Program Report

Joe Janes Discusses the Library of Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow

Heather Buckwalter
Creighton University
School of Law

Those who had to leave the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Conference early missed a great session. Joe Janes, Associate Professor, Master of Library and Information Science Program Chair at the University of Washington Information School, was entertaining, informative and thought-provoking. Mr. Janes discussed his new, edited work, *Library 2020: Today's Leading Visionaries Describe Tomorrow's Library* (Lanham: Scarecrow, 2013). He discussed those who authored chapters in the book (no, he does not know the identity of the annoyed librarian) and how the book was organized: stuff, people, community, place, leadership & vision, and My Turn – Joseph Janes.

The question posed to each author was "The library in 2020 will be _____?" He gave them an open ended question and told them to fill in the blank, asking them to be creative and inspirational in their responses. Mr. Janes then discussed some of the responses received to this question by a variety of authors. As he discussed the authors' responses, he elaborated with his own thoughts and comments. There was discussion regarding what "stuff" the library would have, both tangible and electronic. The word 'stuff' always reminds me of George Carlin and his routine on the importance of stuff. Some authors talked about the importance of the library as a place for people to gather and as a service to the community. Other authors spoke of leadership and vision, risk taking, inspiration and fiscal responsibility.

Joe Janes gave us some insight into what some of today's library leaders see for the future of libraries. He ended his discussion with, as he put it, "My Turn." He says the five elements of stuff, place, people, community, and leadership & vision will endure but that libraries cannot be only about access. There are things librarians uniquely offer, including service orientation, organization, literacy, quality/depth/authority/detail. Mr. Janes then posed a question to the audience to answer for themselves: "*My* library in 2020 will be _____."

This question definitely made me think. I could relate to some of how each author had responded. My library in 2020 will be a place for people to find answers, in all types of resources. A place that is supportive of people's research and makes them feel welcome but also a place that reaches out to people. I will read Mr. Janes' book, though it may not be until fall or Christmas break. Still, I am intrigued to know how these authors envision the library in 2020 and how their vision relates to my library.

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

---

2013-2014 Officers, Committee Chairs, and Representatives

TS-SIS

Chair:
Brian Striman
University of Nebraska
Vice Chair/Chair-Elect:
Suzanne Graham
University of Georgia
Secretary/Treasurer:
Hollie White
Duke University
Members-at-Large:
Cindy Spadoni (2012-2014)
UCLA
Eric Parker (2013-2015)
Northwestern University
Acquisitions Committee:
Trina Holloway
Georgia State University
Awards Committee:
unfilled
Bylaws Committee:
unfilled
Cataloging & Classification:
Lia Contursi
Columbia University
Education Committee:
Christine Dulaney
American University
Membership Committee:
unfilled
Nominating Committee:
unfilled
Preservation Committee:
Lauren Seney
William & Mary
Professional Development Committee:
unfilled
Serials Committee:
Jacob Sayward
Fordham University

OBS-SIS

Chair:
Katrina Piechnik
Jenkins Law Library
Vice Chair/Chair-Elect:
Karen Selden
University of Colorado
Secretary/Treasurer:
Elaine Bradshaw
University of Oklahoma
Members-at-Large:
Corrine Jacox (2012-2014)
Creighton University
Ilona Tsutsui (2013-2015)
University of Oregon
Education Committee:
Katrina Piechnik
Jenkins Law Library
Local Systems Committee:
Kevin Carey
Ohio State University
Nominating Committee:
Christina Tarr
University of California, Berkeley
OCLC Committee:
Jacqueline Magagnosc
Cornell University
Web Advisory Committee:
F. Tim Knight
York University

OBS and TS-SIS Representatives

ALA MARC Advisory Committee
Patricia Sayre-McCoy, University of Chicago
ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)
John Hostage, Harvard Law School
ALA Subject Analysis Committee (SAC)
Suzanne Graham, University of Georgia
OBS/TS Joint Research Grant Committee
Chair, Kerry Skinner, Arizona State University
OBS SIS Reps: Merri Hartse (2012-2014), Ellen McGrath (2013-2015)
TS SIS Reps: Victoria Sukhol (2012-2014), Frederick Chan (2013-2015)

Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section

Welcome to the year very close to my heart, the year of "Beyond the Boundaries." Oh yes, in my life I crossed many boundaries.

This year's Annual Meeting in Seattle was extremely successful thanks to members of the Executive Board and Education Committee, including Keiko Okuhara, Karen Selden, Michael Maben, Georgia Briscoe, and chaired by Chris Tarr. Let me applaud them for the job well done. A Standing Ovation is due here! Our programs were well received and attended. I hope to make the San Antonio Annual Meeting even better. Please volunteer to help us organize next year's conference. The Online Bibliographic Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS) is still looking for program ideas. October 7th is the deadline for submitting proposals. We are all very busy volunteers, so we definitely could use some help. Do not be shy, step outside your boundaries, it is well worth it, and your colleagues will thank you for it.

We may also award you with a special certificate for contributions to OBS-SIS. You never know. This year, OBS-SIS awarded eight certificates to our very special members, including Chris Tarr, Hollie White, Karen Selden, Tim Knight, Marjorie Crawford, Barbara Szalkowski, Virginia Bryant, and Corrine Jacox. One is still owed to Keiko Okuhara.

I would like to thank the Ad Hoc Committee members who updated the OBS-SIS Strategic Plan. It was approved during the OBS-SIS Business Meeting in Seattle held Sunday, July 14, 2013. Thanks go to OBS-SIS Past Chairs Betty Roeske, Chris Tarr, Michael Maben, Georgia Briscoe, and former Member-at-Large, Keiko Okuhara. It was my pleasure to chair this group for they were a delightful group with which to work. See OBS-SIS's new strategic plan at http://www.aallnet.org/sections/obs/documents/strategicplan.html.

The 2013-2014 OBS-SIS agenda is as follows:

1. Update the Procedure Manual for the benefit of our officers. I want to encourage our current and past chairs of OBS-SIS committees to work on the updates together. Since things change as time goes by, documents like this need to be kept current.

2. Update the OBS-SIS Bylaws at http://www.aallnet.org/sections/obs/documents/procedures-manual/bylaws.html. However, my understanding is that the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) plans to implement one set of bylaws that will govern the entire association. When this is implemented, we will need to approve those bylaws. AALL is aiming to have one set of bylaws that will work for the entire Association.

3. Present programs during the San Antonio Annual Meeting, possibly in conjunction with other Special Interest Sections.

So, let us step out "Beyond the Boundaries" and think about an even better conference next year in San Antonio. Use the online Program and Workshop Proposal Collection site at http://proposals.aallnet.org/ to develop your proposal in your own workspace, share it with your colleagues, and submit it online by October 7.

Katrina Piechnik
Jenkins Law Library

Technical Services
Special Interest Section

What's the most important action item RIGHT NOW? October 7, 2013 is the deadline to submit proposals to the Annual Meeting Planning Committee (AMPC). It's not too late. You are the "owner" of the program or an idea for a solid program. Presentations can be several styles and various time frames, so don't figure you have to come up with an hour long talking heads program. Do this → You go to the AMPC program URL, fill out the form, press submit, and you're done. Then you wait for AMPC to do their thing. If you want help of any kind, Our Education Committee is awesome. Their job is to review it, and help you through the process. They've read what AMPC is looking for. Your AMPC Technical Services liaison is Rosemary LaSala. She wants to help you; that's her job as liaison. You can't dilly-dally though. You have a few days to submit it by the time you are reading this wonderful *TSLL* issue. Contact the chair of our Education Committee, Christine Dulaney.

The next most important action item is that you MUST REALIZE we need to communicate more often about more things. Every one of you reading this must bite the bullet, and we must use AALLNET's My Communities, which has a sour taste initially, but our communications channels are best historically kept as long as we use this. Archival principals must trump how clunky it is to communicate. I wanted to set up a task force to look into getting us all a separate, old fashioned, easy-to-use traditional listserv, but then we lose our history. We need to market our other communication channels such as the Facebook group TSLAWCHATS, and our TS blog, and our Twitter presence.

Some argue that by diversifying communication channels, we dilute the amount of communication flow and cause confusion as to where to post what, which leads to not wanting to communicate at all. AALLNET's My Communities allows for single-site multi-level communications. I am concerned that limiting our professional communications to only those colleagues who are American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) members may be stifling those who are on the fence about whether membership dues payment is a "value" to them. How many non-AALL technical services law librarians are denied access to the rest of the community who can afford to be in this elite group? This is a topic that is near and dear to my heart. I'm contemplating setting up a task force to do research to determine communication barriers in our field and to see if we can craft any reasonable solutions. If you are interested in this and are passionate to get us all talking about issues regularly like in the pre-My Communities days, contact me.

The next more important thing is to re-start and recalibrate two major components in our field of tech services law librarianship: 1) Acquisitions; and 2) Finding, embracing, and infusing new and newer colleagues. Many of you know about the recent past two years of losing very valuable colleagues to their deserved retirements. If we want to stay a strong and formidable factor in AALL, then we cannot be complacent. We cannot "let someone else do it." It's one thing to ask new TS members to wear special ribbons at the AALL Annual Meeting, but it's an entirely more difficult enterprise to find and hook new passion and talent that we know is out there. For acquisitions reinfusion, contact Trina Holloway. You acquisitions librarians cannot tell me you don't have a ton of challenging issues you face every day. Wouldn't it be great to have communications venue for all of you? Again, AALLNET has a fairly easy way to start up a group. You have to be a paid AALL member though.

There is a lot more I want to convey, but I would start to lose you to being on the cusp of stopping to read because you don't have the time to continue, and may not return back to reading this column.

In my **Statement of Interest for running for office of Vice Chair-Chair Elect**, I wrote the following:

> *"I'm going state 4 things that I think are vitally important right now for each member in TS-SIS. The list is in priority order so you know what I'm thinking. Working closely with many of you, and with the Executive Board, and keeping my head in the TS Handbook, so I don't mess up too badly, I'll do my best to: 1) Enable cost-effective, timely, free, year-round professional development programs addressing topics YOU tell me you need via survey results; 2) Enable more aggressive measures of getting 20-25% more attendance of TS-SIS members to AALL Annual Meetings for those who aren't able to attend due to financial constraints regardless of how long they've been in our profession (existing models are not effective enough and this is a measureable goal) because it's crucial that colleagues meet in face-to-face venues in a larger conference type model; 3) Keep fighting AALL to insure the Board understand and react appropriately in our favor to keep Special Interest Sections demands as crucial to the future of the Association; and finally, 4) Enable ways to find, recognize, welcome, and actively invite and draw in new*

and newer technical services law librarians. This will take many volunteers to help pull these priorities together, and it will take an understanding that our Treasurer will be using financial reserves to help with the "enabling." I'm honored to be nominated to be on the ballot for this leadership position."

Now, here I am in the wheelhouse of the Good Ship TS-SIS. The first thing any Captain does is assess what he has and then get the best crew around. The first mate is Suzanne Graham and petty officer Eric Parker, who came with the ship, as did petty officer Cindy Spadoni. Then of course is the previous captain, Miriam Childs and the best port admiral at sea, Hollie White, who takes care of the business end of running a large vessel.

Next was to assemble the crews (committee chairs). I'll mention the other committees in later columns, but for now, for good reason, I'm going to discuss Christine Dulaney, chief petty officer of our Education Committee. Her crew members are also top-drawer: Diana Jaque, Jean Pajerek, Maxine Wright, and Elisabeth Umpleby.

Ironically, I'm not communicating to everybody like I want. I hope to get better. For example, Martin Wisneski has been waiting for new updated content from me for our website. It's not him. It's me. The TS executive board is also waiting for me to start communicating with them more. I hope to get that going soon as well.

Brian Striman
University of Nebraska

From the Editor

As I assume the position of editor-in-chief of *TSLL*, I have reflected on the path my career has taken over the years. This October, I will mark 25 years as a law librarian and coincidentally, 25 years with Indiana University, Bloomington (funny how that has worked out—I guess I like living in Bloomington and working for Indiana University). When I started at Indiana in 1988, we still were operating in a card environment receiving weekly shipments from OCLC and having a workforce of four card filers for our catalog. We had two OCLC M105 terminals (remember those—press [Display Record] then press [Send]), one OCLC M300 machine, and the only individual in the library that had a desktop computer was our secretary.

The technical services environment has changed dramatically in the past 25 years, beyond what many of us could have imagined. But through it all, *TSLL* has been there to guide, inform, and even entertain. It has been our link to each other and to the larger library technical services world as an indispensable resource we rely on to do our jobs, and now I have the honor of editing it. I suggested to Virginia Bryant that she edit *TSLL* back when I was chair of the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS), and now it has come full circle back to me. My goal and desire is to continue to produce a publication you will find indispensable and of which you will be proud as it represents our two special interest sections.

I would like to thank Brian Striman, Chris Tarr, Virginia Bryant, Nonie Watt, Linda Fariss, and the *TSLL* Board for their confidence and encouragement. An editor may receive the credit for a publication, but it would not happen without the work and dedication of the additional staff. *TSLL* is no exception—it would not happen without the work of Associate Editor Michele Thomas, Layout and Design Editor Julie Stauffer, Webmaster Martin Wisneski, and the numerous columnists and contributors. These individuals deserve your thanks and appreciation—they have mine. Finally, as editor I am always interested in article submission by you, the members of OBS-SIS and the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS). If you have an idea or an article you want to share, please let me know. This is your publication, and I want to publish articles that you are interested in reading. I cannot promise I will publish everything, but I want you to feel free to submit your ideas for consideration—thank you.

Michael Maben
Indiana University, Bloomington

TSLL Annual Report
Covering July 2012–July 2013

TSLL volume 38 had four issues, published in pdf format, and is available on the *TSLL* website at http://www.aallnet.org/sections/ts/TSLL/Issues, and on HeinOnline at http://www.heinonline.org/HOL/Index?index=lcc/TSLL&collection=journals. Virginia Bryant completed her fifth year as *TSLL*'s editor-in-chief, grateful for the excellent assistance provided by Michele Thomas, Associate Editor; Julie Stauffer, Layout and Design; and Martin Wisneski, Web Manager. Each issue this year was available on schedule thanks to the dedicated columnists and the conscientious *TSLL* staff who consistently met their deadlines. Thanks are also due to the faithful *TSLL TechScans Blog* contributors who've posted approximately 40 entries since July 2012 to keep readers current in the latest news and technology trends.

Several columnist changes occurred throughout this year. Giving it a test run, Karen Wahl assisted Lia Contursi with two "Classification" columns and then agreed to officially join the co-columnist ranks with the June issue. *TSLL* thanks Matthew Jenks for keeping readers up-to-date and well-informed on Internet topics for three years. Dan Blackaby assumed writing "The Internet" column with the June issue. Chris Hudson stepped down from the "Serials Issues" column in December after recruiting Wendy Moore to take over the column with the March issue. After eight years, Corinne Jacox completed her editorship of "TechScans." But she too found *TSLL* an excellent successor, Jackie Magagnosc, one of the faithful *TechScans Blog* contributors. All continuing columnists also deserve thanks for the outstanding effort they put into their columns to keep *TSLL*'s readers well-informed.

In addition to the regular columns, volume 38 included a special article by George Prager recounting his sabbatical adventures in Italy. The September issue featured program reports from AALL's Annual Meeting in Boston, for which nineteen volunteers reported on programs they attended. The editor continues to urge more use of *TSLL* as a venue for sharing information among the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) and Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS) membership. Adapting to change is one of the hallmarks of technical services; so why not contribute a short article about a new activity affecting your department?

TSLL, via the Americal Association of Law Libraries (AALL), made a three year agreement with William S. Hein Inc. to include *TSLL* in HeinOnline. This agreement automatically renewed at the end of 2012 for successive one-year terms unless cancelled in writing by either party. As part of the HeinOnline collection, *TSLL* is available in both "Spinelli's Law Librarian's Reference Shelf" and "Law Journal Library."

After five years at the helm, I am delighted to turn over responsibility for *TSLL* to Michael Maben (Indiana University-Bloomington) who agreed to serve as *TSLL*'s next Editor-in-Chief. A long-time active member of both TS-SIS and OBS-SIS, Michael is well-positioned to assume the editorship and move the combined SIS publication forward.

Thank you to Christine Dulaney, Marilyn Nicely, Victoria Sukhol, and Lorna Tang, who've served on the *TSLL* Editorial Board this year. It's been my pleasure to work with them, the columnists, the *TechScans Blog* contributors well-coordinated by Corinne Jacox, and the *TSLL* staff. I appreciate all of the assistance given me along this journey in the combined effort to continue to issue a high quality publication for OBS-SIS and TS-SIS members.

Submitted by
Virginia Bryant
TSLL Editor-in-Chief

Technical Services Special Interest Section
2013 Annual Business Meeting
July 14, 2013 — Seattle, Washington

Miriam Childs called the meeting to order at 5:35pm. Hollie White verified existence of a quorum with 41 attendees.

Introduction and Welcome of Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) VIPs Adam Schiff and Steve Shadle.

Approval of Minutes from July, 22, 2012 Business Meeting in Boston, MA
Minutes were approved. Ismael Gullon moved, and Suzanne Graham seconded.

Executive Board Reports

Secretary/Treasurer: Hollie White
According to the latest budget report from headquarters ending on May 31ˢᵗ 2013, TS-SIS has $21,684.11.
Election: The election was conducted from April 8, 2013 to April 22, 2013 with 28% of members participating. Our incoming Chair/Chair-Elect is Suzanne Graham, and incoming Member-at-Large is Eric Parker. They will begin their terms after the Annual Meeting.

Members-at-Large: Richard Paone and Cindy Spadoni
The "Alphabet Soup" reception cost approximately $5834.00. The extra $334 will be divided between the other SIS members. Next year, we may want to discontinue the open bar option and offer more hor d'oeuvres. The silent auction is going well, and there are many nice things. The auction ends at Monday at 4pm. The extra tables worked well for the display.

Vice-chair/Chair-Elect: Brian Striman
Brian has most committee chairs assigned and is working on filling out the rest of the committees. All volunteer efforts are greatly appreciated. Brian wants to set up a task force to investigate how we communicate.

Chair: Miriam Childs
As a Board, we made some changes to the Handbook regarding the electronic minutes and the Education Committee. The Education Committee will consist of a chair, one member from each of the TS standing committees, and one member from the Professional Development Committee. The Board agreed to purchase ribbons to identify new and established TS members and made these available for pick-up at the TS activities table. We tried to use My Communities and other methods to communicate with the group. Some examples are the Twitter account @AALL_TSSIS; Facebook group is TSLawChats. Consistency between the different platforms is something that should be focused on in the next year. There was a discussion about how the different platforms are used in various ways. Marketing and repeat messages about the various platforms may be important.

Standing Committee Chair Reports*

Acquisitions: Trina Holloway
Trina's report is on the web at http://www.aallnet.org/sections/ts/committees/Acquisitions/Minutes/2013-Minutes.html.

Cataloging and Classification: George Prager
Lia Contursi will be taking over the Cataloging and Classification Committee. We did very well with the Treaty proposal, and it was accepted by the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA). The *Resource Description and Access* (*RDA*) workshop was successful this year with 30+ attendees. The Cataloging and Classification meeting had 48 attendees.

Preservation: Lauren Seney
The Preservation Committee was very active. They added many pages and resources to the website. Preservation Week was highlighted and preservation tip of the month provided. The winner of this year's Worst Book Contest University of St. Thomas. Digital Access to Information policy was updated and is under vote this meeting.

Serials: Wendy Moore
The Serials Report is on the web at http://www.aallnet.org/sections/ts/committees/Acquisitions/Minutes/2013-Minutes. html. Exchange of Duplicates had fewer participants. Pat Roncevich will continue with this group. Acquisitions and Serials meeting/roundtable is tomorrow morning at 7am is in the Ballard Room. Discussion topics will include Adventures/New Discovery and the Evolution of Acquisitions and Serials work in Law Libraries.

TSLL Report: Michael Maben
Virginia Bryant's report is available online and in the next issue of *TSLL*. All four issues were published this past year. The report details changes with columns and thanks all the fantastic publication support staff. The Agreement with Hein has been continued.

Awards: Calmer Chattoo
    Marla Schwartz Grant: Antionette Vanterpool
    Educational Grants: Joseph Reimers & Diane Menashi
    Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award: Sally Wambold, the award was accepted on her behalf.

Special Certificate of Appreciation was given to Virginia Bryant in honor of her work on TSLL from 2008-2013.

Special Recognition of TS Retirees

- Sally Wambold
- Mary Jane Kelsey
- Kathy Winzer
- Pam Deemer
- Cindy May
- Richard Amelung
- Rhonda Lawrence
- Janice S. Anderson

These retired members are honored for their service to our community.

Words of Appreciation: Miriam Childs
Miriam Childs was glad that she was able to serve TS during all the various changes with the Annual Meeting and Programming. She worked to keep our spirits up and will continue to help the board in the upcoming year.

Passing of the "gavel"
Miriam Childs passed the gavel to Brian Striman.

Comments from the New Chair

- Brian Striman presented Miriam Childs with a mock-up of her plaques of appreciation for her service as chair. The actual plaque was mailed directly to her office.
- The Hall of Fame has a few TS people on it including, Ed Hart, Sally Wambold, Eileen Dolan, Michele Finerty, Antionette Vanterepool, Trina Holloway, and Calmer Chattoo.
- New members were recognized and asked to stand up.
- SIS counsel did discuss a few things including My Communities and Annual Meeting programs. The group set in motion a proposal to the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) and the Annual Meeting Program Committee (AMPC) committee to employ SIS as an entity that is connected to program proposals

Meeting was adjourned at 6:37 pm.

All officer, committee, and representatives reports will be available on the TS-SIS website.

Hollie White
Duke University School of Law

Report of the AALL Representative to the ALA, ALCTS, Cataloging and Metadata Management Section, Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) ALA Midwinter Meeting, Seattle, Washington, January 2013 ALA Annual Conference, Chicago, Illinois, June 2013

John Hostage
Harvard Law School Library

24 July 2013
Primary contact (at ALA): Peter Rolla, chair.

The work of CC:DA continued to be focused on *Resource Description & Access* (*RDA*) in the past year. After years of deliberation and preparation, *RDA* was fully implemented by the national libraries and many other libraries in this country, including law libraries, earlier this year. In the past year, the text of *RDA* was reworded for greater clarity and readability. Meanwhile, work on the Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative, now nicknamed "Bibframe," has continued. The goal is to produce a model to replace the MARC format and take full advantage of the possibilities of *RDA* in the developing linked data world.

CC:DA continues to study proposals for revisions to *RDA*. In collaboration with other law catalogers, I prepared a proposal to change the construction of access points for treaties under *RDA*. The text as written called for entering treaties under the first-named signatory. For many multilateral treaties, this would lead to access points that started with "Afghanistan" or "Albania" or some other country at the beginning of the alphabet. This was unacceptable to the law cataloging community; so, we proposed that the access point for all treaties should consist of the title of the treaty followed by the date of signing. This proposal was accepted by CC:DA and sent on to the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of *RDA* (JSC), which will decide on the matter at its next meeting later this year.

CC:DA has been looking at proposals for revisions to other parts of *RDA*, especially the instructions and vocabularies for relationship designators, an area that is emphasized much more strongly in *RDA* than it was in AACR2. Another area is the instructions concerning names of places; I am serving on a task force whose charge is studying ways to make the instructions simpler and more consistent.

The law cataloging community is considering whether to propose other changes in the coming year. One possibility is elimination of the conventional collective title "Laws, etc.," which is used for certain compilations of laws.

2013 MARBI Report

Patricia Sayre-McCoy
University of Chicago

MARBI Meeting, ALA Midwinter Jan. 25-28, 2013

Report on Selected proposals and discussion papers

As always, the agenda for the MARBI meetings at the American Library Association (ALA) Midwinter meeting was daunting. There were many proposals to consider—some I was at least familiar with since many of them had been reviewed as discussion papers at earlier MARBI meetings in 2012 and several discussion papers that were new. I included here proposals that law catalogers would find useful. As usual, there were proposals and discussion papers from the Music Librarians Association, as music catalogers need many new fields to comply with *Resource Description and Access* (*RDA*) instructions. However, many other proposals, unlike the past year's proposals, had broad aspects as they were needed to prepare for the use of LCGFT headings and the changes in subject headings that will result. There were two meetings of MARBI at ALA, Saturday, Jan. 26 and Sunday, Jan. 27.

1. MARC Proposal no. 2013-01: Identifying Titles Related to the Entity Represented by the Authority Record in the MARC 21 Authority Format. This proposal discussed the need for adding titles known to be associated with the entity in the 1XX or known not to be associated with the entity. This information helps determine authorship and often while establishing an authorized name, the cataloger determines that a work is or is not by this entity. Proposal 2013-01 proposes new MARC fields to record this information. It is not meant to be an exhaustive bibliography but to record information catalogers discover as part of their regular work. New fields would also allow the information previously recorded in #b of the 670 to be used for other purposes.

New field 672: Titles Related to the Entity Represented by the Authority Record. Use of the 672 can be in addition to adding information to the $b of the 670 or instead of using the 670. This field specifically says "titles related" but does not define the relationship so as to allow maximum use of the information. There is no expectation that the entity listed in the authority record is the main entry of the title listed.

Old practice:
670 ## $aPhone call to pub., 2/23/88 $b (Ronald Fernandez, also author of Social psychology through literature)

Proposed new practice:
672 #[filing indicator]$aSocial psychology through literature

New field 673: Titles Not Related to the Entity Represented by the Authority Record. This field is used to record titles that are known to be unrelated to the entity represented by the authority record but which may have the same or similar authority headings.

Old practice:
670 ## $aNLW AL, rec'd 3 Jan. 2010 $b(…not the author of To nourish humanity or Sir Eglamour of Artois)

Proposed new practice:
673 #0 $aTo nourish humanity
673 #0$aSir Eglamour of Artois

The proposal was amended to include only the title proper in the 672/3 note (245 $a. $n, $p) and to add the date field ($f) to the 673 field. It was passed unanimously.

2. MARC Proposal No. 2013-03: Making Field 250 Repeatable in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. Although this was proposed by the Music Library Association, the repeatability of the 250, Edition statement, applies to other materials too. This proposal is necessary because information that was recorded in the Statement of Responsibility in the 245 are now separated out by *RDA,* and the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) requires this information to be in an "edition" statement field. This field would not be used for continuing resources which use sequential edition statements to indicate volumes, which will continue to be recorded in the 362, Dates of Publication and/or Volume Designation.

Old practice: (Two separate edition statements found on the cover)
250 ## $aCanadian ed., 3rd. revised and updated

Proposed new practice:
250 ## $aCanadian ed.
250 ## $a3rd ed. revised and updated

Approved unanimously.

3. MARC Proposal No. 2013-05:Defining New Field 385 for Audience Characteristics in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. This new field allows recording audience characteristics of works and expressions which will no longer be included in the Subject Headings and are not LCGFT headings. Audience was previously explicitly stated in headings such as "Almanacs, Children's" or implied as in headings "Braille periodicals." Legal materials, such as accounting for lawyers or the "Doing business in…" series would also use this field to indicate the audience. A suggested list of audience attributes was included in the proposal but it is not a static list; there was discussion as to whether the Library of Congress (LC) Policy and Standards Division (PSD) would take on the maintenance of such a list. The field would be repeatable. MARBI agreed that there would be a "best practices" developed for use in North America.

Approved unanimously.

4. MARC Proposal No. 2013-06: Defining New Field 386 for Creator/Contributor Group Categorizations in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. As with the previous proposal, this one proposes a new field to hold the information about creators/contributors that will no longer be included in subject headings and are not appropriate for LCGFT headings. Such terms are explicit in subject headings, such as "Political prisoner's writings" or implicit in headings such as "College prose." In headings such as "Mexican poetry" the nationality refers to the creator of the work. It was suggested that a "best practices" also be written for this field. The proposal was accepted for works and expressions, but not for authority headings. Personal name headings were deferred for a later discussion.

Approved unanimously for works and expressions.

5. MARC Proposal 2013-07: Defining Encoding Elements to Record Chronological Categories and Dates of Works and Expressions in MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. This proposal suggests establishing a new field, 648, to record dates or other chronological information about works and expressions that will be dropped from Subject Headings and are not appropriate for LCGFT headings. This is especially useful for works with aggregated contents which used to have a chronological subdivision, such as "$y19th century." This field would contain dates for either the date or time period covered or the date or time period created, depending on which aspect is necessary. This field could then be combined with a genre term in the 655 to identify works previously identified by subject subdivisions. "Best practices" would be written to determine when this field should be used.

Authority records contain a 046 field which would have two subfields added to indicate the date of coverage of a work or manifestation. These dates would not be the dates of publication of the work or manifestation.

Approved unanimously.

MARBI Meeting, ALA Annual meeting, June 29-30, 2013

Discussion paper No. 2013-DP05: Defining Indicator Values for 588 Source of Description Note in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.

This paper discussed defining the first indicator position of the MARC field 588 as a display constant controller to show the correction caption(s) of the note and allow the information in the note to be treated as data elements that could be easily mapper to other formats or used for other purposes. The paper noted that the captions are lengthy, complex and often contain misspellings or variants of the prescribed notes, all of which would be eliminated with the use of a display constant. The paper suggested the following indicators:

Option 1
First indicator
No display constant generated (used for legacy materials to avoid recoding)
0—Description based on *or* Identification of the resource based on
1—Latest issue consulted

Option 2
First indicator
Obsolete
0—Description based on *or* Identification of the resource based on
1—Latest issue consulted
8—No display constant generated

Several members objected to making an old indicator "Obsolete" and preferred Option 1 for that reason. There was much discussion on the wording of the note, and it was noted that the display 1 constant had two suggested wordings, leaving it up to the local library to determine what to use. But there were questions about how that would work with OCLC records— would they have to be edited before or after importing or would libraries just have two notes depending on where the patron saw the record? Other discussion focused on the differences between cataloging serials (which this proposal seemed to address) and cataloging monographs. Serials catalogers frequently combine the source of title note and the description based on note (which requires a date or issue number). Monograph catalogers use the 500 for the source of title note. The source of title note was not addressed in this proposal. Some members objected to the wording "display constant" since it assumes there is a display and so sounds outdated.

Option 1 was agreed upon and a new proposal will be submitted to MARBI Revisited (see later notes for that explanation).

Discussion Paper No. 2013-DP06—Defining New Field 388 for Chronological Terms in the MARC 21 Authority Format.

This will affect law catalogers as it is another new field that was created by the LCGFT headings which do not include chronological subdivisions. This proposal discusses creating a new MARC field for chronological terms representing the date or time period of creation or origin for works and expressions. Formerly these terms were in the subject heading chronological subdivisions, but they are not subjects. Instead, they are qualifiers or attributes of the work or expression. Since the date of creation of a work or expression (as opposed to the date of the manifestation in-hand, usually the publication date), it was proposed to create this new field. These terms ideally would come from a controlled vocabulary to insure consistency. Although there is no vocabulary yet, the examples used LCSH terms for periods of time and some Faceted Application of Subject Terminology (FAST) chronological headings in the examples.

The 046 field does include subfields for date of creation of a work or expression, but they are for more precise dates than "eighteenth-century" or "Middle Ages." It was agreed that there was a need for recording the chronological terms for dates of creation in the authority records in addition to whatever was added in the 046 and that it should parallel the use of the 648 field (Subject Added Entry—Chronological Term) in the bibliographic records. It was also agreed that field 388 be used for this purpose.

Common examples of the use of this field would be a sound recording collection made between 1964 and 1979, containing performances of operas from the 18th century, or an anthology of medieval poetry published in 1990. Unlike the parallel bibliographic field 648, this authority field would not include provisions to record the date or time period covered in the work or expression, as this is subject information, which are not included in work or expression authority records.

This field would be used for single works and aggregate works. It was agreed that this field is necessary to hold information that would otherwise not be recorded and that it should parallel the 648 field in the bibliographic record. Further discussion focused on the need for best practices for the chronological period for contents of aggregate works since that is where they are mostly needed to describe the date that is really important. A final question asked whether using the first indicator to distinguish the difference between the date/time of creation or origin of a work/expression (including an aggregate work) and the date/time of the creation of the origin of the individual works in an aggregation, but this was not clear in the proposal.

It was suggested that a revised proposal be submitted to MARBI Revisited at the ALA Midwinter meeting in January 2014.

Proposal no. 2013-08: Defining Subfield #7 in the 8XX Series Added Entry Fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Record

This proposal was submitted by the German National Library, which does not use the MARC Authority format for series. Instead, series are usually described in an equivalent to a MARC bibliographic record. Because a series can have different bibliographic levels in German-speaking catalogs (a multipart monograph or a continuing resource or monographic series) it is necessary to distinguish in the MARC record for the part whether the field in the 800-830 is for the multipart monograph, or a continuing resource/monographic series. A new subfield 7 in the 76X-78X fields was proposed to hold this information.

The following new subfields in the 80X-83X were proposed:

> #7 Control subfield
> > /0 Type of record
> > > a Language material
> > > c Notated music
> > > d Manuscript notated music
> > > e Cartographic material
> > > f Manuscript cartographic material
> > > g Projected medium
> > > i Nonmusical sound recording
> > > j Musical sound recording
> > > k Two-dimensional nonprojectable graphic
> > > m Computer file
> > > o Kit
> > > p Mixed media
> > > r Three-dimensional artifact or naturally occurring object
> > > t Manuscript language material
> > /1 Bibliographic level from leader/07 of related record
> > > a Monographic component part
> > > b Serial component part
> > > c Collection
> > > d Subunit
> > > i Integrating resource
> > > m Monograph/item
> > > s Serial

Proposed changes were approved as submitted.

Proposal No. 2013-09: Defining Subfields for Qualifiers to Standard Identifiers in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats

This paper proposes defining subfield #q (Qualifying information) in field 015 National Bibliography Number (BD); field 020 International Standard Book Number (BD, AD, HD), field 024 Other Standard Identifier (BD, AD, HD), and field 027 Standard Technical Report Number (BD, AD, HD) to accommodate qualifiers to the standard identifiers recorded in those fields. In response to Discussion Paper 2013-DP02 MARBI/MAC suggested that a proposal be developed to add the subfield for the qualifier to 020, 024 and 027. It was also suggested that national bibliographic agency numbers (encoded in field 015) should be included since they are treated as standard identifiers and can sometimes include qualifying information in qualifiers.

Current practice is to include any parenthetical qualifying information such as paperback, hardcover, microfiche, etc. in subfield #a. Machine matching of the standard numbers could be improved and be simpler to implement if the actual standard number was encoded separately from the qualifying information. In addition, the improved granularity this offers is consistent with the desire to provide explicit coding for data elements defined independently in *RDA*.

The proposed changes are to make #q (Qualifying information) repeatable in the 015, 020, 024 and 027 where #q is described as A brief statement of qualifying information concerning the record control number being recorded in subfield #a Volume numbers or other data that qualify a national bibliography number are recorded in subfield #q following the number and are enclosed in parentheses. The #c in the 020 and 024 would include only the price and/or statement of availability of the item.

The proposal was passed with minor revisions.

New Business

MARBI is officially dissolved as of June 30, 2013. It will be replaced with a new committee, the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) which will continue to revised the MARC format and also work toward the transition to the new Bibliographic Framework. Unlike our role in MARBI, which was strictly advisory, AALL will have a voting member in MAC. Details of the new committee will be sent out later. Proposals and discussion papers will continue as with MARBI.

Report of the AALL Representative to the ALA
ALCTS Cataloging and Classification Section
Subject Analysis Committee (SAC)   *Suzanne Graham*
2012-2013   *University of Georgia*

Genre/Form Headings: SAC continues to work through the creation of genre/form terms for constituent groups. The music and literature communities currently are compiling term lists. The law community completed its initial list of terms in 2011, but additional terms may be proposed as identified and/or needed.

Yael Mandelstam, active member the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL), is chairing a group to identify general genre/form terms (overarching and/or non-specific).

As part of the disambiguation of genre/form and subject, the committee submitted several proposals to the MachineReadable Bibliographic Information Board (MARBI) to have additional fields identified and reserved, in bibliographic and authority records, to accommodate data on intended audience (385) and creator (386) demographics and on chronology (additional fields in 648 and 388) of the work. MARBI approved all of these proposals and they are now available for use and are included in the online version of *MARC21 Format for Bibliographic Data and MARC21 Format for Authority Data*.

Examples

Title: *Law for the Small Businessman by a Lawyer*
385 _ _ $a Businesspeople $2 lcsh
386 _ _ $a Lawyers $2 lcsh

Title: *New law for wives and daughters* (published in 1920s)
385 _ _ $a Married women $a Daughters $2 lcsh
648 10 $a Nineteen twenties

In June, the committee read and commented on a discussion paper by Janis Young, Library of Congress Policy Standards Division, justifying the need for and outlining the creation of a new controlled vocabulary for demographic terms to be used in the 385 and 386 fields (Library of Congress Demographic Group Term and Code List, $2 lcdgt). Most of the new terms will be taken from existing *Library of Congress Subject Headings* (LCSH), and only in situations in which LCSH does not have an appropriate term would additional terms be created. The committee agreed that a single controlled vocabulary was essential and supported the use of LCSH. The Committee also volunteered to assist with the creation of the initial list should the PSD agree to pursue.

***Resource Description and Access* (*RDA*) Implementation:** The *RDA* Implementation subcommittee forwarded a discussion paper to the full committee recommending that the *RDA* Joint Steering Committee should base its guidance on subjects on *Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data* (FRSAD), not *Functional Requirements of Bibliographic Records* (FRBR). This decision would mean that the four subject elements in FRBR would be replaced by the two FRSAD terms: Themen and Nomen. Both would be referred to as "subjects" in *RDA*.

FRBR is found lacking for its overly proscriptive guidance that goes beyond subject analysis and would exclude some descriptors that our communities might choose to use.

Additional, specific proposed points:

- *RDA* will have only one subject entity. Nomen will be part of "Subject" (previously, themen)
- Only have works will have subjects
- Genres will have a separate treatment (and be covered in a separate chapter of RDA)
- Proposes only three chapters on subjects: a general chapter on attributes on subjects; a general chapter on recording subjects; and a chapter on recording relationships between subjects
- Jurisdictions would move to Chapter 11 (with Corporate Bodies)
- JSC will need to identify core elements, but subcommittee recommends:
  - Name of subject
  - Preferred name of subject (a subtype)
  - Identifier of subject
  - Controlled access point for subject
  - Scheme (LCSH, MeSH, etc.)

The committee will continue to discuss the paper until July 22, when it will be forwarded to the *RDA* Joint Steering Committee for consideration at its November 2013 meeting.

Presentation by Eric Miller on BIBFRAME: Committee heard an explanation of BIBFRAME by Eric Miller focusing on the potential for automated subject heading proposal creation. He described in general terms how a trusted series of links creating new connections. For example, a "popular" 653 (local, non-authorized heading) could be submitted to PSD for authorization without interrupting workflow of libraries. Authentication would need to be part of the process to keep some provenance and to track errors.

Joint Research Grant Committee Report

Hollie White
Duke University

In 2012-2013, the Joint Research Grant Committee continued its efforts in advertising the grant by including advertisements on both the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) and the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS) email lists, in the President's newsletter, in *TSLL*, and in various regional newsletters. To simplify the application process, an online grant submission form was created with the help of Katrina Piechnik and F. Tim Knight. Unfortunately, despite these efforts, no one applied for this year's grant.

Acquisitions and Serials Standing Committees
Joint Meeting and Roundtable
2013 Annual Meeting Minutes
July 15, 2012 — Seattle, Washington

Stephanie Schmitt
University of California
Hastings College of the Law

The meeting was called to order at 7:14 a.m. by Wendy Moore (University of Georgia School of Law), chair of the Serials Standing Committee.

Approval of the Acquisitions Standing Committee and the Serials Standing Committee Minutes

Motion was made by Ismael Gullon (Mercer University School of Law) and seconded to approve the minutes from the Acquisitions Standing Committee and the Serials Standing Committee meetings held at the 2012 American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting & Conference in Boston, Massachusetts. Motion carried.

Reports

Exchange of Duplicates Program (Patricia Roncevich, University of Pittsburgh School of Law)
As more libraries are binding fewer titles every year, there are fewer members who participate in the program. The program has improved the exchange and storage of information in the database, especially the checking of title authority before adding information to the database. Currently, the program raises funds through the membership fees and approximately one third of the available funds are expended on the support work of a database administrator. The current question is how often the exchange services should be done. It is a lot of work. One option is to handle the exchange approximately once a year. Wendy Moore stated she raised this issue with the board, and the Serials Committee will submit the issue to the board again.

Project COUNTER Task Group (no report provided)

Survey on Collection Development Trends in Law Libraries (Damon Campbell, Florida Coastal School of Law, in absentia)
Wendy Moore reported that the survey has been completed and that Damon requests assistance from members who know how to calculate statistics. Volunteer are welcome to help compile and analyze the data for the report. Damon may be contacted at dcampbell@fcsl.edu.

AALL Price Index for Legal Publications (Carol Nicholson, in absentia)
Wendy Moore reported that Carol Nicholson, editor of the AALL Price Index for Legal Publications will continue her role in editing the annual publication as a retiree. Luz Verguizas (Columbia Law School) reported that the Committee for the Price Index for Legal Publications is discussing expanding and changing categories. An example is to include e-resource pricing and access options. Comments and concerns about possible changes may be submitted to the Committee. Stephanie Edwards (Roger Williams University School of Law) stated it would be useful to have electronic pricing data included in the Index.

List of Law Publishers (Anne Robbins, University of Illinois College of Law, in absentia)
Wendy Moore reported that the project to convert the current List of Law Publishers (formerly AcqWeb) to a blog format to ease management of the resource has stalled. Wendy stated that Anne Robbins is seeking volunteers and may be contacted via email if you are interested in assisting with this project. Wendy Moore stated a taskforce from the Serials and Acquisitions Standing Committees may provide enough people to complete the project as well as accountability to get the work done. Stephanie Edwards stated it remains a valuable resource. One goal of moving the site to a blog format is that it could readily support having multiple editors for ongoing maintenance.

Education Programming for AALL 2014

Wendy Moore stated that Christine Dulaney (American University Washington College of Law) is the incoming chair of the Education Committee. The Committee is considering changes to AALL programming processes and how best to work with the Annual Meeting Program Committee (AMPC). AMPC seems to want only the ideas for programming topics, and then they pursue the programming details. Wendy stated that Brian Striman (University of Nebraska College of Law) is especially interested in programming ideas from the Acquisitions and Serials standing committees. Wendy asked attendees to develop programming ideas for the Education Committee.

Roundtable Discussions

Topics

1. New discovery, purchasing, and management
   a) Ebook acquisitions and management
      • There was much discussion about the LexisNexis Digital Library.
      • Often, packages were being negotiated by the main library, whereas the law library continues with title by title selections
      • There was interest in partnering for the cataloging of the West Study Aids. This is limited because law libraries are not purchasing the package. The wide disparity may be due to variation in pricing quotes, though the pricing may be standardized by West soon. Melody Lembke (University of California at Irvine Law Library) suggested subdividing the cataloging work by series.
   b) Patron-driven acquisitions (PDA) (a.k.a. demand driven acquisitions (DDA))
      • Law school had pushed DDA to its faculty to make use of main campus (University Library) DDA services. Assessing the cost to the law school as yet to be worked out.
      • A law library in Florida negotiated with the main campus library to have all K schedule acquisitions from DDA billed to the law library.
      • It was suggested that some vendors seem not to have experience working with and for law library needs in this area.
   c) Electronic Resource Management (ERM) systems
      • ERM systems continue to be useful for managing subscriptions and statistics.
      • There are several libraries that have or are working to deploy open source ERM clients.
      • One library reported that its ERM is overpopulated with titles entered as an access provider rather than for management. It is time to sift out titles that are 'free' or that do not require oversight (other than access) by the library staff.
      • OLLARA and ERMes were briefly discussed.
   d) Next-generation library management systems and newer discovery environments
      • The application of ERM systems may be changing due to the availability and implementation of discovery platforms. The result may be that ERMs become more of an internal management resource than a public access tool.

2. Evolution of acquisitions and serials work in law libraries
   a) What changes to workflow and staff duties have you made this year?
      • Changes have been driven by more electronic acquisitions and less print.
      • Interdepartmental staff sharing is trending (placement of staff shared between library and other law school departments such as communications or web design).
      • More cross-training of staff.
      • While centralizing technical services (e.g. Harvard Law) may be discussed, law libraries are also withdrawing from a centralized support model to focus on law school management needs.
      • More collaboration with public services was noted.
   b) How are our roles as technical services librarians changing?
      • Technical services staff have contributed to maintenance and creation of finding aids such as LibGuides pages.
      • Direct faculty support is growing. Examples included acquiring copyright permissions and assisting with faculty research.
      • Tech Services librarians are participating more in the marketing of library services.

The meeting adjourned at 8:46 a.m.

Cataloging and Classification Standing Committee
2013 Annual Meeting Minutes
July 14, 2013 — Seattle, Washington

Diana Menashi
Jacob D. Fuchsburg Law Center, Touro College

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 AM by George Prager. A sign up sheet was passed around. There were 48 attendees. George announced this was his last term as Chair of the Cataloging and Classification Committee. His 2012-2013 committee annual report is available at http://www.aallnet.org/sections/ts/committees/Cataloging/Annual-Reports/2012-2013.html. The new Chair will be Amalia Contursi, and her term begins at the end of the conference.

Pat Sayre McCoy – AALL Representative to Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information (MARBI)

Pat announced that MARBI completed the proposals for the new MARC fields that were required by *Resource Description and Access* (*RDA*). She also reported that MARBI was officially canceled at the end of the American Library Association (ALA) 2013 meeting. The MARC Advisory Committee is a new group that is continuing the MARBI committee format and transiting it to MARC format and standards. The Committee is also continuing to develop MARC fields and sub-fields. Voting for membership will be elaborated on at the next MARC Advisory Committee meeting.

John Hostage – AALL Representative to ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)

John stated that the AALL proposal for the revision of *RDA* regarding treaties was approved with very few changes by CC:DA. The proposal will be discussed at the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) meeting in the fall, and if approved, *RDA* should be updated by early 2014 with the changes. The proposed changes will instruct that the authorized access points for treaties be based on title rather than the first-named signatory, which could have resulted in many international treaties entered under Afghanistan or Albania.

CC:DA is also working on a list of additional relationship designators for persons and corporate bodies to be included in Appendix I of *RDA*. Another area of focus is *RDA* instructions for names of places; John is serving on a task force that is studying how to streamline these instructions.

Suzanne Graham – AALL Representative to Subject Analysis Committee (SAC)

Suzanne stated several new genre terms for law have been approved. She is working on identifying appropriate MARC fields for non-subject information that is currently being given in subject fields of the MARC format for the time when we move away from including that information in 650-651 fields. Suzanne stated that MARBI approved three new MARC fields for use in bibliographic and authority records. These fields are 385 (intended audience), 386 (creator demographics), and 648 and 388 (chronology of the work). Current Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) will serve as the basis of a new controlled vocabulary for demographic terms that are used with the 385 and 386 fields.

Suzanne also reported that the SAC *RDA* Implementation Subcommittee wrote a discussion paper to address subject analysis under *RDA*. These suggestions can be reviewed in their entirety in Suzanne's full report. The paper will be sent to the *RDA* Joint Steering Committee for review at its meeting in November 2013.

Suzanne Graham – Chair, Cataloging and Subject Policy Advisory Working Group

A group of 12 law librarians worked on identifying crime terms in LCSH. These crime terms will be available to have the subdivision *Law and legislation*. The SACO Law Funnel continues to welcome new proposals and new administrators.

Cindy Spadoni – Chair, Task Group on Vendor-Supplied Records

Cindy reported that the Task Group was fairly quiet this year, working with two vendors on assuring that they were cataloging e-resources according to the Provider-Neutral Record standard.

Melissa Beck – Chair, Descriptive Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group (DCAG)

Melissa praised John Hostage's dedication and hard work in successfully passing the *RDA* change proposal for treaties through CC:DA. In the coming year, the DCAG will be working on areas of *RDA* that could benefit from best practices recommendations for the law cataloging community.

Jolande Goldberg, LC Liaison to TS-SIS: Library of Congress Update

Jolande stated that the law schedule Class K will be completed this year.

She has finished working on the classification for the law of Hawaii to approximately 1900. The preferred classification will be in Class KVJ, which places pre-1900 Hawaii among the other Pacific jurisdictions in the regional schedule KL-KWX. For libraries wishing to combine all Hawaiian materials in the pre-existing United States subclass KFH Hawaii, there will also be an option to use a 3000 number table applied to KIH5000. Archival and other documents of historical importance from pre-1900 Hawaii have been digitized at the State Archives /Honolulu and will be made accessible eventually via links in the new Hawaii classification.

MARC 21 classification records are being created for classification numbers in the new Class KIA-KIK, Law of Indigenous Peoples: North America. This class will include numbers for major reference sources; it is accompanied by an extensive *Guide to application* and an *Index* of URL's for Websites and Web resources used for this classification. The KIA-KIK schedule will be ready by the end of the year. Most of the numbers in KF8200-KF8228, the Indian law section of the KF schedule, will be closed, with the exception of the numbers for federal law pertaining to Native Americans. The latter section will be expanded. Similar operations await execution for Class KE (Canada). A related project includes digitizing the Indian collection in LC Class E.

The online functionality is further investigated for the possibility of linking identified and curated URLs to specific classification numbers, or linking from specific classification numbers to selected authoritative Web resources, as well as developing a means for using maps for accessing Native Jurisdiction's Web sites and displaying constitutional/legal information or for enhancing visually the content of particular areas in the classification by maps. Recently, the entire Class K has been transferred into the LC Linked Data Service (http://id.loc.gov/authorities) which has converted and exposed Class K as linked data, free of charge.

Jolande Goldberg is also working on classification of the law of indigenous Mexico (Class KIL) and Protestant canon law (Class KBX), as well as the reclassification of JX to KZ, JZ, or K. So far, about 1,000 international law titles from JX have been reclassed to KZ and K. Extensive revisions (expansions and cancellations) of the affected classes (JZ, KZ, and K), go hand in hand with the reclassification.

The meeting was concluded by George Prager at 8:15 a.m.

Announcements
Technical Services SIS Cataloging & Classification Committee

The meetings and discussions in Seattle inspired us all, spurred some new ideas, and renewed energy. The Cataloging & Classification Standing Committee and the three working groups under its flag have ironed out the language of their mission statements and responsibilities, in an effort to work harmoniously and efficiently towards a solution of the current, most pressing issues in law cataloging. The names and acronyms of the three working groups have slightly changed and now systematically mirror each other as follows:

> **Classification and Subject Cataloging Advisory Working Group** (CSCAG), Yael Mandelstam, Chair;
> **Descriptive Cataloging Advisory Working Group** (DCAG), Melissa Beck, Chair;
> **Vendor-Supplied Records Advisory Working Group** (VRAG), Angela Jones, Chair.

The chairs of the standing committee and the working groups are in the process of updating their respective web pages with the indispensable assistance of our web master Martin Wisneski. The website will be more organically organized and easier to navigate. All the chairs envision more discussions and are preparing to undertake new projects within their respective groups. As they move along with their work, more content will be added to the website.

As soon as the revised web pages are ready, I will post an announcement on the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) listserv that will include information about new and renewed memberships.

Also, the "Exception for Treaties" section of the *PCC Post RDA Test Guidelines* have been updated at http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/rda/PCC%20Post%20RDA%20Test%20Guidelines.html (and the update date) changed to Aug. 29, 2013.

The new text states the following:

> **Exception for Treaties**
>
> The legal community is re-evaluating how authorized access points for treaties should be constructed under *Resource Description and Access* (*RDA*), and will be forwarding proposals for change to the Joint Steering Committee. In the interim, apply these guidelines for new and existing authorized access points:

New authorized access points for treaties: If no authorized access point exists for a treaty, continue to use AACR2 instructions (AACR2 25.16 Treaties, etc., and 21.35 Treaties, Intergovernmental agreements, etc.) to establish the authorized form, except, use the full form of the name of a month when necessary to record a date a treaty was signed instead of the abbreviations from AACR2. Code any new authority record as AACR2 in 008/10 (Descriptive Cataloging Rules) as an exception to the PCC Post-*RDA* Test Guidelines.

Existing authorized access points for treaties (AACR2): Do not revise an existing AACR2 authorized access point in a name authority record for a treaty to the *RDA* form, continue to use the AACR2 form in *RDA* bibliographic records.

Existing authorized access points for treaties (*RDA*): Do not revise an existing *RDA* authorized access point in a name authority record for a treaty back to AACR2, continue to use the *RDA* form in bibliographic records.

<div align="right">

Lia Contursi
Columbia University

</div>

Marla Schwartz Grant
AALL Conference Report

<div align="right">

Antionette Vanterpool
University of Florida

</div>

I am a proud recipient of this year's Marla Schwartz Grant to attend the 106th American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting & Conference in Seattle. I express my deepest thanks to the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) for choosing me and giving me the opportunity to attend my first AALL Annual Meeting.

As a first-time attendee, I was overwhelmed by the number of activities and sessions available. I know some people have recommended taking time to see the sights when attending an Annual Meeting, but as a first time attendee, I wanted to soak up as much information as possible. As a recipient of this grant and as a Library Assistant working in my Library's Technical Services department, I tried to attend mostly sessions related to technical services issues but also some other sessions on topics such as exploring Congress.gov, how to increase influence in the workplace, and top trends reshaping the legal industry.

One of the technical services sessions I attended was "Making Sense of the Numbers: Understanding Vendor Statistics." The speakers provided insight on the fact that sometimes the numbers aren't exactly what you think they are and how you have to know what the terms really mean when the statistics say things like "hits" or "item request." The speakers showed examples of how different vendors from OneLog to HeinOnline produced statistics and some of their variations. The speakers also discussed how the location from which a material is accessed (on or offcampus through a proxy server) may impact vendor statistics. The knowledge of how those statistics are actually computed can impact a library's decisions.

Another fascinating technical services session I attended was "Linked Data: The New Bibliographic Framework in the PostMARC World." In the Linked Data session, the topic was the Library of Congress's Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative, which aims to connect the Library's material in MARC format to the world of information on the Internet. The speakers encouraged the attendees to work in their Library's to take action and to connect their library materials. However, as seen from the discussion between the speakers and the attendees, the Initiative sounds like a great idea—one easier said than done.

Not only did I attend interesting sessions, I also ventured into the Exhibit Hall and spoke with various vendors to learn about their products. I also met with several AALL members who provided insight into their respective organizations and special interest sections. I learned that an AALL Annual Meeting is a fast-paced event for which you have to be prepared. And although I was overwhelmed, it was an experience that taught me valuable information about the profession and one I will never forget. I look forward to next year's Annual Meeting in San Antonio, and I hope to get to know and learn more from the wonderful librarians in the profession.

OBS-SIS Local Systems Roundtable:
Orbis Cascade Alliance & Shared ILS Implementation

Rebecca Martin
Boston University Pappas Law Library

Presenters included the following: Bill Kelm, Systems Librarian at Willamette University in Salem, Oregon; Al Cornish, departing Systems Librarian at Washington State University at Pullman and incoming Shared ILS Program Manager for the Alliance staff; and Ann Nez, Coordinator of Technical Services at Gallagher Law Library at the University of Washington.

Steadily, but not so slowly, libraries have had to manage increasingly e-resource focused collections using integrated library systems (ILSs) equipped to manage primarily print-based collections. Consequently, we have seen a large number of next-generation library services platforms arise from a wide number of vendors that address this fundamental shift in our collection development practices. Still, making the transition from our client-based to newer cloud-based systems is a daunting task; and the process of researching and choosing a new system can be just as challenging as implementing one.

Luckily, some members of the Orbis Cascade Alliance came to speak at the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS) Local Systems Roundtable meeting at the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting in Seattle on the trials, tribulations, successes, and excitement of choosing a new ILS; planning the migration of all 37 consortium members, including six law libraries; and implementing the transition to the Ex Libris Alma and Primo management systems. The program was not a petition for other libraries to move toward the Ex Libris product specifically, but a general discussion of the difficulties and successes of choosing, migrating and implementing an integrated library system.

Al Cornish and Bill Kelm began the program providing background and context for the Alliance's decision to transition to a shared library management system for all consortium members. They explained that the Alliance's Strategic Agenda of 2008-09 drove the decision to move toward the practice of collaborative technical services and investigation into the feasibility of a shared ILS system. In 2010, an initial Shared ILS (SILS) Team was created to explore broad administrative considerations ranging from per member cost-analyses to legal and governance implications.

In 2011, the SILS Team undertook a Request for Information (RFI) process that focused on gathering information and encouraged vendors, nonprofit organizations, and other library associations to develop creative solutions to the questions and obstacles the Alliance foresaw in its movement to a shared ILS. Cornish explained the RFI was an important step in confirming the Alliance's next step, which is recommending a timeline, projecting potential staff needs, and proceeding with a Request for Proposal (RFP) process. More detailed information about the RFI, RFP and initial decision-making can be found in an article written by Cornish and two Alliance colleagues entitled "Selecting a Shared 21st Century Management System" in *Collaborative Librarianship*, Vol. 5, No.1 (2013). The article can be found at http://collaborativelibrarianship.org/index.php/jocl/article/view/232/180.

The Alliance's Shared ILS Implementation webpage might the most valuable resources for other libraries considering a migration to a new ILS system – whether for a shared consortium model, across campuses, or an individual library. The website details the history and background of the entire process, including the original RFI and RFP documents; SILS Team meeting minutes dating back to 2010; white papers on best practices and strategic agendas; checklists for migration; FAQs; and more. This information can be found at http://www.orbiscascade.org/index/rfp and at http://www.orbiscascade.org/index/committees.

The second half of the Roundtable shifted to discussion of the migration and implementation itself. As of the AALL Annual Meeting, only the first of four cohorts of Alliance institutions had migrated and gone live on the Ex Libris Alma and Primo systems. One of the institutions was the University of Washington. Ann Nez spoke at the Roundtable about some of the unforeseen difficulties of implementation. Nez explained Gallagher Law Library historically had a completely separate ILS from the main campus; thus, preparation in order to harmonize records with the main library was a formidable task. There were templates and checklists available to assist in preparation, but it was a long process of troubleshooting to disengage from existing special acquisitions and cataloging practices. There was also the issue of problem-solving on the vendor side. Cornish and Kelm explained the initial round of training from Ex Libris was very unhelpful. After the Alliance SILS Team became vocal about the poor condition of training and lack of resources and support, Ex Libris responsively and responsibly revamped training for the next cohort.

Nez also explained one of the largest obstacles to implementation and use of the new system was definitely preconceived notions. Nez, her staff, and others in the first implementation cohort developed glossaries to compare vocabulary and understand the intersecting nodes between the old ILS and Alma. An audience member, who also works at an Alliance

Page 20   Technical Services Law Librarian, Vol. 39, No. 1

institution, explained a large part of the transition has definitely been getting staff to slowly shed reliance on the old ILS and its related processes.

Ultimately, there is incredible possibility with new library management systems, but individual or library-wide presumptions can hinder the process. Luckily, the Orbis Cascade Alliance's experience, documented in great detail and available for public use, can help other libraries overcome at least the technical and administrative obstacles related to such a large-scale project.

OCLC Update and Roundtable

Jackie Magagnosc
Cornell University

The 2013 OCLC Users Roundtable held Sunday, July 14th, was well attended. The American Association of Law Library's (AALL) OCLC liaison, Glenn Patton, covered new developments with WorldCat, WorldShare Management Services, *Resource Description and Access* (*RDA*) and OCLC, WorldCat quality, and WorldShare ILL. Glenn's PowerPoint slides are available on the Online Bibliographic Services (OBS) website at http://www.aallnet.org/sections/obs/documents/reports/OCLCUpdate2013.pdf.

Glenn began by announcing that Skip Prichard became president and CEO of OCLC effective July 1, 2013. Mr. Prichard is a lawyer and has previously worked with Ingram, ProQuest, and LexisNexis.

Highlights of Glenn's presentation include the following:

WorldCat

As of June 7, 2013 WorldCat contains over 300 million bibliographic records and over 2 billion holdings.

WorldShare Management Services

WorldShare Management Services (WMS) provides a single, integrated set of management services for libraries intended to improve visibility and efficiency. This suite of services provides a cloud-based replacement for traditional integrated library systems and is built on a platform designed to ease interaction with various services. The majority of current users are located in North America; there are additional users in Australia, four in Europe, and one in Aruba.

WorldShare Management Services shares a common cloud-based infrastructure with extensive mobile and social technologies built into the platform. The data layer covers traditional MARC data as well as article and full-text-based information and other types of digital content. A set of common web services that interact with the data are available to libraries and partners to build new Application Programming Interfaces (APIs).

Metadata services live alongside acquisitions, licensing, and ILL analytics. There are two major metadata related services:

WorldShare Metadata Record Manager

The Metadata Record Manager provides record-at-a-time metadata creation, as well as use and reuse of linked data to speed record creation, improve quality, and enhance visibility. Initial release to WMS libraries is planned for September 2013 with regular periodic enhancements. A pilot is underway to beta-test functionality for creation of new WorldCat records, enrichment of existing records, maintenance of WorldCat holdings data, and customization of local bibliographic holdings records.

Glenn reassured attendees that the current Connexion browser and client will continue to be available for several years. No end of life date has been set for these products.

The WorldCat Metadata API was released in June 2013. It allows member libraries to manage WorldCat data (creation and enrichment of bibliographic records and maintenance of holdings information and local data) through library—and partner—built applications as an alternative to OCLC-developed applications.

WorldShare Metadata Collection Manager

WorldShare Metadata Collection Manager is now available. This product facilitates management of metadata for physical, electronic, and digital collections of records. WorldShare Metadata Collection manager automatically delivers WorldCat MARC records, ensuring that metadata and access URLs for collections are continually updated for better user access, freeing staff time for other priorities. This service can produce sets of records for journal aggregations. It is available to any

library in North America. The WorldCat knowledgebase includes e-journal and e-book aggregators plus some streaming media. The WorldCat knowledge-base and Collection Manager are covered by current catalog subscriptions. OCLC is producing an ongoing set of webinars to introduce this product. See the support and training section of the OCLC website

RDA and OCLC

Glenn reviewed OCLC's *RDA* policy statement effective March 31, 2013. The origins of this policy are in the discussion paper *Incorporating RDA practices into WorldCat*, *RDA* is not required; OCLC member libraries may contribute records using any cataloging code they are currently using. WorldCat continues to be a master record database with one record per manifestation per language of cataloging. OCLC's *RDA* policy attempts to look forward to a post-MARC world and balance the dual roles of WorldCat as a discovery interface and a repository of bibliographic data. Webinars in April included more information about the policy, hybrid records, and planned conversion of existing data. Recordings are available at http://www.oclc.org/en-US/events/2013/rdawebinar041113.html, or search" *RDA* webinar" on the OCLC webpage.

The April 2013 OCLC macrobook revision includes changes to three macros: add33X, generate043, and GenerateAuthorityRecord. The updated macrobook is available at http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/oclc/connexion/oclc.mbk.

OCLC-MARC update 2013, described in *Technical Bulletin 262* (June 2013) details *RDA* additions for bibliographic records, authority records and indexing. The full bulletin is available at http://www.oclc.org/support/services/worldcat/documentation/tb/262.en.html.

OCLC started updating WorldCat records in March starting with LC/NACO name authority records. LCSH subject authority records were updated in April 2013. More than 2 million bibliographic records with controlled headings have been updated. OCLC is now working on updating access points that are not controlled to avoid split files. Glenn's slides provide extensive examples of the types of programmatic changes being made to master records.

Bibliographic Formats and Standards documentation has been updated to reflect most new MARC code changes from Technical Bulletins 261 and 262. Work to add examples and make other updates is just beginning. Implementation of a new content management system is making this work easier for OCLC staff. Revised pages are activated as they are finished.

WorldCat Quality

OCLC continues to actively detect and resolve duplicate records. Duplicate records to be merged are selected from daily journal files. To date, Duplicate Detection and Resolution (DDR) has merged over 11.3 million records.

WorldShare ILL

WorldShare ILL, launched in March 2013, will replace WorldCat Resource Sharing. To date, there have been over 1,000 registrations. WorldCat Resource Sharing will be retired as of December 31, 2013. The new ILL interface is in the WorldShare style. ILL functionality currently in the FirstSearch administrative module will move to the OCLC service configuration tool. FirstSearch nine digit authorizations will not work with the new service; you will have to go through new web-based process to create a username and password. Each institution will have a unique URL. During the process of migration, libraries can use both services at the same time because both services work with the same underlying database. WorldShare ILL is browser based. Chrome works best, and while Firefox 21.0, Internet Explorer (IE) 8 or 9 work, IE 7 and 10 are not supported. A roadmap for future developments and functionality in WorldShare ILL is available at http://oc.lc/3Bhn3x. Planned features include a buy it workflow, display links to open access resources, tight integration with article exchange, display of supplier cost information as part of holdings display, and changes to support variable lender aging (EMST). OCLC's white paper Meeting the Delivery Challenge is available at http://oc.lc/abCRF9. Future releases are planned on an almost monthly basis. Documentation and support and training materials are available at http://www.oclc.org/en-US/worldshare-ill/getting-started.html.

The timeline for migration to WorldShare ILL is as follows:
March-December 2013: open migration to WorldShare ILL for libraries in the United States;
June-December 2013: Non-US migration;
November 2013: no more new requests in;
December 2013: end of WorldCat Resource Sharing

ILLiad software version 8.4 is now available and is required for the transition to WorldShare ILL. Previous versions will no longer work. Functionality with Copyright Clearance Center's Get It Now product has been added. See http://oclc.org/en-US/illiad/latest-version.html.

Updating the OBS OCLC Committee List and Webpage

The Online Bibliographic Services (OBS) OCLC webpage and OBS OCLC Committee list on the webpage have been updated. Please review the webpage (http://www.aallnet.org/sections/obs/Committees/OCLC-Committee) for content and clarity. If you have any suggestions for links or other information you would find useful, please contact me at jkm95@cornell.edu. Additionally, if you are interested in being a member of the OBS OCLC Committee, please check to be sure your name is listed on the webpage. If it is not, or if your listing is incorrect, please contact me.

The OBS OCLC Committee is open to any OBS member who has an interest in OCLC and its products or services. There is no formal committee work required of members, but it is useful to create and maintain a community of OBS members who share similar interests and concerns.

If you have any questions or concerns about OCLC and its products and services, please forward them to me, and I will work with Glenn Patton at OCLC to find answers.

TS-SIS Preservation Standing Committee
2013 Meeting Minutes
July 15, 2013 — Seattle, Washington

Michelle Gorospe
UCLA
Lauren Seney
College of William & Mary

Lauren Seney opened the meeting on Monday, July 15, 2013 at 5:30 pm and began with introductions of all participants. There were 5 people in attendance.

Old Business

The general goal of the past year was to raise awareness and generate interest in preservation.

1. An overview of the resources created in the past year was given. This included:
    *   Digital Preservation resources on the website
    *   Preservation Staff Awareness Guide (copies were available in the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) table in the exhibit hall)
    *   Preservation on the Cheap (copies were available in the TS-SIS table in the exhibit hall)
2. Unveiled the Preservation Tip of the Month
    *   Margie Maes at the Legal Information Preservation Alliance (LIPA) has requested that the committee write blog posts about the content in the Preservation Tip of the Month.
3. Promoted Preservation Week
    *   Inaugural Preservation Tip of the Month
    *   Also sent out a Preservation Trivia Quiz and the Worst Book contest announcement during Preservation week
4. Worst Book Contest
    *   Nine entries were received after the deadline was extended. This is two more entries than last year. All of the entries have been posted to the website and images were available at the TS-SIS table in the exhibit hall.
    *   The winner was University of St. Thomas.
5. Revision of the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Preservation Policy was passed by the Board and now incorporates digital resources. The committee may want to consider reviewing this every three to five years to ensure it remains current.

New Business

Lauren Seney has talked with Margie Maes about additional ways to collaborate with LIPA. One of the ideas is to put together a more combined front for Preservation Week.

Programming for 2014:
*   The committee is very open for collaboration for programming in the future, and suggestions were made to work with LIPA and/or the Government Relations Committee in addition to TS-SIS.
*   A potential program idea on preserving born-digital media and one on the next step for institutional repositories were suggested. The committee discussed potential participants.

Another way to raise awareness is to write about what we are doing. The LIPA blog is a great way to share information; however, there are other options. The committee should pursue publishing in print and electronic resources, including

Spectrum and the *Spectrum Blog*. Potential topics are the preservation work we are doing at our institutions, such as the Preservation Display done by Oregon, and the topics in the Preservation Tip of the Month. The "Stay Well-Preserved" blog is also a resource for publishing content and if we are able to maintain the blog on a consistent basis, it will be a great Tip of the Month.

Rare Book Cataloging Roundtable

Sabrina Sondhi
Columbia Law School Library

The Rare Book Cataloging Roundtable met for its sixth year at this past annual meeting in Seattle. Due to the new Annual Meeting Program Committee (AMPC) rules, this Roundtable was (and will continue to be) sponsored by the Legal History and Rare Books Special Interest Section (LHRB-SIS) instead of the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) as it had been the previous five years. Susan Karpuk, Roundtable Chair and Rare Book Cataloger at Yale Law School Library, began the discussion which focused this year on "bibliographical fingerprints." Using constructed character strings, these unique identifiers can help to distinguish variant editions as well as aid in identification of partial texts. They are created using a sequence of specific counted characters derived from the text of an early printed book. A brief introduction to the topic can be found at http://users.ox.ac.uk/~bodl0842/fingerprints/.

As always, while the Roundtable discussion began with a single topic of interest, it quickly turned into an opportunity for attendees to share current projects and seek suggestions for tackling specific problems. Significant time was devoted this year to local classification systems for closed stack materials, particularly when wishing to shelve books by size. Ming Lu shared how the Los Angeles Public Library appends size indicators (*i.e.* "+" or "++") after a Library of Congress call number to indicate in which closed stack range the book resides. This enables the library to shelve these books in a space-efficient manner in the closed stacks, but retain their proper placement when shelf browsing by call number in their catalog. The Law Library of Osgoode Hall Law School in Toronto also uses Library of Congress call numbers for their closed stack books (so that they sort properly in the catalog), but doesn't actually shelve them in that order. Instead, the closed stack books are shelved in accession order based on size. A sample call number would look like KF 1234 N56 A-0125, where "A" indicates the book's size (and therefore range in the closed stacks) and "0125" indicates that it is the 125th book in that range. This enables the collection to be shelved compactly, but without needing to either leave space for potential future acquisitions or to rearrange existing books to accommodate new material.

Another topic discussed this year was the question of how to indicate the provenance of a specific book or collection, especially if you want that quality to be searchable. Two potential solutions were suggested. First, the 655 genre field could be used, either by employing a thesaurus that covers provenance in the desired manner or by creating a local field. Alternatively, Yale Law School Library has long used 710 added author fields to collocate materials, *e.g.* their Blackstone Collection: http://goo.gl/U9nmVw.

Other topics of interest included (1) a display room being built at William & Mary Law School to showcase the law book collection of George Wythe (1726-1806); (2) taking snapshots of title pages of rare books for display in OPACs; and (3) how new catalogers can best gain experience in rare book cataloging.

Can't wait until the next roundtable? The rare book cataloging mailing list is available as a TS-SIS subgroup in the "My Communities" section of the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) website.

An Unforgettable Experience at the
AALL 106th Annual Meeting

Diana Menashi
Touro College Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center

I would like to thank the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) for the opportunity to attend the 106th American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting.

As a relatively new cataloger, I was thrilled at the prospect of meeting seasoned professionals and hearing about their experiences applying *Resource Description and Access* (*RDA*). I was excited as I approached the room in which my first lecture, the "*RDA* Cataloging Cooperative," was to take place early on Saturday morning. There were two discussion topics of interest to me: the implementation of relationship designators and the creation of authorized access points. I was familiar

with each of these components in *RDA*, albeit on a basic level. The opportunity to learn about the complexities involved in their formation and proper use followed by several examples enriched my understanding. I was eager to review the material and share what I had learned with my supervisor when I returned.

I began Sunday morning by attending the "Cataloging and Classification Standing Committee Meeting." Since I volunteered to take minutes, my concern was ensuring that I recorded the main discussion points. I was exposed to another side of the profession as I learned about the tasks of each of the various committees and working groups that exist within cataloging and classification. These tasks included Library of Congress Liaison Jolande Goldberg's work with the reclassification of the JX classification schedule to the KZ, JZ, or K classification schedules and Descriptive Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group Chair Melissa Beck's work with best practice suggestions for *RDA* law cataloging.

This meeting was followed by the "Opening General Session/Keynote Speaker." I was fascinated by the topic presented by the keynote speaker, David Weinberger. He discussed how knowledge is becoming networked and the ways in which libraries can improve this network. I agreed with his assessment that "libraries must be a platform for knowledge" by "engaging in knowledge networks." Though it is often said that libraries are fast becoming an institution of the past, this cannot be further from the truth. Each librarian, no matter his or her position within the library, whether it is in reference, technical services, acquisitions, or management, is in the profession of gathering and working with different types of information and the way in which it is discovered and applied by users. This is an exciting time for librarians as we learn from each other's skills to determine the best course of action to move the library forward to better serve its users.

The "Bibframe: Linked Data in a Post-MARC World" lecture defined linked data, explained its use of the Internet as its foundation, and provided several examples. This lecture also addressed linked data as an eventual replacement for MARC. Linked data provided users with additional, rich data that extended beyond the information found in a traditional library catalog. It can be argued that this is additional proof of the continued value of the cataloger, who must apply his or her skills to determine how linked data can be applied in a library setting and, at the same time, extend beyond the boundaries of the library to the world stage to serve as a robust and innovative interface. He or she will acquire and apply new skills and/or develop new ways in which to approach and solve problems. It is this type of challenge that makes cataloging an exciting and rewarding profession, and I am looking forward to the continued development of linked data.

My final meeting for the day was the "TS-SIS Business and Awards Meeting." I wanted to meet the individuals who allowed me to have the opportunity to attend this year's conference and thank them personally. This meeting was also an important experience for me as I was able to see how each of the groups in TS, such as Preservation, was of service to the profession and how each of these groups was indispensable to TS. It was wonderful to meet the new Chair of TS-SIS, Brian Striman, and to speak with him about my interests and professional goals.

I attended the "Descriptive Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group" on Monday afternoon. The majority of this meeting served as a brainstorming session. Each individual shared his or her ideas regarding an appropriate medium through which to share personal experiences and practices in cataloging different materials using *RDA*. It was interesting to hear each idea proposed but more importantly, to witness the foundations of a plan of action taking place to address these shared concerns. I am looking forward to taking part in the formation of this group strategy following AALL.

My final meeting at AALL was the "Cataloging and Classification Roundtable." The topics discussed during the *RDA* Cataloging Cooperative and the Descriptive Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group were summarized. This meeting also provided an opportunity for each cataloger to describe the practices that he or she was applying in his or her catalog and compare them to those of his or her colleagues. This served as a valuable learning experience since each cataloger was able to determine which of these practices might be useful in his or her work.

The most important aspect of my experience at AALL was the opportunity to meet others in the field and to hear their professional and personal stories. I hope the individuals I met will become lasting colleagues and that we will enrich each other's careers through frequent contact and continued sharing of experiences.

RDA Cataloging Cooperative

Sue Kelleher
Texas Tech School of Law

There was no preparatory work necessary prior to this all-day workshop, unlike last years introductory session (*RDA* for Law Catalogers). Attendees this year were expected to be familiar with or regularly using *Resource Description and Access* (*RDA*) in their libraries. The only information sent out prior to attending the workshop was an email explanation of the workshop content and a request for question and idea contributions. The format for the workshop was a series of questions and hot topics, with each presenter covering one or two sessions.

The Welcome and Introductions were conducted by co-moderators Ismael Gullon (Mercer Law School) and Angela Jones (Southern Methodist University School of Law). Ismael Gullon took care of housekeeping issues for the day. Angela Jones introduced all participating speakers and panelists. There were also three panelists presented as *RDA* specialists, including Paul Frank (Library of Congress), George Prager (NYU School of Law), and Melissa Beck (UCLA School of Law).

The morning session consisted of sessions that asked questions such as, "***How do I train my catalogers in RDA?***" presented by Adam Schiff of the University of Washington; "***How do I distinguish between compilations and collaborations?***" with Jean Pajerek (Cornell Law School); "***How do I use relationship designators?***" by Pat Sayre-McCoy (University of Chicago School of Law); "***How do I handle a title change involving a mode of issuance?***" with Steve Shadle (University of Washington); and "***How do I create an authorized access point?***" also presented by Adam Schiff.

The morning included some highlights. During "***How do I train my catalogers in RDA?***", several points were stressed, such as how much of *RDA* is the same as AACR2R and how *RDA* terminology is very different from AACR2R. This appears contradictory; but it is nonetheless true. Adam also stated a major thing to remember is that in *RDA* you transcribe what you see (titles, education, etc.). Paul Frank spoke up and suggesting using the MARC record structure and identify where those fields/elements now fall into the *RDA* structure as a method of beginning the training process.

I also found the discussion about "***How do I handle a title change involving a mode of issuance?***" very helpful and timely, especially with all of the changes in format involving so many titles. Steve specifically went over how to describe a change from serial to loose-leaf; how to describe a change from monograph to loose-leaf; and how to describe a change from print serial to online serial.

The general format for all of the speakers consisted of each one presenting the question they were given, with some explanation of the *RDA* rules. But the majority of the time was spent going through the examples and asking/answering questions posed by the attendees.

The afternoon sessions ironically began with the "***Wrap up: Do we have best practices to consider within the law community?***", which was scheduled to be moderated by Angela Jones and Ismael Gullon, together with all speakers and participant, but was actually just Angela Jones. The rest of the afternoon consisted of "***Hot Topic 1: RDA tools and tips***" with Lia Contursi (Columbia Law School); "***How do I catalog treaties?***" by John Hostage (Harvard Law School); "***Hot Topic 2: RDA in action***" by Pat Sayre-McCoy; "***How do I handle revised editions?***" by Jean Pajerek; and finally, "***How do I work with non-RDA records in OCLC?***" with Steve Shadle.

The question of "***How do I catalog treaties?***" that John presented was of particular interest to the legal community that was present. He discussed the new *RDA* standards and how unhappy law catalogers were. An American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) committee wrote a new proposal to revise the *RDA* standards for treaties, recommending that the preferred access point always be the title proper instead of the first named governmental body. The proposal was submitted to the ALA CC:DA, and can be seen at http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/aall2013-1.pdf. The proposal was approved and then submitted to the Joint Steering Committee to be decided upon in November 2013. The Library of Congress is continuing to use AACR2R until the new policy is fully adopted.

The session on "***How do I handle revised editions?***" also provided ample opportunity for head shaking during the afternoon. George Praeger provided assistance with the examples. The session was spent going through various specific examples. Most of the time was spent covering two examples, laughingly referred to as a "rapid descent into (cataloger's) Hell". They were *McCormick on Evidence* and *Prosser on Torts*. Both examples dealt with *RDA* 0.4.3.6 (Attribution). Paul Frank was called upon to clarify the *McCormick* example. He responded, if you have the resources, LC would recommend changing all the records; otherwise the present/future is more important. The final analysis was to "use cataloger's judgment". *Prosser*

continued the descent. In the end, it was decided that Smith (the original author) would be attributed as long as he was still listed in the resource. But once he (Smith) was no longer there, then attribution must change.

Ismael and Angela closed the workshop by encouraging attendees to attend other sessions during the conference and thanking the speakers, panelists, moderators, as well as all of the attendees of the workshop. Overall, the workshop was well worth the time of attending. The speakers were very knowledgeable about their topics and mostly able to share that knowledge in ways that made difficult subject matter more understandable. The only real drawback was lack of time to properly discuss some of the examples provided. The presenters always seemed to be rushing through things to make sure they got through all of the materials. Probably the most memorable advice given during the workshop—and it was given more than once in multiple sessions—was that "cataloger's judgment/discretion" and "best practices" are heavily relied upon to answer many questions about *RDA*. I could have gone on for pages talking about what was explained in each session, but time and space limitations prevent me from doing so. Instead, I tried to highlight the most memorable points.

Program Report

"Libraries as Platforms" Opening General Session/Keynote Address by David Weinberger

Christine Korytnyk Delaney
American University Pence Law Library

Can a former gag writer for Woody Allen, philosophy professor, and dot-com entrepreneur provide a window into the future of libraries? If you attended David Weinberger's keynote address at the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting in Seattle, you would immediately realize the wisdom in his vision of future libraries, in which they transition from repositories to platforms that connect users to the knowledge they require. Currently serving as co-director of the Harvard Innovation Lab and author of several monographs on the transformation of knowledge and ideas by the Internet, Weinberg's keynote address defined a new strategic direction for libraries based on the rapidly changing nature of information systems.

Weinberger set the context for his vision of the future by identifying three facts which confront our libraries. First, libraries face various pressures that call for either cutting costs or increasing value. Second, the Internet is the greatest amplifier of values since it can increase or decrease the value of whatever is found online. Third, the value libraries provide their users are under-represented on the Internet.

A key concept is Weinberger's definition of how humans understand knowledge. Our ambition to know everything is limited by the physical tools at our disposal, including our own intellect and our ability to comprehend vast amounts of data. To manage this knowledge, we have developed strategies for limiting and constraining the infinite amount of information found in our world. For instance, we tend to filter out knowledge to reach that which we believe has most value. Further, our understanding of knowledge has been constrained by the mediums we have used to transfer knowledge—the written word, the printed page, a physical book, or the length of shelf space in a library. These physical objects keep knowledge static and noninteractive.

In contrast, knowledge is amplified in the online world so that rather than filtering out data, we can filter <u>forward</u>. This new strategy enables us to include everything in anticipation of future known and unknown needs. Second, because the Internet enables us to interact with data, continually seek more information, and link various content, we are able to create a network of knowledge or an ecosystem of information with various levels of expertise. Third, networked information breaks the constraints of the physical medium. By the limitations of the physical page or the constraints of a limited amount of linear shelving in a library, the Internet multiplies the quantity of knowledge we can access so none needs to be discarded or restricted. Everything can be accessed online. Fourth, the difference between data and metadata disappears with networked information. The familiar order created by our strict definition of metadata and data does not translate to the web where all data can also become metadata. But the breakdown of this distinction creates new meaning as well as infinite possibilities for new knowledge.

According to Weinberger, in a networked world, the services provided by libraries take on increasing value and importance as a counterbalance to networked information. First, libraries provide access particularly to locked or licensed content. Second, libraries provide the "trusted guidance" needed to find the vast amount of information available on the Internet. Third, libraries provide a guide to divergent opinions, which counteracts the tendency to surround ourselves with homogeneous thinking. Fourth, the library as a social space counterbalances the disembodiment of the web.

By taking on the role of a platform, libraries can evolve to meet the requirements of structured and meaningful access to knowledge, rather than a repository of the knowledge itself. Weinberger defines this platform as a series of the following layers: a data or metadata layer, services layer, and an applications layer. Ultimately, the people interacting with these layers create knowledge networks, unique services, or community involvement that can be fed back into the platform and reused by others. This continual recycling amplifies the value of the library.

Several challenges need to be overcome in order to achieve this vision. We lack appropriate software, skills, standards, policies, and privacy guidelines as well as a commitment to openness with our metadata, access, and linked data. We also need institutional cultures that support these ideas. Ultimately, Weinberger believes the Internet that created these challenges will also provide the answers. Just as the Internet as an open platform that enabled the creation of new technologies, the library is a platform that can serve as the centerpiece of the Internet and the world of networked knowledge. Rather than anticipating the future, the library should focus on becoming the platform that enables the future for those who have the ideas.

Program Report

Making Sense of the Numbers: Understanding Vendor Statistics

Beth Farrell
Cleveland-Marshall College of Law Library
Cleveland State University

Presented by Suzanne R. Graham (University of George), Jean O'Grady (DLA Piper), and Jacob Sayward (Fordham University), this informative program was designed to help law librarians track and evaluate aggregator-supplied and vendor-supplied statistics so they can make better-informed collection development, customer use, and funding decisions. The session opened with a discussion of Project COUNTER and SUSHI. Since 2002, the international initiative Project COUNTER (Counting Online Usage of Networked Electronic Resources) has set standards designed to make vendor online usage statistics more comparable and reliable. SUSHI (Standardized Usage Statistics Harvesting Initiative) is a technical protocol which harvests and produces COUNTER-formatted usage statistics. For more information see the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) Project COUNTER Task Group page at http://www.aallnet.org/sections/ts/committees/Serials/Project-Counter; the Project COUNTER site at http://www.projectcounter.org/index.html; and the NISO page on SUSHI and COUNTER at http://www.niso.org/workrooms/sushi/.

The presenters reported that the many vendors who have not adopted the COUNTER standards think the statistical reports they provide are "better" or else they claim not to have the time to adopt the COUNTER standards. Jacob Sayward believes law database vendors are behind the times in developing reliable statistical reports, and he urged librarians to speak with their vendors about becoming COUNTER compliant.

The presenters next discussed and provided examples of reports produced by several data providers including Lexis, Westlaw, Serials Solutions, Bloomberg Law, Gale, HeinOnline, Onelog, and Lookup Precision. Lexis and Westlaw historically have provided very detailed usage reports, but these reports were focused on providing data for cost recovery from a firm's clients. Typical information provided to the firm included the client billing number, name of the lawyer who ran the search, retail/custom cost per search, time of search, and pages printed. While not needing this kind of usage information to manage billing costs, academic law librarians certainly could use some of this information to help them make better-informed collection development decisions.

Presenters cautioned that care must be taken when comparing vendor reports because vendors who are not COUNTER compliant do not follow standards for labeling and reporting data. For instance, one vendor's "hits" may be another vendor's "articles retrieved." In order to better clarify report data, Jacob Sayward suggested librarians ask each of their vendors a question such as, "If I had a session in which I did X, Y, and Z – how would your system report this information back to me?" Using this information, a librarian could build a spreadsheet comparing apples to apples data across content providers.

A more automated (and sadly, expensive) way to compare and track usage data from various data providers is to use a third party monitoring tool. Jean O'Grady mentioned that DLA Piper uses Onelog to measure utilization of the firm's electronic resources. She felt Onelog's reports very much helped her make informed decisions when she needed to reduce her electronic resources budget. Other third party monitor tools include Research Monitor, Lookup Precision, and Quattrove.

Presenters mentioned that authentication/proxy servers can be another source of usage data. If users are authenticated by password, usage stats could be reported for patron types, or in some cases, individual users. If users are authenticated by IP address/proxy server, librarians may be able to set up the server to define what gets counted and how.

At the end of the session, presenters again urged librarians to speak to their vendors about the importance of providing consistent usage reports – perhaps even saying "Look, I don't want to have to drop your product because you can't give me good data." Kudos to Suzanne Graham, Jean O'Grady, and Jacob Sayward for providing program attendees valuable advice about how to better evaluate our extremely expensive online resources!

Program Report

Linked Data: The New Bibliographic Framework in the Post-MARC World

Karen Selden
University of Colorado
William A. Wise Law Library

Presented by Karen Coyle, Eric Miller and Glenn Patton

This 90 minute program on the first afternoon of the conference was an especially appropriate follow-up to the morning's opening session, in which keynote speaker Dr. David Weinberger, from the Harvard Library Innovation Lab, encouraged librarians and developers to create apps using current library data that will allow access to library collections in new and innovative ways. As if in response to this call to action, the Linked Data program's description in the conference program book notes that "[t]he Library of Congress' Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative will transform existing metadata (the MARC format) into a sustainable bibliographic encoding system, connecting library resources to the whole world of information resources."

Program coordinator and moderator Keiko Okuhara, Bibliographic Services and Systems Librarian at the University of Hawaii's William S. Richardson School of Law's Library, structured the program to begin with two fast-paced and informative presentations for the first 50 minutes, followed by 40 minutes allotted for questions from the audience to the three panelists. The presenters were Eric Miller and Karen Coyle, who were joined by Glenn Patton to form the panel that took questions from the audience. Full biographies of Eric and Karen are available on the program's handout, which is freely available on the AALL2Go website at http://aall.sclivelearningcenter.com/index.aspx.

Eric Miller is co-founder and president of Zepheira (http://zepheira.com/). He was a principal participant in the Semantic Web Initiative in its early days for the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) and also worked in the library and information science field at OCLC and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). He and his company are currently contracting with the Library of Congress to work on their BIBFRAME Linked Data Project (http://bibframe.org/).

Eric began the program with a presentation entitled "Future of the BIBFRAME Model -- Linked Data Project at the Library of Congress." He explained that the BIBFRAME project envisions creating a bibliographic environment that is robust enough to deal with content created 40 years ago yet also flexible enough to handle content created over the next 40 years. This framework can be used by all "memory organizations," such as museums and archives, and not just libraries. In an architectural sense, the integrated and interconnected content created by this project is viewed as being "of" the web, rather than just "on" the web. While Eric admitted that some view this project as "vague but interesting," he used various slides to illustrate the concept of moving beyond just creating links between various people, places, topics, and events on the web, and starting to very specifically define the relationships between the data and items being linked. For example, one slide expressed the web of connections for Eric's presentation: Eric works for Zepheira and wrote a paper for a conference sponsored by AALL on July 14, 2013 in Seattle, Washington.

His paper was influenced by a paper written by another author. Defining connections as specific as Eric "presented with" or "pointed to" a particular person during the presentation could even be created. Creating these highly specific connections could greatly refine searching and navigation of information. A precursor of this sort of retrieval system is creating Linked Data, which shares and connects data on the Semantic web using URIs (Uniform Resource Identifiers) and RDF (Resource Description Framework). However, this means content creators must rethink their applications and their integration, so that data can be created in one application and then reused in others.

With this general background in mind, Eric explained BIBFRAME in more detail. BIBFRAME is a Linked Data model for library data, as well as data from other "memory organizations." Its requirements and goals include the following: (1) being content agnostic (it must accommodate MARC, RDA, DACS, CCO, etc.); (2) handling description and management of traditional materials (books, serials, etc.) and non-traditional materials (born digital items and data sets); (3) integrating supporting data (authority records, holdings, and classification); and (4) benefiting from "all the goodness the web has to offer" (web triggers, collaboration, data driven, etc.). BIBFRAME is a core model for defining web control points for more effective sharing, navigation, and collaboration. In the framework, relationships are coded in particular tags to help contextualize relationships between various people, places, topics, and events.

Eric also discussed the concept of recombinant data. Creating and using recombinant data allows one to reconnect different data sets to create new data sets. Legos are the perfect example of recombinant data sets. Each individual Lego piece is created to precise and unchanging standards, so that each individual piece can be used with any combination of other Lego pieces to create a nearly infinite amount of new and interesting combinations. In addition, these larger combined sets of Lego pieces are more interesting and useful, so these combinations are greater than the sum of their individual parts. In this same way, the BIBFRAME project hopes to create the equivalent of many small, standardized data pieces that can be used to create larger and more useful blocks of data that can then be shared with others. Just like various Lego combinations can be named (dinosaur, rocket, etc.), so too can new data combinations be named or identified. Additionally, just like with Lego pieces, one can group together data pieces with similar patterns or for specific purposes.

The initial phase of BIBFRAME work is nearing completion. Documentation and reports created to date are available on the BIBFRAME website at http://bibframe.org/. The website also contains a translation service that allows one to add MARC data and see what it looks like as linked data. Audience members were highly encouraged to try this service to both learn more about the linked data that can be created from MARC data and to give feedback. The project also has seven early experimenters, including the Library of Congress, OCLC, the British Library, George Washington University, and Princeton University. The next phase of the project will include extended experimentation, creating more detailed documentation, and working with developers and the vendor community to develop tools and services. For example, VTLS, Inc. recently announced a beta BIBFRAME cataloging and navigation module, and the University of Colorado has done some open source development work.

Eric detailed the next steps that audience members should take, which include the following: (1) Continue to learn about linked data (both inside and outside the library community); (2) Join the discussion, at bibframe@listserv.loc.gov; (3) Follow updates to documentation, examples, vocabulary, services, prototypes, etc. on the BIBFRAME website (http://bibframe.org/); (4) Start to engage vendors by asking them "What is your Linked Data strategy?" and (5) Define your own linked data strategy.

Eric is a very engaging speaker and used his slides and humor effectively to make this theoretical model accessible to the audience in a short time frame. If you are interested in linked data or BIBFRAME, viewing this presentation on the AALL2Go website (http://aall.sclivelearningcenter.com/index.aspx) is highly recommended.

Karen Coyle is a library consultant and contractor with over thirty years of experience with library technology. As a consultant, she works primarily on metadata development and technology planning, and she is currently investigating the possibilities offered by the semantic web and linked data technology. Her recent articles and presentations on linked data and other library metadata and technology subjects are available on her website at http://kcoyle.net/.

Karen's presentation was titled "Libraries and Linked Data," and she discussed the possibilities that linked data provide and showed examples of websites that currently use some form of linked data. Data is moving from separate data stores to shared data space, making it easier to re-use and "mix and match" data. In this sort of data environment, anyone can make connections between data, creating another form of crowdsourcing. Karen pointed out the need for the library community to release our public catalog data (although not acquisitions or patron data) out for use by others, while also using other publicly available data to serve our patrons. While the mix and match concept can be scary for the library community in general because of the lack of standards, Karen showed and discussed the British Library Linked Data Model, which nicely integrates data from various sources. Linked elements diagrams for authors, publication information, and subjects demonstrate how non-MARC data can enrich these areas of a catalog or website. For example, biographical databases, the Virtual International Authority File (VIAF), and Dublin Core can be mined for author data, geographical databases can be mined for place of publication information, and Simple Knowledge Organization System (SKOS) and Medical Subject Headings (MESH) can be used in addition to LCSH for subjects.

Karen demonstrated examples of library systems that are already using linked data. The Swedish National Library's LIBRIS catalog (http://www.kb.se/english/find/regina-libris/services/) and the Food and Agriculture Organization's OpenAGRIS (http://aims.fao.org/openagris) catalog both use linked data for linking out, thus making use of resources outside of the library. Even though the entire LIBRIS catalog system has moved to linked data, the public display is still quite traditional. However, the catalog can link out to data on DBPedia (the linked data version of Wikipedia), id.loc.gov (Library of Congress linked data), MusicBrainz, VIAF (OCLC's Virtual International Authority File), etc. The Swedish National Library no longer feels there is a difference between internal and external data, but rather it is all just data. Karen highly recommended that audience members try the OpenAGRIS catalog for themselves because she thinks it provides a lot of added value that greatly enhances the user's experience. Panels on each side of the article that a user retrieves show relevant related information, such as maps or other links that can add context or provide jumping off points for further exploration. This additional, added

value information is linked from outside sources, such as DBPedia, the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF), the FAO Geopolitical Ontology, the AGRIS serials dataset, and the World Bank.

As an example of libraries using linked data to link into their library catalogs, thus enhancing the "discoverability" of the information stored in the library catalogs, Karen demonstrated how WorldCat and Evergreen have implemented Schema. org. Schema.org was developed by Google, Yahoo, Bing, and Yandex (a Russian search engine), and allows data elements in library catalogs, such as title, author, item location and status, and even services (hold this item for me), to carry outward into the web in html format. Html coding is added for such elements as names, birthdates, and titles, and once this granular information is coded in html format, it is easily searchable and discoverable on the web.

WorldCat (http://www.worldcat.org/) has been experimenting with coding this underlining data since June 2012. Karen used *A Selection of Early Statistical Papers of J. Neyman* (OCLC number 527725) as her WorldCat example. At the bottom of the public display for this title is a plus sign next to the caption 'Linked Data." Clicking on either the plus sign or the caption will expand the panel to reveal the underling linked data for this title. Generally, this data is hidden in the catalog's public display, but it is essential information for discovery beyond the library catalog in the web. To put this linked data to use, OCLC has created a WorldCat Facebook app (https://apps.facebook.com/worldcat).

If you enter an OCLC number into the search box, you will receive the book title as well as information about the book, such as any of the people mentioned in the book, the author, the topics covered in the book etc. This information, drawn from linked data in Wikipedia, DBPedia, and various geographical and other sources, makes it possible to create a rich page full of relevant information based on just an OCLC number. Schema.org linked data also makes it possible for search engines to create "rich snippets" in search return lists. Rich snippets include more than just a title and a link to a webpage, and are common in Google search returns even now. For example, a Google search for "Steve Jobs book" will give you a list of options that include the Amazon Kindle rating for the book (4.5 stars) and the price of the paperback through Barnes and Noble. Karen hopes that someday, through linked data, users can perform a search on the web and be directed to a rich snippet that includes data on the holdings of the book in the user's local library.

Karen also explained the concept of community profiles, using the *RDA Toolkit* as an example. The *RDA Toolkit* allows a library to create and define a workflow that uses only the subset of *RDA Toolkit* materials and data that the library finds necessary. However, many *RDA Toolkit* users will have needs beyond what the basic *Resource Description and Access* (*RDA*) standards and *RDA Toolkit* can provide. These users will want to consult workflow and training materials both within and outside of the Toolkit. Community profiles allow users to reduce, extend, and combine resources that they need, in another example of the "mix and match" possibilities of linked data.

Karen is an engaging speaker, and her slides offer very helpful graphics and website examples to illustrate her points. For this reason, viewing this presentation on the AALL2Go website (http://aall.sclivelearningcenter.com/index.aspx) is recommended.

The large, attentive audience at this program was a testament from the beginning that many law librarians are interested in the possibilities that linked data offers. The questions from the audience and the buzz after the program leave no doubt that many law librarians are excited about and already sold on these possibilities. They now want more practical advice and details about how to implement linked data in their catalogs and websites.

Themes that surfaced during the question and answer period included pushing both local institutions and ILS vendors to start using linked data. Glenn Patton explained some of the OCLC projects that use linked data, including VIAF and the embedded linking identifiers that are used in OCLC's controlled headings function. When asked when libraries can get rid of MARC, Eric felt there would be a transition period, rather than a "cold turkey" abandonment of MARC. He did not feel MARC would disappear within months, but he also did not anticipate that MARC would survive for decades. He felt the transition would occur somewhere in the timeframe in between.

When pressed for details about what practical steps individual catalogers can take right now to prepare for BIBFRAME and linked data, Eric suggested they start reading about both topics and look at websites that use linked data. For programmers, he suggested that they start experimenting with linked data in different environments and on different platforms. It seems that since linked data is still in the experimental stage, practical advice, and details about how to implement it will have to follow in due time.

This program was an excellent introduction to linked data in general and the BIBFRAME project in particular, and it left me and others catalogers in the audience primed and hungry for more practical information about how to implement linked data into our workflows in the future. The handout for this program is freely available on the AALL2Go website (http://aall. sclivelearningcenter.com/index.aspx), while the audio and PowerPoint slides are available for a fee.

Law for the Non-JD Librarian

Jennifer Noga
Wake Forest University Law Library

As a librarian who is relatively new to legal resources and information, I was especially excited to attend "Law for the Non-JD Librarian" sponsored by the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS). The learning curve for the non-JD Librarian who is new to a law school or firm is steep (at least, it has been for me), and every legal educational opportunity helps to make the whole picture a bit less murky. This educational program definitely lived up to expectations in that regard. Ajaye Bloomstone (Louisiana State University) acted as coordinator and moderator of the program. Francis X. Norton, Jr. (Loyola University College of Law) and Heather Casey (Georgetown University Law Library) were the presenters with Norton focusing on U.S. legal resources and Casey discussing resources for foreign, comparative, and international law.

Norton began the program with an overview of the U.S. legal system and its history and basis in English common law. He then discussed primary sources of law, giving the audience easy ways to remember concepts, i.e. think of statutes as broad big ideas and regulations as the details and rules. He explained these are rearranged into codes and how publishers print annotated codes that are more current and have value added in footnotes to cases. He also briefly explained other primary sources of law on the local level. An overview of case law was next as he summarized the court system. He covered secondary sources, touching on Restatements, digests, and law journals and reviews. Norton then broadly addressed the question of how to conduct legal research, pointing out resources that are applicable at the federal, state, and local levels.

Was some of this a review (depending upon your background and years of experience)? Yes. However for me, it is helpful and even necessary to revisit these concepts regularly. Also, Norton presented the overview in a fun way with a fresh and engaging perspective that made the content interesting and enjoyable.

The second half of the program was an introduction to foreign, comparative, and international law (FCIL - as I learned). My first thought was that this part probably wouldn›t be as useful to me. But as Casey explained the concepts and related resources, I realized this area of law is increasing in importance in legal education and therefore law libraries. She explained that *foreign* refers to the law of other countries, *international* to the laws governing relations between nations, and *comparative* is the scholarly study of the differences between legal systems. Casey gave an overview of the varied foundations of the laws of other countries as well as the differences in legal publishing between countries. She talked about resources to use for finding FCIL materials and what sources to look for. Lastly, she went over some online subscription sources for finding FCIL information.

Overall, this program was interesting, informative, and useful to anyone who is a non-JD librarian working in law library. Those of us working in Technical Services or other non-reference functions must have a basis of understanding about the materials we work with every day. A program like this goes a long to increase that understanding and help us do our jobs more effectively.

American Indian Law: Access and Collections

Jonathan Tuttle
College of William and Mary Law Library

Moderated by Catherine Kellett (Yale Law School), presenters included Eugenia Charles-Newton (Texas Tech University School of Law); David Selden (National Indian Law Library); Sherri Nicole Thomas (University of New Mexico School of Law); and Robert Anderson (University of Washington School of Law).

Eugenia Charles-Newton began the session on American Indian law by quoting from an article entitled "Lessons from the Third Sovereign" by Sandra Day O'Connor. "Today, in the United States," wrote O'Connor, "we have three types of sovereign entities—the federal government, the States, and the Indian tribes." Charles-Newton suggested law libraries should reflect the existence of these three sovereign entities by making an effort to collect and provide access to tribal law materials. While many libraries may already have resources on federal Indian law—federal laws that relate to Native Americans—they may have experienced difficulty in collecting tribal law, those laws created by the individual tribes to govern their own sovereign nations.

Charles-Newton offered a brief history of tribal sovereignty, demonstrating that throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the independence of the tribes—while always regulated by the federal government—was gradually eroded by encroaching state power. Late in the twentieth century, the trend shifted back to fuller Indian sovereignty, and in 2010, Congress issued the Tribal Law and Order Act, which increased the sentencing authority of tribal courts. As Robert Anderson noted in his presentation however, with the increased authority, came the provision that the tribes' criminal laws, rules of evidence, and rules of criminal procedure must be made publicly available.

Although more tribal law will thus be published, collecting that law will likely remain a challenge. In her presentation, Sherri Nicole Thomas compared the variety and abundance of tribal law to that of municipal law and explained that many tribes simply lack the resources for an internal library able to make their law permanently available. She suggested the Native American Rights Fund assist the tribes in bringing their laws to law libraries around the world.

David Selden has overseen the collection of tribal law materials at the Native American Rights Fund as Director of the National Indian Law Library. Selden offered the following three suggestions for tribal law collection development: (1) purchase print when available (which will be limited); (2) seek copies of laws directly from the tribes (which might be time-consuming); and (3) establish electronic connections to the law from reliable sources (likely the easiest option). Westlaw collects the opinions of 21 tribal courts as well as the codes of 24 tribes. The National Indian Law Library itself has over 90 full text codes and over 230 in print. Over 50 tribes have published their codes on their official websites, links to which are aggregated with many other tribal law resources at http://www.narf.org/nill/triballaw.

If a law library has gathered a collection of tribal law materials, it must still provide access to that collection through a logical organization. In 2012, the Library of Congress released the final draft of the KIA-KIX classification schedule on the law of indigenous peoples of the Americas. The subclass removes American tribal law from the KF subclass, thus emphasizing the sovereignty of the tribes. The Library of Congress has begun classifying new materials in KIA-KIX, and Charles-Newton recommended that law libraries do the same once the schedule is available on Classification Web. Even just the placement of tribal law within its own subclass, said Charles-Newton, can serve as a reminder to students that the tribes exist as the third sovereign in the United States.

Program Report

Off the Page and Beyond the Book: New Models for Buying and Selling Legal Information

Sabrina Sondhi
Columbia Law School Library

We're all familiar with the traditional model: publishers print books for a set price, and libraries buy them. With the advent of e-books, this model has been questioned. Must e-books be sold for single-user access? What if a user only needs part of an e-book? Should e-books automatically update themselves? This panel proposed to discuss (1) the prevailing models and (2) how traditional ways of thinking about physical books affect how vendors and librarians treat electronic legal information. Over 250 conference attendees crowded into the room to hear what these speakers had to say.

The core message is our need to distance ourselves from the paper metaphor when thinking about electronic legal information. Vendors continue to price and package titles as if they are equivalent to their print counterparts; librarians continue to hold down costs by cutting titles. Instead, we should discuss what we *want* e-books to be, both now and in the future. For example, imagine a looseleaf equivalent that's always up-to-date (but still has time-stamped old editions). Imagine primary legal materials released at low or no cost directly by the state governments rather than by print publishers. Imagine e-book content personalized and targeted to a specific firm, practice group, or law school course. Imagine consortiums sharing resources regardless of their geographic location, ILS, or loan rules.

The speakers did not always agree on what the future should hold, but they agreed that if the consumers of legal e-books demand something, the publishers are likely to listen (and at least consider the idea). The moderator of the panel, Ed Walters (Fastcase) emphasized that back-and-forth dialogue between publishers and libraries was key. Since both groups were at the convention and interested in what the other had to say, Walters argued that, collectively, we have the power to make e-books into whatever we want them to be.

Aside from its valuable content, this presentation was one of the most successful examples I have ever seen of blending traditional live speakers with pre-recorded video. In addition to the panel of speakers—Scott Meiser (LexisNexis), Jean O'Grady (DLA Piper), and Jason Wilson (Jones McClure Publishing)—six speakers had pre-recorded 60-90 second

statements on one or more aspects of the issue. These speakers hailed from the following diverse cross-section of libraries: David Mao (Law Library of Congress), Julie Tessmer (Wisconsin State Law Library), Steve Lastres (Debevoise & Plimpton LLP), Elizabeth Farrell (Florida State University), Sarah Glassmeyer (CALI), and Bob Nissenbaum (Fordham Law School). Furthermore, in addition to a Question & Answer period, the audience had the opportunity to interact with and ask questions of the panelists (both live and recorded) throughout the presentation via the speakers' twitter handles, which were posted prominently. All in all, this was an excellent panel and—if you missed it—might be worth the $15 price tag for streaming it on the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) website.

Program Report

Mass Digitization in Law Libraries: Obstacles and Opportunities

Abigail Bibee
University of Michigan Law Library

Presenters: Speaker: David Hansen, University of California-Berkeley School of Law
Moderator: Dean Rowan, University of California School of Law Library

The speaker, David Hansen, is a Digital Library Fellow with the Berkeley Digital Library Copyright Project. He discussed digitization in libraries and examined current case law involving libraries and digitization, including Hathi Trust and Google Books. If these lawsuits have deterred libraries from embarking on their own digitization projects, Hansen encouraged librarians that copyright does not have to be a scary topic. His presentation examined the rights and protections afforded libraries in copyright law found in Title 17 of the United States Code, specifically §107 and §108, fair use and reproduction by libraries and archives respectively.

A considerable portion of the program discussed the hot topic of orphan works, which are works under copyright, but the owner of the copyright cannot be found. Hansen argued, if properly researched, fair use is a legitimate argument for digitizing orphan works and should not be considered copyright infringement.

He outlined the following four principles supporting this belief for academic and research libraries:

(1) Academic libraries digitize works to support research, scholarship, and teaching;
(2) The nature of the works being digitized are scholarly and specialized. The purpose of the work is to convey information, which is not what copyright law was designed to protect;
(3) Although digitizing entire books could weaken libraries' claim of fair use, enough of the work must be digitized for it to be useable; and
(4) Orphan works have no effect on the market because the owner cannot be found.

To assist libraries trying to manage the risks of digitization, Hansen outlined a few helpful resources. He is currently designing a best practices guide for digitizing orphan works. Additionally, the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) is developing a code of best practices for digitization in academic and research libraries, which has been vetted by a legal team.

This program was different from others I attended at the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting 2013. It consisted of a single speaker who lectured for the entire program with no interactive audience participation until the question session at the end. Yet, it was one of the best programs I attended at the conference and serves as an important reminder that traditional programs can still be of value to the conference and its attendees.

Program Report

Hot Topic: Rethinking the Cloud: Legal Aspects of Cloud Solutions

Karen Selden
University of Colorado
William A. Wise Law Library

Presented by Danielle Conway and George Pike

This program was a very appropriate Hot Topic choice, and the content and presenters did not disappoint. Program coordinator and moderator Keiko Okuhara, Bibliographic Services and Systems Librarian at the University of Hawaii's William S. Richardson School of Law's Library, structured this 60 minute program to first feature an overview of and introduction to cloud computing, including both technical and legal issues. The second half of the program featured a very interactive

discussion of risk management and ethical issues related to using cloud computing in law firms, as well as legal strategies for cloud computing implementation in both law firms and libraries. The presenters were George Pike and Danielle Conway, and their biographies are available on the program's handout, which is freely available on the AALL2Go website at http://aall.sclivelearningcenter.com/index.aspx.

George Pike is the Director of the Barco Law Library and Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Pittsburgh School of Law. George provided the overview of and introduction to cloud computing. While some of this content was fairly technical in nature, George provided fun analogies to actual clouds on his slides and in his presentation. The definition of cloud computing is using the Internet to do what you do on your computer. With cloud computing, there is no on-site hardware or software, and some think of this as "renting" computer space online. Others compare cloud computing to using a public utility, like getting electricity from your electric company. The five essential characteristics of cloud computing are as follows: (1) on demand self-service; (2) broad network access; (3) resource pooling; (4) rapid elasticity; and (5) measured service.

George also described the three layers of the cloud. The **Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS)** layer is the base layer, which provides the computing infrastructure, such as storage, routers, and firewalls. The **Platform as a Service (PaaS)** layer is the intermediate layer, where clients use the provider's web platforms and infrastructure to create their own applications and products. Thus, the PaaS layer is considered more of a development layer than an end-user layer. In contrast, the **Software as a Service (SaaS)** layer is the consumer use layer, where web-based services are provided directly and seamlessly to end-users. ILS software is an example of SaaS.

The four types of cloud environments are as follows: (1) Private (not usually a cost savings, but higher control and privacy for the customer); (2) Public (for example, Dropbox); (3) Community (for example, a university's e-mail system); and (4) Hybrid (a combination of any of the other three, but usually a private and community combination). The reasons for using cloud computing include the following: (1) cost savings (of not having to purchase servers, etc.); (2) flexibility; (3) scalability; (4) capability; (5) tech support (which can be done remotely, reducing or eliminating the workload of the local IT staff); and (6) redundancy (backing up data). Concerns of using cloud computing include (1) reliability; (2) availability of services; (3) complexity; (4) questions of how much cost savings; (5) lack of standards and protocols within the industry; (6) ownership and security of data; (7) control (within and throughout the layers); and (8) legal issues.

George introduced two hypothetical situations and encouraged the audience to identify the legal issues each presented. The first was using Dropbox for grading student papers, and the second was moving the local ILS to the cloud. Issues raised and discussed included the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), privacy, loss of data, and jurisdiction. George's general list of legal issues related to cloud computing include the following: (1) privacy; (2) confidentiality; (3) data security; (4) jurisdictional issues (where is the data stored?); (5) copyright ownership and compliance; and (6) regulatory compliance.

Specific legal issues for librarians' use of cloud computing include the following: (1) FERPA (student rights related to their data, especially grades); (2) the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) (for health related records of students); (3) the Sarbanes-Oxley Act; (4) state library record laws (especially those concerned with confidentiality issues); and (5) licensing agreements with cloud computing companies (which should include privacy and jurisdictional issues). George is very knowledgeable about this subject area and made the technical information he presented quite accessible; if you are interested in more detail about the technical aspects of cloud computing, viewing this presentation on the AALL2Go website (http://aall.sclivelearningcenter.com/index.aspx) is recommended.

Danielle Conway is a Professor of Law at the University of Hawaii at Manoa School of Law. She is an extremely dynamic and engaging presenter and, having been a practicing attorney, extremely knowledgeable about how to address cloud computing issues within a law firm environment. Her program consisted of in-depth discussions of hypothetical situations (mostly within law firm settings), which resulted in a great deal of audience participation and many concrete risk management strategies. The first hypothetical, and the one that most of the discussion focused on, was the following: "I am the Managing Director of a Honolulu Law Firm and would like to implement a cloud-based online client portal. We have branch offices in Europe and Asia. What are some fundamental issues I will need to address before proposing such a service to the firm's Executive Advisory Committee?"

This wide ranging discussion touched on many issues. Jurisdictional issues include where the branch offices are located, as well as where the server is located. An attorney/client privilege breach could occur if the service was hacked. These are among the reasons that large firms are not as interested in cloud computing systems. Larger firms can afford in-house IT solutions that do not expose them to so much risk. However, small firms tend to embrace cloud computing solutions more readily to save money. Danielle identified the fundamental issues raised by this hypothetical as (1) Confidentiality (privacy; data ownership and control); (2) Security (due diligence for data protection and preservation; electronic signatures; biometric and webcam authentication; and pre-server upload encryption); and (3) Efficiency (cost benefit analysis; multiparty document

collaboration; document storage; calendaring; searchable filing systems; client reports, online invoicing, credit card bill payment procedures; forms; and conflict checks).

Concrete advice from this discussion included carefully examining all boilerplate Service Level Agreements (SLA). In addition, ensure that licensing agreements specify hefty financial penalties for the service provider if problems arise, since it is risky to rely solely on legal remedies to these problems. A varied patchwork of United States legislation exists to protect online privacy. And while European Union (EU) laws concerning online privacy are currently stronger than laws in the United States, the EU laws are under review and likely to be relaxed to be more friendly to service providers.

Another in-depth discussion revolved around the use of client information for business development and marketing efforts. Trying to aggregate or make data anonymous seemed risky, while use of disclosure forms seemed a bit heavy handed. From Danielle's experience, Client Advisory Boards offer a good solution for this situation and for helping to vet other confidentiality issues.

Danielle also discussed the ethical issues for attorneys who are dealing with cloud computing services. She reviewed applicable American Bar Association (ABA) ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct that cover competence, confidentiality, and duty to supervise third parties. In the area of competence, Rule 1.1 stipulates that a lawyer shall provide competent representation to a client, and was updated in 2012 to specifically include maintaining the requisite knowledge of the benefits and risks associated with relevant technology. An example of how to comply with this rule is using due diligence when reviewing service level agreements (SLA) for cloud computing services.

For the area of confidentiality, Rule 1.6(a) stipulates that a lawyer shall not reveal information relating to the representation of a client. This rule was updated in 2012 to include preventing the inadvertent or unauthorized disclosure of, or unauthorized access to, information relating to the representation of a client, as well as safeguarding such information against unauthorized access by third parties. Once again, due diligence in reviewing any SLA is applicable, as well as providing informed consent to clients, and possibly creating a Client Advisory Board.

Finally, Rule 5.3 covers the duty to supervise third parties by stipulating that a lawyer may use non-lawyers outside of the firm for various services, and specifically mentions document management companies that create and maintain databases. The use of well-crafted contracts with cloud computing vendors will demonstrate a reasonable effort to comply with this rule.

Danielle listed six risk management strategies. First, avoid boilerplate contracts and licenses, and instead negotiate the terms of service and use of SaaS cloud computing services. Second, review and update the firm's privacy policies. Third, draft express language in retainer agreements about confidentiality and security of client data and information. Fourth, be aware of your industry's best practices using cloud computing technology. Fifth, maintain appropriate insurance, with express coverage for compromises in data security. Finally, run a cost benefit analysis of free versus paid cloud services, although generally free services will be too risky.

Danielle ended her presentation with the following six strategies and best practices for using cloud computing services; (1) Conduct due diligence in both selecting a service provider and selecting a platform; (2) Establish a Client Advisory Board; (3) Keep clients informed; (4) Err on the side of disclosure to clients; (5) Negotiate the terms of use and service, especially for remedies in the event of crashes, breaches, data corruption, business interruption, or destruction of data. Finally, investigate the potential for cloud computing partners (as opposed to service providers), possibly under a community cloud model with other firms or like organizations.

In response to a question from the audience about use of a cloud-based ILS, both George and Danielle stressed the need to bring in the parent organization's general counsel to review the contract and to include remedies for any data breaches.

Both speakers were very well-suited to their roles in this program. The program featured very concrete advice and strategies for cloud computing implementation, and is especially relevant for those working in law firm environments. For these reasons, viewing this program on the AALL2Go website (http://aall.sclivelearningcenter.com/index.aspx) is highly recommended for librarians interested in learning more about cloud computing in the legal information field, and especially for law firm librarians who work in firms considering or currently implementing cloud computing solutions. The handout for this program is freely available on the AALL2Go website at http://aall.sclivelearningcenter.com/index.aspx, while the audio and PowerPoint slides are available for a fee.

Program Report

Implement/Access an E-book Collection in a Law Library

Deborah Dennison
Case Western Reserve

A panel of speakers, moderated by Ralph A. Monaco (New York Law Institute), presented an overview on acquiring e-books in libraries as well as discussing attendant issues (e.g., platforms, pricing models, etc.). Of interest to every library, this program was well attended, and provided a good discussion about an e-landscape that is much in flux.

Presentations were organized so that the first speaker and program coordinator, Ellyssa Kroski (Practising Law Institute), began the program with an excellent primer on everything e-book, an informative overview for librarians novice to experienced. She outlined the array of challenges in adding e-books to a library's collection, including different practices among vendors and interfaces, the variety of e-book devices and e-book formats, software installation and firewalls, and mediated loan issues. Giving an overview on who and what e-book aggregators, publishers, and wholesalers are, she then spoke about technical and other questions libraries should ask of vendors, described various access and pricing models, and gave specific examples of the combination of e-book strategies libraries are employing (e.g., direct purchase or though aggregators, access through library memberships, highlighting existing collections, even creating their own e-books).

Jeremy Sullivan spoke next about DLA Piper Law Firm's approach to e-books solutions. The firm began considering the use of e-books in 2011. Observing e-book publishing trends and considering that attorneys were already using e-devices, librarians were proactive about adding e-books to the firm's collection and practice. As manager of research services, Jeremy noted, "[W]e are the book people, shouldn't we be doing the evaluation of e-books?"

An exploration of the topic included defining an e-book in terms of law practice needs and usage, as well as questions about portability versus connectivity. Consideration of the 3X factor–those available in print, in databases, and now e-books—is critical in determining which resources the firm might really need. For the latter, deskbooks were chosen over treatises because the portability factor translates well, a reduction in library upkeep, instant updating, and they have the appearance of cutting edge. Jeremy's recommendations included finding out attorneys' interest in e-books, evaluating platforms carefully, trial testing a single title, and creating a work flow for the roll-out process.

Jerome Sayward discussed e-books in an academic library setting at Fordham. Carefully considering collection development, scholarly monographs were selected as a good starting point for e-book format for the following reasons: (1) good publisher and vendor management; (2) simpler products than most practice-based materials (e.g., no updating); and (3) typical lack of online versions available. Jerome also spoke of a concern every library shares to some extent—the balance between print and e-books in the collection. For now, his library continues to add print monographs despite e-book availability for the same title. The library will prudently monitor a time to decrease print expenditures in favor of e-book purchases. Jerome also discussed the advantages of utilizing a Patron Driven Acquisitions (PDA) plan, a justintime solution to which many libraries are turning.

Last speaker David Swords (EBL) discussed Demand Driven Acquisitions (DDAs) for this rapidly changing e-book environment. Many agree with David that DDAs will change the whole practice of libraries. David discussed the DDA collection development rationale in an entirely use-based world. DDAs directly involve the patron in the selection process, and load the OPAC with scholarly selections while simultaneously saving costs to the library. David described basic DDA terminology and process, customizations (e.g., settings for auto-purchase), and consortium models.

Gleaned from the speakers, and most decidedly librarians' own experiences with e-book packages, there are no perfect solutions now. Take-aways include the following: (1) thoughtfully evaluating e-book packages and their usefulness to your clientele; (2) creating a work flow for the roll out process; (3) promoting the products; and (4) above all, librarians should continue to communicate with providers and publishers on better solutions for uniform standards, platforms, pricing models, etc.

Program Report

Beyond Digitization: Designing and Marketing a Collaborative Online Experience Using the Tokyo War Crimes Trial Papers

Sallie Smith
University of Pittsburgh Barco Law Library

How do you bring to life the stories contained in boxes of archival material? And how can you tell those stories to users of all levels while preserving the underlying scholarly content? Co-presenters Elizabeth Ladner and Loren Moulds addressed those questions in Session I-2, Beyond Digitization: Designing and Marketing a Collaborative Online Experience Using the Tokyo War Crimes Trial Papers. The session was aimed at those interested in marketing their collections, building innovative discovery tools using new technologies, and creating collaborative opportunities both in the classroom and with outside institutions.

The presentation centered on the University of Virginia (UVA) Law Library's first major digitization initiative using the collection's unique personal papers of Frank S. Tavenner Jr, a 1927 UVA law school graduate. Tavenner served as Acting Chief Prosecutor, International Prosecution Section, of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East (informally known as the Tokyo War Crimes trial). This treasure trove of more than 20,000 original documents offered a valuable glimpse into the events that helped shape international legal standards against aggression. The collection was well-organized and highly used, but the fragile onion skin paper of the 1940s was deteriorating and needed to be preserved for future generations.

Project Director Elizabeth Ladner explained the overarching vision was to bring the collection to life by creating an accessible, interactive, informative, and collaborative portal offering content for every level of user. Initial project considerations determined that (1) this was a manageable project in terms of time and cost; (2) digitization would add value to the collection; (3) the Law Library had the rights to post the material online; and (4) the project would complement and invite collaborative opportunities with other institutions holding similar collections.

Document scanning began by utilizing the digitization services of the main UVA library. Transporting materials back and forth was not ideal, however, and the Law Library quickly decided to gain total control over their project by creating an in-house digitization lab. Digital Collections Librarian Loren Moulds helped organize and furnish the dedicated workspace with a movable bed scanner and other necessary equipment. Library staff developed a digitization workflow, created a naming schema to track the images, wrote detailed procedures for scanning and image storage, and used student workers to help with the project.

With the images "in hand," library staff faced the task of making them Internet deliverable. They chose CONTENTdm, a customizable out-of-the-box tool to store, manage and deliver the digital collection to the Web. The scanned TIFFs were converted to JPEG, uploaded to the host server, and Dublin core metadata was added. The digital collection was now Web accessible and searchable, but did not yet meet the goal of providing an exciting and interactive digital "exhibit" for scholars and other interested users.

Digging deeper into his technical toolbox, Moulds created a Tokyo War Crimes Trial website using Go Daddy (for domain registrar and web hosting), Structured Query Language (SQL), and a Drupal interface. To search, browse, and view the library's CONTENTdm collection from within the website, he used Mark Jordan's CONTENTdm Integration Drupal modules. With these enhancements, the digital collection was well on its way to becoming a holistic system of rich, interactive content showcasing the people and events of the two-and-a-half-year trial that set significant precedence for international law.

Relevant to both scholars and history buffs, the site provides descriptive narratives, a photo gallery of individuals involved in the trial, customized exhibits on topics related to the trial (such as biological warfare and women's involvement), embedded videos which can be shared via social networking websites, and references to similar collections at the University of Virginia as well as other institutions.

More collaborative opportunities emerged when an Associated Press article publicized the UVA Law Library digitization project. Family members of those who had served in the war offered personal stories and photographs, such as the relative of a man who drove the defendants each day from the jail to the courtroom.

The UVA Law Library's Tokyo War Crimes Trial Digital Exhibit, at http://lib.law.virginia.edu/imtfe/about, is a work in progress with plans to add more content and new features to enhance interactive learning opportunities. Website visitors are encouraged to check back often to experience online this fascinating but lesser known chapter in history. Shaped by philosophies of outreach and advocacy, this UVA Law Library online experience is an exemplary template for librarians looking to develop their collections into educational discovery tools.

**Renee D. Chapman Award for Outstanding Contributions
in Technical Services Law Librarianship**

Sally Wambold
University of Richmond

Thank you to the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) for the Chapman Award and to my Director, Timothy Coggins, who nominated me. I am overwhelmed to join the group of librarians who have received this award because I hold every one of them in the highest regard. I hope that my TS-SIS colleagues know that I value all Technical Services librarians. Our work is demanding and challenging. When I joined the group of students studying the block library courses at Chapel Hill in August 1978*, I registered as someone who wanted to become a technical services librarian. It is with deep gratitude that I have realized my dream.

Further, my esteem for librarians is global. All areas of librarianship are important in my mind. I have heroes in every department of libraries and in every type of library. What better profession is there? Librarians provide an enormously important service, as we must recognize. The knowledge we seek to make accessible to all is fascinating to us as well. This I believe.

I regret to disappoint anyone by not being here in person. I have health concerns that make me reluctant to venture far from home.

So, again I thank TS-SIS for the award and Tim for his confidence in me; but I also thank the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) and all its entities, including the Online Bibliographic Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS), the Academic Law Libraries Special Interest Section (ALL-SIS), the Social Responsibilities Special Interest Section (SR-SIS), the committees on which I have worked, the Virginia Association of Law Libraries (VALL), and the Southeastern Chapter of AALL (SEAALL) for the opportunities they have given me. Before I end, I must also express appreciation in memory of my mentor Anne Cresap, a most elegant, intelligent librarian who gave generously of her time and experience.

Thank you more than I can ever express for the Chapman Award.

*P.S. My group of entering students at Chapel Hill was nicknamed The Blockheads. That piece of trivia may not be appropriate for my acceptance remarks, but I hoped to make you smile by sharing it with you.