Developing management skills in any library is not intuitive. They must be learned. Many of us have been thrust into management positions with little or no advance preparation. Instinct guides us to some extent, but there are skills we need to acquire that aren’t even apparent to us. When I first became a manager, I took every management course that University Human Resources made available. While they were helpful, there were some things that weren’t covered. Aspects of management specific to libraries weren’t discussed, since these courses were designed for managers throughout the university. Technical services management issues certainly weren’t covered. Therefore I had to do my own research to find the specific management skills I needed. I have compiled a brief annotated bibliography covering library management in general and technical services management in particular. I refer to these titles constantly even though I have been a technical services manager for over twenty years. There always seems to be a new approach to management issues. Here are some management titles no technical services manager should be without.

**General Library Management**


These two volumes give all the information a library middle manager needs to know to make the transition from librarian to manager, and to remain successful as a middle manager once the transition has been made. Especially helpful in *Transitioning* is information on how to make the switch from peer to supervisor, becoming familiar with the idiosyncrasies of staff and dealing with the “baggage” left behind by former managers. These are issues that I hadn’t seen in any other management book. *Staying Successful* builds and expands on concepts that were introduced in *Transitioning*. It is aimed at the middle manager who has

*Continued on page 30*
2009-2010 Officers, Committee Chairs, and Representatives

TS-SIS

Chair:
Chris Long
Indiana University-Indianapolis

Vice Chair/Chair-Elect:
Pam Deemer
Emory University

Secretary/Treasurer:
Wendy E. Moore
University of Georgia

Members-at-Large:
Betty Roeske (2008-2010)
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP
Katrina Piechnik (2009-2011)
Jenkins Law Library

Acquisitions Committee:
Ajaye Bloomstone
Louisiana State University

Awards Committee:
Wendell Johnting
Indiana University-Indianapolis

Bylaws Committee:
Linda Tese
College of William and Mary

Cataloging & Classification:
George Prager
New York University

Education Committee:
Carol Avery Nicholson
Univ of N Carolina Chapel Hill

Membership Committee:
Sean Chen
Duke University

Nominating Committee:
Elizabeth Geesey Holmes
Partridge, Snow & Hahn

Preservation Committee:
Marilyn Estes
Washington College of Law

OBS-SIS

Chair:
Patricia Sayre-McCoy
University of Chicago

Vice Chair/Chair-Elect:
Kathy Faust
Lewis & Clark College

Secretary/Treasurer:
Karen Selden
University of Colorado Boulder

Members-at-Large:
Elaine Bradshaw (2008-2010)
University of Oklahoma
Keiko Okuhara (2009-2011)
University of Hawaii

Education Committee:
Pat Sayre-McCoy
University of Chicago

Local Systems Committee:
Caitlin Robinson
University of Iowa

Nominating Committee:
Andrea Rabbia
Syracuse University

OCLC Committee:
Ming Lu
Los Angeles County

Web Advisory Committee:
F. Tim McKnight
York University

TS-SIS (cont.)

Serials Committee:
Shyama Agrawal
Duke University

Professional Development Committee:
Karen Nuckolls
University of Kentucky

OBS and TS-SIS Representatives

ALA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI)
George Prager, New York University

ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)
John Hostage, Harvard Law School

ALA Subject Analysis Committee (SAC)
Yael Mandelstam, Fordham University

OBS/TS Joint Research Grant Committee
Chair, Hollie White, Univ of N Carolina Chapel Hill; Richard Amelung (ex officio)

OBS-SIS Reps: Pam Deemer (2008-10); Hollie White (2009-2011)
TS-SIS Reps: Barbara Henigman (2008-10); Patricia Satzer (2009-2011)

AALL Representative to NISO (National Information Standards Organization)
Mary Alice Baish
From the Chair

Technical Services Special Interest Section

Jingle bells, radio stations playing Christmas music 24/7, and braving the mall to get that last-minute gift. Those may be some of the things that are on your mind as you read this. As I sit down to write this, though, it is still a week before Thanksgiving, so let’s talk turkey about TS-SIS.

The annual running of the gantlet, otherwise known as scheduling our programs and meetings in the AALL meeting matrix, has been accomplished, hopefully with as little conflict as possible. We will host 25 events in Denver, and that is not even counting the programs selected by the Annual Meeting Program Committee (AMPC). Fitting all of these activities into 3 ½ days is something akin to, well, me trying to wedge myself into jeans I wore in high school. Not always pretty, not very comfortable, and definitely a challenge!

Thanks to the excellent work of our Education Committee, we will have a cornucopia of programs at the next annual meeting. We do not know yet what our first program will be, however, since we have reserved our initial slot for a “Hot Topic” on Sunday, July 11, 12:00-1:15 p.m. If you have suggestions about what the hot topic should be, please send them to Carol Avery Nicholson at cnichol@email.unc.edu, this year’s Education Committee chair.

Next up is “What’s in a Name: CORE and I-2, New Standards to Improve Efficiency in the Electronic Resources Environment” (Sunday, July 11, 1:30-2:45 p.m.). This program is self-sponsored by TS-SIS and will discuss two standards, Cost of Resource Exchange (CORE) and I-2 (Institutional Identifier), that promote interoperability among the diverse systems we use to manage electronic resources.

“Open Source ILS: What a Service Oriented System Brings to You and Your Library” (Sunday, July 11, 3:00-4:00 p.m.) is an AMPC program cosponsored with OBS-SIS. Presenters will discuss how an open source ILS can reengineer your overall library service, and the challenges its implementation presents.

We finish off the Sunday programming with “Catalogers Today: Skill Sets, Expectations and Challenges” (Sunday, July 11, 4:15-5:15 p.m.) another AMPC program cosponsored with OBS-SIS. This program will especially appeal to catalogers who are dealing with changing expectations due to the need for different skills and/or budget constraints. And isn’t that all of us?

But wait, you are not yet dismissed for Sunday, because following the programs will be the TS-SIS Business and Awards Meeting from 5:30-6:30 p.m.

Monday’s round of programs starts bright and early with “SKOS and HIVE: Enhancing the Creation, Design, and Flow of Information” (Monday, July 12, 8:45-9:45 a.m.). Your head will be buzzing as the presenters explain new ways that traditional classification and subject heading schemes are being used in Semantic Web applications like SKOS (Simple Knowledge Organization Systems) and HIVE (Helping Interdisciplinary Vocabulary Engineering) and how this is relevant to law libraries.

Next is “Bringing Increased Efficiency to Technical Services: Is EOCR for You?” a program that will discuss how Electronic Order Confirmation Records (EOCR) can make your acquisitions workflow more efficient.

“The Ever-Evolving World of Vendor-Supplied MARC Records” (Monday, July 12, 10:45-11:45 a.m.) is another TS-SIS self-sponsored program in which members of the TS-SIS Task Group on Vendor-Supplied Bibliographic Records will discuss the new standards for provider-neutral e-monograph records and explain the ongoing work of evaluating MARC record sets and working with vendors and others to improve the quality of these record sets.

Later on Monday afternoon, you will be presented with a choice of technical services-related programs. One option is a presentation cosponsored with OBS-SIS called “MARC and RDA: An Overview” (Monday, July 12, 4:00-5:15 p.m.). The speakers will explain the changes in MARC to support compatibility with the upcoming cataloging standard, Resource Description and Access (RDA), and the influence of those changes on law cataloging. Since it is likely that this program will generate some discussion, it will be immediately followed by the Cataloging and Classification Roundtable from 5:30-6:30 p.m.
A second option in the Monday 4:00-5:15 p.m. timeslot is “Database Ownership: Myth or Reality?” (Monday, July 12, 4:00-5:15 p.m.), a program cosponsored with CS-SIS in which you can learn about the hidden costs of owning a database and the intricacies of data and metadata manipulation for storage, access and display.

Tuesday morning kicks off with “The Semantic Web and RDA: Making the Catalog a Networked Bibliographic Environment” (Tuesday, July 13, 9:00-10:30 a.m.). Cosponsored with OBS-SIS, this program features Diane Hillmann and Karen Coyle speaking on how RDA can integrate the library catalog with the web services developing from the Semantic Web.

Following that will be “Charting New Roles for Technical Services: Faculty Publications and Institutional Repositories” (Tuesday, July 13, 10:45-11:30 a.m.) which will discuss the emergence of institutional repositories and faculty publications websites and how technical services staff can continue to support the library’s evolving mission even as traditional work routines in technical services diminish.

Our final program of the Annual Meeting will be “How Are We to Accomplish That Much More with That Much Less?” (Tuesday, July 13, 2:15-3:15 p.m.). Using active discussion by librarians and a mental health professional, this program will give guidance dealing with the psychological toll of change, including how libraries have managed their changing environments due to shrinking budgets and the human responses to these changes. After the program, stick around for the Technical Services Management Issues Roundtable that will immediately follow (Tuesday, July 13, 3:15-4:00 p.m.).

At this point you may be saying to yourself, “This all sounds great, but I don’t know if I will have the funding to go to Denver this year.” If that is the case, consider applying for an AALL or TS-SIS grant. You can read more about TS-SIS grants at http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/grants/educational/ and information about AALL grants can be found at http://www.aallnet.org/committee/grants/grants.asp.

Our continuing education needs, however, are ongoing and cannot all be met at the Annual Meeting. For a couple of years, TS-SIS has had an Ad Hoc Committee on Professional Development that has worked to provide continuing education opportunities outside of the Annual Meeting. Recognizing that this will be an abiding need, the TS-SIS Executive Board has transformed this ad hoc committee into a permanent administrative committee called the Professional Development Committee. This change should ensure that we have professional development offerings throughout the year, not just at the Annual Meeting.

One more pitch for volunteerism. We are a large SIS and an extremely active one. I guess I always knew this, but did not realize how active until I became chair. Our effectiveness, however, depends on the contributions of our membership. If someone contacts you about volunteering, please give it serious consideration. You are not too new (we need your energy and fresh ideas) or too, shall we say, seasoned (we need your experience and wisdom).

May your winter be happy, healthy, and blessed!

Chris Long
Indiana University School of Law-Indianapolis

---

Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section

Although it’s a typical November here in Chicago, cold and rainy, with gusty winds, my mind moves ahead in time to a warm, sunny place—Denver in July 2010. The Education Committee completed the program planning process and OBS will sponsor or cosponsor five programs at AALL in 2010. Given that OBS is one of the smaller SIS’s, this is a great achievement for us. I hope our colleagues will attend our programs and realize what OBS can do for them and inspire them to join. Many of you reading this already know how valuable OBS programs are and I encourage you to spread the news.

The program planning process began in January 2009 and has come to fruition (at least for the 2010 programs) after an intense period of discussion, description, revision, and scheduling. I am very pleased with the results. The Education
Committee worked many hours on these programs, from the initial ideas to selecting the speakers and filling out forms (a not inconsiderable part of the process). After a break of a month or so, AMPC notified us of their choices, and I am pleased to say that out of eleven proposals, AMPC accepted five of them this year. They were all good proposals, making it hard for the committee to rank them. It was a very exciting process and resulted in excellent proposals.

The programs for Denver in 2010 that OBS will sponsor or cosponsor are the following:

1. “Open Source ILS: What a Service Oriented System Brings to You and Your Library.” This proposal, developed by Keiko Okuhara (University of Hawaii), introduces librarians to the open source concept of library systems, as opposed to the traditional integrated library systems purchased from vendors. The program will concentrate on an introduction to open source applications, how they are used and what the advantages and disadvantages are.

2. “Catalogers Today: Skill Sets, Expectations and Challenges.” Proposed by Ellen McGrath (University of Buffalo), this program will be a lively discussion format on the expectations of today’s libraries for catalogers, and the skills catalogers need to function in current cataloging and library structures.

3. “MARC and RDA: An Overview.” This program proposal by Clara (Yan) Liao (Georgetown University) will focus on the new cataloging standard, RDA, and how the MARC format will need to change to allow its fullest expression. The implications for law libraries will also be explored.

4. “The Semantic Web and RDA: Making the Catalog a Networked Bibliographic Environment.” Also proposed by Clara Liao, this program will discuss the new cataloging standard RDA and how it can be used with the Semantic Web to expand the online catalog to the web and facilitate its use outside the traditional catalog structure to shape a more flexible retrieval tool.

5. “Is Quality Control in Academic Law Library Online Catalogs Declining?” This program, proposed by Georgia Briscoe (University of Colorado), will present the results of her AALL-funded study of academic law library catalog record quality and what the results mean. The presentation will be followed by a discussion, which should be very lively and informative.

In addition to these educational programs, there will be the usual committee meetings and roundtables, users groups, and the Alphabet Soup reception on July 10. The OBS “Hot Topic” currently scheduled for July 13 will feature the OBS VIP, Janet Swan Hill, Professor and Associate Director for Technical Services at the University of Colorado at Boulder, a leading figure in the library technical services profession. It’s too early to finalize her topic, but it will be well worth attending.

I have more committee appointments to announce, though some are still up in the air.

The challenging task of the Nominations Committee chair was accepted by Andrea Rabbia. Joseph Thomas and Sherri Nicole Thomas join her in working hard to select candidates for the positions of Vice Chair/Chair-Elect and Member-at-Large.

Hollie White is representing the OBS portion of the OBS/TS Joint Research Grant Committee. Ming Lu will chair the OCLC Committee—it was decided that there is no point in calling it the OCLC/RLIN Committee since the changeover to OCLC by RLIN libraries is now complete. Ellen McGrath remains the OBS representative to the TSLL Editorial Board and Tim Knight is the chair of the Web Advisory Committee and web master. And, of course, Kathy Faust will chair the Education Committee for the 2011 meeting in Philadelphia. If anyone is interested in working on OBS committees please contact the committee chair or me to let us know of your interest. Newer members are especially welcome.

Happy belated Thanksgiving.

Patricia Sayre-McCoy
D’Angelo Law Library, University of Chicago
In Memoriam: Michael J. Petit (1949-2009)

The past few weeks have been a time of reflection as I’ve been thinking about friends and colleagues. One of my close college friends passed away in November from heart failure caused by other complications, and coming on the heels of that sad event, Mike Petit, a long time law librarian colleague and friend, also passed away, on Thanksgiving Day.

I first met Mike at the Atlanta AALL Annual Meeting, and later had the opportunity to work with him when he served as vice chair/chair-elect and chair of TS-SIS from 1994-1996, the years I was the secretary/treasurer. More recently, Mike served as vice president/president-elect and president of SEAALL. During his term he helped select the Washington DC area (Alexandria, VA) as the site for the SEAALL 2008 Conference, where I recall we had a long and interesting conversation. Locally Mike was well known, having worked at various times at five of the seven DC area law school libraries—probably a record. Over the years he held a number of technical services positions, most recently as the Head of Cataloging and Bibliographic Access, American University, Pence Law Library. This issue of TSLL is pleased to include a recent article Mike coauthored with colleagues Sima Mirkin and Billie Jo Kaufman about their library’s implementation of an ERM system.

In thinking about colleagues and friends, I am grateful for the wide-ranging opportunities we have within our professional organization to exchange ideas, to network frequently at conferences or through social media, or work together on various committees. The opportunities, when we take advantage of them, have the ability to significantly enhance both our lives and professional careers. In this TSLL issue, both Chairs Pat Sayre McCoy (OBS-SIS) and Chris Long (TS-SIS) encourage you to volunteer—so, please contact them, and you’ll be glad you did.

Acquisitions in Times of Increased Costs and Shrinking Budgets, Installment 3 of 4

Trina Robinson
George Washington University Law Library

In this installment I will address the issue of journals that find new publishing homes and how this move can impact the elasticity of the acquisitions budget.

Journal relocation, as I like to call it, is probably the most unpredictable change that affects the acquisitions budget. These changes almost always come as a surprise and with a significant price increase. I have even seen prices triple in more than a case or two. These journals are sold to other publishers sometimes because they aren’t profitable enough for the current publisher and the new publishers think they can increase the title’s profitability once they own it. The quickest and easiest way to do that is to raise the price. Even if they lose a few subscribers due to the increase, there will always be some libraries that will hang on to the title to meet their users’ needs. Eventually there may be evidence in the quality of the publication that justifies the increase in price, but it rarely starts out with any justification for the rise in cost, except for the fact that the journal has a new publishing home. The first time you pay the higher rate, you are doing so in the dark, unaware of any enhancements to the publication.

There are several methods to learn that a journal has a new publishing home. One is notification from your current vendor or current publisher; two, notification from the new publisher; or three, your internal tools of discovery, i.e. your library’s claiming process. Timely notification from the current vendor or publisher is the preferred method. As soon as a vendor or publisher learns about the change, the subscribers should be notified. Of course if you use a vendor, a slight delay is expected because they first have to be notified by the publisher. If you purchase directly from the publisher, the notification to subscribers should be even faster. The notification should include the exact time period when the relocation will occur, or at the very least the last time the current publisher will be responsible for the publication. There are some instances when the new publisher may hold back publication, changing the publication schedule either temporarily or permanently. This timely notification is essential for proper budget preparation. Some vendors as well as some publishers do a fair job.

The second method to receive this information is by notification from the new publishers. This is a little less timely, because sometimes there is a delay in the schedule when new publishers take over, and they usually make their notification factoring
This column will be mostly “odds and ends” with a few reminders.

I continue to come across loose-leaf titles and serials in the Library of Congress online catalog where the work letter “a” has been added to the end of the call number. I am trying to clean these up or add a note to the record that the “a” is not appropriate for that call number. Work letters for legal materials are used for editions of monographs published in the same year and these start with “b”. They are also appropriate for our call numbers that have the date of publication used at the end of the call number instead of a cutter for the primary access point, e.g., KF9305 $b .A3 1980 and KF9305 $b .A3 1980a for the second collection of homicide laws published in 1980. The best source of information about the use of work letters is the Classification and Shelflisting Manual (2008).

I was asked if Access to Justice and the Judiciary: Towards New European Standards of Affordability, Quality and Efficiency of Civil Adjudication (Antwerpen: Intersentia, 2009) belongs in KJC or KJE. LC does not have a copy of this title. The cataloger said the book contains very little European Union law and is mostly comparative European law. It belongs in KJC. Please be careful when classing material in KJC and KJE. You may want to read the discussion on this topic in TSLL 33, no. 2 (2007): 8-9.

Beware of classing “General works” of a country in the number for “History of law. General works” or in the number for “Philosophy, jurisprudence, and theory of law. General works.” The first decisions in classing a work in the K schedules are “Is this a law book?” and “What is the country?” After that you must be very careful that you put the book in the right number for that topic under the right broad legal subject. Look at the places where evidence can class in a K schedule; you will want to class a work on criminal evidence under criminal procedure and not under civil procedure. Be very, very careful about the hierarchy. Look at the hierarchy line in Classification Web or the topic under which your subject is indented in the paper schedule.

Many of you attended the discussion during the Classification and Subject Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group meeting at AALL in DC about international criminal courts and international criminal law. I hope to wait until after the conference in Africa on the Rome Statute in the spring before doing any more work on this. If anyone finds any helpful information on this topic, please let me know at mwhited@loc.gov.

One of the joys of being new law catalogers is finding all of the strange K call numbers. They cannot believe that KF9305 $b .A3 1980 is a real call number for a work with the primary access point of United States. They insert cutter numbers in
I wrote the first installation of this column in May of this year, a mere three months into a comprehensive analysis of my library’s collection. Though we had spent a significant amount of time deciding how to approach our task, evaluation of individual resources didn’t begin in earnest until February. At the time, I was intently focused on the scope and structure of the project ahead, fixated on engaging in a meticulous and thoughtful review of every item in our collection that received any kind of regular updates. As I mentioned at the outset of this experience, I expected every decision on our journey to be the result of our best judgments based on the acquisition team’s collective 78 years of experience at the University of Tulsa Mabee Legal Information Center. I was prepared for an Odysseus-style collection development adventure, one of both epic proportions and difficulty. And I was right … on some counts.

In the intervening six months, I have discovered that much of what I envisioned and expected was right on target. Our work has been based predominantly on our library’s mission, geared toward the needs of our students and faculty, with a watchful eye on the fiscal bottom line and an unwavering dedication to maintaining the highest levels of service that our users have come to expect. The continued open lines of communication with all our library departments has been critical to our success to date, and the commitment of our acquisitions committee (including our director, assistant director for reference and research, collection development and acquisitions librarians) has allowed us to make consistent and conscientious decisions. At the same time, I have been alternately surprised and dismayed at some of the obstacles we have encountered along the way.

Because the project we have undertaken is so large, I wanted to tackle it here a slice at a time beginning with the complete periodicals review I have come to think of as “the great periodic debate.” Those of us in collection development are no strangers to the key elements of the debate, which include the sanctity of our print periodical collections, the increasing availability and convenience of our electronic databases containing both text and pdf periodicals, and the fundamental question concerning whether duplication of format in a single title is essential or superfluous. The short version of our story concludes with the discovery that there is no “right” side to the debate; every decision we have made has been deeply contextual. The long version of our story ends the same way, but it begins (as all good stories in librarianship should) with a list.

In truth, we began with a few lists. One list was comprised of every currently updated print periodical title in our library’s collection. Another list was taken from the Washington & Lee University School of Law Library, commonly referred to as the Law Journals: Submissions and Ranking list.¹ The list generated from the Washington & Lee site was based on the combined score ranking of the top 1027 law reviews.² The third and most important list was the TU law librarians’ discussion list, to which I sent regular updates and requests for help from our librarians. I simply can’t stress enough the importance of the team effort in this process. Our first task was to take our list of current print periodical subscriptions and divide them into two categories. First, we created a list of those titles that were on the Washington & Lee list. By process of elimination, we were then able to create a list of our currently updated print holdings that did not make the Washington & Lee list.

One of the topics that I will be investigating for the 2010 columns is transnational insolvency and where to class it.

Kate Wilko will be joining me as coeditor beginning with the next column. Kate is a reference librarian at the Robert Crown Law Library at Stanford University. She has both a library degree and a law degree. She is interested in cataloging and classification. She will bring a reference point of view and her knowledge of law to the column. I know that some of you met her at the Cataloging and Classification Committee meetings at AALL. I am just delighted that she will be coeditor.
For both lists, our librarians worked tirelessly to review each title based on the following factors: price per year; regular routing and circulation data; availability and format of online access in Westlaw, Lexis, HeinOnline, and other periodical databases; and inclusion in periodical indexes. Titles requested by current faculty members were noted, as were titles connected to existing package plans, exchange programs with our University of Tulsa law reviews, and various library memberships. I would be remiss not to disclose the fact that it took us nearly two and a half months to collect data on all the titles on both lists. However, when the data collection was done we were in an excellent position to begin looking at each title on its individual merits.

We began our evaluation with several basic (and flexible) rules. Titles in the top 100 on Washington & Lee’s list would be considered last. If we simply ran out of time in deciding on our cuts, we believed strongly that keeping the top 100 on the list in print format would be an appropriate choice. Titles currently routing to faculty were automatically retained with a single exception. Titles in package plans we wished to maintain were not considered for cancellation, nor were titles received as part of library memberships. Also, law reviews received as part of an exchange program with one of our in-house law journals were retained. Finally, we agreed to maintain a print subscription to the primary law review from all accredited law schools. All other titles were open for discussion. Our goal was to complete the evaluation of our periodicals prior to our receipt of our fall invoice from our subscription agent, allowing us to communicate the complete list of cancellations for the upcoming year and receive an invoice reflecting only what we wished to keep.

As we worked our way through the lists, several questions stayed at the forefront of our conversations. How critical is the format of this publication to the kind of use it gets from our patrons? If it is available as a pdf, is that sufficient? How important is browsability in law reviews outside the context of symposium issues? How will our interlibrary loan statistics be impacted by our decisions? Will our library users who do not have academic Westlaw and Lexis accounts be negatively impacted by our print cancellations? Are there any restrictions on the cancellation of this material? Is this title critical to one of our certificate programs or to our professors’ areas of individual research? We answered many of these questions as our acquisitions team sat around the table, while others required consultation with our faculty and other librarians.

In total, we took just over eight months to complete our periodicals review, wrapping up the project in mid-October. Granted, we were engaged in a simultaneous serials review that required an equal amount of our attention, but I’m not sure that added significantly to the time we took. The result of our work was a decrease in our projected print periodical expenditures of over 30% for the next fiscal year. Yet this is only the tip of the iceberg of impact that this project had on me as a young librarian. First and foremost, I have become considerably more attuned to what our users actually want when they are seeking assistance with legal periodicals. I ask questions about format and access preferences and keep what I learn for use in making future collection development decisions. I have also discovered that I have a far more intimate knowledge of that aspect of my library’s collection than I used to, and it is difficult to overestimate the value of that level of knowledge. Knowing what we have and how it can be accessed gives me a better context for decision-making about what we should add to (or subtract from) our collection in the future.

The most compelling thing I have learned from the process thus far is exactly that—this odyssey isn’t over. The next leg of our journey involves evaluating the impact our decisions have on those we serve. This part of the adventure will take me outside of my comfortable world of lists and data and into the nebulous world of qualitative analysis of our work. Each meeting at the reference desk involving periodicals will be an opportunity to see if we have reached our aims of achieving cost savings without sacrificing the quality of our service. Each staff meeting will offer a chance to see how the cancellations we have made are impacting our entire library system. And there is no projected deadline for this phase of the work. We will keep listening, learning and serving our users. Consider this a travelogue in progress. I promise to keep you posted.

1 http://lawlib.wlu.edu/LJ/ (accessed November 21, 2009)
2 For a complete explanation of the methodology used to rank the journals, visit http://lawlib.wlu.edu/LJ/method.asp. (accessed November 21, 2009)
3 We ultimately decided to maintain a print subscription to the top 100 listed titles.
4 It turns out that a few of the titles we retained were connected to contracts entered into by our main campus library years before.
Library of Congress issues report and study on economic aspects of creating and distributing bibliographic data


In response, in September 2009, LC’s OTR Report Implementation Group (chaired by Regina Reynolds and Bruce Knarr) issued ‘On the Record Report’ Recommendations the Library of Congress Should Pursue over the Next Four Years (26 p.). See http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/news/OTR_rep_response_final_091509.pdf. The executive summary of the Implementation Group’s report stresses that LC must find ways to create “efficiencies” in the creation of bibliographic data (more bibliographic records) that will allow “enhancements” (improved access to resources). Among the topics to be explored: determining if LC can use ONIX data from publishers for “batch creation of catalog records,” investigating all potential sources of metadata from “within and outside the library community,” and examining the feasibility of LC allowing “evaluative user-generated data” in their bib. records.

Meanwhile, the firm R2 Consulting LLC was hired by LC to study the economic aspects of their current practices regarding creation and distribution of bibliographic data, and that report was issued in October 2009: Study of the North American MARC Records Marketplace (47 p.) available at http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/news/MARC_Record_Marketplace_2009-10.pdf.

Cataloger’s Desktop 3.0


Changes in reporting Bibliographic File Maintenance (BFM) to LC

On May 27, 2009, Anthony R.D. Franks, Head, Cooperative Programs Section, sent an email to the PCC (Program for Cooperative Cataloging) discussion list stating that henceforth NACO (Name Authority Cooperative Program) participants should report “all NACO-related matters to naco@loc.gov.” I asked him if they preferred email over LC’s online form, and he explained that only NACO participants should report issues by email; non-NACO libraries should still use the online error report form available at http://www.loc.gov/help/contact-libarch-report.html.

All 123 issues of Cataloging Service Bulletin (CSB) now freely available online

All issues of CSB (Summer 1978 to current) are now available at no cost at the LC Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS) website at http://www.loc.gov/cds/PDFdownloads/csb/index.html.

Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide

At the American Library Association (ALA) 2008 Annual Meeting, the PCC formed the Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record Task Group. The group’s main charge was to “develop a provider-neutral cataloging model for a single bibliographic record that could be used for all the instances of an online monograph.” The group’s work is finished, and the PCC Policy Committee gave their proposed policy final approval in June 2009. The Provider Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide (19 p.) is available at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/PN-Guide.pdf.

While the guide was created specifically for PCC-member libraries, non-PCC-member libraries are encouraged to follow it as well. I have created several records based on the new guidelines, and have found the records to be greatly simplified, without any loss of important information.

There were many questions on the various discussion lists about catalogers changing provider-specific records to provider-neutral records in OCLC’s database. Robert Bremer from OCLC responded on the PCC list: “As in most areas of cataloging
policy, OCLC member libraries should follow PCC practice and discontinue creating provider-specific records … OCLC member libraries can edit and replace master records for online textual monographic resources to reflect the new provider-neutral guidelines.” OCLC plans to eventually “neutralize” the majority of provider-specific records, but acknowledges that there will be records in the database reflecting old and new practices throughout 2010.

Update to the MARC Record Guide for Monograph Aggregator Vendors


MARC 21 Update no. 10 now available

The changes to MARC 21 from update no. 10 are now integrated into the MARC Standards, http://www.loc.gov/marc/. Within the standards documents, changes are highlighted in red. Among the major changes are: new fields 336 (Content type), 337 (Media type), and 338 (Carrier type) which will replace the GMD in field 245 when/if RDA is implemented; subfield “x” for the ISSN in the series statement in the 490 field is now repeatable, so that ISSNs may be recorded for both the main series and any sub-series in field 490.

MARC 21 changes to accommodate Resource Description & Access (RDA)

This draft document, http://www.loc.gov/marc/formatchanges-RDA.html, highlights changes and additions to the MARC data elements in the Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings formats in order to accommodate anticipated changes from RDA.

Implementing the repeatability of the MARC 21 260 field

In 2001 the MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data rules for the 260 field were changed, making the field repeatable. OCLC officially announced an August 16, 2009 implementation date for this change, and LC and PCC implemented new guidelines on September 1, 2009 as published in the Library of Congress Rule Interpretations 1.4 Appendix. See http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/260field.pdf.

RDA updates

From Nathalie Schulz (Secretary of the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA) posted to the RDA discussion list on June 23, 2009:

- RDA text has been finalized and submitted to the co-publishers on June 22, 2009; RDA is scheduled to be released at the end of November 2009. [On December 3, 2009, Mary Ghikas, Chair of the Committee of Principals, announced the revised publication date of June 2010.]
- New JSC Chair: Alan Danskin will be the JSC Chair beginning July 1, 2009. He is the Metadata and Bibliographic Standards Coordinator at the British Library.
- The RDA JSC Web site has moved to http://www.rda-jsc.org/.

OCLC expert community experiment

August 15, 2009 was the official end-date for OCLC’s six-month expert community experiment, though the functionality remains in place for the time being. According to OCLC’s August status report, participants replaced 108,766 records as part of the experiment. The experiment allowed OCLC members with full-level authorizations to make more changes to master bibliographic records than their authorizations had previously allowed. Before the experiment, members would have had to go through the process of obtaining an Enhance authorization from OCLC in order to make these changes. OCLC held a wrap-up webinar in late September that they archived and made available online. Presenter Glenn Patton states that “all of the increased functionality remains available.” It is never made clear whether or not OCLC has decided to officially change the functionality permanently, or if they are still developing a new model. View the webinar at http://www.oclc.org/us/en/worldcat/catalog/quality/expert/websessions.htm.

Final Report of the Task Group on BIBCO Standard Record Requirements

Based on the concept of the CONSER Standard Record, BIBCO Standard Records are intended to be “‘floor’ records containing a mandatory element set which replaces both the BIBCO Core and Full level record standards … Emphasis is given to access points, not to extensive descriptive data.” For details see http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/BSR-Final-Report.pdf.

Carolyn Ruth Sturtevant (LC Cooperative Programs) noted in a November 24, 2009 email to the PCC discussion list that January 4, 2010 was set as “the implementation date for the BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) guidelines for printed
books. Libraries contributing BSR records for printed books (excluding rare books) using the BIBCO Standard Record requirements will use the single encoding level blank.” See implementation details at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/BSR_ImplementationDoc.pdf.

However in a message to the PCC discussion list on December 4, 2009, Beacher Wiggins, LC’s Director for Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access, stated LC needed to delay the January implementation of BSR guidelines for several reasons relating to internal decisions, software considerations, and documentation.

Online series
CONSER Standard Record Guidelines and LCRI 25.5B have been revised to reflect the PCC practice to not require a uniform title for an online monographic series solely to differentiate the online form from other physical media. For more information, see http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/Online-Series.pdf.

Functional Requirements for Authority Data (FRAD)
In March 2009 the Standing Committees of the IFLA Cataloguing Section and the IFLA Classification and Indexing Section approved the final draft of Functional Requirements for Authority Data. This document has now been published by K.G. Saur and is available for purchase. See http://www.ifla.org/en/news/new-ifla-publication-functional-requirements-for-authority-data.

---

The Internet

Library Success = Student Success = Research Success!

Matthew Jenks
Franklin Pierce Law Center

There are many factors which contribute to the success of a law school. Those of us who work in law libraries understand the special role that libraries play in that success. It can be said that the law library, more than any other kind of library, is the heart of the institution it serves. At the very least, it is the nerve center, the conduit through which information and knowledge are obtained, filtered and dispersed outward. While administration and faculty are the law school’s face to the outside world, the library and the information professionals who run it are the law school’s face to itself. It is the law school, with all its knowledge, focus, student demographic, reputation, and even its hopes and dreams, reflecting back upon itself. What have we learned? What do we want to learn? Where do we want to go? How will we get there? And most importantly, who are we as an institution, as a community, and as a group of dedicated professionals and students devoted to legal education, knowledge, and practice?

In this vein, we can say that as goes the law library, so goes the law school, whether sooner or later. With this in mind, it remains to be asked – How can we make our library better? How can we make it more successful, or more successful than it is now?

What immediately occurred to me when I thought about this is that whether a law library (or any library) is successful or not is ultimately determined by its users. Do law students find what they’re looking for in a library? Are they successful most of the time? Does the library provide them with all the tools they need for a smooth and satisfying research experience? Is the library a place they want to come back to and look forward to coming to? Do they associate it with positive outcomes? Finally, does the library play a key role in nurturing academically successful law students, students who are fulfilled, productive, and (dare we say it) happy? For it is these students who are your key marketing tools, and who will promote your law school and your library tirelessly.

Therefore, if we could answer Yes to all of these preceding questions, then there is no doubt that we would meet the definition of success as applied to the modern academic law library. Going further, there was one obvious factor here which tied all these questions together: success in the law library = success in research. Successful research is the key, and if we could come up with tools to enhance and make the research experience at our law school more successful, we would also enhance the success of our students and the reputation of the law school.

In looking at the library at Franklin Pierce Law Center, its strengths and its shortcomings, I was able to come up with a total of five key tools or implementations which I felt made, or could make, the research experience and our law library more successful. You may disagree or come up with others, but I think the important thing here is to develop a list for your own
library, one which works for you and your students. Start with a base set that fits your law school’s personality, student demographics, and individual characteristics. Thomas Hemstock, our Electronic Resources Librarian, calls it Library 2.1, a library-centric point of view that focuses on your unique institution with its unique students. What fits one library and its technology needs won’t necessarily fit another. At any rate, here is what I came up with for the library at Franklin Pierce:

1. **Find ways to highlight your law library’s specialty and particular offerings** – This is all about creating added value for your library and publicizing that added value. What does your library carry that makes it unique? What is your school’s focus and does your library complement and support that focus?

   Our law school specializes in intellectual property law (we are the no. 5 IP school in the country), and we feature our *IP Mall* prominently on our website: “an internationally acclaimed IP resource website providing a unique collection of Pierce Law hosted intellectual property resources and links to the most valuable IP resources in the world (patents, copyrights, trademarks, trade secrets, licensing, technology transfer, etc.)” *IP Mall*, [http://www.ipmall.info](http://www.ipmall.info), gives us the benefit of not only publicizing the school’s specialty, but also grouping all our specialty features together in one place for visibility and ease of use. This greatly enhances the research experience for the student.

   There are other examples from different schools, but I was surprised I didn’t find more. Outside of research guides, most library websites don’t seem to carry or feature many of these Specialty Area Links (SALs). Yale Law School is an exception. There, one can click on the Research tab on the Lillian Goldman Law Library home page, [http://www.law.yale.edu/library/index.asp](http://www.law.yale.edu/library/index.asp), and be brought to an easy-to-read menu with a wealth of research links. But what struck me was the Environmental Law Clinic link, [http://www.law.yale.edu/library/research/15912.asp](http://www.law.yale.edu/library/research/15912.asp), on the top left-hand side of the page, which brought everything related to environmental law and research under one umbrella, much like our *IP Mall* link. Not far below, one could click on Specialized Research Information to find other SALs. However, the big schools don’t have a monopoly on this sort of thing. Vermont Law School’s library website might be simple and Spartan, but they were able to create an equally effective link, [http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Environmental_Law_Resources.htm](http://www.vermontlaw.edu/Environmental_Law_Resources.htm), to a web page featuring their school’s specialty, which also happens to be environmental law. They also have a great RSS feed page with links to selected environmental sites, a nice added feature. You can even choose a reader to use from this same location.

   To sum up, publicizing the things that make your library and your law school special on your library website is essential. One of the best ways to do this is through the use of SALs, which not only feature your school’s strengths from convenient, visible locations, but will help make the student’s research experience smoother and easier to manage.

2. **Publicize and highlight your library’s offerings with an attractive website and visuals. Functionality is essential, but it’s not the whole story** – This may seem like unnecessary fluff to some, not worthy of their time and not for the serious information professional, but I submit it can make all the difference in your library’s visibility and level of use. By extension, this can improve the overall impression and reputation of your law school. And first impressions are what get people in the door; the real substance, the meat and potatoes, is what happens after they walk through that door.

   Of course, moderation is the key here. In a law school, you don’t want a library website that is too busy, too full of bells and whistles and distracting media. Rich and calming colors are common, as well as highly visible links and convenient navigation. Blues, reds, and greens seem to be the most common colors (in that order), and not many law schools stray from these primary palettes.

   To learn what best fits your library website, most web management systems have some handy tools to use. Our library intranet, run through Drupal, [http://www.drupal.org](http://www.drupal.org), has a statistics feature that allows one to look at most viewed pages, last viewed, most clicked on items, etc. This enables the IT or the electronic resources librarian to learn what sorts of web pages and links students are most drawn to, whether for informational purposes, aesthetic reasons, functionality reasons, or all three, and then use that information to improve the overall look and feel of the website and navigation.

   In terms of visuals, digital cover images of each book or information object are vital nowadays, and I find students prefer slightly larger images to small ones. In Drupal, I now insert featured acquisitions images in our blog at approximately 150 X 213, though this will vary slightly depending on the dimensions of the book, and I have received good feedback from students. We also use Syndetic Solutions for enhanced cover images and added features like reviews, tables of contents, and summaries. If Syndetic Solutions doesn’t have these features available, I add them myself using Drupal.

   Of course Syndetic Solutions isn’t the only game in town. ContentCafe2, [http://www.btol.com](http://www.btol.com), is popular as well, courtesy of Baker & Taylor. The point is, whatever your choice, be sure to use the technology available to enhance your patrons’ research experience with visual stimulation as well as intellectual stimulation … in moderation, of course.
One additional note: there is a digital management program for libraries and other institutions called DSpace, http://www.dspace.org, which enables libraries to organize and make their digital collections available in a separate repository. The beauty of it is that it is open source, free, and completely customizable. In addition, one can, through their BSD open source license, use, modify, and even integrate the code into their commercial application without paying any licensing fees. This means “one can fully customize the look and feel of the DSpace website so it will integrate seamlessly with your own institution’s website and can be more intuitive for your users.” (DSpace website) In addition, it accepts most media and digital content formats, such as PDFs, Word documents, JPEGs, MPEGs, and TIFF files. And though the default metadata is written in Dublin Core, one can “ingest” other metadata schemas, such as MARC or MODS, into the program. Very flexible, very cool – and it’s FREE!

3. Use TOC’s (tables of contents) liberally in your library’s catalog to complement how students search the Internet
   – If you think this is splitting hairs, a) you are not a cataloger, b) you are not a reference librarian, and c) you better think again. We live in a world so completely different from the world of, say, 1985 or 1990, a world so completely changed by the Internet and the vast network of cyberspace (and Google and Yahoo), that most students in today’s modern academic library couldn’t even tell you what a subject heading is, and they certainly don’t grasp the concept of a controlled vocabulary. Granted, most don’t understand searching algorithms, either; they simply plug in a few keywords related to the topic they are researching, and then sift through the results, looking for books, articles, treatises etc. which seem the most relevant and contain the most pertinent information for their topic. Without information literacy classes of some kind, it is a rare young person that takes it very far beyond this, though electronic journal databases tend to have more searching features which enable researchers to better hone in on their topics. Law students, too, are slightly more likely to use an advanced search and/or construct their searches creatively (Boolean connectors, quotation marks, wildcards, etc.). Still, they need all the help they can get.

What tables of contents will do for students is vastly increase their keyword searching recall potential. From obscure terms like “The Dead Hand” to organization names like the World Intellectual Property Organization to the names of cases (In Re Bilski, Brown v. Board of Education), the potential increase in relevant results is enormous. This increase in relevant results will have a direct correlation on the other end, namely, in the quality and content of papers, case studies, etc. and in the increased satisfaction, success, and, dare I say it again, happiness of law students. These happy students will hang out in the library more, represent your school with greater distinction, be just plain nicer to be around and, most of all, promote your school (and your library) tirelessly. In short, successful, satisfied, and fulfilled students are your best marketing tools, and vital to the success of the library and the law school. TOC’s are one sure way to increase their population.

The next factor is even more important for nurturing and generating successful students:

4. Stress and promote information literacy heavily in the library and throughout the law school. Develop an information literacy program – The fact that, even now, many schools still aren’t doing this is alarming. If law students don’t learn the science and art of engaging in effective research, it is highly unlikely they will ever be top-notch lawyers. Knowing how to be an effective lawyer is all about taking initiative, being a self-starter, being ahead of the curve, and, most of all, truly representing a client. If you don’t understand what your case law is all about and where its direct and indirect history comes from, then you don’t understand your case. It’s that simple. Pulling out “relevant” facts and “pertinent” case decisions at a given point in time without understanding the entirety of your case law means you could be missing something important. Legal professionals who are properly trained in information literacy and know how to engage in effective research are ready for anything. They have a more comprehensive grasp of the law, a keener ability to discern what is useful from what is not (whether they receive the information from paralegals or do it themselves), and are more flexible on the fly.

Our school does have a very comprehensive information literacy program through our library, http://library.piercelaw.edu/InformationLiteracyPlan, which states better than I how important this skill is in the legal profession. Amazingly enough, we are one of only a small number of law schools with an official, faculty-approved information literacy program. See http://www.hg.org/law-school-library-new-hampshire.html. The University of Kansas School of Law Library, http://www.law.ku.edu/library, is another. Use another school’s information literacy plan as a starting point for designing your own implementation, or create your own from scratch. But do it. Your law school’s (and your library’s) survival may depend on it. Remember, well-prepared students will do better academically, and academic achievers are more satisfied, more fulfilled students. These fulfilled students are vital to the success of any law school (and law library) and its reputation. An information literacy program is another sure way to increase their population. Create “expert” researchers!
5. **Provide students with the tools to make their research smoother and less stressful** – This is an area of technology that is still developing, but currently there is one application out there that stands out above the others. It is called Zotero, [http://www.zotero.org](http://www.zotero.org). Sure, it is not the only thing going, but Google has stopped development on Google Notebook, which was somewhat of a surprise, and Connotea, [http://www.connotea.org](http://www.connotea.org), awesome as it is, is so far meant only for the scientific community. In terms of popularity, Zotero is the only game out there right now.

Zotero is no slouch, however, and is now used and promoted on many academic library and school websites. It makes anyone’s research experience immensely easier and actually incorporates features found in the best of the previous generation of apps with new open source technology. Plus, it is free!

Basically, it works like this: After loading the free, open source software, you will see a small Zotero icon on the bottom right of your screen. Now do a search for articles, references, anything you want. This can be any type of search – Google, Google Scholar, JSTOR, LexisNexis etc. Once you find articles you want to use or even investigate further, simply click on the article citation, then click on the zotero icon in the URL. Zotero not only creates your library for you, but populates it with each article you choose, completely formatted according to whatever style you’re using. So, you not only have the bibliographic information now organized and at your fingertips, you also have it available from any PC, anytime or anywhere. In other words, this library, whose interface unfolds from left to right much like an iTunes menu, is virtual and completely online.

Another feature of this application is that, if available, it will also copy the full text of the item into your Zotero library (as a PDF). Once in your library, this article, passage, or whatever it may be, becomes completely keyword-searchable. You can store images and web pages as well.

Beyond this, Zotero has a notes feature which enables you to write annotations or jot down notes regarding a particular citation. The notes become searchable as well after you do this.

Once all your references are in your library, you can create citations or a complete bibliography with the click and drag of a button. Simply drag an item (each item represents a citation to an article or other reference) onto your Word document and let go. The program will format automatically (and alphabetically) according to the style of reference you have selected.

Yes, Zotero is a bit clunky, but there is truly nothing quite like it anywhere. It will be so helpful to modern law students’ research that they will wonder how they ever did without it.

These are the most important factors I came up with for enhancing the research experience. Some of them we have already implemented in the library, while with others I feel we could do more. The key is to create your own research list, and let it act as a template for what needs doing. It can be an ongoing guidepost to you and your staff, but remember: In the end it is all about what is successful for your library.

So go forth and make your library and law school better than you ever thought they could be. Let the Internet be a tool for you. If something works, use it. If it doesn’t– if it seems clunky or doesn’t fit your library’s identity, cast it aside. The Internet is merely a research tool– important, yes, but merely one of a number of pathways you can use to move into the future and your own, personal Library 2.1!

---

**Making Preservation Fun: Not Exactly an Urban Legend, More Like a Confession**

*Kelli Wambold*

*University of Richmond Law Library*

Kevin Butterfield issued a challenge to the Virginia Association of Law Libraries (VALL) Preservation Committee longer ago than I want to admit. He wanted to see a preservation game on the web as a learning tool for AALL members. Steve Mirsky suggested Raptivity software to facilitate this project. Raptivity is very sophisticated and too expensive for VALL’s budget. So, an application for a BNA education grant went to AALL. VALL received the grant, and AALL purchased the software.

And there the project stalled. University of Richmond Law was short a reference librarian, and none of the Preservation Committee members had any extra time. This unfortunate situation did not make preservation fun for me, I confess.
Finally, the list of questions was ready to input. Fear of loading software took over. Give me some slack, gentle readers. When I went to UNC SILS, desktop computers did not exist. For a digital alien, I do reasonably well. Finally, I surmounted my fear and loaded the software. Inputting was easy, but the preview revealed another consideration. The display area was very small. At least three revisions finally made complete questions and answers visible.

Seeing the sound volume icon, I did a preview with earphones. The questions spoken were not our questions, but the questions of the template I was editing. The narrator selected is a radio announcer and media wizard who works in the library.

What else needed refinement? Did I mention that Raptivity expects the players’ answers to be an exact match of the answers I input? It does. So, in addition to finishing the soundtrack for Preservation Jeopardy, the introduction needed editing to alert game players to the unforgiving nature of the game software. Players should consider the game as a learning experience and not something to win. Preservation Jeopardy is not ready for prime time. I hope to give TSLL readers a URL in the next column.

AALL will receive the software for future educational projects, once Preservation Jeopardy is ready for prime time. Maybe someone reading this column is a digital native with a great idea for using Raptivity. That would be a lovely outcome.

VALL is a Green Chapter

Surely, this column has bragged about the Virginia Association of Law Libraries preservation efforts. Permit yet another item. The VALL Preservation Committee issued a challenge to create a disaster preparedness kit. At least one library said they did work on this challenge. No library found time to submit an entry, probably because the entry form was too detailed. The University of Richmond Law Library analyzed the list of items required found on the SOLINET (now Lyrasis) website. Readers may notice that preservation projects are not instant gratification. Tim Coggins, the director of the University of Richmond Law Library, wisely noted that many items on the list were readily available. Operations Manager Deb Barlett acquired what was not on hand. We had to query Lyrasis about what kind of detergent was required; it was gentle detergent for cleanup of the library and not the books.

Below are pictures of the emergency supplies. Deb declined to be in the picture, despite her work.

Photographs courtesy of: Carl Hamm

Thank you for reading these preservation anecdotes, and may all AALL law libraries stay well preserved!

Exploring Research: Vocabulary Control

Hollie C. White
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Over the last few months, my own research, writing, and teaching have focused on the topic of vocabulary control. What makes this topic interesting is that it is not just about how to apply LCSH to library materials found in the OPAC; vocabulary control includes all standardized controlled vocabularies, thesauri, locally developed terms, lists or taxonomies, and even
ontologies. Vocabulary control goes beyond the domain of the OPAC, and it is used in digital libraries and repositories as an underlying knowledge base, as well as in online portals and print/digital user-centered finding guides. It is often the vocabulary choices or categories used on a vendor website that create a more user-friendly environment. Folksonomies and social tagging are also considered in the realm of vocabulary control as new user-centered approaches to description and access. As far as research is considered, now is a very exciting time to be thinking and conducting studies about vocabulary control.

Vocabulary control has permeated many types of libraries and departments. Because of its importance to the library science community, I thought I would share some of the more interesting research articles I have found lately on this topic.


Shiri and Chase-Kruszewski conducted a study that looked at the underlying knowledge organization systems that help patrons access digital collections. According to their study of 269 online digital libraries in North America, the two most common underlying knowledge organization schemes are locally developed taxonomies, used by 113 libraries, and LCSH, used by 78 libraries, in some variation or modification.

I found this article interesting for many reasons. First, it reminded me of questions that are frequently asked on the TS and OBS discussion lists (i.e., What is everyone doing about x?). It is a reminder that research can be as simple as knowing what other people are doing or writing about a topic. That’s encouraging, since often research can be seen as hard and time-consuming. Shiri and Chase-Kruszewski’s research also points out that even in the digital environment, which caters to a larger user population than the physical limitations of a traditional library, the use of locally developed “taxonomies” is the most frequently used method for organizing information—meaning that libraries are creating their own resources to fit their vocabulary control needs and not using already standardized controlled vocabularies.


Schwartz’s article takes a historical look at how thesauri, facets, and tags have been perceived over the last three decades. Schwartz discusses a variety of library-related topics including LIS education, the catalog, and user needs in the Web 2.0 environment. Her conclusion is that the future of the online catalog is in guided navigation, where catalog users doing a search are guided through thesaural relationships in controlled vocabularies in order to learn more about what types of concepts might also be important to research.

I think this article is worthy of note because it first looks at the recent historical changes that have taken place in relation to thesauri and indexing. Having this historical perspective adds to Schwartz’s conclusions about the user’s perception of search and how vocabulary control can be used to improve user experience with the catalog.


Spiteri’s article discusses how social tagging can potentially be used to enhance library catalogs. It is often thought that folksonomies do not have relevance in the library community of cataloging and classification because of their nonstandardized and uncontrolled nature. Spiteri’s research found this assumption to be untrue. In this article, Spiteri analyzed tags used in del.icio.us, technorati, and furl and found that many of the tags “correspond closely to a number of the NISO guidelines pertaining to the structure of terms, namely in the types of concepts expressed by the tags, the predominance of single tags, the predominance of nouns, the use of recognized spelling, and the use of primarily alphabetic characters.” Based on these findings, Spiteri suggests that tagging could be integrated into the library catalog and assist in providing better access to resources while still maintaining information standards.

People often question the practicality of controlled vocabularies in the age of folksonomy, yet Spiteri’s article suggests that there is middle ground through hybrid approaches that integrate user tags with traditional library subject analysis. I believe that this idea of a hybrid approach is encouraging because it allows new ways for users to experience the catalog that benefit both the user and library.

All of these articles are good examples of research that has been conducted on vocabulary control in the last few years. Research articles are meant to help the reader learn, think, and possibly research more on his/her own. I believe these articles bring up many interesting points that can be applied to the law library technical services community in ways that can promote further research that could eventually improve service.
The following serial title changes were recently identified by the serials and acquisitions staff of the University of California, Berkeley Law Library:

**Buffalo women's law journal**
Vol. 7 (spring 1999)-v. 16 (2008)
(OCoLC 40718641)
**Changed to:**
**Buffalo journal of gender, law & social policy**
Vol. 17 (2009)-
(OCoLC 439600828)

**Computer law review and technology journal**
[Vol. 1] spring 1997-v. 10, no. 3 (summer 2006)
(OCoLC 37429374)
**Changed to:**
**SMU science and technology law review**
Vol. 11, no. 1 (fall 2007)-
(OCoLC 234616873)

**Environmental law journal**
Vol. 10, no. 3 (Jan. 1980)-v. 37, no. 3 (summer 2007)
(OCoLC 6035468)
**Changed to:**
**Texas environmental law journal**
Vol. 38, no. 1 (fall 2007)-
(OCoLC 261384032)

**Southwestern journal of law and trade in the Americas**
(OCoLC 133151066)
**Changed to:**
**Southwestern journal of international law**
Vol. 15, no. 2 (2009)-
(OCoLC 401314979)

**United States government internet manual**
2003/2004-2008
(OCoLC 53294311)
**Changed to:**
**E-government and web directory**
2009-
(OCoLC 436922275)

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

**Bar examination fact book**
**Ceased with:** 4th (1997/98)
(OCoLC 21343869)

**Bloomberg corporate law journal**
**Ceased with:** Vol. 4, issue 1 (winter 2009)
(OCoLC 64668144)

**Bulletin of international legal developments**
**Ceased with:** 2009, no. 12 (July 2009)
(OCoLC 75492650)

**Directory of associations of women lawyers**
**Ceased in print with:** 2005/2006
(OCoLC 13415364)
Continued by an online version
(OCoLC 164595000)
[http://www.abanet.org/women/directory.html](http://www.abanet.org/women/directory.html)

**The franchise lawyer**
**Ceased in print with:** Vol. 11 (2008)
(OCoLC 36152467)
Continued by an online version
(OCoLC 82018775)

**Guernsey law journal**
**Ceased in print with:** Issue 29 (July-Dec. 2000)
(OCoLC 25652768)

**Index to government orders**
**Ceased with:** 1991
(OCoLC 1715321)

**Integration & trade**
**Ceased in print with:** No. 28 (Jan/Jun. 2008)
(OCoLC 86731982)
Continued by an online version
No. 29 (Jan/Jun. 2009)-
[http://www.iadb.org/intal/icom/eng/i_home.html](http://www.iadb.org/intal/icom/eng/i_home.html)

**International legal theory**
**Ceased with:** Vol. 12 (fall 2006)
(OCoLC 38022033)
LCSH and international crimes

There is an ongoing discussion on the classification of international crimes (and human rights law in general). Scholars of international law look at the growing body of treaties and conventions addressing these areas, and see the subject as their own, which would class it in KZ (public international law, also called the law of nations). However, the subject matter (civil rights, murder, larceny, etc.) is also covered by national law, which suggests classification in K (law general) or in KD-KWX (law of countries and regions). The problem from a subject cataloging (in LCSH) perspective is how to distinguish between public international law, and national or international uniform law, especially for books discussing actual applications, theories of crimes or trials.

Classic “law of nations” deals with how nations relate to other nations. International offenses are crimes defined by international law, which is the law of nations. However, countries are never prosecuted, only natural (or occasionally, juristic or corporate) persons are charged. One can argue this is more like “uniform” law in the American federal system. We can use a qualified heading to indicate a perspective, such as Children (International law), or a specialized heading such as Rape as a war crime. However, such headings are the exception, and it is unclear if they should be made common or made free-floating to indicate the international law treatment of a regular legal subject.

Subject Headings

Aaron Kuperman
Crimes against peace are less ambiguous. Private citizens do much more than attempt to influence a government whether to go to war, and more importantly, there are few real-world situations in which a country would prosecute its own citizens for “crimes against peace.”

The references for Crimes against humanity perhaps need to be reconsidered. Forced labor and Slavery aren’t inherently illegal, and have at times been considered to be good social policy by the country involved. Human trafficking sometimes involves willing victims. Genocide involves Mass murder directed at a specific group. Not all War crimes are crimes against humanity. One could almost say that Crimes against humanity is a legal theory to allow a court exercising international jurisdiction to address various types of crimes that are usually illegal under national laws, though perhaps a different legal theory is used to transform the routine crimes into international crimes. While this poses no problem in cataloging a book on the theory of crimes against humanity, catalogers can’t always determine what legal theory is being applied if the author focuses on the events or the acts, rather than the theory.

We have a subject heading for Rape as a war crime. If it meant one country asking reparations from another country for the latter having ordered its soldiers to commit rape, it would be part of public international law. However, the typical case involves soldiers from one country raping women from another country. Professors dealing with this matter in the abstract see this clearly as an “international” issue.

The trials of the rapists suggest a more complicated analysis. To use a crude example, consider whether a person accused of Rape as a war crime can get acquitted by convincing a “war crimes” tribunal that he was motivated by sexual desire rather than a political motive. Can the rapist prove the he lacked mens rea to violate public international law by proving he is merely an apolitical sex fiend, resulting in the international court apologizing to the serial rapist for having thought he was a heinous war criminal? Especially when war crimes are addressed by national courts, such as in Rwanda, it isn’t always clear which is a Crime against humanity as opposed to being a “mere” Crime.

Accounts of War crime trials can be a problem since the country where the trial is held isn’t necessarily the place where the events took place. In some cases, the soldiers are being tried by their own country, either because they were acting against orders, or because the government changed after the war and the new government disapproves of its predecessor’s acts. In some cases they are tried by their enemies in a foreign country’s national court (e.g., the Eichmann case in Israel, and the trials of various persons accused of involvement in the 9-11 bombings in American courts). Some are tried in “international courts,” such as the special courts established after World War II to try Axis leaders, or more recent international criminal courts established by the United Nations.

Well-known trials can be established in LCSH, such as Nuremberg Trial of Major German War Criminals, Nuremberg, Germany, 1945-1946. Such a heading should make it clear what court is involved, where the trial is, and what crimes are covered. If the trial isn’t established in LCSH, which is the usual case, bringing out all aspects of the trial is a bit complicated.

The ongoing trials pertaining to Rwanda are an example. Some of the trials are before the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda which was established by the United Nations, and is located in Tanzania. Some of the trials are in regular courts in Rwanda, or are dealt with by the Gacaca justice system which is a Rwanda court based on customary law. A heading such as War crime trials—Rwanda would be misleading in many cases. (Were these truly “war” crimes? It was less of a civil war than a massive pogrom that accompanied a putsch.) If before the UN’s court, the heading would require use of the geographic subdivision reflecting where the trial occurred, such as International criminal courts—Tanzania or War crime trials—Tanzania. While we usually don’t use a 610 for a court, it might be useful in such cases. For works pertaining to a conflict, it is often useful to add a non-law heading for the conflict, e.g., Rwanda—History—Civil War, 1994—Atrocities; or in some cases one can also exploit the fact that —Law and legislation is free-floating after names of wars, in order to bring out the name of the conflict that led to the trial. Note that history headings with the word “Conflict” in them, such as Cambodian-Vietnamese Conflict, 1977-1991 and Arab-Israel Conflict are wars and therefore take free-floaters applicable to wars.

Classification has it “worse” since classifiers have to decide where to put something, and worry about combining unlike materials or separating like materials. Subject catalogers merely have to make sure that the matter is clear to any and all groups of users. At least the LCSH task is doable.
Contributing Authors: Georgia Briscoe, Marlene Babrick, Andrea Rabbia, Yümin Jiang

Please welcome our new contributing author, Georgia Briscoe, Associate Director and Head of Technical Services, University of Colorado Law Library.

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

Risk in Buying the Wrong Book
http://www.against-the-grain.com/2009/06/v-21-3-imhbco/
Anderson, Rick. “Is the Library Collection Too Risky?” Against the Grain 21, no. 3 (June 2009).
In this opinion piece, Anderson first pointed out that “out of print” means much less nowadays with Google Books and the Espresso Book Machine. He then argued that with the budget woes we face now, the risk in buying the wrong book has increased while the risk in failing to buy the book has decreased. He concluded that libraries should reconsider their traditional strategy of building large collections in attempts to anticipate users’ needs. Instead, they should show users everything available out there and only buy items users say they need.

RSS for Acq
RSS can be used to track electronic monographic series for new volumes added, and aggregators such as Project Muse and JSTOR for new titles added. Acquisitions staff can also use RSS to keep up with updates from publishers and vendors. Libraries can push information about new acquisitions via RSS feed, with tagging for subject access. Another possible use is to inform users about outages in databases or library systems.

Approval Plan
It takes a lot of library infrastructure to support an approval plan, but now with tightening budget and staff time, maybe it is time to re-evaluate the role of approval plans.

Cataloging

New OCLC WorldCat Record Use Policy Council is Formed
A new Record Use Policy Council has been convened by the OCLC Board of Trustees, charged with developing the next version of the WorldCat record use policy. The new policy will replace the Guidelines for Use and Transfer of OCLC Derived Records that was developed in 1987.

OCLC Americas Regional Council
Plan now to join OCLC for the first meeting of the OCLC Americas Regional Council, which will be held on Friday, January 15, 2010, 8:30–11:30 a.m. (ET), in conjunction with the American Library Association (ALA) Midwinter Meeting in Boston, Massachusetts. For those unable to attend in-person, details will be provided on how to view portions of the meeting that will be broadcast live on the web.

Comprised of members from libraries and other cultural heritage organizations from Canada, Latin America, the Caribbean and the United States, the Americas Regional Council is part of the OCLC cooperative’s new governance structure that consists of three Regional Councils and a Global Council to facilitate member-to-member discussions across the cooperative. (OCLC discussion list)

MARC Record Guide for Monograph Aggregator Vendors
“The Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide was approved by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging and OCLC in 2009. The provider-neutral record is defined as a single bibliographic record that covers all equivalent manifestations of an online monograph. Manifestations are considered equivalent if their format and their content are essentially the same, based on clues from the author, title, edition, publishing information, and physical description. Moving to the provider-neutral model puts the emphasis on the content of the resource. Other information such as individual database names, individual e-package names, publishers or third party aggregators that had formerly been entered into the bibliographic records to distinguish different versions should be coded only in appropriate fields in the local version of the record following this guide.” (TS-SIS discussion list, posting by George Prager)
BIBCO Standard Record Approved


The PCC Policy Committee (PoCo) has approved the creation of a BIBCO Standard Record (BSR) for monographic materials, with the requirements laid out in the final report of the Task Group on BIBCO Standard Record Requirements. The Policy Committee will be discussing the details of BSR implementation at its upcoming meeting in November at the Library of Congress and will also consider the process of creating BSR guidelines for other formats. (AUTOCAT discussion list)

SkyRiver: New Bibliographic Utility

The owner of Innovative Interfaces Inc. (III), Jerry Kline, started a new company to compete with OCLC. SkyRiver will offer an initial database of 20 million MARC records (OCLC has 144 million records) which are claimed to be of higher quality than OCLC records. The records are derived from the Library of Congress and the British Library. SkyRiver makes no claim to ownership of the records; libraries can use the records in any way. SkyRiver will offer copy and original cataloging support, record notification and shelf-ready services. Payment will be by annual subscription based on a multi-factor formula. Leslie Strauss, former III vice president, is president of SkyRiver. The company’s website, http://theskyriver.com, shows Michigan State University and California State University at Long Beach as fully operational with SkyRiver.

http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA6700415.html


LCRI Revisions for MARC 21 Changes Implemented
Sept. 1, 2009
http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/lcrichanges.html

Six Library of Congress rule interpretations (LCRIs) have been revised to reflect changes in the 4XX field in the MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data. The changes include making the 440 field obsolete, redefining the first indicator in the 490 field, and adding subfield $3. New subfields are also being defined for the 520 field. These changes to the MARC 21 format will be implemented at the Library of Congress on Sept. 1, 2009.

LC Cataloger’s Learning Workshop Materials on Web/iTunes U

Last year LC announced that they would discontinue selling training materials from the Cataloger’s Learning Workshop, and would make them freely available for downloading. Now LC has announced that these valuable workshops will also be available via iTunes U, an area of the iTunes Store offering free education content.

Government Documents
Z39.50 Download Limit Increased
http://www.fdlp.gov/component/content/article/16-cataloging/504-z3950-download-limit

Library Services and Content Management announced a ninety-day pilot that increases the Z39.50 per session limit to 10,000 for download and retrieval of records from the Catalog of U.S. Government Publications (CGP), effective October 1, 2009.

Information Technology

Challenges for Great Libraries in the Age of the Digital Native
http://iospress.metapress.com/content/c7t6417n2484vk22/?p=0f0e081b63ff47b7af84f5b26a27fa7d&pi=1


This is a lecture given by Dame Lynne Brindley, Chief Executive of the British Library. She pointed out that the information profession should participate in defining the future of knowledge creation, knowledge ordering and dissemination, and knowledge interaction. There are six issues that libraries need to pay attention to in order to ensure that they are strategically positioned for continuing relevance: 1) e-Science and e-Research – life beyond the document, 2) Web 2.0 and Web 3.0 – beyond the technologies, 3) Special collections and digital content, 4) Information literacy for the 21st century, 5) Digital preservation and long-term access, and 6) Inspiring spaces.

Permanent Usability Team in Libraries
http://southernlibrarianship.icaap.org/content/v10n02/nichols_j01.html


In 2006, Oregon State University Libraries started its ongoing usability team. The team has studied various library web pages and services such as the library home page, an institutional repository, a digital library, an interface for metasearch, terminology used in website navigation, and a video. Methodology used includes formal user testing, hallway style testing, open houses, card sorting, etc. The usability team has proven to be a success.

Total Recall Era Coming

Three streams of technology are merging to bring about the
Google to Reincarnate Digital Books as Paperbacks

Bytes in Brief issue 149 (October 2009).

On September 17, 2009, Google announced that it will make part of its digital library available to On Demand Books, a high-speed publishing machine company to manufacture a paperback-bound book in under five minutes. The Harvard Book Store will be among the first locations which already have a machine to have access to Google’s digital library. Initially, only two million books which no longer are protected by copyright will be available.

WorldCat Digital Collection Gateway

http://www.oclc.org/nextspace/013/productsandservices.htm


OCLC released a new service, WorldCat Digital Collection Gateway, that helps libraries and other institutions maximize the Internet visibility of unique primary source materials such as digital photos, newspapers, letters and diaries.

The Gateway offers libraries a self-service tool to easily upload metadata from their unique digital content to WorldCat. Once the metadata is in WorldCat, a library’s digital collections are more visible and discoverable by web searchers through popular search engines.

First U.S. Internet Addiction Center Opens

Bytes in Brief issue 149 (October 2009).

ReStart, located in Seattle, is the first residential center for Internet addiction in the United States. A 45-day program to wean yourself from pathological computer use will cost about $14,000. It will not be covered by insurance since it is not a recognized disorder by the American Psychiatric Association. Many such treatment centers exist in East Asian countries.

Local Systems

Web-Scale Index Searching and Advanced Open-Source Library Systems to the Rescue?


This article claims: “There are people who just cannot find what they need and they’re just sort of giving up on libraries” and that academic libraries are becoming marginalized because of this problem. The Ithaka study in 2006 found university faculty members less dependent on the library for their research and teaching. The hope offered in the article is that “Web-scale index searching” will come to the rescue. Web-scale index searching is expected to improve federated searching because it works more like Google, searching against a vast index of all library holdings including the many silos of articles and electronic resource databases.

The article also mentions several open source systems which are expected to help academics find what they need at the library: VuFind developed by Villanova which is now used by at least ten libraries, BlackLight under development by Virginia and Stanford, and XC for eXtensible Catalog which Rochester is developing with a $1.2 million grant from the Mellon Foundation. These open source products compete with existing commercial products such as Encore from Innovative Interfaces, AquaBrowser from Media Lab and Primo from ExLibris. The new systems all have faceted browsing, relevance ranking and other discovery elements to turn searching into finding.

LibraryThing for Libraries


In a quest to bring more Web 2.0 technology to their library, staff at Cleveland State University implemented LibraryThing for Libraries for use with their Innovative Interfaces Inc. WebPAC Pro public catalog. LibraryThing enhances information already in a bibliographic catalog by creating natural language tags, and by highlighting a listing of “other editions” and “similar books” in the collection.

OPACs in the Clouds


Due to the increase in usage of social applications and other Web 2.0 technologies, librarians must embrace innovations that are beneficial to their users and that promote the library’s presence as the center for information retrieval. The authors, both academic librarians, viewed academic libraries with Web 2.0 interfaces on their OPACs. Institutions used for this study were San Francisco State University’s LibraryThing, University of Pennsylvania’s PennTags, St. Lawrence University’s Encore, and Harvard University Libraries’ AquaBrowser.

OPACs that offer social applications are becoming more popular in academic libraries. After reviewing the OPACs of the above four academic institutions, the authors do see value in using an interface, and conclude that a library 2.0 catalog would increase the value and usage of the OPAC.
Management

Peer Review

Rockwood, Irving. “Peer Review: the History, the Issues, and New Directions.” Against the Grain 21, no.3 (June 2009): 1.
Gives a brief history of peer review, and summarizes current discussion on this process. Also describes five types of experiments by BioMed Central as alternatives for the common peer review process.

Mergers Aplenty

OCLC continues consolidation of its regional cooperatives: SOLINET (Atlanta based,) PALINET (Philadelphia based,) and NELINET (New England based) merged to form Lyrisys. A new Board of Trustees and management were formed from the predecessor organizations.

“DSpace Foundation and Fedora Commons, the two major organizations involved in governing open source software for repositories, have combined to form a new organization called DuraSpace.”

Income-Producing Activities in Libraries

The author is the Director of Special Initiatives at the University of Pennsylvania Libraries. He shared his findings from a two-year study of “income-producing” activities for the library. Here “income” has four levels, from partial cost-recovery to true profit. Ideas considered include: licensing or selling software developed by the library, sale of images, and expanded benefit “membership” for alumni. The most promising one seems to be re-publishing or e-publishing for print-on-demand services using the Espresso Book Machine, or a similar service.

Preservation

NDIIPP Partners Play Major Role at iPRES 2009
The 2009 International Conference on Preservation of Digital Objects was held in San Francisco, CA, October 5 and 6. The meeting was hosted by the California Digital Library, a National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program partner. The financial cost of digital preservation received particular attention during the conference. Speakers included Martha Anderson, NDIIPP Director of Program Management, who gave a keynote address that focused on the growth of the NDIIPP distributed collaborative effort; David Kirsch of the University of Maryland, who talked about preserving the digital records of corporations; Henry Lowood of Stanford University, who talked about preserving virtual worlds (and included the memorable quote, “This is how the world ends, not with a bang but an error message”); Ardyz Kozbial, who discussed the Chronopolis project; and Rebecca Guenther, who spoke on best practices for expressing preservation metadata.

New BLOG: PCAN
http://prescan.wordpress.com/
Beth Doyle and Holly Robertson have launched a new online blog devoted to preservation and conservation administration called PCAN or Preservation and Conservation Administration News. (TS-SIS discussion list)

Copyright in Archival Materials Digitization
http://www.springerlink.com/content/d68378548316j886/
The author investigated how copyright affects what items Canadian archival repositories select for digitization and online access. She found that Canadian repositories select items that are perceived to incur little risk of copyright infringement, or those that require few or no resources to investigate copyright status or obtain copyright authorizations. The findings suggest that repositories’ selection decisions are more restrictive than the law requires.

CLOCKSS Trigger Event Lessons

Reich described the two trigger events for the CLOCKSS archive in 2008. As a result, the two Sage journals, Graft and Auto/Biography, are now freely available under the Creative Commons open access license.

Processing

NISO Approves New Document That Aims to Facilitate Library Resource Sharing
http://www.niso.org/news/pr/view?item_key=85529122530e18e6753743fbc834ac40d4226702
The National Information Standards Organization (NISO) Voting Members approved a new work item to develop a Recommended Practice related to the physical delivery of library materials.
The Pence Law Library Electronic Resource Management Implementation Tale

Billie Jo Kaufman, Sima Mirkin, and Michael J. Petit
Pence Law Library, American University

1. Vendor Selection

In the early fall of 2005 the Pence Law Library at the American University, Washington College of Law, started the process of selecting a system for managing its growing number of electronic journal subscriptions. The library considered systems from three vendors: TDNet, Innovative Interfaces (III) and Serials Solutions (SS). The presentations of the representatives of two companies – TDNet and III – were held in the library for the entire staff, and a phone interview was conducted with a SS representative. All three companies presented impressive products which offered better control of subscription and license information for e-journals and better access to electronic collections via a smart linking capability. The library made its vendor selection based on which system offered the most seamless connectivity of its product with our existing integrated library system (ILS) and with other new technology tools (such as meta-search engines) the library might consider in the future. The winner of the bid was III, whose ILS the library was already using. Their product is the Electronic Resource Management (ERM) module packaged with the Content Access Services (CASE), containing ready-for-delivery metadata for e-titles.

2. Beginning the Implementation Process

The ERM and CASE implementation project began in the spring of 2008 with a three-day setup and training session conducted by a representative of III. Our library was one of the very first “clients” under their new ERM setup and training. While enlightening in many aspects, the training session still left the project team with a great deal of figuring out to do in order to make the software work. The team was able to overcome its difficulties by studying the system user’s manual, placing service calls to the III help desk, and employing its own intuition within the context of trial and error.

3. Beta Testing and Problems We Encountered

3.1. New Job Responsibilities

ERM and CASE implementation and subsequent operation of these systems required some new job responsibilities in the Pence Law Library’s Technical Services Department:

- Creating and maintaining RESOURCE, LICENSE, and CONTACT records
- Creating the library’s profile in CASE by creating and updating RULES for each aggregator database
- Loading metadata and coverage data received from CASE into Millennium via the ERM module
- Updating existing coverage by conducting periodical catalog and coverage data loading from CASE
- Creating .xml files for electronic non-CASE materials when the appearance of the ERM holdings record box in the OPAC is desired
- Conducting regular maintenance of e-titles to ensure correct matching, essential for accurate access to the materials

3.2. Setting up the Library’s Profile in CASE

The library’s profile in CASE is created and updated by entering rules that determine the library’s subscription with each provider. The library decided to include only full-text resources in the profile, and to include in its profile not only titles to which Pence Law Library subscribed, but also law-related titles to which the main campus library subscribed.

Creating the profile for each aggregator in CASE requires browsing the list of all titles within the aggregator and selecting those suitable for the needs of our library users. The accessibility of the titles can be checked directly through CASE. We used this feature for selecting from the aggregators to which the main library subscribed. We either selected “All” titles for the law databases, or selected the law-related titles from other aggregators. Below is a screen shot of a part of the Pence Law Library profile:
3.3. Coverage Loads of CASE Files via ERM module

Once we selected the library profile, we had to request a file from CASE. When the requested CASE file is received by the library server, the next step is to do a coverage load which creates brief bibliographic and holdings records in the catalog. The process is fairly straightforward, but not without its share of problems. The CASE file is preprocessed and prepared for the load in the Coverage Load component of the ERM module. The two options, Load Catalog and Load Coverage, can be done simultaneously or separately. The load can also be done individually by each vendor. We ran many trial loads and modifications before we identified all the problems and figured out remedies.

3.3.1. Proxy Server Early Problem

At the time we started setting up ERM, III only supported their Web Access Management (WAM) proxy server. Because we use EZproxy, another means of adding the prefix had to be devised. Since August, 2008 Innovative has supported EZproxy. However, the procedure described in this section can be utilized for loading non-CASE metadata into the coverage table. The following is a screen shot of the “manually” created ERM holdings record for *The Federal Register*.

To add our proxy prefix [https://proxy.wcl.american.edu/login?url=] to the URLs in the CASE data, we worked out a procedure that was tedious, yet effective. CASE files were converted into .txt files in Excel, and then the proxy prefix was appended to the URLs using Excel’s Find- and-Replace function. These .txt files were then converted back into .xml files in Excel. We also learned to edit the Coverage Spreadsheet Conversion Rules file to properly convert the coverage spreadsheet data into a form readable in Millennium. The revised files were uploaded into Millennium using ERM’s Coverage Load function. Load Catalog and Load Coverage can usually be run at the same time but, with these revised .xml files, they had to be run separately.

3.3.2. Match Points Issues

Match points are crucial to the loading of coverage data into ERM. These are fields in which the system looks for duplicates. The fields used by ERM as match points are ISSN, Title and the field inaccurately labeled “OCLC number.” Alt lookup is also available.
We originally encountered problems because both print and electronic records matched, causing the creation of duplicate records and attachment of electronic holdings records to print bibliographic records. This problem was solved by creating and maintaining a review file of electronic journal records to run our coverage loads against. This took time and experimentation, but we seem to have solved most of our matching problems.

The matching problem that remains stems from drawbacks in CASE. Frequently CASE has different information in the match points fields for the same titles in different databases. This creates duplicate records. In the screen shots below, the CASE metadata for this title in WESTLAW lacks an ISSN.

### 3.3.3. Title Changes in CASE

CASE does not handle title changes consistently. HeinOnline is the aggregator most affected by this issue. When the current and previous titles have the same ISSNs in CASE, then the number of links (equal to the number of titles) appears in the Holdings record box. The screen shot below shows the current journal title which continues *Loyola Consumer Law Reporter*. The screen shot offers two HeinOnline links with different coverage data reflecting the two titles. The first HeinOnline link shows the complete coverage for the combined titles, instead of the actual coverage for the *Loyola Consumer Law Review*, which begins with volume 10 (1998). The second HeinOnline link having the same ISSN does not need to be present, and just adds confusion to the coverage display.
If the ISSNs in CASE are different for sequential titles of the same publication, the system then creates two separate records as in the screen shot below. Holdings records attached to each bibliographic record in this case contain identical links to the title page in HeinOnline, but the holdings display in Millennium is less confusing because the “see” link will take the user to the complete coverage of the combined titles. If the user selects the first title, he/she will be led to a correct display of the coverage for *Malaya Law Review*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Titles (1-2 of 2)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Malaya Law Review</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Malaya Law Review See: Singapore Journal Of Legal Studies</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Not Over Yet

The library reported the problems described above to III in response to their solicitation of feedback from our experience with CASE. In March 2009, we received a message from III: “We have just completed development on a matching algorithm that generates a specific CASE ID to each journal title, thus ensuring that coverage loads with up-to-date holdings information is matched to the correct title.” The message also proposed that the library become a development partner to test this capability, and the library agreed.

5. Administration Role

The library administration’s role in this project was “three-fold”:

1. **Advocate to secure funds for the project.** ERM tools may be part of a librarian’s mindset, but explaining them to deans, university budget officers and purchasing managers can be challenging. Terms like federated searching and ERM aren’t part of their vocabulary. It was necessary to give them a glimpse of what the end result would be in very practical terms.

2. **Serve as a liaison between librarians, staff, and III.** The administration is responsible for ensuring that contract terms are fulfilled. It may be necessary to troubleshoot with vendor representatives or higher-ups in the company to keep the project on track.

3. **Cheerlead.** This work takes time, patience, intellect, creativity, innovation, and desire. The staff time it requires is enormous, and hard work sometimes results in error messages or even failure. But the success is unbelievable. Our OPAC (LEAGLE) is “alive” and a researcher’s dream. More importantly, administration can pull data for the dean’s office that in the past was either maintained in someone’s “gray” matter or yellow sticky notes.

Now, the truly tough part—educating faculty, staff, and students on LEAGLE’s power—ah, the work ahead!

6. Conclusion

As a result of ERM and CASE implementation, LEAGLE became a one-step research tool that connects patrons directly to various full-text resources. At the time of this writing, 4,480 new bibliographical records were added to LEAGLE with direct links to their full-text contents.

Patrons can connect to current issues of any major U.S. newspaper or legal periodical directly from LEAGLE instead of going to specific databases. The metadata from CASE describing each e-resource is elegantly presented by ERM in LEAGLE.

An A-Z E-journal and newspaper portal has been generated by CASE and links with LEAGLE’s homepage, further elevating access to e-resources. ERM and CASE systems, along with a new interface, have enormously enhanced the performance and visibility of LEAGLE, which has been transformed into a powerful and modern research tool.

*Editor’s note: This article was previously published in Law Library Lights 52, no. 3-4 (Spring/Summer 2009): 27-30 and printed here, with the permission of the authors and Law Library Lights, in order to increase dissemination of its information to more technical services librarians.*
Law Libraries are moving their online catalogs to discovery platforms in an effort to keep pace with rising patron expectations. Library users expect all their online experiences to be as easy as a Google search or shopping at Amazon or Land’s End. One of the most difficult tasks is to present a single search box which will search both article databases and the catalog. In other words, the search will retrieve library holdings of books, websites, microforms, etc. as well as articles from the many databases to which the library subscribes.

I’m happy to report that the website at the William A. Wise Law Library of the University of Colorado School of Law now has one search box which retrieves articles from our subscription databases and hits from our catalog all displayed clearly on the first screen with facets and a discovery pane. This is accomplished with an AquaBrowser Discovery Platform, a Serials Solution 360 federated search, plus Syndetics enhanced contents and art, all working on top of our Innovative Interfaces Millennium automated library system.

In this case, a picture truly is worth a thousand words.

![Screen shot of the website at the William A. Wise Law Library of the University of Colorado School of Law showing a discovery platform with a single search box which retrieves articles from subscription databases and hits from the catalog.](image-url)
Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award

It’s that time of year again when the TS-SIS Awards Committee is seeking nominations for the annual Renee D. Chapman Award.

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

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

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

***Deadline: February 1, 2010***

For further information, see the Chapman Award section of the TS-SIS Handbook at http://aallnet.org/sis/tssis/handbook/appendix06-chapmanaward.htm.

Questions? Or, Nominations: Contact TS-SIS Awards Committee Chair

Wendell Johnting, Chair – TS-SIS Awards Committee
Indiana University School of Law—Indianapolis
wjohnhtin@iupui.edu

Also serving on the TS-SIS Awards Committee:

Linda M. Sobey        Gwen Gregory
Florida A & M University   John Marshall Law School
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progressed beyond the transition stage. Topics such as dealing with ongoing staff relationships, refining your relationship with the administration, motivating and mentoring staff and succession planning are covered. Both volumes contain case studies which illustrate the concepts presented in each chapter. At the end of each case study, a list of observations gleaned from the case study is presented. There are also thought and discussion exercises which can be used to gain more perspective on the issues. Transitioning also contains a useful annotated bibliography of management sources. Both books are written in plain language that is easy to follow.


This is a collection of essays written by law librarians at different career stages offering practical advice on navigating through your library career. The book is divided into sections corresponding to each point in your library career, covering the issues relevant to new librarians, experienced librarians, new supervisors and new directors. Information is included on how to tell if you really want to take on a management position, skill sets needed to be a library director and how to manage office politics.
Technical Services Management


This brief volume gives details on the specific areas within the purview of the technical services manager. Summaries and lists of suggested readings are included in each chapter. This book is also helpful in keeping experienced managers on track with the issues they should be handling.


This book may be geared to new supervisors, but it can be extremely helpful to experienced managers. A chapter is devoted to each of the key management responsibilities: planning, personnel management, art of management, communication and time management. Each chapter has a group of individual management activities related to the key responsibility. Each section is written by a tech services librarian. There is an overview of each activity and a list of steps for performing the activity. By considering each one of these steps, a manager is assured that he/she has approached the activity in an effective manner. There is also a bibliography of further readings at the end of each activity section. I find myself referring to this book often to make sure I have covered all the steps to successfully perform each management activity.


Since technical services is constantly changing due to new technology, retirement, change in staffing or the economic climate, reorganization and redesign is a constant activity for the technical services manager. These two volumes give an overview of the changes going on and how to deal with them. There are case studies from all types and sizes of technical services departments relating how change and reorganization were accomplished in their libraries. Included among the case studies are those of two law libraries, written by Andrea Rabbia, in the first volume, and Karen Nuckolls in the second volume. Of particular interest is a chapter in the first volume on how to use workflow analysis as a basis for reorganization. There is something of value in every chapter of both books. There is a literature search on the subject of library reorganization in the first volume, as well as references at the end of each chapter for further information.