TS-SIS Educational Grants for 2009

Congratulations to the following recipients awarded TS-SIS Educational Grants for the AALL 2009 Annual Meeting in Washington, DC:

Leslie Wakeford is the third recipient of the TS-SIS Marla Schwartz Grant to support her attendance at CONELL (Conference of Newer Law Librarians). Leslie is the Technical Services Librarian at Wake Forest University Professional Center Library.

Ajaye Bloomstone receives a Workshop Registration Grant to attend “Managing from the Middle”. Ajaye is the Acquisitions Librarian at LSU Law Center Library in Baton Rouge, LA.

Jared Wellman receives both a Workshop Registration Grant to attend “Managing from the Middle” and an AALL Registration Grant. Jared is Assistant Librarian for Acquisitions and Technology at Vermont Law School’s Julien and Virginia Cornell Library.

Iris Garcia receives a CONELL Grant. Iris is the Bibliographic Control Librarian for St. Thomas University Law Library.

Lindsay Beth Given receives both a CONELL Grant and an AALL Registration Grant. Beth is a library science student at Indiana University School of Library and Information Science.

Victoria Sukhol also receives both a CONELL Grant and an AALL Registration Grant. Victoria is the Assistant Director for Cataloging at New York Law School Library.
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Alphabet Soup Reception

Please join the four SIS’s (TS/OBS/RIPS/CS-SIS) at their Joint Reception sponsored by Innovative Interfaces, Inc. from 7:00-8:30 p.m. Saturday, July 25, at the Renaissance-Ballroom West AB in Washington, D.C.
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Ah, the summer months. So many people think summer brings with it a slower pace, but this is just the time when TS-SIS activities really heat up!

You may have noticed the absence of an annual survey this year. Last July, I appointed a task force to study the survey and determine what we needed to accomplish and if a survey was the best way to accomplish it. The task force, ably chaired by Joe Thomas, included Sean Chen, Katie Jones, Alan Keely, Chris Long, Sara Robertson, and Martin Wisneski. Their report concluded that a web-based volunteer form (currently in the works) should be completely separate from any survey activities. The report also tabbed the Education Committee as the best forum for gathering program ideas for the annual meeting. With these two annual needs addressed, the task force suggested that a survey covering other issues such as questions about TS-SIS activities could be implemented on a non-annual basis. The Executive Board agreed with these recommendations and is currently working on determining survey frequency and the best methods to ensure repetition. More information should follow in the coming months.

I’m pleased to report that eight TS-SIS members will benefit from section grants this summer. In recognition of the current economic malaise, the Executive Board approved funding for a greater number of educational grants to assist members traveling to the Annual Meeting. Leslie K. Wakeford from Wake Forest University received this year’s Marla Schwartz Grant which she’ll use to attend CONELL. Iris Garcia, St. Thomas University; Lindsey Beth Given, Notre Dame Law School; and Victoria Sukhol, New York Law School are also recipients of a grant to attend CONELL. Lindsey Beth Given, Notre Dame Law School; Emily Phillips, Wilmer Hale; Victoria Sukhol, New York Law School; Richard Todd, University of Tulsa; and Jared Wellman, Vermont Law School, were each granted awards to attend the Annual Meeting while Ajaye Bloomstone, Louisiana State University, and Jared Wellman, Vermont Law School, received grants to attend the workshop, “Managing from the Middle.” Congratulations to each of you and we look forward to hearing about your educational adventures.

A heartfelt congratulations also goes to our 2009 Renee Chapman Award winner, Curt Conklin. Curt, Associate Director for Technical Services at the Howard W. Hunter Law Library at Brigham Young University, has been an AALL member for 35 years and is a founding member of TS-SIS. His numerous contributions include program presentations at AALL conferences, two books, numerous articles, and service on multiple TS-SIS committees. Check out his profile in the TS-SIS Centennial Celebration: Profiles of Long-Time Members Pioneering Change in Law Libraries at http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/history/profiles/conklin-curt.htm. I also hope you will join me as we celebrate Curt and present his award during the TS-SIS annual business meeting in Washington, D.C.

Speaking of Washington, D.C., it’s not surprising that most TS-SIS activities over the past few months have centered around the upcoming Annual Meeting. As usual, the schedule is full of programs, committee meetings and roundtables for every interest. To check out all we have planned, go to the TS-SIS website http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/index.htm, then mark your calendars! I think you’ll find more than enough activities to keep you very busy in Washington, but let me highlight a few noteworthy events. First, as in past years, TS will participate in the TS/OBS/RIPS/CS-SIS Joint Reception which is sponsored once again by a generous donation from Innovative Interfaces. Please join us at the Renaissance Hotel on Saturday evening before you move on to the Opening Event.

I also encourage you to attend our “Hot Topic” program, “Working with OCLC’s Record Transfer Policy,” to be held Monday, July 27, 12:00-1:15 p.m. Thanks to Keiko Okuhara and Phoebe Ruiz-Valera, our two co-coordinators, and special thanks to Roberta Schaffer from the Library of Congress and our own members, Michael Maben and Pat Callahan, for agreeing to participate as panelists.

A third event to note is a new opportunity for members to participate in an inter-SIS NISO advisory working group. Last year in Portland, Mary Alice Baish, AALL’s representative to NISO, met with leaders from CS-SIS, OBS-SIS and TS-SIS to begin the process of creating a group of advisers to help her with reviewing and commenting upon the NISO standards. Mary Alice has organized a training session on how to review draft standards with Karen Wetzel, Standards Program Manager at NISO, for Saturday, July 25, 3:30-4:30 p.m. Space is limited, so please contact me (l.tesar@law.vanderbilt.edu) and let me know if you’d like to attend.
Now for the really big news! I am extremely excited to announce that the TS-SIS VIP for this year’s meeting is Gabriel Horchler, Head of the Law Section of the U.S. and Publisher Liaison Division of the Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Directorate of Library Services at the Library of Congress. According to Marie Whited who nominated Gabe, his section does 90% of the law cataloging for the Law Library of Congress. Gabe has an economics background, so this is a wonderful opportunity to showcase AALL, TS-SIS, and law librarianship to an important Library of Congress staff member. We hope to introduce him to as many aspects of TS-SIS as possible and we’ll be working with Gabe to coordinate his schedule for maximum effect. If you’re in D.C., please make a point of welcoming Gabe and thanking him for his participation.

One last note regarding the meeting in D.C.—when we meet in July, four Executive Board members will be ending their terms: Past Chair Alan Keely, Member-at-Large Carmen Brigandi, Serials Standing Committee Chair Carol Avery Nicholson, and Cataloging Standing Committee Chair Karen Nuckolls. Each of them has been an outstanding leader for the section and I know we all hope they’ll continue to share their talents and expertise with TS-SIS. I also want to welcome and congratulate our new officers, Vice-Chair/Chair Elect Pam Deemer, and Member-at-Large Katrina Piechnik. Thank you again for your willingness to take on such important leadership roles.

In closing, this year has been an incredible experience and I have a number of people to thank for all the help and guidance they gave me. Top of the list are the members of the Executive Board. Chris, Wendy, Alan, Ajaye, Betty, Carmen, Carol, Karen and Marilyn—thank you so much for your wisdom and counsel. I have truly enjoyed working with each of you. I also want to thank Linda Sobey, Karen Douglas, Sean Chen, Janice Anderson, JoAnn Hounshell and Joe Thomas for serving as chairs of our administrative committees and task forces. Martin Wisneski deserves a huge thanks for another excellent year as webmaster as do Smita Parkhe and Alan Keely for managing the discussion list. A final thanks to every member who serves on a committee or task force, as a representative, board member, editor or columnist. The section cannot function without you and this past year gave me ample evidence of the fruits of your dedication and hard work. It has been an honor being your chair and I highly recommend the experience. I’ve learned too many things to enumerate and I’ve had the opportunity to become better acquainted with many of the wonderful people of TS-SIS. Thank you.

I hope each of you has a fabulous summer—including a trip to D.C., of course!

Linda Tesar
Vanderbilt University

Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section

I would like to start this column by announcing OBS-SIS election results:

Vice Chair/Chair-Elect  
Kathy Faust—Lewis and Clark

Secretary/Treasurer  
Karen Selden—University of Colorado

Member-at-Large  
Keiko Okuhara—University of Hawaii

Also, thank you to Mila Rush, Amy Moberly, and Sara Repinski for their willingness to run for an OBS office, and to all OBS members who took the time to vote.

In my final column as OBS chair, I would like to acknowledge and thank several people. Our board has been very supportive of me and I appreciate all of them: Andrea Rabbia (Past Chair), Pat Sayre McCoy (Vice Chair/Chair-Elect), Mary Strouse (Secretary/Treasurer), Elaine Bradshaw (Member-at-Large), and Susan Karpuk (Member-at-Large). Kevin Butterfield ably managed our website. I have known Kevin for over 20 years and I wish him well as he takes a new position outside of law libraries at the University of Richmond. Also, I need to acknowledge the work of our other committee chairs: Susan
Goldner, Pat Callahan, Keiko Okuhara, Ming Lu, and Caitlin Robinson. Finally, I must mention my compatriot, Linda Tesar. The chairs of the two sections work together very closely to coordinate and minimize conflicting events at the conference. I have known Linda for a number of years and it was special to work with her this past year.

The AALL Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. is just around the corner. AALLNET is the best place for up-to-date information (www.aallnet.org/events/) about the conference. Keep in mind our three AMPC programs:

1. “MarcEdit: A Magic Wand for MARC Records.” This program, proposed by Yan (Clara) Liao (Georgetown University), will feature MarcEdit software developer Terry Reese from Oregon State University. It will be held on Sunday, July 26, 3:00-4:00 p.m. In addition, OBS will sponsor a roundtable discussion with Terry Reese, also on Sunday, July 26, 5:30-6:30 p.m.

2. “Latest Trends in Library Automation: Building Creative and Inspiring Discovery Platforms.” This program, proposed by Georgia Briscoe (University of Colorado) and co-sponsored by the Academic Law Libraries SIS, will feature Marshall Breeding, Director for Innovative Technologies and Research at Vanderbilt University Libraries. Mr. Breeding will be the ALL-SIS VIP to the Washington meeting. This program will be held on Sunday, July 26, 4:15-5:15 p.m.

3. “Taking the Aggravation Out of Aggregators: An Update on Aggregator-Neutral Bibliographic Records.” This program, proposed by Karen Selden (University of Colorado) and Ellen McGrath (SUNY Buffalo), is cosponsored by the Technical Services SIS. The program will be held on Monday, July 27, 10:45-11:45 a.m. and will feature Eugene Dickerson (Ralph J. Bunche Library at the U.S. Dept. of State), and Kara Killough (Serials Solutions).

In addition to these three programs and one roundtable discussion, OBS-SIS decided to self-sponsor two additional programs:

1. “TOC Market Report: Undervalued TOCs Yield Huge Dividends.” This program, proposed by Sally Wambold (University of Richmond), will discuss the use and value of tables of contents in bibliographic records. The speakers will be David Williamson (Library of Congress) and Christine Mitchell (Blackwell). The program will be held on Tuesday, July 28, 2:30-3:15 p.m., with a follow-up discussion 3:30-4:00 p.m.

2. “Classification Web and Cataloger’s Desktop Training at the Library of Congress.” This program will be held on Wednesday, July 29, at the Library of Congress, and is completely booked.

OBS will be cosponsoring a training session on NISO on Saturday afternoon. Various local user system roundtables will also be held on Tuesday during the noon hour. I hope to see many of you in Washington.

As I prepared this column, breaking news came from the OCLC Members Council meeting in Dublin, Ohio: The Special Review Committee OCLC formed to examine the revised use and transfer policy announced they were recommending OCLC remove the current proposed policy and start over, closely involving the membership in any revision. This is exactly what OBS, TS, and others recommended in a proposed resolution that was approved by the AALL Executive Board in April. Now that cooler heads prevailed, we should be able to have a reasoned discussion with OCLC about the use and transfer of WorldCat records.

In closing, I want to thank you, the OBS members, for choosing me to lead this SIS for 2008/2009. OBS is an incredible SIS—small in number but big in influence within AALL. We have done great things, and I know that with Pat’s leadership next year and Kathy’s leadership in 2010/2011, we will continue to be on the cutting edge of innovation, discussion, and leadership. Please continue to support OBS and these leaders— Thanks again.

Michael Maben
Indiana University, Bloomington
As promised in this second installment, I will focus on the increased cost of electronic resources that law libraries currently face. Much like Dragnet, the names have been removed to protect the innocent.

For some smaller publishers, it is often a huge cost savings to change from print to electronic-only format. But it remains for libraries to decide how best to offer electronic formats to their patrons. Those libraries wishing to retain titles in their print collections (usually in addition to their electronic offerings) must determine how to have them printed and bound for the collection, and then must absorb all of the other costs associated with storing and maintaining print materials. There is some sympathy for the small publisher among librarians and library users, as smaller companies continue to get consumed by larger companies, or somehow get lost in the shuffle. The importance of these publications to a particular collection will, however, dictate how much additional work a library is willing to assume to maintain access, particularly in print. Libraries choosing to offer a product only in electronic format have the added responsibility of shifting users to the new format. And staff must invest time and effort into making their own individual adjustments to the new format (some quite easily, some with a little more difficulty).

Larger publishers/producers of electronic resources often have to increase their prices to keep up with demands that their products perform in certain ways (which are arguably justifiable user-driven increases). Also, there is the profit margin. Although we all realize that companies have to pay attention to the bottom line to keep competitive in the market, some of the cost increases can put a strain on acquisitions budgets. Many libraries find themselves having to cancel print titles in order to cover the ever-increasing number and cost of electronic resources. These issues have to be constantly evaluated, because just as publishers must stay competitive, so must the institutions/libraries purchasing their products.

When acquisitions librarians purchase electronic resources from international publishers, the costs increase for the same reasons mentioned above, with an additional factor to consider, the “current exchange rate.” The price of one such resource increased nearly 75% over the last year, due mainly to the exchange rate, which of late has not been great for the US dollar.

However, all the news is not bleak. One of the larger publishers offers a multi-year deal to seal the current price for a specified term. The upside of this offer is the predictable cost (and no increase); the downside is being locked in for a period of time, reducing flexibility. Another publisher promises to forgo an increase for the next year because of the current state of the economy, but this promise is only for the coming year. Still, there remain many publishers who have not made it clear what kind of increases we can expect.

Another method of dealing with increased costs has been tried by a few publishers, and it may be the way to go. These companies offer a basic product, and the customer can add on other components. The basic product does experience growth in content and is accompanied by price increases, but in comparison to other vendor increases, these remain more easily manageable. In addition, the add-ons to the basic product are usually topic/subject focused. The advantage is that libraries can pick and choose which add-ons to purchase, based on user needs. Buying an add-on becomes much like purchasing a new acquisition and follows a similar procedure. From an acquisitions budget standpoint, this is an advantage because it often doesn’t require a large investment of funds and because the library can be selective. Sometimes discounts for add-on’s are even offered to current subscribers to the basic product. Still, most of the larger electronic resource publishers add new content as they see fit, and subscribers pay the price whether they plan to use the new content or not.

One last area worth mentioning relates to predictability. Often vendors will offer incentives such as pre-publication pricing, introductory discount rates, or extended use plans that provide extra months of use for the amount paid. Taking into account regular price increases, the arrival of the “true” price at renewal time could have an especially severe effect on the acquisitions budget. On the other hand, if incentive agreements are still supposed to be in effect after a year or longer, there may be the added cost of time spent documenting this for sales representatives or billing departments. That discussion, I am afraid, will be left for the “people’s resources” portion of this series.
This column is a result of a discussion with Jolande Goldberg, Policy and Standards Office, Library of Congress, Library Services, about international crimes and international criminal courts. In the last column we raised the question of where to class international crimes and the new International Criminal Court (ICC). Jolande reminded me that she has always considered KZ as a schedule in flux and, in her introduction to the schedule, she says, “Although the formal development of KZ is considered completed, the design for the large collections of treaties and related materials in schedule KZ is still rudimentary, in particular where relationships to the regional subclasses for such collections are still being investigated.”

Later she added, “Currently, investigations are under way of newly established organizations, developing subjects and related materials due to the steadily evolving international theater. Fortunately, the schedule has at the end more than 3,000 numbers.”

According to Parry and Grant Encyclopedic Dictionary of International Law, 2nd ed. (New York: Oceana, 2004), classical international law did not include the notion of criminality. However, even under the classical system, piracy was considered an offense against the law of nations. Slave trade has been called an international crime. War crimes were originally national matters until 1945 when The Charter of the International Military Tribunal listed the following as international crimes: crimes against the peace, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. It stands to reason that if these were considered international crimes under the charter, there must have been some historical justification. Other crimes that can be considered or have been considered as international crimes are genocide, aggression, torture, terrorism, and apartheid.

The Draft Code of Crimes against the Peace and Security of Mankind (1996) lists the following as international crimes: aggression, genocide, crimes against humanity, crimes against the UN and its personnel, and war crimes.

Parry and Grant makes the distinction between proper international crimes and crimes which attract multi-state jurisdiction on the basis of international treaty law. These include hijacking of aircraft, terrorism, and crimes against internationally protected persons. The work does seem to suggest that there are crimes that belong in KZ and those that belong in K.

Currently international crimes class in K (General) in the criminal offenses section. Some of the country schedules also include numbers for international crimes when they are committed and prosecuted in a country.

1. What are the individual international crimes? Jolande considers international crimes to be those listed in Bassiouni’s Introduction to International Criminal Law (Ardsley, NY: Transnational Publishers, 2003). She recommends we all take a look at this book. His list breaks down the crimes into the following categories: Jus ad bellum and jus in bello, protection of human interests, protection against terror-violence, and the protection of social and cultural interests. Some of the crimes he considers international are those defined by treaties, such as theft of cultural property. These treaties have been classed in K.

2. Can the crimes mentioned in the sources cited above be defined as strictly international crimes or will some be both international (KZ) and multi-state (K or regional K’s)? We have seen from looking at a few sources that there are differences in what crimes are considered international offenses. Jolande feels that the crimes defined in Introduction to International Criminal Law do belong in KZ and not in K. However, she stated that an international offense committed by the national of a country in that country is a national crime and would be prosecuted as such. In her own words, “Rationale: Both schedules K and KZ are on the global comparative level, K for domestic law comparisons, predominantly in the private/civil sector (with some old glitches) and KZ for true international public law. The fact that jurisdictions aligned themselves with international law doctrines (here: international crimes such as war crimes and crimes against humanity) and codified them in order to prosecute them on their soil, does not make these crimes “domestic” crimes. Thus, I still would like to put comparative works on codification or trials of these “international crimes” by different countries (multi-state (General) or in a particular region) into KZ and not any longer in K (General) nor in the regional schedules. These are all half settled issues and still in flux, concerning sovereignty and jurisdiction questions (expressed by the term “complementarity” of the ICC’s jurisdiction). It needs just a good reference structure. But at the end, I feel, the collections and the users thereof are better served.”
3. Should all international crimes be moved to KZ? She stated they all should be moved.

4. Where would they class in KZ and would you make a section at the end of KZ for crimes and procedure like in the other schedules? She thought that a section for international crimes and procedure could be created at the end of KZ and that numbers from both K and the range of numbers around KZ6310 could be moved.

In a general discussion of international offenses, Jolande used the phrase “internationalization of crimes” to describe what is going on in this area. She also mentioned that the placement of these crimes was a contentious subject back when KZ was being developed.

The ICC was formed in 2002. It had been established by the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998). This court has jurisdiction over genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and aggression. Aggression will become a crime over which the ICC has jurisdiction once the crime has been defined and conditions are set under which the ICC may exercise jurisdiction. In order for a case to be tried before the court:

- the person accused must be a national of a state party or a national of a state that has accepted the ICC’s jurisdiction;
- the crime must have occurred on the territory of a state party; and,
- there is a referral from the UN Security Council.

It was interesting to read that the court can only try a case if the national court is unwilling or unable to investigate and prosecute the crime. This is considered complementarity of the ICC’s jurisdiction, according to Jolande. It is the state’s responsibility to prosecute and investigate. The ICC cannot try a case already tried by another court unless the other court’s proceedings were shielding a person from further prosecution or the case was not tried in accordance with the rule of due process. The Rome Statute itself, Parry and Grant Encyclopaedic Dictionary of International Law; and Wikipedia provided helpful information on the ICC. There will be a conference in 2010 to review the Rome Statute and maybe amend it. Some are proposing that terrorism and drug crimes be added to those international crimes under the jurisdiction of the court.

Currently the decisions of the ICC are classed in KZ219+ and works about the court are classed in KZ6310+.

1. Will the classification numbers for international crimes impact the classification numbers for the ICC? Jolande said that is possible.

2. Does the fact that the ICC will only try a case if the national court is unwilling or unable influence the placement of the class numbers for international crimes? Jolande again stressed that national courts will always try crimes committed by their nationals on their own territory and that it is time to move the international crimes to KZ.

3. Currently the ICC is listed with the other international courts under “Arbitration and adjudication – International courts.” However, the International Maritime Court has been referred to KZA. In other schedules, subject courts are classed with the subject, e.g., tax courts are in the taxation area, labor courts in labor and so on. The decisions of the subject courts class not with the works about the court but with the decisions form division of the subjects being decided. If KZ numbers for international crimes and their procedures are established, will the numbers for the ICC decisions and for works about the ICC be moved to the new KZ criminal law section? As stated above, moving the ICC decisions and works about the ICC would be a possibility, since there is room at the end of KZ to create an international criminal law and procedure section.

4. Another cataloger asked about the classification of a work: Judicial Decisions in the Pre-trial Phase of Criminal Proceedings in France, Germany, and England: A Comparative Analysis Responding to the Law of the International Criminal Court (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2008) by Pierre Hauck. The author compares procedures in three countries to illustrate the strengths and weaknesses of the pre-trial procedure of the ICC. LC classed this title in KJC. What are some of the things we should look at in a book like this to determine whether it should class in KJC (comparative European countries) or in the KZ6310+ area? This book may or may not belong in KJC and might belong in KZ. Jolande said she had not made a decision regarding the relationship between the international schedules and the regional schedules concerning international crime and procedure but would like to keep international public law out of the regional schedules (see above 2).

It seems likely that numbers will be developed in KZ for categories of international crimes and that international criminal procedure will follow the section on crimes. The big categories mentioned by Bassiouni will probably be put in KZ. At the present time I have no problem with the international crimes mentioned in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998) being moved to KZ. The crimes mentioned in Draft Code of Crimes against the Peace and Security of Mankind (1996) probably could be moved. I am uncomfortable in moving some of the other crimes mentioned in Bassiouni’s section.
on the protection of social and cultural interests until they gain wider acceptance from the international community by being included in the *Rome Statute* or the *Draft Code*.

If Jolande does go ahead and decide to change the placement of individual international crimes, what happens next with the KZ development of international crimes and procedure will depend on the decisions of the editorial body of the Policy and Standards Office. Jolande will, on advice of that body, develop a brief outline of a new section at the end of KZ which could be the basis for further discussion. This will not happen overnight; it may well be a year before anything happens. I am sure that the Law Section catalogers in Library Services will have an opinion. Here at the Law Library of Congress we will have to decide if we want to change call numbers for international criminal law currently classed in K. I think we are all in agreement that we do not want to send catalogers to several places to weigh all of the possibilities of where to class. Both Jolande and I felt it would be better to put them in one place rather than two places. So if genocide is added to KZ, the number in K will be put in parentheses. In short, we hope not to have to ask catalogers to decide between KZ, law of nations, and K, transnational, cross-border and comparative law. We want to point them in the right direction.

I want to thank Jolande for patiently answering my questions and helping with this column.

This is the last column for Monica as coeditor. Thank you, Monica, for your help.

---

**TS-SIS 2010 Program Ideas Needed:**
Washington, D.C. Announcement

*Posted on the TS-SIS discussion list May 20, 2009*

Greetings! While it may seem far too early to think about AALL in 2010, planning is underway for the Denver Annual Meeting.

Program proposals must be submitted to the TS-SIS Education Committee by Monday, August 10th—a mere 12 days following the 2009 meeting. We have lots of flexibility to propose learning opportunities that are important to us, but we need your ideas and proposals!

The theme for the Denver meeting is “Summit 2010: Mapping Our Future.” Just the theme evokes all sorts of program possibilities. One little idea can inspire us to reach new heights as we plan, chart and build a brighter future!

For those of you who are attending the Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C., please join us at the TS-SIS Education Committee Meeting on Monday, July 27 from noon-1:15 p.m. at the Washington Convention Center, Room 148. For those of you who are unable to attend, I would like to extend to you an opportunity to become involved by submitting a program idea for the 2010 annual meeting.

To submit a program proposal, please click on the following URL [http://aallnet.org/sis/tsis/annualmeeting/2009/#programideas](http://aallnet.org/sis/tsis/annualmeeting/2009/#programideas) and carefully follow the instructions on how to submit your idea, or if you wish, you can email your idea to one of the committee members: Shyama Agrawal, Donna Barratt, Ajaye Bloomstone, Marilyn Estes, Alan Keely, Keiko Okuhara, George Prager, Hollie White, Pam Deemer (ex-officio), and Chris Long (ex-officio). Email addresses are included at the aforementioned URL.

A great program starts with a single idea. We are here to help and give your program proposal the best chance of being approved. We look forward to hearing from you.

Carol Nicholson
Chair, TS-SIS Education Committee
Associate Director for Technical Services
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Law Library
While preparing to write my first collection development column, I sought advice from several colleagues and friends. I asked them which topics I should tackle and what kinds of policies and practices I should explore. I wanted to choose a topic that was timely, relevant and interesting, yet still reflected the knowledge and experience I have gained in my years as a librarian. Their responses were unanimous: write about what you know. This sage advice was just what I needed, and that’s exactly what I plan to do throughout this series of articles.

If there is one aspect of collection development I know best at this moment, it is the art of developing the collection during a period of reduced acquisition budgets. Not only have we been working through this process in my own library, but I have also spent the last year talking to other librarians across the country about their experiences with this difficult task. Many of us are like the financial planners for our libraries who have seen our traditional models for maximizing growth for our valuable portfolio (our collections) tossed out the window by current economic conditions. We must now work collectively (pardon the pun) if we want to devise the best practices to protect the yield on our portfolio in these uncertain and difficult economic times. When I recommended that this year’s Collection Development Roundtable at the AALL Annual Meeting focus on this issue, I was stunned at the number of enthusiastic and supportive responses I received. It has become abundantly clear to me that I am not the only collection development librarian grappling with this situation—not by a long shot.

I want to inaugurate this series of columns by talking about the beginning of my library’s journey to balancing the highest standards of excellence in service with the challenges of achieving a sizeable reduction in expenditures. The Mabee Legal Information Center (MLIC) at the University of Tulsa has a collection of approximately 410,000 volumes and serves a law faculty of 38 and a student body of 416. We are part of a private university with a total student body of about 4,200. We have nine librarians who also teach and assume some administrative responsibilities, six permanent staff members, and a mix of temporary and student staff that, among other duties, help to cover our 113 hours of operation per week during the academic year. I provide these demographics to give you a sense of who we are so that you can have some organizational context as I describe the policies, practices and innovations that we are implementing. Over the next year, I hope to use this column to share not only the MLIC’s efforts but also the suggestions and solutions communicated to me by other collection development librarians in academic law libraries. If ever there was a time to share our strategies for the greater good, now is certainly that time.

You might notice that I use the words “we” and “our” throughout my narrative. I cannot emphasize strongly enough the importance of involving our entire team of librarians in this effort. Some of our librarians serve as selectors for particular subject areas in our collection. The overarching decisions we make about changes to our collection development practices have to become part of their decision-making process as well. Our librarians and staff members in technical services and interlibrary loan will also be impacted by the collection development decisions we make. Reference librarians have to be aware of the format changes that are taking place in some frequently-used reference sources, and their input is critical in the decision to retain or cut certain titles. As we set out on this journey together, I realized for the first time how truly interdependent each department of the library is.

After discovering that our budget would be decreased in the next fiscal year, and would likely decrease again in the following year, we formed a steering committee to do the detailed work of a title-by-title review of all continuations and electronic resources in our collection. The director, assistant director for reference and research, acquisitions librarian and I decided to meet weekly, summarizing the results of each meeting and disseminating those results to the rest of the librarians and technical services staff. The first and most critical task faced by this group involved organizational introspection. We had to ask questions that we had not examined in depth in recent fiscal years. Who are we as a law library? Whom do we serve and how do we provide that service? Are we advancing our mission? How can we assure that our process of making cancellations is as attentive, well-reasoned and thoughtful as our process of selecting new resources? With fewer resources to manage, the careful allocation of those precious resources would rest on our answers to those questions.

For guidance, we turned to our library mission statement. This carefully crafted document identifies the primary users of our facility and the most essential services we provide. No matter how many difficult questions we face, it is this core understanding of who we are and what we do that must guide our answers. I also spent some time reflecting on our existing collection development policy. I wanted to make sure that the elements of the policy were in line with our mission and
that we didn’t need to revisit any major areas of the policy before beginning our work. Because our mission statement was thoroughly reviewed, revised and approved only a few years ago, we were able to glean a clear sense of purpose and direction from it. Additionally, our collection development policy undergoes a comprehensive review every year, so its provisions accurately reflect our current library practices. Together, these two documents provide us a basis for making well-reasoned and consistent decisions. Moreover, we can trace our decisions to stated policies, a fact that gives me a real sense of comfort when we face some of our more difficult choices.

Though my experiences come directly from my position in academic law librarianship, I think the basic principles of our approach to collection development in the face of a shrinking acquisitions budget can be applied in a number of settings. First, know your mission. Understand the most fundamental services your library offers and identify the groups or individuals to whom those services are provided. Second, review your existing policies. Whether you have a written collection development policy, a general policy and procedure manual or something less formal, evaluating the guiding principles of your collection development decisions can make the difficult choices ahead easier to handle. Third, think about which members of your staff need to be kept in the loop. For a smaller library like ours, keeping everyone in the loop is ideal. In larger organizations, it may be easier to work in small groups first or to maintain one primary contact in each department.

I want to close with one final recommendation. Don’t go through this process alone. This isn’t the first time library budgets have been reduced. It isn’t the first time librarians have been asked to make difficult decisions about the development of their collections. Learn from the experiences of those around you. Ask questions—lots of them. If you are a solo librarian, use the AALL discussion lists or law-lib to connect with others in similar situations. Be ready to share ideas and be sure to take good notes. We are all in this together, and I may be calling you for advice soon.

The Library of Congress launches Authorities and Vocabularies service

Of particular interest to the non-traditional metadata community, LC launched their Authorities and Vocabularies service http://id.loc.gov/authorities/about.html, which “enables both humans and machines to programmatically access authority data at the Library of Congress.”


“This means that system developers and integrators can rely upon that link [http://id.loc.gov/authorities/sh85042531] to represent a concept … This should facilitate the ability for disparate systems and services to simply share concepts and therefore understanding – one of the basic principles behind the Semantic Web.”

He goes on to evaluate the service’s potential: “This move by the LoC has two aspects to it that should make it a success. The first one is technical. Adopting the approach, standards, and conventions promoted by the Linked Data community ensures a ready made developer community to use and spread the word about it. The second one is openness. Anyone and everyone will not have to think “Is it OK to use this stuff” before taking advantage of this valuable asset.”

The only vocabulary included at this point is the LC Subject Headings, but they plan on adding the following in the future: Thesaurus for Graphic Materials, MARC Code List for Geographic Areas, MARC Code List for Languages, and MARC Code Lists for Relators, Sources, Description Conventions.

Cataloger’s Desktop 3.0

The Library of Congress is developing Cataloger’s Desktop 3.0 and targeting a mid-2009 release to subscribers. For more background, and to see a list of the proposed enhancements (too numerous to list here) please visit http://www.loc.gov/cds/notices/desktop09.pdf.
Library of Congress continues working with consultants, establishes a social networking site

In January 2009, the Library of Congress retained R2 Consulting LLC as discussed in [http://www.r2consulting.org/pdfs/LC%20Press%20Release.pdf](http://www.r2consulting.org/pdfs/LC%20Press%20Release.pdf) to investigate the economic aspects of their current practices regarding creation and distribution of bibliographic data. R2 Consulting will research and describe the current “marketplace” for MARC cataloging records; their report is due at the end of June 2009.

Ruth Fischer, one of the founders of R2 Consulting LLC, created a social networking site [http://bibrecords.ning.com](http://bibrecords.ning.com) which consists of a weblog and a forum for user discussions about this project. It is free to join this site, and as of this writing, there are 764 members.

LC, NLM, and NAL to test RDA

The Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine (NLM), and the National Agricultural Library (NAL) formed a Steering Committee whose members are listed at [http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/rda/committee.html](http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/rda/committee.html) to coordinate the formal testing of RDA and specifically its online component. Approximately 20 additional formal test partners also committed staff and resources to testing. [Editor’s note: The list of RDA test partners was subsequently released June 6th and can be found at [http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/rda/test-partners.html](http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/rda/test-partners.html). Law libraries at the University of Chicago, Columbia, Emory, Northeastern, and Stanford universities will join with their main libraries to test RDA.]

Testing will begin when the online version of RDA is released (projected for July 2009 or later) and is expected to last six months (three months for training and practice, three for creating test records and submitting information about the record creation process and the records themselves).

The three national libraries will make a joint decision on whether or not to implement RDA based on the results of this testing. For more information about testing RDA see [http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/rda/](http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/rda/).

Barbara Tillett webcasts about RDA, FRBR, and FRAD

The Library of Congress posted webcasts available at [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/rdawebcasts.html](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/rdawebcasts.html) by Dr. Barbara B. Tillett, Chief of the Policy and Standards Division of the Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate. These webcasts are from a series of lectures about Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR), Functional Requirements for Authority Data (FRAD), and Resource Description and Access (RDA).

First webcast was: March 14, 2008. Resource Description and Access: Background/Overview (67 minutes).

Second webcast was: June 10, 2008. Cataloging Principles and RDA (49 minutes).

CLA pre-conference: “From rules to entities: cataloguing with RDA”

On May 29, 2009, there was a pre-conference on RDA at the Canadian Library Association Conference. The live webcast was recorded and is available at [http://www.ustream.tv/channel/from-rules-to-entities%3A-cataloguing-with-rda](http://www.ustream.tv/channel/from-rules-to-entities%3A-cataloguing-with-rda). For a detailed agenda and more information about the pre-conference see [http://tsig.wikispaces.com/Pre-conference+2009](http://tsig.wikispaces.com/Pre-conference+2009).

Genre/form headings for moving image materials

In February, the Library of Congress Cataloging Policy and Support Office announced that all SACO participants can now contribute proposals for new and revised genre/form headings for moving image materials (films, television programs, video recordings, etc.) and radio programs. This decision was based upon a successful pilot project involving Brigham Young University and the University of Washington.

The SACO online genre/form proposal form, as well as the existing subject proposal form, and the change proposal form, can be accessed via the SACO web page [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/saco](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/saco/).

According to their timeline, the pilot project for law related genre/form headings will begin in mid-2009 and conclude in mid-2010. To read the plan and timeline see [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/genretimeline.html](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/genretimeline.html).

Single encoding level for “BIBCO standard record”?

At their November 2008 meeting, the Program for Cooperative Cataloging Policy Committee (PoCo) endorsed the concept of using a single encoding level for monographic records instead of the current BIBCO encoding levels “Full” and “Core.” A task group was charged with the responsibility to draft a set of required elements for such a record. The Task Group is using “BIBCO Standard Record” as the working name for the proposed model. The Interim Report of this Task Group is available at [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/TG_InterimRpt_BSR-MAP5_20Mar09.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/TG_InterimRpt_BSR-MAP5_20Mar09.pdf).
The Task Group will submit their final report by mid-June, and PCC will make their decision on this after the ALA Annual Meeting.

**PCC changes in CONSER records**


042 code “pcc”

Beginning May 1, 2009 all CONSER institutions will use the authentication code “pcc” in place of codes “lcd” and “lc” in records newly authenticated and distributed as part of the CONSER Program. The code will be used in records for both serials and integrating resources.

Catalogers do not need to change authentication codes lcd and lc on existing records to “pcc”

008/39 code “c”

Beginning May 1, 2009 CONSER practice for coding the 008/39 cataloging source will also change. CONSER institutions, other than CONSER national libraries, will use code “c” (defined as “cooperative cataloging program”) in all records - original or copy - authenticated and distributed as part of the CONSER Program. Previously, authenticated records based on existing copy were coded “d” (defined as “other”) by default. The new practice harmonizes with BIBCO practices and will facilitate OCLC processing of CONSER records for integrating resources and serials.

Catalogers do not need to change cataloging source code on existing records to “c.”

The coding practices of national bibliographic agencies participating in CONSER, (e.g. the Library of Congress, Library and Archives Canada, National Library of Medicine, and National Agricultural Library) will not change. These agencies will continue to use code blank in the 008/39 for original and previously unauthenticated OCLC records.

Instructions in CONSER Editing Guide sections 042 and 008/39 will be updated as will the introduction of Descriptive Cataloging Manual section Z1.

**OCLC Expert Community Experiment**

OCLC launched the Expert Community Experiment in February 2009 as discussed in [http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/catalog/quality/expert/default.htm](http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/catalog/quality/expert/default.htm). The experiment will last for six months, during which time members with full-level cataloging authorizations will be able to edit and add to OCLC master bibliographic records (excepting PCC records (BIBCO and CONSER)). Participants will be able to replace Library of Congress records that are not coded PCC.

OCLC held free webinars introducing the experiment, and provided a recorded version for those unable to attend, which is available on their Expert Community Experiment webpage.

Several people posted inquiries on the OCLC discussion list about how the activity with the experiment did or did not affect credits. On Feb. 18, 2009 Cynthia Whitacre responded, and stated that the credits for upgrading minimal level records and database enrichment activities remain unchanged, but “OCLC is not offering credits for the new activity during the course of the experiment. Part of the experiment will involve evaluating what is possible in the future regarding credits for this type of activity.” In a separate response, dealing specifically with OCLC Enhance, Cynthia stated: “When you use your Enhance or CONSER authorizations for the formats for which you are authorized, you will continue to receive credits as usual. You will, during the course of the experiment, be able to make changes to formats for which you do not yet have authorization. If you use your Enhance authorization to correct or change a full level record in a format for which you are not authorized for Enhance, that falls into the Expert Community Experiment, and you will not receive credit for that.”

As for what this all means for the future of OCLC’s Enhance Program, one of OCLC’s Experiment page FAQs offers this vague statement: “OCLC staff have already begun talking with Enhance Program participants about ways in which the Enhance Program might be refocused in other ways that would continue to make use of the talents and expertise of current and future participants. Those discussions will continue during the course of the experiment.”

Thus far, the Experiment seems to be popular among catalogers. Karen Calhoun posted some illuminating statistics on the Metalogue blog [http://community.oclc.org/metalogue/archives/2009/03/more-on-the-expert-community-e.html](http://community.oclc.org/metalogue/archives/2009/03/more-on-the-expert-community-e.html).
**OCLC Extends WorldCat Local**

Marshall Breeding wrote an interesting article in the April 23, 2009 issue of *Library Journal*, “In Challenge to ILS Industry, OCLC Extends WorldCat Local To Launch New Library System” which is available at [http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA6653619.html](http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA6653619.html). He discusses OCLC’s new project in which “Libraries that subscribe to FirstSearch WorldCat will get, for no additional charge, the WorldCat Local ‘quick start’ service: a locally branded catalog interface and simple search box that presents localized search results for print and electronic content along with the ability to search the entire WorldCat database and other resources via the Web.”

---

**Management**

Karen B. Douglas  
*Goodson Law Library, Duke University Law School*

The more things change, the more they remain the same. Back in July of 1979, during the infancy of desktop computers, when Dialog, Lexis and Westlaw had just gotten started, Michael Gorman, a visionary even then, wrote a column for *American Libraries* entitled, “On Doing Away with Technical Services Departments.” He discussed such issues as division between technical services and public services. Gorman said, “The present economic situation forces us to use our human and technical resources as efficiently as possible.” He further stated, “The tremendous impact of automation on our library processes has made it necessary to distinguish between the professional task and the non-professional task, and to distinguish between the task best carried out by a human being and that best carried out by a machine.” He conceived a “central automated processing system for ordering, receipt, rapid cataloging and routing of library materials with little or no professional involvement.” He also condoned flattening the hierarchy and merging professional technical services librarians into the public service sector.

Thirty years later the work and responsibilities of technical services departments are still in a state of continuous change. Managers still constantly analyze work flow and retrain staff to perform new responsibilities. Technology has moved at warp speed during the past thirty years. Yet over this time period, some of the changes that Gorman predicted in his 1979 article have yet to come to fruition. Some technical services departments have reduced their number of professionals. Some have only one, with paraprofessional staff responsible for most of the core functions of technical services. Others have professional librarians performing core tasks. There is still no one model for the technical services department and it does indeed continue to exist.

I wonder if the current economic situation in 2009 will finally be the one to cause the metamorphosis of technical services. Our automation is a great deal more sophisticated. We are now looking toward our third generation of online systems. The advent of electronic resources, especially HeinOnline, changed the way we deal with serials and binding. Many libraries made the decision to stop binding journals or even to cancel print subscriptions altogether when journals are available electronically. Staff members who formerly spent hours checking in serials and preparing bindery shipments don’t have as much work to do as they once did. In an era when we are told that “the catalog is dead” and “it’s all on Google,” technical services managers find themselves having to justify the existence of their departments, when much of what they do can be outsourced or is no longer necessary. Many of us have wondered if there is a future for technical services.

In subsequent columns, I will report on the survey I conducted on what responsibilities heads of technical services now have in their job descriptions, and some new activities that are being taken on by technical services departments.

If you are planning on attending this year’s Annual Meeting in Washington, DC, I urge you to consider attending Workshop W-3, “Managing from the Middle: Techniques for Success in Technical Services,” on Saturday, July 25, 8:30 a.m-5:00 p.m. You will get valuable information on how to manage in these difficult and uncertain times.

---

An OCLC report, *Online Catalogs: What Users and Librarians Want* [http://www.oclc.org/reports/onlinecatalogs/fullreport.pdf](http://www.oclc.org/reports/onlinecatalogs/fullreport.pdf), was recently made available to the public. In 2008, OCLC formed a research team and conducted a worldwide web-based survey in order to compare the data quality expectations of catalog end users and library staff, and to recommend catalog data quality priorities by taking into account the perspectives of both groups.

The OCLC research team used three methods: end user focus groups, an end user pop-up survey, and a library survey, to identify the catalog data quality expectations of catalog end users, librarians, and other library staff. End user focus groups included undergraduates, casual searchers, and scholars. The end user online survey popped up when a respondent clicked through to the detailed record in WorldCat.org. The library web-based survey targeted librarians and staff not only through WorldCat.org and WorldCat on FirstSearch, but also through Connexion, Z39.50, and WorldCat Resource Sharing.

The study found that what end users want in terms of data quality includes direct links to online content (text and media formats); evaluative content such as summaries/abstracts, tables of contents and excerpts; relevant search results; item availability information (if the item is available and how to get it); and simple keyword search with an advanced, guided search option.

The study also found important differences between the catalog data quality priorities of end users and those who work in libraries. End users, librarians, and library staff approach catalog data with different purposes. End users generally want to satisfy information needs, and their expectations of data quality arise from their experiences of how information is organized on popular websites. The work roles of librarians and library staff influence their data quality preferences: Librarians’ perspectives about data quality remain highly influenced by classical principles of information organization, while other library staff members generally have practical work assignments to carry out. What is needed now is an integration of the best of all these worlds, in a new and expanded definition of what “quality” means in library online catalogs.

This report offers:

- Insight for readers seeking to define requirements for improved catalog data,
- Information about the metadata elements that are most important to end users in determining if an item will meet their needs,
- Support for the enhancements end users and librarians would like to see made in the online library catalog, and
- Findings for readers who have a part to play in contributing, syndicating, synchronizing, or linking data from multiple resources in next-generation library catalogs and integrated library systems.

The report concludes with recommendations for a data quality program that balances what end users and library workers want and need from online catalogs, plus a few suggestions for further research.

OCLC’s report will be addressed in the OBS-SIS OCLC Committee Update and Roundtable at the 2009 AALL Annual Meeting in Washington, DC. At that time, a representative from OCLC will present an OCLC update, which will include more information about this report. Please mark your calendars and plan to attend this session.
Earnest Request to Enable the Benefits of Preservation

Sally Wambold
University of Richmond Law Library

No question, preservation is a demanding task. If we do not have the time or the money, why do it? More to the point, how can we preserve our collections without enough time or money? Surely, I have written about preservation being self-preservation; part of that self-preservation is the preservation of our own morale, maybe even our sanity. Think about it: If our collections are crumbling, how can we do our work? How can we serve our users without resources?

Preservation has so many layers! We are not just preserving access to books, as all librarians know too well. Digital challenges are just as daunting as paper challenges. Access is not merely the existence of resources; it is the ability to find them—again, a well-known fact, but worth emphasizing.

I would like to request feedback from you. Email me at swambold@richmond.edu with information about the following preservation topics:

- How do you find time to preserve your resources?
- How do you find money for preservation work?
- What are your priorities for preserving resources?
  - Do the resources have to be at least fifty years old?
  - Must the resources be rare instead of merely old?
  - Do you concentrate on a particular subject?
  - Do you concentrate on a particular author or scholar?
  - In other words, what is important for you to preserve?
  - How do you determine your priorities?
- With digital collections, how do you provide access?

The answers to these questions could prove crucial to the promotion and provision of preservation! I hope to hear from you.

Stay well preserved!

---

National Standards Information Organization (NISO) Training Session

Reprinted (in part) from the OBS-SIS discussion list May 27, 2009, with additions by the editor.

The Computing Services, Online Bibliographic Services, and Technical Services Special Interest Sections are cosponsoring a NISO training session on Saturday, July 25th at the Washington, D.C. Annual Meeting. Mary Alice Baish, AALL’s representative to NISO, has organized a training session on how to review draft standards, with Karen Wetzel, the NISO Standards Program Manager, as the speaker. This program is open to all with an interest in NISO and who are considering helping to review future NISO proposals.

The program will be Saturday, July 25th from 3:30-4:30 p.m. at the Renaissance Hotel, Room 2. Since space is limited, if interested, please contact Linda Tesar (l.tesar@law.vanderbilt.edu) to let her know of your interest in attending. Coming to the training session does not obligate you to review the proposals.

Michael Maben
Indiana University Law Library, Bloomington
Most of you have heard of at least one social networking site, and may even be a member of one or more. I’ve been interested in social networking for some time, and have been using these sites for personal reasons. Recently I attended an AALL continuing education webinar on “Social Networking for Law Librarians” given by Sarah Glassmeyer, which got me thinking more about using these resources for professional reasons. Obviously I will not be able to go into much depth in this column, but I would like to share some of the reasons I think law firm librarians might want to use social networking tools, particularly Twitter. I confess I joined Twitter a few months ago, dabbled a little, but could not see why I should be interested in it. I was already using Facebook, which was meeting my personal networking needs, using LinkedIn for my professional contacts, and reading blogs and discussion lists, so why Twitter?

Twitter is a microblogging tool where posts are limited to 140 words. You create a short profile and include a brief bio of yourself and interests so others can find you. You can choose whose posts you want to follow, you can tweet for everyone or make your tweets private, and you can also send direct messages to users. Here are some of things I have been using Twitter for, and which you might find useful in your work:

1. **Discover new blogs.** Twitter users all have profile pages on which they can link to their websites or blogs. As tweets catch my attention, I click through to find interesting—and previously unknown to me—blogs.

2. **Follow blogs I already read.** Many blogs I already read have Twitter feeds. I can follow the latest activity and click on the link to the full post if I am interested. I find it faster and easier than remembering to check my RSS feed reader.

3. **Locate experts.** Either by posting a message to Twitter or by using its search function, you may be able to find experts on a particular topic.

4. **Network with other law librarians.** For solo librarians and self-employed consultants, Twitter is a virtual office water cooler. Throughout the day, librarians on Twitter comment on the news, throw out questions, and share articles and items of interest. You can reply directly to others, either publicly or privately. I use this the same way I do a discussion list such as law-lib. The advantage is that I can choose the people whose posts I want to read by following them. I choose my own group of colleagues and eliminate unwanted “noise.”

5. **Follow the government.** The White House, federal agencies and members of Congress are among the many sources within the U.S. government that use Twitter to distribute news and announcements. A list of federal government Twitter feeds is at Twitter Fan Wiki ([http://twitter.pbworks.com/USGovernment](http://twitter.pbworks.com/USGovernment)).

6. **Track activity at a conference.** Using what Twitter calls hashtags, you can tag posts to connect them with other posts. One way this is useful is at a conference, enabling attendees to find each others’ posts. The tag is marked using the pound symbol and placed directly within the post. For example, #aall2009 will be used by attendees at the AALL conference in Washington, DC this July. Even if you cannot attend the conference you can follow the action virtually.

7. **Keep up to date.** What are hot topics among law librarians, or law firms in your practice area? What are people saying about your firm, your ILS, legal technology? Select the people in these areas whose posts you wish to follow. You can also search all Twitter posts to find people who are interested in or tweeting in areas you want to know about. Go to [http://search.twitter.com](http://search.twitter.com).

I am sure there are other reasons to use Twitter, but these are just a few to encourage you to get started. I would love to know how others are using Twitter, so please feel free to send me a tweet at bethgholmes, or you can email me at egh@PSH.com.
Understanding Research: Choosing a Design

Hollie C. White
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Over the next few issues, I plan to introduce basic research concepts. The idea of research can sometimes seem unwieldy and, while some of the readers of this column may already be familiar with the topic of research and publication, it is my hope that these columns will make research seem more manageable. My plan is to describe certain basic details of the research process, especially things that need to be understood or known before beginning research projects that end in publication. This issue’s discussion will be about distinguishing between the different types of research designs.

Whether a person is looking at library staff job satisfaction or which subject headings are applied most frequently for new acquisitions, an important part of doing research is understanding in which category of research the work falls. Research design is the overall plan of how a research project is going to work; it is like a map of what research will take place and how it will be conducted. Many research experts, like John Creswell, Juliet Corbin and Anslem Strauss, recommend having a research design in place before beginning a project. In libraries, most research can be classified into one of three types of designs: qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods. Each of these designs is dominated by certain characteristics.

Qualitative Research
Qualitative research explores the “why” aspect of attitudes or behavior in order to understand the social or more human-based aspects of a problem. Instead of trying to answer a specific set of questions through experimentation, qualitative research is often trying to find interpretations and is inductive, as opposed to deductive. The product of qualitative research is usually words.

Quantitative Research
Quantitative research is a more systematic, scientific evaluation or measurement of certain variables. This type of research is often deductive and empirical, meaning that the information is being gained through observation, experience, or experiment. It tests theories and may use more close-ended questions when collecting data. As opposed to words, quantitative research relies more on numbers and statistics.

Mixed Methods Research
Mixed methods research occurs when a design combines techniques that are both qualitative and quantitative in nature. According to Creswell in Research Design, “It is more than simply collecting and analyzing both kinds of data; it also involves the use of both approaches in tandem so that the overall strength of a study is greater than either qualitative or quantitative research.”

While each type of research design has strong characteristics unto itself, it is not uncommon to find designs that are primarily one type, yet also integrate aspects of other types. In other words, it is possible to have a quantitative study that also has a few qualitative aspects (and vice versa), but it is still not considered a mixed methods approach.

Typically, a research article clearly states the design of the research being presented before it describes the various steps taken to perform the investigation or experiment. To test your ability to distinguish among different types of designs, next time you read a research article try to determine if the methods being used are primarily qualitative, quantitative, or mixed.

Many authors have tackled the subject of research; I consulted a few to write this article. Here are two recent print resources that I found very helpful:


Finally, I would like to call your attention to the Writers’ Workshop being offered at the AALL Annual Meeting, as announced by the AALL/LexisNexis Call for Papers Committee. The Writers’ Workshop is scheduled for July 26, noon-1:15 p.m., at the Renaissance Hotel. The workshop will include roundtable discussion groups, with editors and experienced authors available at each table. The roundtable discussion groups will focus on: selecting topics, making time to write, working with coauthors, getting published, and more. Although the workshop is likely to be of more interest to newer librarians, anyone may attend. Registration is limited to forty people. If you would like to register, please contact Jim Heller at heller@wm.edu.
The March 2009 issue of the ALCTS Newsletter Online available at [http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/resources/ano/v20/n1/index.cfm](http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/resources/ano/v20/n1/index.cfm) features reports from the ALA Midwinter Conference in Denver. Susan Thomas (Indiana University) reports on a forum sponsored by the American Library Association, Association for Library Collections and Technical Services, Continuing Resources Section, Committee on Holdings Information. The forum, consisting of a four-member panel, held a discussion entitled, “E-serials Holdings: Whether, Why, and How?” The panel touched on a topic of great importance for many libraries, but law libraries in particular, namely, management and display of electronic serial holdings data. Different procedures and points of view were discussed. Thomas’s report can be found at [http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/resources/ano/v20/n1/event/fprog_rpt.cfm](http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/resources/ano/v20/n1/event/fprog_rpt.cfm).

The ability to identify and provide a stable link to content is very important in the management of electronic holdings. The DOI (Digital Object Identifier), discussed by Heather Staines (Springer US), does this very thing. Any type of electronic content can be identified by DOI; DOI will not change even if ownership of the data changes and the link from citation to content is made to work transparently. The largest DOI registration agency is CrossRef, and Staines urged that DOI and metadata information should be deposited into CrossRef, to make the content easily accessible. Staines stressed that indexing is also vital in providing access, since publishers are not able to ascertain where researchers start their searches.

The pros and cons of using ONIX SOH (Serials Online Holdings) to communicate detailed e-serials holdings information from the publisher end to MARC21 systems was discussed by Rebecca Guenther (Library of Congress). A benefit of using ONIX SOH is that it can be mapped to MARC21 holdings, so libraries can easily import and use the data in their local systems. A downside is that SOH version 1.1 cannot do serial issue prediction, and the chronology aligns with other ONIX formats rather than MARC21.

Enumeration displays in holdings lists and link resolvers were the focus of Peter McCracken’s (Serials Solutions) presentation. He pointed out that chronology (e.g., year, month, etc.) displays tend to be dominant, while enumeration (volume, part, etc.) is less common in e-holdings displays. He concluded that, even though there is some demand for enumeration in e-serials holdings data, it has little practical effect on users’ ability to access content, and full implementation of enumeration in e-holdings data would be prohibitively expensive. McCracken noted that enumeration and chronology are embedded in the OpenURL directing users to the content of their search.

Finally, Myrtle Myers (OCLC) discussed the use and display of e-serial holding data in WorldCat. She illustrated how this data is being used for both collection management and resource sharing.

PowerPoint handouts prepared by the forum participants and a more detailed summary report of the forum by Cecelia Boone (MINITEX) and Margi Mann (OCLC) are available on the ALA Midwinter wiki [http://wikis.ala.org/midwinter2009/index.php/ALCTS#CRS_Committee_on_Holdings_Information](http://wikis.ala.org/midwinter2009/index.php/ALCTS#CRS_Committee_on_Holdings_Information).
The following serial title changes were recently identified by the acquisitions and cataloging staff of the University of California, Berkeley Law Library.

**A Guide to United States treaties in force**  
OCoLC 9157644  
**Changed to:**  
Kavass's guide to the United States treaties in force  
2008 ed.-  
OCoLC 317713008

**International peacekeeping (Hingham, Mass.)**  
OCoLC 31359072  
**Changed to:**  
Journal of international peacekeeping  
Vol. 13, nos. 1-2 (2009)-  
OCoLC 277166825

**Japanese annual of international law**  
No. 1 (1957)-v. 50 (2007)  
OCoLC 1782891  
**Changed to:**  
Japanese yearbook of international law  
Vol. 51 (2008)-  
OCoLC 318309945

**Notitia Vasconiae**  
OCoLC 57337201  
**Changed to:**  
Iura Vasconiae  
1 (2004)-  
OCoLC 2007202133

**Public safety (Sacramento, Calif.)**  
1997-2006  
OCoLC 41930856  
**Changed to:**  
Legislative summary. California. Legislature. Assembly. Committee on Public Safety  
2007-  
OCoLC 300102948

**Social biology**  
OCoLC 133063111  
**Changed to:**  
Biodemography and social biology  
Vol. 54, no. 1 (spring 2008)-  
OCoLC 309845773

The following serial cessations were identified by University of California, Berkeley Law Library serials and acquisitions staff.

**The American : a magazine of ideas**  
Ceased with: Vol. 2 no. 6 (Nov./Dec. 2008)  
OCoLC 70822852

**Cayman Islands law bulletin**  
Ceased with: No. 21 (Mar. 2004)  
OCoLC 27900197

**Corporation, partnership, fiduciary filled-in tax return forms**  
Ceased with: 2007  
OCoLC 3589919

**Human rights in development yearbook**  
Ceased with: 2003  
OCoLC 43083795

**International tax news (North Ryde, N.S.W.)**  
Ceased with: 2008, issue 3 (11 July 2008)  
OCoLC 35141155

**Native American law digest**  
Ceased with: Vol. 18, no. 9 (Sept. 2008)  
OCoLC 27120230

**Revista peruana de jurisprudencia**  
Ceased with: Ano 8, no. 70 (diciembre 2006)  
OCoLC 43738696

**Survey on lawyer discipline systems**  
Ceased with: 2003 issue  
OCoLC 18711721  
1998- available online

**WGO : Monatshefte fur europaisches Recht**  
OCoLC 1789857

*Please note: Our publisher informed us that this title ceased with the above issue, but one of the editors says there will be one additional issue, 49. Jahrg., Heft 5/6. To date, our library has not received this issue.*
No, this is not about Mr. Spock® looking for a job or trying to vote.

The legal profession (our constituency) and society at large (the “non-law users”) have different perceptions of what the words “alien” and “foreigner” mean. In order to reflect current popular terminology, the Library of Congress is changing Alien labor to Foreign workers. The proposal came from a non-law library, and it isn’t all that radical as LCSH already has “Foreign workers” as a UF leading to Alien labor. For the overall class of persons, Aliens remains the heading, and “Foreign criminals” and “Immigrant criminals” are being added as UF references to Alien criminals. The problem is that “Aliens” isn’t really a synonym for “Foreigners,” since not all aliens are foreigners, and not all foreigners are aliens, especially in legal usage, and whether an immigrant is a type of foreigner is subject to debate, since many Americans would argue that an immigrant is an ex-foreigner, which is reflected in US law, though popular usage differs among countries and subcultures.

The US uses the principle of Jus soli (citizenship based on place of birth). Those born in the US, even if their parents are illegal immigrants, or even tourists, are citizens by birth. If a pregnant immigrant arrives and gives birth at the airport, she can refer proudly to her child as the “newest American.” This is a function of the wording of the Fourteenth Amendment, and is a principle that many descendants of immigrants hold dear. Under US law, only foreigners are aliens. By definition immigrants or descendants of immigrants are neither foreigners nor aliens, and calling them that when they are immigrants or descendants of immigrants is insulting, and perhaps actionable.

However, LCSH also has to take into account “popular” use, and there is a noisy (but hopefully not very strong) “nativist” movement in the US. While LCSH defines Nativism narrowly (deemphasizing its racist nature, and its modern focus on opposing Hispanic and, to a lesser extent, Asian immigration), “nativists” routinely refer to descendants of recent immigrants as “foreigners,” and in some cases “recent” means during the last two centuries. Many non-Hispanic Americans fail to distinguish between different groups of Hispanic Americans, and regard them all as foreigners (even if their ancestors have been American citizens since the nineteenth century, and never immigrated from overseas). Aliens is a legal term that is clearly defined. It doesn’t reflect popular usage, but it is clearly understood among those who produce and use the material we catalog. Legal literature discusses the problem of Aliens, whereas legal literature discussing Foreign workers will need to start by discussing their Citizenship (Law) status, i.e. whether they are citizens or Aliens.

Many countries use the rule of Jus sanguinis (citizenship based on “blood” or heredity, which in the US is contrary to the Fourteenth Amendment). In such countries citizenship requires being descended from citizens, regardless of place of birth. In these countries, a person may speak only the language of the country, be familiar only with the culture of the country, have ancestors who moved to the country generations or even centuries ago, but still not be a citizen. In such countries, immigrants become a class of hereditary stateless persons. These people are clearly not “foreigners.” Indeed, in a few cases they might be considered Indigenous peoples, since their ancestors lived in the country before the governing group; however, they are legally considered to be Aliens.

One solution might be to establish “Foreigners” as a valid heading in LCSH for non-law works, perhaps with a scope note to clarify that it does not apply to ethnic minorities or immigrants (rejecting the nativist understanding regardless of a country’s citizenship laws) and to have “Foreigners—Legal status, laws, etc.” be a UF pointing to Aliens.

Foreign workers works fine for social sciences, and tolerably for legal works in the Jus soli countries, but it fails miserably for countries in which non-foreigners can still be Aliens. Perhaps Alien labor should be kept rather than Foreign workers—Legal status, laws, etc. It also might be a good practice to have a secondary heading for the ethnic group where applicable, e.g., Mexican Americans—Legal status, laws, etc.—United States (this being a good example of the complexity of the issues, since persons of Mexican ancestry in the US can be illegal immigrants, legal immigrants, persons who became citizens when borders moved, or descendants of any combination of the above). The scope note should specifically address the issue of non-foreign aliens, as well as the need to address popular (but racist) perceptions of minorities being foreigners (even though they are not aliens). Absent a scope note, if we have to use Foreign workers—Legal status, laws, etc. in a country in which the “foreign workers” are native born, a secondary heading for Aliens or the ethnic group, e.g., Turks—Legal status, laws, etc.—Germany, would be a good idea.

Subject Headings

Aaron Kuperman

Foreigners and Aliens
While we are on the subject, the heading for the rights of Mr. Spock® under LCSH is Extraterrestrial beings—Legal status, laws, etc., but not Aliens since, while he might be a “foreigner,” he isn’t an alien, since he would have citizenship through his mother.

---

**Announcement**

**Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record practices**

Post from Les Hawkins, CONSER Coordinator, Library of Congress
Subject: PCC practices for online series
Reprinted (in part) from the TS-SIS discussion list, June 4, 2009, with additional content added by the editor.

“At the April 30, 2009 meeting of the CONSER/BIBCO Operations Committee (OpCo), representatives supported pursuing a Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) practice for online series title qualifiers and creation of authority records for online series.” The practice (reprinted below), based on OpCo discussion and subsequent consultations with LC’s Policy and Standards Division, is posted at [http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/Online-Series.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/Online-Series.pdf)

PCC practice decisions for provider neutral records (all three modes of issuance: serials, monographs, and integrating resources) for online series analytics:

- Give the controlled access point of the print series, if providing a controlled series access point for a series in a bibliographic record.
- Do not create a separate series authority record for the online series and do not add information to the series authority record for the print series.
- Do not delete an existing series authority record for the online series. (The possible deletion of these authority records as recommended in the report must be discussed with the NACO participants, Policy & Standards Division, etc.; such a discussion won’t occur until after the new provider neutral practice has been vetted for a period of time.)

**Example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print series:</th>
<th>130</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider-neutral online analytic:</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title XYZ</td>
<td>Title XYZ*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not further qualified by “(Online)”

“The PCC discussions about online series were an outgrowth of the work of the Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record Task Group. Approval of the provider-neutral record guidelines for e-monographs was also confirmed at the OpCo meeting. The implementation date for the provider-neutral record guidelines is July 17, 2009. The final report of the Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record Task Group is available from: [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-Final-Report.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-Final-Report.pdf)”

Note the scope of the record guidelines referred to in the task group’s report: “The Provider-Neutral E-Monograph proposal is intended to encompass records for monographic titles that are simultaneously issued in print and online, digital reproductions of print resources, and born-digital resources.”

You can learn more information about aggregator-neutral records by attending the TS and OBS-SIS sponsored program, “Taking the Aggravation Out of Aggregators: An Update on Aggregator-Neutral Bibliographic Records,” on Monday, July 27, 2009 – 10:45-11:45 a.m. at the AALL Annual Meeting.
For more news items on the latest trends and technology tools for technical services law librarians, check out the TSLL TechScans Blog at http://www.tslltechscans.blogspot.com.

**Acquisitions**

**ER Assessment Tool Built with MS Access**
Levay describes how she built a local tool for e-resources assessment using MS Access. She incorporated the following factors in her Access database: usage statistics, fund codes, license terms, ISI impact factors, and Eigenfactor (a bibliometric tool that looks at both citation counts and the citation network).

**Institutional Repositories**
http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/library_trends/toc/lib.57.2.html

This special issue examines the current environment and explores the possible future of institutional repositories. It includes the much discussed Dorothea Salo article, “Innkeeper at the Roach Motel.”

**Government Documents**
**USDocs Private LOCKSS Network (USDocsPLN)**
In late 2007, Carl Malamud, with help from the GPO, harvested GPO Access documents that comprise more than 200 gigabytes of data from 1991-2007. USDocsPLN, a private LOCKSS network, is created to preserve those documents and distribute them among fourteen participating libraries. The authors encourage more libraries to join the network.

**Information Technology**

**Importance of Books**
Carter, Stephen L. “Where’s the Bailout for Publishing?”

“Books are essential to American life, and if publishing perishes, Stephen L. Carter argues, democracy itself will soon follow.” Not really about wanting a bailout—this interesting take on the importance of the book as a physical object is well worth your reading time. Thoughts on books as a technology form versus other forms used for reading.

**Metadata Tools for Information Elements**
The author reviews selected information elements (e.g., topical subjects, genre, names, geographic information, dates, etc.), desired services for each element, existing metadata tools for manipulating those elements, and their potential for the future.

**Local Systems**

**Next Gen OPACs**
http://www.emeraldinsight.com/Insight/viewContainer.do?containerType=JOURNAL&containerId=11298

“This special issue focuses on next generation OPACs in libraries. In particular, the implementation of two open source catalogs, VUFind and Blacklight, are described in two articles. Other features, such as social tagging and federated searching, are also discussed in various articles.

**Management**

**Maintaining Institutional Relevance in a Disintermediated Research Environment**
http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/v009/9.2.housewright.html


“The move to an increasingly digital research environment has substantially disintermediated both academic and corporate libraries from the research process. The full impact of this disruptive change has been more clearly expressed in the corporate environment, in which libraries are less insulated by institutional tradition and historical prestige. Consideration of the changes felt and the strategies adopted by corporate libraries to maintain institutional relevance in a disintermediated research environment offers insight for academic libraries into how to weather changes to come and maintain their active roles in the intellectual life of the campus.”—Abstract.
Preservation

Self-Archiving Journal Articles
http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/v009/9.2.troll-covey.html


“Carnegie Mellon faculty web pages and publisher policies were examined to understand self-archiving practice. The breadth of adoption and depth of commitment are not directly correlated within the disciplines. The opportunity to self-archive far exceeds the practice, and much of what is self-archived is not aligned with publisher policy. Policy appears to influence neither the decision to self-archive nor the article version that is self-archived. Due to the potential legal ramifications, faculty must be convinced that copyright law and publisher policy are important and persuaded to act on that conviction.”—Abstract.

E-journals Preservation Registry Service

EDINA, the UK national academic data center based at the University of Edinburgh, is partnering with the ISSN International Center to start a two-year project piloting an e-journals preservation registry service (PEPRS). The aim of the project is to investigate and pilot an online facility that enables librarians and policymakers to ascertain the archival provision for e-journals.

MetaArchive Cooperative

MetaArchive is a network of institutions that collaborate on building a shared infrastructure to enable libraries to create their own digital preservation solutions. Its technical foundation is the LOCKSS software. MetaArchive’s members invest in creating and sustaining their own preservation infrastructure, and gain experience in developing full preservation plans.

2009 OBS-SIS Annual Meeting Information Programs, Meetings

Listed in Alphabetical Order, content based on information from the OBS-SIS and AALL websites.
Formatting by Virginia Bryant

Business Meeting
Monday, July 27, 2009 — 5:30-6:30 p.m.
Michael Maben, OBS-Chair, Indiana University, Bloomington

Cataloger’s Desktop and Classification Web Training (Pre-registration required – all sessions full)
Wednesday, July 29, 2009 — 8:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
• Bruce Johnson, Cataloger’s Desktop Development Team Leader, Senior Library Information Systems Specialist, Library of Congress
• Patricia Hayward, Classification Web Product Manager, Product Services Librarian, Library of Congress

Education Committee Meeting for the 2010 Annual Meeting in Denver, Colorado
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 7:00-8:45 a.m.
Patricia Sayre-McCoy, Chair, University of Chicago, D’Angelo Law Library

Executive Board Meeting, 2008/2009 (outgoing)
Saturday, July 25, 2009 — 5:00-6:30 p.m.
Michael Maben, 2008/2009 Chair, Indiana University, Bloomington

Executive Board Meeting, 2009/2010 (incoming)
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 4:15-5:15 p.m.
Pat Sayre-McCoy, 2009/2010 Chair, University of Chicago, D’Angelo Law Library

Heads of Systems Roundtable
Saturday, July 25, 2009 — 3:30-4:30 p.m.

Innovative Law Users Group Annual Meeting
Saturday, July 25, 2009 — 8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.
Amy Moberly, Chair, California Western School of Law
Joint Research Grant Committee Meeting (OBS-SIS and TS-SIS)
Saturday, July 25, 2009 — 3:30-4:30 p.m.
Ruth Funabiki, Chair, University of Idaho

Latest Trends in Library Automation: Building Creative and Inspiring Discovery Platforms (Program C-3)
Sunday, July 26, 2009 — 4:15-5:15 p.m.
Marshall Breeding will address next-generation library interfaces and what the future holds for merging currently disparate resources, or silos of information. Some next-generation discovery platforms include AquaBrowser, Encore, Endeca, Primo, WorldCat Local and NELLCO’s Universal Search Solution. Breeding is a VIP to AALL 2009, sponsored by ALL-SIS, the Library Journal author of “Automation System Marketplace,” and a Computers in Libraries columnist. In addition, Breeding will update the audience on current innovations in library automation technology.
- Georgia Briscoe, Coordinator and Co-moderator, University of Colorado Law Library, William A. Wise Law Library
- Filippa Marullo Anzalone, Co-moderator, Boston College Law Library
- Marshall Breeding, Vanderbilt University, Jean and Alexander Heard Library

Law Users Roundtable
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
- ALEPH Law Users Roundtable
  A representative from Ex Libris will be at the meeting to discuss any ALEPH-related questions.
- EOSi Law Users Roundtable
- InMagic Law Users Roundtable
- Softlink Law Users Roundtable
- Voyager Law Users Roundtable
  A representative from Ex Libris will be at the meeting to discuss any Voyager-related questions.
  Jean Pajarek, Coordinator, Cornell Law Library

Local Systems Committee Meeting
Monday, July 27, 2009 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
Caitlin Robinson, Chair, University of Iowa Law Library

MarcEdit: A Magic Wand for MARC Records (Program B-6)
Sunday, July 26, 2009 — 3:00-4:00 p.m.
This presentation introduces MarcEdit, a free downloadable metadata software suite created by Terry Reese, Digital Production Unit Head at Oregon State University. The tool is designed specifically for large-batch record processing, including batch editing MARC records, character set conversions, and record extractions from data files. MarcEdit provides a method to customize and correct vendor records outside of the ILS system to avoid potential damage to the existing records in a catalog. It is also a great tool for database maintenance. The presentation will cover MARC record editing using MarcEdit, discuss topics related to processing XML metadata, and investigate MarcEdit’s built-in OAI metadata harvester, which provides a simplified method for generating MARC records from OAI repositories (like Dspace, Fedora or CONTENTdm).
- Clara Liao, Coordinator and Moderator, Georgetown University Law Library
- Terry Reese, Oregon State University

MarcEdit Roundtable and Discussion (OBS-SIS)
Sunday, July 26, 2009 — 5:30-6:30 p.m.
This will be a roundtable discussion of the earlier MarcEdit program with Terry Reese. Reese will be available to answer questions and provide further demonstrations of the software.
- Terry Reese, Gray Family Chair for Innovative Library Services, Oregon State University

NISO Training Session (OBS-SIS, TS-SIS and CS-SIS)
Saturday, July 25, 2009 — 3:30-4:30 p.m.
This program is open to all with an interest in the National Standards Information Organization (NISO) and who are interested in helping review future NISO proposals.
- Mary Alice Baish, Coordinator, Director of the AALL Government Relations Office
- Karen Wetzel, NISO Standards Program Manager
OCLC/RLIN Update and Roundtable
Sunday, July 26, 2009 — 12:00-1:15 p.m. (Update); 1:30-2:45 p.m. (Roundtable)
Keiko Okuhara, Cochair, University of Hawaii, William H. Richardson School of Law
Ming Lu, Cochair, LA Law Library
Update session agenda:
• Brief update on the proposed Policy for Use and Transfer of WorldCat Records
• Report of the OCLC Members Council meeting in mid-May on the Review Board of Shared Data Creation and Stewardship
• Online Catalogs: What Users and Librarians Want — OCLC report based on a number of focus groups and surveys conducted during 2008
• OCLC Terminology Services — Connexion-related terminologies, which are designed to help catalogers create records that include terms from thesauri other than LCSH
• xISSN OCLC Web Service — Provides ISSNs and other information associated with serial publications in WorldCat
Roundtable discussion agenda:
• Report on the OCLC Members Council meetings submitted by Phyllis Post, OBS OCLC representative

Research Roundtable (OBS-SIS and TS-SIS)
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 10:45-11:45 a.m.

Special Committee on Record Sharing
Monday, July 27, 2009 — 4:00-5:15 p.m.
Pat Callahan, Chair, University of Pennsylvania, Biddle Law Library
Taking the Aggravation Out of Aggregators: An Update on Aggregator-Neutral Bibliographic Records (Program F-6; OBS-SIS and TS-SIS)
Monday, July 27, 2009 — 10:45-11:45 a.m.
An aggregator-neutral record is one that is separate from the print that covers all versions of the same online resource on one MARC record. Our colleagues in general academic libraries led the way toward using aggregator-neutral bibliographic records to ease patron access to electronic journals available from multiple sources. Now that legal databases such as HeinOnline and MOML are providing electronic monographs, the need for aggregator-neutral records continues to grow. Join panelists who use and create aggregator-neutral records to learn about the many issues related to these records: availability, creation, standards, purchase, customization, quality, maintenance, display, etc.
• Karen Selden, Coordinator and Moderator, University of Colorado Law Library, William A. Wise Law Library
• Eugene (Gene) Dickerson, U.S. Department of State, Ralph J. Bunche Library
• Kara Killough, Serials Solutions

The TOC Market Report: Undervalued TOCs Yield Huge Dividends (OBS-SIS)
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 2:30-3:15 p.m. (presentation); 3:30-4:00 p.m. (discussion)
Using the catalog or discovery platform helps researchers find valuable material in the library. But the title and subject headings in a catalog record don’t always reveal the essence of a work as completely as the table of contents (TOC). In this panel, a front-line reference librarian, a vendor and a representative from the Library of Congress will discuss the value of TOCs and how to provide—and afford—them.
• Sally Wambold, Coordinator, University of Richmond
• Mary Whisner, Moderator, University of Washington, M.G. Gallagher Law Library
• Christine Mitchell, Blackwell
• David Williamson, Library of Congress

TS/OBS/RIPS/CS-SIS Joint Reception
Saturday, July 25, 2009 — 7:00-8:30 p.m.
Sponsored by Innovative Interfaces, Inc.

TSLL Board Meeting
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
Virginia Bryant, Editor, George Washington University
2009 TS-SIS Annual Meeting Information
Workshops, Programs, Meetings

Listed in Alphabetical Order, content based on information on the TS-SIS and AALL websites.
Formatting by Virginia Bryant

**Acquisitions Standing Committee Meeting and Acquisitions Roundtable**
Monday, July 27, 2009 — 7:00-8:30 a.m.
Ajaye Bloomstone, Chair, Louisiana State University

**Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Development**
Saturday, July 25, 2009 — 5:00-6:00 p.m.
JoAnn Hounshell, Chair, Chicago-Kent College of Law Library, Illinois Institute of Technology

**Business Meeting and Awards**
Sunday, July 26, 2009 — 5:30-6:30 p.m.
Linda Tesar, TS-SIS Chair, Vanderbilt University

**Cataloging & Classification Roundtable**
Sunday, July 26, 2009 — 3:00-4:00 p.m
Karen Nuckolls, Chair, University of Kentucky Law Library
Agenda:
  • Beacher Wiggins, Director for Acquisitions & Bibliographic Access, Library of Congress. Mr. Wiggins will speak about the RDA testing

**Cataloging & Classification Standing Committee Meeting**
Monday, July 27, 2009 — 9:00-10:30 a.m.
Karen Nuckolls, Chair, University of Kentucky Law Library

**Cataloging Video Recordings: AACR2 Chapter 7 (TS-SIS program)**
Monday, July 27, 2009 — 10:45-11:45 a.m.
This program is an introduction to the basics of cataloging DVD videorecordings: review of MARC record, selecting copy, enhancing copy, and creating a new record. Common problems and issues will be discussed. This program will present an overview of the latest practices and standards for video and DVD cataloging. The workshop will focus on current OCLC/ MARC21 coding and tagging for bibliographic records in these formats, the applicable AACR2 rules, and their associated LCRIs. We will also explore related topics such as evaluating cataloging copy, determining whether to input a new record into OCLC Connexion, solving common video cataloging problems, assigning subject headings to video recordings, and resources for cataloging videos and DVDs.

**Classification and Subject Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group Meeting**
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 7:30-8:45 a.m.
Chris Tarr, Chair, University of California-Berkeley

**Descriptive Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group Meeting**
Monday, July 27, 2009 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.

**Education Committee Meeting for 2010 Annual Meeting in Denver, Colorado**
Monday, July 27, 2009 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
Carol Nicholson, Chair, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Law Library

**Executive Board Meeting, 2008/2009 (outgoing)**
Saturday, July 25, 2009 — 5:30-7:00 p.m.
Linda Tesar, 2008/2009 Chair, Vanderbilt University
Executive Board Meeting, 2009/2010 (incoming)
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 4:15-5:15 p.m.
Chris Long, 2009/2010 Chair, Indiana University School of Law—Indianapolis

Heads of Cataloging in Large Libraries Roundtable
Sunday, July 26, 2009 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.

Here Today, Gone Tomorrow? The Future of Print Periodicals in Law Libraries (Program A-6)
Sunday, July 26, 2009 — 1:30-2:45 p.m.
The number of law reviews, journals and other serials publications appearing in digital format has increased dramatically in recent years. HeinOnline’s attempt to digitize each law review title up to the last issue published is making many libraries reconsider format preferences in collection development and retention policies. This program presents scenarios of how electronic periodicals have changed collection development policies; and how libraries are managing and maintaining periodicals collections. Explore collection development policies from a recently established library; a long established library that has adopted changes in its collection development policy to prefer electronic format of journals; vendor plans to continue a digitization project of law reviews and a non-academic library’s explanation of how e-journals have impacted their collection development and service to the public.
• Paula Tejeda, Coordinator and Speaker, Charleston School of Law
• Ann B. Kolodzey, Moderator, Widener University School of Law
• Michael J. Petit, American University, Washington College of Law, Pence Law Library
• Katrina M. Piechnik, Jenkins Law Library
• Richard J. Spinelli, William S. Hein & Co., Inc.

Here’s to Your (Digital Archive’s) Good Health! Auditing and Evaluating Digital Preservation Projects (Program H-3)
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 9:00-10:30 a.m.
So, you’ve digitized your treasures in special collections. You’ve harvested state task force reports that were only available online. Or maybe you’ve accumulated an institutional repository full of digital scholarship. Your library’s digital collections are valuable and unique, and preserving and ensuring future access to them is critical. Auditing and evaluation must be integrated into any digital preservation program to ensure its long-term viability. This program will focus on the practical application of best practices and core criteria in evaluating digital preservation projects. Discover how criteria set forth by the RLG-National Archives Certification of Digital Archives Project, as well as qualitative and quantitative evaluation parameters, can be feasibly implemented in the evaluation of digital preservation projects from the law library community and beyond.
• Sarah J. Rhodes, Coordinator and Speaker, Georgetown University Law Library
• Bruce Ambacher, University of Maryland, College of Library and Information Sciences
• Eileen Fenton, Portico
• Victoria Reich, Stanford University Libraries

Hot Topic Program see Working with OCLC’s Record Transfer Policy

Joint Research Grant Committee Meeting (TS-SIS and OBS-SIS)
Saturday, July 25, 2009 — 3:30-4:30 p.m.
Ruth Funabiki, Chair, University of Idaho

Managing from the Middle: Techniques for Success in Technical Services (Workshop)
Saturday, July 25, 2009 — 8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.
It’s a brave new world in information resources management where 21st century collections are universally accessible. Are you a technical services librarian interested in enhancing your management skills to deal with these challenging times? Take advantage of this opportunity to explore new horizons in technical services middle management via an environmental scan that sets the stage for a highly informative workshop learning experience. Identify innovative tips for personnel and resources management. Become more effective supervisors as you explore the challenges created by providing information in new formats and meeting increased demands for patron services. This workshop will update technical services middle managers on a range of personnel topics such as delegation, staff motivation and generational differences. Learn new tips for resources management and vendor relations. Engaging speakers also will demonstrate communications skills and advocacy techniques designed to promote your department as you navigate through this brave, new electronic world.
• Carol Avery Nicholson, Co-coordinator, Moderator and Speaker, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Law Library
Karen B. Douglas, Co-coordinator and Speaker, J. Michael Goodson Law Library, Duke University School of Law
Filippa Marullo Anzalone, Boston College Law Library
Rick J. Block, Columbia University
Yvonne J. Chandler, University of North Texas School of Library and Information Sciences
Emily Hicks, University of Dayton, Roesch Library
Alan Keely, Wake Forest University Professional Center Library
Joseph W. Thomas, Notre Dame Law School, Kresge Library

Membership Committee Meeting
Sunday, July 26, 2009 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
Sean Chen, Chair, J. Michael Goodson Law Library, Duke University School of Law

New Catalogers Roundtable
Sunday, July 26, 2009 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
Sean Chen, Facilitator, J. Michael Goodson Law Library, Duke University School of Law

Next-Gen Integrated Library System (ILS) Features Relevant to the Private Law Firm Library (Program 1-3; TS-SIS and PLL-SIS)
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 10:45-11:45 a.m.
The presentation begins with an overview of the Return on Investment (ROI) of Next-Gen ILS solutions which have a direct impact on delivering improved client services. Through case studies of various Next-Gen ILS features, including customizations and third-party integration solutions deployed at two AMLAW 100 law firm libraries, the presenters will show how technical services librarians can take a more proactive role as enablers of knowledge management and technology initiatives resulting in improved client services and more efficient utilization of library professionals and paraprofessionals.
• Steven A. Lastres, Coordinator and Speaker, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP
• Bess Reynolds, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP

NISO Training Session (TS-SIS, OBS-SIS and CS-SIS)
Saturday, July 25, 2009 — 3:30-4:30 p.m.
This program is open to all with an interest in the National Standards Information Organization (NISO) and who are interested in helping review future NISO proposals.
• Mary Alice Baish, Coordinator, Director of the AALL Government Relations Office
• Karen Wetzel, NISO Standards Program Manager

Peer Collaboration (TS-SIS Program)
Monday, July 27, 2009 — 4:00-5:15 p.m.
Colleagues, often from different departments, must frequently work together to achieve library goals. This can be difficult to manage as neither has supervisory responsibility for the other and therefore cannot set deadlines or duties for the other. Tensions can occur if they don’t understand each other’s goals and deadlines. Ideally, two colleagues can share the joys and pains of working together either as part of daily work or on special project. Issues to be addressed include how labor is divided, joint supervision of staff, and equitable split of credit.

Preservation Standing Committee/Preservation and Binding Roundtable
Monday, July 27, 2009 — 10:45-11:45 a.m.
Marilyn Estes, Chair, American University Washington College of Law, Pence Law Library

Rare Book Cataloging Roundtable
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 10:45-11:45 a.m.
Sarah Yates, Coordinator, University of Minnesota Law Library

Redefining Work Roles in Response to Changing Collection Environments (TS-SIS Program)
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 2:30-3:15 p.m.
As libraries have adjusted to their changing collection environments by taking on new roles within their institutions, by purchasing fewer resources or by changing formats of resources purchased, managers have seen an increased need to reallocate some staff from tasks that are less in demand to others now in greater demand. This program will present differing approaches taken at different libraries in response to their environmental changes. Ample time for discussion will be provided.
Research Roundtable (TS-SIS and OBS-SIS)
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 10:45-11:45 a.m.

Serials Standing Committee Meeting
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 7:30-8:45 a.m.
Carol Avery Nicholson, Chair, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Kathrine R. Everett Law Library
Agenda:
- Introductions (New Chair & Recorder)
- Announcements
- Old Business
  - Exchange of Duplicates Program
  - Project Counter Subcommittee
- New Business
  - 2010 Annual Meeting Program Proposals
  - Project Ideas for 2009/10

Taking the Aggravation Out of Aggregators: An Update on Aggregator-Neutral Bibliographic Records (Program F-6; TS-SIS and OBS-SIS)
Monday, July 27, 2009 — 10:45-11:45 a.m.
An aggregator-neutral record is one that is separate from the print that covers all versions of the same online resource on one MARC record. Our colleagues in general academic libraries led the way toward using aggregator-neutral bibliographic records to ease patron access to electronic journals available from multiple sources. Now that legal databases such as HeinOnline and MOML are providing electronic monographs, the need for aggregator-neutral records continues to grow. Join panelists who use and create aggregator-neutral records to learn about the many issues related to these records: availability, creation, standards, purchase, customization, quality, maintenance, display, etc.
- Karen Selden, Coordinator and Moderator, University of Colorado Law Library, William A. Wise Law Library
- Eugene (Gene) Dickerson, U.S. Department of State, Ralph J. Bunche Library
- Kara Killough, Serials Solutions

Task Force on Standards for Vendor-Supplied Bibliographic Records Meeting
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
Angela Jones, Chair, Southern Methodist University

Technical Services Management Issues Roundtable
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 3:15-4:00 p.m.
Instituted in 2008 to help alleviate overcrowding on the conference schedule, the Heads of Technical Services Roundtable and the Management Issues Roundtable held in previous years were combined to form this roundtable. The Technical Services Management Issues Roundtable is an open forum where any issue related to management in technical services may be discussed. One need not be the head of a technical services department to attend. If you have a problem or issue you can’t seem to resolve, or just want to find out what others are doing, this is a great opportunity to find answers.

TS/OBS/RIPS/CS-SIS Joint Reception
Saturday, July 25, 2009 — 7:00-8:30 p.m.
Sponsored by Innovative Interfaces, Inc.

TSLL Board Meeting
Tuesday, July 28, 2009 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
Virginia Bryant, Editor, George Washington University

Website Advisory Roundtable
Sunday, July 26, 2009 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
Martin Wisneski, Coordinator, Washburn University Law Library

Working with OCLC’s Record Transfer Policy (Hot Topic Program)
Monday, July 27, 2009 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
After 22 years, OCLC has decided to update their policy on the use of records in the WorldCat database. This is in response to a world of larger databases where users with downloading capabilities have the ability to export portions of the OCLC
database. However, OCLC depends on contributions from its members in order to maintain and grow their resources. Furthermore, they acquired other databases, such as RLIN, that had their own regulations where members were used to a different ownership approach. As members of a consortium, we have to abide by the regulations of such but there are questions we must consider.

- Are these new policies fair to members who contribute original records?
- How do we see the future for OCLC?
- How do we interpret the new OCLC policy? Can we defend our right to our records?
- Can OCLC claim copyright to the database?
- What are the legal ramifications of such a policy?
- What constitutes “Fair Use”?

Attend this session and pose these and your own questions to a panel of experts who can clarify the direction we are heading and possible solutions.

- Keiko Okuhara, Co-coordinator, University of Hawaii, William S. Richardson School of Law
- Phoebe Ruiz-Valera, Co-coordinator, Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton LLP
- Roberta Schaffer, Library of Congress, member of the OCLC Review Board on Principles of Shared Data Creation and Stewardship
- Michael Maben, Indiana University, Maurer School of Law Library
- Pat Callahan, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Biddle Law Library

Continued from page 1

Emily Phillips receives an AALL Registration Grant. Emily is the Acquisitions Librarian at Wilmer/Hale, LLP in Washington, D.C.

Richard Todd receives an AALL Registration Grant. Richard is the Technical Services Librarian at the University of Tulsa, Mabee Legal Information Center.

Awards Committee Members:

Linda M. Sobey
Chair, TS-SIS Awards Committee
Assistant Director for Technical Services
Florida A&M University, College of Law Library

Joyce Manna Janto
Deputy Director
University of Richmond, School of Law Library

Melody Lembke
Director, Collection Management Services
Los Angeles County Law Library
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