Welcome to the March 2015 issue of the Technical Services Law Librarian (TSLL)! As this issue was being prepared, news broke about the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Executive Board making the decision to eliminate funding for a number of representatives to other library organizations, including the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), the Subject Analysis Committee (SAC), and the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC). The Technical Services (TS) and Online Bibliographic Services (OBS) Boards have prepared a response concerning this shortsighted decision. This issue of TSLL has some examples of how the representatives serve us: Jean Pajerek provides an excellent review of recent proposals and decisions by MAC. In addition, in the TechScans column, Jean discusses her experience with the “Jane-athon” pre-conference workshop at the American Library Association’s Midwinter Meeting, which she attended as our representative to the MAC. This decision by the AALL Executive Board and our response is being discussed on the TSLAWCHATS Facebook page—if you are not a member of that group on Facebook, now would be a good time to join.

This issue of TSLL has several new columnists and others who have switched responsibilities. Aaron Kuperman (Library of Congress) has switched from writing the Subject Headings column to helping co-author the Classification column. Aaron wrote the Subject Headings column for over 14 years, and I am very appreciative of his willingness to help with the Classification column. Our new Subject Headings columnist is Patrick Lavey (UCLA)—check out Patrick’s comments on subject headings. This issue also has the first MARC Remarks column written by our new MAC representative, Jean Pajerek (Cornell). Finally, Sarah Lin (Reed Smith) is now helping co-author the Private Law Libraries column.

Speaking of the Private Law Libraries column, Sarah’s comments are thought-provoking to those who have invested a lot of time and effort into our catalogs. I would encourage you to read her column and ponder her conclusions. Then, I suggest you read Dan Blackaby’s column on the Internet, in which Dan discusses digital resources and bibliographic control. The two columns complement each other, even though there was no intention or pre-coordination to do this.
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After a tough Winter full of wild weather (especially for our New England friends and colleagues), I think most of us (the exception being dedicated cross-country skiers, like my husband) are anticipating the advent of Spring and all the possibilities that the new season holds. This is the time of year when we transition from snowbanks the size of small houses and temperatures worthy of the North Pole (check out some of the Facebook TSLAWCHATS pictures and posts on those topics) to the many literal and figurative forms of March Madness and “Spring training” activities in our personal and professional lives. Those activities might include: watching the actual college basketball tournament or professional baseball’s Spring training camps; preparing for the hectic and fast-approaching end of the academic year; finishing those pesky tax returns and other home- or work-based projects; Spring cleaning, both at home and at work; and preparing for Spring outdoor fun (gardening, running, walking, hiking, fishing, bird watching, baseball, softball, etc.). In a similar fashion, I want to use this quarter’s column to review the Winter activities of the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS) and look forward to some Spring events.

The OBS Education Committee continued to remain active after learning that the following three program proposals from committee members were selected to be presented at the 2015 American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting in Philadelphia: (1) BIBFRAME: How Did We Get Here and Where Are We Going?; (2) Google Analytics: Using the Software, Using the Data; and (3) Striking a Balance in Your Library: TMI vs. TL1 in the Catalog. In November 2014, OBS Education Committee member Sarah Morris Lin, with feedback from the committee, proposed a two-part User-Friendly Library Websites webinar for inclusion in AALL’s 2015 Monthly Educational Webinars series. The proposal was accepted, and the webinars (with Sarah serving as the moderator) will be broadcast free of charge to pre-registered AALL members in March and April 2015. Please see the AALL Webinars page (http://www.aallnet.org/mm/Education/webinars) for more details and to register. In late February, the committee submitted two “Hot Topic” program ideas to the 2015 AALL Annual Meeting Program Committee: Recruiting and Equipping Law Librarians to Lead Lean and the National Information Standards Organization’s (NISO) new Open Discovery Initiative. Looking ahead to OBS- and Technical Services (TS)-focused programming for the 2016 AALL Annual Meeting in Chicago, two OBS Education Committee members have been chosen to serve on 2016 Annual Meeting Program Committee Content Area Teams: Pat Sayre-McCoy will serve on the Data and Content Management team, and Sarah Morris Lin will serve on the Leadership, Administration and Career Development Team. Thanks to the efforts of the entire OBS Education Committee, some very practical, timely, and useful programming for OBS and TS members will be offered online this Spring, in Philadelphia in July 2015, and in Chicago in July 2016.

Similarly, the Task Force to Revise the Procedures and Guidelines of the OBS/TS Joint Research Grant continues to be active in order to implement the recommendations it made in its Fall 2014 report. Toward this end, the task force is holding an online Name that Grant contest through March 16. For more details and to enter the contest, see http://www.namecontests.com/cmqcjev2.

OBS OCLC Committee Chair Jackie Magagnosc is finishing her two-year term in July 2015, so watch the OBS listserv for the call for nominations to fill this important position. In the meantime, if you are interested in knowing what this position entails, please refer to the committee’s homepage at http://www.aallnet.org/sections/obs/Committees/OCLC-Committee or contact Jackie or me directly.

Last, but certainly not least, it is my pleasure to announce the winners of the February 2015 OBS Executive Board election. Please join me in congratulating these newly elected OBS officers:

**Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect:**
Calmer Chattoo
Serials/Electronic Resources/Special Formats Catalog Librarian
University of Miami School of Law Library

**Secretary/Treasurer:**
Melanie Cornell
Systems Librarian
University of New Hampshire School of Law
Member at Large:
Jackie Magagnosc
Continuations Management Librarian
Cornell University Law Library

I also want to give heartfelt thanks to: candidates Jessica Hanes, Kevin Carey, and Jason LeMay for being willing to run for office; OBS Immediate Past Chair Katrina Piechnik for administering the election; the 61 OBS members who took the time to cast their ballots; and the OBS Nominations Committee (Chaired by Betty Roeske, who worked with Keiko Okuhara, Brian Striman, and Barbara Szalkowski) for delivering a terrific slate of candidates for the election.

As always, I want to encourage and support all OBS members to participate in OBS activities to the extent that their time and interest allows. Watch the OBS listserv for news and chances to become involved, and please don’t hesitate to contact me or any other OBS Board member to share ideas, questions, concerns, or feedback.

Happy Spring to all, and enjoy your personal and professional March Madness or Spring training activities!

Karen Selden
University of Colorado

From the Chair

For some of you, the sense of isolation is much more physical this Winter. Snows have blanketed the northeast in a relentless succession, making commutes impossible. Strains on our time and energy also contribute to our isolation. To be clear, retrenchments into our daily work and away from the bigger community are absolutely necessary. We might quarantine a couple of hours to grapple with universal implications and alternatives to “Laws, etc.,” but then we must re-engage with the priorities of the institutions that fund our paychecks.

I’m not so naïve to think that this tension between local exigencies and larger professional leadership isn’t cyclical and proper, but what I perceive is a pervasive change from a cycle to a spiral. We do come back to engage broader issues and professional concerns, but not quite at the same level or place or in the same numbers.

Every couple of weeks, I am trying to find someone to volunteer for this or that opportunity (write for Technical Services Law Librarian, blog for Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS), run for SIS office, join a committee, scout out delivery methods for professional education, develop a program, etc.). So, admittedly, I’m in a position to talk to more of my colleagues this year than I ever have been. What strikes me is how many of us are in flux. How many of us start with disclaimers like: “We are down a couple of positions” or “I don’t do much cataloging anymore” or “I’m leaving the field.”

Isolation.

To my colleagues who want to do more, please contact me. It is my error if you are on the sidelines eager to join and haven’t been contacted. I truly don’t know everyone, and even those that I do, I’m sure I don’t know all your professional interests and talents. I have something for you! Even though the volunteer survey has closed, please contact me if you wish to volunteer—we want you and need you to chip in.

To my colleagues who are overwhelmed by new duties, what do you need? You shouldn’t feel like you must absorb it all alone. Neither should you feel that you need to learn it all by yourself. Let’s exchange ideas. Honestly, I’ve always loved the managers’ meetings because I learn that the crazy stuff in my life isn’t unique to me. TS-SIS now has video conferencing software that allows us to interact and conduct virtual meetings and training.

To my colleagues who are no longer cataloging or doing preservation or buying print materials, what is pushing those duties out of your portfolio? Is it time for a summit on the state of cataloging/preservation/purchasing in law libraries? Can someone do research on outsourcing trends in special libraries? There is power in the collective.

To all of us, don’t forget about the mentoring program, MentorMatch (http://community.aallnet.org/mentoring/aboutmentormatch/). MentorMatch allows you to seek out a mentor or a mentee that fits your needs. Just want someone
doing acquisitions in a law firm? We have limiters for that search. The involvement and commitment is what you make of it. If you only want to talk for a couple of months with a seasoned supervisor while you work through a start-up or a particular situation, then do so. There’s no institutional expectation that matches will last a year or six months or any other number of days. It’s all up to the partners.

Best,
Suzanne

Suzanne Graham
University of Georgia

---

**Statements Supporting the AALL Representative Program**

*Editor’s Note: The following four statements have been issued to the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Executive Board in response to their decision to end the AALL representative program to such groups as the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), the Subject Analysis Committee (SAC), and the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC).*

**Statement Approved by the Executive Boards of the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) and the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS)**

To: Holly Riccio, President, American Association of Law Libraries, Members of the American Association of Law Libraries Executive Board, Kate Hagan, Executive Director, American Association of Law Libraries
From: Suzanne Graham, Chair Technical Services Special Interest Section on behalf of the TS-SIS Executive Board, Karen Selden, Chair of Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section on behalf of the OBS-SIS Executive Board
Subject: AALL Funding for Three Technical Services Representatives
Date: March 13, 2015

The Executive Boards of the Technical Services Special Interest Section and Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section of American Association of Law Libraries respectfully disagree with the AALL Executive Board decision to discontinue its support for AALL representatives to technical services committees of the American Library Association (ALA) and MARC Steering Group. The TS-SIS and OBS-SIS Executive Boards highly value the work and dedication of our liaisons, who serve as valuable links between law catalogers and three influential and active committees of the larger cataloging community.

We believe that the work of these groups goes beyond our library catalogs and grapples with the future of access to information. Their discussions are more than fields, semantics, and punctuation. They are redefining which data points are critical to discovery, how to uniquely identify and parse them, and how to best represent them in the evolving Semantic Web. We feel that the special nature of the materials we handle demands our presence in these deliberations.

The current decade is a transformative one for libraries: we adopted a new set of description standards, continue to create new taxonomies for relationships and genres, and now look to a new linked data based framework for encoding our descriptions. We would hope that the AALL Executive Board would continue to support official representatives through this period of major transition.

In the past two years our representatives to ALA’s Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) have proposed major revisions to the cataloging code *Resource Description and Access (RDA)*. These proposals have been adopted by the wider community and have resulted in significant improvements to the cataloging of treaties and compilations of laws. This kind of direct influence on shared standards is only possible because AALL has a recognized seat at the table.

Our MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) representative is a full, voting member. Continued presence on this committee is critical as we believe this group will oversee the pivotal transition from the MARC encoding format to the new BIBFRAME model.

Thanks to the efforts of our representative to ALA’s Subject Analysis Committee (SAC), the law community became the first specialized area to devise and implement Library of Congress-approved genre headings, allowing us to separate books...
about laws from actual codes and statutes. These new terms enhance discoverability of resources in our faceted catalogs. Our representative marshalled our trailblazing work three years ahead of the art and literature communities and two years ahead of the music community.

Our current AALL representatives help to set the agendas of the meetings they attend and actively participate in the real-time discussion of cataloging reform. The expertise of the liaisons is greatly appreciated, and actively sought after, by these groups. Without official association recognition, they will no longer be party to closed sessions nor will they be able to submit reports to inform the committees of the activities and discussions of law catalogers.

Membership on each of the committees varies, but we wish to underscore that our liaison program is not unique. Many smaller and similarly-sized organizations support representatives on these same committees. We believe the Board’s decision disadvantages the interests of law libraries compared to the support given by the Music Library Association, Art Libraries Society of North America, Special Libraries Association, American Theological Library Association, and the Society of American Archivists.

Beyond the committee meetings, the representatives serve to keep AALL members well-informed of wider professional discourse. Through presentations at Annual Meeting, conference debriefs, queries to TS and OBS committees, postings to Technical Services Law Librarian, and annual reports, the representatives communicate with their colleagues concerning possible changes and solicit feedback.

Our AALL representatives serve to update and advance the way we describe our materials. We believe that it is critical to have an expert in the meeting when proposals and ideas are first being discussed to help inform discussion and guide future developments that will affect us all.

We believe that the work done by these representatives is a core expectation that our membership has in our association—that it is engaged actively in transformative discussions. The presence of our representatives on the committees that develop national and international cataloging standards and policies means that we shape these policies and standards, rather than being passive observers and implementers of policies and standards created by others.

To: The Members of the AALL Executive Committee  
From: Jean Pajerek and Pat Sayre-McCoy, current and immediate past AALL representatives to the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC)  
Date: March 11, 2015

The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) advises the MARC Steering Group concerning changes to the MARC 21 formats. The MARC 21 formats for Bibliographic, Authority, Holdings, Classification, and Community Information data are maintained for the MARC 21 user community based on open discussion of issues. The MARC Steering Group is an international body composed of the Library of Congress, Library and Archives Canada, British Library, and the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek.

The membership of MAC includes eight national libraries and a long list of representatives from library association committees and groups, networks, and communities of users, of which AALL is one. Other groups represented on MAC include:

- Art Libraries Society of North America
- Association of College and Research Libraries, Science and Technology Section
- ISSN Review Group
- Music Library Association
- OCLC
- Online Audio-Visual Catalogers
- Program for Cooperative Cataloging
- Public Library Association
- Society of American Archivists
- Visual Resources Association

When the MARC Advisory Committee was reconstituted in 2013 (upon the dissolution of the Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee, commonly known as MARBI), the AALL representative to MARBI at the time was approached by Sally McCallum of the Library of Congress (LC) and asked to serve as a full member of MAC, with full voting rights. Ms. McCallum clearly recognized that expertise with legal materials was needed on the Committee. Legal materials are unique and technical services law librarians are the ones best suited to guide future developments that will affect us.

Currently, law libraries and libraries in general are poised at a pivotal moment in the history of our profession. The
implementation in 2013 of a new cataloging standard (Resource Description and Access, also known as RDA) by LC and many other libraries worldwide has generated tremendous interest in the deployment of library data as linked data on the World Wide Web. This migration of library data to the Web will only be possible if our “closed” MARC 21 formats are replaced by a more open, Web-friendly communications format. The first steps in this direction were taken when dozens of new fields and subfields were added to the MARC formats by MARBI and its successor, MAC, enabling more precise designation of the data entities contained within a MARC record. LC and a number of other libraries are already deeply involved in the development of BIBFRAME, which is the intended replacement for MARC 21. AALL must be involved in BIBFRAME development efforts from their earliest stages to ensure that the law library community’s interests, and those of our constituents, are effectively represented and promoted. Now is not the time for law librarians to disengage from this vital task. The plan to develop a replacement format for MARC will revolutionize the representation of bibliographic metadata and involve much discussion about legacy data in MARC. MAC is certain to be one of the groups leading such discussions; we cannot afford to forfeit our vote when decisions that will affect us for years to come are made.

In reading AALL’s stated Vision and Core Purpose, it is hard not to see a disconnect between them and the AALL Executive Board’s recent elimination of the cataloging representatives’ positions. The cataloging representatives are literally the embodiment of the Association’s Vision (“AALL and its members will be the recognized authority in all aspects of legal information”) and Core Purpose (“AALL will advance the profession and the professional growth of its members”). We advance the excellence of law librarianship in our roles as representatives to national and international policy-making groups where decisions with enduring and wide-ranging impact on our profession are made. We heighten the visibility of law librarianship when we share our expertise with those in other areas of librarianship. Silencing us will in no way advance our profession; rather, we will become isolated and invisible to these policy-making groups and the interests of our community will no longer be taken into consideration.

We respectfully urge the members of the AALL Executive Board to reconsider their decision to withdraw support from the cataloging representatives. The work the representatives do is too important abandon, especially at this time of ongoing and intense upheaval in the cataloging world.

**To: The Members of the AALL Executive Board**  
**From: Lia Contursi, current AALL representative to ALA Cataloguing and Metadata Management Section (CaMMS), Subject Analysis Committee (SAC)**  
**Date: March 13, 2015**

The Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) examines problems related to subject analysis and genre/form, including particular issues concerning the relationship between classification and subject headings. It provides a liaison between SAC and other American Library Association (ALA) and non-ALA associations that have an interest in the development of subject analysis. Membership of SAC includes elected members as well as representatives from other groups and associations interested in voicing special concerns and advancing the common interests of subject analysis and discovery in a global and coherent manner.

Groups and associations represented at SAC include:

- Sears List of Subject Headings
- ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description & Access
- Decimal Classification Editorial Policy Committee
- American Association of Law Libraries
- International Federation of Library Associations
- Music Library Association
- Library of Congress

Our past representatives (Yael Mandelstam and Suzanne Graham) have worked hard over the past six years to promote the interests of law cataloging and to collaborate with SAC as well as with the Library of Congress in order to create a controlled vocabulary for law genre and form terms and their application. Our online catalogs are becoming more sophisticated every year, and their faceted features are increasingly empowering library users with more effective search abilities to discover special materials. Together with the TS-SIS Classification and Subject Cataloging Working Group, the SAC representatives initiated the pioneering project of creating a controlled vocabulary of law genre terms; they have consulted with other members of SAC and their working sub-groups; they have worked with the Library of Congress very closely and finally have been able to compile the vocabulary of law genre/form terms which the majority of law libraries are now applying. The AALL SAC representatives endure long hours of meetings at ALA Midwinter and ALA Annual; they also meet with members of *ad hoc* SAC subgroups to review new issues emerging from the applications of subject headings and genre terms. All those
meetings are followed by months of active discussions via email and real work on resolving new problems or proposing new terms and new ways of their application. The work of the SAC representatives is not a ceremonial formality; they do not simply step up to a podium for a few minutes, thanking colleagues and promoting AALL. They stay connected to SAC all year round; they work on projects organized by the SAC sub-groups; they immerse themselves deeply in the work of SAC in order to participate meaningfully in the discussions held at ALA Midwinter and ALA Annual.

Most recently the representative of SAC has been acting as the voice of law catalogers in a new SAC sub-group which has been assigned the task of finding a more comprehensive definition of genre term, as it needs to be applied uniformly across a variety of disciplines. The necessity of such an approach arises from a confluence of circumstances. After the recent approval of the Music Genre Terms and the General Genre Terms, together with the imminent approval of the Literature Genre Terms and the work currently underway on genre term vocabularies for Art and Religion, it has become important to review the general semantics of genre and forms in cataloging, because catalogers need to ensure that there are no conflicts or incongruences among the vocabularies across all the disciplines. This is an example of how the work of the SAC representatives intersects with, and has an important impact on, that of other library communities.

This is a critical moment in libraries where the vision of linked data is becoming a new reality. However linked data and discoverability can only be effective if libraries can guarantee a coherent structure of their databases. SAC is the perfect example of a forum that seeks consensus and cooperation among all the different specialized subject areas. SAC is the organ which seeks to establish clear and harmonized standards. It is vital that law catalogers continue to participate and contribute to the debate and the developments of those standards in subject analysis. We cannot stay away from this and other cataloging caucuses where crucial decisions are made to promote the integrity of our databases. The work of the TS-SIS Representatives guarantees that the interests of legal information are advocated and protected. Being silent and observing from the margins will undermine the AALL Vision of being recognized as an authority in the world of legal information. Staying at the margins will betray the AALL Core Purpose of advancing professional growth and making the law libraries relevant.

I respectfully urge the Executive Board to reinstate the positions of the SAC Representative, the MAC Representative and CC:DA Representative of AALL to ALA.

To: The members of the AALL Executive Board
From: Robert Bratton and John Hostage, current and immediate past AALL representatives to the Committee on Cataloging: Description & Access (CC:DA)
Date: March 13, 2015

We were shocked and dismayed to learn that all three AALL representative positions related to technical services are being eliminated. This message explains the work of the Committee on Cataloging: Description & Access, why the work of the AALL representative on that Committee is important to both American Library Association (ALA) and AALL, and why the Executive Board should reconsider its decision to withdraw support for this and two other cataloging related representatives.

The American Library Association’s (ALA) Committee on Cataloging: Description & Access (CC:DA) continually assesses needed changes in the field of descriptive cataloging. CC:DA recommends solutions to problems relating not only to bibliographic description but also to choice and form of access points, other than subjects. The bulk of the Committee’s work is devoted to initiating proposals for additions to and revisions of the current cataloging code (Resource Description & Access (RDA)) and to reviewing proposals initiated by other groups. After internal discussions online and in person, CC:DA develops official ALA positions on such proposals in consultation with other appropriate ALA units and organizations in the U.S.A. The Committee then works with the ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee for the Development of RDA (JSC) regarding the official ALA position and to suggest acceptable bases for negotiations. To be a member of the committee (even a non-voting member) one is required to attend the CC:DA meetings at ALA Annual and ALA Midwinter.

CC:DA consists of 9 voting members, 12 ALA liaisons, 15 non-ALA liaisons, 2 interns, 1 webmaster and 6 non-voting ex officio representatives. The non-ALA liaisons represent:

- American Association of Law Libraries
- American Theological Library Association
- Art Libraries Society of North America
- Catholic Library Association
- Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
- IFLA Cataloguing Section
- MARC Advisory Committee
• Medical Library Association
• Music Library Association
• Online Audiovisual Catalogers
• Program for Cooperative Cataloging
• Society of American Archivists
• Special Libraries Association

The voting members of CC:DA and the ALA representative to the JSC rely very heavily on the expertise of the liaisons from specialist communities and actively collaborate with the liaisons in doing the ongoing work of the Committee. They call on the AALL liaison to work on formulating official ALA positions on proposals relating to cataloging legal resources. The AALL liaison (in consultation with the AALL cataloging community) has recently proposed three RDA rule changes that were formulated by the AALL cataloging community. CC:DA approved all of these proposals; one is now officially in RDA, and the two others are before the JSC awaiting their decisions.

Discontinuing the AALL liaison to CC:DA would result in the following scenario: when the Committee discusses proposals that affect cataloging of (and access to) legal resources, there would be no one in the conversation who has any experience cataloging legal resources. This is analogous to a group of law catalogers formulating the official ALA position on proposals related to music cataloging. This is ludicrous.

When you look at the list of non-ALA liaisons that serve on CC:DA, consider what an embarrassing omission it would be if AALL was not represented. The AALL liaison to CC:DA gives law catalogers influence well beyond their numbers in the development of cataloging standards. The development and continual refinement of these standards results in enhanced access to both legal- and non-legal resources for all library users. It also provides a dedicated avenue of two way communication between the ALA and AALL cataloging communities, mutually benefiting members of both organizations. The AALL representative to CC:DA regularly engages with members of AALL’s Descriptive Cataloging Advisory Working Group and Classification and Subject Cataloging Advisory Working Group to discuss issues before CC:DA that are relevant to those Groups. It is in collaboration with members of these AALL Groups that the representative to CC:DA formulates proposals to submit to the Committee. None of the representatives who serve as liaisons on the three technical services committees were consulted regarding the decision to eliminate some (but not all) of the AALL representatives. No one in AALL’s Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) was consulted prior to the AALL Executive Board making this decision. Nor was anyone on the cataloging committees consulted about the need for AALL’s liaisons.

We respectfully urge the members of the AALL Executive Board to reconsider their decision to withdraw support from the cataloging representatives to: Committee on Cataloging: Description & Access, the MARC Advisory Committee, and the Subject Analysis Committee.

Acquisitions: Repurposing Staff

Anne Myers
Yale Law Library

In the last 13 months, I said farewell to two long-term acquisitions staff members. Between them, they had 97 years of experience and were responsible for creating over 110,000 records; that is a huge loss of institutional knowledge! Their departures left giant holes to fill in terms of productivity and workflow, but they also forced us to rethink what we’re doing in terms of the nature of work, the way in which it’s done, and to ask the Yirka question: What can we stop doing in order to do other, higher-priority things?

Traditional acquisitions work—searching, placing orders, receiving books—takes less time than it used to. Instead of manually keying bibliographic records into our system, we can usually find and download an OCLC record in a fraction of the time and with greater accuracy. We use templates to create order records for the same reasons. Receiving books takes a few keystrokes and, if they come with supplied cataloging, the books head right to the shelf. Easy peasy.

We send orders electronically instead of mailing little pieces of paper stuffed in envelopes, and even vendor selection is faster with so much vendor consolidation. We still have to manage the budget to be sure we’re spending the right money on the right things (assuming we have any left to spend in the first place), but we’ve streamlined the ways we do that, too.

Acquisitions work that used to fill up all day, every day now simply doesn’t, but there is non-traditional work to be done as well. Why not use acquisitions staff to do some of it? We are expanding traditional job descriptions to include working on
digital assets and e-resources management, doing record loads, and performing quality control of digital projects. There is a website to be maintained, modified, and updated. Library systems need expert users for troubleshooting. The ever popular “other related duties as assigned” include very different options now than they did five, or even three, years ago.

This sounds all well and good, but how do we make it happen? These days it feels like throwing all the chips in the air and seeing where they land, reassigning some traditional work, and adding in some of the new tasks. Grab the opportunity to rewrite the job description of a departing staff member in light of the current needs of more than just one department. Look around at what’s needed in the library to see if those needs can be absorbed completely or in part by acquisitions staff. Look at the tasks assigned to different staff levels and align those tasks properly. With proper documentation and review, support staff can and must do more complex tasks than ever.

Staff members also need to keep their skills relevant. Encourage them to attend classes to learn new software or increase abilities with software they already use. Be sure to have work that they can do right away using this new knowledge, even if it’s just practicing on something for 30 minutes at a stretch. My university has a subscription to Lynda.com, with self-paced online videos on hundreds of topics; check with your technology department to see if that’s available for you. I really want my staff to build their skills on work time, although sometimes they don’t believe me when I tell them that.

Change is the constant now. Job descriptions and workflows are written, not in stone, but on whiteboards that can be erased and changed as often as needed. Managers and staff should expect to review the overall work of their units at least once a year and be open to significant reshuffling. It’s not comfortable for many of us who have been doing the same things for a long time, but it’s necessary and, with the right support, can even be fun. Chocolate helps.

Carl Yirka’s question reminds us that, in order to do higher priority things, we have to let go of some of what we’ve been doing. Sometimes that happens with technology, but sometimes we just have to make choices about what’s important and what isn’t as important anymore. Deciding to let something go can be extremely difficult because we hold on to what has worked and tend to pile more and more on top of it until we’re drowning in minutia and lose sight of the big picture. Letting go of a procedure, a policy, a workflow step, or a job description gives me a way to keep my staff and myself more relevant, productive, and moving forward.

Public international law classes in KZ - except when it doesn’t

“Public international law” refers to the law of nations. It’s about principles which have evolved over millennia, governing how nations deal with each other. It refers to, for example, the United States and Canada (and perhaps dozens of other countries) signing a treaty to do something. Until the mid-20th century, most public international law dealt almost exclusively with matters of war and peace. International law rarely affected the average lawyer and client. During the last 70 years, public international law has expanded to include many treaties and conventions that directly impact the lives and interests of “real people.” This means that public international law has changed from something of interest only to a few specialists to something of interest to almost everyone dealing with the legal system. While the traditional “public international law” materials class in KZ, or occasionally in a “regional” schedule, materials on how public international law impacts national, local, or regional legal systems class with the subject, outside of KZ.

Before going further, it’s important to note the term “Private international law.” This is what most Americans refer to as “conflict of laws,” though in America this usually involves interstate rather than transnational issues. It deals with the question of what law to apply when people having a claim are from different jurisdictions and/or the matter affected by their claims is in a different jurisdiction. For example, in the simplest form, think of someone from Maryland who rents a car in the District of Columbia and crashes the car in Virginia—which jurisdiction’s law governs? Increasingly, treaties, rather than common law, govern many aspects of conflict of laws (a.k.a., private international law). In a world in which international transactions are increasingly common, one might argue that substantive law is subsuming the entire subject. Whether you call it “conflict of law” or “private international law,” it never classes in KZ. Instead, it always classes in a national, regional, or comparative law number elsewhere in the K schedules.

Until a generation ago, the Library of Congress Classification (LCC) combined both public international law and international relations in the JX schedule (which made sense a century ago). LCC then split the subjects, and KZ is now exclusively for public international law (including KZA for Law of the sea, and the recent additions for International criminal law).
However, most public international law does not class in KZ. To understand why, let’s look at the first few lines of the KZ schedule, which attempt to explain what belongs in KZ (quotations in boldface).

“Class here works on legal principles recognized by nations, and rules governing conduct of nations”: Theoretical legal principles governing public international law class in KZ. Anything on law governing relations between sovereign states is exclusively KZ. But what of a legal principle or rule governing conduct of nations confined to a single region (such as legal principles recognized by the nations of the Middle East, but not necessarily by anyone else)? These probably class in KZ either with the subject or perhaps in the numbers for nations and regions as subjects in international law (KZ4110-KZ4825). Works on how public international law affects the rights of individuals, as opposed to the rights of nations, class outside of KZ (such as K3240 for human rights). Note that all schedules for national legal systems have a place for the status of public international law within the national legal system (e.g. KF4581).

“and their relations with one another, including supra-regional Intergovernmental Organizations (IGO’s) and the legal regimes governing such organizations”: However, an organization with a specialized-subject focus usually classes with the subject either in the K schedules if supra-regional (e.g. World Trade Organization in K4610) or in a regional schedule (e.g. North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) at KDZ944+). It only classes in KZ if the subject pertains to the matters of war and peace that were the traditional focus for public international law (e.g., regional and supra-regional collective security alliances such as North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) at KZ5925). The legal status of a general-purpose regional organization goes with the region in a number captioned for regional organizations, e.g., KQE for regional African organizations such as the African Union in KQE721+. But, the commercial law standards of the Organisation pour l’harmonisation en Afrique du Droit des Affaires (OHADA) classes with the subject in KQC242 because its activities are limited to that specific subject area. The relationship between KJE and KJC is similar, but more complicated, because the European Union is evolving into a jurisdiction, but hasn’t quite reached it yet. LCC treats the European Union as a jurisdiction, unlike the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) and the LC Name Authority File (NAF), which do not recognize its existence as anything more than an international organization.

“Class here the sources of international law, i.e. the law of treaties, arbitral awards and judicial decisions of the international courts”: However, most works about treaties have a subject focus and class with the subject (e.g. Table K8, cutter .A34-A43). Judicial decisions class with the subject or the court, and most international courts and arbitration groups are either regional or subject-oriented, meaning they don’t class in KZ (even if the more glamorous ones such as the International Court of Justice class in KZ).

“For organizations with missions limited to a particular region, see the appropriate K subclass for the regional organization (e. g. KJE for the Council of Europe)” The regional organizations with specific missions do not class in the organizational law sections (KQE, KJE, etc.). Instead, they class with the mission in the topical arrangements (KQC, KJC, etc.). The Americas are different because they don’t have a place for regional organizations. Thus, the Organization of American States (OAS) classes in KDZ1134, along with comparative law and uniform law. For example, the Council of Europe (classing in KJE121+) sponsors the European Court of Human Rights, which classes with the subject in KJC5138. The European Court of Human Rights produces a lot more legal literature than the Council of Europe. As a consequence of what is actually published, very little goes in the numbers for regional organizations, while much more goes in the numbers based on subject (except for the European Union, as mentioned above, which is confounding us by evolving into a geographic jurisdiction as opposed to a regional organization).

“For works on comparative and uniform law of two or more countries in different regions, and on private international law (Conflict of laws), see subclass K”: While comparative law is fairly easy to understand, uniform law is increasingly problematic. At one time, interest in uniform law came from academics and professional groups working independent of their governments. However, in the 21st century, governments often enter into agreements or treaties that unify previously private law. Such agreements are public international law, but they still class as private law in the K schedule (defined as “Comparative and uniform law”). Public international law (such as treaties) pertaining to areas of law that are usually governed by national/domestic legal systems class with the jurisdiction, or as comparative law—not in KZ.

Sometimes, international organizations draw up treaties or conventions that are actually uniform laws for countries to ratify and implement. Well-known examples include the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (K639. A41989), the Kyoto protocol on global warming (K3593.A41992), and the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (K1028.3198). In a jurisdiction that has ratified such an agreement, it is part of the local legal system. So, even though it originated in manifestations of public international law, it classes with the jurisdiction or as comparative/uniform law in K, not in KZ.

International criminal law is a new and expanding subject. However, the same principles apply. Courts convened under international supra-regional authorities are in KZ, those convened by regional authorities class with the region, and those
convened by an individual country class with the country. The substantive crimes recognized by international criminal law class in KZ, but the laws of specific countries on the same matter (and most international crimes have always been illegal under national laws) class with the jurisdiction. Thus, for example, we have KZ7220 for international law pertaining to terrorism, but also have numbers such as K5256, KF9430, and KQC982.T47 for terrorism as dealt with under the laws of individual countries.

To understand how all this relates, instead of the linear K-KZ way most of us look at LCC, we should understand it as a circle, with K and KZ being next to each other, because, as a whole, the two represent supra-national law. K and KZ are really a single de facto schedule, even if awkwardly structured (some would say contorted, based on how international, uniform, and comparative law have evolved over the last century). Together, the de facto K/KZ schedule represents the law that applies without regard to national boundaries, be it public international law in the traditional sense, or uniform multinational law, or comparative law that looks at law beyond the limits of national boundaries, or newly evolving areas of transnational law that are round pegs that don’t fit neatly into the 20th century (or earlier, much earlier) squares of LCC.

---

**Collection Development**

The Collection is Dead, Long Live the Collection!

Theodora Belniak  
University at Buffalo  
Charles B. Sears Law Library

As I ponder the implications and impact of a new collection development policy, I have revisited many old ideas and found new ones that need to be integrated into the policy’s background. I’ve been reading about long-tail purchasing (a hot topic in 2006), about the sunk cost fallacy, rhizomatic organizations, and about the changing nature of general collections in the face of shrinking budgets and interconnectivity between libraries. I’ve been talking with colleagues about their on-the-ground observations of the use of the collection, reviewing circulation statistics, poring over purchasing statistics, and holding an ongoing conversation about the role of special collections in the library setting with our resident archivist.

Because of budgetary constrictions, we have moved to a purchase-on-demand model for most new acquisitions. Our current purchasing model reflects the real-time demands of our faculty and students in the overall collection. This reflection is quite different from its predecessor, which mirrored the projected needs of our faculty and students as perceived by selectors. Many academic law libraries are taking this approach because of budgetary necessity, but one of the impacts of this new model is that libraries’ holdings will not overlap or be duplicated with the same frequency across libraries. The changing standards promulgated by the American Bar Association and the changing demands of the legal education market incorporate more deviations from the standard collections trajectory. Push these assumptions into the future, and law libraries will look very different from both the profile of their current collection and from each other’s collections.

Law libraries are differentiating in unpredictable ways. Many decry these changes as a loss of the tradition and of the traditional “library.” They’re not wrong, but change isn’t always all bad. Budgetary pressures are pushing all of us to be even more creative with collection dollars. Technological interventions create efficiencies, which allow us the space to uncover growth areas in libraries’ collections. Focus can shift from duplication of content across libraries to bolstering a collection that reflects the local and regional users’ needs through purchase-on-demand and through the integration of unique collection materials. Well-publicized rare books, special collections, and institutional repositories can make the value of the library that much more obvious, can make our services indispensable, and can push the collection toward being unique in the field.

While drafting our collection development policy, differentiation is at the forefront of my mind. What is the best way to balance the expansive demands of our users with our budget? How can the policy incorporate the support of unique collection trajectories for future use and distinction?

What do you think, Gentle Reader, about the direction of our collections as a whole? Will law libraries be able to differentiate without sacrifice and survive? Or is the loss of the library tradition a signal of other things to be lost?

---


3 Technological interventions run the gamut from email to social networking to interlibrary loan to data repositories, but each allows for more communication of more information in a shorter amount of time, which in turn impacts the use and profile of the collection.
As announced via various channels in December 2014, the Library of Congress (LC) added the much-anticipated “general genre/form terms” to the Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms for Library and Archival Materials (LCGFT), and they are now live in the authority file. The project to develop these general genre/form terms was a partnership between LC’s Policy and Standards Division (PSD) and the American Library Association’s Association for Library Collections & Technical Services (ALCTS) Subject Analysis Committee’s Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation (SAC-SGFI), which formed the General Terms Working Group. The Working Group based its list on subject headings and form subdivisions in Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH), but did not limit their proposed terms exclusively to LCSH.

Within these new general genre/form terms, there are ten “umbrella” terms which serve to collocate more specific genre/form terms: Commemorative works, Creative nonfiction, Derivative works, Discursive works, Ephemera, Illustrated works, Informational works, Instructional and educational works, Recreational works, and Tactile works. Catalogers will not assign these broad genre/form terms frequently, if at all. Instead, they will use more specific terms (e.g., you would use “Study guides” or “Textbooks” instead of “Instructional and educational works”). These broad terms are analogous to the genre/form term “Law materials” that serves to collocate the law specific genre/form terms.

PSD has no current plans to cancel any of the LCSH headings or form subdivisions that overlap with the new general genre/form terms. LC encourages libraries choosing to use these new genre/form terms to assign them in addition to subdivided subject headings. Thus, these genre/form terms (MARC 655s) and LCSH and/or form subdivisions (MARC 650s and 650 $v) will coexist, at least for the time being.

Examples:

655 7 Biographies. $2 lcgft
600 10 O’Connor, Sandra Day, $d 1930- $v Correspondence
655 7 Personal correspondence. $2 lcgft
650 0 Nanotechnology $x Research $x Law and legislation $v Congresses
655 7 Conference papers and proceedings. $2 lcgft
650 0 Law $z United States $v Dictionaries
655 7 Dictionaries. $2 lcgft

This is similar to how many law catalogers have been applying the legal genre/form terms.

Examples:

650 0 Law reports, digests, etc. $z France
655 7 Court decisions and opinions. $2 lcgft
650 0 Constitutional law $z United States $v Digests
655 7 Law digests. $2 lcgft

LC has not decided when they will begin using these new genre/form terms in their cataloging, but look for an announcement from them in the near future. PSD and SAC-SGFI are currently working on the LC Genre/Form Manual, which will be similar in structure and scope to LC’s Subject Headings Manual. But there is no need to wait; start using them now! We are already seeing these genre/form terms in our copy cataloging. This begs the question: what about adding genre/form terms retrospectively to existing bibliographic records? We will certainly never be able to add these terms to every single potential record, but, with the creative use of global updating, we should be able to add them to many existing records that need them.
New general genre/form terms of interest to law libraries include the following (many thanks to Yael Mandelstam and the TS-SIS Classification and Subject Cataloging Advisory Working Group for compiling these):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abridgments</th>
<th>Dictionaries</th>
<th>Programmed instructional materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstracts</td>
<td>Directories</td>
<td>Records (Documents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic theses</td>
<td>Encyclopedias</td>
<td>Reference works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almanacs</td>
<td>Essays</td>
<td>Registers (Lists)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual reports</td>
<td>Examinations</td>
<td>School yearbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autobiographies</td>
<td>Facsimiles</td>
<td>Serial publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographies</td>
<td>Finding aids</td>
<td>Speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biographies</td>
<td>Gazetteers</td>
<td>Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blank forms</td>
<td>Handbooks and manuals</td>
<td>Study guides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>Style manuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalogs</td>
<td>Indexes</td>
<td>Tables (Data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census data</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Teachers’ guides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City directories</td>
<td>Lectures</td>
<td>Telephone directories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concordances</td>
<td>Minutes (Records)</td>
<td>Textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference materials</td>
<td>Newspapers</td>
<td>Thesauri (Dictionaries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference papers and proceedings</td>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>Trademark lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing education materials</td>
<td>Outlines and syllabi</td>
<td>Union catalogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course materials</td>
<td>Quotations</td>
<td>Vital statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>Yearbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death registers</td>
<td>Personal correspondence</td>
<td>Yellow pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debates</td>
<td>Problems and exercises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Internet

Dan Blackaby
Cornell University Law Library

Earlier in February, we here at Cornell rolled out the LexisNexis Digital Library for our patrons to use. It works in much the same way as the Overdrive e-book platforms, allowing users to download temporarily some of Lexis’ legal secondary sources and study aids. Most often, users access the material through either their browser or through Adobe Digital Editions software.

That’s all well and good, another platform for our users. I had a different reaction, however, when the question arose of “should we catalog these titles?” Cataloging e-books has always been a problematic exercise, because although in many ways they resemble “normal” circulating volumes (with qualifications), Overdrive and Lexis add some artificial strictures. For example, users can download a PDF placed on a website as many times as desired or needed. The Digital Rights Management (DRM) that Lexis and the other vendors have implemented prevents this from happening with e-books. So, like printed books, there are a limited number of copies to be checked out. Unlike printed volumes, however, vendors can withdraw these volumes and the very “shelves” they sit on. Many Kindle users can tell you how a volume (most notoriously, George Orwell’s 1984) vanished from their machines when Amazon deemed it necessary. In some ways, this is a great idea for libraries—no overdue books! Simply “zap” them off the e-readers. However, it leads to a possible distrust of whether one can truly own these volumes.

So, how’s a catalog to handle this? I’ve seen it done various ways. The simplest option, of course, is not to catalog them. If they can’t truly be deemed to be “permanent” parts of the collection, then why put them in the catalog? The countervailing argument would be that you need to represent correctly your collection at any particular point in time. But how to do this when your content is, for all intents and purposes, present only by contract?

Some libraries have gone down this path before, buying and using records that reflect the contents of various subscription databases, most notably the secondary sources in Westlaw and LexisNexis. Unlike with Hein, there’s no assertion that the purchase of these records implies ownership of the content. So, to catalog the Digital Library or not? And if so, how does this fit with the new cataloging methods and tools, Resource Description and Access (RDA) and BIBFRAME?
There have been various approaches to integrating record loads into an online public catalog. You can reconcile the various records by title, putting each manifestation onto the same record with a link resolver to collect the various access points. Or, you could not reconcile them at all, which would result in multiple records with multiple access points. The former option is work intensive, while the latter results in a catalog many would find chaotic and difficult to use.

Patrons would see an e-book as a particular manifestation of a particular expression of a particular Lexis secondary source. Inside that, though, are various sub-iterations. Some people go so far as to label PDF files as e-books, but for the purposes of this discussion, let us stick with e-books derived from EPUB and MOBI files, for use with the Adobe and Kindle platforms, respectively. Those two versions are the ones patrons are most likely to use.

Unlike other books, e-books have this DRM ticking clock within them, acting in many ways as a palimpsest that erases itself as it is read or the self-destructing missions that appeared at the beginning of each episode of Mission: Impossible. So, what’s the easiest solution?

Many libraries already link the online Westlaw or Lexis version of a resource within its print record—I’d argue that, given the relative impermanence of the manifestation and possible rotation of the contents of the digital collections themselves, this would be the comprehensive approach. An easier, if somewhat muddled, solution is to catalog them as truly separate manifestations, making it much easier to remove when or if the time comes.

Of course, all of this would be obviated if we go to a WorldCat model, where we’re simply noting holdings or access, hinged off of a single record.

While I am no longer a cataloger, I understand at least some of the various issues. As someone who’s been involved heavily and recently with website design and User Experience, I have a new perspective, which comes down to this—make it as easy to use as possible. Libraries are, more than ever, treating collections such as the LexisNexis Digital Library more as services than holdings, so treating them as we would treat JSTOR or Academic Search Premier makes a lot of sense to me. We are providing what may be temporary access points, and it is those access points that our patrons utilize. Every book has its use, but I’ve reached the point to where I don’t believe that always requires every book to have its record.

Database Usage Statistics and Challenges of Determining the Value of Electronic Expenditures in the Legal Realm

Since the shift to the digital age, libraries must manage not only their traditional print collection, but also their ever-increasing electronic offerings. Electronic resources are appealing options, as they generally require less time to initially process, maintain their currency with little effort, allow you to enhance your collection free of physical space constraints, and often allow multiple patrons to use them at the same time. However, print materials are not without their own unique merits. I’m steering clear of the soapbox on the print versus electronic debate, though. Instead, I’m going to talk about another part of the puzzle, one which is remarkably challenging in the legal realm—finding a way to balance the costs and benefits of our expenditures on electronic offerings by leveraging available usage data. This is a task that becomes even more difficult as budget lines shrink and cancellations are necessary.

Legal database and print material costs are sky-high, and both keep getting higher. Additionally, legal materials require a standard of currency, regardless of whether they are in an academic, public, or private setting. Once you’ve decided to invest in a particular resource, keeping it up-to-date is rarely an optional fee, if you want your original investment in the materials to maintain its value to your patrons. To add insult to injury, if the updates jump in price, you have little recourse—you must simply find the money somewhere or cancel the material and have it begin to lose value. I’ve seen times where it’s far cheaper to buy a brand new up-to-date set of materials every few years rather than pay the update costs continually; assuming, of course, that slightly out-of-date print materials can meet the needs of your patron base.

Obviously, electronic versions of legal resources don’t require updates like loose-leaf releases, advance sheets, pocket parts, and supplements. While you’re still responsible for the cost of maintaining access to the resource and are beholden to price increases there as well, the staff time it takes to check in the materials, process them, and update them in a timely manner can help push any cost-benefit analysis in favor of the electronic resource. Cheaper and faster and more up-to-date is often the mantra of electronic resources.
There are a few things to beware of, though, when debating investing in electronic resources over print resources or even when choosing which electronic resources to purchase. Databases can be full of bells and whistles that seem exciting to your library staff, but which your patrons may not use. There could be a cheaper option with an interface that appears limited to you, but which easily meets your patrons’ needs. Databases have practically unlimited cloud storage, so it’s easy to pad title counts that may impress you, but which your patrons never even notice. Oftentimes, materials are available on multiple database platforms or through open access, freely available online. Isolating specific user actions within databases and tracking the total amount of activity in a consistent manner can help us be sure that our investments are worthwhile and the cost-benefit analysis is accurate.

It’s not as easy as it seems, though. In the print world, you can measure the ‘usage’ of a book by tracking check-outs and developing a simple method to approximate in-house usage for materials which cannot be checked out, such as asking for books not to be re-shelved. This allows librarians to formally track data on books pulled off the shelf, and it provides valuable informal usage data through observation of patron behavior.

However, patrons can use electronic materials outside the physical space of the library where it is impossible to gather informal information through mere observation, and the two basic ideas of check-outs and in-house-usage tracking are replaced with a cacophony of terms, such as page views, record clicks, downloads, hits, article views, users, sessions, searches, and more. Each database defines their own terms and their own “usage statistics,” and databases aren’t required to provide you with any statistics at all. Some may offer no way of quantifying your specific patron group’s user behavior, and you’re left to fill in the blanks as best you can with surveys, user experience testing, and ILS tools such as Web Access Management systems. These measure access, not necessarily activity, and thus have their own set of limitations.

Enter Project Counting Online Usage of Networked Electronic Resources (COUNTER). COUNTER is an initiative which focuses on setting consistent, credible, and compatible standards for both recording and reporting online usage statistics for online journals, databases, books, and reference works. COUNTER has also worked with the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) on the Standardized Usage Harvesting Initiative (SUSHI), a protocol that allows tools to automatically retrieve and consolidate usage statistics across vendors. COUNTER-compliant databases use the same definitions for their metrics, count things in the same way, and report them in identical formats with consistent report names. I always like saying it gives librarians a chance to put two databases next to each other and compare apples to apples, instead of apples to yellow. COUNTER reports also give you a chance to create consistent return-on-investment measures, such as cost per search or cost per session, which allows you to compare the value of these databases to your patrons across the board.

Without a doubt, Project COUNTER is a stroke of brilliance. However, vendors are not required to be COUNTER compliant any more than they’re required to provide you with usage statistics. And in the legal realm, where a few big players run most of the show and monopolize your budget lines, only a few vendors offer COUNTER reports. This factor makes navigating the world of gathering and comparing usage data across platforms especially challenging. While usage data may not be the only thing that you use when deciding whether to cancel or keep an electronic resource, it can be an incredibly valuable tool. The challenge is finding ways to effectively quantify our return on investment without the luxury of COUNTER-compliant reports.

In my next column, I’ll offer some practical advice on delving into usage data within the legal field. As my law library life has been solely in the academic realm, I would welcome any advice from those outside of academia to help flesh out my own tips and tricks. If you have some practicalities to share, whether private, public, or even academic, please email me at amoye@charlottelaw.edu and I’ll include you in my next column!
When Gallup polled 10,004 U.S. residents during 2005-2008, they wanted to examine leadership from the “follower” perspective. Gallup noted that previous leadership research primarily focused on case studies or research within one organization. They believe that their poll (using Gallup’s standard Random Digit Dial methodology) was a more representative sampling, which they could then project to the entire U.S. population (read more at http://strengths.gallup.com/private/Resources/Followers_Study.pdf).

Tom Rath and Barry Conchie thoroughly discuss this poll and other related Gallup research on leadership in their 2009 book *Strengths Based Leadership: Great Leaders, Teams, and Why People Follow*. The authors note that, of the four leadership traits desired by employees, trust may be the “do or die” factor for leaders. Happy and productive employees trust their leaders, and their leaders reciprocate that trust.

In their study of trust within a state government organization, Yoon Jik Cho and Theodore Poiser report that under high levels of trust, employees are willing to accept rules, cooperate, and engage in organizational citizenship behaviors (*Public Personnel Management*, June 2014, 43: 179-196). In addition to these benefits, Robert F. Hurley reports that trust in a person’s direct supervisor influences time spent on task, job performance, willingness to share sensitive information, job satisfaction, organizational commitment, goal commitment, and organizational trust (*Decision to Trust: How Leaders Create High-Trust Organizations*, 2012).

Greater job satisfaction? More cooperation? Improved job performance? Sign me up! But how can we inspire others to trust us? And do we even trust ourselves? While generating trust may seem like an iffy proposition, management guru Stephen Covey assures us that trust isn’t some elusive quality that we either have or we don’t—it’s actually a tangible asset that we can create (*Speed of Trust*, 2006).

Covey tells us to begin by looking inward and asking do I have: integrity (do I do what I say?); intent (do I have a hidden agenda?); capabilities (am I relevant?); and results (what is my track record?). After we affirm our credibility, we can move on to building relationship trust.

Relationship trust, Covey notes, arises when employees can count on their managers to be consistent. High trust leaders consistently exhibit the following 13 behaviors:

1. Talk straight
2. Show respect
3. Be transparent
4. Right wrongs
5. Show loyalty
6. Deliver results
7. Get better (elicit feedback, improve your skill set)
8. Confront reality (sharing good news is easy, be sure to address the tough issues)
9. State expectations
10. Be accountable
11. Listen first
12. Meet commitments
13. Extend trust (to earn trust, first demonstrate your ability to trust others and err on the side of being too trusting).

As I was reading Covey’s book, I thought how about how trust in a library environment goes far beyond building a trust relationship between employee and supervisor. Technical Services departmental managers like me are often middle managers who must inspire trust both up, down, and, sometimes, across the organizational chart. Many of us also regularly serve as project managers or chairs of committees, which may include members from the greater university or firm environment. It’s rather daunting to think about building relationship trust in all these people, some of whom we may know only slightly!

To this end, I’ve printed out Covey’s list of 13 high-trust behaviors (and he *really* couldn’t have come up with a fourteenth for those of us who are superstitious?!?) and stuck it on the bulletin board by my computer. In addition to reminding me to be on my best behavior, the list serves as a good check when I’m unhappy about something at work. Replaying the problem in my head, I can look to the list for a way to remedy the situation by resolving any trust issues. Even if the list doesn’t help me resolve the situation, there’s solace in knowing I made the attempt! Trust me.
The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) convened two meetings at the American Library Association Midwinter Meeting in Chicago. MAC took action on one discussion paper and six proposals during the meetings.

**Proposal 2015-01**  
**Defining Values in Field 037 to Indicate a Sequence of Sources of Acquisition in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**  
Proposed by the British Library

This paper proposes the definition of values for Indicator 1 in Field 037 to sequence sources of acquisition. It also proposes the definition of subfields $3 and $5 so that the materials and institution or organization to which a source of acquisition applies can be recorded. The British Library submitted this proposal because it is required to sequence multiple instances of the 037 field (Source of acquisition) to manage the exchange of metadata for electronic serials with third parties. The Committee approved this proposal.

**Proposal 2015-02**  
**Adding Dates for Corporate Bodies in Field 046 in the MARC 21 Authority Format**  
Proposed by the British Library

This paper proposes that Field 046 (Special Coded Dates) in the Authority Format accommodate the date of establishment and date of termination of a corporate body. *Resource Description and Access (RDA)* added the element sub-type “Period of Activity of the Corporate Body” as part of the April 2014 Update. To maintain the correlation between *RDA* and the 046 field, the British Library proposes to define new subfields to code dates relating to a period of activity separately from dates relating to the establishment and termination of a corporate body. The proposal recommends the definition of a new subfield $q for date of establishment and $r for date of termination. Catalogers would use these subfields to code the definite start and end dates of a corporate body and then use subfields $s and $t for dates indicating the start and end of periods of activity, both for persons and for corporate bodies. The Committee approved this proposal.

**Proposal 2015-03**  
**Description Conversion Information in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**  
Proposed by the Library of Congress

This paper proposes defining a new, repeatable field (884; Description Conversion Information) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to record information regarding the process for the conversion of data in a description. The Library of Congress submitted this proposal in anticipation of a mixed MARC/BIBFRAME cataloging environment in which some libraries will perform production cataloging using BIBFRAME and convert the BIBFRAME descriptions into MARC, so that MARC-based systems such as local catalogs and OCLC can use them. The new field 884 would include information such as the process used to produce the data in the MARC record, the date of conversion, and the conversion agency.

This proposal generated a bit of discussion and raised questions about its utility and whether catalogers could encode the information in a local field. Should there be a way to indicate when catalogers enhanced these kinds of MARC records post-conversion, other than the 040 field? Should the Encoding level in the fixed field somehow reflect the status of these records? After some minor rewording and the addition of a couple of subfields, the Committee approved this proposal.

**Proposal 2015-04**  
**Broaden Usage of Field 088 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format**  
Proposed by Alaska Resources Library and Information Services

This paper proposes broadening the usage of field 088 (Report Number) in bibliographic records to include series numbers (in particular, for series in technical report and government publications) by deleting the sentence “Not used to record a number associated with a series statement” in 088’s field definition and scope. The Committee approved this proposal unanimously with little discussion.
Proposal 2015-05
Definition of New Code for Leased Resources in Field 008/07 in the MARC 21 Holdings Format
Proposed by the British Library

This paper proposes the definition of a new code for leased resources in 008/07 (Method of acquisition) in the MARC 21 Holdings Format. The MARC 21 Holdings Format currently has no code to indicate that the method of acquisition is via lease, even though many institutions lease e-resources rather than purchase them. The paper proposes the creation of a value “q” for this byte, meaning “Acquired through lease.” The Committee approved this proposal unanimously without discussion.

The sixth proposal, as well as the single discussion paper, had to do with music cataloging, with no applicability to law cataloging.

2015 American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting

Even though many of us are frozen solid in the midst of the Polar Vortex, it’s not too early to start thinking about the Annual Meeting. Registration for the 2015 AALL Annual Meeting in Philadelphia is now open. The 2015 OCLC Users Roundtable and Update is scheduled for Sunday, July 19, 2015, from 11:30-12:45. With Glenn Patton’s retirement, OCLC regional member liaisons will present our annual OCLC update. This year, our speaker will be Rob Favini, OCLC Member Liaison, Northeast region. This session is open to anyone who uses OCLC products or services and will cover OCLC’s new, enhanced services as well as planned future developments. Program time is allotted for audience members to ask questions and share comments, ideas, and concerns with the speaker and other OCLC users. Please come prepared to learn and participate in this informative and interactive session. If you have any specific questions or concerns you want the speaker to address, please contact me at jkm95@cornell.edu.

OCLC Committee Chair

My term as OCLC Committee Chair is slated to end in July 2015. The Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS) OCLC Committee page on AALLNet (http://www.aallnet.org/sections/obs/Committees/OCLC-Committee) states the duties of the OCLC Committee chair as:

Committee Chair organizes an OCLC Roundtable and Update program each year, which is presented during the AALL Annual Meeting. In addition, appropriate OCLC information is distributed via the OBS and TS listservs throughout the year.

If you would like to nominate an OBS member or yourself for this position, please contact me (jkm95@cornell.edu) or Karen Selden (karen.selden@colorado.edu).

Library Data [R]evolution: Applying Linked Data Concepts

OCLC co-sponsored a “Collective Insight” event held at the San Francisco Public Library on Tuesday, February 10, 2015. The morning sessions were streamed live and were free and open to the public. A recording of the presentations, presenter slides and archives of Twitter and chat comments are available at http://www.oclc.org/en-US/events/2015/CI_SFPL_Feb_2015.html. A summary of the event follows:

In recent years, libraries have made increasing explorations into applying linked data concepts to library metadata. Hear leaders from OCLC and the Library of Congress share insights into the evolving metadata landscape. Learn about two libraries’ active pursuit of linked data projects using BIBFRAME and Schema.org standards, and see how linked data is changing workflows and consumption of library data. Later, join us for an OCLC update and in-depth discussion on the current and future directions of OCLC cataloging and metadata services.

The Metadata Landscape and Putting Metadata to Work
Sally McCallum, Chief, Network Development/MARC Standards Office, Library of Congress
Ted Fons, Executive Director, Data Services and WorldCat Quality Management, OCLC
Best of Show: OCLC presents a one-day virtual event to showcase four programs from ALA Midwinter

“Best of Show,” presented Wednesday, February 25, 2015, featured live presentations from the American Library Association (ALA) 2015 Midwinter Meeting. The sessions included:

1. OCLC Update
Get the latest news from OCLC—updates on products and services, new research, governance and membership activities. George Needham, OCLC Vice President, Global & Regional Councils, will bring you up to date on what the OCLC cooperative is doing.

2. Libraries Realize Real Results
Libraries with WorldShare Management Services (WMS) have shared the ways it helped them save staff time and money, and incorporate new functionality. This, in turn, provided the libraries with opportunities to undertake new projects ... to realize real results. Join us to hear Lea Briggs, Project Management Librarian at LIBROS/University of New Mexico, share her library’s experience as well as the advantages of taking an academic library consortium to the cloud. OCLC’s Andrew Pace will provide an overview and update.

3. From Reference Database to Full Discovery Service
WorldCat Discovery Services enable library staff and users to search WorldCat and find resources in libraries worldwide. With additional options, WorldCat Discovery provides a full discovery service. OCLC’s Andrew Pace and Alice Sneary will review new enhancements such as staff interlibrary loan requesting and new uses for linked data, along with examples of how some libraries are using WorldCat Discovery for reference and discovery.

4. Maximizing Discovery and Access of Library eContent
Providing the best user experience for discovery and access of library materials requires publishers, service providers and libraries to work together on improved data quality. OCLC’s Ted Fons and other authors of a recent White Paper will discuss all aspects of the content supply chain. We will identify key problems and provide practical recommendations to enhance the value of your e-content.


FAST headings
There has been significant conversation on several cataloging discussion lists about FAST headings. Many catalogers feel they duplicate Library of Congress Subject Headings and “dumb down” the catalog. Love them or hate them, it is helpful to understand why they might be useful.

OCLC describes FAST (Faceted Application of Subject Terminology) as “an enumerative, faceted subject heading schema derived from the Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH).” FAST headings are designed for easy application; they represent post-coordinated subject assignment in contrast to LCSH’s complicated pre-coordinated system. FAST headings exemplify linked data in bibliographic records though use of $0 in the MARC field. For example, the LCSH term Constitutional law maps to 650 7 $aConstitutional law$0(OCoLC)fst00875797. The numerical text in $0 is part of a URI (http://id.worldcat.org/fast/875797) for the concept. Additionally, FAST headings enable faceted searching in discovery layers like Blacklight. A detailed explanation of FAST is available at http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/fast.html?urlm=159754.

Duplicate records
Recently, there has been more traffic than usual on the OCLC-Cataloging list complaining about duplicate records, in particular for e-books. OCLC’s Cynthia Whittaker provided the following explanation of OCLC’s ongoing efforts to manage duplicate records in WorldCat:

Thank you to everyone who is concerned about the duplicate e-book records in WorldCat. OCLC staff share your concern. We know how frustrating duplicates are, and that they affect the efficiency of your cataloging workflows. We
are trying to tackle this on a number of fronts, but the problem is not an easy one to solve, mainly due to the many variations in data in the bibliographic records from multiple sources. OCLC’s Duplicate Detection and Resolution software (DDR) has removed almost 18 million duplicates since 1991. We constantly work to improve our DDR software in an attempt to make machine matching and de-duplication better. We will continue to do that, installing improvements monthly. It is very complex to maintain the delicate balance between algorithms smart enough to merge real duplicates that have been cataloged under numerous descriptive conventions, over many decades, and at a huge variance of fullness and quality, and at the same time avoid merging records that are legitimately different manifestations.

We also have staff working to merge all the duplicate e-book records that you report; but the backlog is large and merging is a complex and time-consuming process. So manual merging is only a small part of the solution.

Please do continue to report duplicates and other problems that you see with bibliographic records in WorldCat to bibchange@oclc.org. We take all reports seriously and work on all of them in their turn.

We are having discussions at OCLC to explore additional solutions to the problem. We believe many solutions are needed to address this from multiple angles. We will provide a more comprehensive and detailed answer in the future as we explore those solutions.

Sincerely,
Cynthia M. Whitacre
Manager, WorldCat Quality
OCLC
800-848-5878, ext. 6183
whitaerc@oclc.org

---

**Preservation**

Maxine Wright
Georgetown University

---

**Ways to Preserve Data and Make it Accessible**

Preservation Committee members will serve as guest columnists for 2014-2015. Each member will select their own hot topic. Carolyn Cox, Digital Collections Librarian at Georgetown Law, is our guest columnist for this issue.

**Guest Columnist: Carolyn Cox, Georgetown University Law Library**

One of the things that I love about my job as a Digital Collections Librarian at Georgetown University Law Library is that I am making available, free of charge, enormous amounts of legal scholarship and information to our students, faculty, and public, while preserving and archiving it at the same time. We use a combination of open-source software and paid, or hosted, platforms to provide this legal information in an open-access environment.

One of the ways in which we provide legal information is through DigitalGeorgetown (http://library.georgetown.edu/digitalgeorgetown). The Georgetown University Library started using the open-source repository software DSpace to create DigitalGeorgetown in order to both preserve their Digital Collections and Institutional Repository and to provide it freely to the public. Georgetown Law Library joined DigitalGeorgetown and uses it to provide some of the law centers’ journals, archives, manuscripts, rare books, research collections, as well as collections from the National Equal Justice Library. One of the rare book collections we have stored online is Legal Dictionaries, which date back to as early as 1575.

DigitalGeorgetown is powered using DSpace and administered by the Georgetown University Library, which means that while the software itself is free, Georgetown has to maintain and update it. It is customizable to an extent, and Georgetown has done that so the user doesn’t notice a change when navigating to it from the library’s website.

Another way we at the Georgetown Law Library bring digital content to our public is through our own Institutional Repository, called The Scholarly Commons (http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu). We use Digital Commons, an institutional repository software program hosted by BePress. We upload the content and have control over the appearance and what information we want to provide about the content, while BePress provides the support. As the host, BePress customizes the layout and
information to our specifications within the realm of possibilities for the software. We provide faculty scholarship, law center events, law library events, student works as well as institutes, centers, and other scholarly initiatives.

One of the better-known preservation projects we’ve embarked on is the Chesapeake Digital Preservation Group. While we are not using free or open-source software for this preservation project, we do make it available free to the public. The Chesapeake Digital Preservation Group is a group of four law libraries, Georgetown Law Library, Maryland State Law Library, Virginia State Law Library, and Harvard Law Library. The goal of the project is to stabilize, preserve, and ensure permanent access to critical born-digital and digitized legal materials on the World Wide Web. We do this by using OCLC to catalog and CONTENTdm to manage our collections and provide them free of charge to the end user.

These are only a few of the ways we are using the resources available to archive and preserve digital information while providing it free to the public. There are numerous other resources available through open source or for a fee, if that’s your preference. Just remember, free doesn’t necessarily mean it doesn’t cost. It’s more like free as in kittens—you will still need to manage and update the software you choose to use, so your needs and budget play a role in your decision.

Private Law Libraries

Sarah Lin
Library Systems Librarian
Reed Smith LLP

Last March my predecessor, as co-contributor of the Private Law Libraries column, wrote about the impact of Resource Description and Access (RDA) in law firm catalogs. I enjoyed it immensely, for I had previously thought I was the only technical services librarian not busy implementing RDA. But I think apathy towards RDA is really just a sign that there are bigger fish to fry in the private law library world than headings for treaties. Currently, in my eighth year as a firm librarian responsible for technical services, I’ve been thinking a lot lately on the future of the library catalog, as it has been my central responsibility for the last four years. My conclusion is that there really isn’t a future for the catalog as I know it.

Much like clients are refusing to pay for legal research, the physical presence of the library cannot garner the appropriate monetary investment—we need only look to the recent Kaye Scholer articles to prove this! After the dust settled on a recent library renovation in one of our offices, the librarian told me there was not one electrical outlet in the entire room. The small matter of a circulation desk pales in comparison with the larger issue that the books are an afterthought. And online resources occupy zero linear feet, so it’s no wonder that budgets keep getting squeezed even as we reduce our print holdings. When I talk with other firm librarians and find out they don’t even have a tech services librarian on staff or that they’ve “killed” their OPAC, it affirms my feeling that I need to create a future for my integrated library system (ILS), lest both of us be turned out in the cold (this is a metaphorical cold as I write from my desk in sunny Santa Clara, CA). When I ran 2014 statistics for our library managers in January, I found that the primary function of the staff-side of our ILS is creating orders to track payments and that the top 25 OPAC users (who use the library once a week on average) are our reference staff. The largest number of “loans” are the clicks to URLs for online versions of materials, which our ILS counts as a loan. Aside from the very few print journals we route, the function of my department is, by and large, to serve the other library staff. In that case, it really is no wonder the library itself is an afterthought. If this is reality, what am I going to do?

While the library managers know the work of my department—ordering, paying for, processing, delivering, and keeping track of payments and passwords—is vital to get attorneys the information they need, it has never been more invisible to the rest of the firm. That’s precisely why I’m brainstorming how in the world we can stay ahead of this. If no one cares about the OPAC, I should stop spending so much time thinking about the homepage and the interface. I need to spend more time figuring out how I can get our information to where the attorneys already are (SharePoint) and convincing my director to pay for it. We have not yet embraced e-books, but that is really only a matter of time—a “when,” not an “if.” In some ways, it might be a net positive for us to move to e-books, if people pay more attention to their tablets and smartphones than to dusty books in a library.

When I was a bindery assistant ten years ago, I recall my supervisor asking me about how much work there would be if they cancelled a large portion of their law reviews. That didn’t happen while I was there, but at the time I couldn’t fathom that my job would cease to exist. The lesson I took from that is I really do need to consider a future where my job doesn’t exist as I know it and figure out what I should be doing instead (and to tamp down the terror of joblessness such an idea brings).
So far, my goals for 2015 are to redesign our library intranet pages and practice-group library pages and then continue to track online usage of our catalog and intranet pages. I’ll continue to brainstorm how I can take my insane organizational skills to a different aspect of information management at my firm.

I’d love to hear from those of you in a similar boat: what’s the handwriting on the wall at your firm? How will you future-proof your technical services department? You can reach me at slin@reedsmith.com.

Research & Publications

How Observational Studies Can Inform Technical Services Work

Hollie White
Duke University

Asking and watching. According to Tenopir (2003) and Wildemuth (2009a), these are the two approaches for gathering information about when and how people use library resources. Asking involves using qualitative tools like surveys and focus groups to ask people the when, how, and even why of the user experience. Watching involves conducting use logs of online resources or running observational studies in physical spaces.

Observational studies involve finding out what people actually do. Two types of observational study exist: nonparticipant and participant. In nonparticipant observation, the researcher schedules times during the day to observe certain behaviors in a specific setting (Wildemuth 2009a). In libraries, this could mean scheduling three times a day to walk around the reading room and record the types of materials students are using or are on study tables. Participant observation is when the researcher takes part in the activity he or she is studying (Wildemuth 2009b). For example, this could mean shadowing a particular user throughout the day to see what resources she is using and asking questions during the process. In basic terms, non-participant is “watching others do something,” while participant observation involves active engagement with participants while they are performing normal behaviors. The key to observational studies is that they are examining the normal, everyday patterns and not testing something new. The weakness of conducting observational studies alone is that they do not elucidate the overall motivation behind certain actions or behaviors. For guidance and advice on conducting observational studies, consult the following library-based observational studies:


This study gathered data from four academic libraries using a non-participant model. Researchers categorized student behavior in the library using three criteria: activity type; if the student had access to a device; and where the student was in the library. Results from the study helped with library collection and space planning.


This study gathered information in a clinic setting using a participant model. The researchers followed the participants as they narrated their actions. Results from this study helped the researchers understand more about the technologies they needed to develop to assist in entering information into digital libraries.


This study used a participant model to observe three academics’ information-seeking behavior. The results indicated to the researchers which type of materials academics preferred to use during a normal work day.

With an emphasis on public space and patron interaction, it may not be obvious how observational studies can inform law technical services work. Observational studies tell librarians about what library spaces patrons are using and the activities they are performing in those spaces. Acquiring, describing, and maintaining legal materials are central to library work, so knowing which types of materials patrons use more in the physical library space can help with decisions on how much to buy and how to prepare those materials. For physical items, there are no circulation statistics for items that patrons only use in the building. Without using a systematic observational study, librarians can only base non-circulating use numbers...
on speculation or hazy recollection. Observational studies can also assist in interpreting vendor statistics. In many cases, patrons use certain materials more off-site than in the library, so combining those statistics with an observational study can give technical services librarians and administrators a better sense of how to better assist patrons.

As mentioned in earlier columns, research and assessment can affirm the value of technical services. Observational studies are just one more resource to use when thinking of ways to answer questions about how to improve technical services work.

References:

---

**SERIALS ISSUES**

*Wendy E. Moore*

*University of Georgia Law Library*

**The Future of Serials:** As the writer of the Serials Issues column, you would think that I would have more hope for the future of serials than I do. After reading the *Serials Review* invited article, “The Future of Serials: A Publisher’s Perspective” by James Wiser, Manager of Library Relations & Sales Support at SAGE Publications in vol. 40, no. 4, (2014) pp. 238-241 (available at [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2014.978062](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2014.978062)), I realized that there are many reasons to be optimistic about the future role of serial publications. The article notes that submissions to journal publishers are at an all-time high, at the same time that the long-form monograph is falling out of favor in many academic disciplines. While the article notes that the very nature of a “serial” seems to be changing as dissemination of information is no longer constrained by chronology and print runs, it explores the important role that journals still play in editorial control and meeting the needs of the educational market. Even if serials as we know them might not survive, Wiser concludes that “the infrastructure for coordinating, hosting, and disseminating scholarship will exist, as will individuals who procure, curate, and manage this information for their respective organizations.” Sounds like there will still be jobs for us!

*If a journal falls in a forest...*: One can often hear me proclaim, “I really thought back in 2000 that print journals would no longer exist by now!” Recently, I discovered that the American Library Association’s Association for Library Collections & Technical Services (ALCTS) journal *Library Resources and Technical Services (LRTS)* has gone to electronic-only format as of the January 2015, vol. 59, no. 1 issue. Of course, I read about this change in the e-journal version, since I’ve been accessing LRTS articles for years via *EBSCOhost Academic Search Complete*. If you are at an institution that offers access to general full-text academic databases, don’t forget that these can often be a great source for articles about library practices and problem-solving.

**Books and Journals and Discovery Services – Oh My!:** As a major library services provider, EBSCO has long been associated with serials and full-text article databases. More recently, they have developed the EBSCO Discovery Service (EDS). Even so, I was a bit surprised to find in my inbox e-mails announcing the acquisition of YBP Library Services by EBSCO. The press releases stressed that EBSCO “plans to let YBP be YBP.” My first thought was, won’t that be a little difficult without Baker & Taylor’s giant warehouses of books? But then it dawned on me, this isn’t about print books anymore, is it? This is about selection profiles, approval plans, and YBP’s experience facilitating acquisitions of both print books and e-books for libraries. EBSCO President Tim Collins noted in the press release, “By integrating our discovery service closely with the established workflow tools that libraries use to order and manage their collections, we can maximize the availability and usage of library resources and deliver an improved end user experience.” I recommend reading the full press release (available at [https://www.ebsco.com/news-center/press-releases/ebSCO-shows-major-commitment](https://www.ebsco.com/news-center/press-releases/ebSCO-shows-major-commitment)) even if you are not an EBSCO or YBP customer, because I think it offers interesting insight as to where commercial library services are heading in the future.
Bankruptcy Blues: Back in September 2014, news hit about the bankruptcy of Swets Information Services. Mainly, I was just relieved that I had severed all ties with them many years ago, although my sympathies went out to the many libraries who were finding themselves without 2015 journal renewals and sometimes without funds. Serials Review published an interesting staff editorial titled “The Swets Trap: Understanding the Past to Create the Future” in vol. 40, no. 4, (2014) pp. 235-237 (available at http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2014.979120). They recap how libraries and subscription agents have been down this road before. The editorial notes that, with profit margins becoming thinner for subscription agents, their financial ships can be sinking fast, without libraries even noticing. The editorial does pose the interesting question of whether we are devoting enough library personnel to what is a major percentage of our materials expenditures. With library staff sizes shrinking, libraries may have to be reliant on agents whether we want to or not.

With A Little Help from Our Friends: In December 2014, the Center for Research Libraries announced that the LIBLICENSE Project released a newly revised model license, which is freely available for libraries to use. The model license outlines the core provisions a good library e-resources content license should contain and highlights key points for decisions and negotiations with publishers. Many organizations contributed to this revision, including the New England Law Library Consortium, Inc. (NELLCO). The new model license is available at http://liblicense.crl.edu/licensing-information/model-license/.

It has been a terrible Winter for many of our Technical Services and Online Bibliographic Services colleagues. Hopefully, by the time you are reading this issue, some signs of Spring will have begun to appear!

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

- **Law society journal : official journal of the Law Society of New South Wales**
  - Vol. 20, no. 8 (Sept. 1982)-v. 52, no. 4 (May 2014)
  - (OCoLC 9818257)
  - **Changed to:**
  - **LSJ : Law Society of NSW journal**
    - Issue 1 (June 2014)-
    - (OCoLC 881255054)

- **Legal looseleafs in print**
  - 1981-2014
  - (OCoLC 7139482)
  - **Changed to:**
  - **Legal looseleafs : electronic and print**
    - 2015-
    - (OCoLC 902677044)

- **Legal newsletters in print**
  - 1985-2014
  - (OCoLC 11299533)
  - **Changed to:**
  - **Legal newsletters : electronic and print**
    - 2015-
    - (OCoLC 897981052)

- **Phoenix law review**
  - Vol. 1, no. 1 (spring 2008)-v. 7, no. 2 (winter 2013)
  - (OCoLC 275170814)
  - **Changed to:**
  - **Arizona Summit law review**
    - Vol. 7, no. 3-
    - (OCoLC 863457839)

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

- **All England law reports annual review**
  - Ceased in print with: 2012
  - (OCoLC 10094295)

- **Berkeley journal of international law**
  - Ceased in print with: Vol. 32, no. 1 (2014)
  - (OCoLC 33395175)
  - Continued by online version (OCoLC 60627618)

- **Orbis iurs romani : OIR = Journal of ancient law studies**
  - Ceased with: 13 (2009)
  - (OCoLC 37847920)

- **Planning & environmental law**
  - (OCoLC 53982970)
The Library of Congress Genre Form Terms for Law Materials provides us with an opportunity to significantly improve our subject cataloging efforts. Will we use them? Will we wait and see what other libraries we respect do? Will we delete them from our copy of OCLC records before we export them to our local systems? Perhaps we feel we are too close to retirement to bother with them or that we have never used them before, so why start now? If we do begin now, will we inform reference librarians that, for now, genre searches by themselves may not pull up everything they hope for? Clearly, this is a subject for catalog department meetings and for meetings between catalogers, reference librarians, and library administrators.

A hypothetical example might illustrate some of these problems. Let’s say the director of a law library was heartened to learn of the new law genre terms. He urges staff to add the term “loose-leaf services” to all loose-leaf publications in the collection. His staff points out that this term has a narrower definition and urges him to try a keyword search instead. For the time being, the staff decides to place this term on the backburner. Some workers in our hypothetical catalog department claim to have never heard of many of these terms and find them confusing even after reading the scope notes. Is this a reason not to use them? Hopefully, these questions (again, from purely hypothetical examples) are being discussed nationwide, but the answers are not as simple as we may hope. Do we train copy catalogers to add these or complete their copy cataloging and then hand a printout to a cataloger for action on genre form terms? Only Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) libraries can improve PCC copy. Do we have time to contact them or to send printouts to OCLC suggesting the changes? Many libraries will say no to these extra steps.

As I read over the list of genre terms for law materials, I understood most of the terms (and was grateful for the scope notes) but assumed some of them were more relevant to rare book cataloging or in special library settings, where the emphasis may not be on law. Hopefully, rare book and special materials catalogers, and the reference librarians they serve, will become aware of the possibilities these terms offer. At least one term, “Law materials,” could be very helpful to public libraries but is of no use to law libraries. I have yet to see “Hornbooks (Law)” used, with catalogers seeming to prefer “Casebooks.” OCLC has 51 records with “Hornbooks (Law).” While I hope to use all the terms applicable, I may end up deleting some of them locally after having added them to the national record in OCLC. Our hypothetical library director and his department heads are considering this matter as this column goes to press.

Have we communicated about these terms to our integrated library system (ILS) vendors? If the ILS has genre term searches as an advanced option, a pop-up scope note at the beginning of such searches would be helpful. It would warn of the limited application of genre terms and encourage keyword term searches. It will be awhile before people begin to use such terms. A wait-and-see attitude will delay this. Usage of genre form terms would be a really useful subject for a conference session or preconference training.

Some new/changed terms of interest include:

- Administrative courts (Islamic law)
- Corruption – Law and legislation instead of Corruption – Law and legislation – Criminal provisions
- Judicial corruption – Law and legislation instead of Judicial corruption – Law and legislation – Criminal provisions
- Police corruption – Law and legislation instead of Police corruption – Law and legislation – Criminal provisions
- Political corruption – Law and legislation instead of Political corruption – Law and legislation – Criminal provisions.
Contributing authors: Marlene Brubrick, Jackie Magagnosc, Jean Pajerek, Lauren Seney

Do you find this column and the associated Technical Services Law Librarian (TSLL) TechScans blog (http://tslltechscans.blogspot.com) useful? Would you like to help your fellow technical services law librarians keep up with changes to our rapidly evolving environment? Consider volunteering to become a TechScans contributing author! TechScans contributors monitor library journals, websites, and the activities of library professional organizations and report interesting and/or useful information via the blog and this column. Please contact Jackie Magagnosc (jkm95@cornell.edu) for details if you would like to become part of the TechScans team.

**Cataloging**

MARC, linked data, and human-computer asymmetry


This article addresses the question of why libraries should find linked data a useful construct. The author reminds us that “everyone has discovered and rediscovered that designing data based solely on how it should look for human beings, without considering how computers may need to manipulate it, leases inexorably to ruinously messy, inconsistent data and tremendous retooling costs.” In the end, “[g]iven computer-friendly data, humans can instruct computers to produce human-friendly data displays, in addition to doing all the fascinating behind the scenes manipulation that fuels useful applications from search indexing to text mining.”

The author ends the article by listing principles that distinguish data structures that work for computers from those that work only for humans.

- Atomicity, also known as granularity
- Consistency
- Reliable, unchanging identifiers

Common ground: exploring compatibilities between the linked data models of the Library of Congress and OCLC


This white paper, widely recommended and jointly issued by the Library of Congress and OCLC Research, documents the areas of alignment and differences between OCLC’s Schema.org project and the Library of Congress’ BIBFRAME initiative. The paper concludes with some recommendations for closer alignment of the two linked-data projects.

The paper provides a worthwhile perspective as we think about future directions for our bibliographic data.

**Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) news**

*Resource Description and Access* (RDA) completed Phase 3A changes to name authority records in December 2014. See the following announcements for details:

- [http://www.loc.gov/eds/notices/3A-141201a.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/eds/notices/3A-141201a.pdf) - Phase 3A of RDA Changes to Name Authority Records Begins - The announcement contains details on the changes and has links to other information of interest to Name Authority Cooperative Program (NACO) authority file users.
- [http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/pdf/rdaheadingchanges2014.pdf](http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/pdf/rdaheadingchanges2014.pdf) - The Library of Congress' Policy and Standards Division has also prepared a posting describing the changes, entitled “Changes to Headings in the LC Catalog to Accommodate RDA.”

The bulk of these changes seems to have affected music headings and were necessary for phase 3B, scheduled for April 2015.

**RIMMF 3 now available from The MARC of Quality**

Some of you may be familiar with the original “RIMMF,” which stands for “RDA in Many Metadata Formats.” Deborah and Richard Fritz of The MARC of Quality (TMQ), a library training and consulting firm, as a visualization and training tool for learning RDA developed RIMMF. Released in early January, RIMMF 3 has come a long way since its first version! It encourages (“forces” is such a harsh word!) the cataloger to “think in RDA.” In other words, think about bibliographic data in terms of entities, attributes, and relationships. I have just begun to experiment with RIMMF 3 (http://www.marcofquality.com/wiki/rimmf3/doku.php) and its 18 online tutorials (http://www.marcofquality.com/wiki/rimmf3/doku.php?id=examples), created in support of the “Jane-athon” (http://rdatakit.com/janeathon - see summary below) which took place at the American Library Association (ALA) Midwinter Meeting in January 2015. TMQ also offered a free RIMMF 3 training webinar on January 20, 2015 as preparation for the Jane-athon. I find that working through the tutorials gives me a real, hands-on taste of what cataloging might look like as we transition from MARC to a linked data-based cataloging environment.

**Report from the Jane-athon by Jean Pajerek**

I was fortunate enough to attend the “Jane-athon” pre-conference workshop at ALA Midwinter Meeting in January 2015. Workshop participants chose to work in one of eight different groups, and each group concentrated on a particular kind of Jane Austen-related material. Using the RDA-visualization tool created by Deborah and Richard Fritz (RIMMF3), participants generated RDA-compliant, linked bibliographic data for the different categories of materials, which included: print and non-print versions of Jane’s works; film and TV adaptations; literary and other adaptations; sequels, prequels and spinoffs; translations; biography and literary criticism; and realia such as games, dolls and tea-towels. For two and a half hours, the room was a hive of activity as the various groups created their linked data and tried to figure out how to designate the relationships among Jane Austen, her works, and the works they were cataloging. The realia group wondered how to describe the relationship between Jane Austen and an item depicting her. Finding no relationship designator in RDA for “depiction of,” they settled for (but were unsatisfied with) “honouree.” The translations group wondered what to do with a hypothetical aggregation of several French translations of a single Jane Austen work. Should there be a “Super-Expression” for such a situation? The Jane-athon put both RDA and the concept of linked bibliographic data to the test in a fun, hands-on way, with plenty of support from a group of experts who were on hand to facilitate and answer questions. This was a terrific learning experience; in a post-workshop evaluation form, I said that it was one of the best continuing education programs I had ever attended. The Jane-athon organizers have expressed interest in holding similar events in other venues. I hope they are able to maintain their momentum and bring this valuable learning experience to many more who seek a deeper understanding of library linked data. You can find more information about the Jane-athon and RIMMF at [http://rballs.info/](http://rballs.info/).

**Collection management**


Collection managers should analyze and control the quality of digital collections by actively weeding e-books. Certain print weeding strategies apply to digital materials even though digital materials do not take up physical space. One such strategy is the removal of outdated content in order to maintain updated and accurate collections. However, the e-book format presents some additional and different quality-control challenges. In this article, the authors describe an e-book weeding project at the Louisiana State University Libraries that addresses and demonstrates these challenges.

**Government documents**

Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) releases guidelines for all or mostly online federal depository libraries [http://www.fdlp.gov/requirements-guidance-2/guidance/2124-all-or-mostly-online-federal-depository-libraries](http://www.fdlp.gov/requirements-guidance-2/guidance/2124-all-or-mostly-online-federal-depository-libraries)

The FDLP has provided guidance documents for libraries wishing to become either mostly online or all online depository libraries. A mostly online library is “a selective depository library that emphasizes selection of and provision of access to online depository resources”; an all online depository is a “selective depository in the FDLP that is not selecting any tangible depository resources … and does not intend to add any.” FDLP outlines the procedures for libraries wishing to transition to either mostly or all online depository status.

**Government Publishing Office (GPO) announces FDLP Coordinator Certificate Program**

[http://www.fdlp.gov/academy/fdlp-coordinator-certificate-program](http://www.fdlp.gov/academy/fdlp-coordinator-certificate-program)

The FDLP coordinator certificate program will consist of a series of online classes led by GPO personnel designed to educate
FDLP coordinators on managing depository collections in compliance with the Legal requirements & program regulations of the Federal Depository Library Program. GPO solicited volunteers for a pilot program to run April 1 – June 30, 2015. GPO anticipates that the program will launch in summer 2015. GPO will host a webinar describing the program on June 17, 2015.

Preservation

**Link Rot, Content Drift, and Reference Rot**

The Internet is a fluid machine and the pages that make up the Web are only representative of the present. Links to web pages from last year, and sometimes even last month, are frequently obsolete. As these references become more common in published works from law review articles to Supreme Court decisions, this breakdown in evidence to support arguments progressively becomes more problematic.

To look at the challenges we face and some of the solutions that are available and are in development, The New Yorker’s Jill Lepore reviews the work of Brewster Kahle’s Internet Archive in her article “Can the Internet be archived?” (available at [http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/01/26/cobweb](http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2015/01/26/cobweb)).

Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section

**Local Systems Roundtable – Open Source Software:**

*a Community and a Philosophy of Freedom*

Sunday, July 13, 11:45 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Nicole Engard, Vice President of Education for ByWater Solutions, gave a very engaging presentation about open source software and its use in libraries. Ms. Engard has a M.L.S. degree from Drexel University and worked at Jenkins Law Library in Philadelphia for approximately six years. She has worked with her company, which supports Koha, since its founding. The presentation was a great introduction to the philosophy behind open source and an honest look at benefits and potential pitfalls of adopting open source software. Her enthusiasm for the open-source movement was readily apparent, especially when she discussed how “libraries and open source make the perfect pair.”

Open-source software is code that users have the ability to use and modify for any purpose. There are a lot of myths and misconceptions, or as the speaker called it, FUD (Fear, Uncertainty, and Doubt), about open-source software. Open source (OS) is not the same as open access (OA), so libraries do not need to worry about sharing their data. There is also a misconception that if it is free, then it lacks quality. Most open-source projects have a release manager to review the code before approving it for release. Quality and security can be a concern, but all software is risky. However, because open-source code is not locked down, the user community can make changes themselves instead of waiting for a particular security fix or enhancement to make its way through a for-profit software company’s bureaucracy. Many people work together to develop and to improve the code for the good of everyone.

There are many important things for a library to investigate if it is considering open source, just as if the library was considering acquiring proprietary software. It is very important to learn whether there is an active community supporting the open-source software. Librarians should talk to as many users as possible, visit library sites using the software to see how it works, create pros and cons lists, ask questions on the user community’s forums and social networking sites, and investigate any existing documentation. A good place to start is the FOSS4Lib list ([http://foss4lib.org](http://foss4lib.org)), which lists open source applications for libraries.

The speaker explained that while open source provides the “freedom” to do a lot, it does not mean it is necessarily free of cost. Libraries often cite the lack of local expertise when choosing not to use open source. Libraries are welcome to contribute their own code, but there are many paid support providers available as well. Many libraries have successfully used local students or freelance developers for support, or found that they could develop web programming (Perl, PHP, MySQL, etc.) skills in-house. In addition, because there is no vendor lock-in, libraries are able to use a variety of methods for support.

Continued from page 1

Finally, Jackie Magagnosc puts out a call for more contributors to the TechScans column and blog. I receive more comments concerning this column than any other, so I know it is a popular and useful column. You will work with a number of our colleagues, so it is a good way to meet other TS and OBS members, and you have the opportunity to have your writings appear in print and in a blog. Send Jackie a message for more information.

Michael Maben
Indiana University, Bloomington