2005 AALL Conference Report

Roy Tenant on the Top Trends in Library Systems

Reported by Kaaren Pupino
University of North Dakota Law Library

Roy Tenant is User Services Architect for the California Digital Library. This program was sponsored by the AALL Online Bibliographic Services SIS. It followed closely after the opening plenary session titled “Building the Libraries Our Users Deserve” which was also presented by Roy Tenant.

I have to say that my expectation of this program was that it would be about ILS systems. As far as the technology and the terminology, much of this was new to me.

Initially, Mr. Tenant warned the audience that he would take us on a fast trip through the technology he felt was most important for libraries. He was right about the speed with which the acronyms flew by during this session, and I am glad I was able to review the talk through the CD recording available for purchase after the conference.

Mr. Tenant referred to the plenary session where he had just talked about the fact that other organizations are taking our users because people are finding other ways to get information than coming into or drilling virtually into the library. In addition, a growing trend shows our users are coming to us from unexpected or different places than they have in the past, and they want to do different things than before. An example of this is Google or some other service that is not necessarily a licensed database. Librarians need to do a better job to “create destination locations for our users to draw them back through our virtual doors.”

An example of this is Google Scholar, which is a service that supports open URLs, links appear automatically to the user if the institution has provided information about its holdings to Google Scholar, and if the user is identified as being part of that institution, and it is part of the campus. The result is users coming into the virtual library from a non-traditional gateway.

WEB2.0 is a group of web technologies produced by O’Reilly and Associates. This is in contrast to the more traditional WEB1.0 with the classic web interaction HTTP and HTML. In WEB1.0, the users send a request and get a response. WEB2.0 supports a more varied interaction than just query and retrieve. Users have all this “heavy lifting” at the browser level and the server gets requests to search for more information or it is being programmed to do that. It can join two services. The illustration used was between chicagocrime.org statistics and Google maps.
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Special Committee on Record Sharing

In response to a popular OBS-SIS sponsored program at the San Antonio meeting, Nabbing vs. Sharing: Z39.50 and the Ethics of Directly Importing MARC Records, the OBS Executive Board appointed a special committee to examine this issue further.

The Special Committee on Record Sharing, chaired by Pat Callahan from the University of Pennsylvania Law School, will investigate whether OBS should develop a code of ethics or a set of guidelines on record sharing among libraries. The committee will hold conversations with the OBS membership through email, surveys and/or in person at the 2006 AALL Annual Meeting in St. Louis. Upon completion of compiling background information, the committee will decide whether to propose specific action for OBS membership or to allow each library to continue to use its own procedures.

If you are interested in being a member of this special committee or if you have an opinion to share on this topic, please contact Pat Callahan, Associate Director for Technical Services, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Biddle Law Library; 3460 Chestnut Street; Philadelphia, PA 19104-3406, (215-898-0230), pcallaha@law.upenn.edu.

AALL Education Summit

In September, I attended the AALL Education Summit to represent the interests of the OBS-SIS membership, along with Georgia Briscoe, Past OBS Chair. The Education Summit was an outgrowth of the Career Development Task Force, which was charged with reviewing the continuing education needs of the members through a survey and final report. To deal with some of the findings from the membership survey, a group of over 70 individuals from chapters, special interest sections, headquarters staff, and AALL Executive Board members spent a day and half discussing the options for education programs.

The focus of the Education Summit was not the programs offered at the Annual Meeting, but rather programs that are outside the scope of the Annual Meeting. As we all know, it is often not possible to attend the Annual Meeting every year, especially as travel budgets tighten in most libraries and staffing levels are reduced. It is becoming increasingly difficult to justify meetings outside the office to supervisors, managing partners or deans when expenses of travel are increasing and job coverage becomes difficult.

In addition, even at the Annual Meeting, there are either too many programs to choose from so that one cannot attend everything or there is a perceived lack of programs geared to one’s job. Indeed, one of the reasons for a drop in attendance by some sectors of the Association at the Annual Meeting is that they do not perceive that the programs selected for the Annual meeting justify the cost of attendance. Although a lot of committee work is accomplished during the Annual Meeting and certainly the ability to network with colleagues is a major benefit, the lack of specific educational programs geared to one’s job is a drawback for securing funding.

So, how can the Association meet the continuing educational needs of these members? As quickly became evident during the discussions at the Education Summit, there is no easy answer to this question. Indeed, it became clear that there was no overall resolution that would fit every constituency within the Association for continuing education, which makes difficult coming up with a solution. However, with so many different groups represented and a synergy of ideas, some common ground was identified.

One of the first questions posed to the group was, what do we know about the needs, wants and preferences of our stakeholders? There was actually quite a bit of consensus on this list among the attendees, including the following: people want programs current with job responsibilities; people wanted more regional and local educational opportunities; people wanted affordable programs; people wanted AALL to partner with other organizations to expand educational opportunities; people wanted outside speakers and experts to lead programs; and, people wanted programs that represented a variety of learning styles. Although many local chapters provide excellent educational programs for their membership, there was still a perceived need for more programming and more diverse programs.

Another question posed to the group concerned the current realities of the marketplace and the evolving dynamics of the law library environment. Again, there were many opinions on this topic. Some of them included: how do libraries attract and cope with a diverse staff; how do libraries cope with the constant changing impact of technology?; how do libraries respond to the increasing globalization of information?; how do libraries draw the line between access and ownership?; how do libraries cope with cuts in spending for resources, staff and technology? Due to the complex environment in which librarians work today, the ability to tailor educational programs that are relevant also becomes equally challenging.

The final broad group question concerned the capacity and strategic position of
AALL and its components. What are the expectations of the members for AALL and how can the organization respond? Does it have the capacity to actually meet the members’ needs? Based on the discussions, some general themes were noted: AALL knows that there is competition from other organizations in offering educational programs; AALL knows that it needs to provide targeted professional development opportunities to attract new members; AALL knows that it must become better at marketing itself outside of the Annual Meeting; AALL knows that it must develop better working relationships with the special interest sections and chapters; AALL knows that it has limited resources at headquarters and cannot provide all member needs; and, AALL knows that it must develop a clear and recognizable niche in library education.

These three questions served as important background information of the group deliberations and helped provide perspective on what data had already been collected on this topic. The Summit attendees divided up into small groups and then began more detailed discussions on various topics concerning education assigned by the moderator. As each group reported findings, a general discussion was held for elaboration or clarification on points raised. These discussions resulted in many concrete objectives that could be part of a planning process for establishing a new education program for AALL, with many of them being related to each other or dependent on each other for realization.

As you can imagine, there were way too many options from the group to have them all enacted at once. To this end, each small group was instructed to rank their options and come up with a smaller list of topics that they felt were the most critical. These lists were then compiled onto one list, incorporating the views of all participants.

Once the final list was compiled, it was possible to see that there were a variety of long, medium and short term goals that were encompassed in the results. Based on all the results, however, several main themes emerged, which helped provide a sense of direction. The first general theme was the need for the Association to find a way to repackage the programs from the Annual Meeting for distribution to the chapters and special interest section at the local level. Since the Annual meeting is the premier educational event for the Association, the participants felt that it was important to try to get as many of these programs out to members who may not be able to attend the conference on a regular basis.

The second general theme was the need for the Association to establish a series of grants to support the development of new programs. These grants, geared towards the chapters, would supply financial support for the development of programs on the local level that could be shared with other chapters. Criteria would need to be established for deciding who would be eligible for these grants and how the recipients would be selected.

The third general theme was the desire to link the chapters and the special interest sections together to develop programs on the local level. Many AALL members have joint membership in a chapter (local and/or regional) and in special interest sections that pertain to their job. Finding people with expertise in an area of law librarianship who might be able to develop relevant programming may be possible with greater crossover between these two groups.

The fourth general theme was the desire to electronically distribute educational programming materials to the chapters and special interest sections. The idea was that materials from the Annual Meeting would be the primary documents to be distributed in some fashion, but other programs that were of high quality would also be available for distribution. Finding the right technology and staff to support this venture will be a challenge for the Association, as well as deciding which materials should be distributed.

The final general theme that the participants felt was important was to expand the role of AALL as a clearinghouse for professional development opportunities. This clearinghouse would include not only program offerings from AALL but from other related organizations too. The idea of a central calendar and speaker’s bureau were two concrete suggestions the group had to further this mission.

The Education Summit proved to be a very important step in the ongoing process of identifying the needs of the membership for continuing education. It also became evident that establishing a new educational program was going to be a long process dependent on resources, AALL staff support, possible vendor support and a favorable reception by AALL members.

Richard Jost
University of Washington
It is hard to believe my year as chair is half over. So many exciting things have happened and even more change is on the horizon.

First, I would like to correct an oversight. The new AALL representative to the ALA Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) was inadvertently omitted in the column announcing new committee chairs and representatives. Yael Mandelstam of Fordham University Law School, is replacing Marie Whited as SAC representative.

I am pleased to announce the TS-SIS programs that will be presented at the 2006 Annual Meeting in St. Louis: a workshop entitled “Planning to Preserve: Writing a Plan to Add Value to Your Collections,” and programs entitled “Pioneering the Transformation of Technical Services Librarians to Digital Librarians,” and “Pioneering Towards a New Cataloging Code: RDA-Resource Description and Access.”

TS-SIS will also be sponsoring the following programs not chosen by the AMPC: “Conversations Across the Cubicles: Pioneering Change in the TS-SIS 1978-2006,” “21st Century Technical Services: Reorganizing for the Future,” and “Change at LC: Classweb and Tribal Law.”

In September of this year, I had the opportunity to represent TS-SIS at the AALL Education Summit. A link to the final report is on the TS-SIS web page at http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/index.htm. Richard Jost, OBS-SIS chair, also attended the Summit. Be sure to read his “From the Chair” column this month, where he gives a summary of the charges, focus and methodology of the Summit. I will give an overview of the recommendations and plans for implementation that resulted from the Summit.

Many suggestions for providing continuing education opportunities outside of the Annual Meeting were presented during the day and a half Summit. They were scaled down to five “to die for” action items that would be developed immediately:

1. Repackage annual conference materials for distribution to chapters/SISs for their use at local level
2. Award grants to develop new content: chapters to apply for grants; established criteria determines who and how much $ allocated; programs need to be replicable and sharable
3. Link SISs and chapters together for content development to be delivered locally
4. Electronic distribution of educational programming materials, primarily derived from annual conference, to chapters, SISs, etc.
5. Serve as a clearinghouse for professional development offerings from all sources
6. Develop calendar of events across the field – not just AALL events
7. Develop content/rotating institutes

The AALL Executive Board created three Education Summit Implementation Task Forces made up of Summit participants who volunteered and others chosen by AALL President Claire Germain. The general charge of the three Task Forces as outlined by Claire Germain was: “to create a structured approach and framework on how to provide an integrated Continuing Professional Education program for the next three years that supplement the Annual Meeting programming.” The individual Task Forces and their charges are as follows:

**Task Force #1—Calendaring and Speakers’ Bureau**

Charge: The Task Force will consider a set of policy issues toward the creation of:

1. A clearinghouse of national and chapter programs, with a calendaring system populated by the chapters and other entities.
2. A speakers’ bureau.

**Task Force #2—Framework and Oversight**

Charge:

1. Flesh out the specific roles of the stakeholders: in particular but not limited to AALL, Chapters, SISs, Committees, and Caucuses, and create a blueprint for fostering entrepreneurship among the stakeholders. Describe how the SISs and the chapters will work together to plan and execute the appropriate visions from the Education Summit. Define the scope of the authority of various groups.
2. Create model development for staffing and technology infrastructure.
3. Create implementation plans for annual meeting program repackaging.
4. Create implementation plan for grant funding and funding model, after Task Force #3 on Funding completes its work.

[I am a member of Task Force #2 Framework and Oversight. We will be working on determining the roles various segments of the organization will play in planning, creating and presenting continuing education opportunities. I am anxious to hear your ideas. Please e-mail me at Douglas@law.duke.edu]

**Task Force #3—Funding**

This Task Force will focus on funding issues and will:

1. Create model development for funding (business model, recovery, profit, risk taking).
2. Create model development for grant funding. This work has already begun. Task Force #1 had a deadline of Dec. 1.

All of the work of these Task Forces must be completed in time for approval at the April 2006 AALL Executive Board Meeting.

I wish you all Happy Holidays and look forward to continuing our work in AALL’s Centennial Year.

Karen Douglas
Duke University Law Library
Collection preservation is an essential management tool. Preservation surveys can uncover problems with the collection that may have gone undetected. How you go about it and what is included in such a project was the focus of this session. The idea for holding a program about library collection preservation surveys came from Pat Turpening from the University of Cincinnati College of Law Library after she wrote a review for the book that became the basis for the panel presentation. The book is titled *Assessing Preservation Needs: A Self-Survey Guide* by Beth Patkus. Published by the Northeast Document Conservation Center in Andover, Massachusetts, 2003, it costs $15.00 and is a spiral bound volume that opens completely flat with plenty of space for making notes.

A preservation survey was defined as a tool to identify hazards, prioritize areas of the collection for action, and to assess current programs and activities. The stated goal of this presentation was to help the audience gain the confidence needed to do a preservation survey in their libraries. Ms. Turpening turned this project into a collaborative process when six people from other libraries agreed to do this with her, and included Curt Conklin, Brigham Young University Hunter Law Library; Ann Nez, University of Washington Gallagher Law Library; Joe Thomas, Notre Dame Law School Kresge Law Library; Sally Wambold, University of Richmond Law Library. Also working on the project were Kathryn Fitzhugh, University of Arkansas at Little Rock Law Library, and Dee Wood, University of Kentucky Law Library.

A preservation survey is not to be taken lightly and the amount of work can be daunting. Several panelists stated that they didn’t really know what they were getting themselves into. There are 26 worksheets – and 228-250 questions in the resource book, although not all questions apply to every library. Participants picked the questions and worksheets that they wanted to work on in their own libraries. Participants communicated through a YAHOO-Group website that was set up for this purpose. All contact among the group was electronic.

During the first part of the program, Pat Turpening discussed the purpose of preservation surveys, the process that the group went through, how they communicated, and what the worksheets were like. What was most interesting was the collaborative process among the presenters. They all stated that they had trouble keeping up with the project deadlines. The project was not always “on the front burner” of their workload. The panelists agreed that it helped to do this together because it kept them on track. The collaborative process helped them to get to know each other better, and one result of this project is that most or all have decided to write preservation plans and/or disaster plans for their libraries.

During the second part of the session, Sally Wambold moderated a question-and-answer session among three panelists, including discussion on which worksheets they chose to complete. When panelists were asked to use words to describe experiences they included: frustrating, difficult, overwhelming, and depressing. However, they also used the words worthwhile, a good experience, educational, positive, and worth the effort. Below are some of the key comments from the panelists.

**Joe Thomas:**

Don’t be afraid to think small and be realistic as to the amount of work. They culled worksheets as to what they needed the most, with the idea that other worksheets could be done at a later time. He is still finishing survey worksheets. In assessing whether the environment was safe, other issues that are not really classified as preservation surfaced, such as security. Most law librarians don’t have anyone assigned to do preservation work or to be responsible for it. This is why it is important to think small and tackle it as you can. It doesn’t take special preservation knowledge or training to do this survey. Thomas will use the information they have gathered primarily for the design of their new building currently being planned, taking into account the problems of the old building.

**Ann Nez:**

Ann reported that she had plenty of help with her work on this project through a grant she got for her own preservation training. She also had extra help from library students and law library staff. She was involved in a preservation grant that dovetailed with this project. Also, she was encouraged to use library staff and library science students in helping fill out the surveys. One of the obstacles in finishing the project can be working through the intricacies of the bureaucracy for building-related issues and problems, but some issues to be addressed are in the control of technical services. For example, they took pictures of things they thought were problems and will be preparing a training slide show for staff on proper shelving, proper handling of materials, and so forth. They also found that there are current policies in place that need changing.

**Curt Conklin:**

I didn’t realize what I was getting myself into. I had to go to my administration and ask for time off to do it. I found out that: 1. Preservation is not just about the collection – it is also about the building, so you get facilities people and custodial people involved in this process too. 2. The booklet is brimming with valuable information aside from the information that the worksheets gather. 3. It is very difficult to get reference librarians to be concerned about the physical condition of the books and look at them as artifacts, so it can be hard to get them interested in preservation survey.
work. An obstacle to finishing the survey is the fact that it will take funding to fix what was found to be deficient. For example, the library needs different lighting, etc., which takes money. Further, in his experience, it doesn’t do much good to write a report at the end of such a project because no one will read it or act on it. He plans to bring up issues when there may be opportunity to do something about them. Also, this kind of project is worthwhile if you have not worked at an institution for very long – it helps you get to know the building, collection, and institution staff that are partners in the responsibility for the building, such as facilities and custodial staff.

As I sat and listened to this presentation, I was genuinely amazed that these folks would take on such a huge project so they could test it out and report to the law library community at AALL. They really worked hard for the entire year before the conference to do this survey and learn the problems and pitfalls, as well as the gains that come with doing a preservation survey. I admire them for their commitment and I feel that they have shown us that with commitment and confidence this project is do-able. With adequate planning and realistic goals based on available staff and the information that will be gathered, I believe law librarians can successfully use this tool for collection management, and the program participants will continue to serve our association as resource people for others who undertake preservation surveys.

Digital Technologies and the Acquisitions Process: Two Examples

“I’ve only been doing this fifty-four years. With a little experience, I might get better.”—Harry Caray.

Have the Internet, email, and websites made acquisitions work better? I came across two articles recently that discussed the impact of digital technologies on the acquisitions process. The first concerned selection and purchasing. The second dealt with invoicing.

Barbra Blummer, in her article The Use of Digital Technologies in the Selection and Purchasing of Library Materials among Special, Academic and Public Libraries, reported on the results of a survey conducted to examine the relationship between collection development and acquisitions. Her aim was to measure the extent to which libraries were incorporating digital technologies to expedite the acquisitions process.

The survey instrument asked responders to describe the responsibilities of collection development and acquisitions librarians at each institution, discuss how purchasing recommendations were forwarded to the acquisitions department, what responsibilities does acquisitions have in the ordering process, when difficulties arose in the purchasing process (out of print, price increases, lack of availability) were acquisitions or collection development persons responsible for decisions on how to proceed, who assumes responsibility for negotiating licenses, who monitors the status of purchases, who monitors the acquisitions budget, what is the physical proximity of the two departments, and suggestions for improving the process.

Responses were received from special, public and academic institutions. The data highlighted the use of email, websites, online book databases, publishers’ catalogs on the Internet, and integrated library systems to facilitate collection development and acquisitions activities. Responses from special libraries emphasized the informal nature of the collection development process. Because of their smaller staffs, these libraries were more flexible in their workflows and collaborative in their decision making processes. Digital technologies were integral to the acquisitions workflow both in the selection and purchasing of materials.

Academic libraries were found to have much more formal, structured approaches to collection development and acquisitions. A function of larger staffs and broader patron bases, these workflows were centered on digital technologies, faculty liaisons, collection development librarians, and acquisitions staff. Email, EDI, Amazon.com, MARC record loads all play large and important roles in the process. The collection development process is still largely the purview of librarians.

In public libraries, the results mirrored academics with one exception. In public libraries, unlike many academic libraries, staff librarians typically do selection at the branch level.

What to make of all this? For research and communication purposes email and the web have become integral to our day-to-day acquisitions activities. The degree to which activities are influenced further depends on the size, flexibility and adaptability of the organization involved. Training staff on the availability and use of new technologies, even to the extent of incorporating technical proficiency requirements into job descriptions, has become the standard. Cooperation between collection development and acquisitions grows more important as the length of the workflow increases.

The opposite end of the acquisitions process, invoicing, despite EDI and other related technologies, remains a largely paper-intensive activity. Katherine Treptow Farrell and Janet E. Lute propose an alternative to paper in their article “Document-Management Technology and Acquisitions Workflow: A Case Study in Invoice Processing.”
The authors discuss efforts at the Princeton University Libraries to gain better and more complete control over invoice documents. The Princeton University Accounts Payable Office installed a document management system (DMS) for use as an audit archive. This establishment by the university of digital storage as an acceptable archive medium made it possible for the libraries to explore a similar approach. The goal of the Princeton effort was not to eliminate paper as an archive from the invoicing process. The purpose was greater efficiency.

Interestingly, real efficiencies depended less upon the technology itself than upon staff seeing tangible benefits from the new technology. Once that acceptance was gained, real efficiencies were developed and even expanded. The authors note that the most salutary effects of implementing a DMS to track invoices were not the gains made to date, but the potential for further changes in workflow, greater economies and the expansion of the DMS to other areas of technical services work. They cite the management of licenses for electronic products and the management of approval plan profiles and agreements as areas for further study. As an aside, here at William & Mary, we have taken that extra step and begun managing an electronic archive of licenses and contracts. It has proven very beneficial both as an internal tool, as a means of exchanging information with our campus procurement office, and as a means of responding quickly to issues with vendors.

The authors both state that, faced with the same situation again, they would make the same choice in implementing the system, with the temporary addition of a staff member to compensate for the additional workload at the onset of the project.

On the surface, both of these projects dealt with how digital technologies were impacting acquisitions workflow. Interestingly though, the more important goal of both of these studies was process management. How do we improve upon the acquisitions workflow without detrimentally impacting service and how do we satisfy the record-keeping needs of our organizations and still maintain an efficient operation. Barbara Blummer found that digital technologies complemented but did not replace the need for human interaction in the acquisitions process. Treptow and Lute discovered that digital management of documents generated by the acquisitions process provided opportunities for expanded staff training and development while adding greater transparency to the financial process. Who knows, we all might become a little better by learning from their experience.

Sources

By now, most of us have been using Classification Web for some time, but if you are like me, you could use some reminders about its features and capabilities.

First, if you have not already done so, you should sign up for at least the Class Web Announcement electronic list at http://classificationweb.net/mailman/listinfo/classweb-announce. This low traffic list keeps you informed about the site. You should probably also join the Users Group discussion list, which allows you to communicate with fellow users. Information on these lists and how to sign up for them can be found by clicking on the link labeled User Group near the bottom of the main menu screen in Classification Web.

Second, even if you have already gone through the tutorial, it is worth looking at it again to refresh your memory on all the features of Class Web. Just click on the Tutorial link at the bottom of the Main Menu screen. This Quick Start Tutorial will introduce each feature so that you can get started exploring Class Web on your own. In addition, more detailed descriptions of most features are available at any stage of your Class Web search by clicking on the Help button at the top of the screen. This will give you access to an extensive context-sensitive help system. I tried it out on several screens and there really is a wealth of information not in the tutorial.

Third, remember that there are three different browser views in Class Web: Standard, Enhanced and Hierarchy. When you set your Preferences in Class Web, you can select the one you would like as your default. You can also choose to use a different Browser view temporarily by clicking on the link at the very bottom of the Main Menu screen. When I first started using Class Web, I confess that I didn’t trust
that it could calculate numbers in tables correctly so I only used the Standard Browser which displays the classification schedules with links to other areas of classification and to the classification tables. When you click on a table link in the Standard browser, the data on your screen is replaced with the contents of the table just as if you had flipped to the table at the back of the print version. However, once I had tested the Enhanced Browser numerous times, and became used to the look of this display, I reset my preferences and now use this view the most.

The Enhanced Browser adds support for a calculator that automatically merges classification table data into the main classification display. When you click on a table link in the Enhanced Browser, the table is loaded in such a way that the table data appears to be part of the schedule data (including calculated classification numbers). The Enhanced Browser will not automatically apply a table as you navigate through the classification data. You have to click on a table link to open up that table and incorporate it into the display. One benefit of this Browser view is that when you type a number into the “LC Class #” prompt at the top of the screen, the software will automatically apply tables to take you to the most specific record possible within that number.

I am just starting to experiment with the Hierarchy Browser, which is the most complex of the three. As the Class Web documentation states, “you navigate the data hierarchically by moving down one level at a time and by moving up one or more levels at once. Like the Enhanced Browser, when you type a number into the “Class #” prompt at the top of the screen, the software will apply as many tables as necessary to get to the most specific record possible. The Hierarchy Browser keeps track of your current level and limits the display to that many levels of classification data. By clicking on a link that says, “Hide subtopics,” “Show subtopics,” or “Apply table,” you change the maximum depth that the Browser will go when creating the display.” So far I have used this view to browse a particular classification and then “dig deeper” to find specifically what I want.

Another important thing to remember when using the Search menu in Class Web is to check the display options and the search options under the search boxes to make sure you have selected the best options for your particular search. For example, under display options make sure that you select the option to include both tables and schedules when you are looking for law classification numbers that are formed using a table. Remember that tables are used to form all of the classification numbers of the States of the United States and for many other countries of the world. Class Web defaults to searching only the schedules unless you select the option to include tables only or both schedules and tables. Also remember to combine searches to narrow your results, e.g. to search only the States table in KF, enter your term in the keyword box, then enter the table range KFA-KFZ in the Classification number box. Make sure you have selected the option to include both the tables and the schedules, and then click on the Search button.

Finally, one of my favorite features is the subject heading and classification correlation. By selecting the LC Subject Heading and LC Classification Number Correlations option on the Main Menu you can enter an LC Subject Heading and receive a list of possible classification numbers. Click on any of these numbers to go right to the schedule and see if this number is what you are seeking. You can check out possible subject headings for a particular classification number this way too, or you can do so by browsing the schedules for the number in question and clicking on the letter S next to the caption. There are other interesting letter options after the caption, and one I use often is the letter B that takes you to a Bibliographic search of this classification number in any number of online catalogs including your own. This list can be customized in the Preferences for Class Web. I most often use it to search the classification number in our library catalog to get a feel for how it fits into our collection.

Well, I have already written too much, but that just goes to show that there is more than meets the eye to Classification Web. Take some time to explore and it will improve your efficiency in searching and selecting accurate classification numbers. Also, please send me classification questions to answer in future columns.
Identifying and Collecting Foreign Law Treatises

Margaret Maes Axtmann
University of St. Thomas

Many libraries of all types have only an occasional need for a treatise on foreign law. While primary law for foreign jurisdictions has become relatively easy to find using free electronic resources, secondary sources and explanations of the law are still found mainly in print. Here are some methods for identifying relevant treatises for a basic collection.

Research Guides

I often use online research guides for reference and teaching, and I’ve found them to be surprisingly good sources of information for collection development work. The best guides include a good description of the legal system of the country, an outline of primary sources of law and where to find them online and in print, a discussion of major secondary sources and finding aids, and information about the legal publishing environment.

GlobaLex at http://www.nyulawglobal.org/globalex/index.html is a collection of articles on international, foreign, and comparative law research. Many of the guides are prepared by law librarians working in the jurisdictions. One example of a research guide that is useful for collection building is Christoph Malliet’s Research Guide to Belgian Law, http://www.nyulawglobal.org/globalex/Belgium.htm. Malliet describes the Belgian legal system and the sources of primary law, but he also lists major law reviews and legal journals, encyclopedias, classic general treatises, and major treatises on topical areas of law. Whether one wanted to build a basic collection on Belgian law or a comparative collection on a topic of law, this type of guide is a terrific resource for information on Belgian legal bibliography and related publishing aspects.

LLRX (Law Library Resource Xchange) has a series of comparative and foreign law guides at http://www.llrx.com/comparative_and_foreign_law.html. A Guide to the Israeli Legal System by Ruth Levush is one of the jurisdictional guides, while Julian Zegelman’s Researching Intellectual Property Law in the Russian Federation is an example of a topical treatment that also includes an overview of the legal system and the primary sources of law. Both types of guides can be used to identify secondary sources of law and legal treatises. Often the guides also address language considerations, providing information about availability of resources in English.

Neither GlobaLex nor LLRX is exhaustive in its coverage of foreign jurisdictions, as they rely on finding librarians and legal practitioners with appropriate knowledge and expertise. LLRX guides are being published and updated less frequently than they were a few years ago, while GlobaLex is a relatively new project of the Hauser Global Law School Program at NYU and is rapidly expanding its offerings. Whether you are just beginning to develop a collection of foreign law treatises or are seeking to update an existing collection, I recommend checking the guides at both websites for lists of recommended resources.

Print Monographic Series

Another excellent way to develop a small collection of foreign law is to acquire a basic topical monographic series on various aspects of the law in a particular jurisdiction. Here are just a few examples from different parts of the world:

- Essentials of Canadian Law—This series from Irwin Law received the Canadian Association of Law Libraries’ Award for Excellence in Legal Publishing in 2002. The series currently contains more than 30 titles on a wide variety of legal topics, written by leading authorities. It is aimed at law students and practitioners, but the treatment of each topic provides an overview and general introduction to the law. This is an excellent resource for U.S. law libraries. See http://www.irwinlaw.com/.

- Que sais-je?—Published by Presses Universitaires de France, there are several sub-series by this name for different disciplines, including one that covers law, political science, and international relations. The treatment is scholarly, and these works are highly regarded. They are written in French. In addition to numerous titles on aspects of French law, the series includes titles on European Union law and international law from a French perspective. See http://www.puf.com/.

- China Law—This English language series from Sweet & Maxwell Asia covers mainland Chinese law. It includes approximately 20 titles on aspects of law ranging from banking to intellectual property to constitutional law. The works are written by scholars and practitioners. See http://www.sweetandmaxwellasia.com/.

- Australian Essentials Series—Published by Cavendish Australia, this series is geared toward both undergraduate students and law students. The treatment is concise rather than scholarly, and the titles are inexpensive. The series mainly covers core legal topics that would be studied in a law program. See http://www.cavendishpublishing.com/.

Thanks to Marylin Raisch, Colin Ying, and Roy Sturgeon for helping to identify some of these series.

I welcome additional input on basic law series for foreign jurisdictions, or comments on methods of identifying and selecting these materials. What have you done to build your foreign law treatise collection?
Background on Electronic Serials Cataloging

We will first summarize present practices for cataloging serials available electronically either through their publishers, but more often through other providers, usually called “aggregators” or “aggregator services,” such as HeinOnline, ABI/Inform, ProQuest, JSTOR, and Project Muse. These e-journals are usually reproductions of print versions, but are sometimes issued simultaneously or even in advance of the print version. Prior to July 2003, CONSER policy for serials which were clearly electronic reproductions was for libraries to follow the “Single record approach” (add a note and a MARC 856 field to the record for the print version, and not catalog the electronic version/s separately), or the “Separate record approach” (create a separate record for each electronic reproduction of the same journal). (CONSER is an international cooperative serials cataloging program which is the serials component of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging).

Electronic versions of serials issued simultaneously with the print version were to be cataloged separately from the print. As the number of serial aggregators proliferated, so did the number of records representing electronic versions of the same serial. It was often quite difficult to make a distinction between simultaneous versions and reproductions of a serial. The OCLC database was starting to feature multiple records for the same electronic journal which represented versions of the journal made available through different providers, or even different subscription offerings of the same journal made available to different institutions by the same provider.

Searching for these titles was becoming increasingly complex. In July 2003, CONSER implemented an “Aggregator Neutral Record Policy,” which no longer distinguished between digital serial reproductions and simultaneous versions. One record represents all electronic versions of the serial, as long as the content of a particular e-journal does not differ so markedly that it really constitutes a separate work. Information on the record is applicable to all versions being distributed by all providers. This policy applies to all e-journals, regardless of whether they are available in aggregators, or whether they exist in print counterparts. CONSER is currently focusing on titles in aggregators which contain the full serial, not titles in article-based databases. This policy has helped to streamline the cataloging process for electronic journals, and has also simplified searching for them. (See CONSER Cataloging Manual 31.1.3 “Electronic reproductions,” and the link at the CONSER website under “Aggregator-neutral record” http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/agg-neutral-recs.html. A list of many MARC record sets available for different databases and aggregator services is available at the BIBCO website at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/agglist.html—last updated July 6, 2004; viewed Dec. 6, 2005).

To represent electronic journals in online public access catalogs (OPACs), libraries usually follow either the “Single-record approach” or the “Aggregator-neutral approach.” In either case, libraries can do the cataloging themselves, or subscribe to a vendor service, such as Serials Solutions. Using a vendor service, the library first sends a list of all its e-journal subscriptions to the vendor. The vendor then uses the aggregator neutral records on OCLC or creates its own, based on the print version of the serial, and tweaks the records according to the library’s requests. These records are then loaded into the local OPAC; new and updated titles and notifications of deletions/cancellations are sent to the library on a regular basis. To see an example of how vendor processing works, see the record for “Harvard law review (Online)” in NYU Law School’s OPAC at: http://julius.law.nyu.edu/search/tt/SEARCH=harvard+law+review+online.

Cataloging of Electronic Monographs

Let’s now turn to a discussion of monographs, which are available electronically.  

Proliferation of Electronic Versions for Many Monographs

Parallel to the increasing proliferation of multiple electronic aggregators for the same serial, many monographs are also becoming available electronically through more than one provider.


Three Approaches Used for Cataloging Electronic Monographs

“Single Record Approach”

Some libraries and agencies, for example the Government Printing Office (GPO), provide access to all electronic reproductions via a detailed MARC 530 note on the record for the original version. MARC 856 links are provided to access the electronic version. Example: OCLC #45544852.

“Separate Electronic Record Approach,” with Original Version Described in a Note

When an electronic (or other reproduction) exists in a print or microform original, Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed [AACR2] 1.11A states that the bibliographic record should describe the reproduction, and that data relating to the original should be given in the note area (generally, MARC field 534 is used for this purpose). National Archives and Libraries Canada follows this policy. Most titles in the project “Documenting the American South” have been cataloged
using this approach (in OCLC, search cn: “Documenting the American South Project”).

“Separate Electronic Record Approach,” with Electronic Reproduction Described in a 533 Note
Most American libraries follow Library of Congress Rule Interpretation [LCRI] 1.11A, describing the original resource in the body of the record, and adding details relating to the reproduction in a MARC 533 field. See LCRI 1.11A, examples 3-4. Further examples can be found in OCLC, such as the electronic versions of titles digitized by Law Library Microform Consortium (search OCLC under se=LLMC-digital series), HeinOnline (search se=Heinonline.org), or NetLibrary (kw: NetLibrary, but qualify also by year and language, to avoid retrieving too large a set of records).

In both of the separate record approaches, a MARC 776 linking entry is often made to the record for the non-electronic version, usually the original print version.

Should the treatment of electronic monographs be changed to be more in adherence with CONSER’s policy for e-serials?
Currently, LCRI 1.11A still makes a distinction between born digital and electronic reproductions. Granted, for a particular electronic monographic title, the decision usually only needs to be made once, whereas for continuing resources such as e-journals the situation might change from one issue to the next (i.e., one issue might be a reproduction of the print; the next issue might be issued simultaneously or prior to the print, or have somewhat different content). But is the distinction important enough to continue making it for monographs, even though it is no longer considered worth making for serials? How is the user benefited by having a separate record for each reproduction?

Are notes about the original needed for monographs, such as 533 about the reproduction and the 534, or should other approaches be developed?

Here are several possible options:

1. Keep current cataloging practices, but make greater use of e-book record sets.

More and more record sets are becoming available. Often, these records are machine-generated or derived. This approach is extensively discussed in the report of the PCC Standing Committee on Automation’s Monograph Aggregator Task Group, entitled: Functional Requirements for Electronic Vendor Records (FREVR): final report (available at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/sca/frevrfinalreport919.pdf—dated Sept. 19, 2005; last viewed Dec. 5, 2005). Regarding the various cataloging approaches in use for cataloging electronic monographs, the report states:

“The variety of cataloging approaches is confusing but the TG [Task Group] does not advocate one treatment over another. Ultimately cataloging style is not as important as the availability, accuracy and timeliness of records.” (Page 2 of the PDF version).

This is an excellent point that catalogers should always keep in mind. But it is equally important to ask ourselves the point of a particular policy. Does it achieve its purpose? If not, perhaps the practice needs to be revised or a better one devised. Certainly, that’s often the case in the dynamic and rapidly evolving area of electronic resources cataloging.

1A. Retain the current approach, while working on the implementation of the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records [FRBR].
More extensive and uniform implementation of FRBR has the potential to alleviate many difficulties in the cataloging world, including that of multiple versions, of which electronic manifestations are in large part a subset. Following FRBR principles, OPACs should soon be able to suppress the public display of bibliographic records for electronic manifestations of expressions in print, if the records have MARC field 776 fields linking to the print or other versions. Information relating to the reproduction would display as a copy or hot link on the “master record” for the expression. This information could be in fields 533 or 534 of the suppressed records for the electronic versions, or wherever it is most practical. (See below for other approaches). This practice could be extended to multiple versions in general, and parallel practices could be developed to link and relate other manifestations of the same expression together. Most likely, some development of the MARC bibliographic and possibly holdings formats would be needed. (For detailed information on MARC/FRBR synchronizations, see the MARBI website under the link: MARC Standards: MARC and FRBR, at http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc-functional-analysis/frbr.html (last viewed Dec. 5, 2005); the complete text of FRBR is available online at http://www.ifla.org/VII/s13/frbr/frbr.pdf).

2. Use an Aggregator neutral monograph record.

Use an approach similar to CONSER’s for treating electronic serials: an aggregator-neutral monographic record. All electronic versions (whether born digital or reproductions) could be put on one record, as CONSER does with serials. In fact, many of the same reasons that are given by CONSER to justify the aggregator neutral electronic serial record would apply to aggregator neutral monograph records. Simply substitute the word “monograph” for “serial” in the quote below:

“Why do we need it? The same serial titles are made available by multiple aggregators. CONSER’s earlier policy of creating a separate record for each aggregation became confusing and hard to maintain. While the appearance … might differ among these aggregators, there is still one basic electronic serial that is being distributed …” (FAQ on the Aggregator-neutral record; available at http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/agg-neut-faq.html (dated May 29, 2003; last viewed Dec. 5, 2005).

The description would be based on the chief source of the electronic version (the publisher’s website if the publisher also made the resource available directly; otherwise any of the aggregator versions). Usually, these would all parallel any original print version. Give a note (500) for the source of the title.
If a particular version had a title variation, you could add a note such as:

MARC 246 1 $i “Some versions have title: Sa…”

If the work is a reproduction of a print or microform original, is it important to include information about the source of the reproduction? If not, then LCRI 1.11A would need to be revised, or some provision put into RDA [Resource Description and Access], the up-and-coming cataloging rules (formerly known as AACR3), which are due to be published in a couple of years. MARC bibliographic 856 subfield “z” could probably be used for information on each reproduction, but it would tend to clutter the Electronic location and access fields, which are often in a prominent location in a library’s OPAC. Alternately, 856 links on holdings records could be used in those OPACs that have this capability. (This would be a useful approach for serial aggregator neutral records too). One disadvantage with using the bibliographic or holdings 856 field is that the information concerning each reproduction could not be neatly separated into meaningful subfields as it is in the 533 and 534 bibliographic fields, for the simple reason that most of the possible subfield indicators have already been assigned. We would need a MARBI proposal to allow Greek and Cyrillic or other letters to be used as subfield indicators.

(While as a former Classics major, I would like to see Greek letters used as subfield indicators, this proposal might not meet with MARBI’s rapturous approval).

2A. Aggregator neutral monograph record, except allow one or more 533s for all electronic versions.

A good example is in Fordham’s LAW PAC. Search for: A treatise on American military laws, and the practice of courts martial / by John O’Brien, or click on the following link: http://lawpac.lawnet.fordham.edu/search/ttreatise+on+american+military+laws/ttreatise+on+american+military+laws/1%2C1%2C1%2CB/frameset&FF=treatise+on+american+military+laws&1%2C0%2C

Personally, I’m most in favor of Approach #2 but #2A isn’t bad either. I think however that #1 is most likely for the next few years. If monographic aggregators proliferate and overlap in their coverage the way many serial aggregators are doing, the Monographic aggregator neutral record may become a reality of national or even international cataloging policies.

Update on the previous TSLL issue.

1. European Union.

In the previous issue of TSLL, I discussed the late 2004 change to the treatment of the European Union [EU]. It may now be used as a corporate name heading on bibliographic and authority records. The examples I gave in the previous issue were from authority records, including the use of “European Union” in headings or references, and as part of the name of a subordinate body. I should add that usage of the new corporate heading “European Union” as an access point on bibliographic records is naturally governed by the relevant sections of AACR2 and the LCRIs; for use of “European Union” as a main entry, one should first consult AACR2/LCRIs under 21.4B; for use as an added entry, first see 21.30A-F. A quick search in OCLC of “European Union” as a corporate author retrieved 174 records (as of Dec. 4, 2005), 10 of which were national level records. For a good example of a case where corporate entry under European Union is now appropriate, see OCLC #52133435: Annual report of the state of the European Union.

As the EU is not (yet?) treated as a political jurisdiction by the Library of Congress, a collection of EU law would not be eligible for main entry under the European Union, nor could a uniform title (240) “Laws, etc.” be assigned for a general collection of EU laws (AACR2 21.31A and 25.15A1).

For use of “European Union” as a corporate added entry, see OCLC #62342480: COMESA-EU Trade & Investment Exhibition.

More common are records with headings for subordinate bodies of the EU, either entered dependently as subordinate bodies or entered independently qualified by “European Union”. (Examples are given in the previous issue of TSLL).


Reciprocal see also references should now be made between personal names of heads of state, ecclesiastical officials, etc., and their corresponding official headings. For example, under the new policy, the authority record for: Clinton, George,$d 1739–1812 (n 86125388) and the authority record for: New York (State).$b Governor (1777–1793 : Clinton) (n86125389) would both have reciprocal see also references (MARC authority 5xx fields). Under earlier policy, only the authority record for the personal name heading would have a see also reference for the head of state in his official capacity. There is no retrospective project planned to add the see also references for the personal name headings to the authority records for the official heads of states. However, if the records need to be updated for any other reason, these references should be added at that time.

3. Addition of dates to existing personal name headings in the Name Authority File.

The Library of Congress has announced a pending change in policy with regard to the addition of dates to previously established personal name headings. At the present time, birth or death dates may be added to established personal name headings only to resolve a conflict with another heading. The new policy will be: On an optional basis, death dates may be added to established personal name headings only containing birthdates.

Continuing the status quo, “no conflict” personal name headings without any dates may not be changed.

Until the relevant documentation is revised and published, the current policy should still be followed. (CPSO website document available at: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/ pndates.html—last revised Sept. 27, 2005; viewed Dec. 5, 2005).

4. Retention of initial diacritical marks on capital letters
Access Management: Starting with Identity, Roles, and Rules

As law libraries continue to acquire electronic resources, they face a number of challenges regarding access management. In April 1998, Clifford Lynch distributed his *White Paper on Authentication and Access Management Issues in Cross-organizational Use of Networked Information Resources*, still available online at [http://www.cni.org/projects/authentication/authentication-wp.html](http://www.cni.org/projects/authentication/authentication-wp.html). Lynch identified the problem then as one of identity verification. “The operator of the network resource...needs to decide whether users seeking access to the resource are actually members of the user community that the licensee institution defined as part of the license agreement.” (Lynch, Section 2.0) The issue, he states, “is one of testing or verifying that individuals are really a member of this community according to pre-agreed criteria, of having the institution vouch for, or credential, the individuals in some way that the resource operator can understand.” In December of that same year, the Coalition for Networked Information reported on the 1998 meeting with Norman Wiseman of the Joint Information Systems Committee. The report documented the beginnings of Athens, “an access management service controlling access to distributed resources on a network,” [http://www.cni.org/tfms/1998b-fall/handout/NWiseman-ppt/](http://www.cni.org/tfms/1998b-fall/handout/NWiseman-ppt/). Today, identity management remains a top priority and concern. Athens is one of the highly touted solutions.

Identity management refers to the technology used to manage authorized access to resources through some method of user verification. The technology enables a user to be identified by the resource access management system and permits access according to the permissions or rules associated with the identity presented. The technology used may be usernames and passwords or digital certificates or some other identifying system.

When we manage access to local resources, identity management is locally controlled. Most institutions and organizations handle this very well. For example, when you log in to your integrated library management system, you typically use a unique username and password. This user account identifies you as a staff member. For a higher level of role granularity, you may be identified as a manager in the technical services department of your library. Those details are the roles assigned to your identity. That same username and password, your identity, is linked to a set of permissions that allow you to navigate and take actions within that confined system. If you have permission to run a report, you would be allowed to do so. If the account that you logged in with did not have those permissions granted, you would not be able to do so. These permissions are the rules enacted once identity is confirmed. Typically, one or two people in your library system have created the username and password identity, associated with a group (patron, staff member, or faculty) and assigned the rules that permit a person to get his or her work done.

Currently, most law libraries, at least in the United States, have not relied on identity management at the individual level as a management technology for access to remote electronic resources (except, of course, for access to WESTLAW and Lexis/Nexis). Instead, we depend upon either the technology of IP addresses or the username(s) supplied by the publisher/provider of the electronic resource. Neither of these identifies an *individual* as an authenticated user. Access is granted by association at a very minimal level: either by location or by locally shared knowledge (regarding the username and password). Though these methods are effective and efficient, they don’t provide granularity required for accurate identity management. The point of access set in an IP address provides only the broadest level of identification, which is association with the institution. The problem is that we have come to rely on IPs or generic logins to represent who we are as approved users. A law library that sets up law school-only access to an electronic resource faces a very complex system of control when you throw in technology as common as wireless access, which typically expands the IP ranges to a campus-wide system. Firms face the same challenges with users needing access from home, multiple offices, courts or anywhere firm employees do their research. The specific identification limits to the law school/firm-only provisions of the license agreement become tenuously restrictive. Limiting access via IP addresses becomes virtually useless. We react by modifying our IP ranges and make attempts to control the access points to the electronic resource, but find ourselves lacking verifiable assurance that we are upholding the terms of the license. The alternative is a shared account or a set of accounts provided by the resource provider over which the library has no true controls for distribution and dissemination. Generic institutional accounts certainly don’t identify the user or place him or
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in French, Spanish, and Portuguese. (Proposed revision to LCRI 1.0G).

The Cataloging Policy and Support Office (CPSO)'s proposal to retain these initial diacritical marks, made in mid July 2005, has not been approved as of Dec. 5, 2005.
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The Cataloging Policy and Support Office (CPSO)'s proposal to retain these initial diacritical marks, made in mid July 2005, has not been approved as of Dec. 5, 2005.
FRBR EYES OUR CATALOGS

Whenever I hear FRBR pronounced (like the last name of the famous artist and writer, James Ferber), I think of the interactive toy, the Furby, for some darn reason. What a hierarchical grouping of bibliographic “entities” and a moving, talking toy have to do with each other in my brain is a mystery best left unexplored.

Because this is not the column to go into any depth about FRBR, I shall not give an explanation of what FRBR is other than to quote the recent article in 49 (3) Library Resources & Technical Services, p. 227-242 (2005), titled “The FRBR Model as Applied to Continuing Resources” by National University’s Ed Jones, who writes “…FRBR employs an entity-analysis model that describes various entities (bibliographic resources, persons and corporate bodies, and subjects, their attributes (characteristics), and their relationships with other entities.” There are four levels of abstraction in FRBR: works, expressions, manifestations, and items.

Anyway, to say libraries and OCLC have toyed with FRBR is too glib and belittles the interesting research.

Unlike the Furby, FRBR, IFLA’s 1998 recommended Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, is much more than a fad. OCLC has invested in several projects to test FRBR’s application. These projects, to date, involve xISBN, FictionFinder, FRBR algorithm, and a case study with the work Humphrey Clinker. You can find links to full, detailed descriptions of these projects on the webpage OCLC Research Activities and IFLA’s Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, http://www.oclc.org/research/projects/frbr/default.htm. I am just giving brief descriptions here and a few of my opinions.

The xISBN is a web-based service that supplies ISBNS associated with individual works in WorldCat. In other words, if given an ISBN, it is supposed to return a list of associated ISBNS. OCLC hopes the service’s application will show the effectiveness of OCLC’s FRBR algorithm and the data in WorldCat for intellectual works’ data. Right now there is no charge for trying it out on your own databases. This, of course, will do nothing for your catalog with titles that have no ISBN, such as very old titles and even some newer ones, especially some of the foreign titles. If you have a newer collection with standard works, it should manipulate your catalog well.

The FRBR algorithm is supposed to help automate the conversion of catalog databases to FRBRized catalogs. Name authority files are crucial in utilizing the algorithm to bring expressions and manifestations together under an intellectual work. Thomas B. Hickey, the chief scientist in the OCLC Office of Research, and Edward T. O’Neill, a consulting scientist at the same place, co-authored an article, “FRBRizing OCLC’s WorldCat” in 39 (3/4) Cataloging & Classification Quarterly, p.239-251 (2005), describing the application of the FRBR algorithm. They found it helpful to focus on particular works/types of works: augmented works, revised works, and aggregated works. The algorithm is available at http://www.oclc.org/research/software/frbr/index.shtm.

This summer’s TS-SIS demonstration program, Strategize and FRBRize your OPAC, was particularly interesting, because the speaker, Claudia Conrad of Innovative Interfaces Inc., used...
legal materials to demonstrate how III and OCLC worked to FRBRize bibliographic data by using the OCLC FRBR work set algorithm. Innovative first conducted experiments on the Name Authority File to generate keys to define group entities to extract information from MARC21 records in databases. Keys such as author/title were built and combined for gathering expressions in a FRBR record, but not manifestations and items. Right now application of the FRBR algorithm works best with fiction in monographs or works with well-defined uniform titles such as those in music. According to Ms. Conrad, at present, only 15% of law materials may be FRBRizable using the OCLC FRBR algorithm, due to the often-complex nature of legal materials. Ms. Conrad also noted that super-works, such as adaptations, still need to be considered. As Chris Tarr posted in the TS-SIS Blog, III users may view the PowerPoint slides for this program at III’s website.

FictionFinder is a FRBR-based prototype for fiction in WorldCat. Right now it is a prototype system for fiction, clustered at the work level and only organized down to the expression level. Only textual material is represented.

To study the effectiveness of FRBR on a work of mid-level complexity, OCLC’s Ed O’Neill chose Tobias Smollett’s The Expedition of Humphry Clinker to serve as a case study. According to the OCLC, http://www.oclc.org/research/projects/frbr/clinker/default.htm, Dr. O’Neill found that FRBR in this instance can be valuable to aggregate and that it does enable works to be identified from bibliographic records, but those records do not have enough information to reliably identify expressions.

As noted above, if you try to FRBRize a law collection’s catalog at this point of system experimentation, it will not be terribly effective. It is an interesting concept generating much intellectual thought, papers, discussion, and so on, but actual application will require much more study and refinement, especially with our law materials in mind. The article by Ed Jones, mentioned above, outlines some of the explorations that the library community will need to do, especially with continuing resources, which make up such a large portion of law collections.

Finally, TSL editor, Brian Striman, wants the OCLC column to be more than a repeat of OCLC’s announcements. Therefore, I welcome corrections and comments and, if any of you want to discuss a topic further, please feel free to write to me. If you even want to write a whole column, I encourage you to do so! My e-mail: libped@law.emory.edu.

---

**Preservation at the End of 2005**

Sally Wambold
University of Richmond Law Library

In the last Preservation column I wrote about the meeting, The Changing Book, at the University of Iowa, a meeting that sounded tremendously interesting. As luck would have it, the Chair of the TS-SIS Preservation Committee, Pat Turpening, actually attended this Iowa meeting and confirmed my suspicions about its worth. She is looking forward to the publication of the proceedings. In response, I have placed another call to the University of Iowa to follow up on my initial inquiry about the availability of the proceedings. I hope that I will soon have information for all who are interested. If the information arrives after the deadline for this column, I will post it on the TS-SIS and OBS-SIS lists.

Pat Turpening is also the one who initiated the program Preservation Surveys by the Book, presented in San Antonio at the 98th AALL Annual Meeting. A sequel to the San Antonio program will be a full-day, hands-on workshop in St. Louis. At this workshop, participants will be given the opportunity to get a huge start on writing preservation plans for their own law libraries. The first learning outcome for the workshop will be for the participants to list at least five library functions assessed in preservation surveys so that they understand fully what is included in a preservation survey. Secondly, the participants will be able to complete a priority grid for preservation actions, based on needs at their own libraries. This outcome is extremely focused and practical, as the enormity of preservation needs can stall progress or even prevent starting on such work. It is expected that participants will be collection managers, preservation librarians, and heads of technical services departments. The audience could also be expanded to include other relevant library positions. For example, at the University of Richmond Law Library, the Head of Reference and Research Services is also the Curator of Special Collections. In sum, all librarians who are concerned about the welfare and condition of their collections will benefit from attending this workshop. Interpreting the results of a preservation survey is a prime topic of this workshop. Preservation so often is abandoned because it can be overwhelming.

As said above, setting priorities is a major part of the work. Enlisting support and volunteers can be a great strategy, as the audience learned at the Preservation Surveys by the Book. One of the panelists, Ann Nez, was fortunate to be awarded a grant to attend preservation seminars presented by national experts. She also had student workers available to perform tasks which helped her to complete the preservation survey, which is the foundation of the program. Utilizing such support effectively is essential to success, and Ann did this work most admirably. Ann’s experience was
particularly rich and her survey results showed great depth. An additional component in Ann’s experience was the strong support of her institution, the University of Washington, Gallagher Law Library.

The other panelists added their own richness and perspective to this program. Curt Conklin of Brigham Young University, Howard W. Hunter Law Library, pointed out challenges to preservation, showing how wisely his library had been built, to include preservation-friendly elements. He also mentioned the wonderful and fortunate low humidity of Utah! Joe Thomas related the security challenges at Notre Dame Law School Kresge Library, challenges that would have to be prioritized and overcome before preservation could be effective.

The preservation plans for the upcoming workshop can also be a tool of advocacy to garner support from the library’s institution. Focusing on the most important needs of a library can influence budget allocations. As I have probably written ad nauseum, effective preservation is practical, achievable preservation. I will add that the library’s catalog is also a part of practical preservation. Properly backed up, it is an inventory of the library’s collection often including the monetary value of many of the titles in the collection.

This leads me quite tangentially to an advert for the MARC record, the foundation of a large percentage of our catalogs. In July 2006, OBS will participate in the AALL Annual Meeting Centennial Celebration Variety Show in St. Louis, with a skit entitled OBS Salutes MARC, Pioneer of Change, performed by MARC Fields and the Indicators. Come celebrate this great organizational/access tool which pioneered the structure of our online catalogs, and documented the titles contained in our library collections—and made it possible for those catalogs to be backed up in order to preserve the information in the collections. Although this OBS skit is a light-hearted look at the MARC record, the value of MARC remains undiminished by the high jinks in the program.

To wind up this column with another tangent, I would like to mention disaster planning. Since disaster preparedness is a major component of preservation, it makes me very proud to write that the Southeast Chapter of the American Association of Law Libraries (SEAALL) Annual Meeting in Raleigh, NC, in April 2006, will begin with a Disaster Preparedness Institute. SEAALL has most energetically supported its members affected by Katrina and Rita. This institute is just one more expression of commitment to library preservation on the part of SEAALL. Contact me for further information about the SEAALL Institute. Details will be forthcoming in early 2006. If there is enough interest, the information can be included in the next issue of TSLL in this column.

At the end of 2005, interesting and promising developments are taking place in the world of preservation. I have only touched on a fraction of these developments. May 2006 bring greater progress yet. Let’s drink a toast to the health of our collections and make our plans accordingly!

---

**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.
“Pushing” Information to Lawyers in a Private Firm

Information sources continue to multiply. Professionals desiring to stay on the “cutting edge” of relevant new developments must monitor an ever-increasing number of print and electronic resources. But not all professionals possess the organizational skills to do this efficiently and effectively. Enter the librarians, who by definition have the ability to organize and synthesize information.

At Bryan Cave’s St. Louis office, the library and research services staff manages information from various sources and “pushes” it to lawyers using several creative methods. This is a team effort, involving both technical services and research librarians. “Pushed” information at Bryan Cave falls roughly into three broad categories: regularly issued periodicals, new resources, and current awareness news.

**Periodicals**

The traditional way to “push” a periodical to its readership consists of physically routing it to a list of users who have expressed an interest in it. This eliminates the burden on the user to remember when a given title is due to arrive so he can go to the library and read it promptly. The method has its drawbacks, however. If the last person on the route list is to have any hope of seeing the issue before it is “old news,” several copies of the periodical need to be routed simultaneously. Even then, we can’t guarantee that an issue won’t get “stuck” in someone’s in-box along the way.

In many cases, we have discontinued traditional routing in favor of a different approach. When it is acceptable to the title’s readers and meets copyright standards, our Library Assistant scans the table of contents of a periodical and posts it on the library and research services section of the firm intranet. She then emails the webpage link to the lawyers for whom this title is important. They can view the TOC and decide whether to request the issue or a specific included article from the library.

Some periodical subscriptions include access to an electronic copy, and some significant periodicals are freely available via the Internet. In these cases, the Library Assistant sets up an Outlook reminder to check on the publication at regular intervals. When a new issue comes out, she posts the link to the appropriate library webpage and emails the interested parties to let them know it is available.

**New stuff**

The Cataloging Librarian at Bryan Cave maintains a database of significant new acquisitions. Each month, the Research Librarian downloads this information into the library and research services bulletin, which he emails to all of the attorneys in the St. Louis office. The lawyers can contact the library to borrow the titles that look important to them. The bulletin also serves as a tool for informing lawyers about new features available in the electronic resources they use.

When we receive a new edition of a monograph or annual serial, we first look to see if the old edition is currently checked out. If it is, then our Collection Management Librarian notifies the borrower of the old edition that the library has received the new and asks if she would like to check out the new edition. In this manner, we “push” new items directly to those who find them relevant.

**Current awareness**

The Director of Library and Research Services monitors discussion lists and blogs, and notifies specific attorney practice groups of current developments by email on an ad hoc basis. The Manager of Library and Research Services in Bryan Cave’s Santa Monica office takes a different approach to current awareness alerts. She has created blogs for individual practice groups which she maintains with current news and information relevant to each blog’s audience.

**Conclusion**

Taken as a whole, these techniques for “pushing” information primarily give lawyers more opportunities for serendipitous knowledge acquisition via browsing. We provide them with the ability to browse journal tables of contents and the library’s “new book shelf” from their desktops. And in the case of the current awareness blogs, we provide a place to browse relevant news aggregated from a variety of sources in one central location. Browsing has always been the heart of library usage in all sorts of libraries, and these new technologies carry on the tradition.
Collaborative Writing: Are Two Heads Always Better Than One?

Collaboration has been a hot topic in scholarly circles lately, due in no small measure to the increasing emphasis on interdisciplinary research. It is hard to find a writing workshop or conference that does not include at least one session on collaboration’s importance. Nevertheless, successful collaboration does not just happen. Like any good partnership, a prosperous collaborative writing project requires careful forethought and vigilant maintenance. Here are some advantages that collaboration can bring to a project, some potential drawbacks, and a few tips on how to make the relationship work.

**Positives**

Complementary skills
Few of us are equally strong in all the areas needed to write an excellent article. Teaming with another researcher can bring needed skills to a project. For instance, if your article requires statistical analysis but the last math class you passed was Remedial Addition & Subtraction, find a partner who can provide this expertise.

Ability to tackle larger research projects
With multiple demands on our schedules, many librarians have to eke out time to work on a publication. Sometimes these constraints limit us to taking on less ambitious projects than we would like. Being able to divide the labor with a coauthor may make it possible for you to conduct research on a larger scale than you could solo.

Alleviate isolation
Writing can be a lonely endeavor. With the size of many technical services departments nowadays, being a tech services librarian can be a lonely endeavor. Therefore, being a tech services librarian trying to write an article can be a real lonely endeavor! Working with a colleague on a research project can help reduce one’s feelings of professional isolation.

**Maintaining a project’s momentum**
Whether it is an extra workload, the loss of financial or time support, or just plain lost motivation, every publication encounters obstacles. These roadblocks often result in the project becoming bogged down. Agreeing to be part of a collaborative project, however, means that each partner has made a commitment to the other. This heightened sense of responsibility to someone else can help you keep going when, if you were going it alone, you might have been tempted to throw in the towel. Some people also need the interpersonal energy boost that comes from working with another person.

**Potential Drawbacks**

Delay of project
Research collaboration requires planning, project management, discussion, and negotiation. If one party is regularly unavailable or dilatory in asking for or giving feedback, the project may be delayed. This can have disastrous consequences if a grant deadline is missed, if another author publishes a competing article on your topic, or if the article’s content has a short “shelf life” that expires while you wait.

Expenditure of emotional energy
Maintaining any good relationship requires effort. There will likely be differences of opinion during the course of a collaborative research project, whether they are disagreements over content, timelines, or work styles. One partner may let the other one down. Joint writing ventures are especially prone to strain because the relationship is usually informal, with unspecified responsibilities, unequal commitments, or mismatched values.

Loss of complete control over the project
While two heads may be better than one, both of those heads have to be pointed in the same direction for the product to be successful. Collaboration requires compromise and placing trust in someone else’s judgment and ability. It may occasionally mean that your ideas take a backseat to your partner’s, or that your thoughts do not come out as forcefully as you would prefer. Many authors do not want to give up this much control.

Promotion and tenure considerations
It is sometimes difficult for promotion and tenure committees to evaluate an individual author’s performance or contribution to a collaborative work. Authors that have too many co-authored publications run the risk of appearing to be riding the coattails of others. It is up to the author, then, to clearly specify his or her role in all jointly authored publications when navigating the promotion and tenure process.

**Making It Work**

Seek a partner who is equally motivated
Try to find a coauthor whose passion for the subject and interest in completing the work matches your own. If your article’s topic fires you up but only elicits a tepid response from a potential partner, or if you are going up for tenure in a year and your partner is retiring soon, that may be a portent of trouble down the road.

Make sure your partner has something to bring to the table
If you already have a publishing record of accomplishment, you may be asked to collaborate. If you do not know the other person well, do enough investigation to make sure they have the proper motivation and talent to make a meaningful contribution to the project.

Develop a pre-collaborative agreement
Decide at the outset which party will...
be responsible for each component of the endeavor. This includes all aspects of the project, including how expenses will be handled, who will collect the data and/or conduct a literature review, who will write which sections of the article, and who will create tables and charts. Reach an accord on how editing will be handled, deadlines, the journals to which you want to submit the finished product, and who will be first author. The agreement should also include a way for either party to leave the partnership, spelling out the specific conditions under which this can occur and the disposition of the work accomplished thus far.

Don’t hesitate to quarrel
Like steel sharpening steel, constructive conflict can result in a better piece of work. Notice, though, that I used the word *constructive*. Alternatives should be explored and disagreements should be voiced, but these things should be done in such a way that resolution, not dissolution, is the result. Quarreling can also reveal if you and your partner have the same goals for the publication in mind; you may think you are writing a theoretical work, while your coauthor envisions a “how we did it good in our library” article. Ideally, this should be done during the pre-collaborative agreement stage. For constructive conflict to work, though, both authors must feel like peers and be able to argue without fear of reprisal, so think carefully before agreeing to collaborate with your boss or someone you supervise.

Find a critic
Although collaborative writing is in some ways a self-critiquing process, find a trusted independent third party to review your work. You are not interested in someone who will just say “Good job.” You want someone who will honestly and constructively point out your work’s faults, omissions, etc.

**References**


Thomas, Joy, *Collaborative Writing, or; Is Half a Loaf Worth the Stomach Ache?* ERIC (1997 available from ED410776)

**Hall of Acclaim**

Belated kudos to Nancy Babb, Cataloger and Senior Assistant Librarian at the Charles B. Sears Law Library, State University of New York at Buffalo School of Law, for winning the 2005 ALL-SIS Outstanding Article Award. Nancy’s winning article, *Cataloging Spirits and the Spirit of Cataloging* was published in 40 CATALOGING & CLASSIFICATION QUARTERLY (no. 2, 2005) 89.

If you have published something recently, please email me so that I can list it in a future issue!

**News & Notes**

Remember that the deadline for the AALL/LexisNexis™ Call for Papers Competition is approaching soon. More information can be found at [http://www.aallnet.org/about/award_call_for_papers.asp](http://www.aallnet.org/about/award_call_for_papers.asp). Haworth Press has started a new peer-reviewed journal called *Journal of the Internet in Technical Services*. Its aim is to offer readers examples of innovative applications of technologies in library technical services operations. For more information, see [http://www.haworthpress.com/web/JITS/](http://www.haworthpress.com/web/JITS/).

**Serial Issues**

Richard Paone
The Dickinson School of Law
The Pennsylvania State University

In *ALCTS Newsletter Online* (v. 16, no. 1, Feb. 2005) Stephanie Schmitt of Yale University Law Library reported on “Codified Innovations: Data Standards and Their Useful Applications,” a half-day ALA Midwinter 2005 symposium held in Boston, sponsored by the ALCTS Serials Section, Committee to Study Serials Standards, that drew seventy-seven attendees and featured five speakers. Moderator Robert Wolven (Columbia University) opened the afternoon program with a discussion of the relationship between standards and innovation. He called for participants to “be inventive and flexible in our use of existing standards, and to watch for ways in which new standards can help meet the needs for exchanging and managing new kinds of data.” Drawing attention to the CONSER Summit, [http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/summit.html](http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/summit.html), that took place in March 2004, Wolven explained that in order to solve the complexity of the problems we face as information organizers and providers, a lot of information is required. We can attempt to avoid problems in the first place through “prompt, accurate communication of this information among several parties—publishers, subscription agents, serials management companies, library system vendors, and libraries” by broadening participation as well as creating awareness of the work done to develop, apply and use standards.

Diane Hillmann (Cornell University) opened with a brief discussion of the evolution of standards development. She brought attention to the MARC21 Format for Holdings. She questioned how an established standard with a solid infrastructure could be met with resistance rather than enthusiasm towards its implementation. Hillmann considered key reasons for hesitating to implement a standard,
perhaps because of its complexity or because of a lack of understanding about its potential applications. Using the MARC21 Holdings Format standard as an example, she emphasized that the solution for removing hesitation is to establish common goals. These shared goals permit communication, whether by individuals or machines, and the results are collaborative, shared solutions such as those shown in the work of CONSER, specifically the program to share title publication history. Building on the idea of shared solutions, she introduced the concept of a “super record,” a possible solution to the FRBR ‘work’ level for serials. By defining information through the use of standards, data can be shared with multiple purposes and be used for multiple outcomes. For additional information about the super record concept, see An Approach to Serials with FRBR in Mind, http://www.lib.unc.edu/cat/mfh/serials_approach_frbr.pdf, by Hillman and Frieda Rosenberg.

Regina Reynolds (National Serials Data Program, Library of Congress) began her presentation with a visual demonstration about what standards do for us: that they enable interoperability and long-term compatibility through identifiable components. Reynolds drew a parallel example demonstrating industrialized interoperability in the form of sewing machines and their related component parts. Using standardized expectations, a bobbin made in 2005 can still be used on a machine built in 1905. Interoperability is defined as “the ability of two or more systems or components to exchange information and to use the information that has been exchanged.” Focusing on the International Standard Serial Number (ISSN), Reynolds spoke about current innovations being considered as the ISSN standard is vetted against the needs of contemporary information markets. Identification was the “original, basic function of the ISSN.” Reynolds presented three possible levels for ISSN identification: the title level, middle level and the product level. At the title level, an ISSN would be assigned to allow clustering of multiple formats; for example, one title being identified for which both print and online versions of the same content are available. To this end, Reynolds presented a new concept called the tISSN, or ‘title level’ ISSN. Referencing identification requirements being explored in information design projects such as Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR), she encouraged the audience to explore broadly what types of unique identifiers are required.

Reynolds further examined the complexity of title level identification issues. She then presented a brief overview of the “Info” Uniform Resource Identifier (URI), http://info-uri.info/registry/docs/misc/faq.html, focusing on the possible application of the ISSN as an embedded object, a foundation upon which more specific identifiers can be built. Using the ISSN in this manner “avoids having to invent a totally new standard and demonstrates ISSN convergence with emerging standards and usage.” Product level identification assigns an ISSN at more specific levels of granularity, and this concept is being explored with the international European Article Numbering (EAN) Association, http://www.issn.org:8080/English/pub/faqs/barcodes. At the middle level, a separate ISSN is assigned to print titles independent of their iterations in other formats; the middle level is the current level of identification applied by the ISSN standard. She ended her remarks with an overview of the ISSN revision timetable and implored the audience to contribute directly to the dialogue and to follow the developments of the ISO Working Group 5: ISSN Revision.

Ted Fons (Innovative Interfaces, Inc.) discussed aspects of evolving standards affecting the future of serials in the electronic resource era. Linking functional transactions involving information exchanges with the variety of options developed to meet specific needs, Fons shed light on the challenges facing serials information management. Touching on library functions ranging from serials claiming to system migrations, he consistently found problems stemming from either a lack of standardization of the exchanged data, or a failure in a standard’s implementation. Solutions are available that meet these problems, including the formation of standards development groups such as the NISO/EDiteur Joint Working Party (JWP) and documentation of such as is found in the NISO whitepaper, The Exchange of Serials Subscription Information, http://www.niso.org/standards/resources/SerialsWP.html, by Ed Jones. The tasks given to the JWP are: 1) to “Propose enhancements to ONIX for Serials to support exchange of serials subscription information,” and 2) to “Conduct pilot projects involving publishers, intermediaries, and libraries to demo ONIX for Serials as an exchange format for serials subscription information.”

Fons focused on the ONIX for Serials, http://www.editeur.org/onixserials.html, work, specifically three new standards developed to describe specific aspects of serials metadata: Serials Online Holdings (SOH), Serial Products and Subscriptions (SPS), and Serial Release Notification (SRN). Fons closed by shedding light on several successful pilots of new standards, and he drew attention to new initiatives such as Project Counter and the use of Extensible Markup Language (XML) to enhance information exchanges.

John Espley (VTLS, Inc.) focused on the vendor’s perspective regarding standards and their implementation and application in the systems environment. Espley began with a brief overview of two newer projects: FRBR and electronic resource management systems. Adding to Hillmann’s discussion of the “super record,” Espley demonstrated examples of FRBR representations as presented by VTLS. Espley expounded on the aspects of systems development that adhere to standards, whether those standards are developed fully (for example, MARC21) or are currently emerging (the Digital Library Federation [DLF]’s Electronic Resource Management Initiative Deliverables). He explained that emerging standards such as the DLF’s provide good problem definitions and roadmaps from which system developers can examine and learn. This collaborative process supports further development of evolving ideas and contributes directly to the acceptance and establishment of standards on their way to codification.
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:

**California criminal law review [electronic resource]**
Vol. 1 (Feb. 2000)-v. 7 (June 2004) (OCoLC 47731170)
**Changed to:**
**Boalt journal of criminal law [electronic resource]**
Vol. 8 (Dec. 2004)- (OCoLC 61710254)

**Florida Coastal law journal**
Vol. 1, no. 1 (spring/summer 1999)-v. 4, no. 2 (spring 2003) (OCoLC 42422760)
**Changed to:**
**Florida Coastal law review**
Vol. 5, no. 1 (spring 2004)- (OCoLC 61719715)

**IIC : international review of industrial property and competition law : IIC**
Vol. 34, no. 8 (2003) (OCoLC 1714535)
**Changed to:**
**International review of intellectual property and competition law : IIC**
Vol. 35, no. 1 (2004)- (OCoLC 55531559)

**International trade and business law annual**
Vol. 2, issue 2 (May 1996)-v. 8 (May 2003) (OCoLC 35954285)
**Changed to:**
**International trade & business law review**
Vol. 9 (Aug. 2005)- (OCoLC 61719276)

**Latin American finance & capital markets**
-v. 10, no. 22 (Dec. 15, 2003) (OCoLC 32491939)
**Changed to:**
**Latin American finance executive report**
Vol. 11, no. 1 (Jan. 15, 2004)-v. 11, no. 22 (Dec. 15, 2004) (OCoLC 54369695)
Which was then **Absorbed by:**
**Latin American law & business report**
Beginning with v. 13, no. 1 (Jan. 31, 2005) (OCoLC 26709734)

**Model arbitration law quarterly reports**
**Changed to:**
**Model law materials**
Vol. 5, issue 1 (spring 2005)- (OCoLC 61157610)

**U.S. Customs Service. Customs regulations of the United States**
-2001 ed. (OCoLC 2784214)
**Changed to:**
**U.S. Customs and Border Protection. Regulations of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection**
2003 ed.- (OCoLC 54362795)

**Zeitschrift für schweizerische Kirchengeschichte**
**Changed to:**
**Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Religions- und Kulturgeschichte**
98. Jahrg. (2004)- (OCoLC 57230169)

The following serial cessations were identified by the University of San Diego Legal Research Center serials staff and the University of California, Berkeley Law Library acquisitions staff:

**California citation guide and table of depublished cases**
**Ceased with:** 2004 (OCoLC 43845937)

**Capital defense journal**
**Ceased with:** v. 17, no. 2 (spring 2005) (OCoLC 34734513)
Available online:
**Capital defense journal (Online)** (OCoLC 57445623)

**Directory of Community legislation in force and other acts of the Community institutions**
**Ceased with:** 42nd ed. (as at 1 Jan. 2004) (OCoLC 12205168)

**International business lawyer**
**Ceased with:** v. 32, no. 6 (Dec. 2004) (OCoLC 1787580)

**National Legal Conference on Immigration and Refugee Policy. In defense of the alien**
**Ceased with:** v. 26 (2003) (OCoLC 19608210)

**The Toledo journal of Great Lakes' law, science & policy**
**Suspended publication with:** v. 5, no. 1 (fall 2003) (OCoLC 38401249)

And finally, a new member of the “bibliographic undead:”

**John F. Kennedy University law review**
**Suspended with:** Vol. 9, no. 1 (1998); **publication resumed with:** Vol. 10, no. 1 (2004)
(OCoLC 21104916)
Contributing Authors: Marlene Bubrick, Elizabeth Geesey Holmes, Yumin Jiang, Ellen McGrath, Andrea Rabbia, Patricia Turpening

Acquisitions/Collection Development

Journal Use Study

In a scientific approach to evaluating journal usage, Yale University’s Cushing/Whitney Medical Library conducted an interesting study. Unbound print journal usage was monitored in-house over a period of 3 months, while SFX statistics for usage of e-journals was monitored over the same period. One overriding observation of the study was that print journals are used only a fraction as often as their electronic counterparts. The factual information that this study provides can guide library management in making collection development decisions.

Value of Usage Statistics

Developing meaningful electronic serials usage statistics requires significant investments by libraries, but libraries can use those data to benefit a variety of library activities such as budget process, instructional programs, collection management, and system administration.

E-Resource Administration

Hair-raising jaunt through the “horrors” of managing e-resources, primarily subscription-based, that face an academic library in the 21st century. The author’s tongue-in-cheek style makes palatable what otherwise must be a challenging situation. On display is a system so complicated that vendors can’t tell what they hold, whether you’re subscribed to it and, er, when it’s expected to come back online.

―Reprinted by permission from Current Cites 16(9) (Sept. 2005)

E-Serials Terminology

When historians finally record this stage in our digital research culture, I do hope they go beyond such simplistic statements as, “and then it all became available online.” The authors here point out how complicated and confusing access to subscription-based resources can be. “As digital resources librarians,” they observe, “we live in a world of platforms, gateways, packages, and aggregations.” Their proposed solution, developing “precisely defined terminology,” sounds a bit iffy, but they rightly stress the need for librarians to help make sense of this mishmash, “distilling,” as they put it, “the important aspects of these definitions for readers.”

―Reprinted by permission from Current Cites 16(8) (Aug. 2005)

Analytical Skills for Collection Development

To effectively manage collections in a fast-changing digital environment, libraries can benefit from a set of analytical skills to transform a collection strategy into a regular, sustainable, and flexible program. The author recounts her library’s experience transforming an ad hoc serials review project into an on-going process of evidence-based reviews using business systems analysis, requirements analysis, and information systems analysis.

Cataloging

Authority Control

Describes alternative structures for authority records containing languages written in non-Roman scripts.

Metadata

 Defines metadata and discusses the meaning of metadata for library cataloging. (Catalogablog)

ISBN-13

This brief 16-page guide, subtitled “Everything you need to know about the ISBN-13 transition,” provides answers to anticipated questions, and is geared toward publishers and booksellers as well as librarians. Like the rest of the “for dummies” books series, it contains easy-to-understand icons and explanations that are easy to follow. Included are sections on transitioning the ISBN from 10 to 13 digits, becoming ISBN-13 compliant, and the impact on electronic communication with vendors. TechKNOW 11(3) (Sept. 2005), at http://www.library.kent.edu/files/2005-09_September_TechKNOW.pdf.
Crunching the Metadata

How will we manage the metadata for the digitized content of books? (Lorcan Dempsey’s Weblog)

Joint Steering Committee News
http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/news.html

Includes outcomes from the meeting on a new cataloging code held in London, October 10-14, 2005, plus more. (Catalogablog)

FRBR

Discusses the use of a hierarchical catalog for the Perseus Digital Library and the implications of hierarchical catalog records for searching and browsing. (Catalogablog)

FRBR

Discusses four broad areas of concern regarding continuing resources as they relate to the FRBR model.

FRBR Review Group

Minutes of the IFLA FRBR Review Group’s meeting in Oslo, August 18, 2005. (Catalogablog)

CC:DA’s Comments on FRAR

CC:DA’s comments on Functional Requirements for Authority Records (FRAR). (Catalogablog)

FRAR

This paper reports on the current state of the IFLA FRANAR (Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records) Working Group’s activities. (Catalogablog)

Tag Cloud
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tag_cloud

“A tag cloud (more traditionally known as a weighted list in the field of visual design) is a visual depiction of content tags used on a website.” (Catalogablog)

COinS
http://www.openly.com/coins/

OpenURL COinS (ContextObjects in Spans): A convention to embed bibliographic metadata in HTML. (Lorcan Dempsey’s Weblog)

Automatic Cataloging & Classification
http://www.oclc.org/research/memberscouncil/2005-10/childress-autocat.ppt

Slides from a presentation by Eric Childress (OCLC). (ResourceShelf)

Library Thing

Personal cataloging site. (Catalogablog)

Government Documents
Online Federal Depository
http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/coll-dev/online_coll_tips.pdf


FDLP Selection Mechanisms
http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/selection/index.html

“GPO’s Information Dissemination (Superintendent of Documents) organization has undertaken a review of the item number system used by libraries in the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) to select tangible and electronic titles.” (ResourceShelf)

FDLP Vision Statement


Information Technology
Web 2.0

Web 2.0

If you haven’t noticed already, we’re living in a Web 2.0 world. The network is our platform, information is disparate, the user has control. The author of this article readily acknowledges the hype but still sees characteristics that are significant for libraries. More than anything, the article serves as a jumping-off point for considering how exactly libraries are going to fit in.

—Reprinted by permission from Current Cites 16(11) (Nov. 2005)

Library 2.0


Pattern Recognition for Technical Services
http://www.weblog.oclce.org/archives/000829.html
Slides from a presentation by Eric Childress (OCLC). (Lorcan Dempsey’s Weblog)

Metasearch

RLG Metasearch Survey Report. (Lorcan Dempsey’s Weblog)

Greasemonkey
http://greaseblog.blogspot.com/

“Greasemonkey seems to do for web browsing what TiVo does for television. ...A piece of software, usually Javascript, allowing users of the Firefox browser to modify specific web pages to better meet their needs and tastes. ...Part of a larger movement called ‘active browsing,’ a practice by which the human browser is not a passive wanderer in cyberspace, but rather exercises some control.” (Smart Libraries)

ACRLblog
http://www.acrlblog.org/

Blogging for and by academic and research librarians. (ResourceShelf)

Blog Software

A useful web article on blog software choices. (blogwithoutalibrary.net)

Check This Out!
http://jmilles.libsyn.com/

“Check This Out! Law, Libraries and Life in a Northern Border Town” is a weekly podcast by Jim Milles. (LAWLIB)

Current Web Technology for Academic Research

After a hiatus, Laura Cohen is back in the Choice special web issue with another nicely organized overview of current web technology useful for academic research. Bombarded as we are with news of recent innovations, it is hard to see the forest for the trees sometimes, and this article takes the step back for you. In her discussion of search engines, concept clustering, scholarly content in the deep web, blogs and RSS feeds, she always does a thorough job of describing what behaviors to expect from the tools and what particular use they can be put to in an academic setting. Librarians in other types of libraries should read it, too - while the sample searches and subjects are appropriate for the intended readership, the knowledge to be gained about web technology is good for all. For further exploration, Cohen appends a complete list of sources cited.

—Reprinted by permission from Current Cites, 16(8) (Aug. 2005)

Google Scholar and OpenURL
Ferguson, Cris. “Google Scholar and the OpenURL.” Against the Grain 17(4) (Sept. 2005: 83-84).

Google Scholar is a web search engine focused on scholarly materials, though “scholarliness” is not clearly defined by Google. Google’s main objective in using the OpenURL is to lead users to online full text, while libraries’ main priority is to find users the appropriate copy whatever its format.

Wikis

A wiki is a website where users can not only contribute to, but also edit, the content. It is unique because of the collaborative nature of the application. In addition to a brief history of wikis, a list of library wiki sites is also included.

Comparison of Citation Databases
Jacso, Peter. “As We May Search - Comparison of Major Features of the Web of Science, Scopus, and Google Scholar Citation-Based and Citation-Enhanced Databases.” Current Science 89 (25 Nov. 2005): 1537-1547, at http://www.ias.ac.in/currsci/nov102005/1537.pdf.

Announced to wide acclaim a year ago, Google Scholar remains a bit of an enigma. The scholarly search service provides little or no information that can be used to evaluate it as an information source, and therefore people such as the author of this article are left to do the best they can to determine the coverage of the service, its accuracy, and user options. Jacso has published previous evaluations of Google Scholar, but this one is the most in-depth review I’ve seen, and the comparison with similar commercial services is also instructive. If you have read Jacso’s earlier articles, his criticism of Scholar will come as no surprise. But those who are pointing users to Scholar or who use it themselves would do well to read this article.

—Reprinted by permission from Current Cites 16(11) (Nov. 2005)

Local Systems
New Model Library System Vendors
http://orweblog.ole.org/archives/000786.html

Discussion generated by SirsiDynix formation. (Lorcan Dempsey’s Weblog)

OCLC Back in the ILS Biz?
http://www.oclcplcica.org

“Though not considered a major move back into the integrated library system arena, OCLC PICA, a cooperative of European libraries in the Netherlands, has acquired Sisis Informationssysteme, a small company that produces library automation software.” (Smart Libraries)

Management
Innovation Tips

I’m cheating a bit on this cite, which points you to the final part of a three-part series that stretched from July to October. I did this since only the third part points you to the two previous
parts. Enough of the mechanics, as usual Stephen Abram rocks in this pithy, well-written and inspiring set of tips. Each tip is a phrase such as “Iteration is everything” and “Good not perfect,” accompanied by an explanatory paragraph. Those who keep up with business literature may find some tips familiar, but such street wisdom is unfortunately much less prevalent in the library literature. So if you don’t get out much, and even if you do, don’t make the mistake of overlooking this series simply because it is a vendor’s newsletter. Feel free to overlook the obligatory references to SirsiDynix products. This is certifiably great stuff, period.

—Reprinted by permission from Current Cites 16(11) Nov. 2005

Patron-Centered Technical Services Librarian


The author offers the following four mantras for technical services librarians: 1) My job is not to manage information, but to deliver it; 2) I will not try to think like a good librarian, but like a bad patron; 3) Not everything worth doing is worth doing well; and 4) I can’t eliminate error—I can only prioritize it.

Libraries in the Digital World


The issue of whether libraries have been rendered obsolete in the digital world is not a new one. Recently, it’s surfaced again in the wake of the University of Texas announcing that it would expel the books from its undergraduate library and turn it into an “information commons.” And, of course, there is the 800-pound gorilla—Google Print. Gandel—Vice President for Information Technology and CIO at Syracuse University—points out in this article that “the relationship between collections, consumers, and the library as mediator remains.” However, as he points out here, “the Web is affecting the very core areas of library services: (1) collections, (2) preservation, and (3) reference.” He explores each of these areas in depth, discussing commercial information aggregators, digitization and e-books, and Google ... which “has become the most widely used tool for addressing all sorts of questions,” virtually supplanting the reference librarian at the local public library. Libraries have tried to rise to the occasion, he says, with such initiatives as virtual reference services. “But it is not clear whether these redesigned services can compete with the rapidly growing commercial services available on the Web.” Although libraries have largely adapted to incorporate new technologies, the role of the librarian hangs in a sort of limbo. “It is not hard to imagine a scenario in which colleges and universities will shift their resources to pay for a national information service customized to the needs of the individual institution rather than support their own local library reference service.”

—Reprinted by permission from Current Cites 16(10) (Oct. 2005)

Libraries in the Chronicle


This is a special Chronicle supplement on libraries containing a package of stories, most of which are available to subscribers only: Thoughtful Designs: “As they renovate old libraries and plan new ones, colleges consider the purpose of the buildings—and how to make them popular.” Evolving Roles: “Today’s reference librarians need IT and pedagogical skills. Institutions are adapting in various ways, says W. Lee Hisle.” The Beauty of Browsing: “Fred D. White doesn’t want stacks closed and mechanized. He wants to hold books in his hand and see where they take him.” Should Librarians Get Tenure? Yes, It’s Crucial to Their Jobs: “College librarians are crucial partners in teaching and research, and they should be eligible for tenure like their faculty colleagues, says Catherine Murray-Rust.” (This one is available free to non-subscribers.) Should Librarians Get Tenure? No, It Can Hamper Their Roles: “Librarians should be involved in college governance, but, writes Deborah A. Carver, they don’t face the academic-freedom issues that professors do, and don’t need tenure.” (This one is available free to non-subscribers.)

—Reprinted by permission from Current Cites 16(9) (Sept. 2005)

Preservation


RLG DigiNews special issue on certification of digital repositories. (Peter Scott’s Blog)

JSTOR Launches XML Gateway http://www.jstor.org/about/xml_gateway.html

“A new interface to the JSTOR Search Engine. This interface, called the JSTOR XML Gateway, was created to better facilitate metasearching, which is also known as ‘federated searching’ or ‘cross-database searching.’” (Resource Shelf)


Urgent action needed to preserve scholarly electronic journals. (Resource Shelf)

Self-Serve Digital Copying Pilot Project http://www.collectionscanada.ca/services/005-211-e.html

“A six-month initiative that will allow the clients of Library and Archives Canada (LAC) to use their own photographic equipment (digital and non-digital cameras) and LAC microform printers/scanners to copy certain documents from the holdings of LAC for the purposes of research or private study.” (Resource Shelf)


“The web team at Internet Archive...
launched the public website Archive-it
that allows users to create, manage and
search their own web archives through a
web interface.” (ResourceShelf)

Requirements for Digital Preservation
Systems
abs/cs.DL/0509018.

This paper inspects threats to digital
preservation repositories from internal
issues such as the failure of storage
media, hardware, software, operator
error, natural disaster, external attack,
economic failure, organizational failure,
and others. The authors then suggest
strategies to address these issues,
such as replication, transparency,
migration, diversity, audit, sloth (yes,
sloth), and others. The paper ends with
some specific recommendations for
repositories, many of them focused on
open disclosure of internal policies and
procedures.

—Reprinted by permission from
Current Cites 16(9) (Sept. 2005)

Digitally Unwrapping Damaged
Manuscripts
Gregory, Alicia P. “Digital Exploration: Unwrapping the Secrets of Damaged
Manuscripts.” University of Kentucky
Research Odyssey (Fall 2004), at http://www.research.uky.edu/odyssey/fall04/
seales.html.

Brent Seales, of the University of
Kentucky Computer Science
Department, has developed software
which is capable of reading manuscripts
damaged by hundreds of years of
moisture.

Preservation Standards
http://www.ifla.org/VII/s19/index.htm

IFLA has published First Do No Harm: a
Register of Standards, Codes of Practice,
Guidelines, Recommendations and
Similar Works Relating to Preservation
and Conservation in Libraries and
Archives. All the works cited in this 79
page publication were published in the
last ten years.

Rare Books
Starmer, Mary Ellen, et al. “Rare
Condition: Preservation Assessment
for Rare Book Collections.” RBM: A
Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts,
and Cultural Heritage 6 (Fall 2005):
91-106.

The University of Tennessee surveyed its
50,000 volume rare book collection.

Online Service for Used, Rare, and
Out-of-print Books
http://www.biblio.com/

Biblio.com, a supplier of used, rare, and
out-of-print books, has announced that
it now lists more than 20 million titles
through its online service.

Digitization
Kennedy, Marie R. “Reformatting
Preservation Departments: The Effect
of Digitization on Workload and Staff.”
College and Research Libraries 66

Data from a survey of eighteen ARL
libraries over five years were used to
track the number of reformatting tasks
completed and staffing trends in order
to determine whether there is an evident
effect from digitization.

Serials
NASIGuide: Serial Holdings
http://www.nasig.org/publications/
guides/holdings/

“Designed to serve libraries automating
display that meaningfully ties together
or could be a virtual construct with a
publication’s relationships.

Access Level Record for Serials
http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/
consln27.html#ISSN

This summer, the Library of Congress
Serial Record Division began work
with other Program for Cooperative
Cataloging (PCC) members to develop
and test an access level record for
serials. This collaborative pilot project
is cochaired by Regina Reynolds
(LC) and Diane Boehr of the National
Library of Medicine.

The access level record pilot for serials
will take advantage of the model used
for non-serial e-resources developed by
Dave Reser (LC), Tom Delsey, LC
cataloging staff, and LC reference staff.
Exploration of the access level record
for serials may lead to the development
of a single standard of record elements
for serials. The serials pilot will include
creation of test records based on the
essential set of AACR2 and MARC 21
elements and the cataloging guidelines.
The records will be evaluated in terms of cataloging costs and how well the records meet end user and library processing needs. If successful, a recommendation will be made to PCC to establish the access level record as the new standard for serials.

The project is expected to result in a chart of essential data elements and an outline of cataloging guidelines by January 2006. A progress report, including an evaluation of the pilot, is expected by the end of April 2006. The charge for the pilot including a detailed discussion of background, methodology, and deliverables is available from: http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/Access-level-chargele-pccaug17.pdf

Serials Education

Serials management is one of the more complex and costly areas of librarianship. How, then, can librarians interested in serials work be better trained before they enter the profession? A recent study shows that only 19.6% of 56 LIS schools included a serials-related course in their curriculum. Other training could be on-the-job or through continuing education, such as workshops offered by NASIG and SCCTP. Given the proliferation of continuing resources in library collections today, what is the most effective type of “education” for serials librarians?

continued from page 1

Users could plot out geographically the crime statistics data that are geographically referenced.

Acronyms mentioned in this presentation include:

SOAP (Simple Object Access Protocol): allows software to exchange information with other software.

REST: a particular way in which a SOAP (an http post that is a file) application can be used by sending a URL code in XML that will create useful links.

AJAX: describes a set of technologies using XHHTML CSS (which, says Mr. Tennant, is another way of saying HTML done right). CSS stands for Cascading Style Sheets. It does XML and XSLT, which is how you can convert XML into something else.

XML HTTP REQUEST: a request can be sent to a web server that returns structured information that it parses on the screen for the user. It makes the web browsers, such as Firefox and IE work in a much more interactive way. Googlemaps is one of the main users of this. WIKIPEDIA defines parsing as the process of analyzing a continuous stream of input (read from a file or a keyboard, for example) in order to determine its grammatical structure with respect to a given formal grammar.

JAVASCRIPT: binds it all together.

UNILOG.COM: a website where anyone can put his or her bookmarks. If a user likes a particular website, they can add comments, and then hit “stack” so that other people who use that website can see all the comments. It becomes a user review of that website. This allows for “collaborative filtering.”

RSS FEED: a family of XML file formats for Web syndication. The RSS formats provide web content or summaries of web content together with links to the full versions of the content. This can be useful for a community of users who share a common interest. People are creating their own lists of favorite books and websites. An example of this is del.icio.us at http://del.icio.us/about/. Mr. Tenant states that this may also be a way to change the whole scholarly paradigm dynamic. For example, the University of California Website has over 7,000 papers (as of July 2005) with 28,000 downloads recorded during one week. That is an average of five downloads per paper. It may be useful for faculty committees and so forth to know how much interest a paper has received. He reports that 40% of the use is from Google.

D-space: a website where their name defines their mission. The DSpace digital repository system captures, stores, indexes, preserves, and distributes digital research material. It has over 14,000 objects from papers to PowerPoint presentations and so forth. Information in repositories can be difficult to find and difficult to catalog. Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAIPMH) can retrieve information from repositories that might otherwise be missed.

MODS (Metadata Object Description Schema): This XML schema is similar to MARC but it does not duplicate it. If you transfer information from MODS into MARC and then back to MODS again, there is information loss. Whether that information is necessary is another question. It is the closest thing we have right now to MARC for XML and it is being developed at the Library of Congress. It will be undergoing standards scrutiny in the future. If you are interested, you can find out more and even sign up for a listserv at http://www.loc.gov/standards/mods/.

Metasearching: electronic searching of two or more sources at a time. We are in the very early stages of this and it can be painful and very expensive. However, when searching for metasearch products, don’t just take one quote and go home. Most vendors want you to use their interface, but their customers find they have no voice in upgrade decisions. Mr. Tennant’s institution decided to create its own metasearching interface, so that they are in control.

In the remaining time, Mr. Tenant focused on how to make good technology decisions and provided basic technology advice. I quote: “You need to get work done today and yet you need to know what is coming down the pike—you have
to do both of these. Some technologies might be cool but may not get you any farther in your mission...You don’t want to put all of your apples in one basket...If there are choices of applications and one is proprietary and one is open, go with the one that is open because you will be able to look into it and see how it functions...Wherever you are getting your support know where it is coming from. Sometimes open source communities are better sources than commercial support. Unless you have the money or the staff time, don’t strive to be an early adopter.” He also said you don’t want to be a late bloomer either.

Finally and most importantly was the point running throughout both the plenary session and this session: “Keep your main focus on who you are serving—no matter what you do. Don’t expect patrons to always know what they want. They cannot imagine the best scenario. That is where we come in.”

I’m pleased to report this issue includes the resurrected Serial Issues column, authored by Richard Paone. This important column has been vacant for a very long time. Many thanks to Richard for his contributions. I also want to thank Darcy Jones who was our OCLC columnist for many issues. Pam Deemer took over the OCLC column with the September 2005 issue.

We have begun to list OBS and TS representatives for each issue, along with the listing of TSLL staff, and the officers and committee chairs for both Sections. These lists contain valuable information and are a fast, visible way to see our colleagues who have taken on leadership roles in the field of technical services law librarianship.

We have moved the TSLL publication schedule “box” and the TSLL editorial policy statement “box” to this last page, and they will continue to be found at the end of each issue. We didn’t have enough space on page two to fit everything, and it was felt that the more important information should stay at the front of the issue.

Finally, I want to remind each reader to take advantage of the “send us a message” feature on page two. Clicking this box will send you to a contact information webpage that Martin Wisneski has set up for us. The columnists would love to hear from you.

—Brian Striman