The Logistics of Conference Posters

Hollie C. White
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

This year’s Annual Meeting in Philadelphia introduces a new publication opportunity for AALL members: the poster. When I first heard about posters, many years ago, I had no sense of what one was, how to create one, or why a person would even want to create one. Over the last few years, I created a handful of posters for various local and international conferences. I learned the value and excitement that can come with being a part of the poster experience. Many researchers, instructors, and librarians from a variety of domains have written articles on how to create effective posters. (Seriously, perform a search in Academic Search Premier for “effective poster presentations” and just see what comes back.) The purpose of this column is to discuss the logistics involved in creating a poster. I am including tips that I learned through experience. I hope these tips help clear up some of the questions surrounding the conference poster process.

Why create a poster and what should the poster be about?

Posters are a great way to promote your research, a recent development, a change in process, or to get feedback on a new project. The road to publication can often be long, so I use poster sessions as a way to motivate myself to complete a high stakes publication—like a peer-reviewed journal article. For example, if there is a topic that I am interested in researching, I often submit a poster proposal about the topic to motivate my study. The poster becomes a half-way mark between beginning research and producing a publishable paper.

Conference programs will often tell you what type of topics posters should be about, so read the “call for posters” very carefully. For AALL, poster content is supposed to be about law libraries and legal information in one of the Core Competencies of Law Librarianship.

The poster lifecycle

Conference posters have a certain life cycle. Not only do you have to come up with the creative idea, but you also have to think about all the logistics, including how to make the actual poster, where to print it, how to transport it to and from the conference venue, and what to say about it.
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Rummaging around in my desk, I found the button that reads, “Technical Services is a Public Service.” This reminded me of the comment that one of the weakest things a library school applicant can say is, “I love books.” There is so much more to a library now than the physical items called books, and a big difference between collector and librarian. As to technical services, it’s more than collecting and organizing those books for their own sakes. Even if you only subscribe to the discussion forum AUTOCAT, let alone RDA-L, you can discover that technical services people “aren’t in Kansas anymore,” and our focus in all this wide-reaching change must be on our users’ ease of access to information. We have to look to the future with our imaginations informed by current, available knowledge and possibilities. I hope all eleven of our offerings (one workshop, six AMPC selected programs, and four TS-SIS programs) will help expand your horizons as you consider ways to provide service through technical services work.

What has the TS-SIS been up to since the last TSLL?

An election, that’s what! Congratulations are in order to our 2011-2012 Vice Chair/Chair-Elect Miriam Childs, and to our 2011-2013 Member-at-Large Richard Paone. Heartly thanks should be given to Mahnaz Moshfegh and Ann Walsh Long for agreeing to run for TS-SIS office. Our slate of candidates was excellent because of them all.

New representatives have been appointed by AALL President-Elect Darcy Kirk upon the recommendations of the former representatives and the Cataloging and Classification Committee. Pat Sayre-McCoy will be our representative to MARBI, Ellen McGrath to SAC, and John Hostage to CC:DA. Normally the terms are three years, but Ms. Kirk was persuaded to re-appoint John Hostage because of the need to have him continue working with CC:DA on RDA. Thanks to George Prager for his service on MARBI, Yael Mandelstam for hers on SAC, and to John Hostage for his continuing service on CC:DA.

Speaking of Yael Mandelstam, TS-SIS will be giving her the 2011 Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award at the TS-SIS business meeting. Please join me in giving a cheer for her and all she has contributed.

In addition to the Chapman Award, the Awards Committee presented eight grants to enable attendance at the AALL Annual Meeting. The Marla J. Schwartz Grant was awarded to Jen Richter, Sacramento County Public Law Library. The other recipients are Rebecca Bearden, Erin Harper, Ashley Moye, Amy O’Connor, Keiko Okuhara, Sarah Pearson, and Lisa Wernke. Congratulations to all of them!

It’s not always easy making the transition to cataloging in a law library. The New Catalogers Roundtable, scheduled for Tuesday, July 26, 9:00-10:30 a.m. is meant to help facilitate discussions among new law catalogers and answer their questions. This year the Classification and Subject Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group set up a “Get Classification and Subject Heading Questions Answered” webpage on the TS-SIS website at [http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/classificationquestions/](http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/classificationquestions/)

Four experts await your questions.

RDA is causing uncertainty even for many long-time law librarians. In addition to programs, there will be an “Ask the Cataloger” spot at the TS-SIS table in the AALL Exhibit Hall.

In Acquisitions Committee news: Eric Parker was an invited participant at the AALL Vendor Colloquium. Robert Myers and Shaun Esposito, the outgoing and incoming Chairs of CRIV, will attend the Acquisitions Committee meeting at Eric Parker’s invitation. This is good news, because it has been a long time since there has been any sort of formal communication between the Acquisitions Committee and CRIV. It should be a very interesting meeting.

Don’t forget that the silent auction of handicrafts to benefit the Marla J. Schwartz Grant will also take place at the TS-SIS table in the AALL Exhibit Hall. Katrina Piechnik is still soliciting donations of handicrafts. Please contact Katrina at kpiechnik@jenkinslaw.org for more information. New brochures advertising the TS-SIS will also be available on our AALL table.

Member-at-Large Suzanne Graham, Preservation Committee Chair Marilyn Estes, and Secretary/Treasurer Elaine Bradshaw recently reviewed our TS-SIS strategic plan, which was written in 2005. They determined it is definitely out-of-date and needs revision. Incoming TS-SIS Chair Ismael Gullon will be forming an ad hoc committee to work on the plan’s revision and will be asking for volunteers sometime after the AALL Annual Meeting.
Immediate past TS-SIS Chair Chris Long is also continuing the revision of the TS-SIS Handbook. It is looking much clearer and more instructive.

Of course, I cannot end my last column without thanking all the supportive, creative, intelligent, hard-working people who have made the year do-able! Because I’m writing this for TSLL, I want to start off by saying how much I appreciate Editor Virginia Bryant’s timely publication of TSLL. She and her staff have done a marvelous job. A very big thank you goes to elected officers Vice Chair/Chair-Elect Ismael Gullon, Immediate Past Chair Chris Long. Treasurer/Secretary Elaine Bradshaw, and Members-at-Large Katrina Piechnik and Suzanne Graham. (Both, despite vague descriptions in the Handbook, volunteered for several time-consuming jobs.) Equal thanks go to committee chairs Eric Parker (Acquisitions), George Prager (Cataloging and Classification), Marilyn Estes (Preservation), Shyama Agrawal (Serials), Linda Sobey (Awards), Ajaye Bloomstone (Education — one of the most brain-racking and time-consuming committees to chair), Hollie White (Joint Research Grants), Sean Chen (Membership), Brian Striman (Nominations), and Aaron Kuperman (Professional Development). Thanks are also due TS-SIS online forums manager Alan Keely and our fabulous webmaster Martin Wisneski, who took everybody’s corrections and additions cheerfully in stride and “made them so.” All of you made our teleconference meetings productive and fun. I’m just sorry there isn’t enough space to thank all the committee volunteers by name, other than the Board members and those that report to the Board, but please know your work was very much appreciated.

Looking forward to seeing all y’all in Philadelphia!

Pam Deemer
Emory University

From the Chair

Online Bibliographic Services
Special Interest Section

My year as OBS chair passed very quickly. It’s been a new experience for me, and now that I feel that I’ve figured out what I should be doing, it’s time to relinquish my post to incoming chair Betty Roeske.

My first new experience was coordinating the education program planning. Not that I had to work hard at that— The Education Committee was an experienced group, and took off running. They came up with interesting and timely ideas that were worked into well-conceived program proposals. They made a process I had some angst about into an easy and congenial experience. I am deeply grateful for all their hard work. (The TSLL editors have put together a list of OBS meetings and programs later in this issue so I won’t go over them here.

The process of actually scheduling the meetings was a second, fairly new experience for me. That one was more stressful, but with the help of the OBS Board it got done. In fact, without the Board, we chairs would be lost. Let me just mention some of the work they have done. Karen Nuckolls, our junior member-at-large, took on the job of helping to plan the joint TS/OBS/RIPS/CS reception that is held on Saturday night. Our senior member-at-large, Keiko Okuhara, was in charge of redesigning the OBS brochure and organizing the OBS table in the exhibit area. Stop by and see what she has created. Karen Selden, who is ending her term as secretary/treasurer, kept excellent notes of the board and business meetings, made sure we didn’t spend all of our money, and always had ideas and suggestions for dealing with the issues that came up throughout the year. Pat Sayre-McCoy, as immediate past chair, was the person I turned to for advice most often. She never let me down! And last but not least is Betty Roeske, who is already planning for the coming year. This has been a friendly and cooperative board to work with, and I appreciate all the hard work they put in this year.

I also want to thank the committee chairs and TSLL representatives for their ongoing work during the year. They work behind the scenes making sure the SIS chugs along. They include F. Tim Knight, Web Advisory Committee; Yuxin Li, OCLC Committee; Michael Maben, Nominating Committee; Caitlin Robinson, Local Systems Committee; Hollie White, Joint Research Grant Committee; and Ellen McGrath and Janet Hedin, representatives to TSLL.

As I write this, the final preparations for Philadelphia are being made. One program that is still very much in the works is the OBS hot topic. Our speaker, Steven Bell (columnist, blogger, librarian and adjunct professor) is still considering topics. He is leaning towards talking about building bridges between public services and technical services in order to choose and
implement the technologies that will give our users the best possible library experience. More details will be announced on the OBS list.

Finally, I want to thank OBS members for allowing me to be your chair. I confess that when I was asked to run I figured I would be the sacrificial lamb — that second name on the ballot, with no hope of getting elected. Well ... that sure wasn’t the case! As it turned out, I’ve been proud to be your chair and hope that I’ve served the SIS well.

Kathy Faust  
Lewis and Clark Law School

---

Alphabet Soup Reception – Saturday, July 23, 2011

Please join the Technical Services Special Interest Section, the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section, the Research Instruction and Patron Services Special Interest Section, and the Computing Services Special Interest Section (TS/OBS/RIPS/CS) at their joint reception, traditionally known as the Alphabet Soup reception in honor of all those acronyms.

This year’s event, once again generously sponsored by Innovative Interfaces, Inc., will be held on Saturday, July 23, 7-8 pm, at Maggiano’s Little Italy, located at 1201 Filbert Street — just two blocks south of the Philadelphia Convention Center, at the intersection of Filbert Street and North Twelfth Street.

See you there!

---

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

Trina Robinson  
George Washington University Law Library

Methods of measuring whether a collaborative effort is a success can be varied. One of our main goals for the collaborative periodical cancellation project discussed in the TSLL March issue was to liberate funds tied up in purchasing print versions of titles we had access to via an online database. We collaborated with two other law libraries in order to allow each of the libraries to cancel two-thirds of the titles accessible online and to keep only one-third. The amount of money saved, since a significant percentage of the titles cancelled were law review titles, is arguably negligible. But the savings are not only measured in dollars and cents, but also in space and reduced labor (no check-in, processing, claiming) of these titles in the future. Of course, there is the anticipated increased labor for the interlibrary loan (ILL) department of each library, because a part of the agreement is expedited ILL for the one-third of the titles kept by each library.

In our efforts, approximately 400 titles were cancelled. This large cancellation project led to an increased workload, cancelling titles and updating records, but so far has left surprisingly little clean-up and correction work after that phase was completed. Only a handful of cancelled titles had to be reinstated, and even fewer titles were missed in the original cancellation phase and had to have their cancellations delayed until the next subscription year.

Although the end of this project appears to be approaching, it is not certain when that will actually happen. These cancelled titles need to be monitored to make sure they don’t continue to come. There is also the possibility that the parameters of the original project could be expanded, resulting in additional titles to cancel (certain types of publications were left out of the original set), or similar projects with different databases may arise. This, if it should happen, could be viewed as a measure of the project’s success.

At the moment, given the potential fluidity of this type of collaboration, I believe collaboration combined with cancellation is a far better and more positive choice than cancellation alone. Ultimately, I think the true value of this type of project will best be revealed in the purchases the library makes with the saved dollars, and how well these purchases are received by our patrons.
Human Trafficking

In the past decade, the topic of human trafficking has risen steadily, to become a top priority on both the national and the international stage. It is a crime that raises billions of dollars for its perpetrators and affects the lives of millions of human beings annually. And while recent focus on the crime and its growth adds immediacy and currency to the discussion, it has roots in the United States that reach back to the founding of the country.

Human trafficking is both a criminal issue and a human rights issue. As such, its categorization in either discipline can be problematic. In their 2003/2004 article in *U.C. Davis Journal of International Law & Policy*, “Human Trafficking from a Legal Advocate’s Perspective: History, Legal Framework and Current Anti-Trafficking Efforts,” Ivy C. Lee and Mie Lewis compare various definitions of trafficking as used by the United States in its landmark Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 and by international groups such as the United Nations and the International Human Rights Law Group. The authors note that the definition used by the United States is more narrowly tailored, and theorize that its use in legislation designed to prosecute perpetrators of the crime affects how it was created. Recently the TS-SIS discussion list served as a lively stage for the discussion of the subject of human trafficking in the United States and the stark choice a cataloger has to face when deciding on its appropriate classification number.

At present, if you have a book on human trafficking in the United States and search Classification Web using the correlation LCSH-LC Class Number, you retrieve discouraging results, two numbers in the area of social sciences: (1) HQ281: The Family. Marriage. Woman – Sex, Prostitution; and (2) HQ314: The Family. Marriage. Woman – Human Sexuality. Sex – Prostitution – Rescue work…etc. If the book deals with human trafficking legislation, you must turn your attention to the K schedules. A search of these schedules yields more promising results: (1) K5295: Prostitution. Procuring (Including history (white slave traffic)); (2) K5258: Human trafficking. Human smuggling; and (3) KZ7155: Trafficking in persons. Enslavement.

TS-SIS discussion list participants determined that all three of the options in the latter group are inadequate. K5295 refers exclusively to the procurement of prostitution, while human trafficking comprises at least three elements: the act of recruiting or abducting people (especially but not limited to women and children) in an organized way, transporting or transferring by force, and exploitation. K5258 combines the concepts of trafficking and smuggling of persons, two separate types of crime. Moreover, these options fall outside of the KF schedule, where a work on Trafficking—Law and legislation—United States should reside.

Searching in KF yielded a few options as well: KF9335: Peonage. Slavery, and KF9448: Prostitution. Procuring. (Including history (white slave traffic)). Neither of these captures the essence of human trafficking as it exists today; instead, they both seem to reflect outdated ideas.

At the heart of the challenge of finding the appropriate classification are the different definitions of human trafficking relied upon by the United States and international groups. The narrower context of the United States legislative definition focuses on sex exploitation, while the international definition includes the broader concept of labor exploitation, and is a modern extension of the crime as a true type of enslavement. However, the most relevant difference abides with the consent of the victim of trafficking. In the U.N. Protocol, in order to prosecute the crime, the victim’s consent is irrelevant. In the U.S. Trafficking Act, the abduction or forced transportation is a sine qua non to conduct criminal proceedings, and, more importantly, to apply all the provisions related to immigrant relief and social services to the victims. The new changes in the K and KF ranges mirror this awareness and follow here.

K5258 Human trafficking. Human smuggling, see K5297

**[Additions of]**

1) K5297 Human trafficking.

Class here works on recruitment, transportation, transfer, etc. of persons, especially women and children, by means of threat or use of force or abduction for the purpose of exploitation. Including, but not limited to, forced prostitution or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labor, child labor, debt bondage, practices similar to slavery, or removal of organs.
2) K5299 Human smuggling.

Class here works on smuggling of migrants by land, sea, and air in order to obtain a financial or other material benefit of the illegal entry.

[In KF United States]

3) KF9449 Human trafficking.

Class here works on coerced transportation, transfer or abduction of persons, especially women and children for the purpose of exploitation. Including, but not limited to, forced prostitution or other forms of sexual exploitation, forced labor, child labor, debt bondage, practices similar to slavery, or removal of organs.

4) KF9449.5 Human smuggling.

Class here works on smuggling of migrants by land, sea, and air in order to obtain a financial or other material benefit of the illegal entry.

For the literature focusing on trafficking in persons and enslavement as a crime against humanity we have to apply KZ7155.

All these modifications already appear in Classification Web. However, we might see further developments and updates in the KZ7000 range, as the current international law reclass project at the Library of Congress comes to a close.

---

Chapman Award Announcement

The TS-SIS Awards Committee is pleased to announce that the recipient of the Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award for Outstanding Contributions in Technical Services Law Librarianship for 2011 is Yael Mandelstam.

Yael is Head of Cataloging at Fordham University School of Law, Leo T. Kissam Memorial Library in New York. Some of Yael’s many contributions to the profession are the following:

She has an outstanding record of accomplishments exemplified by her service as AALL Representative to the ALA Subject Analysis Committee from 2005-2011. While SAC representative, Yael spearheaded the Inherently Legal Subject Headings Project, served as founder and chair of the Genre/Form Terms for Law Materials Project, and as member of the Provider-Neutral E-Monograph Record Task Group co-authored with Becky Culbertson and George Prager, Provider-Neutral E-Monograph MARC Record Guide (Washington, D.C.: Program for Cooperative Cataloging, 2009).

A member of the TS-SIS Cataloging and Classification Standing Committee’s Task Group on Vendor-Supplied Bibliographic Records, Yael gave several practical presentations at AALL Annual Meetings on effective methods to successfully batchload vendor bibliographic records by examining the records first using MARCEdit. Her contributions on batchload analysis and crosswalks to OCLC are available on the committee’s wiki at http://tsvbr.pbworks.com.

In addition, Yael has served as a mentor for new law catalogers, and is actively involved in the New York library community as founder of and frequent presenter at the Big Apple Catalogers’ Klatsch (B.A.C.K.).

Congratulations Yael!

The Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award for Outstanding Contributions in Technical Services Law Librarianship is presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Law Libraries to an individual or group in recognition of achievement in an area of technical services, for service to the Association, or for outstanding contributions to the professional literature. Factors considered in selecting the recipients of the Award include such things as the publishing, presenting, or sharing of innovative techniques or research, analysis or commentary; the development of software, hardware, or other mechanisms that significantly enhance access to collections; and the contribution of service to the Technical Services SIS as a whole. Achievements may be in the area of acquisitions, cataloging and classification, materials processing, preservation, automation, or technical services administration.

Linda M. Sobey
2010-2011 TS-SIS Awards Committee Chair
Florida A&M University, College of Law Library
As I prepared to write this column, my last as the contributing author for collection development for *TSLL*, I revisited both the journey I have taken over the last two years, and the writing I have completed as a result of it. Thinking about each collection development project, I reviewed my own observations, methods and guiding principles. In both the lessons I have learned and the ways in which I have tried to convey those lessons, I have taken one vital element of my work for granted. I have not highlighted the vitally important task of collection development policy revision.

One of the most important functions of the regular review of a collection development policy is the opportunity to revisit the fundamentals of collection development. Regardless of whether we are public, private or academic entities, the basic considerations in creating and maintaining a collection development policy remain the same. We start with the library mission. Whom do we serve, and why? Knowing the focus and purpose of our service is important, but translating that knowledge into timely and relevant policies that inform our decisions is absolutely critical to excellence in service-oriented librarianship. And there is an even greater value in asking these questions as our organizations experience rapid and pervasive change. When the answers to these questions change, our policies should take those changes into account. What we do and how we do it should be derived from whom we serve and why. When one changes, it is incumbent on us to reconsider the other.

Policy revisions also provide an opportunity to review legacy practices in our organizations. “Why are we doing this?” can be a powerful question in times of change. Reviewing the rationale behind our policies and practices gives us an opportunity to transition away from decisions and methods that don’t meet our needs toward other practices that are more responsive to our most important constituencies, our users. Moreover, in times of increased constraints on space and resources, our greatest assets will be our creativity and flexibility in finding new ways to achieve our objectives. What better way to reevaluate the way we develop our collections than to revisit the guidelines we have created for that work?

Beyond changes in the organizational mission, structure and resources we have at our disposal, we also find ourselves in a time of rapid change in the way that information is gathered, stored and shared. While we are each keenly aware of the changes taking place around us, there are few guideposts for translating some of those changes into concrete guidelines for a new era of collection development. For example, some law school faculty have begun to take part in new publishing initiatives designed to re-envision the way in which law school casebooks are written, sold and accessed. E-casebook projects like CALI’s eLangdell have begun to reach a wider audience, and as such they require new ways of thinking. Existing models of collecting faculty publications primarily focus on the physical information containers that hold faculty writing. Most academic libraries have clear directions for how faculty authored print monographs or article reprints should be handled. But how should we treat a chapter in an e-casebook? The chapter could be printed if there are no copyright restrictions, but is that the best option? The answer lies in review of the existing collection development policy, with an eye toward the mission and purpose of the library and attention both to the changes at hand and those that are likely to follow.

Another change that impacts public, private and academic libraries alike is the slow but steady move toward the authentication of online sources for primary legal materials. The AALL Government Relations Committee has been committed to the cause of increasing free public access to authenticated primary authorities in digital format for a number of years, and it remains one of the stated goals in the most current iteration of the committee’s action plan. As those striving for freely available authenticated government information find success, those of us charged with the collection and dissemination of that information should reevaluate what we will collect and how it is provided to our users. Once a publication is both official and authenticated online, how much of our limited resources should we spend to maintain a duplicative print set of the material in our collections? What if our most limited resource is space rather than funding? And what if the resource in question is still not official when accessed online? The answers will vary from library to library, but the questions are critically important to ask.

A further fundamental element of our work guided by the collection development policy is weeding, or deaccessioning of materials. Some of the sagest advice I have been given to date with respect to this endeavor is to constantly strive to remove materials from the library with the same level of thoughtfulness and care that I give to the addition of new materials. In
fact, weeding some collections requires an even more acute attitude of reflection and consideration than the addition of new items based on the fragile, fleeting or unique nature of the collections. The policies that guide these decisions must be as carefully crafted and regularly reviewed as those that direct new acquisitions.

What I present here is not so much a call to arms or action as it is a call to reflection. We make our best decisions when we have given time and consideration to our guiding principles, then let those principles help to steer our course. As I move into a new chapter of my professional career, this is one of the essential lessons I will carry with me. The policies I help craft must mirror and complement the people my library serves, including both the reason and ways in which we serve them. At the same time, they must be realistic and forward-looking, taking into account the resources at our disposal and the changes in our future. To continue the good work in which we are already engaged, we must look honestly at each of these things. Ultimately, this honesty will guide us in crafting the best policies.

1 http://www.cali.org/elangdel

Report and Recommendations of the U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee

The Coordinating Committee has released its official report, and in it the Committee recommends that RDA “should be implemented by LC, NAL, and NLM no sooner than January 2013. The three national libraries should commit resources to ensure progress is made on these activities that will require significant effort from many in and beyond the library community.”

Interestingly, the Committee lists several activities it feels must take place before RDA is officially adopted by the national libraries, and those are:

- Rewrite portions of the RDA instructions in clear, unambiguous, plain English
- Define process for updating RDA in the online environment
- Improve functionality of the RDA Toolkit
- Develop full RDA record examples in MARC and other encoding schemas and integrate them into the RDA Toolkit
- Announce completion of the Registered RDA Element Sets and Vocabularies. Ensure the registry is well described and in synchronization with RDA rules
- Demonstrate credible progress towards a replacement for MARC
- Ensure and facilitate community involvement


PCC Policy Committee Discussion Paper on RDA implementation scenarios

The PCC Policy Committee issued a paper on April 5, 2011 that discussed four different actions that PCC could take regarding RDA: (1) do not implement RDA; (2) postpone implementation until certain changes are made; (3) implement RDA; or (4) implement RDA with specific recommended changes or policy decisions for U.S. libraries.

This paper concludes: “PCC should formally adopt RDA, regardless of the RDA Test and the decision of US national libraries, but it should set no time limit on implementation of RDA by PCC institutions.”

They accepted email comments on the paper until the May 11, 2011 deadline. The discussion paper is available at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/PoCo-RDA-Discussion-Paper040511.pdf.
In an email posted to the PCC list on June 15, 2011, John Riemer stated: “The PCC affirms its support of the US national libraries’ decision to implement RDA, slated to be no sooner than January 2013, and looks forward to collaborating with them in this effort.” He also said that the PCC Policy Committee will be creating a set of PCC RDA FAQs that will be posted on the PCC RDA website.

LC’s statement: “Transforming our Bibliographic Framework”

On May 13, 2011 the Library of Congress issued a statement outlining issues it plans to address relating to cataloging in the brave new world of RDA.

I will selectively quote the most significant points:

- Explore approaches to displaying metadata beyond current MARC-based systems
- Determine which aspects of current metadata encoding standards should be retained and evolved into a format for the future
- Plan for bringing existing metadata into new bibliographic systems within the broader Library of Congress technical infrastructure
- Experiment with Semantic Web and linked data technologies
- Foster maximum re-use of library metadata in the broader web search environment
- Enable users to navigate relationships among entities—such as persons, places, organizations, and concepts—to search more precisely in library catalogs and in the broader Internet


Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms for Library and Archival Materials (LCGFT)

The Library of Congress has formally separated genre/form headings from LC subject headings in the authority file. The formal title of the thesaurus is: Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms for Library and Archival Materials (LCGFT). It will appear in print in the Supplemental Vocabularies volume of the 32nd edition of LCSH, which will be published this summer. LCGFT incorporates the genre/form terms for law materials developed by AALL’s Classification and Subject Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group.

Note: It is still valid to use LC subject headings as genre terms. Below are two examples of how these headings should appear in bibliographic records:
655 7 Casebooks. |2 lcgft
655 0 Festschriften.


Silent Auction at TS-SIS Activities Table
open to all AALL members

TS-SIS is again sponsoring a silent action at this year’s Annual Meeting to promote and raise money for the Marla Schwartz Grant, which enables law librarians to attend conferences. For more information on this grant, see http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/grants/schwartz/.

If you would like to contribute an item to the auction, please email Katrina Piechnik at kpiechnik@jenkinslaw.org. Include in your email a description of the item you are donating AND the minimum bid. Bring your item to the TS-SIS activities table in Philadelphia (do not ship it to Katrina).

Everyone please remember to bring your checkbook with you to the AALL Annual Meeting. You never know what treasures you may find!

Questions? Contact Katrina or any other TS-SIS Executive Board Member listed at http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/board/current.htm.

Contributions may be tax deductible.
The Future of the Internet
(with a Special Focus on Electronic Information, Legal And Otherwise)

Matthew R. Jenks
University of New Hampshire School of Law

On April 14, 2011, a number of us gathered together at the IUG (Innovative Users Group) Conference in San Francisco for a vibrant and dynamic few days of learning, sharing and exchanging ideas. As “techies” and information professionals, many of us find we get a lot more out of this annual conference than any other, and this year was no exception. From MARCEdit and RDA to AJAX and Oracle to Encore, Millennium, and WebBridge (and everything in between), we had numerous opportunities to learn about new technologies and enhance our knowledge base.

However, what I will take away most from this year’s conference came not from the numerous seminars and learning sessions, but from our keynote speaker, Thomas Frey.

Frey laid it on the line - the future of libraries will be directly tied to changes in “literacy, books, education and work.” And, what are these changes he foresees? Here is a quote from the Innovative Users Group 19th Annual Conference Program Guide which summarizes very well Mr. Frey’s eyebrow-raising vision for the future:

Literacy will extend beyond just reading and writing, into a flow of conversation that is constantly morphing and fragmenting. As books continue to evolve, the notion of what a book is will go through a metamorphosis unlike anything we have seen. Education systems will transition to hyper-individualized, self-paced learning systems based on direct interaction with experts. Work will form around the needs of an individual or company, and talent will automatically flow to the projects for which they are best suited . . . At the heart of all these changes will be a network of constantly adjusting libraries, adept at molding services to the changing needs of their communities. Libraries will be defined far more by the journey they will have taken than by their facilities.

Notice the words used in this passage all relating to change: “flow ... morphing ... fragmenting ... evolve ... metamorphosis ... transition ... form ... constantly adjusting ... molding ... hyper-individualized.” More on this shortly.

Even more eye-opening in Mr. Frey’s presentation was one of the “take-home” points of the morning: the end of print books. Yes, we would have warehousing for books already out there, particularly our historic works. And yes, there might be specialty publishers to create beautiful print volumes on request. But for the most part the world of words would become virtual, electronic, floating out there in the ether.

As for libraries, they would become more like information commons (his words), think tanks, Internet cafes (my words). I picture students and associates sitting at tables with laptops, or Kindles, or Nooks, or iPhones, or other electronic, Internet-ready devices. In this environment, the knowledgeable and research-savvy librarians are the only ones who differentiate the library from a real Internet cafe or other wi-fi space. Otherwise, it is a generic, antiseptic, bookless place, without inherent value.

What I found most unsettling (and not all readers may agree with me) is the fact that if you compare his words to the current state of things in the virtual landscape, his overall vision may be right on the money. The fact that he heads a think tank (the DaVinci Institute) may have an influence on the vision itself, but nevertheless these are directions in which we are heading. It is an electronic information world which has arrived in a big hurry. And as we know, anything which moves at such a breakneck speed runs the risk of losing control. For this and for other reasons, I hope his vision is wrong.

A big problem I see is that the primary theme of his address points to the devolution of “the work,” in favor of the rise and reign of generic (and ever-changing) streams of data and information. The assumption here is that access to data is what is most important; less important is the interpretation of data by others who have gone before us and the knowledge that has been gained from that interpretation. Even less valued is the knowledge which has been gained throughout time and history (dare we call it wisdom?), knowledge gained through practice, experience, and the application of both discovery and what has gone before (best practices, etc.) to find out what is time-tested, most valuable, and true. This is what the process of learning and the progress of civilization (or who we are as a human collective) are all about. Classic works in the legal field or any field, for that matter, are the amalgamation, and the imprinted (whether digitally or physically) record of data, information, and interpretation, combined with the application of accumulated knowledge (to reach possibly new conclusions), all of which adds to the sum total of what we know and have learned over the course of time. By building on
what we have learned, we grow as a society and become better and more effective than we were before. To sum up, data is data but the legal work is so much more than that.

Therefore, the Internet is a tool, a tool for creating new ways to organize and search through a work, a tool for finding the right works in the first place, a tool for engaging in general searching (and, through the use of metadata, much more effective searching), a tool for communicating and sharing ideas, and, of course, a tool for searching documents like cases, statutes, and legislation, which are essentially static data and information.

As I have opined previously, it is also a vital tool for preservation, preservation that is finally beginning to accelerate in legal librarianship with the Internet Archive (www.archive.org) and the efforts of the Legal Information Preservation Alliance (lipalliance.wordpress.com). Digital preservation has now become as important, or more important (and urgent), than physical preservation.

But the Internet is not an excuse for speed, extensibility, and interoperability at the expense of data integrity, reliability, and stability. If there is a constant flow of information, continuing to adjust and fragment, then stability (by extension) goes out the door. Reliability and integrity are soon to follow. All we are left with is a cloud of swirling data. This is why, if Thomas Frey’s vision for the future of the Internet and electronic information is true, it is so imperative to maximize the preservation of legal works, so that we never lose them, or lose the knowledge and, yes, wisdom that we have gained along the way and over the passage of time. By achieving this, we get to keep what is lasting, authoritative, and true, regardless of what the future of the Internet holds.

And now a final comment on Mr. Frey’s vision for libraries and the end of print books in general. I highly recommend a short article in Salon.com by Laura Miller entitled, “Why Libraries Still Matter,” written in anticipation of the May 23, 2011 100th anniversary of the New York Public Library (the building or edifice as opposed to the institution) available at http://www.salon.com/books/laura_miller/2011/05/11/nypl_centennial. In the article Ms. Miller touts the idea of the library as place and gives numerous examples of why place is so important. But what really struck me was her statement, “The anniversary of the NYPL’s main building is an occasion to talk about why the library needs to be a place as well as an ethereal mass of data residing somewhere in the ‘cloud.’ Not everything we need or want to know about the world can be transmitted via a screen, and not every experience can be digitized.”

I couldn’t have said it better. The Internet is a tool and a path to knowledge and even experience. But it can never be the knowledge or experience itself. Those two things reside in the human mind and in the human collective, and the only time they intersect with the Internet is in the presence of great digital works (of many sorts, from treatises to works of art to literature). What the Internet does do is provide greater access to and greater searchability of those works; it does not replace them.

Now, this being said, it remains a fact that the Internet defines the modern age and defines what research is all about in our technological world. It makes our lives easier, provides avenues to deeper research, gives us an almost unlimited ability to communicate with each other, and opens up to us the rest of the world. Despite having reservations about where the Internet is headed, it remains a fact that the web makes my life richer in numerous ways. For many years, it has also defined and been an intrinsic part of my life and what I do. It is the single greatest fact of what modern libraries are all about, and it will continue to expand and become more extensible and valuable to users as time goes on. But if legal works (and cases, and statutes, and legislation, and literature) are part of the recorded knowledge of our history, culture and civilization(s), then they need to be preserved in whatever forms are available. For libraries this should not be exclusively digital preservation.

I believe in physical preservation as well. Frey’s vision of an end to print books and a bookless library is a non-starter with me. At a minimum, physical volumes – books – are a visual cue of a library’s value and worth. They differentiate a library from an Internet cafe (along with the available expertise). More than that, books provide a different way of doing research, which is three-dimensional. As opposed to a two-dimensional screen which one can only split so many times before it becomes too hard on the eyes, having multiple volumes in front of you provides an effective way to compare, refer back to, and process multiple “streams” of information. In essence it promotes multi-dimensional thinking by its very nature. The drawback is that it does not provide the depth of resources, the searchability, or the speed of the Internet. The best and most effective research combines both the physical and the virtual; they should complement and supplement each other.

So – physical books should remain and complement the digital, and vice versa. Not only that, books define a library, books beautify a library, and books are a record and reminder of why we are all there in the first place – to learn, to gain knowledge, and to add to the existing knowledge of our human culture and human experience. May they (and libraries) never fade from the human landscape but always be available to enrich our lives and enrich society.
Evaluating Staff

Staff evaluations are dreaded equally by staff and supervisors alike. This process is weighing heavily on my mind because as I write this, I’m in the middle of evaluating my own staff. Employees can be very apprehensive about the process; comments that appear on these documents may determine the nature of their pay increases. Supervisors dislike the process, especially in the academic setting, because the areas to be assessed in the evaluation are very generic, so that they can be used by the entire university. Here, the same evaluation form is used for both professional and support staff, regardless of where they work.

Our evaluations consist of self-assessments submitted by employees in which they answer questions about their work activities and goals from the past year. They also include information about their training needs and goals for the coming year. Supervisors use this information to help in preparing the evaluations. The administration has made some minor changes in the self-assessment form to make it more relevant to our operation.

Writing the narratives about how well employees have performed their duties and met their goals, and if they have embodied all of the prescribed behaviors, is hard enough. Assigning ratings to these narratives is really challenging. First of all, there are only three rating choices on our forms: “needs improvement,” “successful” and “exceptional.” There is an unspoken rule that you can only give a few overall exceptional ratings to staff members, since the pool of raise money is divided based on the ratings. Exceptional ratings are very few and far between because too many of them would deplete the budget. This usually limits us to ranking only one employee as exceptional per department at the most. If there are a number of outstanding employees in a department, it’s very hard to explain why several of them didn’t receive an exceptional rating.

The employee receives a separate ranking in each of three categories and an overall ranking. It is difficult for a manager to relate the individual category ratings to the overall rating which determines the percentage of pay increase. If two categories are rated “needs improvement,” and one category is rated successful, can an employee be rated successful overall? Since there are only three categories of rank, difficulties arise when ranking marginal employees. The category “needs improvement” can be used for both a relatively new employee who is still learning the job and for a more seasoned employee who is not meeting expectations. The difference between these two must be carefully described in the narrative. The other problem is that the “successful” rating can be applied to someone who is just barely meeting the goals as well as someone who is doing a really good job, but not “walking on water,” the qualification for an exceptional rating. Employees are disappointed when you praise them highly in the narrative, but only give them a “successful” rating. Since it’s in the middle, some employees perceive that it means they’re average. They don’t accept supervisors’ explanation that being successful is really good, since in our organization, the “average” expectations are extremely high. This situation is very frustrating for supervisors.

We try to compromise by giving an “exceptional” rating in one of the categories. If we gave “exceptional” in more than one category, an overall rating of “successful” would be hard to accept.

During the evaluation conferences, employees expect supervisors to give reasons for the rankings they’ve assigned. This is especially difficult when what the employees have written in their self-assessments differs radically from what supervisors have written in their evaluations. With a difficult or low ranked employee, it’s a challenge to know how far to go with criticism. This is especially tough if supervisors have inherited “problem employees” whose previous supervisors didn’t accurately describe their work. If an employee’s performance has been unacceptable, but has been rated as successful, and the staff has “worked around” this person for years, it may be problematic to document and discipline this behavior. The current supervisor’s assessment of the employee might not be taken seriously.

Enough about the difficulties involved with preparing staff evaluations. Here are some helpful tips that may make the process less painful.

1. Suggest that the administration have a meeting with supervisors to make sure everyone is on the same page about how to conduct evaluations.
2. Examine the evaluation forms thoroughly and familiarize yourself with all of the rankings and their definitions.
3. Have an ongoing dialog with your employees during the year to discuss their work. Don’t put anything in an evaluation that will be a surprise to the employee.
4. Be fair and objective when preparing evaluations. Don’t let personal prejudices or opinions influence them.
5. Tell the truth about the employee’s progress, even if you are evaluating a problem employee. If the employee’s problems continue, it will be easier to make a case for discipline or termination if the evaluation accurately documents the employee’s actions.

6. Always try to mention something positive about an employee in the evaluation, even if there are some areas that aren’t up to par.

7. Prior to your evaluation conference, send the employee a draft of the evaluation, so that the employee can examine it thoroughly before you meet and be prepared to discuss the evaluation and ask questions.

8. During the evaluation conference, give the employee ample time for discussion. Don’t be afraid to make changes in the evaluation, if the employee provides a different perspective.

9. Be sure to discuss goals for the upcoming year and any professional development needs the employee might have.

10. Make sure that any upcoming changes in work assignments are discussed thoroughly during the conference. Provide the employee with a current copy of the job description.

I hope I have provided you with increased awareness of the evaluation process, so that the next time you engage in this dreaded activity, there will be less pain and anguish.

---

The OCLC Update and Roundtable Session

Announcement

Yuxin Li

University of Houston Law Library

The OCLC Update and Roundtable session at the 2011 AALL Annual Meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 26, 9:00 – 10:30 a.m. Carole Myles, one of OCLC’s Member Services Consultants, will be the speaker.

Several weeks ago, I emailed the TS-SIS discussion list requesting topics for which the members would like to have an update. Ellen McGrath, Head of Cataloging at Charles B. Sears Law Library, University at Buffalo, expressed interest in the following topics: (1) OCLC’s handling of RDA implementation; and (2) description and demonstration of features of OCLC’s new Connexion Client version 2.30. I passed these on to Carole. One of the known topics that will be included in Carole’s update is OCLC’s web-scale management services. If any of you have other topics that you would like to be covered, please send them to me at yli@central.uh.edu. I’ll certainly forward them to Carole.

When all the topics to be covered at the session are finalized, I’ll distribute them through the TS-SIS discussion list the week prior to the conference.

Professional Development Announcements

Help Desk at Philadelphia Annual Meeting

As an experiment, we are going to try using the TS-SIS table in the activity area of the exhibit hall at this year’s Annual Meeting as a help desk. **Anyone who needs help in any area of technical services work is invited to come and ask.** Anyone who wants to offer help is also invited. We need helpers with expertise in cataloging, including RDA, and in other areas of technical services as well, such as acquisitions, preservation, and serials control. We have arranged for a power connection at the TS-SIS table, and there is wi-fi service throughout the exhibit hall. Anyone with a laptop will be able to access various online tools, including, for example, Classification Web.

Continuing education

Due to ongoing changes in cataloging rules and standards, changes in technology, and the pending retirement of the “boomer” generation, there is a great need to develop a framework for training technical services law librarians, especially in those areas where working with legal materials is significantly different than working with other materials.

Distance education seems to be the cost efficient way to go about it. Perhaps anyone with interest, experience or expertise in developing online training could lend a hand? If so, please contact Aaron Kuperman, Chair of the Committee on Professional Development, at akup@loc.gov.
Celebrating National Preservation Week

Sally Wambold
University of Richmond Law Library

Sarah Rhodes, Digital Collections Librarian at Georgetown Law Library, reports, “As National Preservation Week 2011 begins, the Chesapeake Digital Preservation Group is releasing the results of its fourth annual analysis of link rot among the original URLs for law- and policy-related materials published to the web and archived by the Chesapeake Group.” It appears the rate of link rot slows with time. Here is a direct link to the findings summary: http://legalinfoarchive.org/custompages/linkrot2011.php. The Chesapeake Group preserves web-published legal materials and is a founding member of the Legal Information Preservation Alliance (LIPA) Legal Information Archive.

The Virginia Association of Law Libraries (VALL) held a joint meeting with VASLA at Regent University on April 29, during National Preservation Week. As I have indicated before, I consider VALL to be a green chapter of AALL because of several book repair workshops and the assembling of a preservation copy of Virginia Reports for the Virginia Historical Society in Richmond. VALL’s acknowledgement of National Preservation Week this year was a brief, low-tech Preservation Tools Sampler program at the Regent University meeting. It was an old-fashioned show-and-tell with a small sampler packet of a few of the tools plus instructions for using other tools. Members of the audience were able to handle the examples; it was real, not virtual. This was simpler than many preservation lectures. As readers of this column know, I believe that preservation needs to be simple. Conservation is another issue altogether; conservation restores an artifact to its original state or as close to it as possible.

Here are tools included in the program:

- CoLibri System keeps dust jackets and loose spines on books. The covers keep books with red rot from damaging other books, shelves, clothes, and hands. CoLibri covers are removable without damaging the books. It is available from LBS/Archival Products in Des Moines, Iowa.

- Kapco sells excellent tools to extend the life of library materials. The products are not archival, as are CoLibri’s. They include:
  * Easy Cover II
  * Poly Cover
  * Easy Wings, Easy Corners, and Easy Bind — used to make simple repairs on the Black's Legal Dictionary on the shelves in my office

Kapco is in Kent, Ohio, toll free (800-791-8965), or at http://www.kapco.com.

- Hydrion Humidicator Detection Test Paper estimates relative humidity. Water vapor causes the paper to change colors. A deep blue indicates 20% relative humidity. At the other end of the humidicator, a bright pink indicates 80% relative humidity. Place a test strip on a wall or in a chamber (or container) for up to 7 days. Each dispenser has enough paper for more than 200 test strips and comes in a sturdy carrying case. Uses include
  * Need for dehumidifiers in homes, offices, or storage areas
  * Justify buying a hygrometer, although there are inexpensive models

Hydrion Humidicator Detection Test Paper is available from several sources. Google it!

Here is a screen shot of the color indicator chart for Hydrion Humidicator Detection Test Paper:
• Groom/Stick, non-abrasive paper cleaner, a Renaissance Product by Pierreator Enterprises Ltd., London
  * Non-staining pick up of a wide range of foreign matter: graphite, carbon, charcoal, chalk, crayon, dry powder colors, mould spores, dust, dirt, and grease
  * Provides a molecular trap for foreign matter
  * Leaves no dirty fragments as do other erasers
  * Can collect and hold foreign matter, until it is several times its original weight
  * Use as a dry-cleaner and de-greaser of hands

Groom/Stick is somewhat expensive. If it performs and lasts as advertised, the cost is worth it. It is available from University Products and possibly other sources as well.

• Tying tape is available from several vendors in different widths, lengths, and fabric types. It will not cut into materials for the bindery or into microfiche cards, which need to stay together before processing. It will not disintegrate as rubber bands do and can provide more reuses than rubber bands.

• The Spiral Book Binder, designed with the University of Iowa in consultation with preservation librarians and book conservators, is a quick and easy solution developed specifically for spiral bound books. There are various widths and sizes. Skinny spiral bound books can slip behind other books when not in such a binder. The binder enables the spine label to be on the spine. A title label is also possible, although it may be more labor-intensive to make than the library can justify. Archival Products in Des Moines, Iowa sells this tool.

• I sprayed sample pages from a 1953 paperback of folk songs by Burl Ives with a deacidification spray I bought on sale. I showed pages not sprayed for comparison. On the handout I provided this link to a technical article about deacidification sprays for further information: [http://cool.conservation-us.org/coolaic/sg/bpg/annual/v15/bp15-17.html](http://cool.conservation-us.org/coolaic/sg/bpg/annual/v15/bp15-17.html).

    I would like to complete the deacidification of this little book and rebind it or get it rebound. My dream is to do a video of the project for YouTube. Since I have no experience creating a video, this will not happen overnight.

I reiterated an important principle of preservation during the VALL program: Do no harm. The books I used for examples were not valuable or in the library collection. This is common sense. We do not experiment on something needed for the collection, something that we could damage and not repair.

Gentle readers, stay well preserved!

---

**PRIVATE LAW LIBRARIES**

Allison Rainey  
Crowell & Moring LLP

I am excited to join the staff of TSLL and am looking forward to writing the “Private Law Libraries” column. I wanted to use this first column to introduce myself and share my background and interests. I have some ideas for future columns, but welcome suggestions or even a co-columnist. I know that my perspective is limited and want to make sure that I am discussing issues that are relevant to the membership of TS-SIS as a whole.

My name is Allison Rainey and I am the Technical Services Librarian at Crowell & Moring LLP in Washington, DC. I have been at Crowell for almost three years. I started in June 2008 after graduating from the School of Information and Library Science at the University of North Carolina. While this is my first full-time professional position, I am no stranger to the world of law firms, having worked as a trademark paralegal for four years prior to attending grad school.

While in graduate school, I worked in a variety of special libraries. I had a chance to do a little bit of everything, but I mostly worked on cataloging projects. Whether I was working with electronic records for NC Health Info, a public web database of North Carolina health and medical resources, slides of medieval medical manuscripts, or clippings files maintained by the North Carolina Supreme Court library, I quickly learned the importance and value of quality records and recordkeeping. As all librarians know, there is no value in having a resource in your collection if no one knows that it is there. I believe that in
technical services, it is our job to make sure that our colleagues in reference and our patrons can find the information that they need, even if they didn’t know a resource existed when starting their search.

At Crowell I am involved in all aspects of our technical services operations; however, I tend to focus on cataloging and improving/maintaining our library catalog. I think that by having some involvement in all areas, I am in a better position to understand and evaluate the needs of our patrons, especially when it comes to translating those needs into improved records. I am always striving to find new projects that can help to enhance the quality of our catalog records. Over the past three years, I have worked with my fellow technical services librarian to add missing ISBN numbers to bibliographic records (to pull Google book covers and table of contents information), add practice group information to acquisitions records (for better internal reporting), and modify the system for tracking registered users of electronic resources to simplify lost password retrieval and new user registration.

I plan to use some of these projects as subjects of future columns. To me it is most helpful to hear about a problem another librarian has faced and how it was resolved. I hope that by sharing my experiences, I can start a discussion about common issues we all face or provide a possible solution for others in the same situation.

The latest issue of The Serials Librarian (v. 60 (2011)) contains proceedings from last year’s annual NASIG conference at which the organization celebrated its 25th anniversary. Held in Palm Springs, California, the conference was named “An Oasis in Shifting Sands” and the proceedings are chock full of forward-looking pieces and presentations, most of which are worth reading for law library serials professionals, but I want to draw attention to two in particular.

In a presentation entitled, “Not for the Faint of Heart! A New Approach to Serials Management,” OCLC’s Jonathan Blackburn and Sylvia Lowden contribute to the development of a revised model for serials processes in the workplace. While employees of OCLC obviously have a vested interest in developing proprietary library workplace systems, at least implicitly, their point is well taken that the development of such systems heretofore has often been as much in response to the mechanisms themselves, as opposed to workplace realities. Their research divides the serials workplace into the four broad “mental spaces” of selection and ordering, negotiating and licensing, receiving and maintaining, and payment and invoicing. From these universal processes, the authors organize lists of tasks related to the four categories to help determine possible areas of improvement and potential new ways of operating. Such a model seems abstract enough that it can be usefully applied to most any serials workplace environment, but especially one that is currently knee-deep in an impending ILS migration, such as my library.

The second article I want to mention is Sarah Glasser’s and Michael Arthur’s “When Jobs Disappear: The Staffing Implications of the Elimination of Print Serials Management Tasks.” Their piece summarizes the results of a survey they conducted in which they found significant reductions in and/or elimination of traditional check-in, claiming and binding functions, and the concomitant reorganization of related paraprofessional staffing. Such a topic of concern necessarily highlights the de-skilling nature of the introduction of technology into the capitalist workplace, but whereas such opportunities are normally seized upon in the corporate world as an excuse for reductions in force, their survey found that eighty-five percent of affected positions were still employed by their libraries. Of course, their results do not suggest that such transitions have necessarily been easy for workers or management to weather, but extensive interest in the survey and at the NASIG session points to the increasing universality of these experiences, and the need for greater planning and collaboration when charting such territory.
The following serial title changes were recently identified by the acquisitions and cataloging staff of the University of California, Berkeley Law Library:

*Environnement : actualite du droit public private et penal de l’environnement*
(OCoLC 51575481)
**Changed to:**
*Environnement et developpement durable*
9. annee, no 1 (janv. 2010)-
(OCoLC 707521212)

*Financial market trends*
No. 1 (Oct. 1977)-no. 93 (Nov. 2007)
(OCoLC 3411611)
**Changed to:**
*OECD journal. Financial market trends*
No. 94 (June 2008)-
(OCoLC 291091900)

*Pierce law review*
Vol. 1, no. 1/2 (fall 2002)-v. 8, no. 3 (May 2010)
(OCoLC 51337254)
**Changed to:**
*University of New Hampshire law review*
Vol. 9, no. 1 (Dec. 2010)-
(OCoLC 703642679)

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

*The journal of American arbitration*
**Ceased with:** Vol. 6, no. 2 (2007)
(OCoLC 47080986)

*Rapport au president de la republique et au parlement*
**Ceased in print with:** 2007
(OCoLC 56053830)

*Revue de droit africain*
**Ceased with:** 11eme annee, no 44 (oct. 2007)
(OCoLC 37880702)

*Tulsa journal of comparative international law*
**Ceased with:** Vol. 16, no. 2 (spring 2009)
(OCoLC 29350757)

*Uppsala yearbook of East European law*
**Ceased with:** 2006 edition
(OCoLC 57073346)

*Women legal*
**Ceased with:** Vol. 3, issue 1 (Sept.-Nov. 2010)
(OCoLC 263042301)

**Subject Headings**

Once upon a time there was a very clear distinction between these. It’s not so simple anymore.

**Comparative law** compares the law of two or more jurisdictions. The subject heading is [Topic]—[Jurisdiction] for each jurisdiction whose law is being compared, and if there are too many jurisdictions, one can use the region, or just the topic without geographic subdivision. Unfortunately, the heading for the topic without a jurisdiction also refers to a general or philosophical work on the topic rather than one comparing multiple jurisdictions. There is no subdivision or form/genre heading for comparative law, though perhaps there should be one to distinguish comparative works from general works lacking a geographic orientation.

While there is a heading for **Comparative law**, the scope note indicates it is for a method of legal study and research, and that works comparing individual legal topics are “entered under the respective headings applying to these subjects.” The pattern holds whether one is comparing the laws of different countries or states within a single country (same principle comparing the USA and France, as in comparing Maryland and Virginia).
Within federations such as the USA, comparative state law can be represented by a heading in a form such as [Topic]—United States—States. You would only use that heading if there were too many states to list them individually, but if from the same region, you could use the region, e.g., –New England for the US, or perhaps –Europe or –English speaking countries, as appropriate for multinational comparative works.

International law is defined in LCSH via the 450 references as “Law of nations” and “Public international law,” but in the past it has been used for comparative law works as well (not necessarily at LC, but as evidenced in various OPACs and book titles). “Law of nations” implies laws that govern relations between nations, but in recent decades it has grown to include some legal relationships involving individuals as well (e.g., international criminal law). If one is comparing “international” with “American” usage, the domestic analogy would be “Federal law” (meaning the same heading can indicate a general discussion of American law or a discussion of uniquely Federal law).

In theory, one can propose adding the qualifier (International law) to any legal heading to indicate that the heading pertains to public international law, but in practice this is done very sparingly. Some of the past usage may have pertained to comparative law, e.g., Antitrust law (International law), which makes no sense because there is no public international law on the subject. And to really confuse everybody, we have the heading International and municipal law which refers to the effect of international law on the internal law of a country, which is distinct from headings in the form of Law—[Another jurisdiction’s influence], e.g., Law—English influences, which indicate how a country’s legal system is influenced by another country’s legal system.

Uniform laws (a.k.a. law unification) result when multiple jurisdictions get together and try to make the law standard among them. In a federal system, such standardization can take the form of the federal law preempting state law, but it also takes the form of Uniform state laws, such as the Uniform Commercial Code, which are drafted by a non-governmental body and adopted by the state legislatures as ordinary statutes. According to the scope note, books about a specific uniform law as adopted by many states get the heading [Topic]—[United States]—[States]. Note that this is identical to how we deal with comparative law, even though “uniform” and “comparative” laws are not quite the same thing.

If we are dealing with attempts by nations to unify their laws, we can use the heading Law—International unification. The subdivision –International unification is free-floating after legal topics. Therefore, we can distinguish between works on the comparative law of countries from works on the adoption of multi-national uniform laws (something we can’t do for American states).

Conflict of laws, which is also called “Choice of law” and “Private international law,” adds to the confusing mix. This addresses the question of which law should be applied to a matter. For example, if a person from a place where contracts have to be in writing makes an unwitnessed oral contract with someone from a place that allows oral contracts, and the contract pertains to a transaction in a third place that doesn’t care whether a contract is oral or written as long as it is witnessed – what determines whose law governs the validity of the contract (considering factors such as the place of one party or the other, the place where the contract was made, or the place where it is to be performed). For this subject, we have the unusual, but useful, construction of Conflict of Laws—[Topic]—[Place]. Under American “conflict” doctrines, laws of a different state are treated the same as laws of a foreign country; the same legal theories apply whether we are discussing multiple states or multiple countries.

At this point everything should be fairly clear, and it would be, if you were cataloging books published in the mid-20th century or earlier, except for the minor inconvenience that non-Americans frequently prefer the term “private international law” (meaning the international law of private persons, as opposed to the law governing relations between countries). Increasingly, any discussion of Conflicts of laws will involve attempts by jurisdictions to minimize conflicts with other jurisdictions. In the example in the previous paragraph, they could adopt a standard rule on whether contracts must be written and witnessed either by each jurisdiction adopting a uniform law, or by having a superior law imposed on them (by a federal law upon states, by treaty ratification, or even by public international law being assimilated into their national legal systems).

Given that the role on international law is constantly evolving (and federal-state relations are similarly changing over time), the best we can do is try to evolve with it, and to be patient when LCSH seems a bit stuck in the 20th century, since we really don’t know what the 21st century will bring.
Acquisitions/Collection Development

Pricing Models
An entertaining read that could come in handy when you receive that call from your sales rep informing you that he/she has a new “pricing model.”

New Tools for Collection Development
Brunetti, Korey and Lori Townsend. “Collecting in the Cloud.” Against the Grain 23, no. 2 (April 2011).
This article describes some web tools/apps that facilitate the collection development process. For sharing documents, Google Docs and Google Sites are recommended for their ease of use. For conducting surveys or data collection, SurveyMonkey is great. A cheap alternative is Google Forms, which is really the public interface for a Google spreadsheet. For scheduling, Doodle works nicely. It can sync with Outlook or Google Calendar. For teaching or training, the authors highly recommend Jing, an app that takes a picture or makes a short video of what you see on your computer monitor and allows sharing via web, email and twitter.

UKSG Transfer Project
http://www.uksg.org/transfer
Pentz, Ed. “UKSG Transfer Project: Two Years of Work to Produce a Three-page Document.” Against the Grain 23, no. 1 (February 2011).
In 2007, United Kingdom Serials Group (UKSG) undertook the Transfer Project to tackle the problems with journal transfers. The group has released Transfer Code of Practice Version 2.0, endorsed by over thirty publishers. The code can help publishers ensure that journal content remains easily accessible by librarians and readers when there is a transfer between parties.

GIST
GIST is a free open source tool for optimizing library workflows. This article describes how SUNY Geneseo Library streamlines its acquisitions and collection development workflow using GIST. Their application of GIST starts with a web interface for the public that provides price, holdings, and online availability information once a user enters a title. The user can then decide to either request it via interlibrary loan or ask the library to purchase it. All information is captured by the system, and requests can be processed and fit into ILL and acquisitions workflow with minimal manual effort.

E-Resources Management Handbook
http://www.uksg.org/publications/ermh
Stone briefly describes the history of the E-Resources Management Handbook, published by UKSG and freely available on its website. This handbook contains guides (called “chapters”) on a variety of topics: cancellation workflow, usage stats and online behavior, new resource discovery mechanisms, beginner’s guide to working with vendors, impact factors, and marketing your e-resources. The handbook is continuously updated, and the editors are always on the lookout for new topics to be included.

Cataloging

RDA Presentations
http://alcts.ala.org/ce/0217_11_RDA_Ask_the_Experts_Webinar.wmv
http://www.rdatoolkit.org/webinar/2011Feb
A recording of the February 17 “RDA Ask-the-Experts” webinar is now available. The webinar, sponsored by ALCTS, features Linda Gabel, Erin Stalberg, Trina Grover, and Kathryn La Barre. You will need to have the Windows Media software on your computer to view the recording.

Troy Linker’s presentation on “AACR2 to RDA: Using the RDA Toolkit” is also available and requires Adobe Flash Player. The presentation covers:
• An overview of the new vocabulary, organization, functions, and resources in the RDA Toolkit that can help AACR2 users quickly interact with RDA.
• Support built into the RDA Toolkit that helps in migrating from AACR2 to the RDA Toolkit.
• How AACR2 is integrated into the RDA Toolkit.
• RDA mappings and workflows, element set, and the “three-tab” concept.
• Enhancements, including improved searching of RDA by AACR2 rule number.
• Links to more in-depth resources on the FRBR and FRAD conceptual models.
(RDA Toolkit discussion list)
New Content and Functionality Added to the RDA Toolkit
http://www.rdata-toolkit.org/blog/119
A new table of contents and index were recently added to the RDA Toolkit. The new book-style table of contents makes it easier for users to get a high-level overview of the structure of RDA. The index is intended to supplement the Toolkit’s full-text searching capability by including terms that are not actually found in the RDA text, such as General Material Designation. The concept of the GMD does not exist in RDA, but the index contains an entry that directs users to the RDA concepts of Carrier Type, Content Type, and Media Type. Printable PDFs of both the table of contents and the index are available free of charge for offline use. A subscription to the RDA Toolkit is not required to view these new additions to the Toolkit. (RDA Toolkit discussion list)

Beyond 2010 the Year of Cataloging Research
http://www.al.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alcts/confevents/upcoming/e-forum/030911.cfm
ALCTS hosted a free forum email discussion entitled, “Beyond 2010 the Year of Cataloging Research” March 9-10, 2011. The forum sought to consider the following questions: (1) How important is cataloging and classification research to your everyday technical services decision-making? (2) Do you find the library literature useful in informing your policies and procedures? (3) Are you producing statistical studies that might help others in the field? (4) How do you disseminate your results?

MARC Record Guide for Monograph Aggregators
http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pecsca/FinalVendorGuide.pdf
From a message by Ms. Kate Harcourt, Director for Original and Special Materials Cataloging at Columbia University, “The Program for Cooperative Cataloging published a guide for vendors. I think vendors will only improve the quality of records if we insist on better records. Please share this guide with your vendors as it maps out in detail how to construct a good quality MARC record.” (OCLC-CAT)

Information Technology
Open Book Alliance Applauds Rejection of Google Books Settlement
http://www.openbookalliance.org
The New York Federal District Court has rejected the Google Book Settlement. In his decision, Judge Chin confirmed that the proposed settlement “would give Google a de facto monopoly over unclaimed works” and concluded that the proposed settlement “is not fair, adequate, and reasonable.”

HathiTrust/Summon Deal
http://www.libraryjournal.com/lj/home/889942-264/hathitrustsummon_deal_increases_search_html.csp

Scholars and students may have turned to other venues of research access since the rejection of the Google Book settlement. The HathiTrust’s collection has grown to more than eight millions volumes from a variety of sources, which are already searchable through the HathiTrust interface. HathiTrust has formed a partnership with Serials Solutions to provide a new option for academic libraries to research its massive collection.

5 Myths about the Information Age
http://chronicle.com/article/5-Myths-About-the-Information/127105/
Darton, Robert. “5 Myths about the ‘Information Age.’” The Chronicle of Higher Education (April 17, 2011). Robert Darton examined in detail these five myths about the information age: (1) The book is dead; (2) We have entered the information age; (3) All information is now available online; (4) Libraries are obsolete; (5) The future is digital. These unchallenged misconceptions prevent us from making the most of the information age.

Perspectives on Mobile Technology
“Getting a Handle on Mobile: Perspectives.” EDUCAUSE Review 46, no. 2 (March/April 2011). The March/April 2011 issue of EDUCAUSE Review offers several perspectives on mobile technology. The authors offer their thoughts on how our expanding notions of portability are intersecting with, influencing, and advancing many of our current ideas on teaching, e-books, iPads, websites, mobile devices, and even change itself. According to the editor, these perspectives highlight three dominant and interwoven aspects of mobility that our institutions need to consider: complexity, communication, and control.

Breaking Down Link Rot
http://www.llrx.com/features/linkrot.htm
Rhodes, Sarah. “The Chesapeake Project Legal Information Archive’s Examination of URL Stability in LLRX.” LLRX.com (March 1, 2011). This article by Sarah Rhodes focuses on the highly significant impact of “link rot” among titles harvested through the Chesapeake Project. “Link rot” refers to the loss or removal of content at a particular Uniform Resource Locator (URL) over time.

In an effort to quantify both the progress and relevance of the Chesapeake Project, evaluation of the project’s efforts has been conducted on a regular basis. Among the parameters used to evaluate the project, project participants have measured the prevalence of link rot among the original URLs for titles preserved in the archive, an analysis designed to demonstrate both the need for the project within the law library community and the instability of open access, web-published law- and policy-related materials.
The study explored the stability of URLs for legal, government, and policy-related web resources selected for preservation and harvested from the web for inclusion in the Chesapeake Project, which was initiated in late February 2007. The results demonstrate that among the original URLs from which content was harvested for the Chesapeake Project, link rot has increased steadily over time.

The results of this study are not meant to be broadly applicable or to provide a representation of link rot throughout the universe of web resources; rather, this study paints a portrait of the vulnerability of the original sources for the collections archived by the Chesapeake Project, while also providing insight into the vulnerability of law- and policy-related web resources selected by experienced law librarians from seemingly stable open-access websites hosted by reputable organizations and state and federal governments.

**Content Versions**


In the electronic world, many versions of a document can exist and be used for different purposes. How can we identify and describe those various versions? This article introduces two projects addressing this issue. The first is a joint project between NISO and ALPSP on journal article versions. A set of recommendations published in 2008 includes seven stages that correspond to stages in the publication process. The other project was conducted by Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) in the UK, starting with the Scoping Study on Repository Version Identification (RIVER), followed by the Version Identification Framework (VIF). Their work examines a variety of content objects that primarily reside in repositories.

**KBART**

http://www.uksg.org/kbart


The Knowledge Bases and Related Tools Project (KBART) started in 2008 as a collaborative effort between the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) and UKSG. The *NISO/UKSG KBART Recommended Practice* recommends some best practices for formatting and distributing title lists. Content providers can follow the guideline and send formatted data about their journals to most OpenURL link resolver knowledge bases. Phase II of KBART will focus on specific issues such as describing consortial agreements and data elements for eBooks.

**Library Automation**


In this article, Breeding addresses the ways that library automation has grown apart from the current needs of libraries and mentions some of the developments now underway that may help to realign technology with library priorities.

The proliferation of many separate genres of library automation, created to meet individual needs, such as ILS’s, ERM systems, and discovery tools—and the lack of specialized support for public services activities such as reference, outreach and information literacy—challenge us to consider this expanding landscape in seeking more comprehensive future automation systems for libraries.

**Electronic Resource Management**

http://www.libraryjournal.com/lj/ljprintspecialty/889092-480/building_a_better_erm.html.csp


Librarians have struggled for nearly a decade with how best to handle electronic resources, as information trends have shifted toward electronic materials. Experimentation and product development have confirmed that electronic resource management (ERM) is difficult. The problem is that managing e-resources is a nonlinear and nonstandard process.

This article describes a survey of academic librarians and Electronic Resource Management System (ERMS) vendors, conducted to find out what librarians want and need in an ERMS. The top priorities of librarians are workflow management, license management, statistics management, administrative information storage, acquisitions functionality, and interoperability. The authors conclude that perhaps currently available ERMS are in fact a bridge between the traditional ILS and the service-oriented architecture (SOA) that is now being developed.

**Google Filtering**

http://www.kqed.org/a/forum/R20110519100
http://rene-pickhardt.de/google-uses-57-signals-to-filter/
http://www.rene-pickhardt.de/algorithmic-information-filter-from-elis-parisers-ted-talks

Several resources discuss how Google is now personalizing searches, i.e., editing search results, creating what one critic calls the “filter bubble.” What this means is that the same search on Google by different people will yield different results, depending on who Google thinks is doing the searching — and there is no way of knowing who Google thinks that is. This filtering is invisible and based on such complicated code that even Google developers cannot explain search results. One thing this means is that the old “page rank” system is no longer operative. This may have implications for Google Scholar and Google Books. For example, if I’m a 9/11 conspiracy theorist, Google will prioritize links confirming my perspective and filter out links that conflict with it.
How Google’s Page Ranking Actually Works


This article discusses how, over the last holiday season, Penney’s came up number one in searches for everything from dresses to luggage to area rugs. The Times got an expert, Doug Pierce of Blue Fountain Media, to look into the mystery, and “what he found suggests that the digital age’s most mundane act, the Google search, often represents layer upon layer of intrigue. And the intrigue starts in the sprawling, subterranean world of ‘black hat’ optimization, the dark art of raising the profile of a website with methods that Google considers tantamount to cheating.” Essentially, Penney’s, or somebody acting for them, got thousands of unrelated websites — mostly set up for exactly this purpose — to link, via phrases like “casual dresses,” to Penney’s website. If you get enough of these trivial links, it really does raise your page rank.

Local Systems

LJ’s ILS Survey

Library Journal recently surveyed librarians to tell what they, and their patrons, thought of their integrated library systems (ILS’s). Nearly 1,300 librarians responded, including 709 public librarians and 541 academic librarians.

Automation Marketplace 2011

This year’s automation marketplace reveals the continued trend of librarians seeking solutions that immediately improve their users’ experiences, especially via discovery products. Meanwhile, the number of complete integrated library system (ILS) replacements declined again this year.

Innovative Interfaces to Launch Sierra

Innovative Interfaces has joined the fray of library automation vendors launching new-generation library automation platforms. Innovative’s new Sierra system, built on service-oriented architecture (SOA), aims to offer the same depth of functionality as their current Millennium ILS. This system leverages current technology architectures that include open source components, with full featured API bundles that enable greater extensibility and flexibility for their customers.

Preservation

University of Chicago Opens New Library with Automated Retrieval System


Last week, the University of Chicago opened the Joe and Rika Mansueto Library, notable for its on-site, underground, high-density storage system, and the absence of browseable book stacks. Described as a “batcave for the Ph.D. crowd,” the storage facility has room to store 3.5 million volume equivalents. It represents a middle ground between off-site book storage and overcrowded stacks in campus libraries. Library users identify the resources they want by searching the online catalog. The loss of browsability heightens the importance of complete and accurate catalog records. Five robotic cranes are deployed to retrieve materials requested by users from among the 24,000 storage bins, a process that reportedly takes less than five minutes.

Some Comparisons between LOCKSS and Portico


This paper examines the overlap of journals archived in both LOCKSS and Portico, and the publishers included in the two archives. The findings show a significant overlap among the archiving systems. They also show that Portico has no prejudice against small publishers and that large publishers are just as willing to choose the LOCKSS software as Portico. LOCKSS does, however, archive many more small and arguably endangered publishers, and may be the only economically viable choice for them.
Marla Schwartz Grant

The 2011 Marla Schwartz Grant recipient is Jen Richter from Sacramento, California. Ms. Richter is the Technical Services Librarian at the Sacramento County Public Law Library. She is a member of TS-SIS, OBS-SIS, and SCCLL-SIS. She is also a member of the Northern California Association of Law Libraries and serves as a member of the Community Services Committee of NOCALL. Ms. Richter will be using her grant to attend CONELL at this year’s AALL Annual Meeting.

Educational Grant Recipients:

Rebecca Bearden received a grant for AALL conference registration. Ms. Bearden is the Acquisitions/Serials Assistant at the University of Connecticut School of Law Library, in Hartford, Connecticut. She is a member of AALL, TS-SIS, Law Libraries of New England (LLNE), and a former student member of the North American Serials Interest Group (NASIG).

Erin Harper received a grant for AALL conference registration. Ms. Harper is a library assistant at Edwards, Angell, Palmer, & Dodge LLP, in Boston, MA. She is a member of AALL, TS-SIS, the Association of Boston Law Librarians, and LLNE Research Instruction Program.

Ashley Moye received a grant for AALL conference registration. Ms Moye is Serials Librarian at the Charlotte School of Law in Charlotte, North Carolina. She is a member of AALL, TS-SIS, OBS-SIS, and the Innovative Users Group (IUG).

Amy O’Connor received a grant to attend the workshop “Putting the “M” in ERM”: Best Practices in Electronic Resources Management.” Ms. O’Connor is the Technical Services/Digital Resources Librarian at the University of Richmond Law Library in Richmond, Virginia. She is a member of AALL, TS-SIS, CS-SIS, and ALL-SIS.

Keiko Okuhara received a grant for AALL conference registration. Ms. Okuhara is the Bibliographic Services/Systems Librarian at the William S. Richardson School of Law Library, University of Hawaii in Manoa, Hawaii. She is a member of AALL, TS-SIS, and OBS-SIS.

Sarah Pearson received a student registration grant to attend the AALL conference in July. Ms. Pearson is a library student at Florida State University School of Library Science and also works as an acquisitions assistant at the FSU College of Law Research Center in Tallahassee, Florida. She is a member of the Acquisitions Subcommittee for the Florida Center for Library Automation.

Lisa Wernke received a grant to attend the workshop “Digitizing Government Information: How to Plan and Conduct a Digitization Project in Your Library” at AALL. Ms. Wernke is the Acquisitions Librarian at the University of Cincinnati, Robert S. Marx Law Library in Cincinnati, Ohio. She is a member of AALL, TS-SIS, ALL-SIS, ORALL, and the Northern Ohio Technical Services Librarians Group.

Awards Committee Members:

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

Wendell Johnting
Assistant Director for Technical Services
Indiana University School of Law—Indianapolis, Ruth Lilly Law Library

Gwen Gregory
Associate Director for Access and Organization
John Marshall Law School (Chicago, IL)

Rhonda K. Lawrence
Head of Cataloging & Metadata
UCLA School of Law, Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library

Ismael Gullon
Associate Law Librarian for Collections and Technical Services
Mercer University Law Library
2011 OBS-SIS Annual Meeting Information
Programs and Meetings

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

Business Meeting
Monday, July 25, 2011 — 5:30-6:30 p.m.
PCC-Room 112B
  • Kathy Faust, OBS-SIS Chair, Lewis and Clark Law School, Paul L. Boley Law Library

Education Committee Meeting for the 2012 Annual Meeting in Boston, Mass.
Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 7:00-8:45 a.m.
Marriott-Conference Suite 1
  • Betty Roeske, Chair, Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP

Emerging Technologies and the Library Manager: How to Navigate the Decision Maze. (OBS-SIS Program)
Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 3:00-4:00 p.m.
PCC-Room 102A
Emerging technologies have become an important tool for enhancing staff productivity and patron services in law libraries. Because they often represent a substantial investment of staff and resources, making an informed decision on what technologies are appropriate for your library is critical. This program will provide some practical guidelines for participants to use to make the most knowledgeable decisions, such as who to involve in evaluating new tools; how to balance project costs, staff time, and user benefits; and when/how much/with whom to communicate throughout the process.
  • Richard Jost, Coordinator and Speaker, Gallagher Law Library, University of Washington
  • Simon Canick, Speaker, Warren E. Burger Library, William Mitchell School of Law

Executive Board Meeting, 2010/2011 (outgoing)
Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 4:15-5:15 p.m.
Marriott-Conference Suite 1
  • Kathy Faust, 2010/2011 OBS-SIS Chair, Lewis and Clark Law School, Paul L. Boley Law Library

Executive Board Meeting, 2011/2012 (incoming)
Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 4:15-5:15 p.m.
Marriott-Conference Suite 3
  • Betty Roeske, 2011/2012 OBS-SIS Chair, Katten Muchin Rosenman LLP

Heads of Systems Roundtable
Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 11:45-12:45 p.m.
PCC-Room 109B
  • Keiko Okuhara, Facilitator, William S. Richardson School of Law, University of Hawaii

Innovative Law Users Group Annual Meeting
Saturday, July 23, 2011 — 8:00 a.m.-1p.m.
Marriott-Room 302-306
  • Marlene Bubrick, Chair, Hastings College of the Law Library, University of California

Joint Research Grant Committee Meeting (OBS-SIS and TS-SIS)
Monday, July 25, 2011 — 7:00-8:30 a.m.
Marriott-Conference Suite 2
  • Hollie White, Chair, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Library in the Clouds: Cloud Computing and Its Impact on Library Services. (Program A3)
Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 1:30-2:45 p.m.
PCC-Room 201C

Libraries are on the forefront of migrating their data and services to the “cloud.” Cloud computing is emerging as a key way for libraries to implement new services. Presenters will discuss how cloud computing can be implemented to leverage library end-user satisfaction and build the necessary interoperability. OCLC member institutions have been contributing to the idea of cloud computing through the centralized Machine Readable Cataloging (MARC) records services. Now, OCLC’s WMS promises less complexity in its library management system to create a more independent discovery and delivery platform. Panelists will also critically analyze the trend of proliferated cloud computing services to demystify questions about privacy, security, and reliability that cloud computing often raises.

- Keiko Okuhara, Coordinator and Moderator, William S. Richardson School of Law, University of Hawaii
- Erik Mitchell, Speaker, Z. Smith Reynolds Library, Wake Forest University
- Andrew Pace, Speaker, OCLC

Library Operations and the Evolution of the ILS: Backfield in Motion? (Program G1)
Monday, July 25, 2011 — 2:15-3:30 p.m.
PCC-Room 108AB

The web-based OPAC, and the more recent “discovery layer” craze, have had a positive effect on how people find resources in libraries. But has there been a corresponding change updating library operations? What will future library management systems offer in terms of the “back-end” staff interface relied upon so heavily to manage and deliver collections? Pressure to improve workflows, increase efficiency, and cut costs continues, but staff can only do so much with the tools they have. Will the next generation of library management systems finally break away from the traditional card catalog and print-based workflows? This session will examine the Open Library Environment (OLE) project and Ex Libris’ Unified Resource Management (URM) framework, as well as explore the future of the library system staff interface.

- Ellen McGrath, Coordinator, Charles B. Sears Law Library, The University at Buffalo, State University of New York
- Sean Chen, Moderator, J. Michael Goodson Law Library, Duke University School of Law
- Mike Tartaglione, Ex Libris Group USA
- Michael Winkler, University of Pennsylvania Libraries

Local Systems Roundtable
Monday, July 25, 2011 — 10:45-11:45 a.m.
PCC-Room 109A

- Caitlin Robinson, Chair, University of Iowa Law Library

Local Systems Users Groups Meetings
Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
Marriott-Independence Ballroom

- ALEPH Users Group Meeting
- InMagic Users Group Meeting
- Sirsi/Dynix Users Group Meeting
- Softlink Users Group Meeting
- Voyager Users Group Meeting

OBS-SIS Hot Topic Program: Steven Bell
Monday, July 25, 2011 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
PCC-Room 102A

OBS-SIS VIP Steven J. Bell will discuss current issues in library trends that affect technical services and systems librarians. Steven Bill is an associate university librarian at Temple University, an adjunct professor in information at Drexel, a columnist, and a blogger.

- Steven Bell, Speaker, Temple University
OCLC Update and Roundtable
Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 9:00-10:30 a.m.  
PCC-Room 112A  
- Yuxin Li, Coordinator, OCLC Committee chair, O’Quinn Law Library, University of Houston  
- Carole Myles, Speaker, Member Services Consultant, OCLC

RDA Test: Law Catalogers’ Perspectives. (Program II; Co-sponsored with TS-SIS)
Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 10:45-11:30 a.m.  
PCC-Room 108AB  
Law catalogers who participated in the RDA testing process during the fall of 2010 will describe their experiences. Topics will include: the testing process, overall impressions of RDA, and use of the online RDA Toolkit. The presenters will specifically compare using the online RDA Toolkit with using printed AACR2 guidelines for cataloging library materials. Participants will learn how RDA affected library workflow and productivity in the test libraries. (Please note that this program is NOT a training session on RDA itself.)  
- Pat Sayre-McCoy, Coordinator and Speaker, D’Angelo Law Library, University of Chicago  
- Edward T. Hart, Moderator, Levin College of Law, Chiles Legal Information Center, University of Florida  
- Amalia Contursi, Speaker, Arthur W. Diamond Law Library, Columbia University

Researchers Roundtable (OBS-SIS and TS-SIS)
Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 9:00-10:30 a.m.  
PCC-Room 109A  
The Roundtable will feature an informal program focusing on how to get involved in researching technical services related topics. During the roundtable, presenters will outline steps for designing technical services research projects by sharing research concepts, funding sources, and showing example of successful projects. Program content will include tips on how to incorporate research into an everyday work schedule, how to identify appropriate research topics, and an overview of research grants available to technical services law librarians. Questions and discussion will be encouraged.  
- Kerry Skinner, Moderator and Coordinator, Ross-Blakley Law Library, Arizona State University  
- Hollie White, Speaker, Metadata Research Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
- Chris Long, Speaker, Ruth Lilly Law Library, Indiana University School of Law—Indianapolis  
- Nancy Babb, Speaker, Charles B. Sears Law Library, The University at Buffalo, State University of New York

TS/OBS/RIPS/CS-SIS Joint Reception
Saturday, July 23, 2011 — 7:00-8:00 p.m.  
Offsite — Maggiano’s Little Italy (1201 Filbert St.)  
- Sponsored by Innovative Interfaces, Inc.  
- Katrina Piechnik, Coordinator, Jenkins Law Library

TSLL Executive Board Meeting
Monday, July 25, 2011 — 10:00-10:30 a.m.  
PCC-Room 110A  
- Virginia Bryant, Editor, George Washington University Law Library
2011 TS-SIS Annual Meeting Information
Programs and Meetings

Listed in alphabetical order, content and formatting based on the TS-SIS website at http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tsis/annualmeeting/2011/programdescriptions.htm; Martin Wisneski, website manager. Some additional information is drawn from the AALL website. Formatting by Virginia Bryant.

Acquisitions Standing Committee Meeting and Acquisitions Roundtable
Monday, July 25, 2011 — 7:00-8:30 a.m.
PCC-Room 105B

- Eric C. Parker, Chair, Northwestern University School of Law Pritzker Legal Research Center
- Robert R. Myers, Jr., Speaker, Case Western Reserve University Law School Library
- Shaun Esposito, Speaker, University of Arizona College of Law Library

Analyzing, Managing and Communication about Library Budgets: How Are You Doing It? (TS-SIS Program)
Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 11:45 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
PCC-Room 203A

Librarians are often called upon to analyze, manage, and communicate about their budgets, despite perhaps having had no formal training in accounting or budgeting rules and procedures. In this program, three librarians will introduce examples of tools they’ve developed to analyze and present budget data to library or institutional managers. A discussion period will follow the presentations, during which attendees may discover helpful tips for both the new(er) and the more experienced librarian.

- Ajaye Bloomstone, Moderator, Louisiana State University Paul M. Hebert Law Center Library
- Eric C. Parker, Speaker, Northwestern University School of Law Pritzker Legal Research Center
- Richard Vaughan, Speaker, Indiana University, Maurer School of Law Library
- Terry Psarras, Speaker, Carlton Fields

Authority Control Vocabularies and the Semantic Web (Program F1)
Monday, July 25, 2011 — 10:45-11:45 a.m.
PCC-Room 108AB

The panel will discuss the application of the Library of Congress Authorities and Vocabularies Service, the Virtual International Authority File, and the Open Metadata Registry. If used, these services will bring libraries into the world of linked data, inter-connecting data on the web via URIs (Universal Resource Identifiers).

- Suzanne R. Graham, Coordinator and Moderator, Alexander Campbell King Law Library, University of Georgia
- John Mark Ockerbloom, Speaker, University of Pennsylvania Libraries
- Barbara B. Tillett, Speaker, Chief of the Policy and Standards Division at the Library of Congress

Business Meeting and Awards Presentation
Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 5:30-6:30 p.m.
PCC- Room 203B

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

Cataloging & Classification Roundtable
Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 4:15-5:15 p.m.
Marriott-Liberty Ballroom Salon C

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

Cataloging & Classification Standing Committee Meeting
Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 7:00-8:45 a.m.
PCC-Room 102A

- George Prager, Chair, New York University Law School Library
Classification and Subject Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group Meeting
Monday, July 25, 2011 — 7:00-8:30 a.m.
PCC-Room 104A

- Cindy May, Chair, University of Wisconsin Law Library

Collection Development Roundtable (ALL-SIS)
Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 11:45 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
PCC-Room 304

- Paul Moorman, Chair, University of Southern California Law Library

Cutting Beyond the Bone: Managing in an Age of Austerity (Program C4)
Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 4:15-5:15 p.m.
PCC-Room 204A

Library budgets are stagnant or being reduced, and administrators are faced with making hard choices of “what” and/or “whom” to cut. In the current economic climate, libraries are often targeted for reductions because everything is perceived as being “online.” An informative dialogue role-play will be presented by a director and a technical services head in a law library that suffered two recent ten percent budget cuts, with another one in the offing. How do you deal with these budget reductions? Do you eliminate or decrease the quality of services, stop binding, buy fewer materials, or reduce staff? This program will offer a range of ideas to cope with stagnant or reduced budgets, when you already feel like you’re “down to the bone.”

- Alan Keely, Coordinator and Moderator, Wake Forest University Professional Center Library
- James S. Heller, Speaker, Wolf Law Library, College of William and Mary
- Jean M. Pajerek, Speaker, Cornell University Law Library
- Jennifer E. Sekula, Speaker, Wolf Law Library, College of William and Mary

Descriptive Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group Meeting
Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 1:30-2:45 p.m.
PCC-Room 106A

- Rhonda K. Lawrence, Chair, Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library, UCLA School of Law

Education Committee Meeting for 2012 Annual Meeting in Boston, Massachusetts
Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 1:30-2:45 p.m.
PCC-Room 104B

- Jim Mumm, Chair, Marquette University Law Library

Electronic Resources Management (ERM) Systems Showcase (Program B1)
Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 3:00-4:00 p.m.
PCC-Room 108AB

As libraries add more electronic resources to their collections, there will be a greater need to manage and maintain these resources effectively and efficiently. By viewing what ERM systems are available in the marketplace and identifying special features of each system, librarians responsible for electronic resources will be better equipped to select an ERM system that best fits their institutions’ needs. Librarians with limited resources will benefit from the demonstration of a locally developed, or open source ERM system. Insights into the pros and cons of different ERM systems will also be shared.

- Lorna Tang, Coordinator, D’Angelo Law Library, University of Chicago
- Shyama Agrawal, Moderator, J. Michael Goodson Law Library, Duke University
- Amy Moberly, Speaker, California Western School of Law Library
- Eric C. Parker, Speaker, Northwestern University School of Law Pritzker Legal Research Center
- Julie R. Stauffer, Speaker, D’Angelo Law Library, University of Chicago

Monday, July 25, 2011 — 2:15-3:30 p.m.
PCC- Room 112B

This program will present current practices for cataloging print integrating resources (updating loose-leaves). We will discuss creating original records for new editions as well as revising existing records to link to new formats, particularly electronic versions. We will also discuss previous cataloging practices in light of Program for Cooperative Cataloging
(PCC) guidelines, why we see a variety of treatments in shared bibliographic databases, and how we should deal with the records we encounter.

- Melissa Beck, Coordinator and Speaker, Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library, UCLA School of Law
- Rhonda K. Lawrence, Moderator and Speaker, Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library, UCLA School of Law
- George Prager, Speaker, New York University Law School Library

**Enhancing Library Services with Technical Services Skills: From the Backroom to the Front Lines (Program K4)**

Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 3:15-4:15 p.m.
PCC Room- 204A

Shrinking library budgets often require reductions in materials and staffing, even as demands for library services continue to grow. Some libraries deal with this dilemma by bridging the previously well-defined distinctions between technical services and public services. Initiatives and projects on public services department “wish lists” can often be readily accomplished when goals are realigned to utilize the expertise and specialized skill sets of technical services staff. This program will explore techniques for building cooperative partnerships between the two departments. Managerial tips, best practices, ways of fostering innovation and creativity, and initiatives at various law libraries will be discussed.

- Patricia Roncevich, Coordinator and Speaker, University of Pittsburgh Barco Law Library
- Catherine M. Bye, Moderator, William S. Richardson School of Law Library, University of Hawaii
- JoAnn Hounshell, Speaker, Chicago-Kent College of Law Library
- Sara S. Repinski, Speaker, Widener University School of Law Library
- Sallie Smith, Speaker, University of Pittsburgh Barco Law Library

**Executive Board Meeting, 2010/2011 (outgoing)**

Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
PCC-Room 106B

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

**Executive Board Meeting, 2011/2012 (incoming)**

Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 4:15-5:15 p.m.PCC-Room 106B

- Ismael Gullon, 2011/2012 TS-SIS Chair, Mercer University Law Library

**Heads of Cataloging Roundtable**

Monday, July 25, 2011 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
PCC-Room 106B

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

**Hot Topic Program (TS-SIS): The RDA Decision and What It Will Mean for Me and My Library!**

Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 9:00-10:30 a.m.
PCC-Room 111B

- Jean M. Pajerek, Co-coordinator and Moderator, Cornell University Law Library
- Patricia Sayre-McCoy, Co-coordinator and Moderator, D’Angelo Law Library, University of Chicago

**Isness vs. Aboutness: Development and Implementation of LC Law Genre/Form Terms (TS-SIS Program)**

Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 3:00-4:00 p.m.
PCC-Room 112B

While subject headings describe what an item is ABOUT, genre/form terms describe what an item IS. Genre/form terms in the OPAC help users target or limit their searches to specific types of materials like Law Reviews or Court Decisions and Opinions. The program will describe how the LC law genre/form terms were developed and how to implement and utilize these terms in your library

- Alan Keely, Coordinator, Wake Forest University Professional Center Library
- Cindy May, Moderator, University of Wisconsin Law Library
- Yael Mandelstam, Speaker, Fordham University Law Library
- Robert Rendall, Speaker, Columbia University Libraries
Joint Research Grant Committee Meeting (OBS-SIS and TS-SIS)
Monday, July 25, 2011 — 7:00-8:30 a.m.
Marriott-Conference Suite 2

• Hollie White, Chair, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Membership Committee Meeting
Monday, July 25, 2011 — 10:45-11:45 a.m.
PCC-Room 110A

• Sean Chen, Chair, J. Michael Goodson Law Library, Duke University School of Law

New Catalogers Roundtable
Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 9:00-10:30 a.m.
PCC-Room 106A

• Aaron Wolfe Kuperman, Coordinator, Library of Congress Law Cataloging Section

Preservation Standing Committee/Preservation and Binding Roundtable
Tuesday, July 24, 2011 — 11:45 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
PCC-Room 106A

• Marilyn Estes, Chair, Pence Law Library, Washington College of Law

Professional Development Committee Meeting
Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 3:00-4:00 p.m.
Marriott-Room 301

• Aaron Wolfe Kuperman, Chair, Library of Congress Law Cataloging Section

Putting the “M” in ERM: Best Practices in Electronic Resources Management (Workshop W2; Co-sponsored with CS-SIS)
Saturday, July 23, 2011— 8:00 a.m.-5:00 p.m.
PCC-Room 203A

Electronic resources present managers with distinct challenges, including personnel, workflow, licensing, and marketing issues. A central tool for handling these challenges is an effective management program that supports and maintains both expanding electronic collections and diminishing print collections. Does your library use a complex variety of staff roles and interactions to manage electronic resources? This workshop will explore best practices for managing electronic resources. Panelists will address administrative and technical issues including: selection, access, workflow analysis, licensing options, ERM vendors, training, marketing, and staffing. Attendees will participate in the review of ERM tasks and design job descriptions for ERM staff. Learn to manage electronic resources and not allow them to manage you! A pre-workshop list of selected readings will be available to attendees.

• Carol Avery Nicholson, Co-coordinator and Moderator, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Kathrine R. Everett Law Library
• Linda J. Davis, Co-coordinator, Georgetown University Law Library
• Cynthia W. Bassett, Speaker, University of Missouri-Columbia Law Library
• Joseph A. Custer, Speaker, St. Louis University Omer Poos Law Library
• Mary K. Dzurinko, Speaker, M.K. Dzurinko Associates
• David Greenebaum, Speaker, LYRASIS
• Alan Keely, Speaker, Wake Forest University Professional Center Library
• Smita Parkhe, Speaker, Georgetown University Law Library
• Gordon Russell, Speaker, Lincoln Memorial University
• Tracy L. Thompson-Przylucki, Speaker, New England Law Library Consortium, Inc.

Rare Book Cataloging Roundtable
Sunday, July 24, 2011 — 12:00-1:15 p.m.
Marriott-Conference Suite 3

• Sarah Yates, Coordinator, University of Minnesota Law Library
RDA for Everyone: Resource Description and Access Explained to Non-Catalogers (Program D1)
Monday, July 25, 2011 — 8:45-9:45 a.m.
PCC-Room 108AB

Resource Description and Access (RDA), the new cataloging code published in June 2010, is based on a recently formalized philosophy for providing access to materials. It is written with the international world of computers and online access strongly in mind, along with the relationships of information elements. Librarians, other than catalogers, may not know much about this new code, nor may they know how these new standards for metadata creation will affect public services and technical services areas other than cataloging. Most may also not be aware of RDA’s possible applications outside of integrated library systems. “RDA for Everyone” will bring together a respected law cataloger/RDA tester, a well-known associate director/professor of legal research, and a reference and technology librarian (who also chairs the CS-SIS Education Committee), to relate a brief history and description of RDA, explaining how it affects discovery and use of information, and how it has potential use outside the traditional library catalog.

- Ajaye Bloomstone, Coordinator, Louisiana State University Paul M. Hebert Law Center Library
- Aaron Kuperman, Moderator, Library of Congress Law Cataloging Section
- Richard Amelung, Speaker, St. Louis University Omer Poos Law Library
- Amalia Contursi, Speaker, Arthur W. Diamond Law Library, Columbia University
- Caroline Young, Speaker, Rutgers University Law School Library

RDA Test: Law Catalogers’ Perspectives (Program I1; Co-sponsored with OBS-SIS)
Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 10:45-11:30 a.m.
PCC-Room 108AB

Law catalogers who participated in the RDA testing process during the fall of 2010 will describe their experiences. Topics will include: the testing process, overall impressions of RDA, and use of the online RDA Toolkit. The presenters will specifically compare using the online RDA Toolkit with using printed AACR2 guidelines for cataloging library materials. Participants will learn how RDA affected library workflow and productivity in the test libraries. (Please note that this program is NOT a training session on RDA itself.)

- Patricia Sayre-McCoy, Coordinator and Speaker, D’Angelo Law Library, University of Chicago
- Edward T. Hart, Moderator, Levin College of Law, Chiles Legal Information Center, University of Florida
- Amalia Contursi, Speaker, Arthur W. Diamond Law Library, Columbia University

Researchers Roundtable (OBS-SIS and TS-SIS)
Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 9:00-10:30 a.m.
PCC-Room 109A

The Roundtable will feature an informal program focusing on how to get involved in researching technical services related topics. During the roundtable, presenters will outline steps for designing technical services research projects by sharing research concepts, funding sources, and showing example of successful projects. Program content will include tips on how to incorporate research into an everyday work schedule, how to identify appropriate research topics, and an overview of research grants available to technical services law librarians. Questions and discussion will be encouraged.

- Kerry Skinner, Moderator and Coordinator, Ross-Blakley Law Library, Arizona State University
- Hollie White, Speaker, Metadata Research Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
- Chris Long, Speaker, Ruth Lilly Law Library, Indiana University School of Law—Indianapolis
- Nancy Babb, Speaker, Charles B. Sears Law Library, The University at Buffalo, State University of New York

Serials Standing Committee Meeting
Tuesday, July 26, 2011 — 7:00-8:45 a.m.
PCC-Room 109B

- Shyama Agrawal, Chair, J. Michael Goodson Law Library, Duke University School of Law

Task Force on Standards for Vendor-Supplied Bibliographic Records Meeting
Monday, July 25, 2011 — 5:30-6:30 p.m.
PCC-Room 104A

- Angela Jones, Co-Chair, Underwood Law Library, Southern Methodist University
- Alan Keely, Co-Chair, Wake Forest University Professional Center Library
Submitting an abstract or short paper for approval

The poster submission date for AALL has passed, but I think that reflecting on this step is important. To get a poster accepted at a conference, usually there is some type of short written description that needs to be submitted (i.e., the poster does not have to be finished or even started when applying for poster session inclusion). The way the poster is described can be important for a successful peer or panel review process. In some cases, this abstract or short paper is published either online or in the conference proceedings. For that reason, I usually write the abstract or short paper in present tense and describe what I plan to put on the final poster.

Creating a poster

Posters can be created in a variety of software programs. The one I use is Microsoft PowerPoint. A poster is basically a PowerPoint presentation with only one slide. The sizing of that slide is changed to match the size specifications found in the poster session guidelines outlined by the conference. It is important to remember to change the size before adding content to the slide.

Posters combine text and visuals as an effective way to communicate with an audience. Text is the words printed on the poster, while visuals are images, charts, diagrams, and/or other graphics. Finding that optimum balance between visuals and text can be tricky. It is important to keep in mind that there will be times when the poster will be standing by itself, so there should be enough text so that viewers can understand what the poster is about. At the same time, a poster is not a journal article. Too much text will make people lose interest in what is being communicated. Below are two examples of award winning conference posters that have good balance between text and visuals.

Understanding Personal Digital Music Collections
By Justin Brinegar and Robert Capra
Winner of the 2010 ASIST Best Poster Award

SKOS for an Integrated Vocabulary Structure
By Marcia L. Zeng, Wei Fen, and Xia Lin
Winner of the 2008 Dublin Core Best Poster Award

Printing a poster

Poster printing is not something that can be done at home. Poster printing requires special printing equipment. I have seen posters printed on multiple pages of 8 x 11 paper and stuck up on a bulletin board, but I do not recommend this method. It looks untidy and a little unprofessional.
An easy place to go for poster printing is FedEx/Kinkos. The advantages of using a printer like FedEx/Kinkos are very high quality printing, quick printing time, and locations around the country. The disadvantage of using Kinkos is that they can be kind of pricy.

Another printing option is PhD Posters. This service is not as expensive as Kinkos, allows online submission, and will ship the finished result.

For those on university campuses, there may be other poster printing options. Sometimes certain departments on campus that have printing facilities may offer free poster printing to students and staff. Places to inquire about this service include GIS labs, health science libraries, and research services departments. Just ask around and you may find a great resource near you that performs free poster printing.

**Transporting a poster**

Getting the poster to the conference venue takes planning. There are several options for transporting. The first option is to print once you arrive at the conference site, by finding a local printer/copy shop. This is an easy option if you have time during your conferencing to run to the printer and back.

If you decide to print the poster before leaving for the conference, options include rolling a poster and putting it in a poster tube, or folding a poster and putting it in a suitcase. Poster tubes come in a variety of sizes and materials. The tubes range from cardboard-based to fancier plastic poster tubes with shoulder straps. Poster tubes can be found at stores like Staples, campus bookstores, or even Amazon. Poster tubes can be carried on planes or mailed.

**Presenting a poster**

The presentation of a poster is just as important as the poster itself. The poster presentation is really a discussion between the presenter and the audience. Getting feedback from colleagues about the poster topic can have a positive impact on future work.

During the poster session or presentation, creators stand next to their posters, talk about the key points, and answer questions. Attendees walk up to a poster expecting that the presenter will have something to say about it before questions are asked. A good way to begin this talk is, “In this poster, I am showing how….”

Usually, the presenter also has handouts for poster session attendees. These handouts can be printed copies of the poster itself, or more information about the topic of the poster. The handout should include the name and contact information (mainly email) of the presenter.

A poster session can be a rewarding experience as well as an extra line added to a CV. I look forward to seeing everyone’s posters!