TECHNICAL SERVICES LAW LIBRARIAN

Volume 36 No. 1
September 2010, *corrected 9/29/10*

http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/tsll/
ISSN: 0195-4857

INSIDE:

The CONELL Experience

Amanda Quist
San Diego County Public Law Library

I was the grateful recipient of the TS-SIS Marla Schwartz grant to attend CONELL at this year's Annual Meeting in Denver. I've been a law librarian for two years and really came into the profession by accident after finishing library school. I was looking forward to meeting other new law librarians, and if I was lucky, finding one whose experience was similar to mine.

I began my CONELL experience the night before, at the "dutch treat" dinner event. As it turned out, the group I chose comprised only three people: the organizer (a firm librarian), myself (a county law librarian), and another new law librarian (an academic law librarian). The small size of our group made conversation really easy and it was great that we represented three different types of libraries. We talked a lot about the differences and similarities we faced. I also discovered that my CONELL colleague shared my experience of having accidentally found herself in law librarianship. Her story was remarkably similar to mine, and it was nice to have found that point of commonality so soon in my CONELL experience.

The next day, CONELL "officially" began with an early morning and continental breakfast. We listened to several speakers in the morning who shared their own CONELL experiences, gave us insight into AALL as an organization and how we can make the best use of our membership, encouraged us to volunteer our time and energy to the association, and exhorted us to make the most of our Annual Meeting experience by meeting new people, taking advantage of goodies in the vendor hall, and trying new things by going to programs that do not fit within our job description.

Later in the morning we visited the AALL Marketplace, a sort of mini version of the activities area in the exhibit hall. There we had an opportunity to meet and discover all the many, many facets of AALL. It was a lively place and I got to meet some new people and find out about some SISs, caucuses, and groups I didn't know about before. But there were many that I didn't get to visit due to the shortness of time and the number of people trying to move through. In fact,

Continued on page 43

A Publication of the Technical Services Special Interest Section and the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section of the American Association of Law Libraries

2009-2010 Officers, Committee Chairs, and Representatives

TS-SIS
Chair:
Pam Deemer
Emory University
Vice Chair/Chair-Elect:
Ismael Gullon
Mercer University
Secretary/Treasurer:
Elaine Bradshaw
University of Oklahoma
Members-at-Large:
Katrina Piechnik (2009-2011)
Jenkins Law Library
Suzanne Graham (2010-2012)
University of Georgia
Acquisitions Committee:
Eric Parker
Northwestern University
Awards Committee:
Linda Sobey
Florida A&M University
Bylaws Committee:
Chris Long
Indiana University-Indianapolis
Cataloging & Classification:
George Prager
New York University
Education Committee:
Ajaye Bloomstone
Louisiana State University
Membership Committee:
Sean Chen
Duke University
Nominating Committee:
Brian Striman
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Preservation Committee:
Marilyn Estes
Washington College of Law
Serials Committee:
Shyama Agrawal
Duke University

OBS-SIS
Chair:
Kathy Faust
Lewis & Clark College
Vice Chair/Chair-Elect:
Betty Roeske
Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP
Secretary/Treasurer:
Karen Selden
University of Colorado Boulder
Members-at-Large:
Keiko Okuhara (2009-2011)
University of Hawaii
Karen Nuckolls
Univ. of Kentucky (2010-2012)
Education Committee:
Kathy Faust
Lewis & Clark College
Local Systems Committee:
Caitlin Robinson
University of Iowa
Nominating Committee:
Michael Maben
Indiana University-Bloomington
OCLC Committee:
Yuxin Li
University of Houston
Web Advisory Committee:
F. Tim McKnight
York University

TS-SIS (cont.)
Professional Development Committee (co-chairs):
Emerita Cuesta
University of Miami
Aaron Kuperman
LC, Law Cataloging Section

OBS and TS-SIS Representatives
ALA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI)
George Prager, New York University
ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)
John Hostage, Harvard Law School
ALA Subject Analysis Committee (SAC)
Yael Mandelstam, Fordham University
OBS/TS Joint Research Grant Committee
Chair, Hollie White, Univ of N Carolina Chapel Hill; Richard Amelung (ex officio)
OBS-SIS Reps: Hollie White (2009-2011); Kerry Skinner (2010-2012)
TS-SIS Reps: Barbara Henigman (2009-2011); Susan Goldner (2010-2012)
AALL Representative to NISO (National Information Standards Organization)
Mary Alice Baish

Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section

It might have helped if I had read *A Lady's Life in the Rocky Mountains* by Isabella Bird, about her experiences riding alone through the Colorado Rockies in the fall and winter of 1873. Maybe then I would have realized how hot Denver can get. Not that I minded the heat and sunshine. We in Oregon (and probably the Northwest as a whole) had just come off the coldest June on record (we started calling the month Junuary to commemorate the cold temperatures), so the heat and sunshine were wonderful.

The conference was also wonderful as Pat Sayre-McCoy and her crew on the Education Committee put together a fine roster of programs. OBS-SIS sponsored one program and co-sponsored four more with Technical Services SIS. Plus we self-sponsored a hot topic program presented by our VIP this year, Janet Swan Hill. Janet is professor and associate director for technical services at the University of Colorado. In addition to presenting the hot topic, Janet also took an active part in the question and answer periods of the programs she attended.

I want to thank Pat for her work on organizing the programs and all the other work she did on behalf of the SIS as chair this past year. But I think she will be even busier this coming year, giving me lots of advice. I know I'll be contacting her many times. I would also like to thank Elaine Bradshaw, whose term as member-at-large has expired. She is being replaced by Karen Nuckolls.

Congratulations to Betty Roeske, who is the new vice chair/chair-elect. She, Karen and Pat will join me on the OBS Board along with continuing board members Karen Selden (secretary/treasurer) and Keiko Okuhara (member-at-large). In addition to the board members there are the various committee chairs and representative that we rely on to keep the SIS going. Those committee chairs and representatives are: Michael Maben (Nominations Committee), Yuxin Li (OCLC Committee), F. Tim Knight (web master), Janet Hedin and Ellen McGrath (OBS TSLL board representatives), Hollie White (OBS/TS Joint Research Committee chair), Kerry Skinner (OBS representative to the Joint Research Committee), and Caitlin Robinson (Local Systems). Without all their help we wouldn't have an SIS.

The Education Committee has been busy putting together program proposals for the meeting next year in Philadelphia. So far we have five programs we'll be submitting to the Annual Meeting Program Committee. The five are on the current testing of *RDA*, cloud computing, the evolution of the ILS as library technical services staff members use it, technical services and systems research, and managing emerging technologies. I hope that by the next issue of *TSLL* I can report on which programs have been accepted by AMPC.

One last item of interest about next year's meeting is that we have a VIP lined up. He is Steven J. Bell, associate university librarian for research and instructional services at Temple University, and an adjunct associate professor at Drexel University College of Information Science & Technology. He is the author of the "From the Bell Tower" column for *Library Journal Academic Newswire*. He also maintains the *Kept-Up Academic Librarian blog* and is on the blogging team for *ACRLog*. He plans on spending at least a day at AALL next year and will give a short presentation.

I would like to close by saying how honored I am to be the Chair of OBS-SIS. Thank you so much for electing me. Please feel free to contact me, or anyone else on the board, if you have any suggestions or concerns for OBS, or if you want to become more involved in OBS.

Kathy Faust
Lewis & Clark Law School

Technical Services Special Interest Section

From the Chair

I'd like to start off this column and long list of 'thank yous' with thank you, Chris Long, for your leadership during the past year. Chris, more than once, voiced our suggestions and concerns to the AALL Executive Board after consulting with the TS-SIS Executive Board. He initiated the special interests sections' expression of concerns with AALL Annual Meeting programming, and wrote to the AALL Executive Board to emphasize the importance of our representatives to CC:DA, SAC, and MARBI. He also conveyed our request that maintenance of bibliographic control of information be added to AALL's strategic goals. All this was in addition to providing guidance to other TS-SIS officers and committee chairs, and the juggling of all those TS-SIS sponsored programs and committee meetings.

Many thanks go to Carol Avery Nicholson and the TS-SIS Education Committee for successfully providing so many technical services-oriented programs at the AALL Annual Meeting in Denver, as well as thanks to the speakers, coordinators, and moderators. This was possibly the best annual meeting for technical services programs in terms of numbers and quality, despite having to cram so much into three days.

Speaking of Carol Avery Nicholson, Chris Long with Margaret Maes presented the Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award for Outstanding Contributions in Technical Services Law Librarianship to her at the TS-SIS business meeting. Her contributions have definitely been outstanding, and never once does she seem to "rest on her laurels," just like Marie Whited, the recipient of the Marian Gould Gallagher Distinguished Service Award this year. Marie is retiring to New England, and the TS-SIS Executive Board wanted to express once more the SIS's very own appreciation for her service to technical services excellence. After Carol's award, Chris then surprised Marie with a certificate of appreciation from the TS-SIS.

Challenges ahead keep things interesting. Contrary to what outsiders may think, anyone who can't handle change doesn't belong in technical services. Our programs at the annual meeting revealed that, by providing more alphabet soup than the combined SIS Saturday reception. (By the way, the reception pleased Innovative Interfaces enough that they are very willing to continue to sponsor it next year. Thank you, Betty Roeske, and the representatives from the other SISs!) Top of the soup bowl is *RDA*, *Resource Description and Access*. Two-thirds of those who completed last year's membership survey are involved with cataloging, but how information is described, organized, and presented affects access, and thus affects the work of all librarians. Good-sized audiences attended programs on *RDA* and the Semantic Web, and MARC and *RDA*. Adding more goodies to the alphabet soup were programs on SKOS, HIVE, CORE and I2. A session on open source integrated library systems added even more. IR stands for institutional repositories, and we drank in information about that. We had a program on catalogers' changing roles accompanying the soup, and another on coping with lukewarm budgets and the stress engendered by those budgets and our changing world.

I was pleased to see we have a new AALL Exhibit Hall table tradition, thanks to the imagination and creativity of board member-at-large Katrina Piechnik! She suggested, organized, contributed, and ran a silent auction at the table to benefit the Marla Schwartz Grant Fund. Practically all the items sold, and $276 was added to the grant fund. Now here's a heads up for the 2011 AALL Annual Meeting: Katrina will be soliciting your craft items for the TS-SIS Exhibit Hall table silent auction next spring. This year's auction was rather a last minute idea, but we hope with more time to create things for 2011, we'll have more donations from more people.

Present and future officers and committee chairs will appreciate the work past chairs Linda Tesar and Alan Keely have done on the TS-SIS handbook. Many instructions and listings of duties were confusing and out-of-date, and there was duplication of responsibilities. It was a supreme effort for them to clarify and straighten things out. Whew! Thanks also go to the chairs and officers who responded to their requests for updates.

Webmaster Martin Wisneski has to be a TS-SIS member forever. He has been so helpful and quickly responsive to posting the surveys and updates I've thrown at him.

I can't end this column without expressing gratitude to outgoing secretary/treasurer Wendy Moore, and member-at-large Betty Roeske. They, along with continuing member-at-large Katrina Piechnik, fulfilled their offices very, very well.

Finally, a great big thank you goes to all the people who responded to my pleas for volunteers, especially to those who will chair committees or serve administratively, and to those who filled out the membership survey. Y'all make this one great SIS.

Pam Deemer
Emory University

Chapman Award Presented to Carol Avery Nicholson

Margaret Maes

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

It has now been 20 years since Renee Chapman was killed in an automobile accident in March of 1990. The SIS had already begun the process of establishing an award to honor achievement in technical services law librarianship, and although the first award would not be made until 1992, the SIS board decided at the 1990 annual meeting that the award would be named after Renee in recognition of her own contributions to the SIS and in particular to continuing education.

Carol Avery Nicholson also has a strong commitment to continuing education, but that is only one of her many contributions to technical services law librarianship.

Carol's resume documents a record of professional activity at local, regional and national levels that began early in her career and continues to this day. She has planned and coordinated workshops and educational programs, presented at numerous conferences, and written for a variety of publications. These are some of the highlights of her technical services contributions:

- Editor of the *Law Library Systems Directory*, first edition published in 1993. This useful reference tool made it possible for libraries to learn more about the automated systems used by other libraries and to share information about hardware and software. The web has made this type of directory nearly obsolete, but at the time it was a significant resource for technical services librarians.
- Chair of the Online Bibliographic Services SIS in 1988-89.
- Co-Director of AALL's Basic Cataloging Institute, 1988.
- Member of the Planning Committee for the annual North Carolina Serials Conference since 1991.
- Chair of the Technical Services SIS Serials Committee since 2005.
- Co-Coordinator of AALL's Amazing Technical Services Workshop, 2008.

Carol has also served on numerous committees in both the Technical Services SIS and the Online Bibliographic Services SIS. In addition, she has spoken on technical services topics at more than a dozen national and regional conferences, and she has published several articles on related issues.

During her service on the American Bar Association's Law Libraries Committee and in conjunction with her service on the Technical Services SIS Serials Committee, Carol played a key role in helping librarians to understand the changes in the ABA Annual Questionnaire related to counting electronic titles and databases.

While Carol's record in the technical services area speaks for itself, it is important to note that her contributions extend far beyond that. She is a Past President of the Southeastern Chapter of AALL and has served on numerous chapter committees. She served AALL as an Executive Board member from 1995-1998 and 2001-2004, and she was AALL President in 2002-2003. The first Members' Briefing published during her presidential year was entitled "Value-Added: Technical Services in the 21st Century," (*AALL Spectrum* 7, no. 2 (October 2002)).

Carol also has been active in a wide variety of AALL committees, and she chaired the Committee on Minorities from 1991-1993. She has spoken on topics relating to diversity and is a co-author of *Celebrating Diversity: A Legacy of Leadership in AALL* (Hein, 2006).

Carol Avery Nicholson is highly deserving of the Chapman Award for her leadership and professional service, her consistent and sustained record of advocacy for technical services standards and excellence, and her contributions to educational programming and professional literature.

Please join me in congratulating Carol and thanking her for her service.

TSLL Annual Report
Covering July 2009-July 2010

Volume 35 of *TSLL* consisted of four issues, published in PDF format and available on the *TSLL* website. Virginia Bryant completed her second year as *TSLL*'s editor-in-chief with continuing excellent assistance provided by Cindy May, associate editor; Julie Stauffer, layout and design; and Martin Wisneski, web manager. Each issue was available on schedule due to the dedication and hard work of the *TSLL* staff.

Several new columnists and contributing authors were added to the *TSLL* staff this year. Kate Wilko, a reference librarian at Stanford University, joined long-time columnist Marie Whited in co-editing the Classification column, and Matthew Jenks, head of collection management and cataloging librarian at Franklin Pierce Law Center, increased our knowledge of new resources with his Internet column. Corinne Jacox did a fabulous job recruiting additional contributors to the TechScans column as Georgia Briscoe, University of Colorado at Boulder; Jean Pajerek, Cornell University; Christina Tarr, University of California at Berkeley; and Ismael Gullon, Mercer University, joined Yumin Jiang and Andrea Rabbia in reviewing current literature on the latest trends and technology to assist readers in keeping-up-to-date. In addition to their column contributions, TechScan authors breathed new life into the *TSLL* TechScan blog, posting current information weekly. Richard Paone has stepped down after three years as the columnist for Serials Issues, so that slot is now vacant; please contact me if you're interested. I would like to thank all of the columnists who shared their ideas and knowledge in *TSLL* this year. Their efforts are much appreciated.

In addition to the regular columns, volume 35 also offered several special articles. Topics included ERM, the discovery platform AquaBrowser, and OCLC's Expert Community experiment. The September issue featured program reports from AALL's Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C., for which over twenty volunteers reported on programs they attended. The editor would like to encourage more use of *TSLL* as a venue for sharing information among the TS-SIS and OBS-SIS membership. If you've implemented a new program, restructured a department, changed acquisitions procedures, evaluated implementing *RDA*, etc.—tell us about the process!

This year AALL signed an agreement with Hein to include *TSLL* in a special HeinOnline library developed for acquisitions, cataloging, and other technical services academic law librarians. *TSLL* is part of the Law Librarian's Reference Library, currently available in Beta mode at http://www.heinonline.org/HOL/Index?index=lcc/tsll&collection=lcc. Discussions are underway with Hein to improve full-text searching capability within *TSLL*. You can participate by letting Hein know how you would use the product, and if there are specific areas of content you want to be able to access quickly and directly.

Submitted by
Virginia Bryant
TSLL Editor-in-Chief
Chair, TSLL Editorial Board

MINUTES

Technical Services Special Interest Section
2010 Annual Business Meeting
Sunday, July 11, 2010
Denver, CO

Call to Order and Verification of a Quorum

Chair Chris Long called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. Secretary/Treasurer Wendy Moore verified that we had a quorum of members present in order to conduct the meeting. There were 67 members present. The Annual Business Meeting quorum requirement is 30 members.

Approval of minutes of the Annual Business Meeting from July 26, 2009, Washington, DC

Alan Keely moved that the minutes from the July 26, 2009 Annual Business Meeting in Washington, D.C. be approved. The motion was seconded. The minutes were approved with a voice vote with no objections.

Secretary/Treasurer Report – Wendy Moore

Wendy Moore reported that the TS-SIS elections held in May saw 218 ballots returned for a participation rate of 33%, an increase over last year's election. She reported that our opening balance this fiscal year was $17,450.02 and that as of April 30 our balance was $19,040.18. However, our estimated balance as of June 30 is $16,121.50, with additional conference-related expenses anticipated. She noted that TS-SIS will close this year with a smaller balance than when we began, due to the TS-SIS Executive Board's decision to spend more of our funds on the membership. In addition to increasing the available funds for scholarships and providing breakfasts at early morning committee/roundtable meetings, TS-SIS along with OBS decided that it was in the best interest of our membership to pick up sponsorship of the AALL Representatives to ALA ALCTS/CC:DA, ALA ALCTS/SAC, and ALA MARBI following the AALL Executive Board's suspension of funding for AALL Representatives in March 2010.

Standing Committee Chair Reports

Acquisitions Standing Committee Report – Ajaye Bloomstone – Bloomstone reported that the revised AcqWeb was almost ready for content when it stalled again. The Acquisitions Committee has been cooperating with the ALL-SIS Collection Development Committee to create a single website related to collection development policies and available to members of both TS-SIS and ALL-SIS.

Cataloging and Classification Standing Committee Report – George Prager – Prager reported that the Cataloging and Classification Committee had a very active year. Its website has been redesigned to include more information. The Classification and Subject Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group submitted their final Genre/Form List to the Library of Congress Policy and Standards Division in October 2009. The Task Group on Vendor-Supplied Bibliographic Records has produced a wiki to assist with the use of vendor-supplied bibliographic records.

Preservation Standing Committee Report – Marilyn Estes – Estes noted that the Preservation Committee held a discussion about preserving library websites and had a speaker about LIPA. There are vacancies on two sub-committees for next year.

Serials Standing Committee Report – Shyama Agrawal – Agrawal reported that the Exchange of Duplicates Program has been running with 37 libraries participating, netting TS-SIS $730 for awards and grants this year. The Serials Committee has also focused their work on promoting the Project COUNTER statistics standard with legal publishers.

Awards – Chris Long reported on behalf of Wendell Johnting

Marla Schwartz Grant recipient Amanda Quist was recognized. She used the grant to attend CONELL.

TS-SIS Educational Grants recipients were recognized. These grants were used in support of AALL Annual Meeting registration. The recipients were: Ajaye Bloomstone, Courtney Selby, and Amanda Quist.

Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award was presented to Carol Avery Nicholson in recognition of her thirty years as a technical services law librarian and her many contributions to TS-SIS. Margie Maes presented the award to Nicholson. Nicholson thanked Laura Gassaway for encouraging her to get involved with AALL and TS-SIS and thanked her library, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and her family for all of their support over the years. She jokingly noted, "If you are a friend of mine, then you have probably been volunteered for a committee!" and she concluded by encouraging everyone to go to all of the TS-SIS programs and committee meetings.

A Certificate of Appreciation from TS-SIS was presented to Marie Whited in recognition of her being honored as this year's AALL Marian Gould Gallagher Distinguished Service Award recipient and for her many contributions to TS-SIS over her career. Whited will be retiring from the Law Library of Congress at the end of the year. She thanked TS-SIS members for all of the fun she has had over the years.

TSLL Report – Virginia Bryant

Virginia Bryant reported that *TSLL* produced four issues this year, all of which were issued on time. *TSLL* columnists present were acknowledged for their contributions. She thanked the *TSLL* staff, Cindy May, Julie Stauffer, and Martin Wisneski, for their hard work. Bryant encouraged attendees to take a look at the new and improved TechScans, http://www.tslltechscans.blogspot.com/, which is available via RSS and she acknowledged the TechScans contributors present. She acknowledged the special article authors for their contributions this year. She noted that back issues of *TSLL* are available on HeinOnline and that in the near future Hein will be undertaking a detailed indexing of those issues, which will greatly improve searching.

Chair's Report – Chris Long

Chris Long noted that there is a detailed version of his annual Chair's Report on the TS-SIS website, along with written reports from all of the TS Executive Board positions. Long thanked Martin Wisneski for the speed and accuracy with which he maintains the TS-SIS website. He reported that the Alphabet Soup Reception held on Saturday evening was successful and that its long-time sponsor, Innovative Interfaces, Inc., was pleased with the event. Long encouraged attendees to stop by the TS-SIS table in the Exhibit Hall to participate in the silent auction to raise funds for the Marla Schwartz Grant and thanked silent auction organizers Katrina Piechnik and Sean Chen. Long thanked this year's Education Committee and its Chair, Carol Nicholson, for the excellent programming at this year's conference. He noted that for TS-SIS there were seven AMPC picks for our submissions, four TS-SIS sponsored programs, and one co-sponsored program. With all its programs and meetings, TS-SIS used every time slot available at this year's conference. Long noted the creation this year of the new TS-SIS administrative committee, Professional Development Committee, which will focus on providing continuing education opportunities for TS-SIS members outside the Annual Meeting. Long thanked the Executive Board members and their commitment this year to reinvest in our TS-SIS membership. He thanked everyone who served on a committee, volunteered, or helped out this year. He noted that the strength of TS-SIS is in the talent, energy, and capability of its members.

Old Business

There was no old business discussed.

New Business

Passing of the gavel – Chris Long thanked TS-SIS members for the opportunity to serve as Chair and noted that it has been one of the most rewarding experiences of his career. He introduced Pam Deemer as the new TS-SIS Chair and presented her with the TS-SIS meeting gavel.

Comments from the New Chair – Pam Deemer presented Chris Long with a plaque and gift in recognition of his service as Chair and thanked him for his contributions to TS-SIS. She then thanked everyone who has volunteered their time with TS-SIS activities, especially those who ran for election. She noted some of the issues that TS-SIS will be focusing on this coming year: mining the results of our membership survey, preparing for *RDA*, supporting the problems of escalating price increases, and pushing for statistical accountability from our online resources.

Meeting adjourned at 6:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Wendy Moore
Secretary/Treasurer

MINUTES

Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section
2010 Annual Business Meeting
Monday, July 12, 2010
Denver, CO

Chair Pat Sayre-McCoy called the business meeting to order at 5:30 PM.

Officer Reports

Secretary-Treasurer Karen Selden gave the elections and treasurer's report. Karen summarized a written report that she distributed to audience members. An online election was held throughout April 2010 using AALL's electronic voting software. From a pool of 311 eligible voters, 99 votes were cast (an approximate 32% return rate). The following officers were elected for the 2010-2011 term:

Vice Chair/Chair-Elect — Betty Roeske, Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP
Member-at-Large — Karen Nuckolls, University of Kentucky

As of April 30, 2010, the balance in the OBS account stood at $9,011.61. However, this figure includes a pre-payment from Innovative Interfaces, Inc. towards the 2010 Joint Reception expenses.

The minutes of the 2009 Business Meeting were approved as published in *TSLL* v. 35, no. 1 (September 2009).

Incoming Chair Kathy Faust gave the Vice-Chair's report and noted that she received 44 responses to the annual member survey. This year, the Board offered a $50 gift card to Barnes & Noble as an incentive to fill out the survey, and Anne Myers of Yale University was the lucky winner.

Member-at-Large Keiko Okuhara (2009-2011) reported on the Joint Reception, which took place on Saturday evening at the Hyatt Hotel and was well-attended. After 2009's expensive venue and reception, the 2010 committee made it a priority to keep expenses as close to the amount donated by sponsor Innovative Interfaces, Inc. (III) as possible. Keiko reported that III representatives were pleased with the reception.

Member-at-Large Elaine Bradshaw (2008-2010) reported on the OBS activities table. The paperback book exchange and bowl of candy continue to be popular enticements to the table. OBS also continues the tradition of raffling off a $25 gift card from Amazon.com. The drawing will be held at 1:45 p.m. on Tuesday afternoon, the winner will be notified by email, and the card will be sent directly from Amazon.

Committee Reports

Pat Sayre-McCoy reported on behalf of Nominations Committee Chair Andrea Rabbia. The other committee members were Joseph Thomas of Notre Dame Law Library and Sherri Thomas of the University of New Mexico School of Law Library. Four nominees agreed to run for the two positions (vice chair/chair-elect and member-at- large), and the results of the election are noted above in the secretary/treasurer's report. Michael Maben will chair the committee in 2011.

Pat Sayre-McCoy reported on Education Committee activities for the 2010 Annual Meeting. Five programs that were either sponsored or co-sponsored by OBS were accepted by the AMPC. These programs were:

B-3: "Open Source ILS: What a Service Oriented System Brings to You and Your Library" (co-sponsored with TS-SIS)
C-5: "Catalogers Today: Skill Sets, Expectations and Challenges" (co-sponsored with TS-SIS)
G-5: "MARC and *RDA*: an Overview" (co-sponsored with TS-SIS)
H-4: "The Semantic Web and *RDA*: Making the Catalog a Networked Bibliographic Environment" (co-sponsored with TS-SIS)
K-5: "Is Quality Control in Academic Law Library Online Catalogs Declining?"

An additional program was self-sponsored by OBS:

"OBS-SIS Hot Topic," presented by OBS VIP Janet Swan Hill
Janet Swan Hill is Professor and Associate Director for Technical Services at the University of Colorado's Norlin Library. Janet has been very active in the American Library Association (ALA) for more than thirty years, including serving on the ALA Executive Board. She also represents ALA on the Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control. Pat reported that in addition to presenting a program, Janet was very active at the 2010 AALL Annual Meeting by attending programs and contributing to discussions during those programs. Pat encouraged OBS members to welcome and introduce themselves to Janet.

Kathy Faust reported on Education Committee activities for the 2011 Annual Meeting. The committee will meet Tuesday morning to work on three current proposals and entertain ideas for other proposals. The 2011 AMPC process has been changed from prior years. The deadline for proposals is September 15, 2010, which is a month later than in previous years. Also new this year is the lack of a theme for the Annual Meeting. Instead, program tracks, based on AALL's Competencies of Law Librarianship, will be used to categorize programs. Kathy encouraged OBS members to attend the Education Committee meeting or send ideas for programs to any committee member.

Pat Sayre-McCoy delivered the Local Systems report on behalf of Caitlin Robinson. The user group meetings were held on Sunday, and some were well attended and some not. Caitlin recommends that the process of organizing and offering these meetings should be studied with an eye toward revising the process and analyzing which user groups should be offered.

Pat Sayre-McCoy also delivered the OCLC Committee report on behalf of Ming Lu. This year the committee again sponsored an "OCLC Update" led by OCLC's Glenn Patton, followed by a roundtable discussion. Glenn also sends OCLC news and updates to the OBS-OCLC email list as appropriate throughout the year. The committee continues to deliver an OCLC column to *Technical Services Law Librarian*. The new chair of the OCLC Committee for 2010-2011 will be Yuxin Li of the University of Houston Law Library. Pat extended thanks to Ming for her years of service on the OCLC Committee and for serving as chair.

Pat Sayre-McCoy also delivered the Web Advisory Committee report on behalf of Tim Knight. Tim completed his first year as the OBS Webmaster, and Board members have found him very helpful and responsive to posting and updating items on the website. Tim's goal when he became OBS Webmaster in 2009 was to redesign the OBS website once AALL completed the redesign of the entire aallnet site in the fall of 2009. The aallnet redesign is still not completed, so Tim continues to update the current OBS site as needed.

Hollie White reported for the Joint Research Grant Committee. No grant applications were received this year, and the committee is concerned that there have been no applications for grants in recent years. In response, the committee made some changes that will make the process easier for applicants and hopefully will spark more interest in the funds. The committee will now accept electronic submissions of applications, and will expand advertising for the funds to a wider audience, beyond OBS and TS. The committee hopes to offer some programming about the research process in 2011, and is enthusiastic about the future of the grant program.

TSLL Report

Editor Virginia Bryant reported that the *TSLL* published four issues, all on time, during the past year. She thanked all of the columnists and authors for their contributions. There are several new columnists, and she is currently looking for a new Serials columnist. The Tech Scans RSS feed and website is now on a weekly schedule so that subscribers can expect at least two new posts each week. Thanks to Corrine Jacox for coordinating the Tech Scans team. *TSLL* printed several feature articles during the past year, including articles on ERM, AquaBrowser, and OCLC's Enhance status.

TSLL is now included in *HeinOnline*, in the Law Librarian's Reference Library. Hein is working to improve the scanning quality of the *TSLL* issues and will eventually reindex the contents to make all of the valuable information in the issues more easily available.

Chair's Remarks

Outgoing Chair Pat Sayre-McCoy thanked the OBS Board and committee chairs for their advice and support throughout the past year. Pat extended special thanks to outgoing Board members Michael Maben and Elaine Bradshaw for their service to the OBS Board. She especially thanked Michael for all of his advice and support as she navigated through the process of serving as an SIS Chair. She concluded that her term of service as Chair had been a lot of fun and that she enjoyed it. Then Pat passed the OBS leadership cap to incoming chair Kathy Faust. Kathy then presented Pat with a token of appreciation for her leadership in the form of a gift certificate to Barnes and Noble. The gift bag and tissue paper had a nautical map theme, which Pat also appreciated for use with her craft projects.

New Chair Kathy Faust took the podium for concluding remarks. She once again encouraged the membership to attend the Education Committee meeting and/or submit more educational program ideas to the committee. One of her goals for the coming year is to review and redesign the OBS brochure. She would also like to choose some giveaways for the OBS activities table. When she asked if there was any other business to discuss, Brian Striman rose to let the audience know about a new Facebook page called *RDA* Café. It was created by Brian and an MLS student, and he felt OBS members would like to become fans.

The final act of business was to hold the raffle drawing for Business Meeting attendees for a sandstone and metal business card holder made by a local Colorado artisan. Jack Bissett of the Washington and Lee School of Law Library was the lucky winner.

Kathy adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Karen Selden
August 10, 2010

Report of the AALL Representative to the American Library Association Association for Library Collections and Technical Services, Cataloging and Classification Section: Description and Access (CC:DA) ALA Midwinter Meeting, Boston, Mass., January 2010 ALA Annual Conference, Washington, D.C., July 2010

John Hostage
Harvard Law School Library

In the past year CC:DA continued to focus on *RDA: Resource Description and Access*, the new cataloging code to succeed *AACR2*. At the ALA Midwinter Meeting in Boston a beta version of the *RDA Toolkit* was demonstrated. The toolkit is an online text database that will include the full text of *RDA* plus the *RDA* element set view, mappings to other systems, the ability to create or share workflows, and other related resources. There was also discussion of the pricing of *RDA*, which turned out to be more expensive than many had expected. Access to *RDA* is based on an annual subscription model, starting at $195 for a solo user. Institutional licenses start at $325, with additional charges for each concurrent user.

At the Midwinter Meeting CC:DA was given a presentation on application profiles by Diane Hillmann, Jon Phipps, and Karen Coyle. An application profile is a set of metadata elements, policies and guidelines defined for a particular application. It is an important tool for managing and processing data on the Semantic Web.

The committee reviewed a list of issues in *RDA* that had been deferred. A couple of them were of particular interest to law catalogers. One issue was a simplification of the rules for reports of a single court that had been proposed by AALL. The AALL representative was asked to prepare a revision proposal before the Annual Conference, which he did with the help of the Descriptive Cataloging Advisory Group, especially Marie Whited. However, CC:DA later decided to postpone consideration of rule revision proposals until after the final text of *RDA* was available. The proposal may be considered at the Midwinter Meeting in January 2011. It is expected that there will be a rule revision process for *RDA* similar to the one for *AACR2*. The next meeting of the Joint Steering Committee for the Development of *RDA* (JSC), the body which makes the final decisions on changes to *RDA*, will take place in the spring of 2011.

The main focus at the Annual Conference in Washington was celebrating the official release of *RDA* a couple of days earlier. *RDA* will undergo a period of testing by the Library of Congress, the National Library of Medicine, and the National Agricultural Library, in partnership with a number of other institutions, during the next six months. The results of this test will be announced early in 2011 and the national libraries will decide whether to implement *RDA* at that time. (Most observers find it hard to believe they will decide not to implement.)

AALL MARBI Representative Report 2009/2010 July 7, 2010 (updated August 10, 2010)

George Prager
New York University Law Library

Highlights

The Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee (MARBI) is an interdivisional joint committee of three units within the American Library Association. It is primarily responsible for the development of the MARC 21 formats. MARBI holds meetings twice a year, during ALA's Annual and Midwinter conferences. MARBI consists of nine voting members and three interns. The meetings are also attended by ex-officio representatives of national libraries and OCLC, and several dozen non-voting liaisons from ALA units and from non-ALA organizations with an interest in library automation standards. As the AALL representative to MARBI in 2010, I attended the MARBI meetings in Boston held during ALA Midwinter on January 16-17, 2010, as well as the meetings held in Washington, D.C., on June 26-27, 2010, during the ALA Annual Meeting.

Several proposals and discussion papers relate to the mapping of *RDA* to MARC 21. Proposal No. 2010-03 added new subfields to bibliographic fields 033 and 518 for recording place and date of event. Proposal No. 2010-04 added new fields and subfields to both the Bibliographic and Authority formats for works and expressions: new subfields to 046, as well as the new fields 380-384. This proposal complements last year's proposal No. 2009-01/1, which added the new fields 370-377 to the Authority Format, for *RDA* attributes relating to persons, families, and corporate bodies. Discussion Paper No. 2010-DP02, related to encoding URIs for controlled values in MARC records, will not be brought back as a proposal.

A number of MARBI papers concern the encoding into MARC 21 of new or draft international standards used in global identification systems. 2010-DP03, 2010-DP04, and Proposal No. 2010-06 discuss the International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI) and the International Standard Text Code (ISTC).

International participation in MARC by non-English-speaking countries continues to grow. The German and Spanish MARC communities have been sending representatives to the MARBI meetings for several years. The German National Library presented a discussion paper and a proposal relating to ISBD punctuation in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format, 2010-DP01 and Proposal No. 2010-07. Several revisions were approved to the codes used in Leader/18 Descriptive cataloging form.

New fixed field codes have been approved in the MARC Bibliographic Format to differentiate between online and direct access electronic resources, chiefly in Form of item 008/23 and 008/29 and related 006 fields (Proposal No. 2010-01).

The agenda for the 2010 ALA Midwinter MARBI meetings is available at http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/mw2010_age.html.

The minutes for the 2010 ALA Midwinter MARBI meetings are at http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/minutes/mw-10.html.

The agenda for the 2010 ALA Annual MARBI meetings is at http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/an2010_age.html.

The minutes for the 2010 ALA Annual MARBI meetings are at http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/minutes/an-10.html.

Summaries of all the 2010 discussion papers and proposals are given below, with links to the full papers. I have also included any changes made to the papers during the MARBI meetings, and subsequently by the Library of Congress' Network Development and MARC Standards Office. Following a summary of all the 2010 MARBI papers, I have discussed the 2009-2010 releases of Updates no. 10-11 to the MARC formats, and the latest OCLC, LC, and PCC plans for implementation of new MARC fields and subfields. "(R)" means that a field or subfield is repeatable; "(NR)" means that it is non-repeatable. The examples are given in MARC 21, except that extra spaces are added for legibility.

Summaries of 2010 MARBI Discussion Papers and Proposals

Proposal 2010-01: Defining codes for online and direct access electronic resources in 008/23 and 008/29 (Form of item)
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-01.html

This proposal originated with the PCC Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record Task Group, a group which I co-chaired. It began life as 2009-DP-04, discussed at the 2009 ALA Annual Meeting, and summarized in my 2008/2009 AALL MARBI Representative Report (available at http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/tsll/35-01/35-01.pdf). The proposal passed as amended at the 2010 ALA Midwinter Meeting. (The Maps and Visual Materials formats use 008/29 for Form of item; all other formats use 008/23; see also #3 below).

1. Code "o" is defined for "online." This code will be used only on a record representing the online resource. It should not be used on a record for the print version that contains a link to the online version.
2. Code "q" is defined for "direct electronic."
3. "Form of item" 008/23 has been added to the Computer Files format.
4. Code "s" "electronic" has not been made obsolete, but remains in the format, for those institutions that do not wish to make coding distinctions between types of electronic resources. Records coded as "pcc" should use the new codes. OCLC will convert code "s" to the appropriate new codes, both on a retrospective and ongoing basis.
5. Codes "o" and "q" have been added to byte 008/22 in Form of original item, Continuing Resources.
6. Codes "o" and "q" have also been added to the corresponding Form of item and Form of original item in field 006, Fixed length data elements — additional material.

Proposal 2010-02: Addition of $5 (Institution to which field applies) in the 80X-830 Series Added Entry Fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-02.html

This paper proposes the addition of $5 in series added entry fields for use in recording the name of a digital collection as a series in records for local and regional digital preservation projects, and projects of wider scope such as the Registry of Digital Masters (RDM). The proposal passed at the 2010 ALA Midwinter Meeting.

Proposal No. 2010-03: Recording Place and Date of Capture in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-03.html

Background: See discussion of 2009-DP06/2 in my 2008/2009 MARBI Representative Report. This proposal passed as amended.

033 - Date/Time and Place of an Event. Data in this field was formerly only in coded form, as a counterpart to the uncoded information in field 518. A new subfield has been added for Place of event, to accommodate specific locations such as recording studios, concert halls, etc. This data may be in controlled or uncontrolled form. The new subfields are:

$p Place of event (R)
$0 Record control number (for $p only) (R)
$2 Source of term (for $p only) (R)

518 – Date/Time and Place of an Event Note. Data in this field is eye-readable, but its content wasn't previously parsed into subfields. The data may now be parsed into the newly defined subfields (to help satisfy *RDA* requirements), or left unparsed.

If parsed subfields are used, the data may be in a controlled or uncontrolled form. Subfield "o" (the letter) will be used for Other event information (rather than $i for an introductory phrase). The changes made to field 518 are similar to the changes that were made in 2008 to field 502, Dissertation Note. The new subfields are:

$d Date of event (R)
$o Other event information (R)
$p Place of event (R)
$0 Record control number (for $p only) (R)
$2 Source of term (for $p only) (R)

Example: 518 $o Broadcast $p Colorado Convention Center, Room 601-603, Denver, Colo. $d 2010 July 12, 4:00-5:15 pm. EST

Proposal No. 2010-04: New data elements in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Format for works and expressions
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-04.html

Background: See discussion of 2009-DP06/3 in my 2008/2009 MARBI Representative Report.

The following new data elements have been approved in both the Bibliographic and Authority formats (see exception in #2 below). Until work and expression level records are created in the Bibliographic Format, these fields will be used only in the Authority Format.

380 - Form of Work (R)
Example (Bibliographic or Authority Format):

380 $a Play

046 - Special Coded Dates (R)
This field already existed in the Bibliographic Format, and most of the subfields were added to the Authority Format with the approval of Proposal No. 2009-01/1. Proposal 2010-04 adds two more subfields to 046 in the Authority Format:

$k Beginning or single date created (NR)
$l Ending date created (NR)

These new subfields will be used to help differentiate one work from another work, or one expression from another expression. The same information will still be seen in headings in authority and bibliographic records, especially in parenthetical qualifiers.

381 - Other Distinguishing Characteristics of Work or Expression (R).
Example (Authority Format -- Work):

130 #0 $a Working paper series (New York University. Salomon Center)
381 $a New York University. Salomon Center

"Other distinguishing characteristics" is deliberately a general term, which can encompass various sorts of information, dependent upon the nature of the resource cataloged. Such information is sometimes needed to break conflicts between headings, and is often lacking from the 670 field of authority records. It may be useful to add this information to the 381 field at the time the authority record is created, regardless of whether or not an actual conflict exists with the title of another work or expression.

382 - Medium of Performance (R)
Example (Authority Format):

382 $a soprano $a alto $a mixed voices $a orchestra

383 - Numeric Designation of a Musical Work (R)

384 - Key (NR)
A first indicator is defined for Key type: "#" Relationship to original unknown; "0" Original key; "1" Transposed key.

Proposal No. 2010-05: Adding $3 (Materials specified) to field 034 (Coded Cartographic Mathematical Data) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-05.html

Approved as written. Since field 034 may now be added to Geographic name authority records by NACO participants, some of us may have occasion to use this subfield. Proposal No. 2010-08 also discusses field 034.

Proposal No. 2010-06: Encoding the International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-06.html

and:
Discussion Paper No. 2010-DP03: Encoding the International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI) and the International Standard Text Code (ISTC) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Format
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-dp03.html

The ISNI is a draft ISO Standard (ISO 27729). Its scope is "the identification of Public Identities of parties: that is, the identities used publicly by parties involved throughout the media content industries in the creation, production, management, and content distribution chains." The ISNI Registration Authority will be responsible for allocating public identity to an ISNI, and managing and maintaining the ISNI database. ISNI is at the Draft International Standard (DIS) stage, and received 100% approval in March 2010. The standard is expected to be published prior to April 2011.

One of the ways that libraries will get ISNIs is through publishers' bibliographic metadata, so ISNIs will need to be recorded in MARC bibliographic records. Recording them in both the bibliographic and authority records will assist in the rights management process. "ISNIs can be assigned to any entity that is or was either a natural person, a legal person, a fictional character, or a group of such entities." (http://www.isni.org; last viewed July 5, 2010). In the MARC Bibliographic Format, ISNIs would be appropriate in main entry fields, subject access fields, added entry fields, and series added entry fields. In the MARC Authority Format, ISNIs could be used in "See also from" tracing fields (4XX), Heading linking entry fields (7XX), and Other standard identifier (field 024). It was clarified at the June 2010 MARBI meetings that ISNIs would not be used in the Authority heading fields (1XX fields); field 024 would be used for that purpose. To record ISNIs in authority fields 5XX and 7XX, $0 would be used. It would be difficult to record the ISNI in a consistent manner in all of the above fields, since few alphabetical or numerical subfields are available.

The discussion paper and proposal recommended using and augmenting the definition of $0 Authority record control number in both the Bibliographic and Authority formats so that ISNIs could be given in this subfield. Code "isni" was suggested for inclusion in the list of Standard Identifier Source Codes (available at http://www.loc.gov/standards/sourcelist/standardidentifier.html; last viewed July 5, 2010). The code "isni" should be given in parentheses and precede the standard number recorded in $0. The proposal was approved at the 2010 ALA Annual MARBI meeting.

Some examples of ISNIs:

(Bibliographic Format): 100 1# Rendell, Ruth, $d 1930- $0 ISNI 8462 8328 5653 6435

In the Authority Format, field 024 could be used to record an ISNI to help identify the entity recorded in a 100, 110, 111, 150, or 151 field. Code "isni" needs to be added to the *MARC Code List for Relators* (available at http://www.loc.gov/marc/relators; last viewed July 6, 2010).

Example:

024 7# $a ISNI 8462 8328 5653 6435$2 isni
100 1# $a Rendell, Ruth, $d 1930-

The International Standard Text Code was only briefly discussed at the January 2010 MARBI meetings, because some issues regarding how best to record it in bibliographic and authority records remained unresolved. A further discussion paper was written on the ISTC. (See below under Discussion Paper No. 2010-04).

MARC Proposal No. 2010-07: ISBD Punctuation in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-07.html

and:
Discussion Paper No. 2010-DP01: ISBD punctuation in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-dp01.html

Germany and Austria have recently joined the MARC 21 community. They previously used the MAB format, which omitted ISBD punctuation when content designation identified an element type. They wish to continue this practice in their MARC 21 records as well. In support of this practice, institutions that implement *RDA* will not need to follow ISBD punctuation conventions, since ISBD punctuation is optional for record displays in *RDA*. As a result of the discussions at the 2010 ALA Midwinter MARBI meetings, it was decided to narrow the use of Leader/18 to ISBD punctuation conventions. In conjunction with this change, it was also decided to make "040 $e (Description conventions)" repeatable. This has already been done, since a repeatable 040 $e was needed for *RDA* testing.

The subsequent proposal was brought forward at the June 2010 MARBI meetings. A new code "c" has been added:

c – ISBD punctuation excluded when redundant

The label for code "a", currently "ISBD/AACR" will be changed to "AACR", and the scope note will be revised.

The scope note for "i – ISBD" will also be revised; this code will only indicate that ISBD punctuation conventions are being followed. (the preexisting definition was "Descriptive portion of the record is formulated according to the descriptive and punctuation provisions of ISBD ...").

A record cataloged according to *RDA* and using ISBD punctuation would use: 008/18 "i" and 040 $e rda.

A record cataloged according to *RDA* not following ISBD punctuation conventions would use: 008/18 "#" and 040 $e rda.

MARC Proposal No. 2010-08: Encoding Scheme of Coordinate Data in Field 034 (Coded Cartographic Mathematical Data) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-08.html

This field has been used in both the MARC Bibliographic and Authority formats for cartographic mathematical data, such as scale, projection, and coordinates, which are given in coded form. Different methods are used to express coordinates, but the particular method has not been given in this field. This paper proposes a new $7 (Coordinate encoding scheme). The code used would be from Coordinate Scheme Source Codes. The proposal engendered a great deal of discussion at the 2010 ALA Annual MARBI meetings. Several technical issues regarding the proposal came up that could not be resolved. For this reason, the proposal was not approved; it may be brought back as a revised proposal at a future meeting.

MARC Proposal No. 2010-09: Addition of Subfield $u to Field 561 (Ownership and Custodial History) to the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Holdings Formats
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-09.html

Field 561 includes information about the ownership and custodial history of the resources described "from the time of their creation to the time of their accessioning." This information may be quite lengthy, and may be available from an external source or sources. Subfield "u" has already been added to many other 5XX Bibliographic fields, and would be useful here as well. The proposal passed as amended at the June 2010 MARBI meetings, with the only change being that the new $u was made repeatable.

Discussion Paper No. 2010-DP02: Encoding URIs for controlled values in MARC records
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-dp02.html

Background: See discussion of No. 2009-DP01/1 and 2009-DP06/1 in my 2008-2009 MARBI Representative Report.

This DP proposes recording Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) for controlled values and headings in the subfield appropriate to the value itself, distinguished by angle brackets around the Uniform resource identifier (URI). URIs would most likely not be keyed into records, but added via automation. This discussion paper will not be brought forward as a proposal. Rather, the Library of Congress and perhaps some other institutions or individuals will experiment with URIs by using some of the techniques described in this paper.

Discussion Paper No. 2010-DP04: Encoding the International Standard Text Code (ISTC) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-dp04.html

The International Standard Text Code (ISO 21047) is "a global identification system for textual works that is primarily intended for use by publishers, bibliographic services, retailers, libraries and rights management agencies to collocate different manifestations of the same title under a work-level record ... The standard was formally published in March 2009 and the International ISTC Agency has started implementing the standard."

The discussion paper presents several options in how the ISTC should be recorded in the MARC 21 formats "so that the potential benefits of the ISTC can be tested and exploited." It is hoped that other standards of a similar nature that identify the content rather than the carrier, such as the International Standard Work Code (ISWC), can also be handled in the same manner in MARC 21.

A major distinction is made in the ISTC standard between the concepts of "original work" and "derivations" or "derived works." Eleven types of derivation are defined, including abridged, annotated, critical, excerpt, etc.

In all likelihood, the ISTC will be imported into MARC records through the conversion of ONIX for Books product descriptions to MARC—the main reason why ISTCs need to be recorded in the Bibliographic Format, not just the Authority Format.

The discussion paper presents several options for recording ISTCs in MARC 21. Option 2 was supported by MARBI at its June 2010 meetings. It requires no changes to the format:

> Record ISTCs for works contained in the manifestation in bibliographic field 024 – Other standard identifier and record ISTCs for source works not contained in the manifestation in bibliographic field 787 subfield $o Other item identifier. 787 subfield $i Relationship information could be used to record introductory text.
>
> There may be a preference not to display the 787 because the ISTC may not be resolvable and there will be no additional descriptive metadata. …
>
> This option would be extensible, through the use of $i Relationship information and/or $4 Relationship code, should the type of relationship become explicit in future.

If the type of the relationship is known or becomes known, other linking fields may be more appropriate than 787 $i, such as field 765 "Translation of."

Here is one of the simpler examples from the DP:

An adaptation of Animal farm:

> **024 7# $a** 0A42010111177788 **$2** istc [ISTC for the work "George Orwell's Animal farm"]
> **100 1# $a** Wooldridge, Ian.
> **245 10 $a** George Orwell's Animal farm / **$c** adapted by Ian Wooldridge.
> **700 1# $a** Orwell, George, $d 1903-1950. **$t** Animal farm.
> **787 18 $i** Related source work **$o** ISTC 0A3200912B4A1057 [ISTC for the work "Animal farm"]

Discussion Paper No. 2010-DP05: Language Coding for Moving Images in Field 041 of the MARC Bibliographic Format
http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/2010/2010-dp05.html

This paper considered what changes could be made to the MARC format that would improve access to the various types of language information found on videos and other moving image materials. It suggests the following revisions to the coding of these materials:

1. Creating a distinction between spoken/sung/signed versus written language in fields 008/35-37 (Language) and 041 $a and $j. The current distinction is between "main" language and "subsidiary" language (such as subtitles and captions). This distinction is problematic for DVDs because sometimes 008/35-37 and 041 $a contain the "main" spoken language, and sometimes they contain subsidiary alternate soundtracks.
2. Distinguishing between original language and language of intermediate translations. Both are currently coded in subfield 041 $h.

At the 2010 ALA Annual MARBI meetings, it became readily apparent how complicated it would be to make all the desirable distinctions in language coding. Questions on the implications of this paper for other formats were also raised. This DP may come back as a proposal.

Other MARC News and Events

MARC 21 Update No. 10 and No. 11 available online
MARC 21 Update No. 10 (October 2009) was made available online in mid November 2009 from the MARC Standards home page (http://www.loc.gov/marc/; last viewed July 6, 2010). Changes to the documentation resulted mainly from MARBI proposals that were approved at the ALA Midwinter and ALA Annual Meetings in 2009.

Although the MARC updates are usually issued annually in October or November of each year, Update No. 11 (February 2010) was made available in early March 2010, in anticipation of the upcoming testing of *RDA*. That documentation included changes resulting mainly from MARBI proposals that were approved at the ALA Midwinter Meeting in January 2010. Both updates have been integrated into the documentation for each of the Online Full and Concise formats that are maintained on the MARC website.

The changes are indicated in red in Update 11. Update 10 changes have also been kept in red. Appendix G of the Bibliographic Format gives a list of all the changes made in Update 10, as well as a separate list for Update 11. Appendix F of the Authority Format gives separate lists of all the changes made in Update 10 and in Update 11. Update No. 12 will most likely be published in October or November of 2010, and will not involve major changes to the formats.

RDA in MARC (May 2010)
"*RDA* in MARC" is a list of all changes which have been approved to the MARC formats to support *RDA*. Hotlinks are provided to MARC 21 descriptions of all the fields that have already been added to the formats. This list has been compiled by Sally McCallum (available at http://www.loc.gov/marc/RDAinMARC29.html; last updated May 24, 2010; viewed July 6, 2010).

OCLC–MARC Format Changes in 2010
On May 23, 2010, OCLC implemented most of the changes related to the OCLC-MARC Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats Update 2010. This included MARC 21 Update No. 10 and most of Update No. 11, MARC Code List changes since July 2009, and user and OCLC staff suggestions. A detailed list of the changes is given in OCLC *Technical Bulletin* 258 (available at http://www.oclc.org/support/documentation/worldcat/tb/258/default.htm).

Here are the major changes to the Bibliographic 21 Format:

Form of item (008/23 & 006/06): new codes "o" online; "q" direct access
490 Series statement, $x is now repeatable, to enable recording of ISSNs for both main series and subseries.
588 Source of description note (LC and PCC will not use for simple Source of title notes, preferring to continue using 500 in these cases).

Changes specifically for RDA:

New 040 subfield $e code "rda" (repeatable)
336-338: *RDA* phrases and codes for content, media, and carrier (replacing $h GMD in *RDA* records)
518 and 033: Date/Time/Place of an Event; new subfields
700, 710, 711, 730: New subfield $i for Relationship information
76x-78x Linking entry fields: New subfield $4 Relationship code; subfield $i renamed: Relationship information (formerly: Display text)

Changes to the Authority Format: All the MARC changes to the Authority Format described above have been implemented by OCLC. However, LC and the PCC have asked all NACO participants not to use the new authority fields and elements until October 1, 2010, the date on which the *RDA* test begins.

MARC Formats Interest Group (MFIG) Meeting June 26, 2010
The topic of the meeting was: How have the MARC 21 formats been adapted to accommodate *RDA* and how is this being implemented?

First Richard Greene, OCLC, spoke about OCLC's recent implementation of MARC 21 changes to accommodate *RDA* and to support the testing of *RDA*. He reported that OCLC's recent implementation of MARC/*RDA* changes involved 129 pages in OCLC documentation. Each MARC update is reviewed by about sixty people.

OCLC has issued "OCLC Policy Statement on *RDA* Cataloging in WorldCat for the U.S. Testing Period" (available from http://www.oclc.org/us/en/rda/policy.htm; last viewed July 6, 2010). Catalogers may start adding *RDA* bibliographic records, once they are familiar with the content and use of *RDA* rules. As of June 26, 2010, a few *RDA* bibliographic records had already been added to OCLC. *RDA* records in OCLC may now be searched in a new index called Descriptive conventions (code dx); use "rda" in the search. This index searches codes found in 040 $e.

Rebecca Guenther of the Network Development and MARC Standards Office, Library of Congress, then discussed the *RDA*-related MARC 21 format changes and their implementation in LC's Voyager Integrated Library System. During the *RDA* test, The Library of Congress will use relator terms $e in headings fields, but will not use relator code $4 in headings or in linking fields. It will also not use $0 ("zero") for adding authority control numbers to headings fields, but will wait until systems can supply them automatically. National libraries will be allowed to use $0 in 7XX linking authority fields during the *RDA* test.

These talks were followed by a question-and-answer session. Then the current chair of the MARC Formats Interest Group, Gene Dickerson, asked for a volunteer to take on the chairing of the group, as his term has ended. Unfortunately, no one else volunteered to become the new chair, so the fate of the MFIG is uncertain. It would be a shame if it dissolved, as its meetings are quite informative.

Report of the AALL Representative to the American Library Association Association for Library Collection and Technical Services Cataloging and Classification Section Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) Midwinter Meeting, Boston, January 2010 Annual Meeting, Washington, D.C., June 2010

Yael Mandelstam
Fordham Law School Library

The Subject Analysis Committee studies problems and recommends improvements in patterns, methods, and tools for the subject analysis, organization, and retrieval of information resources, and provides liaison for those areas of interest between CCS and other ALA and non-ALA organizations that have an interest in and concern for these activities.

Following is a summary of SAC activities and highlights from the Library of Congress (LC) reports.

SAC/LC Free-floating Subdivision Review

After reviewing a proposal presented by Janis Young, the LC liaison to SAC, a decision was made at Midwinter to create a joint SAC/LC task group for reviewing *Library of Congress Subject Headings* (*LCSH*) free-floating subdivisions. The project was divided into three phases: identifying categories of subdivisions in the *Subject Headings Manual* (SHM) memo H1095; arranging all the free-floating subdivisions in H1095 into the categories developed in phase one; and evaluating all the free-floating subdivisions. The group will submit recommendations to the LC Policy and Standards Division (PSD) for cancelling obsolete subdivisions, combining nearly synonymous subdivisions, revising or rewording subdivisions, and establishing new pattern headings. Phases one and two were completed by June 2010 and phase three is scheduled to begin shortly after ALA Annual.

SAC Faceting Task Force

As the use of the term "faceting" is proliferating and becoming less precise, the new task force will look at how the term is defined and will explore the faceting concept in the current environment as it relates to subject terminology.

LCGFT Pre-Conference Proposal for ALA Annual 2011

In coordination with PSD, the SAC chair had submitted a proposal to the ALCTS Program Committee for a pre-conference workshop on the application and development of the new *Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms for Library and Archival Materials* (LCGFT) for ALA Annual 2011.

Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation

A small working group within the subcommittee is reviewing *LCSH* form subdivision in 185 authority records and is evaluating which headings could be used as genre/form terms and which 185 subdivisions may be cancelled or modified. The group will send its recommendations to members of the subcommittee for review. Once passed, the recommendations will be reviewed by PSD and, if approved, the list of genre/form terms will go back to the working group for the creation of scope notes and cross references.

The subcommittee is also working on evaluating the pros and cons of various possible treatments of information related to genre/form terms such as place, ethnicity, language, and intended audience. When done, the subcommittee will submit its recommendations to PSD.

The subcommittee's proposal to MARBI to establish a MARC 21 source code for LC's genre/form thesaurus was approved. In May 2010, LC announced the new code "lcgft", along with a new name for the term list: *Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms for Library and Archival Materials*.

Subcommittee on FAST (Faceted Application of Subject Terminology)

FAST–a subject vocabulary derived from *LCSH*–was developed by OCLC in cooperation with the Library of Congress. The subcommittee on FAST continued to explore issues related to FAST implementation.

The book *FAST: Faceted Application of Subject Terminology: Principles and Application* by Lois Chan and Ed O'Neill is being published by Libraries Unlimited and is expected to be released in July. Other FAST developments include the addition of many references, geographic coordinates, functionality enabling user contributions, and improvement of the conversion of *LCSH* to FAST.

The FAST database is available at http://fast.oclc.org. The full FAST authority file can be licensed for non-commercial use.

Highlights from reports submitted by Janis Young, the Library of Congress Policy and Standards Division.

The full LC at ALA report is available at http://www.loc.gov/ala.

New Editions of LC Classification Schedules. The new editions of two schedules are now available: *P-PA: Philology and Linguistics (General), Greek Language and Literature, Latin Language and Literature* (2010 edition); and *PL-PM: Languages of Eastern Asia, Africa, Oceania; Hyperborean, Indian, and Artificial Languages* (2010 edition).

***Library of Congress Subject Headings*, 32nd edition (2010).** The 32nd edition of *LCSH* now available continues to feature a sixth volume entitled *Supplementary Vocabularies*. It includes free-floating subdivisions, genre/form headings, and children's subject headings. *Supplementary Vocabularies* is also sold as a stand-alone item.

Other Publications Available for Purchase. *Free-Floating Subdivisions: An Alphabetical Index*, 22nd edition; *Subject Headings Manual*, Update No. 1 (2010); *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations*, 2010 Updates.

Authorities & Vocabularies. The vision for the Authorities & Vocabularies service (http://id.loc.gov), which went live in April 2009, is focused on the automatic generation of metadata for digital documents, digital tables of contents, and digital summaries. The service will provide code lists, subject headings, and other terminologies, which can be used to automatically provide codes, suggest subject headings and alternate terminology from various lists, and enrich searching. The Authorities & Vocabularies service is free and open to the public for searching, downloading, and linking to any of the data contained in the service.

Pre- vs. Post-Coordination in *LCSH*. PSD completed a review of the status of the initiatives and projects outlined in the 2007 report on pre- versus post-coordination of *LCSH*. The status review, entitled "The Policy and Standards Division's Progress on the Recommendations made in 'Library of Congress Subject Headings: Pre- vs. Post-Coordination and Related Issues'" was approved by the Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate (ABA) managers in May and is available to the public through LC's web site at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/pre_vs_postupdate.pdf.

***LCSH* Validation Records.** As of June 2010, there are more than 45,000 subject validation records. These records were generated from *LCSH* subject heading strings used in bibliographic records, for which no authority records had previously been created. The objective of this project is to enable more machine-validation of subject headings assigned in bibliographic records.

Reclass of LAW 7 Titles. Work on the retrospective conversion project to assign K schedule classification to previously unclassified legal documents continued within the Law Section of the U.S. Publisher and Liaison Division. As of the end of April, 10,271 items had been reclassed this fiscal year.

Subject Headings for Cooking and Cookbooks. On the June 2, 2010 Tentative Weekly List, PSD approved revisions to approximately 800 subject headings for cooking and cookbooks, to replace the word "Cookery" with "Cooking" (e.g. Cooking, Cooking (Butter), Cooking for the sick, Aztec cooking, Cooking, American–Southwestern style). In approximately 500 additional authority records, the reference structure for a heading was revised but not the heading itself (e.g., Brunches, Comfort food, and Tortillas had the broader term Cookery); in such cases the revisions were made offlist. A new topical subject heading Cookbooks and a genre/form heading Cookbooks have also been approved, and are available for use.

Subdivisions for Video Recordings. The subdivisions —Video catalogs, —Video recordings for foreign speakers, —Video recordings for French, [Spanish, etc.] speakers, and —Film and video adaptations were revised or cancelled on March 3, 2010. This marked the final phase in the cancellation of headings and subdivisions for video recording forms and genres in *LCSH* in accordance with the decision announced on November 6, 2009 in the paper entitled "Decision Regarding the Final Disposition of *LCSH* Headings for Video Recordings."

Subject Heading Projects. Since the Midwinter Meeting, PSD has undertaken several short-term projects to update subject headings and references, to bring them into alignment with current standards as defined by the *Subject Headings Manual*, or to modify outdated language. Some examples are as follows:

The project to revise headings qualified by religion (e.g., Monasteries, Lutheran) into direct order has been completed.

All shopping centers that were established in *LCSH* have now been established in the name authority file, pursuant to PSD's 2009 ruling to move them into SHM H 405 Group 1.

A question from a cataloger led PSD to realize that the heading Frankenstein (Fictitious character) was being improperly used for both Dr. Frankenstein and for Frankenstein's monster. The headings Frankenstein (Fictitious character) and Frankenstein (Fictitious character) in literature have been cancelled and replaced by two different headings, Frankenstein, Victor (Fictitious character) and Frankenstein's monster (Fictitious character). The bibliographic records have also been corrected.

The Folger Shakespeare Library is working on a project to establish every Shakespearean character through the SACO program. PSD has determined that characters with non-unique names (e.g., Clown, Bianca) should be represented by a single heading; in effect, the headings will be undifferentiated names.

PSD has also approved proposals to establish headings for two events currently in the news. *LCSH* now includes the headings Eyjafjallajökull Volcano (Iceland) and Deepwater Horizon Explosion and Oil Spill, 2010. The former was a SACO proposal made by the University of Washington and the latter proposal originated in PSD.

Genre/Forms Terms

Genre/Form Thesaurus to be Separated from *LCSH*. The genre/form thesaurus is now entitled, *Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms for Library and Archival Materials* (*LCGFT*). This title will appear in print for the first time in the *Supplemental Vocabularies* volume of the 32nd edition of *LCSH*. A separate MARC source code "lcgft" has been assigned to distinguish headings in *LCGFT* from *LCSH* headings. The authority records will be revised as follows:

Byte 11 of the fixed field (008/11) will be coded "z" ("other")
The 040$f will be coded lcgft

In bibliographic records, terms from *LCGFT* will be coded: 655 -7 $a [Term.] $2 lcgft

Additionally, LCCNs with the distinctive prefix "gf" will be used as record control numbers. The authority records will be revised to reflect these changes within the next few months, and PSD will provide at least six weeks' notice before making these changes.

PSD is also beginning work on a separate, self-contained manual for genre/form terms and is investigating the possibility of extracting *LCGFT* from *Supplementary Vocabularies* and publishing it separately.

Moving Image and Sound Recordings Projects. The moving image and sound recording headings have moved out of the development stage and are now being maintained.

Cartography Project. Approximately 65 cartographic genre/form headings were approved in mid-May and the subdivisions used for maps will be revised in late summer, with LC implementation to occur soon thereafter, but no earlier than August 1, 2010. PSD will announce the firm implementation date as soon as it becomes available.

Law Project. The American Association of Law Libraries continues to work with PSD to revise its report, "Genre/Form Terms for Law Materials." Online proposals for the headings will be created in mid-2010, with formal approval to follow. In addition, LC's Hebraica Cataloging Section is conferring with the Jewish Theological Seminary and other interested groups to develop a list of headings for Jewish law. LC will implement law genre/form headings submitted by AALL in the beginning of 2011.

Music Project. PSD is collaborating closely with the Music Library Association to deconstruct existing topical headings into their constituent genres/forms, carriers, and mediums of performance, so that those elements can be separately coded and searched.

Religion Project. The American Theological Libraries Association (ATLA) is partnering with PSD to develop genre/form headings for religion. Janis Young, LC's genre/form coordinator, moderated a round table presentation on genre/form headings at the ATLA conference in June 2010.

OCLC Update and Roundtable

Reported by Yuxin Li
University of Houston O'Quinn Law Library;
Ming Lu
Los Angeles County Law Library

The OCLC update and roundtable sessions were held on July 11-12 at the 2010 AALL Annual Meeting in Denver. Approximately thirty people from OCLC's user group attended the two sessions. Ming Lu, OBS-SIS OCLC Committee chair, coordinated and moderated both sessions. Glenn Patton, director of the WorldCat Quality Management Division at OCLC, was the speaker for both the update and roundtable sessions. In his presentations Glenn Patton discussed the following topics: Connexion client, VIAF, Terminologies Service, OCLC WorldCat, and OCLC's plans for *RDA*. Slides of his presentations can be viewed at http://www.oclc.org/us/en/multimedia/2010/files/AALL_Presentation_201007.pdf.

Connexion Client – Connexion Client 2.20 was released on June 21, 2010 and Connexion Client 2.30 will come in late 2010 or early 2011.

VIAF (Virtual International Authority File) – The goals of VIAF are to link national-level authority records, to expand the concept of universal bibliographic control, to allow national or regional variations in authorized form to coexist, to support needs for variations in preferred language, script and spelling, and to play a role in the emerging semantic web.

VIAF's possible applications within OCLC will enhance the functions of FRBR matching, assist authority control for cataloging, better regionalize WorldCat.org, and minimize differences across languages of cataloging.

Terminologies Service – This service provides fast and easy access to a variety of thesauri which users can simply copy-and-paste into workforms and templates. It may be used with Connexion, with an institutional repository, with a digital collection management system … even in an Excel spreadsheet. It's included in OCLC's cataloging subscription.

Tutorials explaining how to get started using the Terminologies Service, manage displays and settings, search, and edit are available at http://www.oclc.org/us/en/support/training/terminologies/tutorial/default.htm.

OCLC WorldCat – There are 197 million bibliographic records and 1.6 billion holdings in WorldCat. Glenn Patton showed graphics illustrating WorldCat's growth. In 2009, 93% of new records were contributed through batchload and only 7% online. Conversely, only 22% of libraries contributed records through batchload and 78% contributed online.

Glenn views OCLC's relation to its members in terms of the cooperative providing the community, while the cooperative activity provides the value. WorldCat is under continuous improvement by its member contributions through the enhance program, record enrichments, expert community changes, and change requests. Furthermore, OCLC's Quality Management Division plays an important role in improving the quality of records through automated record enrichment, FRBRization, support for the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (NACO, CONSER, BIBCO, etc.), ongoing work with library standards, and Duplicate Detection & Resolution (DDR). In fiscal 2010, 11.6 million bib records were enhanced, 120 new authority records were added, and 98,845 authority records were updated.

Beginning in 2009, OCLC ran tests with small batches using DDR, and then in January 2010 began running DDR software in production against the entire WorldCat database, followed by runs against the daily journal files. As of June 30, 2010, more than 65 million records were processed, with 2.9 million duplicates removed.

Glenn Patton encouraged members to report incorrect merges to bibchange@oclc.org. All reported errors are examined for cleanup and algorithm correction. Incorrectly merged records can be recovered, along with all associated holdings, for up to twelve months. Individual duplicate reports are still welcomed.

OCLC and *RDA* – OCLC continues to work with LC, the National Agricultural Library, and the National Library of Medicine in support of *RDA* testing, as participants create *RDA* MARC 21 records in Connexion, work with *RDA* records in all interfaces, and batchload *RDA* records. Glenn discussed specific MARC 21 changes both in bib and authority records, such as fields 336 for content type, 337 for media type, and 338 for carrier type in bib records.

OCLC issued a document entitled, "OCLC Policy Statement on *RDA* Cataloging in WorldCat for the U.S. Testing Period," available at http://www.oclc.org/us/en/rda/policy.htm. Catalogers not participating in the test may contribute original *RDA* records to WorldCat during the testing period. They should code 040 $e rda, and code Leader/18 (Desc) "i" if ISBD punctuation is used or "blank" if ISBD is not used.

Testing participants will begin creating bibliographic and authority records in October 2010. Librarians were strongly urged to become familiar with the *RDA Toolkit* during its free subscription period which ended on August 31, 2010. Librarians should be familiar with both the content of *RDA* and with the functionality of the *RDA Toolkit* before they start entering records.

For materials other than continuing resources: Do not edit a WorldCat full-level master record to change it from one set of rules to another. For continuing resources: You may change a record from *AACR*2 (or earlier rules) to *RDA* when updating information in the record. Once the record has been changed to *RDA*, do not change it back to *AACR*2. Minimal-level or less than minimal-level records: You may change the record from *AACR*2 to *RDA* when upgrading the record to full-level. Do not change it back to *AACR*2 once it has been upgraded and changed to *RDA*.

For records that are not coded as either *AACR*2 or *RDA* (i.e., coded blank or "i" in Leader/18 (Desc) and 040 $e is not present): You may edit the master record to follow either *AACR*2 or *RDA* when upgrading the record. Copy cataloging: You may locally edit records created under any rules to another set of rules. Do NOT replace the master record for this purpose (unless upgrading). No duplicate parallel records are to be created for *AACR*2 and *RDA* records. If a record created according to either code already exists in WorldCat, do NOT create a duplicate record according to the other code. OCLC staff will merge them if found.

New OCLC Committee Chair — At the end of the sessions, Ming Lu introduced Yuxin Li, head of cataloging and serials at the University of Houston O'Quinn Law Library, who will be the new OBS-SIS OCLC Committee chair.

OBS-SIS/TS-SIS Joint Research Grant Committee 2009-2010 Annual Report

Hollie White
Chair, Joint Research Grant Committee

This year marked the beginning of change for the OBS/TS Joint Research Grant Committee. Early in the year, the committee discussed possible changes to the grant that could encourage more members to apply. It was decided to expand the grant submission process to include electronic submissions via email. Also, grant information and grant related documents were updated on the JRG website.

Announcements and reminders of the grant were posted on both the TS and OBS lists. The committee also tried to expand its marketing of the grant by posting the grant announcements on other law library and SIS listservs beyond the required TS and OBS lists. The June Issue of the *Technical Services Law Librarian* also focused on research ideas that benefit technical services law librarianship in relation to the Joint Research Grant.

Despite these changes, there were no applicants for this year's grant. In the upcoming year, the committee plans to expand its marketing effort, as well as, reach out with more educational programming and publications about research related to the grant.

TS-SIS Rare Book Cataloging Roundtable Report
Denver, July 13, 2010

Lia Contursi
Columbia University Arthur Diamond Law Library

The Rare Book Cataloging Roundtable started at 11:45 and was attended by a small but passionate group of catalogers and non-catalogers working with special collections. Sarah Yates chaired the session and invited the attendees to introduce themselves and to describe their roles in their respective libraries. The catalogers explained they perform rare book cataloging or cataloging of special archival material, as well as "regular" cataloging of non-rare items, received by their libraries on a routine basis. Most libraries represented at the roundtable do not actively collect rare books anymore, with the exception of Yale Law School Library.

The first item proposed for discussion was the treatment of the *incipit* title in incunabula. The first line of the first page of many *incunabula* starts with the Latin word "*incipit*" [= it begins], followed by the first phrase of the text. The question posed to the group was whether the word "*incipit*" should be part of the title field in the MARC record or not. The discussion became particularly interesting because it offered the perspective of the catalogers, taking into account their interpretation of the rules in the *DCRM(B)* (*Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)*) as well as the point of view of the non-catalogers present in the room. The unanimous consensus was that the 245 field should start with the actual first phrase of the text proper, excluding the word "*incipit*." However, it should be noted in a 500 note field as: "Title from incipit."

The conversation continued on another issue encountered when cataloging incunabula: often titles for multiple works are bound together by the original printer, and the question posed to the group was if *LCRI* (*Library of Congress Rule Interpretations*) 21.30J for analytic entry applies in such cases. After some consultation, the consensus was that, in the majority of cases, the cataloger should create separate bibliographic records if the pagination and the foliation have separate signatures. However a "Bound with" note should always be added in each separate record. (Ref. *DCRM(B)* 7B18.)

The discussion moved to the hot topic of barcoding. Most of the librarians present believe barcoding is very useful for collection inventory. Moreover, it provides another tool for keeping the collection securely under control. The question is how to apply barcodes without damaging the physical items. Some options were suggested. Barcodes could be applied on an Excel sheet, with the title and other bibliographical information from the items. Alternatively, the digits of a barcode could be printed on acid free strips, usually inserted in the books. Other libraries apply the barcode to a Mylar strip, which is then wrapped around the front cover of the book.

The conversation, almost naturally, evolved into a discussion on how to process the shelving, stamping and inlay material. Some libraries shelve their books by size; this guarantees that space is used more efficiently. Moreover, keeping books of the same size together provides more book spine support, preserving the life of the binding for a longer period of time. The selectors of special collections advocate preserving dealers' descriptions, as well as other laid-in materials that usually accompany rare books at the time of purchase. That material can be very important to trace the provenance. The extra material accompaning a book should be stored in an acid-free envelope, with the call number of the related book, and shelved with the book itself.

From shelving issues, the conversation moved to another descriptive cataloging question. Most rare book catalogers use the *DCRM(B*) for descriptive cataloging and do not have plans to integrate with *RDA*. This generated further debate on the future impact of *RDA* on rare book cataloging.

We then started to talk about classification schemes. Some libraries apply LC classification numbers most exclusively to nineteenth century material, while using other schedules for other portions of their collections. It was argued that for a selector, the most efficient way to browse a collection would be the order in which the material is acquired. In fact, the Beinecke Library at Yale University applies accession numbers, which make browsability very efficient.

Another example considered highly browsable is the collection listed in the ISTC (Incunabula Short Title Catalog) database, which is entered by author, title, date, and accession number.

The session came to a close only after covering another topic considered very important for rare book collections: every library should develop a well-documented policy that should state clearly what kinds of items are desirable and what should be excluded. Unwanted gifts should never be added to a collection.

The Roundtable adjourned until next summer in Philadelphia. Please check the AALL program next year, or contact Sarah Yates at yates006@umn.edu for more information.

TS-SIS Serials Standing Committee 2010 Committee Meeting Report

Wendy Moore
University of Georgia Law Library

The Chair, Shyama Agrawal, called the Serials Committee meeting to order at 7:35 a.m. with approximately twenty-one members in attendance. Continental breakfast was provided by TS-SIS.

Introductions

In a round-robin format, attendees quickly gave their names, positions, and institutions.

Announcements

- *TSLL* is looking for a Serials columnist. Please contact Virginia Bryant, *TSLL* Editor, if interested.
- Programs of interest today include:
    1. I-5 – "Charting New Roles for Technical Services" (10:45-11:30 a.m.)
    2. PLL-SIS Program – "Law Firm Technical Services Challenges and Opportunities" (9:00-10:30 a.m.)
    3. TS-SIS Program – "How Are We to Accomplish That Much More with That Much Less?" followed by the TS-SIS Technical Services Management Issues Roundtable (2:15-4:00 p.m.)
- The Education Committee is looking for proposals for next year's meeting. The Education Committee did a great job to arrange the many relevant programs at the Denver Meeting, but they need your ideas for Philadelphia. The Education Committee can help members put together successful proposals. Contact Ajaye Bloomstone, chair of the Education Committee, if you have an idea for a program, or get the information on the Education Committee from the TS-SIS website.

Old business

Exchange of Duplicates Program (EOD) – Michele Pope sent a report concerning the Exchange of Duplicates Program. Two exchanges were held this year, with 37 libraries participating. There were 16,000+ issues offered with 1697 distinct titles. The EOD Program grossed $1110, with $370 for website maintenance, and $740 net for TS-SIS education awards. Michele would like to resign as EOD Coordinator, so we need a new EOD Coordinator for the coming year. Wendy Moore, current TS-SIS secretary/treasurer, outlined some of the financial duties. Bonnie Geldmacher, a former EOD Coordinator, talked about the responsibilities of the position. Patricia Roncevich volunteered to be the new EOD Coordinator. Attendees were encouraged to use the EOD Program. It is a collaborative program that directly benefits TS-SIS. TS-SIS made the most recent exchange list available, so non-participating libraries can see what types of materials are being traded. Heather Buckwalter shared some good tips on participating in the program and noted that it is now very easy to use, so worth another look if it has been a while since you have participated. Six attendees' libraries had recently participated in the EOD Program.

Project COUNTER Task Force Group – Lorna Tang, Chair, gave a report on the work of this group. She noted that the links concerning Project COUNTER have been updated on the TS-SIS website and that Pat Sayre-McCoy updated the related bibliography through June 2010. The lack of legal publishers/vendors participating in COUNTER has left the Task Force considering what to do next as a group. A model letter has been drafted, but an official letter from AALL would need to come from the AALL Executive Board. The Task Force encourages individual libraries to speak/write to legal publishers/vendors about their desire for COUNTER-compliant statistics, using the model letter as a guide. The Task Force is working on a compilation of how legal publishers/vendors provide access to statistics. Although both Hein and BNA will be providing statistics this year, neither will be COUNTER-compliant.

New business

2011 Annual Meeting program proposals – A reminder to attendees that if we want good technical services programming at AALL, then it is up to us to propose programs. Program ideas discussed included:

1. ERM – Carol Nicholson noted she was brainstorming about a possible ERM workshop that would focus on local management of electronic resources and the process that libraries follow at a departmental level to provide access to information and resources. Maybe focus on things like A-to-Z lists, handling shared resources provided by university libraries, and "best practices." This would not focus on various available platforms/ERMs. Carol said that while she has the idea, she would be interested in just helping someone else who would coordinate.

2. Change Roles of Technical Services – The program I5 "Charting New Roles for Technical Services: Faculty Publications and Institutional Repositories" does address this topic this year, but in a specific way. Could possibly have a broader, panel discussion on finding new roles for our staff as collections change from print to electronic, focusing on the management issues involved, especially as different supervisors start sharing staff. Lisa Arm and Pat Roncevich both expressed interest in the idea.

Open forum for discussion

There was a brief discussion and sharing of examples from a few libraries that have had an overall positive experience/outcome with position downsizing.

Shyama reminded the group to be on the lookout for the survey to evaluate TS-SIS-sponsored programs held at AALL 2010, which will be sent out to the TS-SIS discussion list, among others. Feedback from this survey will be used by the Education Committee to help plan programs for next year's meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 8:52 a.m.

Program Report

AALL Keynote Address by R. David Lankes: Turn Right at the Obelisk

Reported by
Courtney Selby
The University of Tulsa College of Law

When you take a look at David Lankes's blog[1], you immediately notice something incredibly telling. He likes the word "future." Go ahead. Search his blog for the word "future." Impressive, right? He also has a strong affection for words like "beyond" and "new." It is immediately clear that he is an unabashedly forward-looking and forward-thinking person, an exuberant advocate for re-envisioning our profession and our place in Western society. And if you had a chance to hear his keynote address at this year's AALL Annual Meeting, this wouldn't surprise you a bit.

Lankes began sharing his vision for librarianship by taking us on a journey through history—the history of Rome, to be exact. He painted an image of an incredible and intricate city, both beautiful and mysteriously complex to outsiders, yet easily navigable to the Romans who call it home. He compared the extraordinary development of the city to the several thousand year development of the profession of librarianship, noting how both the city and our profession developed around those inside them. Both Romans and librarians are happy to give directions when visitors are lost, but Lankes suggests that perhaps librarians ought to re-think the language and design of the profession instead.

A consistent theme in his address was the power of carefully chosen language. Lankes noted in a tongue-in-cheek way that even though we are the American Association of Libraries, no actual libraries attended the meeting. He suggests a shift in focus from the language of tangible things like buildings, collections and pieces of technology, toward a new vision of libraries as a collection of librarians with all the power and possibility that curious and creative humans bring to the search for knowledge. He advocates for an examination of the ways in which our labels for ourselves inform how we see the work we do (e.g., public services and technical services), and suggests that we even try to change the questions we ask when we are looking for input from our constituents. Perhaps my favorite of his recommendations is that we stop asking people what they need from us and start asking questions like "what are you up to?"

Another theme Lankes explored throughout his talk was the need for a willingness among librarians to shed prior and contemporary images of libraries in an effort to build more relevant communities of librarians and researchers. He sees a future in which there is a very real possibility that there will be more librarians and fewer libraries, and Lankes asks why libraries are still striving to fit a particular physical model. He offered the example of standard thinking about encyclopedias at the start of this century. Who could have imagined that *Microsoft Encarta*, an online encyclopedia built on the successes and reputation of the world's leading software designers, would fail catastrophically alongside the rise of Wikipedia, an experiment in the collaborative collection of information? It is a fantastic example of thinking outside the confines of traditional models in favor of models that better suit the community in which they will be used.

In his closing remarks, Lankes offered three of his fundamental beliefs. First, he believes that the best days of librarianship are still ahead of us. While he celebrates the accomplishments of our past, he challenges us not to follow best practice, but to envision new practice. Second, he believes that we will not reach our zenith as a profession by focusing on process and artifacts. He sees us moving toward serving as conduits for conversation and strongly argues that conversation is the vehicle through which knowledge is created. Finally, Lankes states that we are uniquely situated in the right profession at the right time to serve as leaders in the knowledge age. He asks only that we reinvent the way we think and talk about ourselves as professionals and that we reexamine the structures and epistemologies within which we do our work. It is a tall order, but he believes we are up to the task.

For more information about R. David Lankes, visit his website at http://quartz.syr.edu/rdlankes/.

[1] *Virtual Dave…Real Blog* at http://quartz.syr.edu/rdlankes/blog/ (accessed August 26, 2010).

Program Report

Bringing Increased Efficiency to Technical Services: Is EOCR for You?

Reported by
Georgia Briscoe
William A. Wise Law Library
University of Colorado School of Law

Presenters: Shyama Agrawal, J. Michael Goodson Law Library, Duke University School of Law; Ann-Marie Breaux, YBP Library Services

Shyama Agrawal, Duke Law Library acquisitions librarian, uses Electronic Order Confirmation Records (EOCR), a service provided by YBP Library Services to increase efficiency in her department. With a budget of $1.7 million and more than 50% of her monograph orders going to YBP, she decided to follow the monographic ordering system used by Duke's main library. In doing so, she streamlined her workflow by not having to search and download bib records from OCLC and by not having to create order and item records in her Aleph system. These tasks are done automatically when items are ordered through YBP's GOBI (Global Online Bibliographic Information) website.

Ann-Marie Breaux, YBP's vice president for Academic Service Integration, explained that YBP works with over 110 academic law libraries for approval plans, notification plans, plus firm and standing order plans. EOCR allows the library to order electronically on YBP's GOBI website. GOBI checks for duplicates in titles which have been ordered with YBP in the last 2-3 years and creates a MARC formatted EOCR file for Duke Law Library the next day. The library downloads this file from YBP's ftp server into Aleph, which creates brief bibliographic and order records and encumbers automatically. The slides of the presentation detailed the steps in the current EOCR procedures at Duke Law Library with screen shots from GOBI and Duke's Aleph system.

Libraries using EOCR have four choices for delivery of bibliographic records from YBP: OCLC WorldCat Cataloging Partners, YBP Cataloging, YBP-OCLC Cataloging Plus, and SkyRiver Cataloging Service. The cataloging records selected overlay on the brief bib records that were created with the order. They are delivered at the time of shipment.

Shyama listed the steps she followed to implement EOCR at Duke Law Library. She said EOCR removes searching the local catalog for duplicates, removes searching and downloading time for bib records from OCLC, saves time by not having to create individual order records and not having to input invoice data into the order records. There was little to no additional expense involved in the implementation. Shyama would like to see two improvements in the system: 1) Receipt of the brief bib and order record the same day it is placed instead of waiting until the next day, and 2) Having a purchase order number on the invoice. At Duke Law, assistance was required from their systems office to set up EOCR in their Aleph system.

This brief half-hour program provided attendees with practical advice to improve their workflow and efficiency in monographic acquisitions.

Program Report

Catalogers Today: Skill Sets, Expectations & Challenges

Reported by
Michele Thomas
University of Arkansas at Little Rock

As a society, we've known for many years that the Baby Boomers would begin retiring one day. That day is upon us, and libraries—law libraries in particular—face many challenges in hiring, training, and retaining quality catalogers. During "Catalogers Today: Skill Sets, Expectations & Challenges," moderated by Ellen McGrath (The University at Buffalo – State University of New York), Stacy L. Bowers (outreach librarian, Westminster Law Library) and Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis (associate professor, Morgridge College of Education, University of Denver) demonstrated through a conversational format the challenge in hiring new catalogers.

At least five challenges face law libraries, according to Bowers and Hall-Ellis. First, institutional requirements to increase efficiency and cost-effectiveness often lead to consideration of outsourcing cataloging and increasing numbers of para-professionals. Second, the evolution of cataloging, including implementation of *RDA* and the evolving world of format types, creates uncertainty in long-term planning. In other words, it is difficult to determine staffing needs for the future when the materials cataloged and methods used change at a rapid pace. Third, as mentioned in the first challenge, cross-training, outsourcing, and increasing para-professional positions to avoid professional librarian positions creates another challenge to hiring a new cataloger. Fourth, the rapid development of equipment, software, and other technologies leads to a greater desire to hire persons with increased technical skills. Finally, it is challenging for a library in the market for a new cataloger to find someone who can meet all its expectations. Bowers and Hall-Ellis posit that a new cataloger should possess theoretical knowledge, technical skills with hardware and software, full cataloging competencies, and workplace competencies, including flexibility and ability to communicate orally and in writing. They added that a multilingual cataloger is preferred.

Hall-Ellis presented results from a content analysis that examined cataloging law librarian position descriptions between 2008 and 2010. She found that most hiring libraries sought candidates with a library/information science degree and at least two years experience. Further, a J.D. and the ability to read French, German, and/or Spanish were preferred. The position expectations included researching license and contractual agreements, establishing best practices, supervising professionals and para-professionals, participating in collection development and the faculty liaison program, being included in reference desk rotations and, of course, other duties as assigned.

During a lively question-and-answer session, the topic of entry-level catalogers dominated. Bowers and Hall-Ellis responded to questions regarding law library ethical obligations to hire entry-level catalogers, training for entry-level catalogers, and the near impossibility of hiring and retaining catalogers holding both the M.L.S. and J.D. The panel and many attendees agreed that starting salaries for law catalogers make it very difficult to attract and retain those with a J.D.

The panel and many attendees also agreed law libraries have an obligation to hire entry-level catalogers. However, Hall-Ellis suggested fulfilling this idealistic obligation is difficult due to its large impact on a library. She noted that many law libraries already have small staffs and that the required training time makes it nearly prohibitive to hire an entry-level cataloger. A few audience members shared how their libraries approach new cataloger training. The consensus was that expectations are initially low in terms of speed and productivity. Over periods varying from six months to two years, incremental increases in responsibility occur.

As a dual-degree individual in my first professional position as a catalog/reference librarian, I was surprised to learn that there are so few dual-degree librarians who catalog. The program offered few solutions to the problems and challenges facing law libraries in filling vacancies or maintaining work flow without a new librarian. Instead, it raised questions, presented evidence to support the questions, and began a discussion on this important issue. Only time will tell what lies ahead, but I'm optimistic law libraries will rise to meet the challenges facing their cataloging departments.

Program Report

Charting New Roles for Technical Services: Faculty Publications and Institutional Repositories

Reported by
Tiffany R. Paige, Esq.,
Mississippi College Law Library

Speakers: Carol Avery Nicholson, Kathrine R. Everett Law Library, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Karen B. Douglas, Duke University Law Library

This program was very informative for seasoned librarians as well as those that were newer and unaware of what exactly repositories are and how they work. Both speakers provided information about why, how, and to what extent their respective institutions have implemented repositories. The eyewitness reporting was presented to an average-size crowd that seemed highly interested in the valuable information as was evidenced by the numerous questions during the question-and-answer period after each speaker concluded.

Together, the presenters set out four important points that were thoroughly covered throughout their presentation:

1. Reasons for having an institutional repository
2. Questions to answer before implementing an institutional repository
3. Getting your institutional repository started
4. Maintaining your institutional repository

Karen Douglas started the discussion with a concise explanation of repositories, before going into her more detailed account of the route Duke took to start its repository. According to Ms. Douglas, Duke's commitment to providing open access generally, and to the law school's scholarship specifically, plus the benefits that would result for its students, faculty, and researchers were the three primary reasons Duke decided to actively implement an institutional repository.

Ms. Douglas went onto to explain the history of the repository at Duke. The original software Duke used was Eprints, but the library switched to Digital Commons (powered by Bepress) in 2009, which currently maintains the server. Retrospective articles were collected from the law school's governing faculty. Articles were downloaded from law review sites or provided by faculty. Duke also has the ability to add webcast content from scholarly presentations.

Her presentation concluded with slides from Duke's repository website, along with a brief description of its inner workings. Authors are able to submit their own publications, and are asked to submit abstracts along with keywords-to facilitate searching. If no abstract or keywords are submitted, librarians develop them after reading the submission. Librarians also search for publications by those faculty members who do not submit their work, although in-depth copyright searching is not part of the process. Duke uses its support staff, professional librarians, and IT department to assist with downloading. Presently, the repository only includes work by Duke faculty, but papers from Duke students and centers may be added in the future.

According to Carol Avery Nicholson, deciding to establish an institutional repository is based on two reasons: needs and expectations of the faculty and the mission of the library. Ms. Nicholson added that the library must also determine:

1. What categories of faculty will be included, e.g., current only, visiting, adjuncts, etc.
2. What types of publications will be included, e.g., current only, comprehensive, works-in-progress
3. What typed of content will be included, e.g., books, articles, book reviews, blogs, etc.
4. Which sources will be provided with links, e.g., online catalog, Lexis, Westlaw, HeinOnline, etc.

She made sure to add that these questions are not all open-and-shut. For example, if there are date restrictions on what to include, the goal or outcome may be hindered, even if start-up time is reduced. Restrictions on publication type may exclude faculty whose current output tends to fall into the works-in-progress area, and may never result in more formal publication.

Since this was a TS-SIS program, naturally both speakers touched on how repositories are related to technical services, or if this was truly a technical services job. Ms. Nicholson reasoned that the level of detail and the need to follow precise procedures, combined with public services librarians' lack of time, make technical services the perfect department to handle repositories. Ms. Douglas presented the audience with technical services functions related to repositories: locating and downloading pdf files, assigning subject headings and keywords, maintaining authority control, using metadata to enhance exposure and retrieval, etc. The presenters also provided a listing of selected faculty repositories and websites.

If the Shoe Fits: Institutional Repositories and Technical Services

Pamela Bluh
Associate Director for Technical Services & Administration
Thurgood Marshall Law Library
University of Maryland School of Law

In 2000, the institutional repository (IR) movement was in its infancy. Since then, the IR has had an interesting trajectory.[1] At the University of Maryland School of Law, the decision to showcase faculty scholarship in an institutional repository may be traced back to the early 2000s with the establishment of a Research Papers series in the Legal Scholarship Network (LSN). Based on that experience, and after investigating a number of options, the decision was made to implement Berkeley Electronic Press' Digital Commons platform. The reasons for selecting the Digital Commons have been well documented.[2] The Digital Commons at UM Law (http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/) includes not only faculty publications but also content such as congressional testimony, award-winning student articles, videos on environmental law topics as well as a number of image files of historical significance. As we have gained experience with the repository software and learned from the growing community of users, the potential of the repository as a showcase for the research and scholarship of the faculty and a vehicle to promote the depth and breadth of scholarship in which the Maryland legal community is engaged is continually reaffirmed.

Although Maryland implemented the Digital Commons five years ago, in some circles this qualifies us as pioneers! Inevitably, during conversations about IRs, questions are raised about a host of issues including the pros and cons of implementing a repository in-house versus choosing a hosted solution, how tasks associated with the repository are integrated into existing workflows, and the amount and level of staff needed to implement, maintain, and enhance the repository. Underlying these questions, and often unspoken, has always been the question of where responsibility for the repository should lie. And what is meant by "responsibility"? Responsibility for the content of the IR, for technical support, for day-to-day maintenance, or for all or a combination of these? Should responsibility be shared among several units or consolidated in one unit? There are many variables to consider, so offering a single, succinct answer to this question remains elusive. Ultimately each institution must reach a decision based on its needs and capabilities.

That being said, I would like to suggest that technical services is uniquely qualified to assume responsibility for all aspects of the institutional repository.[3] Although IRs are often viewed as a public service, I believe that the staff of technical services possesses the organizational and technical skills and the intellectual capabilities to support the institutional repository.

The traditional technical services unit includes "library operations concerned with the acquisition, organization (bibliographic control), physical processing, and maintenance of library collections…."[4] In a nutshell, technical services manages the acquisition of content and its subsequent systematic organization and description according to highly structured protocols. The successful IR is based on a hierarchical framework with well-defined components in which content is arranged logically and systematically. Technical services specializes in creating and supporting environments such as this.

A significant part of managing the institutional repository revolves around content recruitment. While some may argue that this task belongs more appropriately to public services, I would propose that technical services is exceptionally well positioned to manage this activity. For decades, technical services has been vigorously engaged in combating inflated subscription prices and as a result has acquired a thorough understanding of the economics of scholarly resources. One solution that has been offered to mitigate the crisis in scholarly communication is the implementation of an institutional repository.[5] Technical services staff are well aware of the depth and breadth of faculty scholarship and thus often among the first to recognize new and emerging research trends. A detailed knowledge of collection patterns coupled with collegial relationships with faculty allows technical services librarians to coordinate and manage the solicitation and, by extension, the mediated deposit of content.[6]

One of the hallmarks that sets technical services apart from other library services is the in-depth knowledge of the staff with regard to descriptive and subject analysis. "Resource discovery metadata is an essential part of any digital resource. If resources are to be retrieved and understood in the distributed environment of the World Wide Web, they must be described in a consistent, structured manner …"[7] Creating accurate, detailed metatdata in a consistent manner and applying name and subject authority control on repository content are all functions of technical services. As discovery tools become more sophisticated, the need for experienced metadata specialists intensifies. By managing content recruitment, metadata creation, and mediated deposit on behalf of authors, technical services establishes the foundation for a reliable and trusted institutional repository.

In today's information-intensive environment, navigating what may seem to be a copyright minefield is a valuable skill. Technical services librarians, with their business acumen and experience in negotiating licenses for electronic resources are well suited to handle the copyright permission process on behalf of authors. By assuming responsibility for copyright clearance, technical services staff are able to systematize and streamline the permission-seeking process, confident in the knowledge that repository content is managed in accordance with copyright law.

The collegial relationship between technical services and information technology formed throughout multiple upgrades and enhancements to the integrated library system created an environment conducive to innovation and collaboration. This is precisely the type of environment in which technical services thrives and which the IR needs in order to flourish.

Data curation and digital preservation are also the purview of technical services. Although the institutional repository is not conceived as a permanent archive providing preservation quality storage, it is often perceived as such. Technical services staff deal routinely with issues related to preservation of both print and electronic content and therefore are best equipped not only to dispel that perception but also to offer appropriate long-term preservation solutions for the collection, including the content of the IR.

Demonstrating that technical services possesses the skills, experience, and knowledge needed to implement and manage the IR is not enough to guarantee its success. The challenge for technical services, with static staffing levels and the need to maintain essential library services, lies in providing continuing education, training and retraining opportunities for staff, in divesting itself of non-essential tasks, and in modifying other tasks so that the additional workload associated with the IR can be assimilated.

As the traditional boundaries between technical and public services become less distinct, opportunities to engage in outreach and facilitate the flow of scholarly communication are becoming more common and desirable for technical services. As Harkness and Cetwinski explain in their 2009 study, "traditionally, [t]echnical [s]ervices has been responsible for organizing and describing material in order to facilitate discovery. Content is the prime concern, format secondary. In all probability, the role of technical services in the modern academic library will expand as content and delivery options increase."[8]

All the skills needed to manage the IR reside in technical services. Entrusting the ongoing responsibility for the institutional repository to library technical services, with the approval and support of the library administration, has been deemed a "good fit."

[1] Greg Tananbaum, *Institutional Repositories: The Promises of Yesterday, The Promises of Tomorrow* **(**Chicago: ALCTS, 2010), http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/resources/papers/irs.cfm (Accessed 15 August 2010).

[2] Pamela Bluh, *Maryland's (out of the trench) Experience*, http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/fac_pubs/598/ and *Digital Commons @UM Law: A Presentation for NELLCO*, http://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/fac_pubs/635/ (Accessed 15 August 2010).

[3] In this essay, the term "technical services" is used interchangeably to refer to the unit within the organization as well as to the staff of that unit.

[4] Joan M. Reitz, *ODLIS — Online Dictionary for Library and Information Science* (Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited, 2004), http://lu.com/odlis/search.cfm (Accessed 12 August 2010).

[5] Institutional repositories "provide a critical component in reforming the system of scholarly communication—a component that expands access to research, reasserts control over scholarship by the academy, increases competition and reduces the monopoly power of journals, and brings economic relief and heightened relevance to the institutions and libraries that support them." Raym Crow, *The Case for Institutional Repositories: A SPARC Position Paper* (Washington, DC: SPARC, Scholarly Publishing & Academic Resources Coalition, 2002).

[6] Early promises for the institutional repository were based on the assumption that authors would be willing to self-archive their material, but that has proved to be a faulty assumption. In fact, repositories where mediated deposit is offered are proving to be very successful. "To facilitate and accelerate faculty uptake and participation in the IR, services are provided to supplement the "traditional" self-archiving model. We call it our "Do It For Me" model, and the terms are basically: send us your publications list, and we will do the rest. The IR staff does article collection, permissions clearing, scanning, preparation of author versions (including typesetting and proofing), and ultimately mediated deposit. More than 90% of the faculty articles in the IR have been acquired via this model. Mediated deposit also allows for greater consistency in metadata, file sizes and data integrity, quality control, and copyright/permissions compliance." Joan Giesecke and Paul Royster, *Value Added Services: Publishing Continuum at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln* (2008), http://works.bepress.com/paul_royster/66/ (Accessed 19 August 2010).

[7] *Choosing a Metadata Standard For Resource Discovery*, http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/qa-focus/documents/briefings/briefing-63/html/ (Accessed 14 August 2010).

[8] Tschera H. Connell and Thomas Cetwinski, *Impact of Institutional Repositories on Technical Services* (2009). http://hdl.handle.net/1811/38978 (Accessed 18 August 2010).

Program Report

Database Ownership: Myth or Reality?

Reported by
Trina Robinson
George Washington University Law Library

This program was presented by Susanna Leers, electronic services librarian; Pat Roncevich, acquisitions and serials librarian; and Sallie Smith, cataloging and systems librarian, all from the Barco Law Library, University of Pittsburgh.

In this session the presenters' goal was to share their answer to the question which is the title of the program, "Database Ownership: Myth or Reality?" Their conclusion -- it is both. It is a reality that the library owned information contained in the database, but it is a myth that the library can continue to use it in the form that it was purchased, absent the continuous payment of the annual hosting fee paid to the publisher. This information led the Barco Library staff on an adventure of discovery.

The adventure began when the library suffered budget cuts and the costly annual hosting fee was on the chopping block. Initially there wasn't much concern on the part of the librarians about the cut since the library *owned* the information, but they quickly learned that what they actually *owned* was a terabyte of digital information. This *owned* information was shipped to the library initially in the form of magnetic tape, and absent any equipment to read magnetic tape, these tapes were essentially useless. The librarians then requested the information be sent to them in another format, and they received hard drives. These hard drives contained seventeen folders of images and eight folders of markup language.

This discovery led the librarians to seek outside assistance, and they advertised for a graduate student in their Information Technology department to take on the task of writing a program to make the data accessible. They hired the one graduate student who applied. After many hours of work, he was able to write a program that was able to make the database accessible. The Barco Law Library now has its own hybrid (home-grown and publisher-made) system. Unfortunately they lost the capability to search full text, but they did ultimately manage to make the information accessible to their students. It was a somewhat costly venture and took a huge amount of time to accomplish, but overall worth the effort, and a real learning experience. Of course, even with the huge investment of internal resources into this project, the use of the database is still restricted by the original contract with the publisher.

This program was both informative and entertaining. The presenters kept the audience's attention, even though it filled the latest program slot of the day.

Program Report

The Ever-Evolving World of Vendor-Supplied MARC Records

Reported by
Brian Striman
University of Nebraska-Lincoln Schmid Law Library

Presenters: Alan Keely (Wake Forest University, Professional Center Library), Angela Jones (Underwood Law Library, Southern Methodist University), George Prager (New York University Law School) and Yael Mandelstam (Fordham University School of Law), panelists and members of the Task Force on Vendor-Supplied Bibliographic Records.

This timely and informative program dealt with the standards and best practices for the handling of MARC bibliographic records that are supplied to subscribing libraries by vendors, such as HeinOnline, Gale's Making of Modern Law, LexisNexis, WESTLAW, and LLMC Digital, as well as third party vendors such as Cassidy Cataloguing, Serials Solutions, and OCLC.

The Cataloging and Classification Committee of the Technical Services SIS created the Task Force on Vendor-Supplied Bibliographic Records in 2006, and this program was mainly a review of the Task Force and its work, as well as its plans for the future. The Task Force has an active wiki at http://tsvbr.pbworks.com. Slides from this program are available as a 42-page PDF file at http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/annualmeeting/2010/handouts/vendorsuppliedrecords-handout.pdf.

Yael Mandelstam demonstrated techniques for evaluating record sets using MarcEdit software. Because her segment of the program was a hands-on, "how-to-do-it" presentation, it is not part of the PDF and detailed notes are not included in this report.

Angela Jones started the program with a history and review of the Task Force and its purpose, which is to provide timely and relevant information to the law library community regarding vendor-supplied provider-neutral MARC record sets. She described some of the issues the Task Force has addressed, such as missing OCLC control numbers, poor authority control, duplicates, and incorrect bibliographic records, some of which have included "bound-with" information.

Alan Keely spoke about what's been done by the Task Force and what hasn't. Alan discussed the elements involved in evaluating MARC record sets, including test records availability and how the records were originally created. He also spoke about what Cassidy Cataloguing services have cataloged and what they have yet to do. Other record sets mentioned were WorldCat, CALI, LLMC-Digital, Marcive's GPO records, Oxford, Rand, and Serials Solutions. Because there are so many sets that still need review and vendor communications, Alan encouraged attendees to contact any of the panelists about sets they would like the Task Force to tackle, and concluded with a plea for help in preparing the evaluations of these sets.

George Prager presented a series of PowerPoint slides on the Task Force's most recent activities. He advised attendees to watch for updates to the *RDA* implementation timetable, and to read the final report of the Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record Task Group, dated July 30, 2009, available at http://www.loc.gov/pcc/bibco/PN-Final-Report.pdf. George then discussed specific PCC guidelines and policies for e-books, the merging of duplicate e-book records in OCLC, the addition of new codes in the MARC 008 field relating to the form of the resource as issued, and MARC field 588 (source of description note) and its appropriate application.

Program Report

How Are We To Accomplish That Much More With That Much Less?

Reported by
Ajaye Bloomstone
Louisiana State University Law Center Library

Pursuant to the cuts that libraries have been asked to sustain while striving to maintain optimum service, we have all had to reorganize, revamp, and realign processes, tasks, procedures, and just as importantly, our daily outlook. The moves employed to deal with these economic uncertainties have taken a toll on our collections and the psychological well-being of library staff in both professional and support positions. This program was developed for those librarians interested in sharing strategies to cope with uncertain economic times.

The program entitled **"**How Are We To Accomplish That Much More with That Much Less?**"** presented the change management scenarios of three libraries over the past few years, and what those libraries have had to do in order to compensate for budgetary cutbacks and other major changes over time. Just as the economic situation is different in every state, different types of libraries also have individual ways of dealing with their situations, and this panel featured representatives from different library sectors: private academic, a state Supreme Court, and public academic.

Leslie Wakeford, technical services librarian at Wake Forest University's Professional Center Library, addressed the "new manager's viewpoint" as one of the individuals in her library who has had to deal with budgetary decreases, building and construction plan changes, change management in terms of the organization as a whole, and staffing issues within technical services. Leslie described a beneficial workshop on "Developing Resilience: Navigating Change from the Inside Out," which Wake Forest staff members were able to attend. Workshop attendees participated in group discussions identifying challenges, what makes them difficult, and "highlighting the human element in an organization's ability to adapt."

Miriam Childs, head of technical services at the Law Library of Louisiana, spoke of her institution's role serving the judicial branch of the state, while at the same time remaining open over sixty hours each week for the public and members of the bar. Everyone on a small staff must learn to juggle duties to handle the cancellations, the public service desk, and potential additional tasks resulting from cuts in student employee hours.

Ajaye Bloomstone, acquisitions librarian at Louisiana State University's Law Center Library, addressed LSU's fairly unique situation. The last serious budget cuts occurred in the early 1990s, and over time the collection was rebuilt and refined. Few hints of budget cuts were heard until late 2008, and they hit with a vengeance that following January, picking up the slack from what many other libraries have had to deal with for several years. She gave an overview of the impact on LSU Law's public and technical services departments.

During the initial program slot, the librarian panelists spoke of their change management situations and coping strategies in both budgetary and psychological terms. They were followed by a presentation by Nancy Charles, a fourth panelist presenting as a volunteer representative of Mental Health America of Colorado, who, along with her colleagues Richard Eveleigh and Tim Webb, addressed mental health issues which can be associated with the work situation during uncertain economic times and how to manage changes that have been necessitated by those times. Topics included reactions to change, change management for managers and employees, what stress is, the different types of stress, common sources of stress, and some of the warning signs of stress that managers might notice. Nancy also provided attendees with a bibliography of books addressing change, and a variety of Mental Health America brochures on change management, mental health wellness, and how to deal with these issues.

The program segued from the speaker presentations into the slot normally reserved for the Technical Services Management Issues Roundtable, so that a discussion and sharing forum could take place among the speakers and audience. This program was coordinated by Ajaye Bloomstone and Alan Keely, and moderated by Alan Keely, associate director for collection services and systems at Wake Forest University's Professional Center Library.

Program Report

Is Quality Control in Academic Law Library Catalogs Declining?

Reported by
Karen Selden
University of Colorado William A. Wise Law Library

Presenter: Georgia Briscoe, University of Colorado William A. Wise Law Library

In 2009 Georgia Briscoe received an AALL LexisNexis research grant to study the question: Is quality control in academic law library catalogs declining? This program consisted of a brief overview of her research and findings followed by a discussion of actions that law librarians can and do take to increase quality in their catalogs. A very attentive and engaged audience gathered to hear this eye-opening and thought-provoking program. Look for the full details of Georgia's research and results in an article to be published in an upcoming issue of *Law Library Journal*.

Georgia became concerned about quality control in law library catalogs after searching various law library catalogs to complete projects such as periodical claiming, closing out bibliographic records for government documents, and cleaning up item records for serial titles. She noticed that many of the catalogs, including the University of Colorado Law Library's catalog, contained errors and/or incomplete or out-of-date information. These experiences led Georgia to apply for the research grant.

Georgia started her research by defining quality in library catalogs. Her literature search uncovered many interesting and relevant definitions and descriptions, beginning with Charles Cutter in 1876. Cutter famously declared that library patrons should be able to find books by author, title and subject within the catalog. More recently, IFLA (International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions) standards specify that library patrons should be able to easily find, identify, and select the items that they want to use. However, if the metadata in the catalog is absent, incorrect, not current, or incomplete, it will negatively affect access.

Georgia chose twenty libraries from the one hundred top-ranked law schools and checked the same information in each of their catalogs: two spelling errors (Informatoin and Ammendment); two title changes, both of which had been listed in *TSLL* months before; itemizing (volume, date, and order of items) for two serial titles; closure of two ceased titles; and two hyperlinks to confirm that they worked. The error rates for the various items ranged from 5% to 80%, with most being over 50%. The high error rates distressed both Georgia and the program's audience.

Next, Georgia surveyed reference librarians to see if they felt these types of errors would affect their ability to provide answers to reference questions when using the library's catalog. Georgia created a survey that provided a hypothetical reference question scenario and asked twelve related questions. She sent the survey to the ALL-SIS list and received approximately 150 responses.

The following percentages reflect those respondents who felt the particular scenario would have "some" or "significant" effect on their ability to provide an answer to the hypothetical reference question.

1. Words in the title, author or subject headings are misspelled. 87%
2. The publisher information is incorrect. 80%
3. The title ceased publication but this is not indicated in the bibliographic record. 97%
4. The title changed completely to another title and this is not indicated in the bibliographic record. 98%
5. There is a checkin record but the issue boxes are out of order, inconsistent, or incomplete. 96%
6. The checkin record displays many issue boxes with a LATE status. 86%
7. There was no item information displaying which volumes the library owns so you will have to go to the shelves to determine your library holdings or what might be checked out. 96%
8. The itemized volumes are out of order. 83%
9. The itemized volumes display the volume but not the date. 89%
10. There is a link to an electronic version of the title but it does not work. 96%
11. You know the title exists in electronic format but there is no link in the bibliographic record. 99%
12. There is a link to an electronic version of the title but there is no way to know if it is available exclusively in the library, or may be available from home. 98%

These findings became a springboard for discussion, as Georgia ended her formal presentation with the simple question: What can we do? Nearly a dozen different speakers shared observations, ideas, and practical advice about database maintenance projects. Comments included:

- Public Services should report errors to Technical Services, so that the catalog can fully meet patron needs. In one library, reference librarians want the latest publisher displayed in the bibliographic record.
- Practical project tips included generating lists of missing items, barcode errors, and duplicate bibliographic records, MARC fields, etc.
- *TSLL* should add a list of closed serials to the list of title changes that it currently publishes. *[Editor's note: Serial cessations have long been included as part of the "Serials Titles" column.]*
- There was a call to create standard practices. One library has created a detailed policy and procedure manual to document and standardize all local practices.
- Georgia called for audience members to review items that are destined for the permanent collection, even if only for a short time, to get a baseline view of the quality of the local catalog. This review process – which she called "revising" – allows managers to see the physical quality of the processing as well as the quality of the bibliographic and item records in the catalog. At the University of Colorado Law Library, Georgia revises all items that leave the technical services department by searching for each item in the public catalog, usually via a title search.
- Concentrate on the quality of electronic resources in law library catalogs. Monthly link checking was recommended.
- Keep statistics about maintenance and quality control projects, and educate directors about these extra maintenance needs and quality control issues.
- Cooperatively work on the issues involved with quality control in law library catalogs, both for existing records and for records that will be imported in the future. Ideas included creating a *TSLL* column for such issues, a culture that encourages cooperative sharing of issues via the current TS-SIS and OBS-SIS lists, or some other clearinghouse format to collect and disseminate issues and ideas.

PowerPoint slides and the audio for this program are available on AALL2go.

NASIG Conference Program Report

RDA: a NASIG Preconference

Reported by
Joseph P. Hinger
St. John's University Rittenberg Law Library

At the 25th annual conference of the North American Serials Interest Group (NASIG), held in Palm Springs, CA, June 3-6, 2010, Magda El-Sherbini, head of cataloging at the Ohio State University libraries presented a preconference workshop entitled "*Resource Description and Access*: A New Cataloging Standard." Having neglected anything about *RDA* for the past several years, I recently learned that *RDA* implementation should take place in late 2010. This implementation date prompted me to sign up for this workshop to learn everything that I could, to make implementation and training easier and smoother at my institution. Ms. El-Sherbini did a superb job presenting this workshop. She was extremely knowledgeable of the content, and she made the workshop interesting and understandable for the beginner, yet the advanced catalogers were also receiving valuable information for their use.

Ms. El-Sherbini began by giving definitions and background information for *RDA*. *RDA* is a new content standard for description and access. It is neither a display standard nor an encoding standard. Libraries should use whatever schema is preferred, such as MARC21, Dublin Core, etc. The *RDA* guidelines will replace *AACR*2. These guidelines indicate how to describe a resource, focusing on the pieces of information (or attributes) that a user is most likely to need to know. *RDA* will be a web-based tool, and it will facilitate the description of relationships between related resources and between resources and persons or bodies that contributed to creation of that resource. Ms. El-Sherbini discussed the need for this new standard, since *AACR* was created for the English-speaking audience. New rules are now needed since cataloging, record sharing, and resource sharing have become more global in nature.

The first edition of *AACR* was published in 1967. A decade later, in 1978, the 2nd edition was published. For the two decades following the publication of the 2nd edition, revisions were published in 1988 and 1998 respectively. The final revision of *AACR* was published in 2002, with many updates over the following seven years. A new edition of *AACR* , to be known as AACR3, was first discussed at a conference in 1997. The first draft of AACR3 was presented in 2003. As discussions of the draft went on, it was decided to abandon a new edition, and in 2005, the move was made to what is now known as *RDA*. Some of the main reasons for moving to *RDA* include: 1) the bibliographic record will reflect changes to optimize the use of the library catalog as an online product; 2) *RDA* will provide guidelines on cataloging digital resources and will improve searching and browsing for users; 3) *RDA* will support the clustering of bibliographic records to show relationships between works and their creators to make users more aware of the work's different editions, translations, or physical formats; and

4) *RDA* will enable libraries to keep up with other information providers such as Amazon, Indigo, Library Thing, etc. As a standard, *RDA* covers all types of resources and content, and it is usable outside the library community. As data, *RDA* is or can be compatible with the existing online public access catalog, *RDA* is independent of encoding formats, and it supports user tasks. Generally speaking, *RDA* enables the user to *find* the resource described; *identify* the person, family, or corporate body represented by the data; *select* a resource that is appropriate to the user's requirements with respect to physical characteristics of the carrier and the formatting and coding of information stored on the carrier, and appropriate to the user's requirements with respect to form, intended audience, language, etc.; and to *obtain* the resource.

RDA will incorporate all FRBR terminology and concepts covered by FRBR. *RDA* will also be developing a new section on controlled access points (authority data), and Functional Requirements for Authority Data (FRAD). *RDA* will be multinational in use, and all "Anglo-centricity" will be removed. Additionally, all abbreviations, acronyms, and Latinisms will be avoided and/or removed. *RDA* will focus more on the "take what you see concept" instead of creating rules for abbreviations, inclusion, deletion, etc. from the bibliographic records.

AACR was divided into two parts, the first being for description, and the second for headings, uniform titles, and references. There were multiple chapters in each of these two parts. *RDA* will be structured differently. It will have two sections: 1) FRBR/FRAD attributes, and 2) FRBR/FRAD relationships. Each of these two sections will be further broken down and include several chapters. Additionally, *RDA* will include appendices dealing with capitalization, abbreviations, initial articles, presentation of descriptive data, presentation of access point control data, additional instructions on names of persons, titles of nobility, terms of rank, etc., dates in the Christian calendar, relationship designators, and complete examples. A glossary and an index will also be included.

In order to be able to use *RDA*, one must be familiar with FRBR and its concepts. Though an entire conference on FRBR would be needed, El-Sherbini gave a great one hour overview of FRBR, and reviewed the three groups of entities on which FRBR is structured. The Group 1 entities are the products of intellectual and artistic endeavor, which entail the work, the expression, the manifestation, and the item. The Group 2 entities are those responsible for the intellectual and artistic content, which are the person, the corporate body, or both. Finally, the Group 3 entities are the subjects of the works, which are the Groups 1 & 2 entities, plus the concept, the object, the event, and the place.

In the next part of the workshop, El-Sherbini discussed general changes in *RDA* in comparison to *AACR*. She reviewed the new terminology that will be used in *RDA*, and compared the terms that were used in *AACR*. El-Sherbini used some great detailed slides showing the MARC21 coding to accommodate the *RDA* elements. These slides also showed the proposed LC practice for many of the codes, fields, and subfields, but also showed where LC has not made decisions yet. One of the biggest changes in *RDA* is the deletion of the General Material Designation (GMD) in the 245 field, subfield h. Instead, fields 336-338 will be used to give the content (336), media type (337), and carrier (338) of the item being cataloged.

El-Sherbini discussed the *RDA* core elements, which is basically a subset of the *RDA* element set. The *RDA* core element set specifies the minimum set of data consistent with *RDA* compliance. The core elements set also reflects those attributes and relationships which attained a "high" rating for the user tasks defined by FRBR and FRAD. This core element set is a floor, not a ceiling. Agencies are encouraged to enhance the core element set to specify national requirements, reflect local needs, or to enable access to a specific resource. The *RDA* core element set "should" be used by any user of *RDA*; by agencies that do not require the richness of the full *RDA* element set; by agencies for specific projects or workflows; and by agencies creating a provisional or basic record which will be updated or incremented over time. The core element set may be used for benchmarking in a collaborative cataloging environment.

In *AACR*, the chief source of information for different classes of material is defined in their respective chapters 2-12. In *RDA*, the preferred source of information is specified for three categories of resources: 1) One or more pages, leaves, sheets, or cards (or images of one or more pages, leaves, sheets, or cards); 2) moving images; and 3) other resources. Another major change in *RDA* is abbreviations. In *AACR*, there are many rules about when and when not to use abbreviations. In *RDA*, abbreviations in transcribed elements are permitted *only* if the data appears in an abbreviated form on the source. *RDA* further requires inaccuracies or errors to be recorded as they appear on the source being cataloged. El-Sherbini gave many examples of abbreviations and the differences between *AACR* and *RDA*. She continued to discuss the changes for the MARC21 fields that are most used in bibliographic records for monographs and continuing resources. Several examples were given for each of the MARC21fields.

The final portion of the workshop discussed implementation of *RDA*. El-Sherbini stated that *RDA* will *only* be available online, and that access to the online version is free of charge through August 31, 2010. Discounts are being given to early purchasers of the online-only *RDA* publication. The major national libraries in the world are already testing *RDA*, and there is a group of volunteer libraries also participating in the testing. The target date for *RDA* implementation in the United

States depends on the outcome of the testing this fall by national libraries (LC, National Agricultural Library, and National Library of Medicine.) Some major factors involved in deciding when to implement *RDA* in your library are, of course, the *RDA* testing outcomes, the ability and timeframe of your library's ILS vendor to incorporate *RDA* into their programming, the implementation of *RDA* into your bibliographic utility, and of course your local policies and decisions on workflows. There will be a learning curve upon implementing *RDA* in your library. El-Sherbini stated that as librarians, we must take advantage of the many resources that are already available, such as online webinars, print publications, and electronic publications. Also, it is important to monitor the newest *RDA* developments by reading the cataloging discussion lists, and other *RDA*, Library of Congress, and published documentation. An *RDA* discussion list has been set up, and anybody is welcome to join. The Joint Steering Committee web page can be viewed at http://www.rda-jsc.org/index.html, where all *RDA* documentation resides.

Program Report

MARC and RDA: an Overview

Reported by
Iris Garcia
St. Thomas University Law Library

A full room of attendees gathered to attend the program coordinated and moderated by Clara Liao (Georgetown University Law Library). The description promised to shed some light on 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." This was an information-packed session, but here are some of the highlights.

The first presenter to take on that challenge was George Prager (New York University Law School Library). Among the many specific examples in his presentation, George described in detail one of the changes that will have wide implications for current cataloging practice: the replacement of General Material Designations.

245 $h will be replaced by the following new variable field:

- 336 Content Type
- 337 Media Type
- 338 Carrier Type

All three fields are repeatable. However, the 337 field is not a core element in *RDA* and is therefore optional. He also explained that the way these fields display in an OPAC is a local decision and that libraries would have to figure it out with their ILS vendors.

Rhonda Lawrence (Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library, UCLA), co-author of *Cataloging Legal Literature*, was the second presenter. Her presentation began with the basics: where to go for information. First place to go is the *RDA Toolkit* website at http://www.rdatoolkit.org. The next stop should be the Library of Congress *RDA* Testing website at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/RDAtest/rdatest.html.

After providing some other useful links to websites to learn more about *RDA*, Rhonda went over some examples comparing *RDA* to *AACR*2 records. Specifically one example was how to deal with a treaty with more than three signatories. While *AACR*2 dictates title main entry, under *RDA* the treaty is entered under the authorized access point representing the signatory named first.

The Q & A immediately after the presentations turned out to be very lively, with many audience members asking questions about specific MARC tags and *AACR*2 rules. One question concerned capitalization and whether there was an option in *RDA* to transcribe the 245 field exactly as shown in the original, in all capital letters as shown on one of the PowerPoint slides. A discussion ensued about how *RDA* provides different options. Diane Hillmann, who was presenting at a later *RDA*-related session, raised an interesting point. She cautioned that the focus should move away from discussions about MARC coding, capitalization and punctuation, as she feared many were missing the bigger picture, the true value of *RDA*, and how it will completely revolutionize cataloging.

Other questions and comments dealt with the estimated cost of implementing *RDA*, not just in the licensing of documentation, but also staff training and workflow issues. It was believed by responding audience members that the Library of Congress and/or some other testers may be performing a cost-analysis and that information should later be shared with the public.

This session was very useful in helping the audience understand some of the MARC changes that have been made to accommodate *RDA*. However, the concluding discussion showed that *RDA* is still a work in progress, and that many changes will continue to take place.

For more information, please see the PowerPoint slides for George's and Rhonda's presentations, which can be found on the 2010 Annual Meeting Information Handouts for TS-SIS Programs at http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/annualmeeting/2010/handouts/. An audio recording of the session is also available at the AALL2go online center.

Program Report

OBS-SIS Hot Topic: Janet Swan Hill on "The Sky Is Not Falling, or, Who Are We, Where Are We Going and Why?"

Reported by
Karen Nuckolls
University of Kentucky

Presenter: Janet Swan Hill, Professor and Associate Director for Technical Services, University of Colorado Libraries, Boulder, Colorado

After some humorous looks at pictures comparing catalogers with various entities (vestal virgins, for one), Professor Swan Hill laid the groundwork for her presentation, speaking about technical services, their organization, and their near-term future (as one can't predict too far these days). She was very clear about what she was not going to talk about: *RDA*, whether MARC is dead, and outsourcing almost everything.

What she was going to talk about was how we identify and define ourselves, the rationales for organizational decisions, and general trends for technical services.

Identification

"Technical services" is still the preferred term used today, although at one point it became a "mechanical" term, and therefore, nonprofessional. *What* do technical services do? AUTOCAT lists many duties. However, the first result from a Wikipedia search for "technical services" concerns technical services staff as a component of the CIA!

Images of Technical Services

Among many images, Professor Swan Hill's favorites are The Engine Room, Hogwarts, and "The Place Where the Magic Happens." The meaning of technical services has expanded. Technical services activities are those that involve processes and countable products, and/or that involve direct and substantive responsibility for the creation, maintenance, and organization of data that lead to intellectual and physical access to information resources. Direct contact with the end user is irrelevant; we are still engaged in user services.

Organizational Decisions

We make reasoned decisions based on principle. There is no ideal structure to technical services departments. Some are logical, some less logical. Decisions can be based on:

people
elimination of positions
physical layout
gradual shift from print
increasing interdependence among functions
oversight for IT and its relationship to technical services
formal vs. informal structures
permanent vs. shifting structures
authority
the common good
the good of the community

Is all administrative structure artificial?

Trends Affecting Our Future

1. Outsourcing: cataloging, materials, digitization
2. Alliances, consortia, partnerships, collaborations

3. Materials preservation
4. Hidden collections
5. Multiple platforms and standards
6. Content of the cataloged record
7. Changing marketplaces and reduced competition among binderies, service vendors, and automation vendors
8. Continuing education
9. Loss of independence and uniqueness

RDA

In the future "*RDA* treatment" will not necessarily be applied to all materials. Other rules and guidelines are already being used, e.g., archival schema. What goes into a cataloging record and who puts it there? Full text in our catalogs is also increasing. People on the outside have a desire to create tags. How can we use these people without letting them create chaos? While Professor Swan Hill welcomes user contributions, she hopes that controlled vocabulary remains.

The Near Future

The ILS is passing, and libraries are returning to specific function systems. Open access is increasing. We have to learn more and keep ahead, or we will fall behind. *RDA* will take time and money.

The future will bring and demand change. Resistance is futile. The future is driving change for us. We need to remember our role in preserving knowledge, lest libraries and librarianship are forgotten.

Program Report

Open Source ILS: What a Service-Oriented System Brings to You and Your Library

Reported by
Katie Lynn
Wyoming State Law Library

The two speakers for this program presented on the development of Evergreen, an open source (OS) integrated library system (ILS) software product that was developed by PINES (Georgia Library Public Information Network for Electronic Services). The first speaker, Bob Molyneux, vice president of business development at Equinox Software, spoke to the benefits and challenges of OS software in general, using examples from Evergreen and PINES. (Equinox is the company founded by the software team that developed Evergreen. Equinox now helps libraries implement Evergreen.) Chris Sharp, the second speaker, is the PINES program manager with the Georgia Public Library Service. He covered the implementation of Evergreen and the benefits, challenges and lessons learned through OS and Evergreen itself.

Bob Molyneux began by asking why a library may want to choose an OS ILS. He described first how the need for more options and control over costs are the biggest factors in choosing an OS system. He noted that financially the structure of the library ILS market is such that a minority of library dollars is spent by a majority of libraries. And ILS systems are built to be bought by a minority of libraries with a majority of library dollars, leaving most libraries without an affordable option for an ILS. Apart from cost, having an OS ILS allows for more control over your library environment and software, as well as continuity. You know that your library data is yours and not owned by the ILS company from which you purchased the software. And you don't have to worry about what happens when that ILS company is sold or goes out of business.

The disadvantages of an OS ILS are, in some cases, the flip side of the advantages. As far as cost goes, the software itself is free, but it's not cheap. You need someone on staff to implement and maintain the system, or you may need to hire a company such as Equinox to assist with implementation. Plus, it is not always easy to find someone with the technical knowledge necessary to maintain the software. If your resident expert moves on, will you be able to find and afford another expert? This is especially true when you're relying on a consortial product, such as Evergreen.

Last, Bob very briefly mentioned that interoperability with Evergreen specifically would need to be something determined by each library individually. Each library would have to work out for itself the inclusion of ERM, ILL, etc. functionality.

Chris began his presentation with a short history of PINES as a consortium. From 2004 to 2006 PINES began to research a new ILS, as the consortium had grown to the point that their data was stretching the limits of proprietary software. They began an OS ILS development with three software developers. Evergreen went live in 2006 and Equinox was formed in 2007. From surveys between 2008 and 2010, patron satisfaction with PINES has been very high. The top praise heard is the ease of holds placement. A top complaint has nothing to do with Evergreen itself, but from a consortial policy constraint (not being able to place A/V items on hold across library systems).

Evergreen benefits PINES in several ways, one of which is cost effectiveness. They estimate the cost to replace Evergreen upwards of $20 million, whereas the actual operations cost now is less than $2 million. Other benefits include ways in which an OS ILS allows PINES to re-engineer overall library service: 1) PINES policy dictates the software, rather than proprietary software limitations making unwelcome policies for PINES; 2) PINES can more easily and effectively apply bug fixes in a timely fashion; 3) OS allows for modular add-ons and customization; and 4) an OS ILS allows for a very granular permissions structure.

For PINES, a challenge in using an OS ILS is in managing user expectations. They would like to set high goals, but maintain realistic expectations. That balance is difficult to achieve. Plus, a key factor is the need for feedback from end-users. End-users must take some responsibility for the software.

As far as the benefits and costs of an OS system, Chris mentioned the "free" cost and that you are really in control, a master of your domain. He also stressed how important it is to be part of and participate in a community model. Much of the support one might need can be found in an OS community at large. Plus, your system may acquire a "network effect" (the more product acceptance, the better the product gets).

However, OS may not fit all library systems or situations. And the support model for OS is not at all like that for a proprietary software system. Chris described this as a lack of "productization." An OS program often has not gone through the process of becoming a product. There is no ease of installation, little availability of documentation or expertise, little to no quality assurance and no built-in modularity or interoperability.

Chris ended his presentation with a brief explanation of PINES support sources, methods for software development, and how they maintain and update their OS system management.

Program Report

The Semantic Web and RDA: Making the Catalog a Networked Bibliographic Environment

Reported by
Beverly Burmeister
Valparaiso University School of Law Library

Presenters: Karen Coyle, Digital Libraries consultant; Diane Hillmann, Director of Metadata Initiatives, Information Institute of Syracuse

The presenters previewed what library catalogs might look like, indeed what they will need to look like, in order to encourage the participation of users, present and future. Hillmann and Coyle led the audience through the "change of mindset" needed to transition from static online catalogs of the present to the networked, interactive world of linked data.

Coyle defined the Semantic Web as a "web of data," not a "web of documents," connecting things which have relationships with other things, which have relationships with other things, etc., etc. One example of this concept, as well as an illustration of how libraries of the future may look, is Open Library available at http://openlibrary.org/. Using Open Library's entry for Shakespeare at http://openlibrary.org/ authors/OL9388A/William_Shakespeare as an example, the display shows the data is not trapped inside a static record and the user can go from one piece of data to another without coming to a dead end. Freebase (http://www.freebase.com/) pulls data from a lot of sources, mines the information, and connects with other resources, as can be seen in this example about Shakespeare at http://www.freebase.com/view/en/william_shakespeare. Worldcat Identities (http://www.worldcat.org/identities/) provides visualization of aggregated data. Again using Shakespeare as an example, view WorldCat Identities at http://www.worldcat.org/identities/lccn-n78-95332 for a snapshot of the publication history for Shakespeare.

According to Coyle, the three things needed to transform our library information are 1) more data and less text, 2) metadata that is web friendly, and 3) metadata that can be used and revised by anyone. How do we do this? The initial steps are to provide data elements and controlled lists in computer "actionable" ways, and to assign identifiers that will be unique on the web. There already are some developments underway to do this, including SKOS (Simple Knowledge Organization System), LC Authorities and Vocabularies, and the National Science Digital Library (NSDL) Registry (which is developing *RDA* data in Semantic Web language). Coyle provided examples of how URIs (uniform resource identifiers) cross translation barriers and thus are operable across borders. The bottom line: the World Wide Web community wants access to library data, and it is urgent that we take steps to get there. Her presentation is available at http://www.kcoyle.net/presentations/.

Hillmann described what getting from "here" to "there" might look like. First, it will not look like a card catalog or a MARC record, and it will not be just library data. It will be more collaborative and less constrained by old assumptions. *RDA* can help us get there because it is FRBR-based, it contains more machine-friendly linkages, it emphasizes relationships and roles, and it relies less on transcription. Her presentation at http://www.slideshare.net/smartbroad/aall-denver-2010 provides links to resources showing the progress that has been made so far in translating *RDA* into computer-operable language. Hillmann's presentation showed concrete examples of the translation from MARC 21 to RDA/XML (with links) for the FRBR Groups 1, 2, and 3 entities, helping us to begin to visualize this change.

Hillmann emphasized that we need to transition from library standards such as MARC 21 to Semantic Web standards of RDF (Resource Description Framework), SKOS, and OWL (Web Ontology Language). RDF is about making machine-processible statements, using extensible markup language (XML) as the building blocks. At the risk of oversimplifying: Uniform resource identifiers (URI) are the machine-processible identifiers for the triple (subjects, predicates, objects) that make up the RDF statement. These "statements" will eventually allow us to deliver our library information in a way that is computer-operable and usable to others on the web.

Hillmann considers the present implementation of *RDA* in the static MARC record a diversion from the ultimate goal of computer interoperability, and thus taking the spotlight away from the questions on which we should be focusing, such as: How will workflow change? What will vendors do about it? What do we need to know to operate in this new environment? According to Hillmann, we need to change the conversation. Realistically, MARC will be around for a long time; but the more people who become involved, the more quickly we can make interoperability happen. Pertinent questions from the audience demonstrated that we are beginning to hear the message, but a critical mass of interested professionals will be needed to make the transition possible.

Program Report

SKOS and HIVE—Enhancing the Creation, Design and Flow of Information

Reported by
Michael Maben
Indiana University Maurer School of Law Library

SKOS (Simple Knowledge Organization System) and HIVE (Helping Interdisciplinary Vocabulary Engineering) represent the next development in the Semantic Web. In this program, Ph.D. student (and former law librarian) Hollie White and Dr. Jane Greenberg, both from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, provided an excellent discussion of these topics.

The program began with an overview of SKOS by Ms. White. She discussed how SKOS has two components: thesauri and the Semantic Web. SKOS provides encoding for the simpler side of the vocabulary-control continuum, such as simple keyword lists and thesauri (as opposed to highly-developed ontologies). The goal of SKOS is to provide the syndetic relationship of terms, such as hierarchical, equivalent, and associative, with which librarians are familiar within the structure of Library of Congress subject headings. Within the different markup languages such as XML (Extensible Markup Language), RDF (Resource Description Framework), and OWL (Web Ontology Language), SKOS is a subset of OWL and is a "family of languages used to describe thesauri, controlled vocabulary, subject headings, and taxonomies." In this respect, SKOS looks very similar to XML markup with its various tags. SKOS is used in a variety of projects, including HIVE.

Dr. Greenberg spoke on the specific HIVE project at the University of North Carolina. HIVE received support from the Institute of Museum and Library Services to develop a model dealing with controlled vocabulary, interoperability, and usability in an interdisciplinary environment. Dr. Greenberg pointed out that sometimes in an interdisciplinary environment one vocabulary is not sufficient, so HIVE was developed to facilitate the use of multiple vocabularies. The project at UNC is "Dryad" and is intended for evolutionary biologists. HIVE's goals, according to Dr. Greenberg, are: 1) to generate automatic metadata; 2) to "provide efficient, affordable, interoperable, and user-friendly access to multiple vocabularies during metadata creation activities;" and 3) to be a model that can be replicated.

Dr. Greenberg then presented a scenario of a botanist depositing data in Dryad, complete with a short video showing the scientist going through the actual process to select terms. She closed her talk by discussing a number of the significant challenges UNC faced in developing HIVE and Dryad, but pointing out that the benefits are enormous, including the real-world application of Semantic Web technology. HIVE can be used in non-scientific institutional repositories (such as law) to enable scholars to index their work using controlled vocabulary. Following the presentations there were a number of questions and comments by the attendees.

I found the discussion to be very interesting and applicable, since my law school anticipates establishing an institutional repository. This is a development that we should continue to follow because of the power it gives librarians and scholars doing the work and research.

Ms. White and Dr. Greenberg recommend the following links for more information about HIVE:

HIVE wiki: https://www.nescent.org/sites/hive/Main_Page
To view the slides and handouts: https://www.nescent.org/sites/hive/Workshop_Handouts_Slides
To view the HIVE Demo system: http://hive.nescent.org:9090/home.html

Program Report

TS-SIS Hot Topic: New Faces of Resource-Sharing—SkyRiver and USS, Just to Name Two!

Reported by
Cindy May
University of Wisconsin Law Library

Moderator: Joni Cassidy, Cassidy Cataloguing Services, Inc.

Speakers: Nancy Fleck, Michigan State University; Tracy L. Thompson-Przylucki, New England Law Library Consortium; Leslie Straus, SkyRiver

The New England Law Library Consortium (NELLCO) received a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services to develop an open source discovery tool. The result, Universal Search Solution (USS), replaces federated search technology with enterprise search technology. In federated searching, a user enters a search which is broadcast to content providers, then search results are returned as they are received. In the enterprise search technology developed for USS, NELLCO locally indexes data from content providers. A user enters a search against that index, the system de-dups and relevancy-ranks the results, then the display links the user to the content providers. The local index includes metadata as well as some full text.

USS has the ability to display geographically proximate library holdings in search results, and can be customized to include home-grown content. USS offers libraries potential for cooperative collection development agreements, collection analysis, subject area collecting, collaborative off-site storage, and patron-driven electronic book collecting (i.e., with the option to purchase an e-book after a certain number of uses).

SkyRiver is owned by Jerry Kline, who also owns Innovative Interfaces Inc., so it's a start-up but it's also connected. It was developed to help relieve libraries of high cataloging costs in a time of budget reductions, and also as a reaction to OCLC's controversial use policy. Michigan State University Libraries (MSU) learned about SkyRiver in early summer 2009, when they were looking for strategies to control costs and encourage more competition in the library systems marketplace. They viewed a prototype demo in July 2009, told their technical services staff about their decision to implement SkyRiver on August 17, and installed SkyRiver the following day. It was SkyRiver's first installation, and included 728 million records.

Core data in SkyRiver include LC and CONSER files, augmented with member records, and the full LC authority files. SkyRiver adopted the master record concept, and the database is kept clean by means of sophisticated de-duping and a strict ban on minimal records. Downloading from the SkyRiver database to local systems is based on unique SkyRiver numbers in lieu of OCLC numbers.

MSU used SkyRiver and OCLC simultaneously through October 2009. Then on November 1 they began working exclusively on SkyRiver. They contacted OCLC about uploading their records for interlibrary loan, but were told there was no way they could do that because they were no longer a cataloging subscriber. Eventually OCLC agreed to develop a new model to accommodate their request, and presented them with a quote on February 1, which MSU declined as too high.

MSU catalog users experienced an easy transition from Connexion to SkyRiver. The SkyRiver opening screen is Google-like. When a search results in no hits, a user can complete a pop-up request form that prompts staff to search for a record in the public domain. Because SkyRiver customers have been deterred from adding their holdings to WorldCat, SkyRiver may develop its own interlibrary loan functionality.

When MSU decided to implement SkyRiver, they didn't think uploading holdings would be a problem. Despite that setback, they are pleased with their decision, they have achieved significant savings, and they are committed to remaining with SkyRiver for the long haul.

Handouts from this program are available at:

http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/annualmeeting/2010/handouts/hottopic-fleck-handout.pdf
http://prezi.com/7_8upt-yvvho/new-faces-of-resource-sharing-skyriver-and-uss-just-to-name-two/

Program Report

What's in a Name: CORE and I-2, New Standards to Improve Efficiency in the Electronic Environment

Reported by
Caroline Young
Rutgers Law Library-Newark

As a proud recipient of an AALL-TS educational grant, I was able to attend the TS-SIS Program, "What's in a Name: CORE and I-2, New Standards to Improve Efficiency in the Electronic Resources Environment." This program featured two speakers who each discussed a standard for interoperability between different products in the electronic resources environment. This was a well-attended program on a fascinating topic. The presenters made a complex subject easy to follow, and I thoroughly enjoyed both of their presentations.

First, Rose Nelson from the Colorado Alliance of Research Libraries discussed CORE (Cost of Resource Exchange), which facilitates the transfer of cost data from integrated library systems to electronic records management systems (ERMS). ERMS customers want to be able to look up acquisitions information while working in their ERMS. Otherwise, this information is frequently duplicated in both modules. The overarching solution offered by CORE is to pull specific data from the acquisitions system into the ERMS.

A group of interested parties and vendors (including Ed Riding, Jeff Aipperspach, and Ted Koppel) decided that it made sense to build an acquisitions exchange standard rather than building separate sharing mechanisms for different products. In the summer of 2008, the NISO Business Information Topic Committee approved the CORE Working Group. The Working Group wrote, designed, and discussed use cases. They analyzed the use cases for common needs, vocabulary, and data elements. They designed the XML message structure and transport mechanism. Ultimately they came up with a draft standard. Vendors have not yet tested nor implemented the draft standard. The Working Group is recommending that the NISO Business Information Topic Committee support the standard as a best practice document until it is tested enough to declare it a standard.

There are a number of benefits to CORE. With CORE, cost data can be pulled into ERMS from other systems. Additionally, duplicate data entry in multiple systems can be avoided.

Helen Henderson from Ringgold discussed I-2 (Institutional Identifier), which is a proposed NISO standard that assigns a unique identifier to every institution. The purpose of I-2 is to create identifiers that will represent sufficient metadata to differentiate institutions unambiguously. This would apply to institutions engaged in the information supply chain, including the selection, purchase, licensing, storage, description, management and delivery of information. Its overriding mission is to establish provenance, authenticity, and authoritativeness of information, as well as make it more accessible and integrative with existing workflows, ensuring its interoperability.

Some of I-2's objectives include developing compelling use case scenarios, developing an identifier strategy, identifying existing standards, resolving issues of granularity, identifying core metadata structure, and identifying an implementation and sustainability model. Conceptually, a standard identifier should be developed for each institution that can be used across publishers and agents. Furthermore, institutional hierarchies and consortia would need to be identified and fit into this model. This same identifier could be used across the workflow process, including interactions with different publishers, agents, online hosts, etc.

In order to develop a true unique identifier that would work in these contexts, a Working Group of Stakeholders was created in Phase I. This group includes libraries, archives, consortia, subscription agents, distributors, publishers, etc. The main issues for all of these groups were identified. Some examples include missing issues and subscriptions not starting, lost access to e-journals, updates in IP ranges, changes in publishers/vendors, etc. Metadata fields were identified that were relevant to electronic resources, institutional repositories, and library workflows.

In Phase II, the purpose, environment and structure of I-2 was developed. Potential existing standards were identified, such as ISIL (ISO 15511), OCLC symbol, MARC organization code, etc., and business scenarios were developed. Metadata were drafted and a consultation document was circulated. By September 2010 a final report and recommendation are expected to be completed. The next steps include reviewing the available identifier standards and making a selection finalizing the I-2 metadata, continuing the implementation and maintenance strategy, and receiving stakeholder feedback. The Midterm Release as well as a link for feedback can be found at http://www.niso.org/workrooms/i2/midtermreport/.

Both CORE and I-2 are standards that I would like to see implemented. After learning about them during this presentation, it is clear to me that both would streamline electronic processes by eliminating the duplication of the same information in different systems and eliminating ambiguity when identifying institutions in different systems. The dedication of the presenters and the workgroups of both of these standards are truly impressive.

Continued from page 1

I think I missed out on seeing about a third of the tables, which was disappointing, but I planned to visit the activities area in the exhibit hall later.

We then rotated into "speed networking," where we were seated in two rows of chairs facing each other. We had two minutes to chat with the person across from us before we had to move down the line to the next person. We were told not to talk about our jobs because we were all librarians; instead we were to focus on other things in an attempt to foster lifelong friendships. However, after the first couple of people, those I talked to all started talking about the job again, with some other stuff thrown in. Personally, I preferred to "talk shop," primarily because even though we are all librarians, there are so many different things that we all do. You never know if you are going to meet someone who is working on something similar to what you are working on, or who could prove to be a valuable contact because of what you hope to do. For example, during this exercise, I met a special collections librarian, and I am working on my library's archives, so I was really excited to meet someone who was working in special collections in a law library. If we had only talked about non-job related things, we would not have known that we had that in common.

After lunch, it was time for our tour! We went out to see the Red Rock Amphitheater and Buffalo Bill's gravesite before touring downtown Denver. Having never visited the area before, I found the tour to be a good introduction; we got to see a lot of the city we wouldn't have been able to see otherwise.

I ended my day by heading out for a simple dinner with my tour bus seatmate. One thing I really liked about the CONELL experience was that everyone there was new, and everyone there was truly open to meeting new people, because that is what we were there to do. I took this philosophy to heart during my experience and did something I never do in "real life," I walked up to complete strangers and introduced myself. I did it throughout the day, pushing my comfort zone for sure. But everyone was really nice and usually pretty relieved to have someone to talk to. We were all new and all in the same boat, and it was nice to feel that sense of camaraderie.

My CONELL experience was truly the highlight of my Annual Meeting. I can't recommend it enough to any new law librarians out there. Thank you, TS-SIS, for supporting my attendance!

TSLL EDITORIAL POLICY

Technical Services Law Librarian (ISSN 0195-4857) is an official publication of the Technical Services Special Interest Section and the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section of the American Association of Law Libraries. It carries reports or summaries of AALL annual meeting events and other programs of OBS-SIS and TS-SIS, acts as the vehicle of communication for SIS committee activities, awards, and announcements, as well as current awareness and short implementation reports. It also publishes regular columns and special articles on a variety of topics related to technical services law librarianship.

Statements and opinions of the authors are theirs alone and do not necessarily reflect those of AALL, TS-SIS, OBS-SIS, or the TSLL Editorial Board. AALL does not assume, and expressly disclaims, any responsibility for statements advanced by contributors. TSLL editors reserve the right to edit contributions for style and length. TSLL has the privilege to reproduce and distribute authors' contributions as part of the issue of TSLL in which they appear. All other rights remain with the author. Prospective authors should contact the editor for content and style information.

Publication Schedule

Issues are published quarterly in March, June, September, and December.

Deadlines (each vol/year):

no. 1 (September)..............August 21st
no. 2 (December) ....November 21st
no. 3 (March) ....February 21st
no. 4 (June)............................May 21st