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[Editor’s note: Starting with this issue TSLL takes pleasure in welcoming as co-columnist for Classification Lia Contursi, law cataloger at the Arthur W. Diamond Law Library at Columbia University.]

It is an immense privilege to contribute to this column and to work with Kate Wilko. Thorough subject analysis and classification would not be possible if catalogers such as I could not rely on the expertise of public services librarians such as Kate. I have seized on the opportunity to write here with the intent to learn more about the complexity of law classification and to try, with your help and suggestions, to keep abreast of all the developments within the Library of Congress Classification scheme. Finally, I would like to seek your pardon, because, after Marie Whited, we have to re-start from a tabula rasa. Marie embodied the rare harmonious pairing of a vast knowledge and a generous grace. No one can possibly replace her.

As we know, the LC Classification Scheme is an organism in perpetual development. As the law expresses the impact of social and economic developments of the world, the K schedule needs to accommodate the new subjects of inquiry analyzed in academia.

This is the case for the latest evolution of international criminal law. Debate and scholarship on international crimes, most often linked to wars or national acts of aggression, have been a part of the broader discussion of international law for many years. Less so, has been the idea of international criminal procedure. In some respects the cart of international crimes has been placed before the horse of international courts and their procedure. In recent years, the horse has been catching up. The discipline of international criminal procedure is charging ahead, asking questions about its nature and development. Is international criminal procedure sui generis, as some argue, or is it a combination of existing common law and civil law traditions? What are the effects of international tribunals giving weight to the decisions of national courts? In the absence or breakdown of traditional national schemes of law, can international criminal procedure provide a rule of law?
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From the Chair

I am happy to say that the teeth-gnashing, hair-pulling exercise of scheduling OBS programs, meetings and activities is over. (I’m sooo glad we’re not an SIS with lots of scheduling to figure out!) I tried to keep the conflicts with other SIS programs to a minimum, but inevitably there will be times when we’ll want to be in two places at once. Following are the three OBS programs accepted by AMPC.

1. “Library in the Clouds: Cloud Computing and its Impact on Library Services.” This program, proposed by Keiko Okuhara (University of Hawaii, William S. Richardson School of Law and OBS member-at-large), will discuss how cloud computing can be implemented at a library. Panelists are Erik Mitchell (Wake Forest University) and Andrew Pace (OCLC). The program will be held on Sunday, July 24, at 1:30 p.m. in PCC room 201(C).

2. “Library Operations and the Evolution of the ILS: Backfield in Motion?” This program, proposed by Ellen McGrath (University of Buffalo Law Library and OBS representative to TSLL) and F. Tim Knight (York University, Osgoode Hall Law School and the OBS webmaster), will look at the Open Library Environment project, Ex Libris’ Unified Resource Management framework, and explore the future of the library staff interface. Panelists include Hsi-yen (Sean) Chen (Duke University School of Law), Michael Winkler (University of Pennsylvania Libraries) and Susan Stearns (Ex Libris Group USA). The program will be held Monday, July 25, at 2:15 p.m. in PCC room 108(AB).

3. “RDA Test: Law Catalogers’ Perspectives.” This program, proposed by Pat Sayre-McCoy (University of Chicago, D’Angelo Law Library and OBS immediate past president), will describe the experiences of law librarians who participated in the testing of RDA. Panelists include Pat Sayre-McCoy and Amalia Contursi (Columbia University, Arthur W. Diamond Law Library). The program will be held on Tuesday, July 26, at 10:45 a.m. in PCC room 108(AB). This program is co-sponsored with Technical Services SIS.

OBS is self-sponsoring two programs.

1. “Emerging Technologies and the Library Manager: How to Navigate the Decision Maze.” This program, proposed by Richard Jost (University of Washington, Gallagher Law Library and a past president of OBS), will provide some practical guidelines to use in evaluating new technologies. Speakers include Richard Jost and Simon Canick (William Mitchell School of Law). This program will be held on Sunday, July 24, at 3 p.m. in PCC room 102(A).

2. “OBS Hot Topic.” The topic will be announced later. Our speaker will be Steven Bell (Temple University). This program will be held Monday, July 25, 12 Noon, in PCC room 102(A).

And, of course, there are the OBS business meeting, receptions, various round tables and users’ group meetings. For a complete list check AALL’s website http://aallnet.org.

In addition to program planning, Keiko Okuhara, our senior (in length of service, not age!) member-at-large, redesigned the OBS brochure. She did a beautiful job! Look for it at the OBS table in the activities area. Also, Betty Roeske put together our annual survey. You may have noticed that the survey was shorter this year. In past years, the response rate to the survey was very low. So in the interests of increasing the response rate the Executive Board decided in Denver to shorten the survey to just the information regarding who we are and who is interested in volunteering for office, or serving on a committee. It’s from this volunteer information that we choose candidates for office. This year that slate is:

Vice Chair/Chair-Elect
Janet Hedin (Michigan State University)
Chris Tarr (University of California, Berkeley)

Secretary/Treasurer
Calmer Chattoo (University of Miami)
Barbara Szalkowski (South Texas College of Law)
From the Chair

Technical Services
Special Interest Section

Some of you may know I play a folk zither called the Appalachian or fretted dulcimer. With only three or four strings and fretted diatonically (that is, it doesn’t have frets for all the sharps and flats that a guitar does) it is limited in the number of keys it can be played in, if played traditionally by just noting on the melody string while the other strings drone. Played thusly, the instrument is often viewed as folk toy to players of other instruments, although it can give great satisfaction and peace to those with not much musical education, because simple melodies can be readily picked out with fewer mistakes than on a fully chromatically fretted instrument.

On the other hand, the diatonic setup while employing all the strings does help learning chords. People can discover the instrument to be a stepping stone to learning the structure of music, not just for picking out melodies. Once they learn chords and other string tunings, they may find themselves able to play with other instruments and in more keys with greater facility. They may find themselves adding more frets to their dulcimers or more easily taking up chromatically fretted instruments later on. They can more readily become part of a blending with other musicians to experience the wonderful, natural high a shared musical experience can be, rather than just playing by themselves.

You got it. This is an extended, transparent metaphor, written by a chair trying to come up with a column. Here’s the pitch: When one joins an SIS or any organization, one can choose just simply to pay dues and maybe attend a meeting once a year –just play a simple melody on one string. Or one can learn how the group really works, volunteer for committees and offices, meet new colleagues/friends, discover new talents, and enrich one’s career and life–harmonize and grow. Please come make music with the TS-SIS and answer Vice Chair/Chair-Elect Ismael Gullon’s call for volunteers for committees and other SIS activities. We have an SIS with an excellent reputation for supporting, educating, and encouraging its members, but it isn’t possible without new and continued help from the members.

The slate for TS-SIS officers was announced on the TS-SIS online forum in January, but it doesn’t hurt to repeat the message here in TSL. Brian Striman and his nominations committee members, Paula Tejeda and Sally Wambold have produced a fine slate of candidates for the TS-SIS Executive Board. They are:

**Vice Chair/Chair-Elect**
Miriam Childs (Louisiana Supreme Court)
Mahnaz Moshfegh (Indiana University—Indianapolis)

**Member-at-Large**
Richard Paone (Penn State University)
Ann Walsh Long (Lincoln Memorial University)

Biographies will be posted later.

Nominations by petition, along with written acceptances, were to be filed with our Secretary/Treasurer, Elaine Bradshaw, by March 15.

Thank you very much for all your hard work to make this slate possible, Brian, Paula, and Sally! And many thanks to Miriam, Mahnaz, Richard, and Ann for agreeing to run!
The AALL 2011 Annual Meeting schedule is now on the AALL meeting website at http://www.aallnet.org/database/meeting_annual_events.asp.

Our webmaster, Martin Wisneski, has also posted the TS-SIS events separately and indexed them at http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/annualmeeting/2011/programdescriptions.htm.

Thanks to Martin, you don’t have to scroll all the way to the end of the AALL schedule to see TS-SIS meetings and programs, plus you can see the descriptions of the TS-SIS/non-AMPC sponsored programs.

Pam Deemer
Emory University

---

**Annual Fundraiser for the Marla Schwartz Grant**

Last year, for the first time ever, we held a silent auction at the TS-SIS activities table in the Exhibit Hall as a fundraiser for the Marla Schwartz Grant, which supports attendance at the Annual Meeting for a TS-SIS colleague. For information on this grant, see http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/grants/schwartz/.

I was very pleased to see that our first auction, which was held almost impromptu, raised $276.00. This was a great beginning, and we had a lot of fun. We are planning to host a second auction at the activity table this year, and I am hoping that it will become an annual tradition.

As you start looking at the AALL 2011 Philadelphia program, please begin thinking of items you can donate to the silent auction. I am positive that you already own some items that deserve re-gifting status. I have already begun selecting my donations, and I urge you to please donate as well. Your colleagues will appreciate your contributions. If you are not planning to attend the conference, you can mail your donations to me. Just email me at kpiechnik@jenkinslaw.org and we can make arrangements.

See you soon in Philadelphia, the City of Brotherly Love.

Katrina Piechnik
TS-SIS Member-at-large
Jenkins Law Library

---

To Collaborate or Not to Collaborate: That is the Question
An Acquisitions Perspective – Part I

Trina Robinson
George Washington University Law Library

In times of tight budgets and stretching our dollars, libraries often look to two options for relief: cancellations or collaborations. Cancellation projects are always labor-intensive and the longer the list, the longer the labor. Collaboration is another way to stretch tight budget dollars by sharing a purchase with another library on campus, joining a package deal with a vendor that will allow multiple libraries (on one campus) to share the cost of the package, or deciding with another similar library to purchase materials in a certain subject area and allow access to those materials to both libraries.

Of these two options, collaboration has a more positive outlook, but both can result in positive change and growth for your library. My focus is on how these two options when merged can put a strain on your workforce while in the throes of the project, but will ultimately bring you to a better place in the end, with more dollars to spend.

My library is currently working with two similar libraries on just such a project. The three libraries each agreed to maintain one-third of the periodical subscriptions contained in an electronic resource in print and to make those items available, mainly via ILL, to the other two libraries and their patrons in an expedited manner. This means that the labor for this project
will occur in all three libraries simultaneously. The division of labor probably varies greatly among the three. The positive in this project is that each of the three libraries only has to keep one-third of the print titles. The negative is that each of the three libraries has to cancel two-thirds. The spin: two-thirds cancellations, two-thirds money saved.

The decision made among the three libraries was to divide the titles in thirds alphabetically. It also was decided that if a library didn’t have a title in its third of the alphabet and another library did, they would then swap out titles. Both of these decisions support the ultimate goal of the project—saving money and freeing it up for other purchases.

The timetable and steps for this project’s completion varied among the libraries and even among departments within the individual libraries; certainly that was the situation in my library. Although this project stretches across many departments within the library, it is most concentrated within collection development, acquisitions and serials. Collection development decided which titles to cancel and which titles to swap. Executing the cancellations, determining the actual subscription end-dates, and ensuring that payments were made only for volumes received or intended to be received lay with acquisitions. Making sure that check-in and cataloging records were updated to reflect the cancellations was the responsibility of serials.

This is a fluid process, although the flow is sometimes unpredictable, and each department has limited control over the pace and process of each of the other departments. Ideally, from an acquisitions standpoint, the only information I needed to be concerned with in this project was which titles needed to be cancelled. But given that we were working with two other libraries and thus multiple departments, the timetable for the list of cancellations stretched far longer that my department could wait. The reason for acquisitions impatience was the arrival of many of our annual renewal invoices.

Initially I tried to get in front of the project so that I could cancel as many titles as possible before the anticipated annual invoices were generated, to save both myself and the vendors/publishers the additional step of requesting refunds or making adjustments on invoices already generated. Since the timetable for the Collaborative Collection Development Group (CCDG) was different than the acquisitions departments, it limited my ability to cancel many titles before invoices were generated. This forced me to have to review all of the titles on the CCDG list (cancellations as well as continuations) to try to weed out, based on the coding within the list, which titles could be cancelled, which titles we were to continue to purchase, and which titles we might eventually be able to cancel. This review is much more manageable when the invoice generated covers a title or two. It becomes significantly more complicated when an invoice includes hundreds of titles and possibly hundreds of cancellations. A few titles which had been cancelled in the early waves of cancellations had to be reinstated when they became swap titles (titles outside of our alphabetical range). Subscription reinstatement is significantly easier to do than cancellation after issues have started to arrive for the period you sought to terminate.

As the main list of titles in the collaboration continued to grow, shrink and change, multiple lists were generated, each a modification of its predecessor. These changes mean constant comparisons to make sure cancellations are still valid. Then, of course, more work is involved in updating all of the affected order records (400 plus), determining the payment status of these titles, and then requesting credits/refunds for the titles that have actually been paid. There is also the fact that “paid” in our integrated library system doesn’t actually mean paid by the university’s accounting department, so there is that small time lag to take into account. Time also is spent with the vendor’s finance department trying to clear up why an invoice was short-paid, which titles were not included in the payment they received, and also which titles were but should not have been. As you can see from the clarity (or lack thereof) of this paragraph, it can be a confusing process.

We are still in the midst of this project, so I will hold off on answering the question, “To collaborate or not to collaborate?” until part II of this article which I plan to write when the project is completed.

---

**Get Your Classification and Subject Heading Questions Answered!**

http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/classificationquestions/

Have you noticed this new service on the TS-SIS website? It’s near the top of the right-hand “Resources” column.

If you have a law-related question about Library of Congress classification or subject headings, simply click, complete the form and submit. Volunteers from the Classification and Subject Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group will work together to answer your question, and we’re eagerly awaiting our first challenges.

If you’ve been around for a while, and you’ve become pretty good at law classification and subject heading practice, please click anyway — There’s a place on the form for you to volunteer to help answer questions!
Statutes and Limitations: Thinking Collaboratively About Print State Codes

Courtney Selby
The University of Tulsa College of Law

There are a fantastic number of things we do well as law librarians, and one of the most important is our facility for working collaboratively. We invest time and energy in our national organization and give individually and as institutions to our regional chapters and consortia. We blog about our experiences and ideas, consult each other daily through the use of discussion lists, emails and phone calls and have embraced various social media resources that allow us to share our professional lives. As members of this profession, we genuinely seem to understand the importance of staying immersed in the conversations that keep us working together.

One of the topics of conversation I have seen floating in the cloud as of late is the question of how best to achieve reduced expenditures for print state statutes without compromising the level of service we provide. More often than not, we are finding savings through cancellation of at least some portion of our print state statute collections. Most of the reports I have seen show a strong tendency for libraries engaged in such cancellations to maintain both the official and unofficial print codes from the library’s home state, along with a few other print codes from selected jurisdictions. Many libraries that have chosen this path have elected to fill the gaps in their collections through the use of interlibrary loan on an as-needed basis. In my own academic law library we have elected to cancel the majority of our print state statues, keeping only the official and unofficial statute sets for our own state, codes for a few states critical to our faculty scholarship, and annotated codes for New York and California.

Among those reporting that their libraries continue to maintain a complete collection of state codes, most reference the need for access to print codes for citation purposes as the leading factor in their decision. Some respondents indicate that they have retained only official codes, while others have a combination of official and unofficial sets. While most of us are equally comfortable performing and teaching state statutory research in print or online sources, there remains a strong preference for citation in legal scholarship to the official and authenticated print statutes. It is this preference for citation to official and authenticated material that has been perceived to assure the integrity and accuracy of the foundations of legal scholarship. There are, however, a number of voices both in libraries and the realm of legal scholarship that are calling for increased flexibility in citation to statutory materials given the rapid growth in access to online codes. Yet concerns about accuracy and reliability in online sources remain, as evinced by the discussion surrounding the recent addition of Title 51 of the United States Code.

One logical outgrowth of the situation in which we find ourselves is the need for continued work toward encouraging both federal and state governments to make official and authenticated versions of codes freely available online. However, the problem with pursuing this solution to the exclusion of other initiatives is the fact that it will not take care of the problem we are facing immediately. We need access to official and authenticated versions of state codes right now, and many of our libraries simply cannot afford to provide it. An alternative stop-gap measure may be the return to a common practice in librarianship, the use of collaborative collection development plans and agreements to assure that each of us is able to get reliable access to the materials we need, even though we may not be able to purchase them for our own collections.

In preparation for this column I contacted a number of collection development librarians, posted a query on the law-lib discussion list and reviewed the publicly accessible information on a number of law library consortium websites. I was unable to find a single instance of documented collaboration between libraries in which individual institutions committed to continue updating a particular code or list of codes for the benefit of the group. While a number of informal arrangements were referenced by the individuals I consulted, there remains an apparent absence of any kind of systematic agreement whereby at least one library promises to maintain a given state code so that others may rely on their collection when in need. The most obvious problem with agreements of this kind is that some of us are unable to predict our funding in a way that allows us to make long-term promises about the maintenance of particular titles. I believe, however, that there are enough libraries in a position to commit to the retention of at least one official print code to allow all of us to breathe a bit easier about the possibility of continued access.

There are certainly details that will need to be attended to and concerns that need to be addressed in order to get a collaborative effort such as this up and running. Should we enter into agreements on a regional basis through existing consortia? Or
would it be better to develop these collaborative collections based on the nature of the libraries involved? Perhaps this is an opportunity to build bridges beyond the distinctions we typically recognize and develop a retention list that includes the holdings of academic, firm, public and private libraries. Given the potential scope of this type of project, my comments here will fall short of providing the detailed recommendations needed to complete this journey. Yet the most critical element of this type of project is firmly in place; we already possess a deeply rooted history of collaboration within our profession. The challenge before us is to take the relationships we have established and the knowledge we have developed and apply them to the information need with which we are presented, and it is a task for which we are uniquely well-suited. We are librarians. This is what we do.

Endnotes

1 I want to extend my sincerest thanks to Merle Slyhoff of the University of Pennsylvania Biddle Law Library for starting the conversation that led to this column.

2 The 19th edition of The Bluebook allows citations to statutes in the following order of preference: current official code or its supplement, current unofficial code or its supplement, official session laws, privately published session laws, a commercial electronic database, a loose-leaf service, an internet source or a newspaper. (see Rule 12.2.1)

3 Title 51 was added by Pub. L. No. 111-314, which was signed by the President on Dec. 18, 2010. As noted by a keen observer in the law-lib discussion list, the title was still unavailable on Westlaw as of January 30, 2011.

4 For more information on the current status of advocacy in this area, consult the AALL Government Relations Office page on AALL Leadership on Authentic Legal Information in the Digital Age at http://www.aallnet.org/summit/.

LC’s policy on Resource Description and Access (RDA), post-RDA testing period

Posted by Judith Kuhagen to multiple discussion lists:

The Library of Congress will not create original RDA bibliographic records and generally will not create RDA authority records during the interim period after the US RDA Test ends on December 31, 2010 through the announcement of any implementation decision.

Some US RDA Test participants who are PCC NACO participants will continue to create RDA bibliographic records after Dec. 31, 2010. Other non-US RDA Test participants are creating RDA records now and may/will continue to create RDA records.

RDA records will be used by LC during this interim period in the following categories:

• CIP verification;
• Records created by other libraries, vendors, etc., for materials being added to LC’s collections.

In both categories, the authorized access points may be all RDA forms, all AACR2 forms, or a combination of AACR2 and RDA forms; name authority records may or may not exist in the LC/NACO Authority File.

LC’s internal procedures are posted at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/existing_RDA_records.pdf.

Send questions to LChelp4rda@loc.gov.

PCC Post RDA Test Guidelines

PCC has issued guidelines about the future disposition of 7XX fields added to AACR2 authority records.
The guidelines, which deserve careful reading, are available at [http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/PCC-Post-RDA-Test.htm](http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/PCC-Post-RDA-Test.htm).

From the guidelines:

Future disposition of the authority record 7XX fields … In the event RDA is implemented by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC), the 7XX fields added to the AACR2 authority records will not just automatically be flipped to 1XX fields. The differences between the 7XX fields added to existing AACR2 authority records will be evaluated to determine possible categories of “RDA-compatible” authorized access points.

**LC will not change “Dept.” to “Department” in headings**

The Library of Congress announced that it will not undertake changing headings with the abbreviation “Dept.” to the fuller form for now. Between August 20-October 1, 2010, LC requested comments from the library community on changing “Dept.” to “Department” to follow the AACR2 provision (which is also incorporated into RDA) of not abbreviating “Department” in headings unless it is abbreviated by the body on the resource from which the name has been taken.

Posted to multiple discussion lists by LC’s Policy and Standards Division:

The few comments received by the Policy and Standards Division, Library of Congress, via email showed a clear preference for making this change but the limited response did not constitute a mandate. In addition those opposed to the change had solid reasons for not undertaking the change at this time. Consequently, the Library’s Policy and Standards Division will NOT proceed with implementing the change now. The issue will be reviewed again, following a decision regarding implementation of RDA.

---

**The Internet**

Matthew R. Jenks
University of New Hampshire School of Law

In the first installment of this series, we featured several website applications known as social information networks, in which the key, or raison d’etre, is the sharing of information by many different users for the purpose of enhancing both information availability and information quality. The common thread which tied all these sites together was the fact that they are Internet-oriented, meaning the information they make available for sharing, judgment and consideration is obtained and pulled exclusively from other websites, and therefore it is the websites themselves that are rated by users for the information they contain, not to mention how they are structured, how they present the information functionally and visually, and what extra features they provide.

In this second installment of “It’s Nice to Share,” we will go in an entirely different direction. The focus here is not the sharing (and rating) of information provided on websites, but the sharing of information from much more tangible sources. The websites are merely the digital vehicles by which these tangible information objects are presented to the user (and sometimes by the user). And they are all completely different from one another. Website #1 is somewhat of a surprise mainly for its lack of surprise. It is promoted on nearly every law school and college campus website nationwide:

1. **YouTube.com**— After the obligatory eye-roll, it remains a fact that as an information-seeking tool from a knowledge and research standpoint, this remains one of the most under-used applications out there. This is because normally the focus is almost exclusively on social and entertainment-oriented sharing. But there is so much more here. If you don’t believe me, try entering some law topics in the search box at the top. I entered the phrases “Patent Infringement” and “In Re Bilski.” With patent infringement I saw some highly relevant and informative video results for both law students and attorneys right off the bat: “Pre-Litigation Checklist for Defendant in Patent Infringement Case” (Maier & Maier), “Design Patents: the Basics” (Tracy Durkin), “How to Choose the Best Patent Litigation Firm for Patent Infringement,” and “Patent Infringement” (developed for a Markman hearing in a patent litigation matter), to name just a fraction. There are numerous other quality results just for this one search, and these videos are by law scholars and professionals who know their stuff and know the law.

For the phrase “In Re Bilski,” the total results were fewer, but a few were highly relevant and informational, including the series of videos entitled, “Patent Absurdity – US Patent Law” and “Supreme Court : the Year in Review.”
Try your own law topics and see what appears. You will be surprised. I think there are several good reasons for this increased utility of YouTube in terms of its informational value. Most obvious is the mass and even mainstream acceptance of the application as a vehicle for socializing and information sharing. It has become iconic as one of the primary ways we communicate and share using the Internet. This facilitates an increased use of the application and video streaming in general as an educational tool and as a means of sharing information. Behind this, of course, is the general use and acceptance of the web as a valid source for information, data, and knowledge.

2. SlideShare.net — SlideShare is the world’s largest community for sharing presentations. With it, you can upload or view and download documents and pdfs. “SlideShare features a vibrant professional community that regularly comments, favorites and downloads content. Content also spreads virally through blogs and social networks such as LinkedIn, Facebook and twitter. Individuals & organizations upload documents to SlideShare to share ideas, connect with others . . . Anyone can view presentations & documents on topics that interest them. The site is growing rapidly with over 25 million monthly visitors.” (Quoted from the website description in the “About” section.)

Here are some of the things you can do on SlideShare:

- Embed slideshows into your own blog or website
- Share slideshows publicly or privately
- Sych audio to your slides
- Market your own event on SlideShare
- Join groups to connect with SlideShare members who share your interests
- Download the original file

Essentially, with SlideShare you can do the same searches as on YouTube, retrieve numerous quality results, and be assured that every single result is professional and of high quality. Though you can’t generally use a slide presentation as an official reference, you can use the information obtained here to better understand concepts, gain in-depth insight into a particular case history, establish a framework for your research, gain a real-world understanding of concepts, law terms and ideas in action, and generally learn about the law in a much more understandable, natural-language way than you might get from a textbook or casebook — a Big Plus for law students. Not only this, but law professors can upload their own lesson plans to the web for viewing by students.

3. LibraryThing.com — This information-sharing website is completely unlike anything else out there. It’s best described at http://www.librarything.com/about:

LibraryThing is an online service to help people catalog their books easily. You can access your catalog from anywhere—even on your mobile phone. Because everyone catalogs together, LibraryThing also connects people with the same books, comes up with suggestions for what to read next, and so forth . . . LibraryThing is a full-powered cataloging application, searching the Library of Congress, all five national Amazon sites, and more than 690 world libraries. You can edit your information, search and sort it, “tag” books with your own subjects, or use the Library of Congress and Dewey systems to organize your collection. But best of all: LibraryThing is also an amazing social space, often described as “MySpace for books” or “Facebook for books.” You can review books, check out other people’s libraries, see who has the most similar library to yours, swap reading suggestions and so forth. LibraryThing also makes book recommendations based on the collective intelligence of the other libraries.

And LibraryThing (LT) does one more thing: with a simple installation, you can add LT data and features directly to your OPAC, enriching your own library’s online catalog. This includes a virtual shelf browser, tag clouds, recommendations, the ability to write reviews, and many other enhancements. It allows you to “browse, search and discover your library’s holdings in a new, powerful, and engaging way.” If you click on LibraryThing For Libraries in the Help section, you are provided with links to the catalogs of over 1600 libraries and consortia worldwide that use LT for Libraries. This way you can view for yourself all the ways in which LibraryThing enhances the diverse catalogs and interfaces presented, and determine if it might work for you.

The upshot of all this is that LibraryThing provides a multitude of opportunities for law libraries to heighten their visibility, enhance their image, and provide learning options for law students. Professors can create class web pages with course literature requirements and suggestions on the topic, law students can form study groups and post highly recommended or reviewed literature on a class topic, and law libraries themselves can help create a much richer library catalog environment, which provides ways for students, professors, and staff to get more out of the library’s OPAC. Not only this, but with LibraryAnywhere, users can access LibraryThing from their Blackberry, iPhone, or other mobile device.
A quick note here that whereas LibraryThing is free for an individual account up to 200 books, it does cost $25 for a lifetime unlimited membership and $10 for an annual. In addition, there is a cost associated with LibraryThing For Libraries, depending on what features are selected. However, given the number of participants in the program so far, it appears to be a price many consider well worth paying. At any rate, sign up for a LibraryThing account (again, it’s free) and give it a look to see if it’s worth promoting in your school or library. I’m willing to bet you’ll be a convert.

Space does not allow for more listings, but there are numerous other free applications worth downloading and using which do different things, like iGoogle, GoogleDocs, GoodReads, Shelfari, DropBox, Box.net, Memopal, etc., etc. You may have your own list, completely different from mine. A note here that, while all these applications are free for a basic download, a number of them have upgrades which provide access to more features, storage space, etc., and they do charge for these upgrades. However, for most of them, I didn’t find an upgrade necessary, certainly not for an individual. The upgrades seem to be designed mostly for law firms, business accounts, etc.

The list of applications out there is not endless but it is vast, but the number of them which provide truly worthwhile utility, and can benefit your school, students and library on a long-term basis, is not. The point is to experiment, see what works for your needs and your school’s needs, and market those applications which best complement your library’s mission. Enjoy!

Management Issues

Karen B. Douglas
Goodson Law Library
Duke University Law School

One of the questions most frequently asked at job interviews for supervisory positions is, “What is your management style?” This question can be answered in a variety of ways. Your management style is impacted by the organization where you work. It is also impacted by the employees you supervise. The current climate or situation in your work place can also be a determining factor. During your career, you will probably use several management styles, some of which could be simultaneous.

In this era of massive and constant change, situational leadership is a very effective management style. This style is much more flexible, allowing you to use several different management styles as the situation warrants. People and circumstances will determine which type of management style will work best.

With continuous change taking place in technical services in particular, there are bound to be some employees who are uncomfortable with change and don’t adapt well. The coaching management style may be helpful to motivate employees to discover how their talents can best be used in new situations. The affiliative style helps bring people together as a team and encourages harmony among the staff. The democratic style is useful in making the staff a part of the change by gathering input from them about how to best make the change and own it.

When the participative management style is used by administrators, it’s bound to make change more tolerable. It will be easier to get buy-in for a change where communication flows in all directions, not just top down. Group participation in decision making will make it easier to implement the change. A good example of participative management was used at our main library. The technical services staff was faced with a very unpopular change. The whole operation was being moved to an off-site location not near the library. The administrators formed working groups made up of professional and support staffs that were being moved off-site, to investigate and make recommendations on all aspects of the move. Those who were moving off-site helped determine what their life would be like at the new facility. Several groups were formed to study various aspects of the move. Work Flow and Resources Needs identified and explored issues related to the workflow of technical services, including changes to current practices which would need to be made as a result of moving off-site. They also used this opportunity to streamline existing workflows. A group was formed to make recommendations on space planning and design. The staff was moving to a building which formerly served as a tobacco warehouse whose interior was being totally remodeled. This group made recommendations on work stations and lounge area configurations, furniture, flooring, etc. There was also a group formed to study work life quality. I think this was probably one of the most important groups and I applaud the administration for forming it. The feelings and reactions of those impacted by this change needed to be addressed for the change to be successful. This group brainstormed ideas to make the staff that were moving more comfortable with the move and also to research services available to provide for the necessities of life. The areas the committee investigated were issues related to the social and psychological impact of the relocation with particular concern about staff morale while...
dealing with this major change. Finally, there was a buildings and grounds group which was responsible for issues relating
to the design, functionality and accessibility of areas around the building. They also made recommendations for employee
safety and building security, as well as for parking and transportation issues. The administrative group commented on the
final reports of these groups and incorporated many of their suggestions in the final plans.

The move was very well thought out and successfully achieved. The staff is very happy with their new space. Because
administrators allowed the people with the most firsthand knowledge and the biggest stake in making this plan work, to
be fully involved in all stages of the planning for this move, it was less painful for everyone involved. Not all of the staff
recommendations were implemented, but a large enough number of them were so that staff could have some ownership
of the project.

This move was possibly on a much larger scale than most of us will experience, but participatory management can work
with smaller groups of people. Surveys and focus groups, two of the tools used by working groups at our main library, can
be used with small groups. Retreats and other staff gatherings where ideas and opinions can be expressed can help smaller
transitions run smoothly as well.

References
(Chicago: Technical Services and Systems Committee, Systems and Services Section, Library Administration and
Management Association, 2007), 79-81.

Final Reports of Working Groups formed for the Relocation of Duke Libraries’ Technical Services Dept. to Smith Warehouse,
2007.

MARC Remarks

George A. Prager
New York University Law School Library

This report summarizes the MARBI meetings that were held during the ALA Midwinter Meeting in San Diego, on January
8-9, 2011. I will announce on both the TS-SIS and OBS-SIS lists when the status of the MARBI papers discussed below
has been updated by the Network Development and MARC Standards Office at the Library of Congress.


Proposal 2011-01: Coding for Original Language in Field 041 (Language Code) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

In the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format, field 041 $h is defined as “Language code of original and/or intermediate translations
of text.” This subfield is used to record not only the original and/or intermediate languages of main works, but also for
recording the original and/or intermediate languages of librettos and accompanying material such as liner notes. Although
each 041 $h is supposed to follow the subfield with which it is associated, automated parsing based solely on order can be
problematic. In this paper, Online Audiovisual Catalogers, Inc. (OLAC) proposes the following:

1. Redefining subfield $h so that it will contain only the language code of the primary original text/soundtrack
regardless of whether the resource is a translation. It would not be required to supply the original language if the
resource is not a translation. Since the majority of existing 041 $h represent the original language of the primary
work, only a modest amount of database maintenance should be required.

2. Defining new subfields for language code of intermediate translation and language code of the original language
of subsidiary materials. Alternately, separate subfields could be defined for the original language of different types
of subsidiary materials. The desire is for the coding to enable users to search by original language—especially
useful information in the case of moving image materials.
This proposal passed at the MARBI meeting:

1. $h$ has been redefined as “Language code for primary content of original.” Optionally, original language may be recorded, whether or not the resource is a translation.
2. $k$ has been defined as “Language code of intermediate translations.”
3. $m$ has been defined as “Language code of original for accompanying materials [other than librettos].”
4. An additional subfield will be added for “Language code of original for librettos.”

Please note that the exact wordings of the redefinition and definition may be changed slightly before they become integrated into MARC 21 in a future update.


Discussion Paper No.2011-DP01: Changes to the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to Accommodate RDA Production, Publication, Distribution and Manufacture Statements

MARC 21 bibliographic coding does not differentiate between statements of production, publication, and distribution: 260 $a and $b are defined as Place of publication, distribution, etc., and Name of publisher, distributor, etc. (Manufacturer already has separate subfields). There is also no separate field or subfield for statement of copyright notice, which may appear in 260 $c by itself, or with other dates, such as date of publication. However, these are all separate elements in RDA. During the testing of RDA, some catalogers have found it difficult to properly apply RDA, due to the difference in granularity between RDA and MARC 21 in this area. This discussion paper presents several options for distinguishing these separate RDA elements in MARC 21. These options include:

**Option 1.** Add a second indicator to field 260 for function of statement (#-3). Separate 260 fields would be used for publication, distribution, production, and manufacture statements. A value of “blank” would apply for unspecified statements (primarily legacy data).

**Option 2.** Add separate subfields for each function in field 260 for place, name and date of production, publication, and distribution. Subfields $a$, $b$, and $c$ would remain for legacy data, and for cases when the cataloger cannot distinguish which function is involved.

**Option 3.** Define new fields (264, 266, 267-268). Field 260 would be retained for legacy data, and cases when the cataloger cannot distinguish which function is involved.

Depending upon which of the above options are chosen, a new field or subfield can also be defined for date of copyright. (Field 542, defined in 2008, would not be suitable: its purpose is to give information on whether or not a resource is legally protected by copyright. The RDA copyright element serves a different purpose, as it is simply a statement of copyright notice on the item itself). If a new field were to be defined, it would be something in the 2XX block of MARC fields.

At the MARBI meeting, there seemed to be support for both Options 1 and 3; Option 2 was not popular. Reinhold Heuvelmann, representing the German National Library, pointed out that the German MAB format uses indicators to make these distinctions (similar to Option 1). Richard O. Greene of OCLC was not in favor of Option 1. He stated that many catalogers don’t assign indicators correctly, and many OPACS don’t use the values properly. The preference of the MARBI Committee seemed to be for Option 3. Several other variations of these options were also discussed at the meeting. This discussion paper will most likely be brought back as another discussion paper or a proposal at the ALA Annual 2011 Meeting.

Discussion Paper No. 2011-DP02: Additional Elements to Support RDA in the MARC 21 Format

Proposal No. 2009-01/1 and No. 2010-04 previously defined new attributes for Group 2 FRBR entities (persons, families, corporate bodies) and Group 1 FRBR entities (work, expression, manifestation, item), respectively. These attributes can be recorded as part of the heading, but are separate elements in RDA that may also be recorded separately even if they aren’t currently needed in a heading. It is useful to record each such RDA element in its own field or subfield, in case it later becomes necessary to differentiate the heading from another one that is otherwise identical. For example, field 046 $f may contain birth date, such as 1946 or 19460101. This information may or may not also appear as part of the authorized access point (1XX) on the authority record.
No. 2011-DP02 discusses several additional *RDA* data elements that are not well accommodated in the MARC 21 Authority Format:

1. **Language of expression** (*RDA* 6.11; a core element when needed to differentiate an expression of a work from another expression of the same work). In our current database models, this information usually appears in authority records, not in bibliographic records. Two options are presented: Field 041 might be defined in the Authority Format, or Authority field 377 (Associated language) might have its definition broadened to include Language of the expression. (It currently includes only Language of the person and Language of the corporate body). It might also be helpful to add a subfield for the recording of language terms, rather than just codes. Field 377 could more easily accommodate both language codes and language terms. (Language codes are currently used in Bibliographic field 041, but not language terms).

2. **Associated institution** (*RDA* 11.5; a core element for conferences in many cases, and sometimes for other corporate bodies as well). Field 373 (Affiliation; *RDA* 9.13) could be broadened to encompass Associated institution, most likely in a new subfield. Field 510 would not be an option, because *RDA* requires that the data is in the form as found on the resource. (Field 510 is a controlled field, defined as “See also from tracing—Corporate name).

3. **Fuller form of name** (*RDA* 9.5; a core element when needed to distinguish a person from another person with the same name). This information, if included in a heading, is given in subfield $q$ of the access point, i.e.: 100 1# $a$ Smith, John A. $q$ (John Allen). It may be useful to record this information in a discrete field, regardless of whether it is needed at the time that the heading is created. A new field 378 is suggested for this purpose.

4. **Type of jurisdiction** (*RDA* 11.7.15 and 11.13.1.6; added to the name of a government other than a city or town when needed to differentiate between access points for two or more governments with the same name. Example:

   Preferred name: Cork (Ireland : County)

   Type of jurisdiction added as an element: County

   Additionally, the paper suggests that it might be useful to broaden the above use of this field to include non-governmental geographic entities such as rivers and deserts. *RDA* does not feature a controlled list of geographic terms, but the Board of Geographic Names does use controlled terms, and presumably other lists exist as well. Field 334 is recommended for the new field. It would be useful not only for supporting *RDA*, but also for using geographic facets in searching resources.

The MARBI Committee reacted favorably to all four parts of the discussion paper, so it is likely that the paper will be brought back as a proposal at the 2011 ALA Annual Meeting.

**Discussion Paper No. 2011-DP03: Identifying Work, Expression, and Manifestation records in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats**


Several earlier discussion papers and proposals have offered ideas on how to identify FRBR Group 1 entities in the MARC 21 formats (2008-DP04, 2008-05/1, 2008-05/2, and 2009-02/3, available from the MARC Development webpage: http://www.loc.gov/marc/development.html).

The identification of FRBR entities did not seem vital for the initial implementation of *RDA*. However, since the major testing of *RDA* has been completed, the Library of Congress would like to revisit the issues. Clear identification of type of Group 1 entity should assist in the design of better displays and the support for user tasks, as well as facilitating more analysis of record content.

While most institutions are currently using authority records for works and expressions, and bibliographic records for manifestations and items, it is likely that in the future, authority, bibliographic, and holdings records will be used to support more varied configurations. Therefore, this DP proposes that a new field 883 (Entity type) be defined in all three formats. Subfield $a$ would be used for Primary entity type term (work, expression, manifestation, or item ), subfield $b$ for Primary entity type code (“w” (work), etc.), $n$ for Cataloger’s note, and $2$ Source (frbrgroup1). Bibliographic records lacking 883 fields would by default be considered manifestation records; Holdings records lacking 883 fields would be considered item records. A note field could be included for the cataloger to explain exceptional circumstances.

Bibliographic records for manifestations would include 245 fields. Bibliographic records for works or expressions would contain a 130 or 240 field, but no 245.

This paper generated much spirited discussion. John Attig (Penn. State; audience) advised that we should only use the coding when it can be done cleanly. Our current bibliographic records are broader than just manifestation level (for example, they
usually contain some work level information, such as subject headings). Sally H. McCallum (Chief, Network Development and MARC Standards Office, Library of Congress) reminded the group that the fields wouldn’t be mandatory; their use would be as structural metadata that would hopefully support experimentation; the fields are not meant to be displayed or used directly by searchers. John Espley (AVIA representative from VTLS) added that the VTLS OPAC has been using local fields for these levels for a long time; defining values in MARC 21 for this information would be beneficial. A straw poll indicated that the MARBI Committee and the audience were in favor of having this DP brought back as a discussion paper or a proposal at the 2011 ALA Annual Meeting.

Discussion Paper No. 2011-DP04: Treatment of Controlled Lists of Terms for Carrier Attributes in RDA and the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format

Carrier attributes are given in the new MARC fields 336-338 as either terms or codes (or both). These attributes are mapped to Leader/06 (Type of record), 007/00 (Category of material) and 007/01 (Specific material designation). Prior to RDA implementation, it was decided to use the coded data fields in MARC rather than establish new fields or subfields for the carrier attributes. However, based on experiences during the testing of RDA, the Library of Congress has suggested that it might be clearer to assign specific MARC fields or subfields for each of the carrier attributes listed in RDA (Chapter 3), as follows:

1. Field 340 Physical Medium (expansion of field; to be renamed: Carrier Characteristics)
   New subfields could be added for the RDA elements: Generation, Layout, Book Format, Font size, etc.
2. Field 344 Sound Characteristics (New)
3. Field 345 Projection Characteristics of Motion Picture Film (New)
4. Field 346 Video Characteristics (New)
5. Field 347 Digital File Characteristics (New)

Other notes pertaining to carrier attributes currently map to MARC 500 notes. This DP suggests that subfield $i could be added for the attribute name. Example: 500 ## $i Mount: $a Mounted on starched linen.

The discussion paper was well received, and will most likely be brought back as a proposal, with further examples added.

Reports

At the Jan. 8 MARBI Meeting, Sally McCallum reported that a a new draft of Understanding MARC Holdings was being prepared. Also, a great deal of work continues to be done on LC’s Authorities and Vocabularies service available at http://id.loc.gov/. This service “enables both humans and machines to programmatically access authority data at the Library of Congress via URIs.” Much new content has been recently added to the service, including links to LCSH (Library of Congress Subject Heading) terms, geographic area codes, and country codes. LC is encouraging experimentation with this linked data, and would like to hear back about how the data is being used.

LITA/ALCTS MARC Formats Interest Group Meeting, January 8, 2011, 4:00-5:30 p.m.

This meeting was entitled: “Will RDA Mean the Death of MARC?” The speakers were Christopher Cronin (University of Chicago), Jacque Samples (Duke University), and Kelley McGrath (University of Oregon).

The consensus of all three speakers was that MARC 21 doesn’t do the job we want now. In an increasingly web environment, we need a broader standard, one that is understood by more people. While we can work to improve MARC 21 with incremental small changes, eventually we’ll have to replace it. But the actual demise of MARC is probably a long time away, for several reasons: Lack of an heir apparent, despite MARC having been on its deathbed for so long (in the words of Jacque Samples); the existence of a huge amount of legacy data (over 1 billion MARC records worldwide, and more being added to that total every day); the need for a more uniform mandate for change; financial reasons—who will pay for the conversion? Implementing RDA will cost a lot, but not compared with converting data from MARC 21 to a new format; training issues; and a need for cultural shifts. In light of all these factors, the shift from MARC 21 to a new standard for data exchange will probably be a gradual and incomplete one. All three speakers gave excellent and thought-provoking presentations.
During a break at the 2009 Innovative Users Group Conference, I heard a cataloging librarian mention that there were a lot of "junk" records in the WorldCat database. The "junk" records that she meant are the level 3 records. Not long ago, I saw some postings on AUTOCAT which complained about updating this type of record. It seemed to me that catalogers needed some explanation to understand why this type of record exists, and what a better approach is when having to catalog the book-in-hand and finding only a level 3 record in WorldCat that matches the book. Therefore, I sent some questions to Cynthia M. Whitacre, Manager, OCLC WorldCat Quality and Partner Content Department. Below are the questions followed by her answers and recommendations.

**Why do vendors create this type of record in WorldCat?**

The level 3 records from BTCTA and YDXCP are machine created records. They are not created by human beings. The agreement with Baker & Taylor to load these records was made a few years ago to enable an OCLC control number to be assigned to a publication very early on in the life cycle of the publication.

**Why does OCLC give them authorization to create this type of record in WorldCat?**

OCLC has not provided authorizations to these vendors. The Level 3 records are being added to OCLC as a batchload project. They are matched and/or added by an automated process, not by human beings. The vendors are not manually creating these records on WorldCat. They are created outside of WorldCat and added via batch process. They are acquisitions records or "baby records." They can grow up to be cataloging records with input from the OCLC membership.

**How does this type of record benefit OCLC member libraries?**

The records benefit libraries that use WorldCat for acquisitions purposes. These records give those libraries an OCLC control number and OCLC record to use for ordering titles. They also do provide a basis for later cataloging work. It is indeed true that the BTCTA Level 3 records are not very useful in cataloging. The YDXCP ones are a bit better, since the tags and capitalization in those records are more consistent with cataloging needs, even though the records are very brief.

**Someone recently posted a message on AUTOCAT saying: “If we upgrade the grossly inadequate, misleading, worse than worthless Lvl3 records we get less credit than if we create new records, even though upgrading is more difficult because one has to be much more vigilant in working with existing information than in creating new information. I have found the easiest way to upgrade Lvl3 records is to delete all of the fixed fields and start over, which means I am doing original cataloging for upgrade credit.” What’s your comment on this post?**

I agree that it is easier to delete fields and start over when working with these records. Joel Hahn’s website includes a macro to do just that. See [http://www.hahnlibrary.net/libraries/mlconex.html](http://www.hahnlibrary.net/libraries/mlconex.html). The macro is the one named “StartFromScratch.” I recommend use of this type of macro whenever anyone complains about the work involved in upgrading level 3 records. It is a lot of work. I’ve personally done many upgrades of these, using full level copy that vendors I work with have sent to me, so I know exactly what folks are talking about when they state how annoying these records are to upgrade.

About the credit issue: original cataloging credits were never intended to compensate people for the costs of original cataloging. They were historically intended to cover the “searching charges” that were part of the historic transaction pricing model, since libraries are obligated to search before original input to assure they are not adding a duplicate record. The searching charges went away with the advent of subscription pricing, but OCLC retained the offsetting credits, even though nothing is now being offset. So, essentially OCLC is giving a bonus to libraries with these credits. The intent was never to provide payment for the original cataloging; the intent was to not have OCLC charges for original cataloging be more than for copy cataloging, since extra searching was often needed. Minimal level upgrade credits are given when member libraries upgrade to full level (Level 1). The upgrade credit is only given when the encoding level is changed. You would be surprised at how many records we see in WorldCat that have actually been upgraded by libraries, but the encoding level has not been changed from 3 to 1. When the encoding level is not changed, the library is not getting the credit to which they are entitled. So, if you do write an article, remind folks to change that encoding level when they do an upgrade.
And, I would strongly urge libraries not to create duplicate records just because they do not like these Level 3 records. Duplicates just make searching and decision making for other member libraries that much more difficult and time-consuming and they do not benefit anyone.

As a side note: Both Baker & Taylor and YBP have excellent cataloging operations; the cataloging records that they contribute that are full level at a later stage in the life cycle of the title are really good and complete records.

---

**Preservation**

Sally Wambold  
University of Richmond Law Library

Librarians are equivalent to life preservers of information. Preserving information can be lifesaving, if only in a metaphorical sense, don’t you think? It can provide scholars with what is essential for their research, for example. I believe readers can provide countless other examples of the essential quality of information.

For Book Preservers and found in ALCTS @ Glance (Association for Library Collections & Technical Services)

---

**Preservation Week Coming April 24-30**

Are You Ready? Pass it on!

This year, April 24 through 30 will mark the second annual Preservation Week. Last year’s Preservation Week was a great success with over 68 known academic, public, and special libraries participating in preservation activities by offering lectures, providing workshops, and participating in two ALCTS Preservation Week sponsored webinars.

The Preservation Week web site at [http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/confevents/preswk/index.cfm](http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/confevents/preswk/index.cfm) provides a wealth of information for those interested in participating in an event or in holding their own event. It includes:

- **Marketing tools** for promoting your own Preservation Week such as logos, bookmarks, and tips for writing press releases.

Local events can be found on the regularly updated Google Map, which plots all locations of planned preservation activities.

If your institution plans to host an open event, please post it to the Preservation Week 2011 Google Map available at [http://maps.google.com/maps/ms?ie=UTF8&msa=0&msid=108978710953426820099.0004880c6f1e1fe34e1c1&ll=37.09024,-95.712891&spn=51.841773,44.033203&z=4](http://maps.google.com/maps/ms?ie=UTF8&msa=0&msid=108978710953426820099.0004880c6f1e1fe34e1c1&ll=37.09024,-95.712891&spn=51.841773,44.033203&z=4). Doing so will help promote your event, and assist with the broader aims of Preservation Week.

Preserving the history of law librarianship is what Ann Nez is doing at the University of Washington. She recently emailed, “My library has been collecting AALL chapter and SIS newsletters forever; for the past ten years we’ve been printing e-only newsletters. It’s difficult to print a blog, especially if there are posted comments. The editor of the blog for our local chapter (LLOPS) used the BlogBooker software from WordPress to create an annual PDF cumulation. We used that as the basis for our print copy. I think we’ll eventually need to change our focus and start cataloging and saving these as electronic files – but we’re not there yet.” Ann wrote further, “It is just another example of the complication of preserving specialized materials. Each of our libraries has at least one unique collection for which we’re willing to jump through hoops. At one time it might have consisted of clippings (files, scrapbooks), photographs or newsletters and now it might be blogs, wikis and digital multi-media. So, lucky us – we have all the legacy formats that need preserving, as well as all the new emerging formats that we want to capture. That’s why I’ll never be bored by my work – always something new to learn.” This is a
variation on the theme of digital preservation. Librarians can be Digital Preservers of Information. What refreshes me is Ann’s positive outlook in the face of a large challenge, i.e., “always something new to learn.”

A frequent star in this column is Margie Maes, Executive Director of the Legal Information Preservation Alliance (LIPA). LIPA has worked in smart, exciting ways to preserve legal information. “With funding and support from LIPA, for example, law reviews published on bepress’s Digital Commons platform can be automatically archived in CLOCKSS, an international dark archive for long-term preservation. CLOCKSS is a not-for-profit joint venture started by libraries and publishers committed to ensuring long-term access to scholarly publications in digital format. Content in CLOCKSS is preserved with LOCKSS technology. In the event that a law review is no longer available from any university or publisher, it will be triggered from CLOCKSS under an open-access Creative Commons license, guaranteeing that law review articles will remain in the public domain forever.” (Information from the LIPA website, http://www.aallnet.org/committee/lipa/) This preservation of law reviews is just one example of the work LIPA is doing. Another example is the Legal Information Archive, a program using OCLC’s CONTENTdm to preserve and archive digital information. Readers may be well aware of this resource, and I hope many of you attended the January 27th LIPA/OCLC webinar on this topic.

Learn about a classic Book Preserver in Archival Products News, 16, no. 2 (2010) available at http://www.archival.com/newsletters/apnewsvol16no2.pdf. Katherine Swift Kelly describes the approximately 90 hours she took to preserve the Laws of Iowa, 7th G.A., 1858. Reading about this painstaking labor of love was inspiring. Not many of us will perform this intensive book restoration; but this article illustrates how broad the topic of preservation can be and how dedicated some Book Preservers are.

Book Preservers can also do small tasks with clever resources. Acid-free, light-fast, waterproof, fade proof and odorless ink pens can help archivists with their work and enable the notations in our special collections to be permanent and non-destructive. These pens, Zig Pens, are available from University Products. Archival Product makes a binder for spiral-bound publications. This binder enables the spiral-bound books to stand upright on the shelves and not fall behind other books. It also enables the call number label to be affixed to the spine and to be more visible. The CoLibri System, also available from Archival Products, is an elegant, archivally sound, book covering system that does not require adhesives. Here is what Ethel E. Hellman, Collections Conservator for Harvard College Library, wrote about CoLibri, “We originally purchased the system specifically for covering books with red rot and it did exactly what we wanted it to do, i.e., protected staff, patrons, and adjacent items from the products of leather deterioration. Since that time we’ve expanded our use to include covering items with paper covers or paper-covered boards that we are loathe to put a barcode label on (the label goes onto the CoLibri jacket); making jackets for items with detached spine pieces (creating a pocket to hold the spine piece in place); jacketing items with covers that have cut-outs (which might catch on something and tear) or other vulnerabilities; covering items that go on reserve in our “undergraduate” library (to protect the covers from careless application of sticky labels, staples, taped flags, etc.).” CoLibri is somewhat costly, but all references who purchased CoLibri found the system worth the expense.

Do any readers have interesting preservation tools they would like to share with others? Please email me and tell me about them and I will include them in a future column, giving credit to the contributors.

Meanwhile, stay well preserved everyone!

---

**Research Resources**

Finding good resources about research and publications in libraries can often be very challenging. I find good resources by getting recommendations from colleagues and monitoring discussion lists. When you find a good resource, you should share it. Here is my effort at sharing. Below are two resources I have found particularly helpful over the last few months.


This article is aimed at librarians who want to apply for grants. It links the reader to resources across the web that cover topics including general grant resources, grant directories, government grants, and proposal writing, plus glossaries, blogs, and professional organizations related to grants.
Ideally, a librarian could spend a few hours engaging with these resources. In reality though, I would recommend spending a few minutes at the end of a workday just exploring the sites to see what is available for your library and the type of research you want to do.


The first chapter of this publication is entitled, “Using research results to improve practice in the information professions,” and sets a great tone for a book that appeal to professional librarians who want to conduct research. The contents include sections on research questions, research designs and sampling techniques, methods for data collection, and methods for data analysis.

The individual articles are well structured and written with understandable descriptions. Each begins with a summary and background of the approach. Then the articles continue by explaining when the approach or technique is appropriate to use. This is followed by how to implement the approach or technique and the reported strengths and weaknesses. After discussing these approaches from both a high level and then a general, step-by-step description, each chapter ends by sharing and reviewing successful examples from previous publications.

I have recommended this text to multiple people who want to learn more about research methods, but find other resources are too vague or not descriptive enough. Personally, I have found the articles about experimental research, naturalistic research, and survey research particularly helpful when developing my own methodologies for research.

Two recent articles from different sources are worth noting in tandem as they reinforce the highly fluctuant future of serials in law libraries. In the January 2011 issue of Library Resources & Technical Services, Patrick L. Carr’s lead article, “The Commitment to Securing Perpetual Journal Access,” reports on his survey of research libraries’ attitudes towards preserving perpetual access as well as actual performance towards that end. In oversimplified fashion, the results could be summarized by the adage, “Do as I say, not as I do.” That is, a majority of respondents felt that preservation of perpetual access was somewhat between somewhat important and essential and yet most respondents either already have or are planning to address budget cuts “by taking actions that compromise perpetual access,” often by cancellation of print subscriptions in favor of reliance on full text aggregators. And while Carr’s focus is on larger academic research libraries, I expect many law libraries may find this scenario to be extremely familiar.

Enter the second article of note, from the latest edition of Law Library Journal, “The Durham Statement Two Years Later,” by Richard Danner, Kelly Leong, and Wayne Miller. Surely most technical services law librarians are well familiar with the formal declaration made in 2008 by a preponderance of top tier law schools simultaneously arguing for open access online publication of law school journals and the ultimate cessation of their corresponding publication in print. The LLJ article looks to summarize progress (or lack thereof) on both fronts two years on and suggests that, while there is increasing agreement on and participation with the former, there is little to no movement on the latter. Muddying the waters even further is the fact that of those law schools which are publishing their journals online, most do so by publishing PDFs of their print publications, which does not live up to the anticipated standards of a truly “stable, open, digital format” as originally envisioned by the Durham Statement.

By way of example, for nearly three years our library has ceased to bind and preserve all print journals available from HeinOnline (excepting the forty most heavily cited general titles as well as our own institution’s journals) which satisfies neither the goal of perpetual access nor that of the Durham Statement. It comes as little surprise to me that significant movement towards the elimination of print publication in favor of electronic-only has been slow to take hold when there are still those, perhaps with the specter of microfiche and CD-ROM peering down over their shoulders, who are at least hesitant (if not defiant) about abandoning print, while at the other extreme the technology continually supersedes itself at a pace that makes grabbing hold of any single example a tenuous endeavor.
As a consequence, Danner and his co-authors fall back on the reality that the digital medium will likely never truly stabilize and therefore one must simply dive in and learn to swim. If there is a potential “third way” out of Durham, I have yet to see it take a firm root, but the US federal depository library community would seem to be an obvious choice of example at which to begin looking for answers, as it grapples with many of the same issues. In any case, despite the perceived dominance of the digital environment, it seems a conversation with a long way yet to go.

---

**Serials Titles**

Barbara Bohl
University of California, Berkeley

The following serial title changes were recently identified by the acquisitions and cataloging staff of the University of California, Berkeley Law Library:

**E.C. competition law handbook**
1994-2010
(OCoLC 31458761)

**Changed to:**
**EU competition law handbook**
2011 ed.-
(OCoLC 690022912)

**Flinders journal of law reform**
(OCoLC 34941636)

**Changed to:**
**Flinders law journal**
Vol. 12, no. 1 (July 2010)-
(OCoLC 651616288)

**National Institute on the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act**
Began 2006?-2008?
(OCoLC 268677080)

**Changed to:**
**The ... annual National Institute on the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act**
2010-
(OCoLC 681597508)

**QLR**
(OCoLC 31216711)

**Changed to:**
**Quinnipiac law review**
v. 27, no. 1 (2009)-
(OCoLC 438846453)

**St. John’s journal of legal commentary**
(OCoLC 13432620)

**Changed to:**
**Journal of civil rights and economic development**
Vol. 25, no. 1 (fall 2010)-
(OCoLC 692736070)

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

**Crime victims report**
**Ceased with:** Vol. 13:6 (Jan-Feb. 2010)
(OCoLC 36334368)

**Immigration & nationality law handbook**
**Ceased with:** 2009/10.
(OCoLC 25463109)

**Indigenous peoples’ journal of law, culture & resistance**
**Ceased with:** Vol. 2, issue 1 (2005).
(OCoLC 55492827)

**Journal of court innovation**
**Ceased in print with:** Vol. 2:2
(OCoLC 150910639)

**National Prison Project journal**
**Ceased with:** Vol. 21, issue 2 (see below)

“The National Prison Project Journal will discontinue paper circulation following this issue” but “if your subscription has already been paid for in advance, you will continue to receive a hard (paper) copy of the Journal until January 2012 … Future editions of the Journal will be available online at: [http://www.aclu.org/prison](http://www.aclu.org/prison)—Vol. 21, issue 2, p. 23.

(OCoLC 23593691)

**U.S. news & world report**
**Ceased in print with:** Vol. 147, no. 11 (Dec. 2010)
(OCoLC 7786209)

**World Bank legal review**
**Ceased with:** Vol. 2 (2006)
(OCoLC 52101409)
Recent Changes in International Law Subject Headings

Approved Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) forms are in boldface. Subject headings that have been cancelled, are pending approval, or are being suggested as possible additions to LCSH are in italics.

International criminal law

The changes are not unrelated to a revision of the treatment of international crimes in the classification schedules, address some long standing problems, and leave some interesting options for future developments.

International crimes had replaced International offenses. The latter was used for works on actual crimes (albeit rarely), the definition of said crimes, and the legal theories of international criminal law. The heading refers to crimes that are defined by international customary or treaty law, including war crimes, genocide, crimes against humanity, and arguably (though it is very debatable) such matters that are traditionally part of national legal systems such as slavery, piracy or the trafficking of women (forcing women to work as prostitute). Note that while these crimes are considered part of public international law (the so-called law of nations), nations are never prosecuted – only natural persons (a.k.a. real people) or corporate bodies.

One might say that International offenses was split into International crimes and International criminal law, but that isn’t what the authority record says, though it may be implied. Interestingly enough, the BTs for International crimes are Criminal law and International law, whereas International criminal law is an RT. The non-international equivalent heading Crime (in the singular) has RTs including Criminal law, Administration of and Criminal law.

It is also interesting to note that International offenses has no 053, though arguably it should have 853s for both its place in KZ and HV. On the other hand, since International crimes accepts geographic subdivisions perhaps it shouldn’t get a 053 for KZ, since individual countries can and do include international crimes in their own legal systems, leading to classing in KD-KX. Since the definition of crimes usually gets the heading Criminal law, if that is not a precedent being followed for international crimes it should be explicit in a scope note. My suggestion is that in legal works, International crimes should cover the definitions of crimes, and be understood as being an NT of International criminal law (as an aspect of the topic) – with the caveat that this isn’t what the authority record says (but I believe is what it means).

International criminal law also accepts geographic subdivision. Presumably this would be used for how the subject is regarded within a single country or region (similar to how International law subdivided by place is utilized). Thus International criminal law—United States would refer to how the American legal system perceives international criminal law. This can be implied but isn’t explicit.

There is a subject heading for Transnational crime which has nothing to do with the subject under discussion. It refers to books on actual crimes (not the law of them) that involve many countries. It should probably never be a first subject in a law book.

Arbitration

Arbitration, International was changed to Arbitration (International law). This heading continues to refer to situations when countries are “suing” each other in, but not limited to, the International Court of Justice (a.k.a. the “world court”). Most of the cases are relatively boring, such as who owns the land when a river border shifts, not unlike cases in which states sue each other falling under the original jurisdiction of the United States. Supreme Court (though sometimes such “litigation” between states gets interesting, such as Nicaragua suing the United States for supporting insurgents trying to overthrow the Nicaraguan government.) The use of the qualifier might mislead some to believe the heading refers public international law governing private arbitration between parties from different countries, but the scope note should obviate this problem.

Left unchanged are the headings for Arbitration and award (used for domestic arbitration, usually commercial) and Arbitration and award, International (which requires that the parties be from different countries, regardless of whether or not one is a governmental body). This leaves room for continued confusion since the usual rule in LCSH is that the multi-national nature of a heading is indicated by the lack of a geographic subdivision. Arbitration and award with no subdivisions therefore indicates a comparative law work on how arbitration works within multiple countries. The continued use
of **Arbitration and award, International** brings out the application of a unique set of rules if the arbitration involves parties from multiple countries. Perhaps the confusion could be reduced if we switched to **Arbitration and award, Transnational**, and we might want to get rid of the “award” part since it doesn’t reflect modern usage.

There are also several other flavors of arbitration that are not connected to the reference structures discussed above, such as **Grievance arbitration**, **Dispute resolution (Law)**, **Arbitration (Administrative law)**, and **Arbitration, Industrial**. One should also remember that one increasingly finds arbitration in domestic relations disputes, and that in the United States, many religious “courts” (such as **Rabbinical courts** or **Islamic courts**, in particular) are considered to be arbitration proceedings under American law – and this is likewise not reflected in the **LCSH** authority structure.

---

**GET CONNECTED – VOLUNTEER!**

**Did You Know …** Every member that volunteers learns something new

**Did You Know …** Every member that volunteers gains leadership skills

**Did You Know …** Every member that volunteers becomes an agent of change

Technical Services has been a strong and vital SIS thanks to the active participation and involvement of the volunteers. Every year we need volunteers to serve on committees to keep TS-SIS a vibrant and meaningful SIS not only for today, but for the future as well.

There are many rewarding and tangible benefits to participating in Technical Services SIS committees. You will learn from the collective wisdom of your peers. You will also have the opportunity to network with your technical services colleagues, not to mention the new friendships you will develop.

Who should volunteer? We are seeking new members — rookies just beginning to look for a place to serve or veterans who may have been on the sidelines and are eager to return to action.

What are the committees? We offer an assortment of committees — Acquisitions, Awards, Cataloging, Education, Membership, Nominations, Preservation, and Serials committees. No previous experience is required. All we need is a willingness to make a difference in the SIS.

We have new challenges to meet and we need you to promote innovative ideas to solve them.

Please fill out the form at [http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/volunteer/](http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/volunteer/)

If you have any questions about any of the volunteer opportunities, please feel free to contact me.

Thank you for volunteering!

*Ismael Gullon*

*TS-SIS Vice Chair/Chair-Elect*
Contributing Authors: Marlene Bubrick, Ismael Gullon, Yumin Jiang, Jean Pajerek, Andrea Rabbia, Christina Tarr

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

Acquisitions/Collection Development

User-Driven Purchase Giveaway Library
http://www.educause.edu/library/ERM1057
Lewis, David W. “The User-Driven Purchase Giveaway Library.” EDUCAUSE Review, 45, no. 5 (September/October 2010).
The patron-driven acquisition model is a hot topic lately. In this short article, Lewis, Dean of the Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) University Library, imagines a more radical model where the library actually gives away all books to patrons. He argues that with digital technologies such as e-book readers and print-on-demand machines, such a library is quite possible. It can serve the same purpose as traditional libraries do: “At the core, either type of library is the means for communities and organizations to provide a subsidy for information use.... Large book collections have been viewed as an institutional or community asset, though the long-term commitment to a book collection also creates a large liability. In the past, the possible future use justified the liability of a physical book collection. In the easily imagined future, alternative delivery mechanisms call this justification into question.”

Cataloging

RDA Ask-the-Experts Webinar
http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/confevents/upcoming/webinar/cat/021711.cfm
ALCTS held a free webinar on February 17 with RDA testers and experts: Linda Gabel, OCLC; Erin Stalberg, North Carolina State University; Trina Grover, Ryerson University, Toronto; and Kathryn La Barre, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, GSLIS.

Status of the US RDA Test
http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/rdadata
The record creation phase of the US RDA Implementation test has passed the halfway point. The 26 participating institutions have completed over 55% of the common set records and created more than 2,700 additional RDA bibliographic records.

Beginning in January 2011, the US RDA Test Coordinating Committee will analyze the test results and prepare a report with recommendations for their respective senior managers at the Library of Congress (LC), the National Agricultural Library (NAL), and the National Library of Medicine (NLM). The goal is to complete the recommendation phase in March 2011. The senior managers will issue a public report by June 2011.

US RDA Test Participant’s Panel Discussion Summary Posted
http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/PCC_ParticipantsMeeting_Minutes_11m.html
A summary of the US RDA Test Participant’s Panel Discussion, held at the PCC Participants’ Meeting at ALA Midwinter in San Diego, CA on Jan. 9, 2011, is available at the PCC website.

RDA survey results
http://connect.ala.org/node/127186
Results of the CRCC Informal RDA Testing Task Force.
http://connect.ala.org/node/126206
.zip files of all records submitted to the National Test
http://connect.ala.org/node/112885
Bibliographic/authority files individually available in sets of 5 (select “Online Docs” in the right hand navigation menu)
Jennifer Young and Valerie Bross, co-chairs of the Informal RDA Testing Task Force of ALA’s Continuing Resources Cataloging Committee, posted this information regarding the Task Force’s RDA testing results. (OCLC-CAT)

RDA
http://pi.library.yorku.ca/dspace/handle/10315/6717
Knight, Tim. “Resource Description and Access: From AACR to RDA.” Canadian Law Library Review, 36, no. 1 (2011). This paper briefly describes the origins of RDA, provides a high level overview of RDA and reviews some of the major differences between RDA and AACR2.

Knowledge Organization 2011 Conference
Coyle, Karen. “Knowledge Organization in Norway.” Coyle’s InFormation (February 1, 2011).
Karen Coyle spoke at the Knowledge Organization 2011 Conference in January 2011 (http://www.bio.no/Enheter/Avdeling-for-journalistikk-bibliotek-og-informasjonsfag/Konferanser/Kunnskapsorganisasjonsdagene-2011) and discusses it on her blog. At a wrap-up session on the first day, a day on which talks were given on RDA, linked data, FRBR, FRAD, and FRSAD, the audience came up with a list of “burning questions” which Coyle wrote down. They are:
“If not RDA, what else is there? Are things on hold waiting for RDA? Are people and vendors waiting to see what will happen? Why wasn’t RDA simplified? How long will we pay for it? Will communities other than those in the JSC use it? Can others join JSC to make this a truly international code? Should we just forget about this library-specific stuff and use Dublin Core?” The second day featured talks on outside data which might be useful to libraries and the usefulness of library data outside the library once it is freed from MARC. Coyle closes her remarks on a hopeful note, “As is often the case I was very impressed at the quality of experimentation that is taking place by people who really want to see library data transformed and made web-able. I think we are at the start of a new and highly fruitful phase for libraries.”

**New Cataloging Model**


Creating library automation infrastructure has become a multiple-choice task. Should libraries continue to rely on integrated library systems installed locally? Should they shift to relying on a globally distributed infrastructure through a web-scale management service? Or should they rely on vendor-hosted arrangements through “software-as-a-service”? The same kinds of questions arise in the way that libraries deal with the bibliographic records that describe their collections. The longstanding copy cataloging model relies on external bibliographic sources for items that have previously been described, i.e. copy cataloging, and making adjustments locally. However, new models of automation will impact cataloging workflows and new developments in the cataloging and metadata arena may require fundamental changes in library automation systems. For instance, web-scale management systems eliminate the need for local copies of records, but mean that all libraries must accept a given record or enhance it for the benefit of all.

The MARC format does not always work well within technology platforms based on XML structures which are moving increasingly toward semantic web concepts of linked data. Resource Description and Access proposes to modernize some of the cataloging rules, but the immense installed base of MARC bibliographic records could mean a difficult transition to a new model of “cataloging.”

**Guidelines for the Assignment of ISBNs to E-books**


**Guidelines for the Assignment of ISBNs to E-books and “Apps.”**

The International ISBN Agency has issued a set of guidelines and FAQs to assist national ISBN agencies, publishers, intermediaries and other interested parties in the appropriate identification of digital publications, including “apps.”

**Thomas Mann on the Importance of Subject Headings**


Syracuse Library School student Joshua Kitlas has posted a short, informative interview of Library of Congress reference librarian Thomas Mann on his blog Kitlas (kitlas.com). Mann touches on how important Library of Congress subject headings are to the reference librarian, and how social tagging will never fill that need. Mann states, “There is so much more to search than Google or OCLC. You need to see relationships between subjects and their headings. Tags by users are simply no substitute. They’re okay as supplements to controlled vocabularies but not substitutes. There’s a need to go beyond the internet and look at the systems librarians and publishers have developed that are not accessible by Google or the other engines.” It’s an interesting view that maybe Google may not be able to replace the tools that librarians and publishers have created over the years. It brings up the further question of whether the semantic web will eventually be able to use the subtle tools that generations of catalogers have created as they were designed to be used.

**Using Data from IMDB**


Charles Ledvina has created a tool which grabs data from the popular movie database IMDB available at [http://www.imdb.com/](http://www.imdb.com/) and pops it into MARC format.

**Government Documents**

**Print and Digital Initiatives**


How should depository libraries manage their collections and provide services when most of the documents will become electronic? Russell describes two initiatives that aim to continue depository libraries’ mission in the new environment. First is a plan proposed by the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL) member libraries. The proposed guideline contains the following recommendations: establish two comprehensive-as-possible collections in the southeast region, catalog collaboratively the print collection held across the regional depository libraries, and prepare options for standardizing and simplifying the collection management and disposal practices. The other initiative is the CIC-Google Government Document Project. The Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) libraries are working with Google to digitize a comprehensive collection of federal documents. The electronic version of documents will be accessible through Google Book
Search and copies will be hosted on the Hathi Trust Digital Repository.

**Information Technology**

**Data Sharing**


Technological advances have raised expectations for data sharing, and financial exigencies have brought the issue into sharper focus, especially as grant-funding institutions are beginning to require shared access to research results and the data that support them. These data are increasingly linked to publications and related resources, thereby making sharing inexorably linked to scholarship itself. In this study, the authors offer a descriptive analysis of the state of data sharing in sociology as compared with practices among a representative sample of other academic disciplines. They also consider the implications for the research community of trends in data sharing and data access. Finally, they address the unique role of academic librarians as partners in support of disciplinary researchers, teachers, students, and other data users.

**From Users to Choosers**


We’re well on the way into the much-anticipated age of ubiquitous computing, when smart resources don’t just sit on our desktops but, rather, surround us. New devices, faster networks, and new modes of service delivery are freeing us from stationary machines and are allowing us to create personal information environments whose virtual components could physically reside anywhere. The rise of this new consumer-oriented ubiquitous computing will reshape—and reduce—users’ reliance on that other major computing domain: enterprise IT. Much of the IT capability that colleges and universities now maintain will devolve to external services, with some remaining under institutional control but with others becoming independent. As the people institutions are accustomed to thinking of as users refashion themselves into choosers, colleges and universities will have to devise new ways of supporting constituents and looking out for institutional interests.

**Open-source Initiatives in the Academy**


Can understanding the principles and practices that govern open-source initiatives, and the communities of practice that manage them, provide a potential reference model for the planning and decision-making processes within higher education institutions?

**Understanding Scholarly Works through Blogs**


Undergraduate students are expected to find, evaluate, and use peer-reviewed or scholarly literature, but they rarely learn about the process of creating new knowledge or the roles the literature plays in the work of scholars. A desired outcome of undergraduate education is the understanding that knowledge is created, evolving, and contextual rather than discovered, static, and universal. There is some evidence that explicit instruction can facilitate this understanding. As scholars use the participatory web to talk about the work that they do, they also create places where students can look in on the knowledge creation process. The authors speak of how they have facilitated students’ learning new ways to use the participatory web, browsing through scholarly blogs to find conversations about their topics.

**Technology Developments in the Digital Economy**


**Web Scale Discovery**


Web scale discovery services for the library environment are an evolution holding great potential to easily connect researchers with the library’s vast information repository, whether physical holdings, such as books and DVDs; local electronic content, such as digital image collections and institutional repository materials; or remotely hosted content purchased or licensed by the library, such as e-books and publisher or aggregator content for thousands of full-text, abstracting and indexing resources. Web scale discovery can be considered a service capable of searching across a vast range of pre-harvested and indexed content quickly and seamlessly.

This entire issue of *Library Technology Reports* is devoted to web scale discovery systems, from defining the concept and explaining why such a discovery system is needed, to profiling four of these systems from major vendors: OCLC WorldCat Local, Serials Solutions Summon, EBSCO Discovery Services, and Ex Libris Primo Central.
Angry Birds for the Thinking Person

Watters, Audrey. “National Library of Finland Turns to Crowdsourcing, Games to Help Digitize Its Archives.” ReadWriteWeb (February 8, 2011).

The National Library of Finland has come up with some creative ideas to engage users in fixing mistakes in its digitized archives. “We have millions and millions of pages of historically and culturally valuable magazines, newspapers and journals online. The challenge is that the optical character recognition often contains errors and omissions, which hamper, for example, searches,” says Kai Ekholm, Director of the National Library of Finland. “Manual correction is needed to weed out these mistakes so that the texts become machine readable, enabling scholars and archivists to search the material for the information they need.” The library has created games for users to play, which, as they are played, will fix mistakes in the digitized archives. In Mole Hunt, users are shown two different words and must determine if they are actually the same word. In Mole Bridge, users have to correctly spell words which appear on their screen. Both these games correct mistakes brought into the digitized material through optical character recognition. (Librarian.net)

Local Systems

Digital Future of Libraries


Once freed from the association with the printed page, books will no longer be tied to text and still images, but might come with enhanced video content and other built-in multimedia features. By the time library collections are composed mostly of electronic materials, a dramatically different model of automation system will be required to manage and provide access to collections. The current model of the integrated library system emerged in an era when library collections consisted entirely of physical materials, and this model has not always effectively evolved to accommodate digital formats. Much of the technology components created for libraries today revolve around the workflows involved in handling and purchasing physical materials. However, over the coming decades a shift will be necessary from systems based on a physical inventory to those capable of regulating access to licensed digital materials in multiple formats.

Management

FirstSearch Database Reports COUNTER-compliant

“FirstSearch Database Reports Now COUNTER-compliant.” Cooperative eNews, 2, no. 2 (December 2010).

OCLC FirstSearch database reports are now COUNTER-compliant, having passed a standards compliance audit for Counting Online Usage for Networked Electronic Resources (COUNTER). OCLC has provided usage statistics for FirstSearch databases for many years. In response to requests from member libraries, OCLC COUNTER reports are now available to help members more easily meet certain requirements within their institutions. COUNTER provides usage statistics reports that allow libraries to compare database usage across vendor platforms in a consistent, credible and compatible manner. OCLC’s COUNTER reports measure journal use within databases, including download methods, database use at the session and search level, turn-aways and service use.

The Need For a Holistic Approach to Scholarly Communication


The future of academic libraries and higher education rests on the ability to reconceive scholarly communication holistically. Projects such as the HathiTrust and the Digital Public Library of America are the result of representatives from many institutions and backgrounds forming an alliance that has the potential to transform access to the content and resources that are integral to research and teaching, while compelling us to rethink the traditional concept of an academic library, the value of information technology, and even the idea of the university.

Technical Services Website List
http://liswiki.org/wiki/Technical_services#Technical_Services_Web_Sites

The LISWiki includes this hot-linked list of technical services websites that allows users to review the information (e.g. activities, processes, policies, practices and procedures) of other institutions’ technical services departments.

ARL 2030 Scenarios


Designed to serve as a resource for ARL member libraries to explore scenario planning, this guide contains four possible futures of research environments in 2030. Scenario planning, used widely in other sectors and industries, is a strategy-related methodology for identifying and engaging with uncertainty and applying the results to organizational planning. ARL is planning to continue its scenario project and develop workshops and other resources to support members’ use of the scenarios. As further support is developed, information will be provided at the project’s website at: http://www.arl.org/rtl/plan/scenarios.
Preservation

ALCTS E-Forum: Digital Preservation
http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/confevents/upcoming/e-forum/011911digit.cfm
ALCTS hosted a free e-mail forum discussion on digital preservation January 19-20, 2011. This e-forum explored how digital preservation impacts each department from acquisitions to reference, and asked participants to discuss what policy and technology steps their libraries have taken to steward digital objects over time.

Defining “Born Digital”
This four-page article provides a definition and lists the variety of born-digital materials. It also has an amusing four-minute YouTube video at http://www.youtube.com/user/OCLCResearch/p/u/2/6o0T79gDT4.

Workflow for Born-Digital Assets
Traditional archival processing methods and description standards often do not apply to born-digital media, requiring the development of new methods and standards. Similarly, digital content containing highly specialized subject areas presents a significant challenge, often calling for outside assistance in creating relevant metadata. Using the Charles E. Bracker Orchid Photographs digital collection at Ball State University as a model, the authors show how librarians and archivists must continue to educate themselves on metadata standards, digital archiving best practices, and asset management technologies to ensure access and preservation of digital resources.

Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST)
http://www.cdlib.org/services/collections/sharedprint/westinitiative.html
Stambaugh, Emily. “Heading West: Circling the Wagons to Ensure Preservation and Access.” Against the Grain, 22, no. 55 (November 2010).
The Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST) is an initiative to organize a distributed print repository service among research libraries in the western region of the United States. The planning phase started in the fall of 2009, with planning team members from the California Digital Library and University of California system. According to the author, the long-term goals for the Trust are to “preserve the scholarly print record at the lowest possible cost through a coordinated system of persistent archives and network level disclosure.” Another objective is to expedite space reclamation in libraries and storage facilities. The initial membership term is five years, and archive providers agree to a 25-year retention period. The Trust categorizes candidate titles into six risk levels, and defines three corresponding archiving types. A prototype collection analysis system was built to analyze records and holdings from thirteen institutions.

Continued from page 1
To a certain degree this area of law has needed to be reactive. Trials held in the years following World War II, like Nuremburg and Tokyo, were structured to deal with crimes that had already taken place. They were also held at a time when the definitions and ideas of what constituted international criminal law were evolving. The crimes occurred; the courts and procedure followed and were built around them. When the trials were over, the courts ceased to function. With no continued court presence or international body with the capacity to monitor and assess these kinds of crimes, the field of international criminal procedure had a difficult time taking root. What has happened in the decades since is the building of a matrix of organizations and courts (both hybrid and permanent)-with a continued need for procedural rules.

On July 1, 2002, a permanent international tribunal was founded through the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC). 2009 saw the seven-year anniversary of the entry into force of the Rome Statute, and with it the required review of the statute, which was held in the summer of 2010 in Kampala, Uganda. The review included considerations of proposed amendments to the statute as well as consideration of the crimes defined in the statute and the actions taken by the court to date. ICC has been recognized as the legal international organ designed to prosecute any individual accused of genocide, of crimes against humanity and of war crimes. Through this tribunal it is finally possible to defend civilians from crimes of human rights in those cases where a national judicial system with primary jurisdiction over the committed crimes would not be willing to prosecute the perpetrators of serious atrocities against humanity. In substance, the ICC functions as an ancillary system to a national criminal justice system. Before the establishment of ICC the international community had nominated ad hoc tribunals for special cases of criminal prosecution. Two typical examples are the trials for genocide in the former Yugoslavia and in Rwanda. The ICC has also expanded the compilation of crimes against humanity that must be brought to justice, either by a national court, or by the ICC.

All these changes have been embodied in the new expansion of the KZ 7000-7500 schedule, designed by Dr. Jolande Goldberg, law classification specialist in the Policy and Standards Division, Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate, Library
of Congress. Jolande has proposed to close the original range K5301-5304.5 for crimes against humanity and war crimes, which served as an overarching catch-all for offenses against racial, religious and ethnic groups, genocide, vandalism, torture, and rape as a weapon of war. These have been incorporated in the new range KZ7140-KZ7192, which is vastly more exhaustive, with the inclusion of the new subject heading (SH) International crimes. Since KZ is a schedule designed for the law of nations and comparative works on international crimes, all the offenses recognized as crimes against humanity do fall into the KZ scheme. Therefore, a work about terrorism, or forced prostitution, even when tried by a national court, would be classed under KZ and not K. In her proposal, the closing of KZ6304-6332 for international criminal courts and tribunals has generated the new range KZ7230- which now can encompass the new SH International criminal courts. The scope note of this entry is explained as: For trials by international courts and criminal tribunals associated with particular wars or conflicts, e.g. International Criminal Tribunal for former Yugoslavia ... This range also incorporates the new SH Hybrid international criminal courts, or “Third generation international bodies.” These are ad hoc courts composed of domestic and international judges and prosecutors, and nominated in order to bring to justice the perpetrators of special cases of human rights violations. The International Center for Transitional Justice explains the mandate of hybrid criminal courts as follows:

Hybrid courts generally operate where the crimes occurred but employ both domestic and international personnel, and usually have jurisdiction to try international crimes. These courts offer an important model for bolstering national capacity with adherence to international standards while ensuring that the proceedings have relevance for affected communities.

The structure of KZ7000-7500 is based on the general model of the K Class. However, it offers the advantage of collocating in one place all the crimes acknowledged by the United Nations and by the Statute of Rome as serious atrocities and offenses against humanity. The hierarchy of KZ7000- provides arrangements for primary and secondary sources for research on international criminal law and procedure, and then it develops into a more detailed classification of types of crimes. Finally, it is divided by types of courts, namely hybrid criminal courts and the ICC. While the ICC may still be in what some consider its infancy, it is a court bolstered by decades of attempts to create an international criminal court. Its decisions and procedure are steps in the evolution of international criminal law. The new proposal for the expansion of KZ allows for the accommodation of a more modern intellectual development of international criminal law, and gives space for further extension of the classification numbers according to future new subject headings. Should the proposal be approved and implemented, we will begin to observe how the shift from K to KZ will take shape. Following the very nature of cataloging, we will probably agonize over some cases, and will need to consult with each other and with our reference librarians. We would like you to share all your questions and answers in this column.
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