Today’s automated library systems look easier to use than their predecessors, but they still use MARC records (or should!) as the building blocks to create your bibliographic records.

You may ask, “What does that mean to me?” It means that you still need to develop a thorough understanding of MARC21 coding to get your catalog records to look and function properly. The fact that your new library system looks easier to use does not necessarily mean that the underpinnings are any less complicated than they were in previously released products.

The MARC load table controls the placement of information taken from MARC records as they enter your library system. If you purchase MARC records from a vendor, or have an output file of your MARC records from a previous system, you will need to load the records into your new library system. To load the records properly, you have to configure the library...
software product’s MARC load table. Make sure your library software vendor explains the MARC load table in the new product so that you understand what it is and how to change it. If the vendor does not allow you to change it, make sure you have a contact person on the vendor’s staff that can make changes for you. Different vendors set up the MARC load table differently, so make certain your vendor explains how your data are loaded and how to change the information if the current set-up does not suit your library’s needs.

Be aware of localized information that you need to discuss with your library automation software vendor, such as branch library locations, satellite locations and sub-locations within the main library collection, as well as call number prefixes or suffixes. These types of information are handled differently from one library automation system to the next.

Ask your vendor to tell you what you need to know about the process of setting up your automated library system in general, and your MARC load table in particular. Do not wait for them to ask you about your specific MARC load table requirements. Their “out-of-the-box” MARC load table might be sufficient for loading your data, but you will find it much less painful to set the table up properly before the load than to attempt to fix problems after records have been loaded. Asking vendors to speak directly to each other on your library’s behalf is frequently effective, if you feel that you have not been able to convey pieces of information to and from your vendors. MARC records and MARC load tables are powerful tools, best used by those in the know.

---

**Special Guest Author**

**Research & Publications**

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

Chris Long called the meeting to order at approximately 11:45 on July 19, 2005. After a round of introductions, Long introduced the guest speaker, Monica Martens, from the National Indian Law Library (NILL) located in Boulder, Colorado. Martens and her colleagues at NILL received an AALL/Aspen Research Grant to improve subject access and subject authority control for their collection.

Martens began by providing some background. In 1972, the Native American Rights Fund (NARF) received a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York to create the library. The NILL is a public law library, devoted to collecting federal Indian and tribal law. The library is staffed with two librarians and a handful of technicians. Martens performs the technical services functions for the library. She said that in the past, catalogers used two sources of controlled vocabulary for subject authority control: a locally developed list of subject headings, and LC subject headings. Assigning subject headings based on the two vocabularies led to inconsistent application over time as library policies changed. In the late 1990s, the staff decided to re-evaluate how to provide subject access to the collection. They became interested in a more thesaurus-style subject approach. They wanted to use LCSH whenever possible, but recognized the need to represent different subject terms reflecting common usage within Indian law materials; such as using “Elders” instead of LCSH’s “Older people,” or using “Sovereign immunity” instead of “Government liability.”

With funding for such a project being problematic, the staff wrote their very first grant application, for an AALL/Aspen Publishers Grant. Martens described the grant application process, including the need to estimate a budget and develop a timeline. The staff evaluated software packages, eventually deciding to use standard word processing software. They decided to incorporate the use of consultants, both attorneys and catalogers, to help brainstorm terms for the thesaurus. Retrospective conversion of existing subject headings is currently in progress. Martens emphasized the “learn as you go” nature of the project. She noted the grant had a number of requirements, including submission of mid-year and final reports, submission of an article for Law Library Journal, as well as a presentation to disseminate information about the project.

After Martens’ presentation, Long noted that smaller projects are now receiving AALL/Aspen grants as well as larger projects. He provided the URL for people wanting to read about the AALL/Aspen grants: http://www.aallnet.org/about/aspen_grant_application.asp. He also mentioned the Joint Research Grants funded by OB-SIS and TS-SIS and supplied a URL for more information: http://www.aallnet.org/sis/obssis/research/researchinfo.htm.

Next on the agenda was discussion of a Research Mentor Program. Long distributed a handout containing a list of the “Top Ten Mentoring Myths” and another list of “Ten Tips for Effective Mentoring.” Long encouraged people to become mentors, since there are always more people wanting to be mentors than people willing to be mentors. Ellen McGrath and Chris Long will serve as coordinators for the mentor program.

Following the mentor program discussion, people were invited to share their research tips and tricks, including:

1. Dust off old school papers, update the research, and publish them.
2. Circulate your article to 6-8 people for comment.
3. Step back from any criticism, and then re-evaluate your paper.
4. Read outside of your profession for ideas.
5. Your article does not need to address a big philosophical issue. Look at what you do on a daily basis; many published articles rely on the “how we do it here” theme.

Someone brought up the need to publish in “peer reviewed” journals to satisfy tenure requirements. What can you do to persuade your tenure committee to accept an article published in a non-peer reviewed publication, like Law Library Journal, as fulfillment of the tenure criteria? Perhaps the answer is to argue that it is the most prestigious journal of the profession. Another attendee commented that every institution has its own culture, and that it would be a good idea to talk to people within the organization to find out more about what would be considered acceptable.

At the conclusion of the meeting, Long announced that he will be turning over responsibility for writing the Research & Publications column in Technical Services Law Librarian next year. If you’re interested in becoming the next columnist, contact Brian Striman. The last piece of business was the door prize drawing. Sarah Yates (from the University of Minnesota) won a copy of Walt Crawford’s book First Have Something to Say: Writing for the Library Profession.

**SERIALS**

Christina Tarr  
University of California, Berkeley

Margaret McDonald  
University of San Diego

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:

**Berkeley women's law journal**  
(OCoLC) 11830558  
**Changed to:**  
**Berkeley journal of gender, law & justice**  
Vol. 20 (2005)-  
(OCoLC) 61146694

**Harvard women’s law journal**  
Vol. 1 (1978)-v. 27 (spring 2004)  
(OCoLC) 3967304  
**Changed to:**  
**Harvard journal of law & gender**  
Vol. 28, no. 1 (winter 2005)-  
(OCoLC) 58798085  
**International journal of biosciences and the law**  
(OCoLC) 35124732  
**Changed to:**  
**Law, science and policy**  
Vol. 2, nos. 2, 3 (2004)-  
(OCoLC) 56503304

**Court news (San Francisco, Calif.)**  
(OCoLC) 22974379

**Changed to:**  
**California courts review**  
Summer 2005-  
(OCoLC) 60385597

**Seton Hall journal of diplomacy and international relations**  
Vol. 1, no. 1 (summer/fall 2000)-v. 5, no. 2 (summer/fall 2004)  
(OCoLC) 45880520  
**Changed to:**  
**The Whitehead journal of diplomacy and international relations**  
Vol. 6, no. 1 (winter/spring 2005)-  
(OCoLC) 60491430

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:

**World press review**  
Print version ceased with: v. 51, no. 5 (May 2004)  
(OCoLC) 5701324  
Subsequently issued as articles on web site, [http://www.worldpress.org](http://www.worldpress.org), see World press review online  
(OCoLC) 56190391
Are the Ten Commandments an expression of “religion” or of “law?” Recently the Supreme Court of the United States attempted to decide whether the placement of monuments containing the Ten Commandments violated the Constitution of the United States. The court definitively settled the matter by deciding that sometimes they do and sometimes they don’t.

Catalogers face a similar problem. If we look at the Ten Commandments as religion, they class in B (theology) and you’ll frequently see subdivisions such as –Religious aspects or –Biblical teaching or the 630 heading Ten Commandments subdivided by a topical subfield x. You will frequently see headings for specific religious groups, but rarely see a geographic subdivision for a jurisdiction. If we decide that something should class in K, regardless of whether it ends up in the new and evolving KB class (with qualifiers for Canon, Islamic or Jewish law) or in our familiar law of the country schedules (all of K other than KB), it gets traditional legal subject analysis. In many libraries, a decision as to whether a book is “law” or “religion” determines if it goes to the theology collection or the law library collection.

The Ten Commandments are established in the Name Authority File as a 130 (uniform title), meaning that as a subject heading they would be a 630. At one point in the past they were also established in LCSH. In accordance with a blatant (authorized) deviation from standard descriptive cataloging principles, they are established in the NAF based on English-language reference sources (the way subject catalogers do things) rather than based on the form in the original language (much to the annoyance of Hebraica catalogers, but probably no one else). It should be remembered that there are two versions of the Ten Commandments (one in the book of Exodus, the other in Deuteronomy, both of which are 430 references to the established heading) which the most pious attribute to a single author writing almost 40 years apart, and many scholars attribute to multiple authors writing much further apart. It also should be remembered that the original is in Hebrew, which over time was translated into Aramaic, Greek, Latin and then English, and that some substantive differences have developed, including in the numbering. These however are descriptive cataloging problems, so I’ll ignore them (I will take all common English editions into account, and refrain from dealing with the subject heading Ten Commandments–Numerical division).

There are currently four possible places to classify the Ten Commandments as a group. They can class in BS1281-1285.6 as a special part of the Pentateuch (classified under Deuteronomy with a cross reference from Exodus). They can class in BV4655-4710 in a section of the schedule for “Practical religion. Christian life” under a caption for “Precepts from the Decalogue. Ten Commandments” (which has a reference to BM520.75, the number for the Ten Commandments in Judaism. In other words, in B, one can treat them as a part of the Bible, or as an aspect of either Judaism or Christianity. Remember that “Biblical law” is a UF heading to the subject heading Jewish law, though perhaps a subdivision should be established to distinguish Jewish law in ancient times from modern Jewish law (an idea CPSO rejected). Also don’t forget that all BM numbers under 524 can also be KBM numbers (LC doesn’t use them as KBM, but unlike LC most law libraries don’t also have Judaica collections). All this involves is taking the “BM” of the classification of any book that classifies in BM1-524 and changing it into “KB.” The existence of the BM number means that there is a number at KBM520.75 for the Ten commandments and Jewish (i.e., Biblical) law. While LC brackets KBM520.75, most law libraries should probably regard the bracketed parts of KBM as “live.” Thus a “legal” analysis of the Ten commandments probably should class in KBM520.75 with a 630 first heading, and probably a 650 for Jewish law, and perhaps a non-legal 650 for Law–Biblical teaching (in part to pacify the theology librarians).

If a book is on the influence of the Ten commandments on a modern legal system, the first heading and classification should be for the modern legal system, with the Ten Commandments as a not-first heading, e.g., KF358 (the number for foreign influence on American law, which is the place for how Jewish, Christian, Roman, or any other laws have influenced American law), indicating the book is first of all on the system influenced, and secondarily on the source of the influence.

The Commandments: Treated Individually

The Ten Commandments open with a statement of jurisdiction not unlike those found in modern statutes and regulations. The one issuing the statute (as in “We the people of the United States . . .” or “Elizabeth II, by the grace of . . .”) followed by endless titles) states their authority. An even closer fit would be an administrative regulation in which the bureaucrat making the regulation recites the authority and rationale for the regulation, before getting into the details. The subject heading Jurisdiction has been established with a qualifier for Canon law, and presumably could therefore be established with any available qualifiers. It will probably class with the legal system being discussed (in KB).
The first substantive commandment is a prohibition of disbelief. The closest fit in our vocabulary would be the subject heading for the crime of Heresy, which doesn’t take geographic subdivision (though this is probably a mistake). There are numbers for it in British and French law. There are numbers in Jewish and Canon law (the former occupying a place taken by treason in the civil law schedules that KBM was derived from).

Most books on the subject have classed in B. In the United States, Heresy is no longer a crime punished by the state, but in any country in which belief in the state religion is a requirement of good citizenship, a heretic’s loyalty is suspect. When Heresy is punished by the government, books on the “crime” and the trials class in K by law of the country. When Heresy is considered solely from the perspective of religious legal systems, it classes in KB. If it is discussed from a purely theological perspective, it classes in B. Consider the Spanish Inquisition of the 16th century: the alleged heretic was investigated by a church agency (in KBR) and turned over to a government court for trial and punishment (in KKT). Witchcraft is in many ways a variant of Heresy (the “crime” had a lot to do with questioning accepted norms and not much to do with broomsticks or casting spells), and there is a substantial place for it in BF (for the “how-to books” among other things), but there is a place for it under the law of the country (such as KFM2478.8.W5 for witchcraft trials in Massachusetts, which has several dozen records in the LC database). Not accepting the supremacy of the deity and accepted religious beliefs can get you classed in K, and not necessarily in KB, especially if you end up being the subject of Trials (Heresy) or Trials (Witchcraft).

The prohibition of graven images is similarly related. This will usually class in B or N (for its impact on art). It might end up in a K (as art and law) number in a situation where the prohibition of graven images of the deity is combined with the belief that man is created in the deity’s image, leading to a prohibition of human images.

The next substantive issue involves swearing (in vain) and Blasphemy. Plain old cussing doesn’t class in K. The subject heading Swearing has places in GT (manners and customs), BJ (ethics) and BV (moral theology). However if you get carried away with it, you could end up being prosecuted for the crime of Blasphemy, which classes in K (e.g., K5305). Blasphemy prosecutions rarely occur in the United States (serious Blasphemy is protected by the First Amendment; swearing enough to get you arrested probably results in a secular charge such as disturbing the peace). There is a subject heading for Trials (Blasphemy).

While both Blasphemy and Heresy are for all practical purposes decriminalized in the United States in the 21st century, they were a factor in our legal system (one role they played was to exclude religious minorities from certain colonies - belief in a religion other than the approved one could lead to prosecution). In some countries of the world today, legal prohibitions against both offenses are enforced. Arguably these are variants of our concept of political correctness, though the latter does not have a legal heading. No, I’m not suggesting establishing Political correctness–Law and legislation–Criminal provisions, at least until someone writes a book on the subject.

The next commandment deals with respecting parents. The subject heading is Ten commandments–Parents, with an NT from Filial piety, Obedience and Parent and child, all with the illegal subdivision –Biblical teaching. This probably classes in B, unless of course it becomes enforceable, such as when a child is required to support an indigent parent, or pay a parent’s debts, which classes in K, and becomes Parent and Child (Law).

The next commandment deals with the Sabbath. To a religion cataloger, who puts things in B, this is Sabbath–Biblical teaching (note that Sabbath is defined as Saturday, which is a RT to Sunday), or perhaps Sunday–Biblical teaching. The captions for the Christian Sabbath are primarily in BV107+, while Sabbath (Jewish law) has a place in BM. However there is a number for Sunday in KB3244, and several places for the Jewish Sabbath in KBM (equivalent to where the civil law schedules have numbers for blue laws).

In deciding between B and KB, there is some deliberate flexibility which can be exploited to get the book in a place where one’s users might expect to find it, depending on the focus of the book and the needs of the users.

However, there’s no rest in classifying the laws pertaining to the day of rest. Sabbath legislation and Sunday legislation should always class in the law of the country (e.g., KF2009). Once the Sabbath legislation is enforced by the government (i.e., you obey the law or big guy with stick comes around to make you obey–assuming the guy with stick is authorized by the government to enforce this law rather than being a pious but extralegal vigilante), it classes with law of the country. If the only penalty is ostracism and perhaps damnation, then you are forced to decide between B and KB.

The next commandment poses a descriptive problem: the original Hebrew prohibits Murder whereas some English translations prohibit “killing” (LCSH: Homicide). For both headings there are forms with the subdivision –Religious aspects, and qualifiers for various legal systems.

Murder is listed in a list of miscellaneous topics in BM, and among a list of sins in BV4627.M8 (practical theology) albeit with very few books on the “sin” of murder. There is also a number for “religion and homicide” in BL. Of course, most books on murder, including famous cases, famous murderers, “how to” books, etc. class in the criminology area of HV. KBM and KBP have ranges for homicide and murder similar to the civil law schedules. Canon law has no number for “murder” but has one for “Delictum homicidii” (KBR/KBU 3755+). While killing people can class in B, it rarely does. Most books are criminological or legal, and if legal class with the law of the country.

The prohibition of stealing (note that some sources regard this as referring to
kidnapping people, e.g., enslavement) comes next. While 
Larceny–Biblical teaching is a valid heading, and there is a caption for “stealing” in BV, almost all works on the subject class in K. Most of the ones in B tend to be on repentant thieves, and border on HV (biographies of criminals) rather than bordering on K.

Now we get to “you know what.” Probably because so many euphemisms are used in this area, confusion is quite likely. The Biblical prohibition is generally understood to refer to 
Adultery which depending on source (just check the authority record in LCSH) refers to “cheating” by a married person (or perhaps only if a married woman is involved), or perhaps refers to any extramarital sex, which leads us to the subject heading 
Fornication, which is an inherently legal heading for illegal heterosexual extramarital sex (note that the BT is Sex crimes). The crime discussed in the Ten Commandments is still a crime in many countries, still has negative legal repercussions even in the United States, and might still be a crime under certain conditions in the United States (usually as a lesser included offense in rape cases).

While the sociology and practice of sex are in HQ, the law is in K, including many places in KB. Non-legal works on Adultery normally classes in HQ806, though there is a place for it in BV (Christian practical religion). The literature in B on the subject tends to be very similar to what classes in HQ, albeit from a religious perspective. One might ask about religious literature that gives set rules governing sexual behavior. For Jews and Moslems, and perhaps Catholics, they arguably class in KB, however the exact policy of what goes in KB as opposed to B or even HQ is still evolving. This leaves open how to classify “legalistic” (what you should and should not do) policies of religions that don’t have a “legalistic” tradition, which gets us into the question of whether a book from a Christian group that has no “canon law” tradition should class in KB if the substance of the book is similar to materials that class in KB if they are from a Catholic, Jewish or Muslim perspective. This is an open question. If the Supreme Court can dodge hard questions, why can’t we?

Ten Commandments–Covetousness is a valid heading. False witness is a UF leading to 
False testimony (a legal way of referring to lying), which is related to 
Perjury (lying while taking an oath). Lying is a UF to Truthfulness and falsehood which classes in a non-sectarian portion of BJ as ethics, and frequently ends up as a heading in religious and other non-legal records, and does accept a subdivision for Religious aspects. Arguably there should be a reference from Truthfulness and falsehood–Law and legislation to False testimony and Perjury since the headings have the same substance albeit in different contexts. Books classified in K are about Perjury and False testimony, and books classified in B (and elsewhere) are about Truthfulness and falsehood, even if they are all about lying.

Ten Commandments–Covetousness and Avarice–Biblical teaching are the least controversial in terms of deciding whether to classify in B or K. There is simply no place in class K for such subjects. A keyword search of the LC database revealed none of those terms in works classed in K (at least in recent years), though a search for “greed” did pick up a few hits (primarily in books about the legal profession).

Summary
Almost all of the Ten Commandments can class in K, and most will usually class in K. Since they are also important to our colleagues in theology libraries, we should probably be sensitive to how they treat them. I would offer advice as to whether they are “law or religion,” but I wouldn’t want to be accused of upstaging the very important court (located across the street from the very large library where I work) and which couldn’t quite decide the matter.

Contributing Authors: Marlene Bubrick, Elizabeth Geesey Holmes, Yumin Jiang, Ellen McGrath, Andrea Rabbia, Patricia Turpening

Acquisitions/Collection Development

Collection Assessment Project
The author recounted the collection assessment project he conducted at the University of Michigan-Flint using the WLN Conspectus software. He offered his thoughts on accounting for electronic resources and adapting numerical formulas to local conditions and particular disciplines.

Cataloging
Bibliographic Enrichment Advisory Team
http://www.loc.gov/catdir/beat/

The Library of Congress (LC) Bibliographic Enrichment Advisory Team (BEAT) develops tools to aid catalogers, reference specialists, and searchers in creating and locating information. (LC Cataloging Newsletter)

Cataloging Directorate Strategic Plan
http://www.loc.gov/catdir/stratplan/goal4wg4report.pdf
LC Cataloging Directorate’s Strategic
Plan initiatives relating to recommended workflows for cataloging electronic resources. (LC Cataloging Newsline)

Wikis and WorldCat http://orweblog.oclc.org/archives/000676.html

Wikis and WorldCat, OCLC’s plan to pilot a mechanism to capture user input alongside bibliographic records. (Lorcan Dempsey’s Weblog)


“Rich browsing.” (Lorcan Dempsey’s Weblog)

Joint Steering Committee Meeting Outcomes http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/0504out.html

Outcomes of the meeting of the Joint Steering Committee held in Chicago, April 24-28, 2005. (AUTOCAT)

Prospectus for RDA http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rdaprospectus.html

Prospectus for RDA: Resource Description and Access (new name for AACR3). (TS-SIS)

RDA

Hicks, Emily. “What’s the buzz about AACR3? There’s a new name (RDA) and a new format.” 11(2) TechKNOW (June 2005), at http://www.library.kent.edu/users/mmaurer/techknow.html.

The Joint Steering Committee for the Revision of AACR is working on a new edition, with the working title of Resource Description and Access (RDA). The RDA will be a new content standard for resource description and access design for the digital age. It will be designed as an online product for use in a web environment. Some of the new special features include organization around FRBR, instructions for recording data presented independently of guidelines for data display to provide more flexibility for records used in a variety of online environments, more user-friendly layout and formatting, and instructions written in “plain” English. Publication is planned for 2008.

FRBR

http://repositories.cdlib.org/postprints/715/

“FRBRization: a Method for Turning Online Public Finding Lists into Online Public Catalogs,” by Martha M. Yee. (Catalogablog)

http://www.frbr.org/
The FRBR Blog. (AUTOCAT)


In May 2005, OCLC hosted an invitational workshop on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) and the various methods and techniques of implementing the concepts described in that report within library catalog systems. This web site offers PowerPoint slides from nearly all of the presenters at that workshop.

—Reprinted by permission from Current Cites, Volume 16, no. 6, June 2005

FRANAR


An invitation to worldwide review of Functional Requirements for Authority Records (FRAR or FRANAR). (ResourceShelf)

Metadata and Cataloging Online Resources

http://www.uwm.edu/~mll/resource.html

“Metadata and Cataloging Online Resources: Selected Reference Documents, Web Sites, and Articles,” compiled by Steven J. Miller. (Catalogablog)

Metadata in Library Catalogs


The author considers online library catalogs in light of recent technological advances in access to scholarly information. While originally created merely to provide online access to information previously provided in our card catalogs, this existing metadata can now be used to provide more in-depth information to researchers. To provide the best possible quality of metadata, technical services departments should be cultivating the best possible quality of catalogers. The author states that library directors should consider the advantages that can be gained by supporting local development of metadata.

MARC Content Designation Utilization

http://www.medu.unt.edu/?p=30

MARC Content Designation Utilization: Inquiry and Analysis is a two-year project that is investigating the extent of catalogers’ use of MARC 21. (D-Lib Magazine)

OCLC Terminologies Pilot

http://www.oclc.org/productworks/terminologiespilot.htm

Web site for the OCLC Terminologies Pilot. (OCLC-CAT)

ISBN Standard


New ISBN standard published. (ResourceShelf)

LexisNexis Taxonomy Program

http://www.lexisnexis.com/about/releases/0802.asp

LexisNexis launches taxonomy program. (Peter Scott’s Blog)

Library Classification Schemes

Shirky is not a librarian, but he has a lot to say about library classification schemes. And most of it isn’t complimentary. “One of the biggest problems with categorizing things in advance,” he states, “is that it forces the categorizers to take on two jobs that have historically been quite hard: mind reading, and fortune telling. It forces categorizers to guess what their users are thinking, and to make predictions about the future.” Catalogers in particular will want to come to this piece with as open a mind as they can muster, and wait...
on interjecting until reading through the entire piece. Shirky is well worth reading, because even if you don’t agree, simply thinking through his points carefully will likely make you think of more possibilities than you came to this piece with. And that alone is worth the price of admission.
—Reprinted by permission from Current Cites, Volume 16, no. 5, May 2005

Government Documents
Catalog of U.S. Government Publications
http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/locators/net/index.html
No new records have been added to the Catalog of U.S. Government Publications (the Monthly Catalog) since May 13, 2005. During the interim until GPO’s new catalog system becomes publicly available, the New Electronic Titles (NET) service is continued as monthly PDF files with links to the online titles. (Catalogablog)

Fugitive Documents Elude Preservationists
“Fugitive Documents Elude Preservationists” (NISO Newsline)

Government Document Brochures and Pamphlets
http://libweb.lib.buffalo.edu/cts/GovDocBP/
This digital collection contains selected general interest publications produced by the U.S. Federal Government and received by the State University of New York at Buffalo Libraries through the Federal Depository Library Program.

Information Technology
Libraries in the Age of Amazoogle
http://www.ocele.org/research/presentations/dempsey/manchester.ppt
“Libraries in the Age of Amazoogle: Flattened and Turned Inside Out,” a presentation by Lorcan Dempsey. Who can resist that title? (ResourceShelf)

LITA Blog
http://litablog.org/
The ALA Library & Information Technology Association (LITA) launched a blog. (ResourceShelf)

Top Technology Trends
http://litablog.org/?cat=6
The LITA blog also contains the archive for the “top technology trends” which merits regular checking, especially around the time of the ALA midwinter and annual conferences.

Special Libraries Association Annual Conference Blog
http://www.infotodayblog.com/
Check out the Special Libraries Association Annual Conference blog also. (ResourceShelf)

NSF Internet Research Agenda
http://www.fcw.com/article89386-06-27-05-Print
The National Science Foundation (NSF) is increasingly focusing on development of the next-generation Internet. (NISO Newsline)

CiteSeer
http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/announcements.html
CiteSeer is a scientific literature digital library and search engine that focuses primarily on the literature in computer and information science. (ResourceShelf)

D-Lib Magazine’s Tenth Anniversary
http://www.dlib.org/
Tenth anniversary of D-Lib Magazine and digital libraries celebrated in its July/August 2005 issue. (D-Lib Magazine)

Open Access, Open Source, and Open Standards
This is a good summary overview of three important concepts for libraries: open access to scholarly and research literature, software for which the source code is available for users to view and change, and standards that are developed and shared in a non-proprietary manner. Corrado argues that the confluence of these three “opens” provides synergistic benefits for libraries when used together. For those who want a gentle introduction to these “hot” topics, and find the religious fervor of some advocates off-putting, this is the piece to read.
—Reprinted by permission from Current Cites, Volume 16, no. 5, May 2005

Legal Guide for Bloggers
Electronic Frontier Foundation. Legal Guide for Bloggers. San Francisco: Electronic Frontier Foundation, 2005, at http://www.eff.org/bloggers/lg/. You’re a blogger, not a journalist or publisher, right? Guess what? You have the same legal obligations as the big guys, but without the specialized training and the troop of lawyers to back you up. Bonne chance! If you live in the US, you need the Electronic Frontier Foundation’s Legal Guide for Bloggers. Of course it “isn’t a substitute for, nor does it constitute, legal advice,” but are you really going to hire a lawyer to vet your blog? Bloglines recently announced that it indexes over 500 million blog entries. That’s a lot of billable hours. So, here’s what the EFF guide offers instead: “The Bloggers’ FAQ on Election Law,” “The Bloggers’ FAQ on Intellectual Property,” “The Bloggers’ FAQ on Labor Law,” “The Bloggers’ FAQ on Online Defamation Law,” “Overview of Legal Liability Issues,” “The Bloggers’ FAQ on Media Access,” “The Bloggers’ FAQ on Privacy,” “The Bloggers’ FAQ on the Reporter’s Privilege,” and “The Bloggers’ FAQ on Section 230 Protections.” Since it’s free, it’s way cheaper than getting a J.D., and it’s in plain English. Sure, it looks a bit overwhelming; however, as the EFF says: “But here’s the important part: None of this should stop you from blogging. Freedom of speech is the foundation of a functioning democracy, and Internet bullies shouldn’t use the law to stifle legitimate free expression.”
—Reprinted by permission from Current Cites, Volume 16, no. 6, June 2005

Blogging Tools
Blog we must, but how? And what’s a trackback, anyway? Try this handy analysis of major blogging software, complete with a blogging terminology guide. Not to be missed is the link to the detailed “Blog software comparison chart.” Before you know it you’ll be moblogging and using bookmarks.


TechKnow
[http://www.library.kent.edu/page/11226](http://www.library.kent.edu/page/11226)

TechKnow’s mirror site for interested non-OLC members (Ohio Library Council).

**Local Systems**

SirsiDynix Merger

Sirsi and Dynix announce merger. (Smart Libraries)

**PCC Standing Committee on Automation Task Group on Linking Entries**
[http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/archive/tglnkentr-rpt05.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/archive/tglnkentr-rpt05.pdf)

The PCC Standing Committee on Automation Task Group on Linking Entries examined the way that various integrated library systems (ILSs) handle the display of linking entry information and issued a report. (LC Cataloging Newsline)

**Electronic Resource Management Systems**


This is part two of Duranceau’s report on Electronic Resource Management (ERM) systems. Part I of her report, an overview on ERMs offered by the various integrated library system (ILS) vendors, was published in the September 2004 issue. The vendors covered in Part II include EBSCO, Harrassowitz, Proquest SerialsSolutions, Swets, and TDNet. ERM features compared include: ERM system availability, stand-alone or integrated, operating system/platform/interface, pricing model, customer base, architecture, degree of integration with print, data maintenance, and compliance with DLF (Digital Library Federation) guidelines. A good starting point for ERM comparisons.

**ISBN-13**


One of several articles on ISBN-13 from authors in various sectors of the publishing and library world featured in the April issue. Willan pointed out that libraries will still need 10-digit ISBNs, and listed key issues for library systems, including: display, printing, validation of data entry, indexing, searching, linking, record identification, and matching.

**Management**

LIBER 34th Annual Conference

Lorcan Dempsey’s observations generated by the LIBER 34th Annual Conference in Groningen. (Lorcan Dempsey’s Weblog)

32 Tips to Inspire Innovation for You
[http://www.imakenews.com/sirsi/e_article000423643.cfm?x=b5dRbWJ.b2rpmkgK](http://www.imakenews.com/sirsi/e_article000423643.cfm?x=b5dRbWJ.b2rpmkgK)

“32 Tips to Inspire Innovation for You and Your Library: Part 1” by Stephen Abram, Sirsi Corporation Vice President of innovation. (ResourceShelf)

**Preservation**

UK Web Archiving Consortium

The UK Web Archiving Consortium is a group of national bodies collaborating to selectively archive websites of interest, not the complete web. (Lorcan Dempsey’s Weblog)

**PREMIS Working Group**

PREMIS Working Group publishes *Data Dictionary for Preservation Metadata*. (ResourceShelf)

**Future Access to Digital Collections**

Future access to library, museum, and archive collections could be jeopardized by a failure to address digital preservation issues, warns a new report from the Museums, Libraries, and Archives Council (MLA) and the Digital Preservation Coalition (DPC). (NISO Newsline)

**PDF Archival Standard**


**Data Dictionary for Preservation Metadata**


This data dictionary is the culminating deliverable by a large, distinguished, and international group of individuals participating in the Preservation Metadata: Implementation Strategies (PREMIS) working group, sponsored by OCLC and RLG. As stated in the introduction, “The Data Dictionary defines and describes an implementable set of core preservation metadata with broad applicability to digital
preservation repositories.”
—Reprinted by permission from Current Cites, Volume 16, no. 1, January 2005

NARA and Storage of Digital Government Records
The National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) has a big problem. Because “(e)lectronic records rot much faster than paper ones,” NARA has got to quickly develop a way of saving the “tsunami” of contemporary digital government records. “It is confronting thousands of incompatible data formats cooked up by the computer industry over the past several decades, not to mention the limited lifespan of electronic storage media themselves.” The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and other core documents, “written on durable calfskin parchment,” live in sealed glass cases, immersed in protective argon gas. NARA has hired two contractors, Harris Corporation and Lockheed Martin, to come up with a similar durable means of storage for digital records. A secondary issue is that many electronic records are simply not being retained in the first place. Organizations in the private sector are, of course, facing similar crises, but the sheer size and scope of NARA’s situation is a problem of unimaginable complexity. And because the agency has no good system for absorbing more data, a staggering backlog of electronic records hangs in limbo at countless federal agencies. This article talks about research efforts and potential solutions to NARA’s situation.
—Reprinted by permission from Current Cites, Volume 16, no. 7, July 2005

Serials
OCLC pilot designed to increase use of libraries’ eSerials. (D-Lib Magazine)
NASIGuide http://www.nasig.org/publications/guides/license.htm
NASIGuide: License Negotiation 101. (ResourceShelf)
“VTLS recently increased its footing in the electronic resource management (ERM) product market with VERIFY, its new ERM system.” (Smart Libraries)
CONSER proposal for a provider-neutral record for online integrating resources. Not to be confused with aggregator-neutral record, this would apply to databases offered by multiple companies. (AUTOCAT)
Recommendations from the Publication History Record Task Force http://www.loc.gov/acq/conseronconop2005.html#12
Recommendations from the CONSER Publication History Record Task Force.

Technical Services Special Interest Section
Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award for Outstanding Contributions in Technical Services Law Librarianship
The Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award for Outstanding Contributions in Technical Services Law Librarianship is presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Law Libraries to an individual or group in recognition of achievement in an area of technical services, for services to the Association, or for outstanding contributions to the professional literature.

Factors considered in selecting the recipients of the Award include such things as the publishing, presenting, or sharing of innovative techniques or research, analysis or commentary; the development of software, hardware, or other mechanisms that significantly enhance access to collections; and the contribution of service to the Technical Services SIS as a whole. Achievements may be in the area of acquisitions, cataloging and classification, materials processing, preservation, automation, or technical services administration.

All members of AALL are invited to submit names for consideration by the TS SIS Awards Committee. Nominations should include the nominee’s full name and address. If the nominee is retired, submit the name, last place or work and the home address. Someone other than the nominee should sign the letter of nomination. The letter should accompany a list of projects, programs, or publications of the nominee and should describe the nominee’s work with respect to qualifications for the award.

For further information see the Chapman Award section of the Technical Services SIS handbook (http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/handbook/app-06chapman.htm) or contact the TS-SIS Awards Committee Chair, Pam Deemer at 404-727-0850 (libped@law.emory.edu). All materials in support of a nomination should be mailed to Pam Deemer, Emory University Law Library, 1301 Clifton Road, Atlanta, GA 30322-2780 by February 1, 2006.

Beginning with the September 2004 issue, Julie Stauffer replaced Linda Tesar, responsible for TSLL graphics and layout. Also, Brian Striman replaced Joe Thomas as editor.

Due to severe SIS budgetary restraints, TSLL was no longer issued in print after the December 2004 issue to the sections’ members. The June 2005 issue was the final print issue that was made and mailed to institutional subscribers. Also beginning with the December 2004 issue, minor changes have been made to column format, graphics and use of “space” to create a more compact publication look.

The TSLL Editorial Board will be investigating models for true web-based format, to enhance reading online; yet also retaining PDF-type format for those who will continue to print out the issues. A goal may be to accommodate both demands. It may be that PDF format is adequate for the near future, and that HTML is not practical or necessary. Concern remains outstanding for the lag time getting the issues converted to HTML.

The financial books have been closed, and the position of TSLL Business Manager has been eliminated with any final print serial claims deadline of December 1, 2005.

The TSLL Board approved revisions to the TSLL Structure and Policies, which is available on the TSLL website. The word Handbook was dropped from the Structure and Policies title.

Staff changes as reflected in the revised Structure and Policies include: the title “editor” became “editor-in-chief,” and added the new position of “associate editor.” Other staff title changes include “layout and production editor” title was assigned, and title changed from “webmaster” to “web manager” was made.

The word “newsletter” as a term long associated with TSLL, has been removed, since TSLL is far more than simply a newsletter, this change was approved by the Board.

The editor-in-chief promoted and recruited more guest articles and conference reports, and will continue this effort.

The TSLL indexing project will be completed, and is about 75% completed, Susan Goldner is investigating how the index will be published and by whom. She should know more in the fall of 2005.

The editor-in-chief is working on a TSLL Author’s Guide ( stylistic conventions), which will be made available on the TSLL website pending board approval.

The 12 primary columns were maintained. A new column “TechScans” began with the March 2005 issue with Corinne Jacox as principal columnist. The PLL column began again with the September 2004 issue after being inactive for several issues, being co-authored by Mary Rose and Donna Rosinski. The editor-in-chief has been working on finding a qualified columnist for the Serial Issues column which has been vacant since June 2002.

The editor-in-chief will continue working on a proposal for a possible new column “Cataloging Conundrums.”

The new Acquisitions columnist will be Kevin Butterfield with his first column in the September 2005 issue (replacing Janice Snyder Anderson); his final Internet column was the June 2005 issue. The Internet column will have Stephanie Schmitt as the new columnist beginning with the September 2005 issue.

The editor-in-chief will propose to the board a “book review” column, perhaps with the March 2006 issue.

The editorial staff will work on investigating and proposing possible changes increasing the interplay between the TSLL website and the TSLL publication. Use the website as the portal to the issues. Use the website to post ephemera-type information, minor announcements and TSLL “news” on the website pages and not in the issues themselves; any changes would be with approval of the editorial board.

The editor-in-chief will be investigating the possibility of having column “templates” that are filled in by the authors and then are sent directly to a TSLL URL issue “staging area” where content is checked by proof-readers and then is ready for “layout.” We are looking at possibly using a master TSLL issue template where the columns get plugged into the master template. Layout would simply alter whatever graphics and borders and increase or decrease the spacing alignments.

The editor-in-chief has begun tracking TSLL staff and columnists’ two-year term dates and reappointment approval dates for the TSLL board, as stated in the Structure and Policies.

TSLL will no longer provide email-direct addresses for columnists and TSLL staff beginning with the September 2005 issue. This will eliminate potential harvesting-bot activity to prevent spam intrusion for the regular contributors. Guest authors will be asked individually whether they want their email addresses appearing in their submissions by the editor-in-chief. Email addresses appearing directly in context with an article will remain.

From the Editor
Report of the AALL Representative to the American Library
Association, Association for Library Collections & Technical
Services, Cataloging and Classification Section’s Subject Analysis
Committee

Marie Whited
Law Library of Congress

Midwinter Meeting, Boston, January 2005
Annual Meeting, Chicago, June 2005

Subject Analysis Committee meets
Sunday morning and Monday afternoon
at both the midwinter and annual
meetings. The SAC meetings consist
mainly of reports from subcommittees
and liaisons. The Library of Congress
report is an important part of the
meetings. This past year, in addition
to general news from the Library of
Congress, the liaison, Lynn El-Hoshy,
reported on the following items of
interest in subject cataloging:

- Contributions in [specific
  field or discipline] under names
  of persons has been eliminated
- Views on [specific field or
discipline] can now just be used
  under the two personal name
subjects headings Jesus Christ
  and Lincoln, Abraham, 1809-
  1865
- 655 second indicator “0” for
  form/genre headings from LCSH
  has been implemented at LC

Please note that the above changes should
now be reflected in Subject Cataloging
Manual: Subject Headings.

- 28th edition of Library of
  Congress Subject Headings is
  now available.
- Subject headings for drug
  addiction and smoking have
  been revised to reflect current
terminology, i.e. Cigarette habit
  is now Smoking or Nicotine
  addiction. See weekly lists
  13 and 19, http://www.loc.gov/
  catdir/cpsd.
- 5 new editions of the printed
  classification schedules have been
  published including H

Other items reported of interest to law
catalogers include

- LC adding machine-generated
table of contents to records
- Cornell will be doing cataloging
  in publication for Cornell Press
titles
- Government-designated parks,
  forests, etc. will continue to be
  in the subject authority file but
  if they author a work, they will
  appear in the name authority file
  with the qualifier (Agency)
- Indian tribal names will be tagged
  151 (geographic name) and can
  be used as jurisdictions with the
  MARC indicator set to “1”, http://
  www.loc.gov/catdir/tribes.html.

Cataloging Policy and Support Office
has announced a new policy for
prioritizing queries:

1. Responses to queries on LC
cataloging policy and practices
2. Follow-up on suggestions
   for improvements to CPSO
documentation and training
3. Resolution of authority record
   problems and correction of
   corresponding headings in
   bibliographic records relating to
   current cataloging
4. Consolidation/deletion of
   duplicate name, series, or subject
   authority records
5. Errors in subject analysis (subject
   headings or classification)
6. Typographical errors and errors
   in content designation that do
   not affect access in either a
   bibliographic or authority record
7. Other

Please read the full report at http://www.
loc.gov/al as it has a lot of interesting
information.

SAC’s Task Force on Named Buildings
and Other Structures was established to
review the policies related to establishing
buildings and other structures in the
subject authority file. They were to
determine if it would be appropriate
to move headings for these structures
to the name authority file. The Task
Force concluded that it could not
make a recommendation on where
the authority records for structures
should be located. More information
is needed for structures not in the
Americas or Western Europe. They did
recommend that an art funnel for SACO
to work with the NACO art funnel in
determining where individual structure
proposals should go and for these two
groups to collect examples. They felt
that more examples should be published
to assist catalogers in formulating the
headings and that more training should
be provided for those contributing
structure headings. They recommended
the creation of an ARLIS (Art Libraries
Society of North America) Cataloging
Advisory Committee liaison to SAC.

The SAC IFLA’s Classification and
Indexing Section representatives
reported that IFLA has established
a working group to study extending
the FRBR model to subject authority
records. IFLA has three other working
groups dealing with multilingual
thesauri, subject access tools, and
minimal requirements for subject access
by national bibliographic services.

Subcommittee on LCC Training
Materials plans on presenting preview
section of the new classification training
workshop at ALA annual 2006 and
a pre-conference in 2007. They are
working on an outline and the course
will focus on general classification
with a special focus on schedules H, N
and P. It will also include practices for
special types of materials, i.e. serials,
bibliographies, works about other works,
etc.

The FAST (Faceted Application of
Subject Headings) Subcommittee
reviewed a sample of bibliographic
records where the LC subject headings were converted to FAST headings. These FAST headings were created and added to the records by algorithms. The headings reviewed indicated some problems in the conversion but not a great many. The Subcommittee advises the FAST program on the scope and suitability of FAST vocabulary, on the FAST use of authority format, on documentation and on other relevant topics. Information can be found at http://fast.oclc.org. The idea is to develop a vocabulary that can be used by personnel without extensive training.

SAC’s Subcommittee on Semantic Interoperability is close to finishing its charge and is working on editing their report. They have identified about 36 projects and are developing evaluation criteria for projects to use. There will be both a bibliography and a glossary with the final report. The goal is to create some documents to provide guidance to the creators of semantically interoperable vocabularies and systems. Renardus, http://www.renardus.org, is a good example of a successful semantic interoperability project and it provides integrated search and browse access to records across Europe. The final report should explain the work of this subcommittee in more detail and it should be available by January 2006.

Technical Services Special Interest Section 2004/2005 Business Meeting

July 17, 2005

The meeting was called to order at 5:35 P.M by TS-SIS chair Cindy May.

One item was added to the agenda—a report from Michael Maben regarding the 2004/2005 Education Committee.

A quorum was verified. Cindy May introduced this year’s AALL VIP, Dawn Smith.

Secretary/Treasurer Report: Chris Long reported the election results for 2004/2006 offices. Rhonda Lawrence was elected Vice Chair/Chair-Elect and Janice Anderson was elected Member-At-Large. 29% of the ballots were returned; Chris expressed hope that next year’s return will be higher since elections will be conducted online. The projected balance as of July 1, 2005 was $8071.04.

Member-At-Large Reports

Joint Reception: Jolande Goldberg reported that Innovative Interfaces contributed $5000 to this year’s reception. The reception came in under budget, and Jolande thanked the volunteers from the other SISes.

Activities Table: Brian Striman reported 2 quilts donated by Sue Burkhart will be raffled off at the TS-SIS activities table. There is a variety of materials from the Library of Congress (LC) on the table, as well as samples of TSLL. Also, a scarf donated by Katrina Piechnik was raffled off to newer tech services law librarians (those with 5 or fewer years of experience).

Standing Committee Reports

Acquisitions: Lorna Tang has taken over as chair of this committee, replacing Diane Altimari. Lorna reported that the Acquisitions Committee meeting will be held on Monday morning and invited members of TS-SIS to bring their acquisitions concerns and program ideas.

Cataloging and Classification Committee: Amy Lovell indicated that the MARBI, CC:DA, and SAC representative reports, as well as an update from LC, will be given during the Cataloging and Classification Committee meeting on Monday morning. The first New Catalogers Roundtable will be held this year. The Inherently Legal Subject Headings project will be discussed at the Cataloging and Classification Issues Roundtable on Tuesday afternoon.

Preservation: Pat Turpening reported that the preservation program was well-attended. Pat invited members to come to the Preservation Committee meeting on Monday morning, as well as the Preservation and Bindery Roundtable later that morning.

Serials: Frank Richardson reported that one serials program was offered this year, “EDI Made Simple.” Frank also indicated that a TSLL columnist for serials was needed. The Duplicate Exchange program increased in participation and revenue. Carol Avery Nicholson will be the new Serials Committee chair. Program proposals for next year will be considered at the Serials Committee meeting.

Ad Hoc Committee on Annual Meeting Programming: Jolande Goldberg began by thanking all of the volunteers from TS-SIS and the other SISes and AALL committees. She summarized the committee’s activity during the past year. The committee was given its original charge on Nov. 1, 2004. The main points of the charge were to examine the effectiveness of the AALL program proposal process in meeting the needs of SISes, and the current time constraints in scheduling SIS meetings and roundtables. In response, Tory Trotta published “Sacred Cows” in AALL Spectrum. It was recognized that a revision of the traditional method of program selection was needed. If implemented, the proposed changes would make AALL more SIS-driven and the number of “no conflict” times would be more limited. Although not all of the committee’s recommendations were accepted, the proposed changes seem very favorable.

Annual Membership Survey Report:
Karen Douglas stated that there were 123 responses to the survey, a higher total than in past years. The survey generated several program ideas. Over 90% of the respondents felt it was a good idea to schedule TS-SIS programs against AALL programs. A few people noted that they were unhappy with TSLL being an online only publication. Karen said she received a few good suggestions how to improve the survey in coming years and on how to get more volunteers. Committee chairs will receive a list of people who expressed interest in serving on their committee.

**Centennial Committee:** Janice Shull asked for ideas on how to celebrate the AALL centennial. The Centennial Committee has submitted a program proposal that will represent our history in a fun way, and it hopes to create a display and a timeline of important events in our section’s history. Janice asked members to look for items like pictures, mugs, lanyards, etc., that would be fun to remember. There will also be a Centennial Talent Show.

**Duplicate Exchange:** Bonnie Geldmacher reported that 43 libraries participated in the program this year, 2 more than normal.

**Education Committee:** Michael Maben, reporting for the 2004/2005 committee, said that the committee met last year in Boston and worked through August. Four programs and one preconference workshop were accepted by AALL. TS-SIS also sponsored a number of programs on its own. He reminded members that the Education Committee will meet on Tuesday to discuss ideas for next year’s program. Karen Douglas, reporting for the 2005/2006 committee, stated that some preliminary work had already been done based on program ideas from the annual survey. A priority will be to eliminate the 7:00 A.M. meetings. Next year, meetings will be allowed to be scheduled against programs. Input on program ideas has also been solicited from technical services librarians who work for law firms and state, court, and county agencies.

**Joint Research Grant Committee:** Cindy May read Eloise Vondruska’s report. The committee awarded a grant to Dragomir Cosanici and Chris Long to support their article on recent Indiana citation practices. No new grant applications have been awarded to date.

**Nominating Committee:** Chris Tarr reported that the winners of this year’s election were Rhonda Lawrence (Vice Chair/Chair-Elect) and Janice Anderson (Member-At-Large). She pointed out that this year was the first time candidate statements and biographies were posted on the TS-SIS Website.

**Online Discussion List:** Betty Roeske said that the recent problems with the list seem to have resolved themselves.

**Website:** Martin Wisneski reminded members that comments regarding the Website can be sent to him anytime. He said that the Website had undergone a number of improvements this year.

**Strategic Plan:** Cindy May advised members that the strategic plan was approved by the TS-SIS Executive Board at their meeting on Saturday, July 16.

**Bylaws Revisions:** Each of the proposed bylaws revisions were considered separately.

- Proposal #1: carried.
- Proposal #2: carried.
- Proposal #3: carried as amended.
- Proposal #4: tabled until next year.
- Proposal #5: carried as amended.
- Proposal #6: carried.

**TSLL:** Brian Striman indicated that TSLL’s annual report will be included in the September issue. Brian awarded Marie Whited with a certificate of appreciation for her years of service as the classification columnist.

**Awards Committee:** Janice Shull announced that the committee awarded four education grants, two for the Electronic Resources from Acquisitions to Access workshop and two for the Effective Subject Cataloging workshop. The winners were Marlene Bubrick (Loyola Law School, Los Angeles), Shan Jiang (Northwestern University School of Law), Cathy Rentschler (Stetson University College of Law), and Linda Sobey (Florida A & M University College of Law).

Janice then presented the Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award to a technical services librarian who has long been recognized as one of the main voices of law cataloging, Ann Sitkin. Marie Whited made a few brief remarks detailing Ann’s involvement within AALL, and her many contributions to various organizations as a representative for law catalogers. Ann thanked Marie for nominating her, and also thanked Lee Leighton, Diane Hillman, Regina Wallen, Marie Whited, and Helen Schmierer.

**LC Report:** Jolande Goldberg told members that this report would be given at the Cataloging and Classification Committee meeting.

**Vice Chair/Chair-Elect Report:** Karen Douglas thanked Cindy May for all of her hard work as TS-SIS Chair and presented her with a gift of appreciation. Karen announced the new committee chairs for 2005/2006: Karen Nuckolls (Cataloging and Classification), Lorna Tang (Acquisitions, completing Diane Altimari’s term), Carol Avery Nicholson (Serials), and Caitlin Robinson (Joint Research Grant Committee).

Meeting adjourned at 6:44 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Chris Long
Secretary/Treasurer
Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section
2004/2005 Business Meeting

July 18, 2005

The meeting was called to order at 5:18pm by Georgia Briscoe.

Secretary/Treasurer Report—Michael Maben

Michael Maben reported that the minutes from the business meeting in Boston were published in the *Technical Services Law Librarian*, vol. 30, no. 1, September 2004. Michael asked if there were any additions or corrections. None were suggested and Michael made a motion to approve the minutes. It was seconded and approved by a voice vote.

The election results were reported to the membership. Michael sent out 326 ballots and 130 were returned before the deadline. Susan Goldner was elected Vice chair/Chair-elect, Kathy Faust was elected Secretary/Treasurer, and Stephanie Schmitt was elected Member-at-Large. Michael then made a motion to destroy the ballots. The motion was seconded and approved.

Michael then thanked the Nomination Committee for their work. The members were Ruth Funabiki, Judith Vaughan-Sterling, and Mary Jane Kelsey, chair.

Michael then gave the financial report for the SIS. Michael reported that as of May 31, 2005, OBS showed a negative balance of $1586.39. With TSLL being published electronically and assuming the bylaws revisions pass eliminating the need for paper elections, we should be in better financial condition next year. Our dues income should be credited this quarter and we will have some expenses from the annual meeting. Michael thought that we should be close to even for the rest of this year and then we should begin to rebuild our funds after that.

Reports of Committees and Representatives

CONELL Marketplace—Georgia Briscoe

Georgia reported she talked up OBS to the CONELL attendees.

OBS Table in Activities Area—Andrea Rabbia

Andrea reported that the table was all set up and available with the giveaways and raffle.

TS/OBS/CS/RIPS Reception—Caitlin Robinson

Caitlin reported that we came in under budget. There was a large turnout and we ran out of food. Innovative again sponsored this event and was happy with the results.

OBS Strategic Plan Committee—Kevin Butterfield

Kevin reported that the survey of the membership has been distributed and the responses are positive so far. The results will be compiled and reported in early autumn.

Education—Richard Jost

Georgia started by reminding the membership of the OBS programs still to be presented in San Antonio. Richard then reported that the committee met that morning. There was a workshop proposal on cataloging serials by Keiko Okuhara. Kathy Fletcher proposed a program on Google search replicas that incorporates a number of issues that Roy Tennant raised in his talks. Karen Selden suggested programs on voice recognition software, and Library of Congress bibliographic enrichment program. Mary Jane Kelsey had a suggestion on RSS feeds and the integration of outside resources in the catalog. Richard said that the deadline with AALL is August 15th and we have the non-AMPC option like what Technical Services SIS used this year. Anne Myers commented on the process and expenses with non-AMPC programs, but it also gives the SIS a lot more flexibility with programming.

Local Systems—Corinne Jacox

Corinne reported on 2 items. The committee webpage now has links to vendors with law libraries listed. Also Ellen McGrath and Corinne are working on a revision of the systems and vendors list. The committee will meet tomorrow during lunch.

Research Roundtable—Chris Long

The roundtable will meet tomorrow during lunch.

OCLC Committee—Michael Maben

Michael reported on the OCLC Committee meeting held on Sunday. The guest from OCLC was Bob Van Volkenberg. He discussed Connexion and the issues that OCLC sees coming after that. There were 23 people there and there was a lot of discussion. Michael reported that Pam Deemer will be the new chair of the OCLC Committee.

RLIN Committee—Virginia Bryant

Virginia reported that the March 1st rollout of the new interface has been fraught with problems. No representative from RLIN was able to come to the meeting. All comments on the new interface will be forwarded to RLIN.

Web Advisory Committee—Shannon Burchard was unable to attend the meeting this year, but it was pointed out she had done an excellent job with the website.

Website of the Month—Karen Selden

This has been a regular feature on the OBS listserv and we have received some additional publicity from Margie Axtmann’s column in TSLL. Karen encouraged others to send in additional examples.

Joint Research Grant—

The report has been submitted on last year’s grant. No new grant applications were received this year. Chris Long thanked OBS for the grant and how
it helped with the publication of the article.

Technical Services Law Librarian—Brian Striman
Brian stated that the full report for the year will be in TSLL. Mary Strouse and Shannon Burchard have been the OBS representatives to the TSLL board. Brian thanked everyone who helped out with the publication this year. The URLs are all hot-linked now. The PDF version is fast and easy to produce, but the HTML version is more problematic. Hollie C. White is taking Shannon’s place on the TSLL board, and Joe Thomas is stepping down from the board. Brian is working on a stylistic/author’s guide, and he wants to revise the TSLL questions on the OBS and TS surveys for more and better information. There will be reports for all TS/OBS events in San Antonio. Brian also wants to get away from a “newsletter” publication look and feel, since we do not have the page restrictions that we had when TSLL was a print publication. Brian reported that he presented a certificate of appreciation to Marie Whited at the TS business meeting for her contributions over the years to TSLL. The entire run of TSLL is now in electronic PDF thanks to Galen Fletcher and BYU and the indexing project is well underway as well. Finally Brian reported that the business manager position has been eliminated and/or morphed into an associate editor position to provide backup to the editor. At the conclusion of his report, Brian received a standing ovation as thanks for all his work as editor of TSLL.

AALL Centennial Committee—Caitlin Robinson
We are starting to talk about it, first among the board and then out to the list. Caitlin has been receiving some ideas. The TSLL index could be offered for sale.

AALL Centennial Variety Show—Sally Wambold
Sally discussed some skit production ideas with dramatic readers, etc. Sally wants to have a rough outline by September 2nd.

New Business
Bylaws Revision—Richard Jost
Richard discussed the bylaws revisions that were distributed earlier this spring that would allow electronic voting and make additional changes. The Nomination Committee wanted to eliminate the requirement to have two candidates for every position. It was also proposed to change the bylaws amendment vote requirement from 2/3rd majority to a simple majority. The last proposed amendment was to remove all unnecessary dates from the bylaws. The proposed changes were then discussed extensively by the members. Some people felt that having dates in the bylaws was preferred in order to have deadlines clearly stated. Changes were proposed but Richard pointed out that the AALL Bylaws Committee must approve any changes to SIS bylaws. Richard stated that AALL had approved these changes and it was most important to get the electronic voting approved. Richard’s suggestion was that we vote on these bylaws as proposed and then if we feel having dates are still important, we should look at it this year and have another bylaws revision ready for next year in St. Louis. Richard then made a motion to approve these bylaws changes as approved by the AALL Bylaws Committee. Anne Myers seconded the motion. Georgia called for a vote and the motion was approved.

Installation of Incoming Board Members—Georgia Briscoe
Georgia introduced the new board members present and then she passed the OBS hat to Richard. Richard then presented a thank-you gift to Georgia.

Incoming Chair’s Agenda for 2005/2006—Richard Jost
Richard stated that he wants to seek more vendor support to build up our reserve funds. He also wants OBS to be more of an advocate with online vendors.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:20pm.

Respectfully submitted
Michael Maben
Secretary/Treasurer

Conference Report

GPO’s Strategic Plan for the 21st Century & New Partnerships with Law Libraries—A Town Meeting with Public Printer Bruce James and Superintendent of Documents Judy Russell

The introduction of GPO’s new strategic plan has resulted in much discussion in the library community about the usability of government documents in electronic form and the future of the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP). The new GPO strategies have raised specific issues for law libraries that include authenticity of primary sources, preservation of documents, and impact on core collections. In February of 2005, the AALL Executive Board endorsed a resolution urging GPO to establish a reliable means of producing and controlling government information. The resolution also encouraged the GPO to solicit advice from and enter into new partnerships with the law library community.

In order to provide a forum for discussion, a town meeting was held at the AALL Annual Meeting on July 18, 2005. Public Printer Bruce James and Superintendent of Documents Judy Russell were present to answer questions and engage in discussion with AALL members. The goals of the session were to allow participants to “evaluate GPO roles and responsibilities.
in the 21st century for the virtual FDLP and the GPO Access System in light of its mission of informing the nation.” Participants also learned how to “be able to measure GPO’s effectiveness in meeting the needs of the public in the digital environment by ensuring the life cycle of electronic government information.”

Bruce James recapitulated his past two years as Public Printer and outlined the trends he sees as significant issues for GPO. He stressed that all information produced by the federal government is the property of the people. The GPO’s goal is to keep an informed citizenry. He stated, “I am charged with preserving government publications and seeing that they are disseminated and available to the people.” After two years of visiting people around the country and working within GPO, a strategic vision has been created. His goal is to reorganize GPO to adapt to emerging technology. This reorganization includes producing more digital documents and moving the printing process into the private sector. The concept of “uncoupling data from the delivery system” is also integral to the reorganization process.

GPO has 25 million dollars approved for the creation of a digital system. This system will “achieve the ability to take government information into a database and repurpose the data for the future.” James pointed out that 50% of government documents are born digitally, and the trend will continue. James also pointed out that the role of depository libraries will remain important because of the expertise of their librarians, with their legacy of in-depth knowledge of government information. James outlined the strategies for moving forward in the next 2-3 years as having two major goals. The first is to increase investments into GPO’s computer system and develop necessary technical ability to move forward. The second is to build a business plan that will include participation from the private sector, develop priorities for what should be kept in print, and create a dark archive as a back up for digital data. James emphasized that the issue is how library “clients & users” use the information. He stressed the importance of dialog, and indicated that decisions are not irreversible. “If the current strategy doesn’t work, we can back up and start again,” he said.

Bruce James’s comments raised several major issues from audience members. These included:

- Authentication of data, including a potential to lose print before authentication is in place, how far ahead to look when considering what to keep in print, and the definition of what is a publication. Also of concern was how GPO will preserve all the documents currently being produced in electronic form while they are working on this new authentication system.
- Impact of privatization of GPO functions, including access to documents in the public domain and access to electronic information that might ultimately become cost-based because of participation by private companies that are looking to make a profit.
- Future of FDLP

James acknowledged that the largest challenge would be what to keep in print vs. what to not keep in print. He proposed that it is the library community that needs to reach a consensus on which resources need to stay in print. He pointed out that he sees a trend in which the library community is asking GPO to get rid of paper due to rising shipping costs and the growing economic issues related to producing print. He also indicated a need to be careful how far ahead we project our need for print sources since we don’t yet know what future technology will bring. He contended that we should be projecting print needs only for the next generation and that we need to be careful of projecting farther into the future. He pointed out that he believes that print-on-demand will be possible from an authenticated database. James also outlined the specific roles of GPO and the National Archives. He maintained that it is the job of GPO to deal with “published” material only. “Unpublished” material falls under the mission of the National Archives. He indicated that GPO, LC, and the National Archives are all working together in a way that is better than ever before.

James’s response to concerns regarding privatization was that we all need to remain vigilant to make sure this does not happen. He stated that only print products would be privatized. He maintained that documents created that were appropriate to be put into federal depositories would be distributed for free. He said he does not expect to charge for any document in the public domain.

In commenting on the future of the FDLP, James indicated that the thing that will define depository libraries in the future would be expertise rather than collections. Judy Russell also indicated that there would be a new program that will provide incentives, training, and support to keep libraries as members of the FDLP.

In closing Bruce James acknowledged that he understood that government documents are widely used by ordinary Americans. He reiterated that the investments and strategies being put into place now are for the future. He proposed that it is “our” job to “get out there and do something” because the world is changing faster than we can imagine. He pointed out that ten years ago we could not have imagined what things are like today, and that today we cannot imagine what things will be like ten years from now.
Conference Report

TS-SIS Acquisitions Committee Meeting


The meeting began at approximately 7:10 a.m. Introductions were made all around, and each attendee summarized the highlights of the previous fiscal year in their library. The main activities mentioned were: 1) being required to reduce the size of the physical collection; 2) deciding which subscriptions to cancel due to budget cuts and/or online availability; and 3) reorganizing the collection in some way (i.e. sending items to storage).

The first topic of discussion was the integration of several Aspen and CCH titles. Aspen and CCH are now part of this new Wolters Kluwer Tax, Accounting & Legal Division. How this will affect invoicing and customer service is yet to be seen. Chairperson Lorna Tang has more details on this development, and will send a report to CRIV to be included in an upcoming CRIV sheet.

There was a general discussion of common problems with continuation titles affected by the CCH/Aspen merger; it took a while to determine which company picked up which titles, and from whom to claim missing supplements.

Next, one library had a problem regarding a Kluwer title that they suddenly began receiving from Hein. They have not been successful in clearing up problems with this title, and several attendees recommended they deal directly with Dick Spinelli.

A problem with Hein monograph orders was mentioned. Carmen Brigandi, now serving on CRIV, gave a brief description of the Hein site visit recently completed. The customer service department recently lost over 85 years of combined experience because of retirements. Loretta was able to return part-time to help train the new people, but some of the slow response is due to this learning curve. Hein is in the middle of updating their website, which some agreed is not currently user friendly. Hopefully the updated site will enable more flexible searching of titles. The full site visit report will be included in the November 2005 CRIV sheet.

Another Hein development is the delivery of the green slips electronically. The benefits of this are yet to be seen.

Carmen described the size of Heins’s staff, which is comparatively small. There are maybe 75 to 100 employees to handle a bombardment of law library business.

The pricing of Hein Online will be restructured due to the many additional components now available. It might be based on a price per online library component, rather than a lump sum.

It was asked if Hein was planning to do more government document printing. Carmen said that Hein will print a document on demand if they get at least 10 orders for the title, or if the document is already scanned and in their system, they will print on an as requested basis.

Next proposed program ideas for St. Louis 2006 were discussed. Lisa Arm suggested a program on print materials—what to keep, what to store, what to discard. With “everything being available online” what do you get rid of? How do you make these decisions? Is it a container or content question? Will electronic products become unaffordable? If something is to be discarded, whom do you offer it to before actually throwing it away? Do faculty want the discarded items?

What about the idea of a central repository or several regional depositories for print storage? Some questions this idea led to are: Who owns the material? What if the depositing library wanted the item(s) back? Who would fund such a project? Is this a realistic solution?

After discussion, it was decided that the final program idea would be on the current state of law library repositories. Lisa Arm and Julie Stauffer will work together to develop a program.

Ayjay Bloomstone recommended a program that she attended at the ALA meeting, “How to assess your vendor’s viability,” with a banker as one of the speakers. Before you spend a large (or any) amount of money with a particular vendor, what are the questions to ask and the information to obtain to determine whether they will still be around in a few years? What are the red flags to look for to warn you away? Ayjay has her notes from the ALA session to provide more information.

This was determined to be an excellent suggestion for a program, and Ayjay will work with Barb Henigman to develop this idea.

It was asked if the Technical Services SIS was making use of the new procedure for submitting programs for the upcoming conference. Karen Douglas explained that sponsoring our own programs would broaden the scope of programs we could offer, but if TS-SIS sponsors, TS-SIS pays for all expenses, including equipment, speakers and travel.

It is also often a problem to bring your own equipment into a convention center, so using our own equipment is not a possibility for saving money. However, we could make a guest speaker into an SIS VIP, so that AALL would pay their registration. If it were
someone local, there would be no travel expense. There are ways of getting around expenses. Ayjay and Barbara will explore this further.

Other suggestions for programs were ISBN-13 and its impact and technology trends in acquisitions departments, neither of which was greeted enthusiastically.

The subject of EDI came up in relation to West and Lexis. How can we encourage them to provide this capability?

Lisa Arm mentioned that West has been conducting focus groups with several acquisitions librarians, and the feedback they received (at least in the session she was involved in) included adding institutional purchase order numbers in their invoices, avoiding cancellation of a standing order title when returning duplicates, and avoiding sending editions of titles other than those actually ordered.

At the Heads of Technical Services Roundtable, a major discussion involved whether the acquisitions “person” in the library should be a professional. Some departments are doing away with the “Head of Technical Services” position, and having a Head of Acquisitions and a Head of Cataloging run the department. There was more discussion of reorganization of technical services departments, how workflows are changing, and how procedures must change in accordance. There is a proposed program on this topic for next year.

Libraries must keep themselves visible, and as Roy Tennant mentioned, they need to get away from just moving books around, and figure out a way to make their knowledge of accessing materials a public service.

Finally there was a reminder that the Law-Acq listserv will be moving to the University of Indiana, and that current subscribers will be automatically moved to the new list.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

---

**Conference Report**

**Visionary Collection Development: Strategies for Building Legal Collections on Emerging Social Issues**

This program was sponsored by the Social Responsibilities Special Interest Section, and was very well attended. There were only a few empty seats at the very front left available. The moderator was Courtney Selby and the coordinator was Larry Reeves. There were three panelists: Roy Mersky, Tarlton Law Library; Amy Atchison, UCLA Law Library; and Brian Keough, State University of New York at Albany.

Roy Mersky spoke about the special collections held at the Tarlton Law Library. These special collections include but are not limited to: the papers of U.S. Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark, the digital collection of the Texas Constitutions and Constitutional Conventions, the works of John Selden and the Selden Society, the Supreme Court photographs collection, and the law dictionary collection. But he mainly wanted to discuss a single collection in particular, the Law in Popular Culture Collection. This collection consists of some 4,000-plus print materials, artwork, over 700 AV materials, as well as online resources such as a bibliography, a collection of quotations, and a resource list. You can find out more information about Texas’ numerous special collections at [http://tarlton.law.utexas.edu/collections/](http://tarlton.law.utexas.edu/collections/).

Amy Atchison is a reference librarian with the UCLA Law Library. She is the librarian charged with the care and keeping of the Williams Project Reading Room and Collection on Sexual Orientation Law and Public Policy. An initial donation of 2.5 million dollars was made to create the Williams Project think tank devoted to LGBT issues. The think tank began as an idea in 2001, and the special collection arose from this in 2002-03. After much negotiation and hard work the collection became a reality in February 2003 with an initial donation of 1 million dollars (from Mr. Williams and an anonymous donor). More information about the collection and the Project can be found at [http://www.law.ucla.edu/williamsproj/home.html](http://www.law.ucla.edu/williamsproj/home.html).

Brian Keough is the archivist for the M.E. Grenander Department of Special Collections & Archives at the State University of New York at Albany, which collaborated with the Capital Punishment Research Initiative (CPRI) to create the National Death Penalty Archives. The archives were created to gather and preserve the historical documents of individuals and organizations having to do with capital punishment. Some of the collections included in the archive are: the papers of Hugo Adam Bedau, the papers from the Capital Jury Project, and the papers of Ernest Van den Haag. The collection makes every attempt to be impartial and collects materials that are pro-death penalty as well as anti-death penalty. Due to the fact that the death penalty is currently legal in the United States, most of the materials that are available to be collected tend to be on the anti-death penalty side. If the situation were to change and the death penalty were no longer US policy, then the situation might change and more organization would emerge and become more vocal in support of capital punishment. Please visit their website or further information at [http://library.albany.edu/specoll/ndpa.htm](http://library.albany.edu/specoll/ndpa.htm).

All three speakers were enthusiastic, well-spoken, and eloquent as they discussed the contents and the creation of their collections. It was a very interesting program and well worth attending.
Conference Report

The Preservation and Binding Roundtable

Monday, July 18, 2005, San Antonio Annual Meeting

Those who attended the Preservation and Binding Roundtable were fortunate to hear Ellen Cunningham-Kruppa describe the history, programs and goals of the Kilgarlin Center for the Preservation of the Cultural Record, at the University of Texas at Austin

The Kilgarlin Center is a direct descendent of the Conservation Education Program founded by Paul N. Banks at Columbia University in 1981. Ellen graduated from that program in 1988 and became head of Preservation at the University of Texas. When Columbia closed their School of Library Service in 1991, the School of Information at the University of Texas was chosen to continue the program. It operated under the name Preservation and Conservation Studies. Carolyn Harris served as director from 1992-1994, followed by Karen Motylewski and Dr. David Gracy. In September 2004 the program was renamed to acknowledge receipt of a one million dollar endowment from William and Mary Kilgarlin, and Ms. Cunningham-Kruppa was appointed director.

The Kilgarlin Center’s mission is to advance preservation of the cultural record through education, research and outreach. Students enrolled in the program receive a Master of Science in Information Studies with a Certificate of Advanced Study in either Conservation or Preservation Management. This is the only program in the United States that offers a course in preservation of audio resources as opposed to audio-visual materials.

The Conservation program currently enrolls 13 students with 8 new students entering in the fall. Chemistry is a prerequisite for this program, which requires 58 credit hours, including 3 book labs, 2 paper labs, 2 conservation science classes, a five week field experience, and a nine-month internship. The Preservation Administration program has 10 continuing and 10 new students. This program requires 52 credit hours and includes coursework in preservation management, electronic and digital records, audio preservation and a five week field experience. Contact Ellen if your library would be interested in hosting a field work student.

The Center’s facilities include a Book Lab, complete with industrial period cast iron equipment and with bench space for 10 people, a Paper Lab, with very large sinks, and oversized tables on wheels that can be rearranged to support enormous maps. Students in the Paper Lab learn to analyze inks and papers through microscopy work and to wash paper. Students learn by working on real materials from the University of Texas collections, including materials from the Tarlton Law Library’s Rare Book collection.

The Dirty Room is a large lab similar to a woodshop. Here students learn to use drills, hammers and saws to make their own knives and bosses, and to work on leather and old wooden cover boards. Lab students also learn to document the condition of materials before and after treatment using digital photography and written treatment reports. Students compile online portfolios of their work, and learn to ingest documents into the Center’s electronic Dspace.

Students range in age from 22-40 and represent a number of countries, including Trinidad. 172 students have graduated from the program since it was founded at Columbia. Graduates work in academic libraries (Yale, Harvard, LC, UC Berkeley), at regional preservation organizations, or as independent consultants. Students with an interest in audio preservation have found positions in the film and video industries as well as the Library of Congress’s new Culpepper Sound Archives facility.

The Center has developed a new doctoral program to address the lack of PhD-holding faculty in the area of preservation, and to encourage preservation research. They have just received a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) to recruit three PhD candidates, one each in the areas of preservation policy, preservation administration and digital preservation. The grant will provide each student a cash stipend and tuition for the first two years of their studies.

The Center’s research agenda targets five areas: management of the documentary heritage, digital archiving, conservation treatment, preservation of the record of cultural communities (such as Native American and blogging communities), and recorded sound preservation.

Recent research includes developing less toxic ways to preserve acetate negatives, surveying ARL preservation librarians about their training and background, production of a webpage and digital video detailing a conservation treatment, http://www.ischool.utexas.edu/%7El381ss02/, and working with the University of Texas Digimorph Project to study the use of high resolution x-ray computed tomography in book conservation, www.digimorph.org/index.phtml. This last project allowed researchers to study the binding and construction of a 16th century volume without disbinding the book. They also co-sponsored with the Library of Congress, ARL and NARAS a conference on preserving sound recordings, http://www.arl.org/preserv/sound_savings_proceedings/.

Consult the Kilgarlin Center’s website for more information about applying to one of their programs or to learn more about their research initiatives: http://www.ischool.utexas.edu/kilgarlin/index.php.

Being a Washington law librarian, I try to attend conference sessions on or about the Law Library of Congress. Each time I attend, I am amazed by the depth and breadth of the programs in which the Library is actively engaged.

Dr. Rubens Medina (Law Librarian, Law Library of Congress) opened his remarks by speaking at some length about the mission of the library. It was almost exclusively to provide high quality, timely, and innovative research, analysis, and reference services to the United States government. Recently, on the recommendations of the ABA and AALL, this scope has expanded to include provision of similar services to the legal profession, academic community, and the general public, based on the strength of its collection and its status as the de-facto national law library.

Dr. Medina focused his early remarks on the ever-expanding globalization of the law. Most, if not all, issues that are researched by Law Library of Congress staff are increasingly complex, and more often than not have global or international implications. For example, in trade, communications, the environment, security, public health, and even labor, all have international aspects.

Dr. Medina spoke about the challenges that face all law libraries: the increasing amount of information in all formats, the expectation of our clients to provide more and more resources electronically, and to convince our funding sources to support the library’s activities that provide the services to our clients. He reminded all of us that technology does not save money and we must try to dispel this myth for our funding sources. He did not think that the challenges were insurmountable. Our profession can no longer serve simply as information brokers but must become information managers. We must also continue to encourage and expand cooperation among institutions to enable each of us to serve the information demands of our clients.

Blake Tart continued the presentation by reporting as a member of the American Bar Association (ABA) Standing Committee on the Law Library of Congress. Mr. Tart has been a practicing attorney for over 40 years, and opened his remarks with a story: If the law librarian at his law school had not been so helpful and knowledgeable, he would be working at a local Exxon filling station. This of course was well received by the attendees. Mr. Tart then proceeded to talk about the long-standing partnership between the Law Library of Congress and the ABA, reminding us that the ABA Standing Committee on the Law Library of Congress is their second longest standing committee. The ABA is supporting the goal of making the Law Library of Congress truly the national law library. The ABA’s vision is that the Law Library of Congress will serve as an extension of the nation’s law libraries, connecting them via the Internet while at the same time continuing its core mission of being the leading source of legal research for the US Congress.

The next presenter, Donna Scheeder (Director, Law Library Services, Law Library of Congress), focused on two overriding themes: patrons viewing the library more as a “service” and less as a “place,” and the continuing theme of the law as much more of an international discipline. She echoed Mr. Medina’s message that the law is not as easy as it once was, and is global and interdisciplinary in most cases. One constant endeavor is exploring new ways and new resources to digitize. The latest venture is building a new web archive of the discussions concerning Supreme Court nominees, based on a model from the 2000 and 2004 elections.

The next presenter, Dr. Walter Gary Sharp (Director of Legal Research, Law Library of Congress) discussed essentially the reference department of the library. Usually this is of less interest to those of us in the technical services areas of libraries but, despite my natural prejudice, I did find his comments of interest. Like many of the presenters, he spoke about the Law Library in relationship to how it can serve our profession. In particular, he noted that the Law Library could assist in finding, accessing, and understanding foreign law, using the expertise of the law specialists on staff. One other interesting activity that the Library is exploring is how it can make the information it prepares for Congress more widely available. This would include better access to Congressional Research Service reports, which have been traditionally available exclusively for Congressional usage and not publicly distributed.

Dr. Janice Hyde (Program Officer, Law Library of Congress) was the last presenter. She introduced the newly redesigned Global Legal Information Network (GLN) interface. It has a contemporary look, which is easier to navigate, with many more search options and search languages available. She encourages librarians to use the site and to provide suggestions on improving it. The site has also been expanded to include four distinct modules: statutes, judicial decisions, legislative records, and legal literature. Dr. Hyde invited librarians not only to use GLN but also to be part of a cooperative effort with the Law Library of Congress to build the system’s content. Specific contributing ideas include publishing legal articles, adopting a country of interest and providing metadata for that particular country, or adding a specific category of United States law and again providing the metadata. The benefits are not only the added content, but as a fully contributing member you and your institution would have access to restricted data in the system.
Conference Report

The ABCs of TOCs: Enhancing Your OPAC with Tables of Contents

There were three presenters for this program: Mary Strouse, Catholic University of America Dufour Law Library; Karen Selden, University of Colorado Law Library; and John Bissett, Washington & Lee Law Library.

The focus of their presentations were about how they are using TOCs (Table of Contents) in their institutions.

John Bissett gave a brief introduction and discussed a survey conducted on the TS-SIS and OBS-SIS electronic lists, about the different priorities libraries have regarding their TOC data. He listed the top five priorities: collections (with multiple authors), conference proceedings, multi-volume works (with individual authors), single author monographs, and collections/selected works (with a single author). He then turned the presentation over to the others.

Mary Strouse spoke about her library’s choice of using vendor-provided TOC data loaded into the 97x field of the MARC record format. Her institution uses an Innovative ILS and Blackwell Book Services (http://www.blackwell.com) TOC information. Other vendors such as Syndetic Solutions, Inc. (http://www.syndetics.com) and Marcive, Inc. (http://www.marcive.com) also provide TOC data in the 97x format.

The Dufour Law Library has decided that its priorities for including TOC data would focus on: edited collections with broad theme, items containing diverse geographical treatments, conference symposia or anthologies, and items of local interest (faculty publications, etc.).

There are some beneficial features of the 97X TOC format. This includes the displaying of the information in an easy to read format, (see http://columbo.law.cua.edu/record=b1020410), the inclusion of page numbers from tables of contents, and indexing flexibility.

However, there are some workflow and user issues with this method. The workflow issues include the limits of the vendor-dependent format (not controlled by the library), the burden on the staff, the co-mingling of vendor and library data and false positives from multiple ISBNs. Some front-end user issues include: the screen space needed for display causes added printing costs, multiple forms of author entry (creating possible split files), search results that do not distinguish between chapter and book length treatments causing a lot of confusion when patrons think they are retrieving books in their search results rather than chapter information. Finally, the restriction of users to the data, or how the data can be used due to licensing agreement contractual obligations.

Ms. Strouse had a wish list for improving the 97X format. She would like to see additional subfields to handle the indexed/authorized form of corporate authors, to indicate data source and ownership, as well as for authority control history. She would also like to see better coding conventions, more transparency, indicators for book or chapter in the record browse screens of online catalogs, and the ability to export data for legitimate fair use purposes.

Karen Selden took over and talked about the University of Colorado Law Library’s use of manually created enhanced 505s in their MARC records. She discussed the issues that she sees when dealing with 505 fields. These issues fall into three categories: indexing and authority control, format and display, and workflow and policy considerations.

The workflow and policy considerations also fall into three general categories: what materials get TOCs, staffing, and sources of data. When deciding what materials will get TOCs, you need to decide what information is most useful and important to your patrons. The University of Colorado Law Library also made the decision to include faculty publications as well as local CLE materials. Staffing is a major issue when contemplating the use of 505 content notes. Do you have the time and labor resources necessary for the task? Who will do the work (clerks, volunteers, etc.)? Some libraries have implemented the use of voice recognition software to alleviate any possible physical strain. As for sources of data, you have a surprising number of options. You can manually input all of the information. You can use the Library of Congress’ BEAT program. Some people find other sources and use the copy and paste option. And still others are scanning TOC information.

John Bissett returned to discuss how the process of scanning TOCs into the enhanced 505 field works at the Washington & Lee Law Library. He used the numbers from Blackwell as an example. In 2004 Blackwell enhanced 300-400 law titles in W&L’s catalog with TOC, while Washington & Lee added over 600 of their own TOC notes. When checking the database he has only been able to find about 16 records input by W&L that have been overlaid by Blackwell records. Some of the bigger issues W&L faced were: time constraints, what to include and what not to include, wasted time if records are eventually replaced by contract source records, the formatting problem of enhanced 505 notes resulting in extra confusion and false positives (e.g., user difficulty to distinguish display results of chapter and parts within a book). There were also the issues of the delimiter “g” question, and the ever-present question of authority control.

John Bissett closed with his aspirations for the future of W&L’s scanned TOC records. These include his wish for the use of the 97X fields for better display,
for Blackwell to increase their coverage and timeliness, for the ability/resources to begin to include retrospective materials from the collection, and for a cooperative database of TOCs, possibly hosted by AALL.

All three panelists discussed the reasoning behind their decisions to implement these procedures. Also discussed were the actual procedures that are followed, the ramifications of what needs to be considered before you begin, and the benefits and limitations of the various methods. The detailed handouts for the session were included in the annual meeting program materials and the slides used during the presentation can be found at http://staff.cua.edu/strouse/.

Conference Report

Nabbing vs. Sharing: Z39.50 and the Ethics of Directly Importing MARC Records

The major players presenting their thoughts and ideas at this session were: Georgia Briscoe (Coordinator, Moderator and Speaker), University of Colorado Law Library; Barbara A. Bintliff (Speaker), University of Colorado Law Library; S. Blair Kaufman, Yale Law School, Lillian Goldman Library; and, Bob Van Volkenburg (OCLC Online Computer Library Center, Inc.)

Is Z39.50 a friend or a foe? Major players offered their views on the ethical dilemmas presented by the ability to freely retrieve bibliographic records via Z39.50-capable Online Public Access Computers (OPAC). Approved by the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) in 1988, Z39.50 is now an international information retrieval standard that is maintained by the Library of Congress. This protocol allows a user in one system to seamlessly access information from other Z39.50-capable computer systems. For more information about Z39.50 see the Library of Congress Website at http://www.loc.gov/z3950/agency/.

This technological ability sounds like a librarian’s--or a book vendor’s--best friend. In addition, for your added convenience in searching and retrieving records, inexpensive, preprogrammed software is available that automatically connects your computer to a multitude of online library catalogs. You can now search and download free bibliographic records until your heart, or your OPAC, is content. But wait a minute--what if your library is on some preprogrammed “hit” list? What happens to the “ownership” of records that you or your catalog librarians have meticulously sweated over to create, or the records which your library has purchased and downloaded at a premium price? You got it—copied and zapped-away in a New York minute to some unknown destination. Those bibliographic records may be used in an institution’s library catalog, but don’t be surprised if you find that your records have been sold to the highest bidder by a book or MARC record vendor.

The national player, OCLC, is a worldwide library cooperative cataloging effort. Used in a collaborative method, the records in that database are to be shared by OCLC members. OCLC supports the development of Z39.50; and their services, FirstSearch and Cataloging, using this standard. A serious concern is present, however, in the use of the Z39.50 protocol by commercial vendors who find and download MARC records (in many cases OCLC member records) from unsuspecting library catalogs. In effect, the companies are stealing the records to turn a profit. To make matters worse, unauthorized use of library OPAC data has the potential to handicap the performance of the unsuspecting library’s OPAC. When libraries choose to use Z39.50 to download “free” MARC records from other catalogs, there is no contribution of holdings information in WorldCat, thus reducing the resource sharing activities. OCLC suggests that targeted libraries contact the profit-driven vendors and ask to be removed from the automatic list of library OPAC addresses embedded in the search and retrieval software. In addition, OCLC plans to alert members to the current profiteering and to develop cost-effective services to attract users to the Cooperative.

Barbara Bintliff added that Z39.50 is neither “good” nor “bad.” The purpose is to help libraries share, and that is what librarians do as a common philosophy. The University of Colorado encourages sharing records with other libraries, with the condition that a request precedes permission to use the record. She expressed her unhappiness with those who steal the records without permission.

Blair Kaufman stated that the Lillian Goldman Library enabled Z39.50 for the purpose of allowing others to make use of their records. A request asking permission to download the records is expected and appreciated. Kaufman qualified the “free” use as being intended for libraries that share information, but are not intended for organizations profiting from downloaded data.

All the speakers agreed that “free” sharing, with permission, on a limited basis is a good idea, specifically for hard-to-catalog and international works. The caveat to this is that records retrieved should be uploaded to OCLC for others to use.
EDI (Electronic Data Interchange) is an exchange of information between two machines without human intervention. However, as EDI has progressed, human intervention is still necessary. The panel spoke on different aspects of EDI and there was much audience participation and discussion, which made the program extremely informative and interesting.

Pamela Bluh, Associate Director for Technical Services & Administration, University of Baltimore, Thurgood Marshall Law School Law Library, gave an overview of EDI. Alan Keely, Assistant Director for Collection Services & Systems, Wake Forest University Professional Center Library, spoke on how and why his institution selected and proceeded with EDI. Dan Rosatti, Senior Vice President, Research and Development, William S. Hein & Co., explained the nuts and bolts of implementing EDI.

The four necessary elements of EDI are the supplier, the recipient, the communication mechanism and the software to process it. EDI transactions can be “two way” with both partners sending and receiving data.

The library or law firm is one partner and the publisher, book jobber or subscription agent is the trading partner. In a library setting, the communication is handled over the Internet.

The benefits of EDI are numerous. EDI helps to improve efficiency by reducing paper usage, thereby lessening both the likelihood of human error and the feeling of drowning in paperwork, freeing up time for staff, and improving workflow. There are benefits for vendors also, which include increased and enhanced service for customers, consistency of data, and faster payment of invoices.

A few drawbacks of using EDI are the amount of time and effort necessary to prepare for implementation and continued maintenance. Records in the online catalog must be cleaned up. This involves using current titles for serials and periodicals, the addition of the “title number” from the vendor in the order record, and giving the purchase order number for each title to the vendor. Ongoing maintenance includes dealing with title changes, number of copies, cancellations, and limiting the number of titles on an invoice.

Alan listed four steps in their implementation of EDI:
1) Synchronizing data—Several months’ time is required for the synchronization of data, which involves getting the list of titles, purchase order numbers, and title numbers to all coincide; 2). Testing—Testing involves fixing problems, such as multiple copies of titles on the same purchase orders. Data must be standardized and information must be matched to be transported properly. There must be at least one match point, such as the purchase order number or title number; 3). Problem resolution—Problem solving involves discovering why records did not match. A report is generated after the transfer of data, which indicates the problem and what did not link; and, 4). Production, as an ongoing process.

He mentioned they learned from hindsight during the implementation of EDI. Using macros to transfer data in records would have saved time and effort in preparing records for the synchronization of data.

Dan elucidated how different publishers and systems have various requirements. There are nineteen differences in requirements between Endeavor Information System’s Voyager, and Innovative Interfaces, Inc. Innovative uses a flat file while Endeavor uses Edifact. Edifact (Electronic data interchange for administration and business) is used most often today. Hein enters into a partnership with each customer using EDI. A significant amount of communication between the William S. Hein Company and the library is essential to solve problems and for ongoing success.

There was discussion on how EDI has been implemented with some vendors, such as YBP, EBSCO, and Hein. Hein is the only legal publisher in the United States to implement EDI. Some legal publishers have not yet committed to EDI, such as Thomson West, LexisNexis and BNA. If one of these publishers would use EDI, others would follow. It was suggested that libraries and law firms should give preferential treatment to vendors who will use EDI on library systems.

Dan explained that an EDI translator such as XTOLL is needed to tell the software to pull data and put it into a document. A kind of binary equivalent of XML called EBML, or Extensible Binary Meta-Language, may be used in the future. Other future enhancements of EDI will include marking for claims, the generation of claims, claim reports, highlighting, and automatic claiming. Currently about 10% of invoices are processed using EDI. The amount of EDI transactions is small and requires time-consuming preparation. Presently, the number of legal publishers capable of using EDI or willing to commit to development of EDI is not large. The hope for the future is that all legal publishers will incorporate EDI, as the benefits are many for both the library and publisher or vendor. Each library needs to evaluate the benefits and shortcomings of EDI and decide what is best for its organization.
Conference Report

Don’t Throw That Away: Ensuring Future Access to Legal Information in an Age of Digital Media

Judging from the large number of attendees at this session, the topic continues to be of great interest. Judith Lihosit (University of San Diego Legal Research Center) opened the session by presenting the results of a survey charting the role that online availability played in canceling print titles in California libraries. The survey tabulated the results into 4 categories: those libraries serving population areas of under 50,000, those serving 50,000 to 150,000, those serving 150,000 to 500,000, and those serving over 500,000. The summary conclusions reached were that 82% of all libraries surveyed cancelled at least 1 print title, smaller county libraries were relying heavily on online resources with 44% of these libraries converting to e-resource only for surveyed state titles, and larger county libraries relied on online resources for out-of-state materials, where smaller libraries provided no access to this titles. For the complete survey results, as well as the slide shows of all presenters for this program, please consult http://www.sandiego.edu/lrc/aall.html.

Cathy Hartman (University of North Texas Libraries) followed with discussion about how e-resources present significant challenges for librarians. In both the analog and digital world, librarians continue to select, acquire, describe, organize, and present material for their libraries. In the digital arena they have the additional new challenges of resource allocation; how best to capture, preserve, and ensure authenticity of the digital material; and finally to address concerns over privacy issues.

Because of the availability of online resources and the expectation of 24/7 accessibility, institutions are finding it necessary to realign resources to meet new demands and challenges. The example presented was that during the period 1995-2005, the University of North Texas has seen a 500% increase in IT staff, and a 250% increase in online spending. All librarians understand that the print resource budget and library staff have not seen similar increases. Given this increased e-resource spending, librarians are becoming anxious about the potential loss of content for which they have no paper or digital backup.

What efforts have been made to alleviate the anxiety and to capture and preserve online material? One such effort is the “CyberCemetery” website: http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/default.htm. This site is a partnership between University of North Texas Libraries and the U.S. Government Printing Office. It was created and maintained to provide permanent public access to the websites and publications of defunct U.S. government agencies and commissions. A good example of the work done by the CyberCemetery is the capturing of the resources of the 9/11 Commission (officially the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States). Once the Commission closed its offices, its website also was taken down. Without the CyberCemetery, the e-publications created would have been lost for future research.

Ms. Hartman indicated that she felt librarians need to take the lead on authentication of e-resources. The key issues as yet unanswered are: how to ensure material is authentic, who can authenticate a document; whether a capturing entity (a library) can be responsible for this, and what the courts will recognize as authentic.

In regards to privacy, Ms. Hartman refused and the testimony remained online. In the second example, by Texas law all appointees’ names and addresses are published in the Texas Register. An appointed judge received death threats and requested that personal information be removed from the Texas Register. In this case, on the advice of highest levels of Texas government, the address was redacted on the electronic version, but the printed version kept the address. In both cases the issue of privacy for online material is and will continue to be discussed.

Ms. Hartman concluded by highlighting the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program (NDIIPP). This Congressionally funded research project is focused on capturing and preserving information published on the World Wide Web. Project work is organized into four overlapping paths of activity: content identification and selection, content acquisitions, content retention and transfer, and partnership building. In fall 2004, the Library of Congress (the sponsoring agency) announced the awarding of 8 grants to further the research related to the capturing and long-term preservation of “born digital” information.

Kent McKeever (Columbia University, Arthur W. Diamond Law Library) concluded the session by speaking about our profession’s semi-panic feeling about losing control of our library “collections.” Today librarians have two major concerns: finding means to maintain historical access to born digital information, and hoarding at least some copies of material being converted to e-copies from paper originals.

The first coherent law library response was a conference convened by Robert Oakley at Georgetwon in March of 2003. The conference led to the creation of the Legal Information Preservation Alliance (LIPA). The key questions were:

- What is “born digital” information?
- What is the role of libraries in preserving “born digital” information?
- How shall we authenticate and preserve “born digital” information?
- How shall we capture “born digital” information to ensure its authenticity?

The questions were discussed and then the conference adjourned.
LIPA raised are how to get the digital data providers to take on preservation responsibilities, and how best to ensure the paper copies of core historical titles are preserved so that librarians can relax about de-accessioning their own individual paper copies.

One option discussed was a “dark archive,” which is a storage option that keeps paper documents in a safe but dark environment not intended for casual or intermittent use. Retrieval is allowed only to re-shoot the originals because of upgrade in technology or flaw in earlier captured images. The best working example is JSTOR which has an archive agreement with the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) where 20,831 titles, (73% of JSTOR titles) are held in the CRL stacks. Other agreements are in the works for additional sites.

Mr. McKeever concluded by talking about the LIPA Dark Archive Network, conceived as an open-ended network designed to hoard 5 or 6 copies of selected titles to preserve the core materials of US law. He believes this kind of network would work best without a legal structure. Libraries need to make the commitment to preserve core resources that they as institutions deem necessary -- not because they are required, but because these titles are essential to their patrons.

---

**Conference Report**

**What is a “Core Collection” Anymore?**

In today’s world, budgets are shrinking and yet collections continue to grow. Over the past ten years there has been a continuous transition toward collecting information in electronic form as opposed to the more tradition print and microform formats. This trend has significantly changed the composition and mission of many law libraries. As it continues to impact us, there is growing concern surrounding the definition of “core collection” as presented in ABA standards 605 and 606.

As librarians and evaluation committees review their collections as part of accreditation reviews and strive to reflect their libraries’ missions within those of the law schools they serve, a number of questions arise regarding the definition of a “core collection.” What exactly does a “core collection” look like today? Does the concept of a “core list” of titles exist within our collection philosophy? How does current electronic information and its accessibility fit into the concept of “core collection” as stated by the ABA standards?

In an attempt to address some of these questions, a panel of speakers was assembled to provide practical information about the evaluation process and expectations of accreditation site visit evaluation committees. Panelists also reviewed the newly revised wording of ABA standards 605 and 606, as well as outlined the committees within the ABA that make changes to standards and implement new ones. The goals of the presentations were to help program participants address problems of applying ABA standards 605 and 606 for core collections to today’s information formats, and to give participants information to help them build collections that will meet the criteria applied by accreditation inspectors. Contributing to the panel presentations were Phyllis Marion, Director of the Library and Professor of Law at the California Western School of Law; Rita Reusch, Director of the Law Library at the University of Utah; and Chris Simoni, Associate Dean for Library & Information Services and Professor of Law at Northwestern University School of Law. All three of these AALL members have experience either serving on the ABA standards committee and/or participating in accreditation site visits.

Phyllis Marion presented a history of “core collection” standards, showing the evolution of ABA standards into today’s current standard 606. Since the turn of the century, the ABA has recognized the importance of the physical existence of a “library” that provides regular hours and assistance to students. Emphasis was placed on ownership of materials and by the 1920’s standards were in place specifying the number of volumes required and the ability to present a detailed core list of books housed in the library. Another concept beginning to evolve was the adequacy of the collection. This concept included currency and usability of materials and the number of students served by the collection.

Rita Reusch presented an overview of the committee structure that produces the standards and conducts the evaluations. Since the evaluation of library collections is only one aspect of the ABA accreditation process, an effort is made to have at least one librarian representative on ABA committees. Librarians also serve in an advisory capacity through bodies such as the ABA Standards for Academic Law Libraries Task Force. Both the ABA Standards Review Committee and the Council on Legal Education play a primary role in reviewing and making changes to ABA standards. These committees are made up of a combination of legal practitioners, judges, administrators, deans, and include librarian representation. These committees forward their recommendations to the ABA House of Delegates which is the formal decision making body. Once the decisions are final, bodies such as the Accreditation Committee and the Questionnaire Committee take over the responsibility of implementing and interpreting
the changes to the standards. The Questionnaire Committee carefully reviews the information that will be sought during the accreditation process. The Accreditation Committee works to interpret the standards and apply these interpretations to the evaluative process. It is this body that builds the “common law” of what standard 606 really means.

The latest revision to ABA standards 604, 605, and 606 was completed in June 2005 and included some slightly different concepts designed to address some current issues. Overall, the new wording emphasizes a model of functionality as a better test for evaluation than simply counting things. The concept of ownership has been expanded to include the concept of availability through “reliable access.” The concept of “core collection” has been left open-ended in recognition of changing formats, consortia agreements, the ease of ILL, and the need for remote storage. However, the concepts of “adequacy” and “currency” of the collection remain quite clear. While the concept of “ownership” is no longer central, the current standard maintains the concept of physical place. Libraries are required to have a collection development policy in writing and show how this policy relates to the overall mission of the law schools they serve. The burden is on the library to articulate how its policies and overall mission.

The speakers noted that it remains to be seen how the Accreditation Committee will interpret the new version of standard 606. The Questionnaire Committee will soon begin its work of rewriting the current questionnaire to reflect the new language. In preparation for a site visit, libraries should actively review their collection development policies and how they fit with their schools’ missions. In assessing electronic resources, a library needs to justify how these resources meet the goals set forth in both mission and collection policy. In assessing remote storage issues, the library needs to specify ease of access and whether or not materials are backed up by electronic access.

Conference Report

TS Panel—Electronic Resources Management: What It Can Do For You

All types of libraries need to keep track of their electronic resources in an organized manner. The primary functions of ERM (Electronic Resource Management) are the enhancement of analysis tools and the management of subscriptions, acquisitions, and licensing information.

Non-integrated solutions include a homegrown database, external link resolver, or publication access management system such as EBSCO and ProQuest.

Another solution is an integrated electronic resource management system.

This panel presented three electronic resource management systems: Innovative’s ERM Module, Endeavor’s Meridian, and ExLibris’ Verde. Each speaker explained how his/her system worked and the benefits of using that ERM system.

On the panel, Theodore A. Fons, Senior Product Manager at Innovative, described the first established ERM, Innovative’s ERM Module was conceived in May 2002 as a project in which Innovative would partner with academic libraries to determine what should be included in an ERM system. The ERM Module displays print and electronic resources jointly; shows licensing information; offers training and online documentation; enables staff management; and includes public finding tools. Innovative offers group presentations to the Innovative User Group community and other interested groups. Other benefits of this ERM system include:

• Storing licensing information
• Analyzing collections/holdings
• Managing contracts
• Managing contacts: phone and emails pertaining to subscriptions
• Compliance with license terms
• Compliance with DLF ERMI resource documents (Digital Library Federation Electronic Resource Management Initiative)
• Active listserv and archives

As of July 2005, over 127 ERM Module systems have been installed worldwide. A second release of the ERM Module was due in July 2005 with improved enhancements, including upgraded matching logic, batch loading of resource records, enriched usage statistics, and management functionality for consortia and WebBridge (integration of electronic and licensing data) users.

Jean Bryan, Digital Product Specialist at Endeavor, explained that the process to develop Meridian was started one year ago. In the first year, four development partners in usability studies worked with the Elsevier User Centered Design Group. This collaboration resulted in an interface that presents all the data you need regardless of your job function. The general release was June 1, 2005 and included 23 mostly academic libraries. This integrated ERM system includes the Cognos ReportNet report writing tool.

The many benefits of Meridian include a central repository, more productive staff time, reflection of complex relationships among packages, integration with local ILS systems for MARC and acquisitions...
Conference Report

Indexes, Taxonomies and the Google Generation: What You Don’t Know Will Hurt You

Reported by Sarah Yates
University of Minnesota

Roy Tennant opened this year’s conference by telling us that our catalogs “suck” (his word) because they are more complex than Google and Amazon. So it was nice to hear that there are still some folks out there—not even just catalogers—who recognize that uncontrolled text searching is not the ultimate research tool.

In his plenary session, Tennant repeated his famous line that only librarians like to search; everyone else likes to find. Perhaps. But the speakers at “Indexes, Taxonomies and the Google Generation” discredited the premise that free text searching is an effective way to find most types of legal information.

While the program was aimed primarily at public services folks, many of the points the presenters made were ones that technical services librarians have been making all along.

Chuck Knapp, indexing manager at BNA, laid the groundwork for the program by establishing that free text searching is not as effective for most types of legal research as using indexes. Knapp discussed a BNA study that compared law students’ success rates searching an online publication.

Not surprisingly, the students had higher success rates with the index than with free text searching. What was surprising was how much more successful—and quicker—the index searching was for all questions. Three of the questions had a 0 percent success rate as index searchers, but their search time was three and a half times longer.

Why is index searching better than text searching? Knapp touched on some of the reasons—the reduction of false positives, the completeness of results, and the role of human input in ensuring better results—but the question was addressed in even more depth by the next two speakers, Dan Dabney, senior director for taxonomies and subject access research (the TSAR tsar) at Thomson/West, and Irene Good, educational technology specialist, legal information librarian, and lecturer in law at Boston College Law Library.

In his plenary session, Tennant repeated his famous line that only librarians like to search; everyone else likes to find. Perhaps. But the speakers at “Indexes, Taxonomies and the Google Generation” discredited the premise that free text searching is an effective way to find most types of legal information.

While the program was aimed primarily at public services folks, many of the points the presenters made were ones that technical services librarians have been making all along.

Chuck Knapp, indexing manager at BNA, laid the groundwork for the program by establishing that free text searching is not as effective for most types of legal research as using indexes. Knapp discussed a BNA study that compared law students’ success rates searching an online publication.

Not surprisingly, the students had higher success rates with the index than with free text searching. What was surprising was how much more successful—and quicker—the index searching was for all questions. Three of the questions had a 0 percent success rate as index searchers, but their search time was three and a half times longer.

Why is index searching better than text searching? Knapp touched on some of the reasons—the reduction of false positives, the completeness of results, and the role of human input in ensuring better results—but the question was addressed in even more depth by the next two speakers, Dan Dabney, senior director for taxonomies and subject access research (the TSAR tsar) at Thomson/West, and Irene Good, educational technology specialist, legal information librarian, and lecturer in law at Boston College Law Library.
Dabney’s presentation focused on context and its role in five types of legal research tools: narrative restatements, codifications, citation indexes, controlled vocabulary indexes, and free text. The first four tools are rich in context, though in slightly different ways. In contrast, free text decontextualizes by presenting pieces of information in isolation.

Why is context so important? Without context, researchers face the problems of missing comparisons, missing boundaries, and missing concepts.

The problem of missing comparisons was an interesting one, and it also illustrated a problem with indexes and other controlled vocabularies that are “flat” rather than hierarchical. Dabney used the term caveat emptor as an example. A keyword search might find all the documents dealing with the principle of caveat emptor, as would a flat index with a main heading for the term. But neither would convey the relationship of caveat emptor to increasingly broader concepts (implied warranties, warranties, sales) the way a hierarchical index can.

Missing boundaries mean that researchers can never be sure that their text searches have given them all the relevant results. One reason that results may be incomplete is missing concepts—that is, when the term for the concept the researcher is interested in does not appear in all the documents. For example, someone researching chattel would miss many relevant documents that refer to specific items of property without using the term chattel.

While the next speaker, Irene Good, did not use the terms “missing boundaries” and “missing concepts,” these were implicit in her discussion of incomplete results as one of the two major problems with text searching; the other was the number of false positives.

Good talked about her experiences working with students on specific law school assignments. One assignment was to “locate arbitration decisions on procedural arbitrability and private companies” using CCH or BNA.

A search for procedural arbitrability in BNA’s Labor Arbitration database returned 337 documents, clearly not all relevant. But adding the word private within ten, one hundred, or one thousand words of procedural arbitrability reduced the results too much; these searches yielded zero, one, and two results respectively—and those not even relevant. So students relying on a text search would have to browse through 337 documents to determine which ones dealt with private companies.

In contrast, the BNA Topic Finder lists all 217 documents on procedural arbitrability in private companies together. Not only that, but many of the documents don’t even contain the word procedural in the text. In other words, the text search yielded both false positives and incomplete results.

The final speaker was Christine Graesser, information specialist at Brown, Rudnick, Berlack, Israels LLP in Hartford, Connecticut. Her presentation focused on how to convince patrons, particularly in law firms, to use indexes and taxonomies.

Graesser had conducted an e-mail survey of lawyers in her firm on their use of various research tools. Google had the highest usage, but second-highest were treatises. From this surprising result, Graesser concluded that attorneys—and by extension, other patrons—are willing to use sophisticated tools, but only if they can see the value in doing so.

Incidentally, Graesser polled the audience on their use of the same tools that she surveyed her firm’s attorneys on. The number of librarians in the audience who reported low usage of the library catalog was alarmingly high— alarming to a cataloger, anyway. Apparently Tennant is not alone in his views on our catalogs.

For what it’s worth, Graesser offered the following advice to catalogers, indexers, and developers of knowledge management systems: “Make your system consistent with other systems, like the Key Number system. Make it consistent with the practices at the institution where it will be used.” Of course, this advice would be nearly impossible for catalogers to follow (particularly regarding the Key Number system), but Graesser was the only speaker to address technical services librarians directly.

All in all, it was a very worthwhile program on an important topic, and all the speakers were very knowledgeable and engaging. Furthermore, there were several thought-provoking points for technical services librarians, even if gleaning these points required reading between the lines at times.

---

**Conference Report**

**Outsourcing: Odious or Out-of-the-box?**

The target audience for this program was law firms, but clearly, outsourcing is here to stay and in fact will only increase in every business environment. For that reason, any type of library (or business) could benefit from information given in this presentation. Program coordinator Lee Nemchek (Morrison & Foerster LLP) succinctly informed the audience on the myriad variations of terminology used in professional journals about outsourcing, described various models, and, as evidenced by the subject’s growth in the literature, convincingly argued that outsourcing is something for which libraries need to prepare.

---

**Technical Services Law Librarian**, September, 2005
The variety of terminology used for outsourcing indicates how widespread the practice has become. One might hear “BPO” (business process outsourcing), “select sourcing” (using multiple outsourcers), “offshoring” (outside N. America), “nearshoring” (Canada or Mexico), “onsourcing” (domestic outsourcing), “in-sourcing” or “back sourcing” (taking back in house previously outsourced functions), and “home-sourcing” (allows employees to work at home). Not to mention “transferring out,” “captive outsourcing,” “contracting out, and co-sourcing.” Of the basic outsourcing models Lee discussed (including functional area models, projects models, staff models, and shared service centers), staff models are understandably the most controversial.

Larry Eiring, following, addressed staff concerns at length.

The two following speakers elaborated on outsourcing’s global aspect from interesting, rather polar positions. H. Larry Eiring (Thomson - Elite) spoke about his experiences as a firm librarian who successfully coordinated outsourcing services. He detailed critical steps in the outsourcing process that would affect a successful outcome, while strongly emphasizing the forged partnership between library and outsourcer, replete with each party’s responsibilities.

Despite what might seem its obvious advantages, outsourcing is not in every institution’s best interest. Eiring’s thoughtful analysis and methodical documentation provide a working model for others to consider.

Ganesh Natarajan (Mindcrest Inc.) discussed outsourcing from the provider’s position. Although outsourcing is not new, Natarajan equates its rapid growth to the growth of information technology beginning about twelve years ago. Other driving factors include the high costs of legal services in the U.S., the availability of U.S. legal resources on the World Wide Web, and (Natarajan’s company is based in India) that India is a low cost source of legal talent.

Interestingly conceived, this program served to somewhat demystify the outsourcing concept. Eiring’s sage advice in particular was empowering; i.e., if this should happen to your library, what is the best way to handle it?

Conference Report

Who’s counting? Who Cares? Revisiting the ABA Statistics Issue

Our program began with Paula Tejeda (Charleston School of Law, South Carolina) reviewing the history of the TS-SIS Serials Committee’s charge to work on revised definitions for “serial title” and “serial subscription” that the ABA could use in their Definitions & Instructions sheet in the annual ABA questionnaire. In the Committee’s attempt to revise the definitions, they realized that the definitions weren’t the real problems. The way people interpret these definitions and others is the problem. Improved instructions and guidelines for understanding what to count, and how to count, were needed.

Other members of the panel discussion were Joe Hinger (St. John’s University), Jim Mumm (Marquette University) and Pauline Aranas (University of Southern California). All were given five minutes to discuss their problems and concerns with the ABA questionnaire and difficulties they have encountered in the counting process. Joe Hinger talked about a survey conducted in 1994, which asked law librarians how serials were counted and what was counted for the ABA questionnaire. The results of that survey indicated people counted at different times (e.g., when the item was purchased, when the item was cataloged, etc.) and they recorded data in different ways (e.g., used an in-house formula, kept a list, counted purchase orders, counted bib records, etc.). He concluded by saying that not a single question was answered uniformly by all respondents.

Jim Mumm talked about the problems of deciding how to count, and what to count as the important questions we should be discussing. He mentioned as an example the Hein bar journal subscription – should it be counted as one title or counted as fifty titles? He also asked about HeinOnline and EbscoHost – count as one or as many? He concluded by suggesting that we need standards written, similar to cataloging standards.

Pauline Aranas is an outgoing member of the ABA Section of Legal Education & Admissions to the Bar Law Libraries Committee. She said that other ABA committees decide what the questions will be for the annual questionnaire. She also mentioned there is only one law librarian on the committee so there is little influence from law librarians. Deans and directors of the law libraries are currently the ones who really influence structure, language and content of the questionnaire. She mentioned that the AALL Academic SIS has a statistics committee looking into problems with the annual ABA questionnaire.

In the question and answer part of the session, the main discussion revolved around electronic resources. Questions were asked about how to count electronic resources and where they fit in the ABA questionnaire. Judith Wright, a member of the ABA Advisory Committee on the questionnaire, was in the audience and informed us that electronic resources are not to be counted anywhere in the questionnaire - they are not to be counted in the title count and are not to be counted as an active subscription. This was news to most of the attendees – including myself. She informed us

Reported by Nancy Cowden
Oklahoma City University Law Library
that when old question 3 (i.e., Number of titles of Web-based products to which the library subscribes) was taken out of the ABA questionnaire in 2003, the counting and reporting of electronic titles was to have stopped. Many of the attendees said this was not clearly stated anywhere in the ABA instructions. Some wanted to count them in question no. 1 because electronic titles are individually cataloged in their library catalog and that should qualify them to be counted as a “title.” Many wanted to count them in question no. 6 because the definition for serial subscriptions states “… Do not count as serial subscriptions titles accessed via on-line databases (LEXIS/NEXIS, WESTLAW/DIALOG, INTERNET) unless the individual title within that database is a separately cataloged record in the library’s catalog.”

The discussion then turned to whether we really wanted to include counting electronic resources again and have them put back in the ABA questionnaire, especially for titles. Currently the only question in the ABA questionnaire that asks about electronic resources is the one asking how much money we spend on them. Several participants emphasized the great expense of time and money it has taken to obtain and enter the bibliographic records for their electronic resources into their catalogs. In addition, their directors and deans will be very unhappy to hear that these electronic resources are not to be counted as either titles or subscriptions in the current ABA questionnaire. This creates a big problem for new law school libraries where electronic resources make up a big percentage of the collection.

The purpose of this session was to come to some consensus regarding the problems we face in counting, and to address the need for specific guidelines to help us count more uniformly. Paula asked the audience to provide some guidance for the TS-SIS Serials Committee since they want to bring these issues to the attention of the designers of the ABA questionnaire. Suggestions were made to ask for a revised definition of “non-book format” to include electronic resources, and for a definition of “electronic resources” -- would it cover titles that are on our web pages, and/or titles with bib records in our catalog, and/or titles that we pay for and/or available thru law and non-law consortiums, etc.? Another suggestion was to ask for better guidelines on how to count active subscriptions for titles held in multiple formats. For example, if Harvard Law Review is held in paper, held in microfiche and held in 3 different electronic collections – should it be counted as three subscriptions (paper, fiche; and electronic, if put back in the count), or as five subscriptions (with the electronic counting as three), or do we only count as one subscription?

The discussion was lively and addressed real problems. We all agreed that doing away with “counting” is out of our hands. In order for the results of the ABA questionnaire to have some meaning and to be useful for comparison from library to library, we need better guidelines and instructions to help all of us count in the same way. The TS-SIS Serials Committee plans to draft recommendations that will be sent to the appropriate ABA Committee in hopes that we can get the changes to the questionnaire that will help us.

Conference Report

Publishing Outside the Law Library Box: Opportunities Beyond Law Library Publications

This program’s presenters were: Maureen A. Eggert, Coordinator, Moderator, and Speaker (Wake Forest University, Professional Center Library), Carol A. Bannen (Milwaukee law firm of Reinhart, Boerner, Van Deuren), Shannon Gilreath (Wake Forest University, Professional Center Library), and George Pike (University of Pittsburgh, Barco Law Library).

Having several CLE publications to her credit, Maureen Eggert shared with the audience her enthusiasm for the possibilities that exist for law librarians to publish within and outside the field. For aspiring writers, AALL chapters offer an excellent opportunity to begin writing in a formalized manner. If interested in starting a writing initiative within an AALL Chapter, she recommends reading Carol Bannen’s article, “Write and Reach Out,” that was published in the March 2004 issue of AALL Spectrum Magazine. For additional support, AALL members have established a Publishing Interest Caucus. Eggert says there is a “new world open for those wanting to publish.”

Carol Bannen encouraged each person in the audience to write at least one article this year, and to join the AALL Publishing Interest Caucus. Writing is an excellent way for law librarians to establish a positive public relations campaign for their libraries and to help others recognize the value of the law librarian’s skill to the legal profession. Carol is the Articles Committee Chair of a newly created writing venture begun by the Law Librarians Association of Wisconsin (LLAW). Through this effort, LLAW has successfully launched a public relations campaign to place articles written by members in a variety of Wisconsin law publications. Modeled on successful initiatives of the Virginia Association of Law Libraries (VALL) and the Northern California Association of Law Libraries (NOCALL), the publication efforts of LLAW members have produced over 200 articles.

Shannon Gilreath’s frequently asked questions and answers are helpful to
Have you ever wondered how to get access to electronic resources or how to write a license agreement for access to an electronic resource? Have you ever just been curious how all those electronic resources are managed or what those strange acronyms associated with electronic resources mean? These are but a few of the issues discussed at this year’s AALL sponsored pre-conference workshop titled “Electronic Resources from Acquisition to Access.” Seven speakers from a variety of institutions presented information on key aspects involved when considering whether

---

**Conference Report**

**Federated Searching and OpenURL**

_Eloise Vondruska (Coordinator & Moderator–Northwestern University School of Law)_

_H. Frank Cerone (Speaker–Northwestern University Library)_

Not surprisingly, studies consistently show that patrons want to use one search interface and connect directly to full text material. Driven in part by the success (i.e., ease of use) of commercial sources and the increasingly multidisciplinary nature of research, there is a strong movement to redesign library OPACs and webpages to accommodate this. Federated searching allows patrons to search multiple databases (e.g., a library’s OPAC and selected research databases) from one query. Other technology then seamlessly facilitates moving from the specific citation to the full text.

This program discussed how federated searching works, some current applications in libraries, and how to implement a federated search service in one’s library. Additionally, the OpenURL standard and other linking initiatives that enable federated searching were discussed.

In discussing how patrons search databases, speaker Frank Cerone noted variations in searching methods between faculty and students. Despite differences, though, both groups used simple keyword searches for most of their research. With 85% of people using metasearch engines, the importance of well-designed federated search tools is apparent.

Problematic areas for federated searching, such as indexing inconsistencies across databases, and various implementation issues (licensing, customization) were addressed at length.

If you can, get a copy of Frank’s handouts. Slides illustrating the process from sending a query (multiple database search, collection & collation of info, listing of results) to models of how OpenURLs work are worth the proverbial thousand words.

---

**Workshop Report**

**Electronic Resources: Acquisitions to Access**

_H. Frank Cerone (Speaker–Northwestern University Library)_

Have you ever wondered how to get access to electronic resources or how to write a license agreement for access to an electronic resource? Have you ever just been curious how all those electronic resources are managed or what those strange acronyms associated with electronic resources mean? These are but a few of the issues discussed at this year’s AALL sponsored pre-conference workshop titled “Electronic Resources from Acquisition to Access.” Seven speakers from a variety of institutions presented information on key aspects involved when considering whether
or not to obtain electronic resources for your library. Topics presented included: 1) Selection/Acquisition, 2) Licensing, 3) Negotiations, 4) Electronic Resource Management, 5) Delivery/Authentication, and 6) Evaluation and Usage Statistics. Throughout the workshop attendees were given opportunities to direct questions to the speakers.

The first topic, “Selection/Acquisition,” was presented by Janice Anderson of Georgetown University Law Library. Items addressed were subscription databases, Internet resources, and sources of reviews. First discussed were several of the key criteria that should be followed when deciding whether or not to subscribe to a subscription database. Ms. Anderson explained how prospective subscribers should consider the frequency of updates, whether the resource includes back files or archives, use limitations, whether access is password or IP driven, and if there is strong IT support if needed. One may also want to consider the availability of training materials, whether or not the source is electronic-only, and any copyright issues that may be associated with it. Aggregators can give subscribers more flexibility in deciding what titles and back issues to which they want access, and make it easier for users to search a variety of journals simultaneously.

Also discussed during this session was the availability of many free Internet resources that a library can catalog and link to its ILS at no cost. Points to consider with free Internet resources are their relevancy, the quality and content of the site, its ease of use, and whether or not it’s a stable site. Some resources mentioned were those containing primary legal material, association and organization websites, open access journals, and research guides. Potential subscribers can find out more about particular sites or electronic resources before purchasing by looking at sources such as Choice Magazine, Legal Information Buyer’s Guide, and ResourceShelf for reviews or evaluations. One other important item to remember is to keep track of subscriptions by using forms or spreadsheets listing all the details about the resources you’re purchasing.

The second presenter, Tracy L. Thompson of the New England Law Library Consortium (NELLCO) discussed licensing issues associated with electronic resources. Specific questions discussed were what is a license, who is licensing, who we license, and what is being licensed. Guidelines related to licensing can be to help potential buyers with writing, evaluating, or understanding licenses. A few of these guidelines are:

- **AALL Principles for Licensing Electronic Resources**
- Yale’s Web site LIBLICENSE: Licensing Digital Information
- California Digital Library licensing guidelines
- IFLA licensing guidelines
- ICOLC (International Coalition of Library Consortia) documents

Licensing is not always an easy task. Many people get frustrated because it can be time consuming, potential subscribers are not always sure they’re getting what they pay for, and vendors don’t always understand the license themselves. Other obstacles include the lack of vendors who provide agreements for review, publishers or vendors restricting fair use, or vendors charging too much for access. So, why is it important to license a product? One answer is that it clarifies the rights and responsibilities of all parties involved, from the vendor to the user. It also helps to protect users, libraries and vendors. Two examples of licenses were given to participants to help show how to read a license and what to look for as key components, including:

- Parties
- Terms
- Content
- Fees / increases
- Authorized users
- Limited or unlimited usage
- Authorized use
- Authentication
- Performance obligations
- Perpetual access / archives
- Usage statistics

- Warranties
- Indemnities
- Choice of law / forum (applies to govt. institutions)
- Dispute resolution

The next section of the workshop, which dealt with license negotiations, was presented by Diane F. Frake from Vermont Law School. First discussed were the results of a pre-workshop survey which had been emailed to all the workshop participants in advance. Results of the survey noted that those who had negotiation experience varied widely as to how much prior training they’d had before having to negotiate a license. The type of training also varied from law school courses to business/company training to annual meetings. The survey results also noted that the top reasons why people choose not to engage in negotiations are anxiety, lack of proper skills and training, lack of bargaining power, and dislike of conflict. Those who negotiate usually fit into one of five different styles: competitors, problem solvers, compromisers, accommodators, or conflict avoiders. Other issues involved with negotiating include steps in the negotiation process, ethics relating to negotiating, and foundations of bargaining.

The fourth section of the workshop dealt with the management of electronic resources. It was presented by Paul Seeman of the University of Connecticut, and Ted Fons of Innovative Interfaces. Libraries can use electronic management resource systems to store all the information about their electronic resources. ERM store license information, manage acquisitions workflow, help analyze collections, keep contact information, help compliance with licensing terms, and are a good way to find out why something is not working. Some key requirements for ERM systems include: deciding on an ERM system, implementing it, and maintaining it. These key requirements also come with key issues: deciding what material should be included, what exceptions should be allowed, who examines the information and fixes discrepancies,
how information is presented to staff and the public, and who will make sure correct standards are followed. Other important issues are the cost of an ERM system, and whether to use an in-house system or go with an already established provider. Three data elements which will help start the implementation of an ERM system are a list of sources, a list of titles, and the licensing information.

Stephanie Davidson, Yale Law School, next presented information on the delivery and authentication of electronic resources. This refers to the behind-the-scenes process of getting the information into the users’ hands. Key terminology used when dealing with delivery and authentication include: subset, MAC addresses, VPN, and proxy server. Even with all the current technology available, problems still happen because of our need to rely on computers that never fail. The delivery of information can depend upon how you use the resources, how users remotely get to the resources, and how well information regarding proxy servers is communicated. One type of authentication presented uses a single or central sign which is attached to a library IP address. Another authentication system is Shibboleth, which is a device for sharing authentication certifications among systems that allows for a single sign-on. With Shibboleth, authentication is not tied to any particular IP address.

Dennis Brunning, from Arizona State University Libraries, gave the last presentation of the workshop. He discussed evaluation and usage statistics for electronic resources. Usage statistics can be collected for commercial databases, online journals, and full text aggregators. Information may include what resource is being used, how often it’s being used, the cost per article, and a variety of vendor data. Statistics can also be gathered about searches, connect time, and the tracking of the cost of each database subscription. All this information is helpful to collection development librarians, reference librarians, and library administrators when making critical subscription decisions.

Overall, the workshop presented many important aspects of electronic resources for librarians to consider. Good examples were presented, and the participation of the attendees resulted in good question-and-answer sessions.

---

**Workshop Report**

**Effective Subject Cataloging with Library of Congress**

**Subject Headings (LCSH) July 15-16, 2005**

A diverse mix of thirty novice and experienced catalogers attended the inaugural presentation of *Effective Subject Cataloging with Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH).* This AALL program was specifically developed by the presenters for law catalogers, and is an adaptation of the workshop *Basic Subject Cataloging Using LCSH* produced by Library of Congress’s Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) and ALA’s Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS).

Program coordinator/moderator Amy Lovell introduced our presenters: Alva T. Stone, Head of Cataloging at the Florida State University College of Law Library, and her colleague from outside the world of legal cataloging, Angela Jones, Manager of Bibliographic Services at the University of Texas at Dallas University Libraries. Together, they led an intensive, informative two-day workshop that reviewed the basic rules and tools of subject cataloging, provided specific guidelines for assigning subject headings to law-related materials, and discussed current problems and issues in this constantly evolving area of law librarianship.

Workshop participants were first introduced to the basic principles of subject analysis. This process involves scanning the resource as a whole to determine what the work is about, its form, and the author’s intent, audience, and viewpoint. A cataloger should consider whether the work concerns one topic or several, how multiple topics relate, and whether there is a focus on a particular place, time or person. The result should be a concise, objective mental statement describing the resource. To reinforce these introductory principles, we reviewed excerpts from two works of current interest (the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and the Microsoft antitrust appeal) and tested our analytic skills by identifying relevant keywords and concepts.

The next step is to translate this descriptive statement into representative subject headings using the controlled vocabulary of *Library of Congress Subject Headings*. The goal of LCSH is to establish uniform headings, based on unbiased natural language and contemporary usage, to bring together works on the same concept. Main subject headings may be topics, form/genre categories (what the work is, rather than what it is about), or names (constructed according to *AACR2/LCRI* practice).

These headings may be single words or phrases reflecting single or multiple concepts, and may be expressed in direct form (“Child witnesses”) or inverted form (“Evidence, Hearsay”). Inverted form was initially used to position the most significant word first for card catalog filing, but this practice is less critical with today’s OPACs and direct form is now generally preferred.

To guide the cataloger in the selection of headings, *LCSH* contains references from variant terms to the authorized heading and from authorized headings to related, broader and narrower terms. Occasional scope notes provide detailed
instructions on the correct application of particular headings. (“Husband and wife” has a more specific meaning in LCSH than in ordinary conversation!) The selection of subject headings should be guided by objectivity (focusing on the author’s intent rather than personal value judgments), and specificity (broader headings are assigned only when required or when a precise heading is not available). While it may be helpful to search library catalogs and bibliographic utilities to find subject headings applied to similar works, we were warned against relying on records that may contain obsolete headings.

Generally, LC practice is to assign one or more headings (but no more than 10!) that best summarize the overall content of the work and provide access to those topics comprising at least 20 percent of that total content. Catalogers should apply the “rule of three” by (1) assigning up to three headings when a work discusses several distinct topics; (2) using a single inclusive heading when a work discusses two or three subtopics; (3) using a broader heading if a work discusses more than three subtopics unless there are only four subtopics and it is preferable to describe those individually. (This exception is apparently known as the “rule of four”!) Subject headings are usually ordered so that the first heading reflects the primary focus of the work and corresponds to the assigned call number. Other headings should follow in descending order of importance.

A display of print tools for subject analysis was provided by Angela Jones, who drove to the workshop from Dallas. The most familiar of these resources was the five-volume set of LCSH, commonly known as the “big red books,” now in its 28th edition (2005) and containing approximately 284,500 entries. Also displayed was the four-volume loose-leaf Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings (SCM: SH). Originally an in-house procedure manual for LC catalogers, this publication now serves a broader audience by providing instructions for standardization and consistency in applying LCSH. Updated versions of these print publications are available online by subscription to LC’s Cataloger’s Desktop. An essential secondary resource for law catalogers is the AALL publication Cataloging Legal Literature: A Manual on AALR2 and Library of Congress Subject Headings for Legal Materials, 3rd ed., by Melody Busse Lembke and Rhonda K. Lawrence.

Having covered the basic rules and tools of subject cataloging, our presenters discussed subject authority records, their elements and coding. Subject authority records are constructed in MARC format, and like bibliographic or holdings records have their own set of fixed and variable fields. LC’s new publication Understanding MARC Authority Records is a useful introductory guide. Authority records are available on the Library of Congress Authorities site, http://authorities.loc.gov, as well as on LC’s subscription-based Classification Web. Bibliographic utilities also provide access to the full file, as do many library systems.

Subdivisions (topical, geographic, chronological, or form) may be added to a main heading to narrow the scope or emphasize a specific aspect of a subject. Subject authority records, in conjunction with LCSH and SCM: SH, provide guidance on applying and ordering subdivisions under main headings. Some subdivisions apply only to specific headings, and are listed under that heading in LCSH. Some main headings are authorized for geographic subdivision and are noted as “(May Subd Geog)” in LCSH. Free-floating subdivisions are more generally-used subdivisions that can be applied to broad groups of headings according to SCM:SH guidelines. The LC’s annual publication Free-Floating Subdivisions: an Alphabetical Index is useful for locating appropriate SCM:SH instructions. Our presenters cautioned that even if a free-floating subdivision appears to be valid with a particular main heading, LCSH may specify instead that a single established heading be used.

A standardized order of subdivisions is essential to ensure that strings with the same elements are not separated in the catalog. Generally, when a heading string concerns aspects of a place, the basic order is [Place]—[Topic]—[Chronological Period]—[Form]. When the string begins with a topic and a geographical subdivision is present, the basic order is [Topic]—[Place]—[Chronological Period]—[Form]. Our instructional session on authority records included several exercises on interpreting authority records and LCSH scope notes in order to apply appropriate headings and subdivisions.

On the program’s second day, Alva Stone presented “Law Topics in Subject Headings Practice,” a session developed entirely by our presenters for this version of the workshop. Participants were introduced to the differing subject cataloging practices for primary legal material, individual texts of primary material and secondary works. Rules were reviewed for applying subject headings to such resources as constitutions and constitutional law, to “laws” in general, and to judicial and administrative decisions. Careful reading of scope notes is important for the proper application of legal subject headings. For example, the headings “Statutes” and “Legislation” are used only as topical headings for works about these subjects and not as form headings for actual statutes or laws. Using selected authority records, we tested our ability to formulate subject headings for several legal topics.

The coverage of legal practices continued with a discussion of the use of subdivisions. Before applying a subdivision listed in SCM: SH as free-floating under legal topics, the cataloger must determine whether that main heading itself is legal. Headings which contain the words “law,” “legislation” or “regulation” are obviously legal. Other headings, such as “Bribery,” “Servitudes,” and “Copyright,” are also inherently legal but not obviously so. The LCSH entry, scope note, related references and authority record may provide clues as to whether or not a heading is legal in nature. General subjects can become legal topics when a legal subdivision such as “Legal
status, laws, etc.” is added. Conversely, a heading string can lose its legal nature when a non-legal subdivision such as “Taxation” is added to the legal main heading. Not all subdivisions are equally free-floating: the subdivision “Law and legislation” is permitted to float freely only under a limited number of topical categories, and any other use of it, however tempting, must be specifically authorized in LCSH.

The legal topics section ended with more exercises, and was followed by a session on subject cataloging of such specialized formats as serials and electronic resources. “Periodicals” is the most commonly used form subdivision for serials, and prior to 1991 this was used for law reviews as well (“Law—Periodicals”). Now, “Law reviews” have their own genre heading. Various form and topical subdivisions for electronic resources were discussed and distinguished. We were directed to use a locally assigned 655 field if we want to add unauthorized form headings such as “Web sites” and “Online databases” to our catalogs. Integrating resources have no special subject heading or subdivision to indicate their updating characteristic, and only fiction video and sound recordings are given form/genre headings.

Finally, our presenters discussed how to evaluate existing subject headings in cataloging copy. We reviewed the subject cataloging tools to which we had been introduced, and were reminded that the absence of an explicit authority record for a given subject string does not mean that the string is invalid. When evaluating headings, catalogers should ask themselves: (1) do the assigned headings reflect the content of the work? (2) is the heading string valid (authorized by authority records or SCM:SH and in the appropriate order)? (3) is the MARC coding correct? The presenters then evaluated eight complex examples of subject strings by reviewing their structure and identifying which resources to consult for each stage of the analysis.

In conclusion, participants were given a checklist to follow when assigning LCSH subject headings and some methods for testing the effectiveness of the results. Such subject cataloging assessment may include asking whether the assigned headings express the work’s uniqueness and accurately reflect its content, whether the user would look under these headings for this type of material, and whether the assigned headings collocate the work with similar works in the collection. Revisiting our initial exercise on the Sarbanes-Oxley Act and the Microsoft antitrust appeal, we evaluated the subject headings assigned at LC in light of all that we had learned.

This summary barely begins to reflect the wealth of information conveyed at the Effective Subject Cataloging with LCSH workshop. Fortunately, Alva Stone and Angela Jones are willing to share their expertise with interested groups to promote effective law cataloging using LCSH. We look forward to seeing more of them in the future.

Footnotes


2 Additions and changes to SCM:SH are noted in LC’s quarterly Cataloging Service Bulletin.
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Workshop Report

Effective Subject Cataloging with LCSH

I was fortunate to have been awarded a TS-SIS Education Grant to attend the Effective Subject Cataloging with LCSH workshop on July 15-16, 2005, in San Antonio. I had applied for the grant because I expected this workshop to benefit me in my daily work. I have been a librarian for more than 30 years, but I have been a law librarian for fewer than three years. My previous experience with LCSH (especially geographic and chronological subdivisions) and with MARC coding was limited.

I expected this workshop to help me understand the inconsistencies I find in LC and OCLC database records. These inconsistencies may be a result of changes to LCSH structure and/or policies over time, but often I’m not sure which is current usage and which is past practice. I also expected to benefit from a refresher on cataloging principles and tools, which have certainly changed since I obtained my MLS.

My expectations were more than met during the workshop. Speakers Angela Jones (University of Texas at Dallas University Libraries) and Alva T. Stone (Head of Cataloging, FSU College of Law Library) are both official trainers with the Cataloger’s Learning Workshop, a cooperative project of the Library of Congress, the Program for Cooperative Cataloging and the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (a division of the American Library Association).

The workshop is based on training materials developed jointly by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, Standing Committee on Training and the Subject Analysis Committee of the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services, with substantial revisions to reflect the materials to law library collections.

Workshop materials included a large loose-leaf notebook covering 15 topics, from broad principles of subject analysis to special practices for law materials, such as legislative histories, and distinguishing between similar topics such as Forms (Law) versus Forms as
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a form subdivision. The manual made it easy to follow the lectures and take notes, and is a valuable resource.

Each of the 15 topics was followed by exercises. The revision of the exercises to focus on legal materials must have taken the presenters a great deal of time to prepare, since attendees needed not only sample bibliographic records but also resources such as authority lists and instructions from the Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings (SCM).

One of the best sessions covered essential tools and other resources for subject analysis. The presenters emphasized the importance of guidelines for legal materials that are provided in Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings (SCM). Its importance was borne out by the constant use made of SCM instructions for treaties, trials, digests and other legal materials throughout the two days of the workshop. Although I keep SCM in my office, I hadn’t been using it as often as I should. I didn’t realize how many questions could be answered by referring to its lists and guidelines.

The final session was a handy checklist of steps for testing results. One of the steps reminds catalogers about free-floating subdivisions, the rule of specificity, proper order within subject strings and the order of headings in the record.

Among the things I learned at this workshop, three that I will use often are:

1. Although CRIMINAL PROVISIONS is a free-floating subdivision under legal topics, it should not be used under headings for crimes.
2. Any “general” subject becomes a “legal topic” as soon as one of these three subdivisions is added: Law and legislation, or Legal status, laws, etc., or Safety regulations.
3. For works about civil trials, headings for both parties are normally used. However, for criminal trials, there usually is a heading only for the defendant. This is because in criminal trials the prosecution is the local, state or federal government.

This intensive workshop was packed with information, and I was not surprised to hear that it was “sold out” well before the registration deadline. I am grateful to the Technical Services Special Interest Section for giving me the opportunity to take advantage of it.

---

continued from page 1

librarians who just wanted to get to know me a little bit better, and who wanted to give me words of advice and wisdom for my current job search and for the longevity of my library career. But it was the members of the TS-SIS that made me feel like a true Library Goddess. I met up with Karen Douglas for the first time when I went to register for the conference, and it was then that I knew this conference was going to be more than just a bunch of informative meetings. She was fun and enthusiastic about technical services and every time I was around her I felt like a technical services cheerleader/recruiter, and I am sure she will be a great Chairperson for the TS-SIS this year for that reason alone.

To highlight a few of the events and meetings I attended, let me first start with the fact that I signed up as a volunteer for the Annual Meeting, and that was one of the best things I could have done. On Saturday morning I headed over to the CONELL check-in to see if there was anything I could do to be of service, and I found that my VIP Guest badge got me a front row seat in one of the most beneficial workshops a new law librarian can ever attend. I met so many librarians in such a short amount of time, that by the end of the lunch I had to head back over to my hotel room so that I could restock up on my business cards. After CONELL, I visited the Job Placement Office located in the conference hotel. I found that the placement office was a highly useful place for anyone seeking employment, and during my time at the conference I managed to have quite a few formal and informal job interviews. My first TS-SIS event was the TS-SIS Executive Board meeting, where I got to listen to all the work that the TS-SIS had done for the past year and also see the preparations that the Executive Board made for the TS-SIS business meeting that was scheduled for the following afternoon. While at the conference I attended several meetings and programs. My goal was to try to attend a very wide variety of activities so that I could experience as much of the conference as I could. Since I am new to the profession, I found that there is no way to attend every program that you would like, but on the plus side you can always purchase an audio cassette of the program you missed or at the very least print out the handouts from that program. I got the chance to attend the TS-SIS business meeting as well as the TS-SIS Program Committee meeting, the Black Caucus meeting and several receptions and parties for various AALL SIS groups and chapters. I also volunteered to help at the Family Social Hour event, which was great fun with librarians and their families, and enjoy some Haagen Dazs ice cream!

On my last full day in San Antonio, I perused the exhibit hall thoroughly and collected as many goodies and informative flyers that I could carry at one time. I did not win the new lap top computer or iPod shuffle that were being auctioned off, but I enjoyed the exhibit hall just the same. As I was heading back to my hotel room to stash my goodies in my newly purchased duffle bag (I had to get it all back home somehow!) I ran into former AALL President Carol Avery Nicholson who promptly turned me right around and led me to the AALL General Business Meeting, which I am extremely glad that I got to attend. At the General Business Meeting I felt like I was able to get a better understanding of the climate and culture of AALL on
many different topics, from items specific to the profession to the pulse of the organization on the war in Iraq.

My final social event of the conference was a wonderful dinner gathering of minority librarians at a fantastic restaurant named Hoover’s Home Cookin’. At this dinner I met so many new people of all cultural and ethnic backgrounds, and I enjoyed hearing about their experience as law librarians. I was so overwhelmed by the number of long term professional and personal relationships that were apparent among many of the librarians in attendance, that I (a normally very shy person) stepped up to the microphone and thanked the TS-SIS and Karen Douglas for making this conference the greatest experience of my very young career. Seeing as how I am only twenty-four years old I know that I will have many more quality experiences with AALL and with the Technical Services SIS, and I feel secure in having made the decision to become a law librarian.

In closing I would just like to say “Thank you all” for allowing me to take part in such a wonderful conference, and thank you for risking something different in giving a library student the chance to experience AALL from a VIP point of view. The memories of my first AALL Annual Meeting as well as my membership with this organization will last a lifetime.