From the Editor

Technical Services Librarians Rewarded for Answering the Call to Service: Whited, Striman, and Nicholson

This year’s Annual Meeting in Denver marks a new era of recognition for the outstanding work of the technical services librarian.

The AALL Awards Committee has granted the 2010 Marian Gould Gallagher Distinguished Service Award to Marie E. Whited, currently cataloging liaison at the Law Library of Congress. Marie is well-known to technical services law librarians for her valuable contributions to our understanding of law cataloging and the intricacies of Library of Congress classification for law materials through workshops and programs she has presented, as well as the columns on classification she authored since 1994 in Technical Services Law Librarian (TSLL). As noted in the excellent article by AALL Awards Committee Chair Camille Broussard, “Marie Whited Honored with Marian Gould Gallagher Award: distinguished technical services librarian recognized for contributions to the profession,” AALL Spectrum 14, no. 8 (2010): 17 available at http://www.aallnet.org/products/pub_sp1006/pub_sp1006_Gallagher.pdf, “Whited’s significant and sustained contributions to law librarianship and to AALL exemplify the very essence of the Gallagher Award.” Marie’s influence on the law library community is broad as she “… has been and continues to be our voice in the development of national policies and procedures defining how law librarians arrange, describe, and give access to legal information.” As I viewed the list of previous Marian Gould Gallagher Distinguished Service Award winners at http://www.aallnet.org/about/award_mgg.asp#winner, primarily former law library directors, my thought was that Marie has shown us the “gold standard” of service to our profession. May many more technical services law librarians step up to the plate. Our congratulations, Marie!

Marie will have to save a place on “stage” for another technical services librarian who is receiving national recognition this year. Brian Striman is one of two inaugural recipients selected by the AALL Awards Committee to receive the newly-created AALL Volunteer Service Award for 2010. Brian, currently Head of Technical Services, Catalog Librarian and Professor of Law Library at the University of Nebraska—Lincoln, Schmid Law Library, is well known to technical
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This stretch of the year is always a time of transition. The temperature gets a little warmer, the grass gets a little greener. One school year’s activities are done while groundwork for the next year is already being laid. So it is with TS-SIS activities. While my year as chair is coming to a close, there still remains a lot to do, and much to look forward to. The main thing I am looking forward to these days is the AALL Annual Meeting in Denver.

As always, there will be many technical services events in Denver. Thanks to the great work of Martin Wisneski, you can look at the complete list of TS-SIS programs (including descriptions), meetings, and roundtables on the TS-SIS website at http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/annualmeeting/2010.

The first main event is the TS/OBS/RIPS/CS-SIS Joint Reception, generously sponsored again this year by Innovative Interfaces. It will be held Saturday evening at the Hyatt-Centennial Ballroom F before the Opening Event.

The Education Committee, chaired by Carol Avery Nicholson, has done another great job of putting together an excellent slate of programs:

Sunday, July 11

12:00-1:15 pm.  **TS-SIS Hot Topic Program:** “New Faces of Resource-Sharing - SkyRiver and USS, Just to Name Two!”
(CCC Room 109) [Description](#)

1:30-2:45 p.m.  **TS-SIS Program:** “What’s in a Name: CORE and I-2, New Standards to Improve Efficiency in the Electronic Resources Environment.”
(CCC Room 109) [Description](#)

3:00-4:00 p.m.  **B3:** “Open Source ILS: What a Service-Oriented System Brings to You and Your Library.”
(CCC Room 201-203) [Description](#)

4:15-5:15 p.m.  **C5:** “Catalogers Today: Skill Sets, Expectations and Challenges.”
(CCC Room 601-603) [Description](#)

Monday, July 12

8:45-9:45 a.m.  **D4:** “SKOS and HIVE: Enhancing the Creation, Design and Flow of Information.”
(CCC Room 205-207) [Description](#)

10:00-10:30 a.m.  **E5:** “Bringing Increased Efficiency to Technical Services: Is EOCR for You?”
(CCC Room 601-603) [Description](#)

10:45-11:45 a.m.  **TS-SIS Program:** “The Ever-Evolving World of Vendor-Supplied MARC Records.”
(Hyatt Capitol Ballroom 4) [Description](#)

Tuesday, July 13

9:00-10:30 a.m.  **H4:** “The Semantic Web and RDA: Making the Catalog a Networked Bibliographic Environment.”
(CCC Room 205-207) [Description](#)

10:45-11:30 a.m.  **I5:** “Charting New Roles for Technical Services: Faculty Publications and Institutional Repositories.”
(CCC Room 601-603) [Description](#)

2:15-3:15 p.m.  **TS-SIS Program:** “How Are We To Accomplish That Much More With That Much Less?”
(CCC Room 107) [Description](#)
I would also encourage you to participate in developing next year’s programming by attending the Education Committee meeting on Monday, July 12, from 12:00-1:15 p.m. The committee welcomes proposals on any technical services topic, so please start thinking now about what topics you would like to see covered in 2011.

The TS-SIS Awards Committee, chaired by Wendell Johnting, was able to offer educational grants to all who applied this year. Amanda Quist from the San Diego County Public Law Library was awarded a Marla Schwartz grant to cover registration costs for CONELL. Amanda also received a grant to assist with attending the Annual Meeting, as did Ajaye Bloomstone from Louisiana State University Law Center Library, Courtney Selby from the University of Tulsa Mabee Legal Information Center, and Caroline Young from Rutgers University (Newark) Law Library.

Hearty congratulations are in order for Carol Avery Nicholson, our 2010 Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award winner. Carol is Associate Director for Technical Services at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Her accomplishments are too extensive to list here, but they include exemplary leadership service at the highest levels of AALL, TS-SIS, and OBS-SIS, as well as numerous presentations and publications. I hope you will be able to join us at the TS-SIS annual business meeting on Sunday, July 11, where we will present Carol’s award.

It was also delightful to see Marie Whited, catalog liaison at the Law Library of Congress, will receive the Marian Gould Gallagher Distinguished Service Award. This award is AALL’s highest honor and recognizes extended and sustained service to law librarianship, exemplary service to the Association, or contributions to the professional literature. It is especially gratifying to see someone who has done so much for TS-SIS recognized by the entire association.

Coming back to the theme of transitions, there will be some new faces on the Executive Board next year. Linda Tesar will be completing her term as past chair after three years of exceptional service and will be working for TS-SIS in other areas. Wendy Moore and Betty Roeske will also be finishing up their two years of outstanding contributions as secretary/treasurer and member-at-large respectively. Ajaye Bloomstone will rotate off as the chair of the Acquisitions Standing Committee but will jump right back into the fire as the Education Committee chair. They all deserve our deepest thanks for their dedication to TS-SIS.

Coming aboard will be Ismael Gullon as vice chair/chair elect, Elaine Bradshaw as secretary/treasurer, Suzanne R. Graham as member-at-large, and Eric Parker as chair of the Acquisitions Standing Committee. They will join the very able continuing board members Pam Deemer (chair of TS-SIS in 2010/2011), Katrina Piechnik (member-at-large), Marilyn Estes (Preservation Standing Committee chair), George Prager (Cataloging and Classification Standing Committee chair), and Shyama Agrawal (Serials Standing Committee chair). I know they can count on the support of the entire TS-SIS membership as they assume their leadership roles.

Special thanks also to everyone who served on a committee, a working group, or even just filled out a survey or gave your opinion when asked. I hope you know that your contributions mattered.

On a closing note, I cannot express enough how grateful I am to have had such a great Executive Board with which to work this year. One thing I learned early on is that TS-SIS is too big and too active for one person to keep a handle on it all. Pam, Linda, Wendy, Betty, Katrina, Shyama, George, Marilyn, and Ajaye have given me great advice and have helped me keep the wheels on the track in a year when we faced difficulty and uncertainty. At the risk of sounding like a cliche, it truly has been a wonderful learning experience, often humbling, always challenging, and I am honored to have been entrusted with this job.

I hope you all have a great summer and I look forward to seeing you in Denver!

Chris Long
Indiana University School of Law-Indianapolis

Alphabet Soup Reception

Please join the four SIS’s (TS/OBS/RIPS/CS-SIS) at their Joint Reception sponsored by Innovative Interfaces, Inc. from 7:00-8:00 p.m., Saturday, July 10, at the Hyatt-Centennial Ballroom F in Denver, Colorado.
Dear Colleagues,

This is my last column as OBS Chair. I thought I’d look forward to it: no more effort to wrestle a column out at the last minute (I work best under tight deadlines), no more rewriting and rewriting to make it thoughtful, perceptive and encouraging, no more searching for a topic everyone would be interested in (as if there were such a thing). After my previous column, I planned to get a head start on this one, outlining an upbeat column on our upcoming conference in Denver and really getting everyone excited about the topics and developments for this year. Well, this isn’t that column. Not that there aren’t exciting programs this summer—I’m still amazed at the number of OBS programs the Education Committee put together and hope as many of you as possible can attend them. They really are on the cutting edge of technology for libraries, and just thinking about them makes me ready for Library 3.0 with web computing, the semantic web, etc. Even RDA has implications far beyond the cataloging record. New library developments appear every day and library applications of social networking software and portable gadgets are astonishing. I’m running so fast to try to catch up that I’m dizzy.

And then … my father died in April, after a surprisingly short illness. He became incapacitated in early March, and I went home to help my mother fill out all the forms for personal home care, VA benefits, and Medicaid, and to visit hospice facilities. Six weeks later he died. I had just become used to him needing so much help, and then to his hospitalization. The day I got home from visiting him was the day he died. It was so sudden—and so difficult and frustrating—all that paperwork I had finally finished and submitted, after spending hours collecting information and completing the endless list of forms—five different sections for the VA benefits form, multiple pages for Medicaid, even a long contract at the hospice (which we never even used). As usual in government bureaucracy, no one talks to anyone else, so each form required almost exactly the same information, in a slightly different form, sent to a slightly different address. Of course, we librarians know that automating this process would have been so much more efficient and reliable. It would have been so easy to select the information each department wanted and just add it to an online form. No worrying about the carbons all being legible (and when is the last time YOU ever used a carbon form?), no problems with miscopying an account number, no questions about how much postage every envelope required. And, possibly, it wouldn’t take six to eight months for the various departments to process all this information. I felt so worn out when the forms were done.

This process gave me a new perspective on librarianship, particularly technical and online services librarianship. We have the software to collect this kind of information in our authority records, and the new RDA authority structure will allow us to add even more information, such as an author’s gender, field of work, address—many different pieces of information collected together to describe a person and allow us to more confidently use these records for our cataloging. We can exchange data easily with the MARC standard communication format, and the Z39.50 process allows almost instantaneous record transfer. Cloud computing may allow us to link nearly all the fields in a cataloging/metadata record and have standardization of publisher names, places of publication, and dates available to catalogers at the click of a mouse. We have many different ILSs that take standard data and display it (more or less) as each individual library (or user group) decides it needs, and the systems are becoming better and better at translating coded data bytes into useful information for users. With the open source modules being developed, we are not locked into vendor-determined displays or fields, but can add and move fields as we see fit. Certainly no one need fill out more than one online form per system!

I also realized how librarians must work with each other to share innovations and solutions to daily problems. I would have loved to have an experienced person helping me with all those forms. Even though some departments and bureaus have a help line, I never got an answer and sometimes I waited for 30 minutes. Online chat—ha! I longed for instant communication—I can’t remember the last time I have had to leave a telephone message for one of my colleagues, even if she was in Hawaii and I was in Chicago. It made me appreciate all over again how advanced libraries and librarians are. We may not be the cutting edge high-tech businesses, but we are certainly taking more advantage of technology advances than many others. Have a problem setting up an import program? Email your OBS colleagues and ask what they did. Someone will answer surprisingly quickly and give you the information you need to make your problem go away. Did your library just join Facebook and you want to know what the heck you’re supposed to do on it? Check with some colleagues with library Facebook accounts see what they are doing—better yet, check the OBS Facebook page. Have a super idea for using
Twitter to assist students with legal research? Tell everyone about it on the OBS discussion list. Just overwhelmed with all the new technology and what to do with it? Attend AALL or buy the recordings of the programs and find out what the latest and greatest is this year. AALL even has some podcasts and program videos. Don’t forget to read TSLL either. And if you attend or listen to a program, or see some great handouts and want more information, just ask. There apparently is no “on hold” button for library information.

Well, this is turning into an uplifting column after all. Turning to happier subjects, I’d like to announce the results of this year’s election. Please join me in congratulating Betty Roeske, vice chair/chair-elect and Karen Nuckolls, member-at-large. Thanks to them and thanks to all who voted in our election and made such fine selections.

I want to conclude by thanking all the OBS Board members and committee members and chairs. You did such a great job and I appreciate all your help and advice, especially you, Mike (I told you I’d put you on speed dial). Board members Michael Maben (past-chair), Kathy Faust (vice chair/chair-elect), Karen Selden (secretary/ treasurer) and members-at-large, Elaine Bradshaw and Keiko Okuhara. Committee chairs: Local Systems Committee, Caitlin Robinson; Nominating Committee, Andrea Rabbia; OBS/TS Joint Research Grant Committee, Hollie White; OCLC Committee, Ming Lu; OBS TSLL Editorial Board Representatives, Ellen McGrath and Janet Hedin; and Web Advisory Chair and Webmaster, F. Tim Knight. I appreciate all the time and effort you have given OBS and me this year. I’d also like to thank all the committee members for their hard work and willingness to volunteer hours of their time for the betterment of OBS and the profession. Special thanks to TSLL editor Virginia Bryant for answering questions, notifying me of deadlines and keeping me on track with the TSLL reporting I was supposed to do; extra special thanks for allowing me to push deadlines to the utmost and, in this case, miss them. Truly, I could not have done much without all these people helping me. Finally I’d also like to thank our sister SIS’s chair, TS-SIS Chair Chris Long. Chris was a pleasure to work with and helped me schedule our programs and events to minimize conflict at the Denver AALL conference this summer. Lastly, please make a note that the OBS Business Meeting will be Monday, July 12 from 5:30 to 6:30 p.m. Please come, hear all the reports of our committees and some plans for next year. See you in Denver!

Pat Sayre-McCoy
D’Angelo Law Library, University of Chicago

Knowing Your Platform/Database

Trina Robinson
George Washington University Law Library

“The great migration” is the reference that came to mind when I started thinking about publishers and complications associated with them. It seemed, for years, we as acquisitions people were sorting out who bought whom and who now owned what, during what resembled a great migration of small publishers (and a few not so small) to a few mega publishers. That great migration seems to have slowed, or at least that appears to be the case, since our focus is now shifting to platforms and packages.

There are more players in this arena, some more successful than others. Success, of course, can be measured in many ways, for example, the number of sales of the product, or how happy users are with the product. But in this article I dare to measure success in a different way: how familiar the people behind the product know the product they are selling and supporting.

This method of measurement of success was brought home to me recently when one of our librarians tried to locate a resource in one of the collections to which we subscribe. When he couldn’t locate the title, he called customer support. He was directed to click on several tabs before he was finally told that if the title wasn’t there, then it required a separate subscription and we didn’t have one. This last piece of information is what led to my role in the problem-solving. The librarian brought me a printed book with a “Current edition available online” label attached. For me, this was clear evidence that this title was indeed in a database to which we subscribed. We needed to find out which database, and if the subscription was still active. As I walked back to my office, book in hand, I decided to take a look at the payment record for the database subscription that my librarian had called about, to see if I could locate the title, even though the person answering the phone couldn’t. It seemed to me that the title had to be there, because there is actually a library within the subscription with a similar name. Ultimately, after scrolling down just a little further on the page that shows our subscription content, we located the library with our subject matter. The title was in that library and we did subscribe.
I am willing to venture a guess that this is not by any means an isolated incident. Of course, there is the learning curve and, with complex relationships among libraries, users, vendors, publishers, parent companies and mega publishers in the legal arena, it can get complicated. Even with that understanding, the least we ought to be able to count on from the people who sell and support these products is their knowledge of where to find them. Sometimes within these large “parent companies” it is difficult for the children (smaller publishers) to know everything about their brothers and sisters (other smaller publishers), but I think that they at least should know who they are and have better ideas about how to find their products.

The “a la carte” option makes it much easier for libraries of varying sizes and varying budgets to subscribe to large packages, but customer support needs to be comfortable with the entire menu. This should be only the minimum expectation of libraries purchasing these databases, or portions thereof, and the measure of success should go up from there. “How well do you know your product?” is a question we as librarians need to ask more often. And instead of just speaking to those who sell a product, we should probably start speaking to those who support it as well, before making our final purchasing decision.

You all may have noticed that the United States Reports has a call number of KF101.A212. Normally, one cutters by the primary access point unless the classification schedule specifies some other means of sub-arrangement. There was a list of “.A” cutters for KF101 that was used by the old Law Shelflisting Unit of the Library of Congress Subject Cataloging Division. This list might have been published in Cataloging Service Bulletin or distributed at one of the early law classification conferences. The list in Piper and Kwan A Manual on KF, page 109, has a similar list but uses decimals rather than cutters. The “.A” cutters are

- .A19 date … the separate editions of the nominative reports
- .A2 … for the United States reports
- .A31 … for United States reports, Lawyers’ edition
- .A32 … for Supreme Court reporter
- .A4 with a second cutter … for editor for abridged and defunct editions

If you look in LC’s database, you will see that the numbers KF101.A31 through KF101.A32 were expanded to achieve a chronological arrangement of editions followed by their finding aids.

The newer court reports classed in KF101 are cuttered by main entry. I would suggest that law libraries follow the old “.A” cutters for editions and continuations of the United States Reports, Supreme Court Reporter, and United States Supreme Court reports (Lawyers’ edition).

Early on, the classifiers at the Library of Congress realized that they had to come up with an arrangement for state court reports in order for this material to be shelved chronologically and also by the importance of the publication. The view was that the official state publication of court reports always came before the unofficial versions. A sub-arrangement of cutter numbers was developed. As the named reports were classed, the cutters and titles were added to the schedules. If you look at the KFA-KFZ court report sections, you will see lists of cutters and titles. The “.A” cutter lists for the state courts were published in LC Classification – Additions and Changes. There was a note that indicated that the following general subdivisions were to be used unless otherwise specified. Sometimes the .A4 instructions indicated “By editor” and sometimes not.

- .A19 date … Original editions of nominative reports, preceding official series. By first year of period covered
- .A2-29 … Official series
- .A3-39 … Unofficial series
- .A4A-Z … Defunct publications. Abridged and selected reports

Law catalogers at LC based the cutters in the list of state court reports in Price and Bitner, Effective Legal Research, 1953 edition, p. 387ff. and on the Law Library collection in the 1960’s and 1970’s. The lists were maintained until 1989; after that the cutters and titles were added to the list only if the work was classed by a cataloger who knew about the list. I doubt if today’s law catalogers are adding to the list. Most are probably just cuttering by primary access point.
Upon examining some of the state numbers I did find some problems with the cutter numbers:

- Under KFA45.A19+, there is the list of nominative reporters. However, the cutters for the defunct publications are .S4 and .S5 rather than the .A4S4 and .A4S5 that the span “.A4A-Z Defunct publications. By editor” would indicate. I have submitted a proposal to add the “.A4.”
- “KFA3645.A4 Defunct publications” is missing the A-Z span but the two publications mentioned use .A4 plus a second cutter.

These examples may be a Classification Web problem, or inconsistencies in the establishment of these cutters.

The arrangement that was published in LC Classification – Additions and Changes has not been included in Classification Web as a table. It is implicit in the list of state court reports but not really spelled out. I wonder how many catalogers have noticed the “A” cutters have an arrangement in the state pages. As I indicated earlier, there are inconsistencies in the use of the table in various states. You would have to look at three or more states to understand the arrangement of the state court reports. If some state were to publish a new court report that was not a continuation, you would put it in KFA-KFZ 45-51. Then you would decide between a cutter in the range of “.A2-29” for official or “.A3-39” for unofficial. I am not sure that catalogers would do this and suspect they would just cutter for primary access point.

Should these lists be maintained or not? Should they just be maintained for sets from before 2000, their reprints and editions? This depends on your perspective. Most users now look for court decisions online. Have law libraries cancelled print court reports in favor of Westlaw or Lexis? Does your library want to maintain court report sets? The chronological order of print court reports is more helpful for the older decisions. Will current paper court report sets become older decisions? Do you plan to use classification numbers for Internet resources at some point? I do know that researchers using the court reports at Yale Law were upset when they discovered that the materials were “out of order” and did not like a 1900 set shelved after a 1930 set. Here in the Law Library of Congress, we still have many older state court reports that are not cataloged or classed. Since our closed stacks are used by lawyers employed by the Library, we would probably want the earlier reports to fit in the right chronological section of the state court reports stacks. If you are in a smaller library, you might not want to bother with such a detailed arrangement. You have to use the classification schedules in a way that makes sense for your law library both in the short and long term.

---

**TS-SIS Educational Grants for 2010**

Congratulations to the following recipients awarded TS-SIS Educational Grants for the AALL 2010 Annual Meeting in Denver, Colorado.

Amanda Quist is the fourth recipient of the TS-SIS Marla Schwartz Grant to support her attendance at CONELL (Conference of Newer Law Librarians). In addition, Amanda was awarded an AALL Program Registration Grant. Amanda is Acquisitions Librarian at the San Diego County Public Law Library.

Three additional members were granted AALL Program Registration Grants by the 2009/2010 TS-SIS Awards Committee. Congratulations go to Ajaye Bloomstone, Acquisitions Librarian at Louisiana State University Law Center Library; Courtney Selby, Collection Development/Instructional Services Law Librarian at University of Tulsa Mabee Legal Information Center; and Caroline Young, Reference and Technology Librarian at Rutgers University (Newark) Law Library.

Awards Committee Members:

- Wendell Johnting
  Chair, TS-SIS Awards Committee
  Assistant Director for Technical Services
  Indiana University School of Law—Indianapolis, Ruth Lilly Law Library

- Linda M. Sobey
  Associate Director for Technical Services
  Florida A&M University, College of Law Library

- Gwen Gregory
  Associate Director for Access and Organization
  John Marshall Law School (Chicago, IL)
For the past fifteen months, the academic law library in which I work has been engaged in a comprehensive collection review with a focus on continuations. Fifteen months is an awfully long time; it is approximately the gestation period of a rhinoceros.¹ And in truth, it has felt a little like carrying and then giving birth to a rhinoceros—an angry one with a fully formed horn.

Actually, it hasn’t been that bad at all. In fact, it has been instructive in so many ways that I am grateful for the opportunity to have undertaken such a process collaboratively with the wonderful group of librarians that are my colleagues here at the University of Tulsa. In December of last year, I wrote about our adventures in periodical evaluation and the resulting cancellation of approximately 2/3 of our print legal periodical titles. We are, of course, still engaged in an open-ended evaluation of our cuts and the impact they have had and will have on those we serve. And while the periodicals project alone was a mammoth undertaking, most of the work on it was completed within the first eight months of our review.

The serials review we have undertaken has been a somewhat more onerous task, involving the title-by-title review of over 550 different serial publications in our collection. It is really this individual review that has been the most labor intensive, and it is my sincerest hope that some portion of what I share about our experiences will be useful to you in your own review of your serial collections. I should begin by noting that our review was shaped in part by a public access Westlaw agreement we entered into with West a few years earlier to provide access to a select slice of Westlaw to all of our library users, separate and apart from the academic password access enjoyed by our faculty and students. The public access agreement, like many of West’s library maintenance agreements, ties significantly reduced prices on select print titles to our continued purchase of the public access Westlaw subscription. Under the agreement, cancellation of any of the “Westpacked” print titles would result in the loss of the discounts we receive on a number of other print West serial titles. Thus, we began our review by deciding to postpone individual review of the print serial titles currently covered by the agreement.

With a vast number of our subscribed West serial publications off the table for the moment, we set about examining every other serial publication in the collection one-by-one as we received regular updates for each title. We collected as much information as we felt we would need on each title, including the approximate annual supplementation charges, number of supplements per year, online availability in our existing electronic resources, routing or check-out to faculty or administration, circulation data, and reviews of the publications. In gathering much of this information, I am heavily indebted to Ken Svengalis’s excellent resource, the Legal Information Buyer’s Guide & Reference Manual.² I have seriously considered creating bracelets that say WWKSD (What would Ken Svengalis do?) for all the members of our review committee!

We decided early on in the process that we would use our library mission statement as the guiding principle behind the decisions we made in keeping or cancelling each resource. As a private law school library with a limited patron base beyond students and faculty, we felt that our most critical duty was to preserve a core collection that reflected the depth and breadth of our curriculum and faculty scholarship. We were also careful to minimize duplication of resources in various formats whenever possible. With a few notable exceptions, we cancelled print subscriptions to titles provided in electronic databases to which we were already subscribed.³ Of the titles we retained in duplicate format, the most common reason for maintenance of the print was the degree to which the print was more user-friendly than the electronic version. A word of warning is appropriate here with respect to this particular strategy. Be aware that some print titles may be tied to the subscription price your library pays for the electronic version of the title. Make sure you enquire with the publisher regarding the ways in which print cancellations could ultimately impact what you pay for electronic access to the same resources.

Another substantial consideration in our cancellation decisions was the target audience of the resource. Treatises geared toward highly specialized attorney practitioners were much less likely to fall into the “keep” category than were treatises that featured applications for academic work as well as law practice. Of course, the subject matter of the treatise was also a critical element of our review, and we gave strong preference to materials that dealt with areas of the law in which the University of Tulsa has a strong curriculum, certificate program⁴ or clinical program. We took this opportunity to scrutinize the scope of our collection development in some subject areas as well. With respect to our International and Native and...
Indigenous Peoples collections, we crafted priority statements detailing what types of materials should be considered critical to our collections, what areas of study were beneficial, though not imperative, and which subject matters, formats or items could be considered lower priority. Not only did these priority statements help us make decisions about cancellations, they also assisted us in moving forward with our continued collection development decisions in new purchases of monographs and other resource materials.

One particularly revealing method of soliciting feedback on our choices for cancellation was a process we devised for physically “wrapping” the titles slated for cancellation with notes indicating that we were considering ceasing updating them. We then left plenty of writing room for comments and requested that users who wished for us to keep updating the material leave us a note on the wrapper. Each wrapper was then checked 6 months after it had been placed on the volumes. I expected that we would receive a number of requests to maintain materials, and I presumed that most of these requests would come from our faculty. Instead, we received only a single comment on a single publication during the entire 15-month process. Interestingly enough, that comment was just a note to let us know that a section of the loose-leaf was missing. In many ways, this total absence of feedback eased my mind about our cancellations. Perhaps it indicates that we are making appropriate selections and that the resources slated for discontinuation were in fact those getting the least use in our collection. Only time and continued attention to patterns of use in our facility will tell.

Ultimately, it is that continued attention, evaluation and critical scrutiny that we rely on to determine the effectiveness of projects of this magnitude. Have we begun to decrease our expenditures in serials? Absolutely. Of the titles we have reviewed to date, we have cancelled precisely 299 items. I suppose that if you stacked up all those titles and weighed them, they might weigh just about as much as a baby rhinoceros. And as complicated, difficult and downright painful as this process has been at times, I am genuinely proud of the work we have done and the things we have learned. This kind of critical review of the library collection is an ongoing process, and every step of the process provides another opportunity to re-evaluate who we are as an institution and the purpose we serve for our users. This is but one stretch of a much longer journey, and I promise to keep you posted.

3 By way of example, we made the decision to continue a print subscription to Nimmer on Copyright, regardless of its presence in our electronic resources repository. Based on feedback from our faculty, it became clear that this was one of several titles that were simply more user-friendly in print than online.
4 The number of certificate programs offered by the College of Law actually changed during the course of this project, and our committee did return some titles to our “keep” list to reconsider mid-stream.

**Description & Entry**

**Robert Bratton**
George Washington University Law Library

**AACR2 to RDA: a presentation with copious examples**
In his presentation to the British Columbia Library Association Conference, Adam L. Schiff (Principal Cataloger, University of Washington Libraries) elucidates the changes from AACR2 to RDA (Resource Description and Access). He gives many helpful examples of how the bibliographic records created according to RDA will differ from those created according to AACR2. For the presentation in PDF see http://eprints.relis.org/18328/1/BCLAPresentation_20100427.pdf. For the presentation with additional notes in Power Point see http://www.rda-jsc.org/docs/BCLAPresentation.ppt.

**AACR2 to RDA: yet another presentation**
Barbara Tillett, chief of the Policy and Standards Division, Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate at the Library of Congress, gave a webcast with a brief overview of the changed instructions for cataloging textual materials according
to *RDA*. The presentation is available at [http://www.loc.gov/today/cyberlc/feature_wdesc.php?rec=4863](http://www.loc.gov/today/cyberlc/feature_wdesc.php?rec=4863), lasts 41 minutes and is followed by a 35 minute question and answer session.

**LC’s website for *RDA* testing**

LC’s website at [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/psd/RDAtest/rdatest.html](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/psd/RDAtest/rdatest.html) notes “The Library of Congress will post here files of policy decisions, training materials, etc., developed for its participants in the U.S. *RDA* Test … Note that these files represent decisions just for the *RDA* Test. If the Library of Congress decides to implement *RDA*, some of the decisions may be changed as the result of feedback from the Test.”

**RDA Online becomes *RDA* Toolkit, adds a discussion list, and is open for free trial sign-ups**

A change in name and URL with content promised in June, 2010 is available at [http://www.rdatoolkit.org/](http://www.rdatoolkit.org/).

The *Toolkit* also has a new discussion list available at [http://www.rdatoolkit.org/rdalist](http://www.rdatoolkit.org/rdalist).

There will be free access to the *RDA Toolkit* beginning on the mid-June 2010 launch date and ending on August 31, 2010. You can sign up by clicking on the “Sign up now” link at [http://www.rdatoolkit.org/openaccess](http://www.rdatoolkit.org/openaccess).

**MARC 21 updates**

Update no. 11 was made available on the MARC website in February, 2010 and it is integrated into the MARC documentation for Bibliographic and Authority formats. The update includes changes resulting from proposals which were considered by the ALA ALCTS/LITA/RUSA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI), the Canadian Committee on MARC (CCM), and the BIC Bibliographic Standards Group in January 2010. Many of the changes have been made to accommodate *RDA*. For specific changes see [http://www.loc.gov/marc/status.htm](http://www.loc.gov/marc/status.htm).

**OCLC WorldCat record use policy draft open for comment**

The latest OCLC WorldCat record use policy is available at [http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/catalog/policy/](http://www.oclc.org/worldcat/catalog/policy/). The deadline for comments was May 31, 2010.

**BIBCO Standard Record drafts and an update**

The PCC Standing Committee on Standards (SCS) issued seven draft BIBCO Standard Record metadata application profiles (MAPs) for review and comment. These drafts are for: electronic resources, rare books, sound recordings, cartographic materials, graphic materials, notated music, and visual materials. The deadline for comments (May 8, 2010) has passed. Links to each draft are available from the BIBCO web site at [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/bibco.htm](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/bibco/bibco.htm).

BIBCO has also issued recommended updates to the BIBCO Standard Record for Printed Books.

008/39: Expand instruction to: Cataloging source “c” (or “blank” if cataloged by a national library)
007 field: Add this field to cover microforms. Includes 00 and 01 as Mandatory if Applicable
020 field: Change instruction to: International Standard Book Number ISBN $a. This states the required subfield “$a” rather than the not-required subfield $c
245 field: Expand instruction to add: In cases of multiple parallel titles, minimally include the first parallel title and any English parallel title
246 field: Change instructions on indicators to replace “246 13” with “246 1#”
260 field: Use is changed to Mandatory if Applicable for $a and $b; $c remains as Mandatory. (This allows for manuscripts as they may only have $c)

**New draft of ISBD open for comment**


**PCC guidelines for punctuation associated with newly implemented subfields**

While not a new branch of librarianship, the Technology Resource Liaison is certainly a new way of serving the patron (whether faculty, student, or otherwise), which is currently seeing explosive growth across the country. It is in direct response to a need expressed by patrons, especially faculty, to keep up with (and choose from) a constant avalanche of new technologies and applications put out there and offered online either for free or for profit. Some are designed to be downloads to your PC, others are created as websites where users register in order to have their own “pages,” or at the very least create their own secure content. There are many different incarnations and numerous apps out there created for almost every purpose imaginable, but it is increasingly difficult to separate the wheat from the chaff, or to determine what would be most beneficial for your particular library or even for an individual patron. Also, faculty tends to be limited by time constraints. In most cases, they simply don’t have the free hours needed to download and try out every new app out there, just based on its functionality or the hype surrounding it.

This is where we as librarians come in. As technology specialists and/or faculty liaisons, we have a golden opportunity here to increase our visibility and the visibility of the library as a whole, ensuring its role as a vital part of the law school and its success.

With this in mind, let’s say your library (meaning, in fact, your library director, in conjunction with the law school dean, the technology department, and faculty members, as represented by a faculty board or a liaison committee) is in favor of the idea of having a Technology Information Resource team for the school. And let’s say you or a group of you are charged with the task of creating and setting up this Technology Resource Information Group (being very pleased, of course, that you thought of such a clever name with such a clever acronym – TRIG). The first question to ask is how will it be organized? What do you want your group to look like, and how will the group interact with end-users? Do you want it to be a passive resource, where faculty can contact members if they are looking for specific solutions or appropriate applications which can address a specific need? Or do you want your group to be proactive, whereby your members reach out to faculty and patrons (they are liaisons, after all) and offer their services through direct contact, presentations, technology demonstrations, etc.? I think the second approach is best at the outset, certainly. You are trying to gain as much visibility as possible to promote your services and highlight your value. Later on, it’s possible to step back a little, as long as you do occasional activities to keep your services in the public eye and keep your group on everyone’s radar.

After this, you will have to hone in on the nuts and bolts of what the group is all about, i.e., the services you will provide. This is the technology itself, and the information regarding how to get it and how to use it. In formulating your information “database” – in other words, a list of the apps available and the services you will provide – the first task (both for purposes of organization, and in order to determine who will be the go-to person for each specialty) is to divide user needs into categories. This is what we came up with at our school:

1. Social media
2. Bookmarking utilities (related to social media)
3. Information and/or bibliographic resources
4. Organizing resources
5. Teaching resources
6. Miscellaneous resources

This covers most of what is out there, and in fact quite a few of today’s apps (open source and otherwise) have multiple functionalities which will cause them to overlap and cross over between categories. What follows is an incomplete list of the apps which we are considering making available as part of our Technology Resource Information Plan (TRIP!). We are approaching this initiative with the idea that we (as a team of four librarians) are a knowledge base for our users. We provide the expertise which others may not always have, as well as the training which they will need. We need to have this knowledge base for each application we choose to draw into our “stable” of apps. With that in mind, here is our potential list:


3. **Information and/or bibliographic resources**: The Internet Archive (http://www.archive.org), WorldCat (http://www.worldcat.org).


5. **Teaching resources**: CALI (Computer-Assisted Legal Instruction) (http://www.cali.org), lesson plans for legal instruction; iClicker (http://www.iclicker.com), an audience response system allows students to instantly provide feedback and answer questions posed by their instructors. Used at many higher education institutions, school districts, corporations, and government entities to enhance the experience of their students or audience.

6. **Miscellaneous resources**: Microsoft Office Live (http://www.officelive.com), website hosting; Flickr (http://www.flickr.com), photo sharing; Aviary (http://www.aviary.com), a website supporting the creation of media for artists of all types; Go To My PC (http://www.gotomypc.com), does just what it says, allowing you to access your PC and desktop from anywhere and any computer, no matter how far away; Google Docs (http://docs.google.com), access your documents online from any location; Slideshare (http://www.slideshare.net), offers users the ability to upload and share (publicly or privately) PowerPoint presentations, Word documents and Adobe PDF Portfolios.

This is by no means a comprehensive list, but it does give us a good palette to offer users when they seek help. A few notes on some of these applications:

- Twitter and Facebook are both popular social media sites which tend to be alter egos of each other. They’ve been described to death, so I won’t go into them in detail here, but in a nutshell Twitter is short and to the point (with a focus on portability), whereas Facebook is all about information and how much of it you can post to your page. Unless privacy is specifically chosen, all of your conversations with all of your friends can be seen and read, well, by all of your friends. Ideally, this creates a community of sorts, especially if your friends also befriend each other. In addition, you can add almost any media to your postings. Most law schools today feature both, though everyone will have a favorite. I like Facebook, but I have a hard time seeing the value in Twitter. On the other hand, plenty of students, faculty, and some librarians I know can’t imagine life without it. It will be to your detriment to pick one over the other to market to your users.

- LinkedIn is, to me, the most valuable social media site for law schools and law students. Not only is it already extremely popular in the legal field (especially with law firms), but it can be an invaluable tool for finding a job and making contacts. This site is all about career networking, putting your information out there, getting to know people in your field, advertising yourself to prospective employers. It is a vital tool for law students as they approach graduation, but it will continue to have value throughout their careers. Check it out.

- It should also be noted that all your social media apps can be linked together through a meta-application called Meebo. Meebo integrates all social network and communication channels into a single, simple-to-use interface. Users can share content and communicate in real time with each other. Meebo does this by integrating all the social media apps together. You can chat with your buddies on every major instant messaging (IM) network in a single buddylist. You can also add a convenient “meebo bar” with all your social media app icons lined up next to each other. We already use Meebo on our law school library website and it works very well, both in terms of convenience and in visual appearance.

- Bookmarking is closely related to social media, but it approaches the concept from a different angle. Users here can share anything web-related through bookmarks online, share them with other people, and see what other people are bookmarking. You can also view the most popular bookmarks being saved at the current moment. This is a great way to learn about new websites and information resources which can benefit your school. I leave it to the reader to explore these sites further. It is worth taking the time to do.

- Most librarians already know at least a few aspects of WorldCat. This is a great example of a crossover application. Besides its searching capability, it has a “Users who read this book also read ...” feature, a user list feature, a reviews feature, an ILL utility (through First Search), a bibliography feature, and of course a cataloging feature through OCLC. In addition, users can now add WorldCat to their mobile phones, for searching on the go!

- The Internet Archive is a vast electronic shared information database which I previously featured in this column. It is well worth taking the time to peruse, and will reward the user greatly. Do Not Miss!

- Zotero may be my favorite resource of all. It is free and includes a “free, easy-to-use Firefox extension to help you collect, manage, cite, and share your research sources.” You can upload research to this site with one click of a button. On top of that, it will automatically cite and create a bibliography in any format you want. In addition,
there are great resources here to help you organize your research and then store it in your own library on the web for future use. And this is only scratching the surface.

- Whereas Zotero helps you organize research, iGoogle helps you organize your life. It is completely customizable, from images to calendars to website links to horoscopes and even games. You can even upload and edit your documents on the site (linking to Google Docs). I use it and recommend it, but everyone is different, so see what you think.
- CiteGenie “copies text with correct citations from Westlaw, Lexis, and other websites.” A must for law students.

I leave it to the reader to look through the rest of the examples in the Teaching resources and Miscellaneous resources categories. There are many great resources here which can enhance the student, faculty, and law librarian experience, and this is probably a great deal less than half of what is out there. Explore, see what else you can find, or delve into the mysteries of some of those apps I listed. Just make sure you and your cohorts become experts and aficionados of the applications you plan to market, so that you can properly assist and train those who come to you for help. The Technology Resource Information Group and its accompanying plan are quickly becoming a vital part of the modern academic law library, and can greatly enhance and increase your library and law school’s reputation and visibility in the greater academic community. Don’t wait to create!

**Repurposing Technical Services Staff:**

**the Inter-Departmental Library Working Group**

Karen B. Douglas  
Goodson Law Library,  
Duke Law School

With more electronic resources replacing print, many of the check-in jobs in technical services have disappeared or become greatly reduced. Books that were previously cataloged and processed in-house are now arriving at the library shelf-ready. Many schools have eliminated or greatly curtailed binding. It is becoming more difficult to keep technical services staff occupied for a full eight hours a day. At the same time, there can be jobs that need to be done within the library that don’t fit neatly into one department. Components of these jobs require input from several library departments. Working Groups were created by the administrators at Duke Law Library to address these issues. The groups also give staff the opportunity to perform duties outside the realm of their daily chores that help advance the library’s mission. Staff members performing technical services functions are represented in all of the working groups. They are given an opportunity to use their technical services skills in new ways to benefit the library.

**Collection Development Working Group**

The Collection Development Working Group is already in operation. It is responsible for establishing and regularly reviewing policies and procedures for selecting, acquiring and providing the best access to print and electronic resources for the law school. Its members include the Assistant Dean for Library Services, who chairs the group, all of the reference librarians, members of the acquisitions and cataloging staffs and a member of the Collection Services Department. Listed below are the charges and functions of the groups as described by the Assistant Dean for Library Services:

**Functions:**

- Organize information and establish guidelines to implement the collection development policy
- Establish procedures for testing and review of new electronic resources
- Development of criteria and principles for choice of format
- Determine best methods for access to print and electronic resources (catalog, holdings and other records practices)
- Collection organization planning and weeding projects
- Members of the working group meet regularly to review “green slips” for ordering material.

It is clear that technical services expertise is needed to perform most of the functions of this group. The acquisitions librarian provides a great deal of input on ordering decisions, testing, and review of electronic resources choice of format. Collection Services, which now includes serials control, plays an integral role in planning collection organization and weeding.
Scholarship Working Group

The Scholarship Working Group is responsible for collecting and providing access to the scholarly works of the Duke Law community. This includes maintaining our Faculty Scholarship Repository hosted by Bepress on Digital Commons. Members include the Assistant Dean of Library Services as chair, and staff from acquisitions and cataloging. Also included is a member of the Academic Technologies staff to provide technical support. This group will be convening and begin its work shortly.

Functions:

• Collection Development: work on projects to broaden the use and content of the Scholarship Repository; develop policies and document procedures
• Bibliographic information collection: coordinate collection and entry of bibliographic information for Recent scholarship and faculty bibliographies; gather information and publish annual bibliography of faculty publications
• Document collection and deposit: locate and download documents from appropriate sources; deposit and update documents to SSRN; deposit and update documents to our Scholarship Repository
• Metadata: assign keywords and choose subjects for entries; maintain author authority control; enhance exposure and retrieval
• Faculty book collection: track and order books with faculty contributions; maintain display of faculty scholarship book shelves with current materials

Document collection and deposit is performed by a technical service staff member. The cataloging department is responsible for creating metadata and maintaining authority control. Acquisitions tracks and orders books with faculty contributions. Technical services functions are a vital part of the Scholarship Working Group.

Rare Book, Special Collections and Archives Working Group

The final group is the Rare Book, Special Collections and Archives Working Group. Its members include reference librarians, a member of the Web Services Group in the Academic Technology department and a member of Collection Services who has archival training. This group is responsible for developing expertise and knowledge about defining, collecting, preserving, and promoting these collections and coordinating use and maintenance of the rare book room. This group will begin its work shortly.

Functions:

• Knowledge and expertise: develop knowledge and expertise about our current collections, including collection strengths. Develop knowledge regarding curatorship, and techniques for collecting, assessing and acquiring materials for these collections
• Promotion: Conduct outreach activities, create exhibits, instructional materials, research guides, etc.; identify digitization projects for promotional activities
• Collection development policies: Write collection development policies for rare books and archives materials; coordinate with Duke University Archives
• Rare book room management: Write a use policy, coordinate room reservations for meetings, etc., and monitor humidity and temperature control
• Law School projects: Develop and work on projects with other departments in the Law School regarding law school history and archives
• Proposed current projects: organize various law school photograph collections and suggest methods for preservation; collect and organize materials related to historical faculty for use in web page display.

This group involves preservation and archival responsibilities, both of which are considered technical services functions. Collecting, assessing and acquiring rare materials are acquisitions functions.

The working groups all contain functions which have been traditionally considered technical services functions. They present an opportunity for technical services staff to use skills they already possess for new and interesting projects. Membership in these groups will provide opportunities for staff to work collegially with members of other library departments. Communication between library departments should be improved and their procedures become more transparent. Working group members can broaden their horizons with different uses for old skills, and learn new skills as well. I’ll report back to evaluate these groups after they have been in operation for a while.
OBS-SIS OCLC Roundtable and Update
Sessions Announcement

The OBS-SIS OCLC Roundtable and Update sessions will be held during this year’s AALL Annual Conference in Denver. The Roundtable is scheduled from 5:30 to 6:30 p.m. on Sunday, July 11, and the Update is scheduled from 10:30 to 11:30 a.m. on Monday, July 12.

As usual, Glenn Patton, Director of OCLC’s WorldCat Quality Management Division, will give presentations at both sessions. At the Roundtable, Glenn will discuss Connexion Client (version 2.20/2.30), Identities and Identifiers, the Virtual International Authority File (VIAF), the International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI), the Open Researcher and Contributor ID (ORCID), and OCLC’s Terminologies Service. At the Update, he will focus on RDA and OCLC and on OCLC’s duplicate detection and resolution efforts. Questions and discussions will be welcome at both sessions. I hope to see many of you there.

Preservation

Sally Wambold
University of Richmond Law Library

Before presenting this column’s feature about the Chesapeake Project, I would like to encourage any TSLL readers to contact Celeste Smith at AALL (csmith@aall.org) if they would like to create a second preservation game with the Raptivity software that was used for the Jeopardy-like preservation game discussed in my earlier TSLL columns and now available at AALL2go. Alan Keely of Wake Forest cleverly suggested Wheel of Fortune as a sequel. Let the games begin!

My thanks go to Sarah Rhodes, Digital Collections Librarian at Georgetown Law Library, for the information on the Chesapeake Project study discussed in this column. She provided a direct link to the findings summary at http://legalinfoarchive.org/custompages/linkrot2010.php.

Just two obvious observations from me: This illustrates the enormous challenge of keeping links current and authentic. Even though this information is available elsewhere, it is highly valuable preservation data.

‘LINK ROT’ AND LEGAL RESOURCES ON THE WEB:
THE CHESAPEAKE PROJECT’S THIRD ANNUAL ANALYSIS FINDS THAT LINK ROT NEARLY DOUBLES PER YEAR, 1 in 3.5 TITLES NO LONGER ACCESSIBLE VIA ORIGINAL URLS IN 2010

The Chesapeake Project Legal Information Archive has released the results of its third annual analysis of “link rot” among the original URLs for law- and policy-related materials published to the Web and archived though the Chesapeake Project.

The Chesapeake Project was launched in 2007 by the Georgetown University Law Library and the State Law Libraries of Maryland and Virginia as a collaborative digital archive for the preservation of important Web-published legal materials, which often disappear as online content is reorganized or deleted over time.

The 2010 analysis reveals that nearly 28 percent of the online publications archived between March 2007 and March 2008 have now disappeared from their original locations on the Web but, due to the project’s preservation efforts, remain accessible via permanent archive URLs. This sample of online publications was first analyzed in 2008 and showed link rot to be present in 8.3 percent of the publications’ original URLs. One year later, in 2009, the same sample showed an increase in link rot to 14.3 percent.

During the three years that the URLs were studied, link rot increased from about one in every 12 archived titles in 2008, to one in every seven titles in 2009, and finally to about one in every 3.5 titles in 2010. These findings demonstrate a dramatic increase in link rot among archived Web content over time.
The analysis also explores the prevalence of link rot among top-level domains, showing content at state-government URLs (state.[state code].us) to be at a significant risk for link rot, compared to resources posted to government (.gov) and organization (.org) websites.

Having successfully completed its two-year pilot phase in 2009, the Chesapeake Project Legal Information Archive is expanding. A new law library (Harvard Law School) has recently joined the Chesapeake Project, and the Legal Information Preservation Alliance (LIPA) in March 2010 announced the formation of its Legal Information Archive, a collaborative digital preservation program for the law library community modeled after the Chesapeake Project. All LIPA-member libraries are invited to participate in the Legal Information Archive.

For more information, visit the LIPA website at http://www.aallnet.org/committee/lipa/ or the Chesapeake Project at http://legalinfoarchive.org/.

---

Private Law Libraries

Things of Interest to Those of Us in Private Law Libraries (and Elsewhere!)

Elizabeth Geesey Holmes
Partridge Snow & Hahn LLP

For this column, I thought I would share some things that I have read, seen or heard about that are of potential interest to those of us in private law libraries and beyond. I hope some of them will be new to you, and you will be inspired to check them out.

First, I recently read a terrific LLRX article entitled, “From the Law Firm Library Trenches: A Conversation Between Two Veterans,” by Karen Krupka and Elaine Billingslea available at http://www.llrx.com/features/lawfirmlibrarytrenches.htm. This article originally published in Legal Division Quarterly 17, nos. 1-2 (2009-2010):9, was posted on LLRX on April 12, 2010. It is a transcript of a conversation the authors, veteran firm librarians, had over lunch. They discuss what to look for when interviewing for a firm librarian position, but most of these tips are applicable to those of us already working in firms as well. It’s also a good overview of the variety of roles law firm librarians play.

Second, I highly recommend John Palfrey’s article in the latest Law Library Journal 102, no. 2 (2010):171 entitled “Cornerstones of Law Libraries for an Era of Digital-Plus.” He shares his vision for the future of legal information in what he calls the “digital-plus” era. I like this phrase as a way of describing this time in law libraries, when we are dealing with lots of information in digital form, but are also still very much managing print materials. At the same time, the study of law and legal research is branching out into other related disciplines. Whether one agrees with him or not, this article certainly makes one think about law libraries and their future direction. I was happy to read that he sees an essential role for technical services librarians in making metadata for digital resources work for users, and in building connections to traditional catalogs.

Third, for those of you with subscriptions to CCH materials online via their Intelliconnect platform, or for those of you considering a subscription, there were two reviews of Intelliconnect on blogs that I read regularly. Greg Lambert was one of several law bloggers invited by Wolters Kluwer to go to New York to view the interface, look at some of the advances that have been made since the launch, and to offer feedback, suggestions, criticisms, etc. to a group of Wolters Kluwer trainers, marketers, developers and executives. His May 21 post, “A Fresh Look at Intelliconnect,” on 3 Geeks and a Law Blog at http://www.geeklawblog.com/2010/05/fresh-look-at-intelliconnect.html advocates taking a new look at this product, which he says needs, “a second chance to make a first impression.” He also refers to the other review I read by Jason Eiseman on his blog, Jason the Content Librarian, on May 19 at http://www.jasoneiseman.com/blog/?p=420. He praises Intelliconnect as a useful tool for practitioners, and while not perfect, he says it’s worth a look.

Fourth, I have been trying to stay up-to-date with RDA and I recommend Barbara Tillett’s webcast and PowerPoint slides on “RDA Changes from AACR2 for Text.” This is available via the Library of Congress website at http://www.loc.gov/today/cybertlc/feature_wdesc.php?rec=4863. Ms. Tillett gives many examples and also notes several other webcasts that give more information on RDA and its background.
Lastly, I wish I could attend the AALL Annual Meeting this summer. Maybe it’s because I can’t go, but I am just sure that there are more programs that look interesting to me this year than in any previous years. Here are just some that I would like to attend, and that might be of interest to you as well.

“PLL-SIS Summit: Change as Opportunity.” This pre-conference is being held on Friday and Saturday to exchange ideas in three areas: Strategic Skills: persuasive communications, time management, better presentations, and business skills; Strategic Knowledge: law firm economics, staffing, space planning, collection development, and change agency; and, Strategic Thinking: law firm economics, staffing, space planning, collection development, and change agency. This workshop is “the completion of the first year of a two-year effort by PLL to identify significant changes taking place in the legal world, to understand how these changes provide opportunities for assuming leadership roles, and to develop concrete plans for becoming leaders within our organizations.” I am thrilled to see librarians taking a proactive stance and wish I could be part of it in person. The idea is to prepare participants with the information and skills necessary to begin leading their own strategic change. Note: if you are not attending the summit, but are attending the main conference, PLL-SIS is offering a wrap-up session, “60 Minute Recap of the Change as Opportunity Summit,” on Tuesday, July 13, 2010, from 2:15-3:15 p.m.

PLL-SIS Program: “Law Firm Technical Services Challenges and Opportunities,” Tuesday, July 13, 2010, 9:00-10:30 a.m.


TS-SIS Hot Topic Program: “New Faces of Resource-Sharing - SkyRiver and USS, Just to Name Two!” Sunday, July 11, 2010, 12:00-1:15 p.m.

H4: “The Semantic Web and RDA: Making the Catalog a Networked Bibliographic Environment,” Tuesday, July 13, 2010, 9:00-10:30 a.m.

I hope to learn from those of you who are attending, and I plan to listen to the programs that AALL will be webcasting live. If any of you have read or seen anything of interest lately please let me know, and if there are any topics you’d like me to address in this column please email me. Have a great Summer!

---

**Research & Publications**

**Discovering Research Ideas, Topics, and Questions**

_Hollie C. White_

_University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill_

The deadline for this year’s OBS-SIS/TS-SIS Joint Research Grant (JRC) is quickly approaching. All application materials are due to the JRG Committee Chair by June 15, 2010 and the winner of this year’s grant will be announced at the Annual Meeting in Denver. Complete grant applications consist of a narrative including detailed budget requirements, two letters of reference, and a signed copy of the Joint Research Grant Agreement form sent via email or regular mail to the JRG Committee Chair. The overarching goal of the grant is to support research that will either directly or indirectly benefit technical services law librarianship. More information on the grant can be found at [http://www.aallnet.org/sis/obssis/research/researchinfo.htm](http://www.aallnet.org/sis/obssis/research/researchinfo.htm).

As the chair of the Joint Research Grant Committee, one question that I have been pondering lately is: What exactly is research that could benefit technical services law librarianship? In order to assist in answering that question, I thought that I would dedicate this column to throwing some ideas out there in hopes that maybe a few of them would catch on.

One area in which I have been encouraging my students to research and experiment is cataloging. With the release of _RDA_, now is the time to put the standard and the available tools to the test. Legal genres make an interesting domain for experimenting with how well _RDA_ works with special and unique materials. Tests, or research experiments, should be conducted on how to use _RDA_ with MARC in legal environments. These tests should be planned in detail and well-documented, so that they
can be easily shared among professionals in the technical services law librarianship community. This is the best way to establish new best practices in the face of emerging standards.

Research is not just about your own library, because some of the most important research can benefit the entire library community. As an example, I am going to focus the remainder of my discussion on one application in particular: the freely available subject authority records available from the Library of Congress at http://id.loc.gov. This resource is a searchable/downloadable version of LCSH in SKOS (Simple Knowledge Organization System). It includes all of the regular features found in a subject heading list, but also includes some interesting visualization tools that graphically show the relationship between SKOS concepts or subject heading entries.

During a visit to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill this past April, Libby Dechman, a former law librarian and now a Senior Subject Policy Specialist with the Policy and Standards Division of the Library of Congress, distributed a list of eight areas where research is needed on id.loc.gov. Below, with her permission, I have reproduced the list she distributed at UNC:

1. How to enable machine application of subject subdivisions to subject headings to build strings:
   a. How to identify headings and subdivisions that belong together?
   b. How to code the subject headings and subdivisions so they work together?
   c. How to display for human users? Heading with a drop-down box of all possible subdivisions? Other ideas?
   d. If all cannot be coded immediately, what percentage is enough to support further research?

2. How to provide and improve access to terminology:
   a. Explore the possibilities of links between LC Classification Schedules and LCSH/SKOS to provide categorical information (“bucket terms”) to subject headings.
   b. Addition of other metadata?

3. How to improve id.loc.gov displays:
   a. Geographic subdivisibility (a planned enhancement)
   b. Other desirable labels?
   c. Visualization—a tab that would allow it to be displayed on the main screen with the term, and as a full-screen display (a desired enhancement).
   d. Visualization—all the full display of links, not just links if there are 20 or fewer (a desired enhancement).
   e. Graphics? Graphics for languages?

4. How to enable the public to interact with and make suggestions about vocabularies on LC A&V [authentication & verification]:
   a. Creative ways to enable individuals to add their own terminology to supplement and enhance LCSH. (Recognizing that the LC firewall severely limits the ability to do testing)

5. How to reach the end user:
   a. Surveys on the listserv?
   b. Reviewers group?

6. Linking vocabularies in the web cloud:
   a. Which vocabularies?
   b. Similar or disparate?
   c. Organization of linked vocabularies?

7. Providing other language versions as part of LCSH? Or Linking to other language versions?

8. Use search engines to guide searching with existing data rather than using direct mappings or crosswalks.

The variety of technical services concerns that affect everyday practice are highlighted in this list. It is also a good example of the types of research questions that may occur in any technical services project. For instance, many of the questions revolve around automating traditional subject analysis creation features, or thinking about what types of visual displays are better for bibliographic tools. The questions also look to both long- and short-term solutions, emphasizing the constant interplay involved between balancing the practical with the ideal.

I hope that some of the ideas and questions I have shared in this column will inspire more research related to technical services law librarianship. If you have any questions about the Joint Research Grant, or just want to discuss some research ideas, feel free to email me at hcwhite1@email.unc.edu.
The following serial title changes were recently identified by the acquisitions and cataloging staff of the University of California, Berkeley Law Library:

*Jones law review*
Vol. 1 (1997)-v. 8, no. 2 (spring 2009)
(OCoLC 43753860)
**Changed to:**
*Faulkner law review*
Vol. 1, issue 1 (fall 2009)-
(OCoLC 589169078)

*Journal of natural resources & environmental law*
Vol. 8, no. 1-v. 22, no. 3 (2008/2009)
(OCoLC 27828994)
**Changed to:**
*Kentucky journal of equine, agriculture, and natural resources law*
(OCoLC 435438731)

*McKinney's New York rules of court. Federal*
2001-2009
(OCoLC 45643082)
**Changed to:**
*McKinney's New York rules of court. Federal bankruptcy courts*
2010 ed.-
(OCoLC 439881058)

**And:**
*McKinney's New York rules of court. Federal district courts*
2010 ed.-
(OCoLC 441408705)

*Prison Service annual report and accounts*
(OCoLC 29882119)
**Changed to:**
*Annual reports and accounts (Great Britain. National Offender Management Service)*
2008/09-
(OCoLC 566191922)

*Texts adopted at the … (Council of Europe. Parliamentary Assembly)*
(OCoLC 47697861)
**Changed to:**
*Adopted texts (Council of Europe. Parliamentary Assembly)*
Standing Committee 28 Nov. 2008-
(OCoLC 430522205)

*Who's who in the California Legislature*
(OCoLC 20588984)
**Merged with:**
*Pocket directory of the California Legislature*
**To form:**
*Pocket directory and Who's who in the California Legislature*
2009 (also called “Preview edition”)
(OCoLC 530178202)
**Changed to:**
*Pocket directory of the California Legislature*
2010-

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

*Anales de jurisprudencia uruguaya*
**Ceased with:** Tomo 18 (2004-2005)
(OCoLC 33249486)

*CCH guide to car, travel & entertainment and home office deductions*
**Ceased with:** 2007-2008 issue
(OCoLC 52281463)

*Entertainment law review*
**Ceased with:** Vol. 3, issue 2 (fall 2009)
(OCoLC 65178673)

*FDCC quarterly*
**Ceased in print with:** Vol. 59, no. 4 (summer 2009)
(OCoLC 49410122)
**Continued online:** Vol. 60-
(OCoLC 49632862)

*Freedom of the press*
**Ceased in print with:** 2008 issue
(OCoLC 53284679)

*Journal of international biotechnology law : JIBL*
**Ceased with:** Vol. 6, no. 6 (Nov. 2009)
(OCoLC 57241856)

*Revue de droit international, de sciences diplomatiques, politiques, et sociales*
**Ceased with:** Vol. 87, no. 3 (sept./dec. 2009)
(OCoLC 1764037)
Health Insurance under LCSH

In case you haven’t heard, the Congress recently enacted the United States. Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (called “Obamacare” by its opponents). The first book LC received on the act was assigned three topical subject headings: Health insurance—Law and legislation, National health insurance—Law and legislation and Health care reform (headings are in boldface; geographic subdivisions are omitted).

**Health insurance** in **LCSH (Library of Congress Subject Headings)** encompasses both traditional insurance (you pay a premium, and get reimbursed if the bad thing you insure against happens) as well as prepaid plans (which many people would argue are really prepaid medical care rather than insurance).

Whereas one might think that National health insurance is a type of Health insurance, the terms aren’t in a BT-NT (broader term-narrower term) relationship. Rather, they are both considered to be NTs of Insurance law. Arguably, most national health insurance systems are a type of Human services program rather than a type of insurance – which suggests the entire reference structure should be taken with a grain of salt (but not too much; some hold it adversely affects Blood pressure). While not clearly defined in LCSH, **National health insurance—Law and legislation** refers to an insurance scheme that includes everyone in a nation, which probably means I shouldn’t have used it for the recently approved statute.

**Health care reform** might arguably take a —Law and legislation subdivision, but with one exception, none of the headings for “reforms” accept a legal subdivision, though that might not be by design.

**Medicaid** is a NT of Health insurance and Poor—Medical care, but Medicaid—Law and legislation has Medical laws and legislation as a BT rather than Poor—Medical care—Law and legislation. By no definition is “Medicaid” an insurance program, unless you define Health insurance in a way that makes it almost indistinguishable from Medical care. Medicare has two BTs: Health insurance and Older people—Medical care, and similarly, Medicare—Law and legislation has a single BT: Medical laws and legislation.

It should also be noted that both Medicare and Medicaid have UFs from the headings with the subdivision —United States, meaning that we don’t use “United States” as a geographic subdivision even when “Law and legislation” is used. **Medicare—Law and legislation** is the valid form of the heading when applied to the United States, but a geographic subdivision is used for a local place in the United States, or for a foreign country. To help complicate our lives, one should note that in Canada and Australia, “Medicare” refers to their national health insurance system covering all persons, not just Older people or the Poor. One might suggest that Medicare and Medicaid are really programs rather than topics, and should be qualified by “U.S.” (e.g., Medicare (U.S.), and we should use the appropriate topical heading, which would be Older people—Medical care—Law and legislation, perhaps doubled with an insurance heading.

There is a heading for National health services which, according to the authority structure, refers to a system of socialized medicine in which most of the health care industry is nationalized and administered by a governmental body. There is no “law” form of that heading at present (the examples of “National health services—Law and legislation” in the LC database come from non-law catalogers). However, establishing it would probably not be a problem. There is, curiously, a printed heading for National health services—Great Britain which refers in its scope note to a period when the British system was a program rather than a corporate body (and ignores the fact that there has never existed a “British” national health service, but rather separate ones for England and Scotland.

There are many heading for various types of health insurance, such as Managed care plans (Medical care)—Law and legislation and Preferred provider organizations (Medical care)—Law and legislation. However “Prepaid health plans” is a UF (use for) in Health insurance and Health maintenance organizations (which also accepts —Law and legislation). There is no heading or reference for “Fee for service,” which probably should be a UF to Health insurance since that is the closest thing to what has traditionally been considered to be insurance. We shouldn’t forget the heading Health insurance—Finance—Law and legislation, which is perhaps the most controversial part of Health care reform.

One should remember that specific statutes are important in the area of health insurance and health care, including not only the newly passed United States. Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act but others such as HIPAA (United States. Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996) and COBRA (United States. Consolidated Omnibus
Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985). Remember that American statutes often have titles that give no clue as to the contents. These should appear as 610s in the records as long as the book (or whatever) in hand is focused on the act, and of course they need to be combined with topical headings reflecting the subject.

Contributing Authors: Georgia Briscoe, Ismael Gullon, Yumin Jiang, Jean Pajerek, Andrea Rabbia, Christina Tarr

Please welcome our new contributing author, Ismael Gullon, Associate Law Librarian for Collections & Technical Services, Mercer University School of Law Library.

The TSLL TechScans Blog is available at http://www.tslltechscans.blogspot.com/.

Acquisitions/Collection Development

Perfect Library


Keller explored the idea of the “perfect library” as discussed in history (e.g., the ancient library of Alexandria, New York Public Library) and literature (the literary machine in Gulliver’s Travels, the ideal library in Jorge Luis Borges’ short story Library of Babel). She then compared these ideals with the Internet, and considered the limitations of the library on the Internet.

Westlaw Shipments


“Not Enough What! On Empty Shipping Boxes Coming from West.” Law Librarian Blog (March 2, 2010)

A funny post on the Law Librarian Blog explains why libraries have been receiving empty shipping boxes from West. CRIV took action, leading to research on West’s part. The answer? Among other things, not enough carton glue.

Cataloging

Directions in Metadata with Karen Coyle


Did you miss the “Directions in Metadata” webinar, or want to listen to it again? If so, this link will allow you to review the video archive and slides of the presentation. Additionally, the discussion about metadata continues on Twitter using the #LibData hashtag. (AUTOCAT discussion list)

New Metadata Blog – Call for Bloggers

http://blogs.ala.org/nrmig.php

Do you have an interest in metadata and digital library projects? Have you recently read a good article on the subject? Have you developed a new project or workflow? Have you attended a workshop or conference of interest to the community? Would you like to connect and get your name out to other metadata librarians? If so, become a contributor to the Metadata Blog. If you are interested, contact Kristin Martin, Blog Coordinator for the Metadata Blog at kmarti@uic.edu. Please provide some brief information on your background and ideas for contributions. (AUTOCAT discussion list, reposted with permission)

RDA Toolkit will be available in June 2010

http://www.rdatoolkit.org/

According to the RDA Online website, http://www.rdatoolkit.org/, the RDA Toolkit will be available in June 2010. In addition to including RDA, the RDA Toolkit “helps you navigate from AACR2 to RDA—the new, unified standard for resource description and access, designed for the digital world and an expanding universe of metadata users.” Check out the website, which also includes detailed US pricing. Clicking on the “Pricing” link provides a means for you to be added to a mailing list for announcements, information about international pricing, and other updates. (RDA website)

RDA Changes from AACR2 for Texts


Barbara Tillett’s webcast of Jan. 12, 2010, is available online. It’s entitled, “RDA Changes from AACR2 for Texts.” Both the webcast (75 minutes) and the equivalent PowerPoint presentation (51 slides) are available. To access the PowerPoint slides, click on the link at the bottom of the webpage, under “Related Library Resources.” Some of the details relate to LC practice for the upcoming RDA test. (Information courtesy of George Prager)

Library of Congress Documentation for the RDA Test

http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/RDatest/rdatest.html

Library of Congress is making available its files of policy decisions, training materials, etc., developed for its participation in the U.S. Resource Description and Access (RDA) test. Other libraries whether participating in the RDA test or not, are welcome to use and modify these files for their local situations. Note that these files represent decisions...
just for the *RDA* test. If the Library of Congress decides to implement *RDA*, some of the decisions may be changed as the result of feedback from the test. (AUTOCAT discussion list)

**Cataloging: Where are we now? Where are we going?**


The College of DuPage Press has made available streaming video of a recent 90-minute webcast entitled “Cataloging: Where are we now? Where are we going?” Originally broadcast on February 19, 2010, the webcast was presented by Renee Register, Senior Product Manager at OCLC, and Karen Coyle, consultant and leader in the area of digital libraries. The presenters review current cataloging practices and discuss the future of metadata, the MARC record, the *Resource Description and Access* standard, and the librarian’s place in online information organization and access. Both high bandwidth and low bandwidth streaming video links are available. (AUTOCAT discussion list)

**Announcing the Year of Cataloging Research Website**

http://faculty.washington.edu/acarlyle/vocr/index.html

In response to “On the Record” (the final report created by the LC commissioned Task Force for the Future of Bibliographic Control), the American Library Association and the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS) are highlighting the need for research in bibliographic control by declaring 2010 the Year of Cataloging Research. While the spirit of the Year of Cataloging Research embraces all research relating to bibliographic control (including metadata, classification theory, social tagging, etc.), the information posted on the Year of Cataloging Research website may be restricted to that specifically related to library metadata, cataloging, classification, and catalogs. (AUTOCAT discussion list)

**New Report: Implications of MARC Tag Usage on Library Metadata Practices**


An RLG Partnership working group has issued a report about MARC tag usage to inform library metadata practices, with a focus on machine applications. (RLG announcement mailing list)

**Library Journal Summarizes OCLC’s New Draft Policy on Record Use**

http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA6725522.html

Hadro, Josh. “WorldCat Rights and Responsibilities for the OCLC Cooperative.” (April 7, 2010)

On April 7th, OCLC released its new draft policy on record use for the WorldCat bibliographic database. The author states, “The new document delineates the record use rights and responsibilities of OCLC contributing members, in contrast to the previous version’s more abstract focus on the details of use and transfer of WorldCat records.”

**Serials Solutions Receives Full Permission as CONSER Affiliate Member**


Serials Solutions announced on March 31, 2010, that its catalogers can “CONSER authenticate” non-CONSER records for distribution as new records. As a CONSER affiliate member, Serials Solutions can improve the quality of CONSER records used world-wide. It can also provide to Serials Solutions clients new and enhanced services.

**Metadata Standards for Digital Audio**

http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/resources/preserv/audio_metadata.pdf

PARS Task Force on Audio Preservation Metadata, and MLA BCC Metadata Subcommittee. *Metadata Standards and Guidelines Relevant to Digital Audio* (February 2010). Developed by the ALCTS Preservation and Reformating Section (PARS) Task Force on Audio Preservation Metadata in cooperation with the Music Library Association Bibliographic Control Committee Metadata Subcommittee, this chart provides a quick overview of metadata standards and guidelines for digital audio projects, including links to standards documentation and examples. The chart is arranged by metadata type, including descriptive, technical, and administrative metadata standards.

**Open Bibliographic Data**

http://wiki.okfn.org/wg/bibliography

Working Group on Open Bibliographic Data

http://blog.okfn.org/2008/03/06/open-bibliographic-data-the-state-of-play/

“Open Bibliographic Data: the State of Play.” *Open Knowledge Foundation Blog* (March 6, 2008)

http://catalogablog.blogspot.com/2010/02/working-group-on-open-bibliographic.html

The Working Group on Open Bibliographic Data has a wiki to support its efforts. Its purpose is to:

1. Act as a central point of reference for people interested in open bibliographic data
2. Identify relevant projects and practices. Promote best practices as well as legal and technical standards for making data open (such as the Open Knowledge Definition)
3. Act as a hub for the development and maintenance of low cost, community-driven projects related to open bibliographic data

A further discussion of open bibliographic data can be viewed at the *Open Knowledge Foundation blog*. Apparently, there really are not many sources of open bibliographic data — but if you think about it, that’s not much of a surprise. Library of Congress data is free of copyright within the United States. *(Catalogablog)*

**User Experience (UX)**

http://www.blogwithoutalibrary.net/659

“On Trend.” *blogwithoutalibrary.net* (January 22, 2010)
Amanda Etches-Johnson, who was asked to speak about user experience at the LITA Top Tech Trends at ALA Midwinter, discusses new trends in user experience on her blog, blogwithoutalibrary.net. Generally what she’s interested in is the user experience of library websites and particularly in the emotional experience, or sort of holistic experience, library users have when using our websites. What seems to be happening more and more is that users are coming to websites from mobile devices, and many websites now have special mobile versions for browsing with mobile devices. Since our catalogs are viewed as part of the library website, this is something for us to consider. How would our catalogs best work on a mobile display?

**Government Documents**

2010 Census


*United States Census 2010*

http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?_lang=en

U.S. Census Bureau. *American Factfinder*  
You’d be hard pressed to have missed all the commercials —many of them quite funny—for the 2010 Census (pronounced twenty-ten, putting an official spin in favor of that pronunciation). Just In Case news from Case Western Reserve Law Library available at http://blog.case.edu/law-library/2010/03/30/featured_gov_doc_census_2010#more  
points to the official promotional website, 2010 Census. There is also a more research-oriented site, called *American FactFinder*. The 2010 Census site is designed to appeal to a wide audience, and includes interesting features like a map of response rates by city and state, videos of participants, and answers to frequently asked questions.

**Information Technology**

Cloud Computing


Nov. 20, 2009, saw the release of a free report from the European Network and Information Security Agency (ENISA) which outlines the benefits and risks of cloud computing. The benefits: available 24-7 instantly on demand and commitment free. The risks: security is in the hands of the service provider and data may not be deleted properly. Users of cloud computing should perform risk assessments, compare different cloud providers and obtain service-level assurances from their selected provider. A checklist and detailed questions to ask are in the report.

E-Reader Boom Kindles a Variety of New Options

http://abcnews.go.com/Technology/wireStory?id=9504985  

For the first time, the International Consumer Electronics Show in Las Vegas devoted a section to e-books. While e-books make up a tiny portion of book sales, they are increasing greatly, with 2.2 million e-readers shipped to stores in 2009. Another important first-time event is Amazon selling more e-books than physical copies, on Christmas day 2009.

A flood of e-readers is set to be released in 2010: from Samsung, Interead (COOL-ER), EnTourage(eDGe), Skiff Reader, all to compete with Amazon’s Kindle, Barnes & Noble’s Nook and Sony’s Readers. Each device will have its special features and with any luck prices will come down. (Library Link of the Day, January 8, 2010)

**Checklist for Digital Book Readers**

https://www.eff.org/files/eff-digital-books.pdf  

Digital books have become widely available through various devices and vendors. This white paper addresses questions about the future of reader privacy, consumers’ rights, and potential censorship. It offers readers of digital books a checklist with eight basic questions, including: Does the e-book reader/service/tool protect your privacy? Do you own the book or just rent or license it? Is it burdened with digital rights management (DRM)? Does it promote access to knowledge?

**Google Book Plan rejected by U.S. Dept. of Justice**

http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/technology/8500022.stm  

The U.S. Dept. of Justice announced, “The amended settlement agreement still confers significant and possibly anti-competitive advantages on Google as a single entity.”  

Google Books (formerly known as Google print) was launched in 2004, but put on hold a year later when the Authors Guild of America and the Association of American Publishers sued over copyright infringement. In 2008, Google agreed to pay $125 million to create a Book Rights Registry, where authors/publishers could register and receive compensation. District Judge Denny Chin sent the latest agreement back to be revised again. Besides antitrust issues, foreign authors and orphan authors’ rights must be considered. A hearing on the settlement is schedule for February 18, 2010. (Library Link of the Day, February 10, 2010)

**Gutenberg 2.0**

http://harvardmagazine.com/2010/05/gutenberg-2-0  


The author interviewed several professors and librarians (including John Palfrey at the Harvard Law Library) at Harvard University to hear their views on libraries. Issues brought up include: librarians’ role as information brokers, the importance of being able to find relevant information when faced with overwhelming data, books and budget, “just in time” libraries, digital preservation, and the future for books.
Webcast: The Summon Service in Academic Libraries
http://www.libraryjournal.com/webcastsDetail/2140493351.html
Serials Solutions and Library Journal sponsored a webcast on April 8, 2010 entitled, “The Success of Web-Scale Discovery in Returning Net-Gen Users to the Library: The Summon™ Service in Academic Libraries.” An archived version of the presentation is available at the above link. (LJ Academic Newswire)

Library Web Design for Persons with Disabilities
http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/lita/ital/292010/2901mar/vandenbark.cfm
Vandenbark, R. Todd. “Tending a Wild Garden: Library Web Design for Persons with Disabilities.” Information Technology and Libraries 29, no. 1 (March 2010). This article gives a brief review of the current U.S. regulations on Internet accessibility and the work of standards-setting groups. It also provides recommendations on improving libraries’ web resources, including subscription databases and libraries’ own web pages.

Local Systems

Lawsuits Filed in Library Automation Industry
Queens Borough Public Library filed a complaint July 2, 2009, against SirsiDynix for breach of contract. As the busiest public library in the U.S., Queens procured Dynix’s Horizon system in March 2006 to replace its aging DRA system. Dynix merged with Sirsi after the purchase and SirsiDynix ultimately withdrew from the development of the new Horizon 8.0 platform for which Queens had contracted. Queens is claiming $5 million in damages for this breach of contract. Queens has since implemented the Virtua ILS from VTLS which replaced DRA.

3M Company filed a patent infringement suit against EnvironWare, Inc. in Minnesota on July 23, 2009. 3M claims their patents were violated in Envisionware’s self-checkout and RFID inventory control products which entered the library marketplace in 2006. Since self-service stations and automated materials handling is a growth area for libraries in the future, the outcome of this case has high stakes.

Major New Open Source Library Automation System under Development
The Mellon Foundation granted Indiana University $2.38 million to develop software created specifically for the management of print and electronic collections for academic and research libraries. This Open Library Environment (OLE) project is being managed through the Kuali Foundation (a non-profit corporation that coordinates the development of free/open source administrative software under the Educational Community License. “Kuali” came from the Malaysian word for wok, a humble but essential dish).

OLE’s mission is to reconceptualize automation for research libraries, embracing the enterprise infrastructure, breaking away from print-based workflows, and reflecting the changing nature of library materials and new approaches to scholarly work. It focuses on the internal business processes of library research resources, not on the end-user experience.
The more than 200 partner libraries which participated in the design phase have now begun software development with the hope of early versions available in 18 to 24 months. Partner university libraries include those from Indiana, Florida, Chicago, Maryland, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Research Triangle Libraries. Design phase libraries not continuing into the build phase include Rutgers, Vanderbilt, Orbis Cascade Alliance, Kansas, National Library of Australia, and Library of Canada.
It is expected that this new library automation framework will be a major competitor for legacy library automation systems in use today.

Management

Redefining IT Leadership: A Provost’s Perspective
The University of British Columbia’s provost believes that repositioning information technology is a key to UBC’s strategic thinking, planning, and ongoing operations. Information technology is of fundamental importance to the research, learning, and student engagement missions of modern colleges and universities. IT innovation has led to new possibilities in global scholarly activity, holds the promise to help transform teaching and learning, and is an essential part of students’ success. The use of information technology is ubiquitous across all functions of the higher education institution, and yet technology has significant untapped potential to more directly contribute to the achievement of strategic objectives. Today’s fiscal challenges make the efficient and effective use of IT resources more important than ever.

Strategies for Sustaining the University Library
http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/v010/10.2.greenstein.pdf
The university library is a vital force at the very heart of the academic enterprise, both physically and metaphorically. Yet, its future has never seemed more uncertain. This essay offers observations about the challenges in the years ahead and possible strategies for responding to them. This guest
editorial is based on remarks made by the author in his keynote address for the meeting “Sustainable Scholarship,” hosted by the ITHAKA organization in New York City on September 23, 2009.

Sustainability
Christensen, Karen. “Sustainability: Will We Find It Online?” *Against the Grain* 22, no. 1 (February 2010).
The author argues that going paperless does not necessarily lead to sustainability. Electronic resources have their own environmental footprint, including rare and toxic metals used to build computers and related products, and the energy required to run those machines to manage, store and transmit information. As the founder and CEO of a small publisher, she advocates publishing responsibly in both digital and print formats.

This Book is Overdue!
http://marilynjohnson.net/_i_this_book_is_overdue_i_89022.htm
http://www.boston.com/business/technology/articles/2010/02/10/in_the_digital_age_librarians_are_pioneers/
http://www.salon.com/books/feature/2010/02/21/interview_marilyn_johnson_librarians/
Lipinski, Jed. “‘This Book Is Overdue!’ Hot for librarian” *Salon.com* (February 21, 2010).
http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA6713622.html
Davey, Donna L. “This Book is Overdue!” *Library Journal* (January 5, 2010).
You’ve probably already seen the reviews for *This Book is Overdue!* , a new book about librarians by Marilyn Johnson. Johnson apparently became interested in librarians while writing her previous book, *The Dead Beat: Lost Souls, Lucky Stiffs, and the Perverse Pleasures of Obituaries*, and coming across the obituary for Henrietta Avram, the mother of MARC. By most accounts, an enjoyable read about a rapidly changing profession.

Preservation
Preserving Born-Digital Materials – Where to Start?
http://www.llrx.com/features/borndigital.htm
Sarah Rhodes speculates that part of the problem is that we often don’t know where to start when it comes to preserving born-digital content. What needs to be preserved? What systems and formats should we use? How will we pay for it? She firmly believes that law libraries must invest in digital preservation if we are to remain relevant and true to our purpose in the 21st century.

Serials
ERM Usage Survey
In February 2010, *Against the Grain* conducted a web-based survey among its readership, and the results are presented in this article. In general, the survey found that librarians are happy with their ERMs, but there is room for improvement. Librarians use ERMs primarily for e-journal and e-package management, online database management, and access to license terms. Many also find ERMs’ ability to integrate with their journal lists and link resolvers helpful. The most common complaint is the time and effort required to populate the ERM with data and to maintain that data. Some reported that their ERM systems do not integrate with their ILS, or do not handle eBooks very well. Many librarians are still using various workarounds such as spreadsheets.

OCLC’s Expert Community Experiment vs. Regular Enhance Status: the University of Colorado’s Experience
Karen Selden
Yumin Jiang

OCLC is a cooperative in many respects, including maintaining the quality of the bibliographic records in the WorldCat database. This quality control consists of both correcting errors and enhancing records, and includes such actions as merging duplicate records; fixing typos; improving brief records; authorizing, correcting and adding subject headings; assigning classification numbers; and correcting MARC coding errors. While some quality control actions, such as finding and merging duplicate records, can be automated, most require direct cataloger intervention, often with the item in hand.¹

Over the years, OCLC has developed various programs to allow catalogers to assist with quality control. First among those programs is the Enhance program, for which OCLC member institutions must apply and be selected as participants. Libraries must apply for Enhance status for particular formats (books, sound recordings, visual materials, maps, etc.), and can receive Enhance status for multiple formats. The Enhance program has evolved into two levels: Regular and National. Regular Level Enhance status lets participants enhance, correct and replace OCLC records that were not created by Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) participants, i.e., records without field 042=pcc. Participation in the National Level Enhance program is more restrictive, and participants are allowed to correct and enhance more records in the WorldCat database,
including records created by PCC institutions. In both Enhance programs, OCLC rewards corrections and updates with monetary credit on the institution’s monthly OCLC billing statement.\(^2\)

OCLC also instituted an increasing number of Database Enrichments that catalogers could perform with no further training or any application process. As with the Enhance programs, OCLC rewarded corrections and updates with monetary credit. These enrichments included adding contents notes, adding information to the 300 field in CIP records, and adding 5XX and 6XX fields.\(^3\) However, there were still many changes that required catalogers to submit a separate error report to OCLC. Some of these error reports, such as requesting changes in the 245 field, had to be accompanied by a photocopy to prove that the change was warranted.

Catalogers repeatedly requested to make more types of changes to records without either joining the Enhance program or taking extra time and effort to provide photocopied documentation. In response, OCLC introduced the Expert Community Experiment, which ran from February 2009 to August 2009. During the Experiment, all catalogers with full-level cataloging authorization were given the ability to improve, upgrade, and make more changes to WorldCat master records than previously allowed. The Experiment was such a success that OCLC decided to adopt it as permanent program, under the name of Expert Community. Currently, all OCLC users with full-level cataloging authorization are able to correct, improve and upgrade all WorldCat master records, with the exception of records created through the PCC program.\(^4\)

How do these programs affect OCLC member libraries? The University of Colorado (CU) Law Library’s experience can illustrate. Historically, the CU Law Library’s catalogers and cataloging staff embraced the concept of acting as good stewards to the OCLC database by enriching OCLC records through the Data Enrichment program. When the Expert Community Experiment was announced, we embraced it heartily as a way to correct more serious errors directly and expeditiously. In July 2009, near the end of the Experiment, we applied for Regular Enhance Status for the Books format, in case the Experiment did not continue. The application process requires submitting the OCLC numbers of 10 to 15 original records created by the institution and filling out a one-page form.\(^5\) OCLC staff then thoroughly review each submitted record, and subtract points for various errors. If the applicant’s score drops below a certain level, the application is rejected.\(^6\) Since we regularly create original records in the WorldCat database, the process was not onerous. Along with our one-page application, we submitted 15 original records for print and electronic monographs. In late October 2009, we were provisionally accepted into the Regular Enhance program for Books format. OCLC staff gave very specific feedback on the errors found on the submitted records and asked us to correct them. Provisional acceptance into the Regular Enhance program is standard procedure. To gain full acceptance into the Enhance program, we were required to submit “before and after” printouts of 10 OCLC records that were corrected using our newly awarded Enhance status. Those records were submitted to OCLC in February 2010 and we expect to hear feedback on them at any time.

An analysis of the 45 records we corrected between late October 2009 and mid-May 2010 yield some interesting results. Only a handful of these records were Encoding Level 3, 8 or M (minimal vendor records or non-upgraded CIP records); the majority of the records were Encoding Level 1 (full cataloging provided by OCLC members).\(^7\) We added or corrected information in 23 distinct categories, spanning the fixed fields, ISBNs, classification numbers, 006, 007, 043,1XX, 250, 260, 300, 362, 4XX, 5XX, 6XX, 7XX, 830 and 856 fields. With a total of 128 distinct edits, most of the 45 records contained multiple edits. Broadly classified, the edits involved correcting MARC coding errors, typos, and ISBD punctuation; supplying or correcting classification numbers; supplying missing information, especially 6XX and 7XX access points; and correcting information, especially in the 245, 6XX and 7XX fields. The most numerous corrections included:

**Controlling Subject Headings (16):** While unauthorized subject headings in most cases are not errors, this process led to correcting eight incorrectly-formed name headings, including the discovery of a pair of duplicate name authority records in OCLC’s authority file. OCLC merged the duplicate authority records within three weeks of being notified. This process also led to the correction of five malformed subject headings. The most interesting subject heading correction was for a string that was incorrectly authorized using OCLC’s automated Control Headings feature:

```
Public lands |z United States |x Law and legislation
```

This string originally stood out because experienced law catalogers know that the subdivision **Law and legislation** can be geographically subdivided. In this case, the placement of **United States** in the subject string was a red flag. However, most non-law catalogers would have accepted this OCLC-validated string without a second thought. Because free-floating subdivisions permit an almost infinite number of valid subject heading strings, not all valid subject heading strings have corresponding authority records. For this reason, the OCLC Control Headings feature allows catalogers to validate a subject heading string subdivision by subdivision, if the full string does not have an authority record in the OCLC database. The heading above is a rare example of a subject heading that was improperly formatted and then validated using this “piecemeal” process. Ironically, **Public lands** is an inherently legal subject heading, so the **Law and legislation** subdivision is unnecessary.

Posted on the TS-SIS discussion list June 4, 2010:

To All TS-SIS Members:

Have you ever attended a program that piqued your curiosity about other topics that should be presented to the membership? Have you ever wondered how these programs come to be? It all begins with an idea and a proposal form!

The TS-SIS Education Committee is ready to accept program, topic, and workshop ideas from the membership for presentation at the 2011 AALL Annual Meeting in Philadelphia, PA, July 23-26. Now is the time to begin planning and developing your

---

3 Copeland and Freeborn, “Many Fingers in the Pie,” 128.
7 For a description of the various Encoding Levels for OCLC records, see http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/es/fixedfield/elvl.shtml.
8 Jay Weitz, email message to authors, April 30, 2010.
9 Ibid.

Typos or incorrect wording in 245 |a or 246 (12): Obviously, these errors greatly affect access.

Adding or correcting 7XX and 1XX fields (8): Again, incorrect or missing headings in these fields affect access.

Adding or correcting LC classification number (11): While not as critical as adding or correcting access points, this step will save time for numerous libraries that subsequently use these records.

Adding missing or additional 6XX fields (5): These were in addition to errors discovered during the Control Headings process.

Adding or correcting ISBNs (3): Not as many corrections in this area, but still an important access point for other libraries and patrons alike.

Adding or correcting URLs in 856 fields (2): Also not numerous, but now that electronic access to material is commonplace and expected, adding the access information or correcting the errors is a timesaver for other libraries and a valued service for their patrons.

Between the time we applied for the Enhance program and the time we were accepted into it, the Expert Community Experiment became a permanent program. Understandably, we wanted to find out the specific differences and similarities between the two programs. According to Jay Weitz, Senior Consulting Database Specialist at OCLC, Regular Enhance Status currently provides catalogers almost exactly the same capabilities as the Expert Community does. However, OCLC intends to expand the capabilities of Regular Enhance Status participants. One such privilege under consideration is allowing participants to merge duplicate records.

Even though the Expert Community program nearly duplicates the capabilities of the Regular Enhance Program, we have no regrets about undergoing the relatively easy application process for the Enhance Program. We are proud to have passed the detailed review process to join the 227 other institutions with Enhance Status (including a total of 20 law libraries). We hope our positive experiences will encourage other law libraries to upgrade records and correct errors more regularly in OCLC, either through the Expert Community process or the more formal Enhance program.
program and workshop ideas, and the Education Committee is more than willing to assist you in this endeavor. If you are requesting sponsorship or co-sponsorship by TS-SIS, the deadline for submission of your program, topic, or workshop proposal to the Education Committee is August 16, 2010 at 5:00 p.m. PDT.

This is the time to begin the proposal process, which ends with proposal submission to the Annual Meeting Program Committee (AMPC) on September 15, 2010, at 11:59 p.m. CST. It is not a long time period from now until then, so the time to begin on your proposal is now. There are a variety of timeslots from which to choose: workshops of 1 or 2 day length and program slots of 30, 45, 60, 75 and 90 minutes.

Unlike our annual meetings of the past, there is no theme announced for the Philadelphia meeting, just a strong effort to get the best programs and workshops possible. Programs can be sponsored by TS-SIS and co-sponsored by another SIS or committee also. The general process is as follows:

2. The handbook will contain instructions with step-by-step guidelines for using the online website to create your proposal.
3. Proposals do not have to be created and finished all at once. You will have the opportunity to save your work and return to it as necessary in order to complete the proposal.
4. If requesting TS-SIS sponsorship (or an additional co-sponsor), identify that group as such on the proposal.
5. When you have completed your proposal, if you are requesting sponsorship from TS-SIS, do not hit the “SUBMIT” button, but click instead on the “SHARE” button and enter Ajaye Bloomstone’s address (ajaye.bloomstone@law.lsu.edu); your proposal will then be forwarded to and reviewed by the TS-SIS Education Committee. A Committee member will contact you to discuss your proposal before the AMPC proposal deadline, and you will be asked to submit your final proposal to AMPC by the final submission date.
6. **NOTE:** Do not click on the “SUBMIT” button until you have heard back from the TS-SIS Education Committee. Clicking on “SUBMIT” will immediately forward your proposal to AMPC, in which case it cannot be retrieved and/or revised.

Anne Myers, Program Committee Chair for 2011, notes, “Members are particularly looking for programs that are at an advanced level. We’re asking proposers to tell us WHY a proposal is at a certain level, to give the AMPC more information when we select programs.”

The TS-SIS Education Committee will notify everyone who has requested TS sponsorship by 5:00 p.m. (CST) on August 27, 2010, as to whether the SIS will sponsor your program. Following that notification, your proposal can be submitted to AMPC for consideration. Optionally, individuals can choose to submit programs to AMPC directly without TS-SIS sponsorship.

The TS-SIS Education Committee will hold an open meeting in Denver on Monday, July 12, in the Colorado Convention Center, Room 206 (check for updated room assignments in the final program) from 12:00 until 1:15 to discuss the process of proposal creation and submission, and ideas that you may have. Committee members will always be available to work with you to submit the best possible proposal. So please bring your lunch and your ideas, and join us for the meeting!

Members of this year’s TS-SIS Education Committee are:

- Ajaye Bloomstone, Chair, Louisiana State University; ajaye.bloomstone@law.lsu.edu
- Eric Parker, Chair, Acquisitions Standing Committee, Northwestern University; ecp278@law.northwestern.edu
- George Prager, Chair, Cataloging and Classification Standing Committee, New York University; pragerg@exchange.law.nyu.edu
- Shyama Agrawal, Chair, Serials Standing Committee, Duke University; agrawal@law.duke.edu
- Marilyn Estes, Chair, Preservation Standing Committee, American University; mestes@american.edu
- Pam Deemer, Ex officio, TS-SIS Chair, Emory University; libped@emory.edu
- Ismael Gullon, Ex officio, TS-SIS Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, Mercer University; gullon_i@law.mercer.edu
- Suzanne Graham, University of Georgia; sgraham@uga.edu
- Edward Hart, University of Florida; hart@law.ufl.edu
- Alan Keely, Wake Forest University; keelyda@wfu.edu

Hope to see you in Denver!

**Ajaye Bloomstone**

TS-SIS Education Committee Chair, 2010/2011

LSU Law Center Library, Baton Rouge, LA
2010 OBS-SIS Annual Meeting Information
Programs and Meetings

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

Business Meeting
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 5:30-6:30 p.m.
Hyatt-Capitol Ballroom 4

• Patricia Sayre-McCoy, OBS-SIS Chair, D’Angelo Law Library, University of Chicago

Catalogers Today: Skill Sets, Expectations and Challenges (Program C5; co-sponsored with TS-SIS)
Sunday, July 11, 2010 — 4:15-5:15 p.m.
CCC-Room 601-603

Is your library short a cataloger but at the same time faced with an administrative mandate to hold or cut costs? Or are you a cataloger looking for a position and wondering how to best achieve your goal? This conversation based on research can help you cope from either end of the spectrum. Dr. Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis, representing the library science professor perspective, describes her research into the changing expectations pertaining to cataloging positions. Stacy Bowers reacts to the research in her role as a law library administrator attempting to balance the constraints of the budget with the need to make materials accessible. And just to make it even more interesting, there is the impending implementation of new cataloging rules to deal with, as RDA replaces AACR2.

• Ellen McGrath, Coordinator and Moderator, SUNY at Buffalo Law Library
• Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis, Morgridge College of Education, University of Denver
• Stacey L. Bowers

Education Committee Meeting for the 2011 Annual Meeting in Philadelphia, PA
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 7:45-8:45 a.m.
CCC-Room 204

• Kathy Faust, Lewis & Clark College

Executive Board Meeting, 2009/2010 (outgoing)
Sunday, July 11, 2010 — 6:30-7:30 p.m.
Hyatt-Sandstone

• Patricia Sayre-McCoy, 2009/2010 OBS-SIS Chair, D’Angelo Law Library, University of Chicago

Executive Board Meeting, 2010/2011 (incoming)
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 4:15-5:15 p.m.
CCC-Room 202

• Kathy Faust, 2010/2011 OBS-SIS Chair, Lewis & Clark College

Heads of Systems Roundtable
Sunday, July 11, 2010 — 4:15-5:15 p.m.
Hyatt-Mineral C

• Richard Jost, Chair, Gallagher Law Library, University of Washington

Innovative Law Users Group Annual Meeting
Saturday, July 10, 2010 — 8:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m.
Hyatt-Capitol Ballroom 1

• Shannon Burchard, Chair, University of San Francisco Law Library

Is Quality Control in Academic Law Library Online Catalogs Declining? (Program K5)
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 3:30-4:00 p.m.
CCC-Room 601-603
Georgia Briscoe will report on her research funded by an AALL grant to determine if quality control is decreasing in academic law library catalogs and if it really matters. She will discuss why quality may or may not be important. Anticipate a lively discussion with participants.

- Georgia Briscoe, Coordinator and Speaker, William A. Wise Law Library, University of Colorado at Boulder

**Joint Research Grant Committee Meeting (OBS-SIS and TS-SIS)**
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 11:45 a.m.-1:00 p.m.
CCC-Room 204
- Hollie White, Chair, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**Local Systems Users Roundtable**
**Sunday, July 11, 2010 — 1:30-2:45 p.m.**
- ALEPH Users Group Meeting  
  Hyatt-Capitol Ballroom 1
- InMagic Users Group Meeting  
  Hyatt-Capitol Ballroom 3
- Sirsi/Dynix Users Group Meeting  
  Hyatt-Capitol Ballroom 7
- Softlink Users Group Meeting  
  Hyatt-Capitol Ballroom 5
- Voyager Users Group Meeting  
  Hyatt-Capitol Ballroom 6

**MARC and RDA: An Overview (Program G5; co-sponsored with TS-SIS)**
**Monday, July 12, 2010 — 4:00-5:15 p.m.**
CCC-Room 601-603
This presentation explains the changes in MARC (MAchine-Readable Cataloging) to support compatibility with the upcoming cataloging standard, *RDA (Resource Description and Access)*, and the likely influence of those changes on law material cataloging. For years, MARC has successfully supported previous cataloging content standards, such as *AACR2*. The new cataloging standard, *RDA*, is designed for our digital world, and is intended to provide more user-friendly access to all types of information resources. Accordingly, MARC formats need to change to facilitate data exchange of records using the new standard. What are those changes, and how will the changes affect law libraries? The presentation will focus on these topics and will help law catalogers and other technical services librarians prepare for the *RDA* era.
Clara Liao, Coordinator and Moderator, Georgetown University Law Library
- George Prager, Speaker, New York University Law School Library
- Rhonda K. Lawrence, Speaker, Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library, University of California

**OBS-SIS Hot Topic Program: Current Issues in Library Trends that Affect Technical Services Librarians**
**Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 2:15-3:15 p.m.**
CCC-Room 210-212
OBS-SIS VIP Janet Swan Hill will discuss current issues in library trends that affect technical services librarians. Specific topics will be developed based on Professor Hill’s expertise in technical services librarianship and issues of current interest that develop through the year.
- Janet Swan Hill, Speaker, University of Colorado at Boulder

**OCLC Roundtable**
**Sunday, July 11, 2010 — 5:30-6:30 p.m.**
CCC-Room 109
OCLC’s Connexion Client, Identities and Identifiers, and OCLC’s Terminologies Service will be discussed.
- Ming Lu, Coordinator, OCLC Committee Chair, Los Angeles County Law Library
- Glenn Patton, Speaker, Director of OCLC’s WorldCat Quality Management Division
OCLC Update
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 10:45-11:45 a.m.
Hyatt-Capitol Ballroom 5/6
Topics will include RDA and OCLC, and OCLC’s duplicate detection and resolution efforts.
  • Ming Lu, Coordinator, OCLC Committee Chair, Los Angeles County Law Library
  • Glenn Patton, Speaker, Director of OCLC’s WorldCat Quality Management Division

Open Source ILS: What a Service Oriented System Brings to You and Your Library (Program B3; co-sponsored with TS-SIS)
Sunday, July 11, 2010 — 3:00 -4:00 p.m.
CCC-Room 201-203
Presenters discuss how OS ILS can reengineer your overall library service, and the challenges of its implementation. While the majority of libraries rely on proprietary systems, the OS ILS is a potentially viable approach for some technologically savvy libraries. Questions about what makes Open Source Software different from proprietary software; how it organizes it elements, what tools it uses, and how it operates are addressed. Presenters also discuss how a service-oriented architecture can be incorporated into OS ILS and how a customized system can be interoperable with various systems to avoid repetitive data management. The foreseeable implementation dilemma on in-house knowledge bases and resources for system development and sustainable system maintenance/update will be surveyed.
  • Keiko Okuhara, Coordinator and Moderator, University of Hawaii at Manoa Law Library
  • Bob Molyneux, Speaker
  • Chris Sharp, Speaker

Open Source ILS Roundtable Discussion
Sunday, July 11, 2010 — 5:30-6:00 p.m.
CCC-Room 602
Open discussion relating to the Open Source ILS: What a Service Oriented System Brings to You and Your Library program.
  • Keiko Okuhara, Coordinator, University of Hawaii at Manoa Law Library

Researchers Roundtable (OBS-SIS and TS-SIS)
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 4:00-5:15 p.m.
CCC-Room 606
  • Hollie White, Coordinator, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

The Semantic Web and RDA: Making the Catalog a Networked Bibliographic Environment (Program H4; Co-sponsored with TS-SIS)
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 9:00-10:30 a.m.
CCC-Room 205-207
This presentation will introduce how RDA, the up-coming cataloging standard, can integrate the library catalog with the web services developing out of the Semantic Web. The Semantic Web is an emerging technology that will build a web of knowledge from today’s web of documents. Using Resource Description Framework (RDF), the Semantic Web focuses on the identification of information entities and the relationships between them. RDA is similarly based on the entity-relationship model of the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR). Applying Semantic Web concepts to the new cataloging standard can result in the evolution of library data into a more effective and flexible information retrieval tool. This will also facilitate data-mining and bibliometric analysis based on the bibliographic relationships coded in the structured metadata.
  • Clara Liao, Coordinator and Moderator, Georgetown University Law Library
  • Diane I. Hillmann, Speaker, Information Institute of Syracuse
  • Karen Coyle, Speaker, Digital Libraries Consultant
**TS/OBS/RIPS/CS-SIS Joint Reception**
Saturday, July 10, 2010 — 7:00-8:00 p.m.
Hyatt-Centennial Ballroom F
- Sponsored by Innovative Interfaces, Inc.
- Betty Roeske, Coordinator, Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP

**TSLL Board Meeting**
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 10:45-11:30 a.m.
CCC-Room 202
- Virginia Bryant, Editor, George Washington University

---

**2010 TS-SIS Annual Meeting Information**

**Programs and Meetings**


**Acquisitions Standing Committee Meeting and Acquisitions Roundtable**
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 7:00-8:30 a.m.
CCC-Room 604
- Ajaye Bloomstone, Chair, Louisiana State University Law Center Library

**Bringing Increased Efficiency to Technical Services: Is EOCR for You? (Program E5)**
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 10:00-10:30 a.m.
CCC-Room 601-603
Have you reviewed your acquisitions workflow recently? Is it as automated and efficient as it could be? How would you like it if you didn’t have to do pre-order searching in your catalog, didn’t have to download bibliographic records, didn’t have to create order records in your online system and didn’t have to input invoice data for most of your titles? No, it is not a joke, you can do all this by implementing EOCR (Electronic Order Confirmation Records) and OCLC WorldCat Cataloging Partners. Many vendors offer this service for firm as well as approval book orders. This session will provide examples from one vendor on how they provide EOCR services and a library’s perspective on how they implemented it.
- Shyama Agrawal, Coordinator and Speaker, J. Michael Goodson Law Library, Duke University School of Law
- Ann-Marie Breaux, Speaker, YBP Library Services

**Business Meeting and Awards**
Sunday, July 11, 2010 — 5:30-6:30 p.m.
Hyatt-Centennial Ballroom G
- Chris Long, TS-SIS Chair, Indiana University School of Law-Indianapolis

**Catalogers Today: Skill Sets, Expectations and Challenges (Program C5; co-sponsored with OBS-SIS)**
Sunday, July 11, 2010 — 4:15-5:15 p.m.
CCC-Room 601-603
Is your library short a cataloger but at the same time faced with an administrative mandate to hold or cut costs? Or are you a cataloger looking for a position and wondering how to best achieve your goal? This conversation based on research can help you cope from either end of the spectrum. Dr. Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis, representing the library science professor perspective, describes her research into the changing expectations pertaining to cataloging positions. Stacy Bowers reacts to the research in her role as a law library administrator attempting to balance the constraints of the budget with the need to make materials accessible. And just to make it even more interesting, there is the impending implementation of new cataloging rules to deal with, as RDA replaces AACR2.
- Ellen McGrath, Coordinator and Moderator, SUNY at Buffalo Law Library
- Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis, Morgridge College of Education, University of Denver
- Stacey L. Bowers
Cataloging & Classification Roundtable
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 5:30-6:30 p.m.
Hyatt-Capitol Ballroom 5-7
- George Prager, Chair, New York University Law School Library
- Professor Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis, Moderator, University of Denver (currently serves on the CC:DA Committee)
- John Hostage, Speaker, Harvard Law School (AALL representative to CC:DA)
- Robert Maxwell, Speaker, Brigham Young University
- Robert Ellett, Speaker, National Defense University (PCC trainer, RDA trainer)

Cataloging & Classification Standing Committee Meeting
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 7:00-8:30 a.m.
Hyatt-Centennial Ballroom AB
- George Prager, Chair, New York University

Charting New Roles for Technical Services: Faculty Publications and Institutional Repositories (Program 15)
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 10:45-11:30 a.m.
CCC-Room 601-603
Institutional repositories are designed to collect, preserve, and disseminate in digital format the intellectual output of an institution. As such, institutional repositories are gaining in recognition as a key factor in emerging digital research and the ability to provide free and unrestricted access to faculty research. A faculty publications website provides similar access, but with different requirements and expectations. Faculty publications websites focus on listing the published works of current faculty, and may not provide open access to all of the publications listed. The model that an institution follows will be guided by its mission and the resources available to support it. As traditional work routines in technical services diminish, this program demonstrates how technical services staff can continue to support the library’s evolving mission.
- Carol Avery Nicholson, Coordinator, Moderator, and Speaker, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Law Library
- Karen B. Douglas, Speaker, J. Michael Goodson Law Library, Duke University School of Law

Classification and Subject Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group Meeting
Saturday, July 10, 2010 — 3:30-4:45 p.m.
Hyatt-Centennial Ballroom B
- Cindy May, Chair, University of Wisconsin Law Library

Collection Development Roundtable (ALL-SIS)
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 9:00-10:00 a.m.
CCC-Room 602
Reviewing, Revising/Updating Your Collection Development Policy: When? How Often? Are there official policies at your school about this? Please bring questions, concerns, (and policies) for discussion.
- Karen Nuckolls, Chair, ALL-SIS Collection Development Committee, University of Kentucky

Database Ownership: Myth or Reality? (TS-SIS Program co-sponsored with CS-SIS)
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 4:00-5:15 p.m.
CCC-Room 107
For some legal databases, vendors advertise the option to purchase the data outright, whereby the library would “own” the content of the database if the vendor goes out of business or if the library decides to cancel its subscription to the database interface. This “ownership” option is usually expensive but promises perpetual access to the data. What does this really mean? The Barco Law Library cancelled annual subscriptions to two such databases and asked the vendors to provide the content as promised. Learn what was discovered about the hidden costs of “owning” a database and the intricacies of data and metadata manipulation for storage, access and display.

Descriptive Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group Meeting
Saturday, July 10, 2010 — 5:00-6:15 p.m.
Hyatt-Centennial Ballroom B
- Rhonda K. Lawrence, Chair, Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library, University of California
Education Committee Meeting for 2011 Annual Meeting in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
CCC-Room 206

- Pam Deemer, Hugh F. MacMillan Law Library, Emory University

The Ever-Evolving World of Vendor-Supplied MARC Records (TS-SIS Program)
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 10:45-11:45 a.m.
Hyatt-Capitol Ballroom 4

As law libraries increasingly rely on online resources, there is a growing need for MARC bibliographic records to represent these resources in the local online catalog. Many law libraries now have access to large digital collections such as Making of Modern Law, LLMC-Digital and HeinOnline, not to mention Lexis and Westlaw, with titles too numerous to be cataloged locally. As a result, law libraries must rely on records supplied by vendors for access to these titles in their local catalogs. Members of the TS-SIS Task Group on Vendor-Supplied Bibliographic Records will discuss the new standards for provider-neutral e-monograph records. The ongoing work of evaluating MARC record sets and working with vendors and others to improve the quality of these record sets also will be explained.

- Alan Keely, Coordinator and Moderator, Professional Center Library, Wake Forest University
- Yael Mandelstam, Speaker, Fordham Law Library
- George Prager, Speaker, New York University Law School Library

Executive Board Meeting, 2009/2010 (outgoing)
Saturday, July 10, 2010 — 5:30-7:00 p.m.
Hyatt-Quartz A

- Chris Long, 2009/2010 TS-SIS Chair, Indiana University School of Law-Indianapolis

Executive Board Meeting, 2010/2011 (incoming)
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 4:15-5:15 p.m.
Hyatt-Agate C

- Pamela Deemer, 2010/2011 TS-SIS Chair, Hugh F. MacMillan Law Library, Emory University

Heads of Cataloging Roundtable
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
CCC-Room 602

- George Prager, Coordinator, New York University Law School Library

Hot Topic Program (TS-SIS): New Faces of Resource-Sharing—SkyRiver and USS, Just to Name Two!
Sunday, July 11, 2010 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
CCC-Room 109

The creative team from Innovative Interfaces has introduced a new bibliographic utility, www.theskyriver.com, to compete with OCLC and, once again, offer libraries a choice for cooperative cataloging. The New England Law Library Consortium (NELLCO) has developed the Universal Search Solution - USS - a master index of material, including participating library OPACs, web-based free and subscription-based material, local electronic content and other e-content that its participating libraries wish to make discoverable to researchers. The USS can also be used as an acquisition and copy cataloging tool. It’s not your Mama’s bibliographic landscape anymore!

- Joni Cassidy, Moderator, Cassidy Cataloguing Services, Inc.
- Leslie Straus, Speaker, SkyRiver
- Nancy Fleck, Speaker, Michigan State University
- Tracy L. Thompson-Przylucki, Speaker, New England Law Library Consortium (NELLCO)

How Are We To Accomplish That Much More With That Much Less? (TS-SIS Program)
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 2:15-3:15 p.m.
CCC-Room 107

Pursuant to the cuts that libraries have been asked to sustain while striving to maintain optimum service, we have reorganized, revamped, and realigned processes, tasks, procedures, and, just as importantly, our daily outlook. The draconian moves employed to deal with economic uncertainties take a toll on our collections and the psychological well-being of library staff
in professional and support positions. This program, through active discussion by librarians and a mental health professional, seeks to give guidance in dealing with these issues. Part 1 will deal with change management — how libraries have managed their changing environments due to shrinking budgets and the march from print to electronic. Part 2 will address the human responses to these changes with a presentation by a mental health professional. Discussion will continue at the Technical Services Management Issues Roundtable (immediately following in the same room).

- Ajaye Bloomstone, Coordinator and Speaker, Louisiana State University Law Center Library
- Alan Keely, Coordinator and Speaker, Professional Center Library, Wake Forest University
- Stephen Kopanos, Speaker, Mental Health America of Colorado
- Miriam Childs, Speaker, Law Library of Louisiana

**Joint Research Grant Committee Meeting (OBS-SIS and TS-SIS)**
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 11:45 a.m.-1:00 p.m.
CCC-Room 204
- Hollie White, Chair, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**MARC and RDA: an Overview (Program G5; co-sponsored with OBS-SIS)**
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 4:00-5:15 p.m.
CCC-Room 601-603
This presentation explains the changes in MARC (MAchine-Readable Cataloging) to support compatibility with the upcoming cataloging standard, RDA (Resource Description and Access), and the likely influence of those changes on law material cataloging. For years, MARC has successfully supported previous cataloging content standards, such as AACR2. The new cataloging standard, RDA, is designed for our digital world, and is intended to provide more user-friendly access to all types of information resources. Accordingly, MARC formats need to change to facilitate data exchange of records using the new standard. What are those changes, and how will the changes affect law libraries? The presentation will focus on these topics and will help law catalogers and other technical services librarians prepare for the RDA era.

- Clara Liao, Coordinator and Moderator, Georgetown University Law Library
- George Prager, Speaker, New York University Law School Library
- Rhonda K. Lawrence, Speaker, Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library, University of California

**Membership Committee Meeting**
Sunday, July 11, 2010 — 8:00-8:45 a.m.
CCC-Room 204
- Sean Chen, Chair, J. Michael Goodson Law Library, Duke University School of Law

**New Catalogers Roundtable**
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
Hyatt-Granite ABC
- Sean Chen, Coordinator, J. Michael Goodson Law Library, Duke University School of Law

**Open Source ILS: What a Service Oriented System Brings to You and Your Library (Program B3; co-sponsored with OBS-SIS)**
Sunday, July 11, 2010 — 3:00-4:00 p.m.
CCC-Room 201-203
Presenters discuss how OS ILS can reengineer your overall library service, and the challenges of its implementation. While the majority of libraries rely on proprietary systems, the OS ILS is a potentially viable approach for some technologically savvy libraries. Questions about what makes Open Source Software different from proprietary software; how it organizes it elements, what tools it uses, and how it operates are addressed. Presenters also discuss how a service-oriented architecture can be incorporated into OS ILS and how a customized system can be interoperable with various systems to avoid repetitive data management. The foreseeable implementation dilemma on in-house knowledge bases and resources for system development and sustainable system maintenance/update will be surveyed.

- Keiko Okuhara, Coordinator and Moderator, University of Hawaii at Manoa Law Library
- Bob Molyneux, Speaker
- Chris Sharp, Speaker
Preservation Standing Committee/Preservation and Binding Roundtable
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 10:45-11:45 a.m.
CCC-Room 202
- Marilyn Estes, Chair, Pence Law Library, Washington College of Law

Professional Development Committee Meeting
Saturday, July 10, 2010 — 4:00-5:00 p.m.
Hyatt-Granite B
- Karen Nuckolls, Chair, University of Kentucky Law Library

Rare Book Cataloging Roundtable
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 11:45 a.m.-1:00 p.m.
Hyatt-Capitol Ballroom 1
- Sarah Yates, Coordinator, University of Minnesota Law Library

Researchers Roundtable (OBS-SIS and TS-SIS)
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 4:00-5:15 p.m.
CCC-Room 606
- Hollie White, Coordinator, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

The Semantic Web and RDA: Making the Catalog a Networked Bibliographic Environment (Program H4; co-sponsored with OBS-SIS)
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 9:00-10:30 a.m.
CCC-Room 205-207
This presentation will introduce how RDA, the up-coming cataloging standard, can integrate the library catalog with the web services developing out of the Semantic Web. The Semantic Web is an emerging technology that will build a web of knowledge from today’s web of documents. Using Resource Description Framework (RDF), the Semantic Web focuses on the identification of information entities and the relationships between them. RDA is similarly based on the entity-relationship model of the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR). Applying Semantic Web concepts to the new cataloging standard can result in the evolution of library data into a more effective and flexible information retrieval tool. This will also facilitate data-mining and bibliometric analysis based on the bibliographic relationships coded in the structured metadata.
- Clara Liao, Coordinator and Moderator, Georgetown University Law Library
- Diane I. Hillmann, Speaker, Information Institute of Syracuse
- Karen Coyle, Speaker, Digital Libraries Consultant

Serials Standing Committee Meeting
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 7:30-8:45 a.m.
CCC-Room 608
- Shyama Agrawal, J. Michael Goodson Law Library, Duke University School of Law

SKOS and HIVE: Enhancing the Creation, Design, and Flow of Information (Program D4)
Monday, July 12, 2010 — 8:45-9:45 a.m.
CCC-Room 205-207
The reality of the Semantic Web is quickly approaching! An increasing amount of attention is being given to The World Wide Web Consortium’s (W3C) Simple Knowledge Organization Systems (SKOS). SKOS is a way of developing standards for knowledge organization systems (i.e. classification schemes, like Library of Congress Classification Schemes; subject headings; and thesauri) that can be used in the Semantic Web. This presentation will give an introduction to the main concepts related to SKOS and discuss how SKOS is relevant to the law library environment. Speakers will also introduce a
SKOS-based project called HIVE (Helping Interdisciplinary Vocabulary Engineering), an Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) funded open source vocabulary server project that is meant to improve access to interdisciplinary collections.

- Alan Keely, Coordinator and Moderator, Professional Center Library, Wake Forest University
- Jane Greenberg, Speaker, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- Hollie White, Speaker, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

**Task Force on Standards for Vendor-Supplied Bibliographic Records Meeting**
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 11:45 a.m.-1:00 p.m.
CCC-Room 608

- Angela Jones, Chair, Underwood Law Library, Southern Methodist University

**Technical Services Management Issues Roundtable**
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 3:15-4:00 p.m.
CCC-Room 107

Discussion continued from TS-SIS program: How Are We To Accomplish That Much More with That Much Less?

- Ajaye Bloomstone, Coordinator, Louisiana State University Law Center Library
- Alan Keely, Coordinator and Moderator, Professional Center Library, Wake Forest University

**TS/OBS/RIPS/CS-SIS Joint Reception**
Saturday, July 10, 2010 — 7:00-8:00 p.m.
Hyatt-Centennial Ballroom F

- Sponsored by Innovative Interfaces, Inc.
- Betty Roeske, Coordinator, Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP

**TSLL Board Meeting**
Tuesday, July 13, 2010 — 10:45-11:30 a.m.
CCC-Room 202

- Virginia Bryant, Editor, George Washington University

**Website Advisory Roundtable**
Sunday, July 11, 2010 — 12:00-1:00 p.m.
Hyatt-Granite B

- Martin Wisneski, Coordinator, Washburn University Law Library

**What’s in a Name: CORE and I-2, New Standards to Improve Efficiency in the Electronic Resources Environment**
Sunday, July 11, 2010 — 1:30-2:45 p.m.
CCC-Room 109

The current marketplace has numerous products from many vendors to address different aspects of electronic resources. Interoperability between them is essential to gain maximum benefits. CORE (Cost of Resource Exchange) describes a message structure which facilitates the transfer of cost data from Integrated Library Systems to Electronic Resource Management Systems. Identifying institutions with multiple departments, campuses and their hierarchical relationship can be very difficult. I-2 (Institutional Identifier) a proposed NISO standard, under development, is a unique identifier assigned to an institution. I-2 aims to be global, interoperable and unique and will show the hierarchical relationship of an institution with all its subsidiaries. Working group members of these two standards will discuss the need for these standards, their goals, objectives, data elements used and implementation issues.

- Shyama Agrawal, Coordinator, J. Michael Goodson Law Library, Duke University School of Law
- Helen Henderson, Speaker, Ringgold
- Ted Koppel, Speaker, Auto-Graphics Inc.
services law librarians for his many years of volunteer leadership activities going back to 1986, having served as former TSLL editor-in-chief, OBS-SIS chair, TS-SIS Board member-at-large, chapter president of the Mid-America Association of Law Libraries, and member of AALL’s Annual Meeting Program Committee for 2002/2003. He’s presented numerous programs from the practical “Problem Publications” to the amusing “Gateway to Career Renewal.” Brian was instrumental in establishing the Joint Research Grant, starting years ago in 1988 as chair of the TS-SIS Ad Hoc Committee to Investigate Publishing Opportunities for Technical Services Librarians, and continuing to encourage potential writers through the “Research and Publications Column,” later co-authored with Ellen McGrath. In 1990, he assisted Lynn Randall and Jean Pajerek in developing the proposal to create the Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award. Even though Brian has not served on the AALL Executive Board nor previously received an AALL distinguished service award, both criteria for the AALL Volunteer Service Award, his remarkable service to AALL has earned him this prestigious honor. Brian exemplifies the active participation and enthusiasm that are so vital to the success of a national association. Our congratulations, Brian!

Still another exemplary technical services librarian, Carol Avery Nicholson, is this year’s recipient of the Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award for her outstanding service to the profession. Carol is the Associate Director for Technical Services at the Katherine Everett Law Library, University of North Carolina—Chapel Hill. As noted in TSLL’s March issue, Carol has served as the AALL president, OBS-SIS chair, and most important for the Denver conference, current TS-SIS Education Committee chair — responsible for pulling together the excellent program choices for technical services librarians this year. Carol has also presented numerous programs on a variety of law topics, including diversity, but is especially well known to technical services librarians as the “go-to” person for questions regarding statistical counts for law libraries. Carol is indeed a role model for excellent service to our profession. Our congratulations, Carol!