Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award Announcement

The Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) Awards Committee is pleased to announce that the recipient of the 2015 Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award for Outstanding Contributions in Technical Services Law Librarianship is Brian Striman.

Brian is Professor of Law Library and Head of Technical Services and Catalog Librarian at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln College of Law Schmid Law Library. His extraordinary contributions and tireless efforts on behalf of technical services law librarians have impacted our profession in a lasting and positive way.

Brian’s dedication, energy, and unique style are legendary among his colleagues in technical services law librarianship, among law librarians in general, and the larger library community.

Brian’s service to the profession is an exemplar of dedication and leadership. He served as TS-SIS Chair in 2013/2014 and as Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS) Chair in 1999/2000. He has served as a TS-SIS Member-at-Large and as Secretary. In addition, he has given his time and energy to numerous other SIS and American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) endeavors, including previously chairing the TS-SIS and OBS-SIS Education Committees, serving on Nominating and Membership committees and on the AALL Annual Meeting Program Committee. AALL recognized Brian’s valuable contributions to the Association by honoring him with its 2009 Volunteer Service Award. All the while he has also been actively involved in the Mid-America Association of Law Libraries for many years, serving as President in 2005-2006 and as Editor-in-Chief of their quarterly publication since 2010.

Technical services law librarians have greatly benefited from Brian’s dedication to promoting research and publication opportunities. In addition to chairing and serving on several committees to investigate those opportunities for the community, Brian was the driving force behind the establishment of the OBS/TS Joint Research Grant. He started the jointly sponsored OBS/TS Research Roundtable and was the co-moderator for it at AALL annual meetings from 1992-1998. He was also the first editor of the “Research and Publications” column in Technical Services Law Librarian (TSLL) and served as editor/co-editor of the column from 1992-1998.
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Technical Services Special Interest Section

Recently, I found myself describing a colleague with the phrase “prefers to actually do stuff rather than be an administrator.” Ever since, I keep replaying that remark mentally because, in my mind, I had said it like a major compliment. After my efforts this year, do I really believe that being a leader is less productive, less useful than working on the line?

Sure, many times during the past nine months I wished I had more time to devote to the brass-tacks discussions of fields and access points going on among the Descriptive Cataloging Advisory Working Group (DCAG) members. But when done right, being a member of an executive board or a committee chair should allow any one of us to coordinate, empower, and assist others to do more together than they could individually.

I have most enjoyed the times that members have approached me with goals, and I could act on the question “What do you need to achieve them?” Our Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) imposes very little red tape and innovation is encouraged. I hope you see this, and I hope I spend a little more time appreciating it as “doing stuff.”

So, in answer to my question about the value of acting as a leader … honestly, it depends. I can think of lots of unproductive/counterproductive leaders throughout world history.

But more immediately to us, to life in TS-SIS, I have to patently reject my earlier skepticism. We have many great “do-er” leaders, who bring us together to tackle things we couldn’t handle individually but need to do. It’s a good, energetic company to be in. Here’s a sample of what I mean:

- Remember those great threads on the DCAG discussion board this year that I mentioned? Thank you, George Prager, for all your work delegating, coordinating, and refocusing many brilliant cataloging minds.
- Remember the survey call for folks engaged in archival work? Thank you, Maxine Wright, for your energy and enthusiasm on behalf of the Preservation Committee and for creating a network of archivists in our libraries. Now we know who to contact!
- Remember those monthly acquisitions tips? Thank you, Diana Jacque and Richard Vaughan, for sparking good conversation and opportunities for sharing!
- Remember the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) webinar “Soft Skill: Professional Indicators of Success?” Thank you, Step Schmitt and the Professional Development Committee, for proposing a program, winning a Bloomberg/BNA grant, and producing a successful webinar!
- Remember the overhaul of the Joint Research Grant program? Thank you, Kerry Skinner, for guiding that group and soliciting our input along the way.
- Look for the fruits of Ashley Moye’s leadership in the very big investigation into our small group organization.
- And a most-sincere tip of the hat to my predecessor as chair and 2015 Renee D. Chapman Award winner, Brian Striman. Brian asked fundamental questions about our spending, our continuing education, our communication, how we think of ourselves, and what to call our work. He’ll be greatly missed in retirement.

For the leaders that continue to come forward to serve, I welcome you. We have a strong, newly-elected TS-SIS Executive Board that will begin in July: Hollie White (Chair), Eric Parker (Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect), Katherine Marshall (Secretary/Treasurer), Ashley Moye (Second-Year Member at Large), and Wilhelmina Randtke (First-Year Member at Large).

We will have a new Professional Development Standing Committee, signaling our continued commitment to improving educational opportunities for members. I’m excited about the leadership duo of Ajaye Bloomstone and Chris Tarr launching this committee.

I also applaud Pat Sayre McCoy. She will serve on the Annual Meeting Program Committee for 2016. Let’s continue to push forward high-quality, timely programming concepts. At every workshop or webinar you attend, be a talent scout. Think about the subject and the speaker. Is this someone we should hear more from? The more we communicate with our Professional Development Committee and Pat, the better our programming can be.

I ask each of you to think about running for AALL Executive Board and advocating for your colleagues on a larger stage. Some of our SIS members have been successful—Joyce Janto was president! And keep in mind that TS-SIS offers grants to
attend the AALL Management Institute and Leadership Academy where our rising stars can network with emerging leaders in other SISs across the country. You could start there.

See the vision of where you want to be, and let’s go—sometimes leading and sometimes following, but always learning and moving forward.

Suzanne Graham
University of Georgia

From the Chair

Online Bibliographic Services
Special Interest Section

The days are long, but the years are short.

I think most of us relate to this saying in one way or another. Whether at work or at home, we spend many long days tending to the “crisis du jour,” putting out the latest fire, herding the cats (literally or figuratively), and juggling the myriad of “little” and “big” things that just need to be done, while also remembering to take the time to smell the roses and make the time to refresh and recharge. Then one day we look at the calendar and wonder how another 12 months passed by so quickly.

As the 2015 American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting approaches (and my year as Online Bibliographic Services (OBS) Chair comes to an end), I feel that I’ve lived through a fast-paced, whirlwind year filled with long, busy, constructively successful, and (generally!) fun days. The past year has been busy with all the details that lead up to a successful AALL Annual Meeting for OBS members. I’m excited to use my final column as OBS Chair to share the details of all of the events that OBS will offer in Philadelphia in July, as well as recap recent events.

In May, Jason LeMay, the Assistant Law Librarian for Cataloging & Metadata at Emory University’s Hugh F. MacMillan Law Library, was appointed to serve as the new Chair of the OBS OCLC Committee. Jason will begin serving his two year term (2015 to 2017) at the conclusion of the AALL Annual Meeting in Philadelphia in July. Jason replaces Jackie Magagnosc who served in this position for the previous two year term (2013 to 2015). Many thanks to Jackie for keeping us informed about OCLC news throughout the year and coordinating the annual OCLC Update at AALL Annual Meetings. Jackie also laid the groundwork for partnering with OCLC in the “post Glenn Patton era,” as Glenn, our long-standing and popular OCLC liaison, retired in December 2014.

Fortunately, Jackie will continue her service to OBS by joining the OBS Executive Board as the newest Member at Large (2015 to 2017) during the AALL Annual Meeting in Philadelphia. Jackie deserves our thanks for both serving as the OBS OCLC Chair and for taking on a leadership role on the OBS Executive Board. Calmer Chattoo, the Serials/Electronic Resources/Special Formats Catalog Librarian at the University of Miami School of Law Library, will be the other new OBS Executive Board member. Calmer will join the Board during the Annual Meeting in July as the new Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect of OBS.

Adding new members to the OBS Board means that other members will reach the end of their terms. Many thanks to Jennifer Noga, who was appointed in July 2014 to a special one year term to fill a vacant Member at Large position. Jennifer is coordinating the OBS display table in the AALL Exhibit Hall in July. Please consider volunteering to staff the table when she solicits volunteers, and please stop by the table to visit with OBS colleagues during the Annual Meeting. We will also bid a very fond farewell to Katrina Piechnik, our Immediate Past Chair. Katrina is among the most enthusiastic, positive, pleasant, and productive OBS or AALL colleagues one will ever meet. I cannot overstate how much fun I’ve had collaborating with Katrina on a variety of OBS projects and how much I’ve learned from her in the two years that I’ve served on the OBS Executive Board. Many thanks to Katrina for being such a terrific mentor for me on the OBS Board and for creating valuable OBS-sponsored programming for the 2014 AALL Annual Meeting in San Antonio.

In addition to these various “comings and goings,” some Board members will change roles. I’ve enjoyed my year as the OBS Chair, but I’m looking forward to serving as the next Immediate Past Chair and supporting Marjorie Crawford as she becomes the next OBS Chair. Marjorie is both thoughtful and enthusiastic, and I know she will coordinate valuable OBS-sponsored programming for the 2016 AALL Annual Meeting in Chicago. As OBS Chair, Marjorie will also serve as
the Chair of the OBS Education Committee, so please consider serving on this committee when Marjorie puts out a call for volunteers. You don’t have to be a program moderator or speaker; helping to polish program ideas and edit program proposals are valuable tasks that can be accomplished remotely and don’t involve speaking or attending the Annual Meeting. Note that the OBS Education Committee will meet in Philadelphia in July (see the listing of OBS-sponsored events below), but you don’t need to attend that meeting to be a committee member.

By the end of the 2015 AALL Annual Meeting, the 2015-2016 OBS Board will consist of:

- Marjorie Crawford (Chair);
- Karen Selden (Immediate Past Chair);
- Calmer Chattoo (Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect);
- Melanie Cornell (Secretary/Treasurer, 2015-2017);
- Barbara Ginzburg (Member at Large, 2014-2016); and
- Jackie Magagnosc (Member at Large, 2015-2017).

Please join me in congratulating this team and wishing them the best during the 2015-2016 term of office.

For those attending the 2015 AALL Annual Meeting, please put the following OBS-sponsored activities on your schedule. See the OBS (http://www.aallnet.org/sections/obs) and AALL (http://www.aallnet.org/conference) websites for the most current information and more details about these events.

Note that PCC stands for Philadelphia Convention Center in the following list:

Saturday, July 18:

Visit the OBS Table in the Activities Area of the Exhibit Hall during the Opening Reception (5 p.m.-6:30 p.m.)

PCC-Exhibit Hall B

Then join your OBS colleagues at the “Alphabet Soup” CS/OBS/RIPS/TS SISs Joint Reception (sponsored by Innovative Interfaces) from 7 p.m.-9 p.m. at the Marriott-Grand Ballroom Salon CD. Plan to bring your sweet tooth to this event.

Sunday, July 19:

11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m., OCLC Update — PCC-Room 112B

NOTE: This will be listed on the AALL conference schedule site under Meetings & Events, then SIS.

Jackie Magagnosc will moderate this session, featuring a representative from OCLC who will make a presentation about new and updated OCLC products and services and take questions from attendees.

1:00 p.m.-2:00 p.m., Program A6: “Google Analytics: Using the Software, Using the Data” — PCC-Room 103A

The first part of assessing return on investment (ROI) for online resources is identifying your users and how they use the virtual library. Google Analytics is free software that can help answer those questions, giving libraries of all sizes hard numbers that enable data-based decision making. Program presenters will discuss how to install and use Google Analytics on your library’s web pages and OPAC, what data it does and does not provide, and what decisions their libraries have made as a result of the data gathered.

5:15 p.m.-6:30 p.m., OBS-SIS Outgoing/Incoming Executive Board Meeting — Marriott-Room 302

Monday, July 20:

10:00 a.m.-11:00 a.m., Program D7: “Striking a Balance in Your Library Catalog: TMI vs. TLI” — PCC-Room 113BC

With catalog records available for individual titles of large databases, such as ProQuest, HeinOnline, LLMC, and MOML, are we creating catalogs with “too much information (TMI)” in the form of overwhelming search results? Conversely, without many “go to” Westlaw and Lexis titles in our catalogs, do we offer patrons “too little useful information” (TLI)? Is it possible to provide TMI and TLI simultaneously? Hear the results of a recent survey of both public services and technical services law librarians on this topic, as well as the experiences of a law firm librarian and an academic law librarian in evaluating and addressing issues of TLI and TMI in their catalogs.

3:15 p.m.-4:30 p.m., OBS Local Systems Committee Program: “Migrating to Open Source: Koha and Kuali OLE in Law Libraries” — PCC-Room 111A

NOTE: This will be listed on the AALL conference schedule site under Meetings & Events, then SIS.

Curious about open source integrated library systems (ILS)? Wondering what it takes to migrate to one? Hear an overview of what open source is, why a library might choose it, and how a vendor might help with migration. Then hear the experiences...
of three law librarians who helped the following libraries migrate to open source systems: Brooklyn Law School (III to Koha); Rutgers Law School (III to Koha); and the University of Chicago’s D’Angelo Law Library (Horizon to Kuali OLE).

Moderator: Kevin Carey, (Technical Services Librarian, Ohio State University Moritz Law Library) OBS Local Systems Committee Chair

Speakers: Nate Curulla, Owner, CRO of ByWater Solutions  
Jeff Gabel, Cataloging Librarian/E-Resource Manager, Brooklyn Law School Library  
Marjorie Crawford, Head of Technical Services, Rutgers University Law School Library  
Pat Sayre-McCoy, Head of Law Cataloging and Serials, University of Chicago D’Angelo Law Library

4:45 p.m.–5:30 p.m., OBS Business Meeting — Marriott-Room 303
Please come and hear what the OBS Board and Committees have accomplished during the past year, as well as plans for the future.

5:30 p.m.-6:30 p.m. OBS Education Committee Meeting — Marriott-Room 302
Please come and share your programming ideas for the 2016 AALL Annual Meeting or for AALL webinars throughout the coming year.

Tuesday, July 21, 2015:

2:30 p.m.-5:00 p.m. – Program I1: “BIBFRAME Deep Dive: How Did We Get Here and Where Are We Going?” — PCC-Room 201BC
The Bibliographic Framework Initiative (BIBFRAME) will reimagine and implement a bibliographic environment for a post-MARC world. The relationship between linked data and BIBFRAME, as well as how BIBFRAME differs from linked data, will be explained. The program will include a demonstration of a BIBFRAME editor and other tools currently in development, and an examination of the BIBFRAME data structure and its relationship to MARC. Attendees will be introduced to MARCNext, a new metadata research toolkit developed to expose user-friendly tools for exploring and testing linked data/non-MARC metadata concepts using local MARC data.

Finally, in what might be viewed as “old news” by now, I want to extend many thanks to all of the OBS members who offered support and ideas to the OBS and TS-SIS Executive Boards in March as we asked the AALL Executive Board to reconsider its initial decision to discontinue funding for the TS-SIS representatives to ALCTS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) and Subject Analysis Committee (SAC). It was gratifying to see the AALL Executive Board reconsider and ultimately reverse their decision. During this process, the AALL Executive Board learned a lot about the important work that OBS and TS-SIS members accomplish. Additionally, OBS and TS-SIS members learned that we cannot take for granted that our non-technical services colleagues understand and value our contributions to our libraries, to AALL, and to librarianship in general. To paraphrase TS-SIS Chair Suzanne Graham’s announcement when the AALL Board restored funding for these three representative positions:

Let’s build on our momentum by continuing to:

• nominate and support AALL Executive board members
• serve on professional committees
• craft quality programming for the AALL Annual Meeting
• write for Technical Services Law Librarian (TSLL), Law Library Journal, AALL Spectrum, and other professional publications

Please let the AALL Executive Board’s actions and Suzanne’s message serve as “calls to action” for all of us. An easy way to become more active is to participate in OBS activities to the extent that your time and interest allows. Watch the OBS listserv for news and chances to become involved, and please don’t hesitate to contact any OBS Board member to share ideas, questions, concerns, or feedback.

To bring this column full-circle, many thanks to my OBS colleagues for allowing me to serve you during this short year that included some (but not too many!) long days working on OBS projects. I’ve enjoyed my time serving all of you, and would be happy to talk with anyone who is interested in becoming more involved in OBS activities or leadership.

I’m looking forward to seeing many of my OBS colleagues in Philly in July for a whirlwind of long days full of fun, learning, connecting, and collegiality!

Karen Selden  
University of Colorado
Transition Planning

I’m retiring in October. It wasn’t expected but it’s now my reality and I’m in transition-planning mode. This isn’t the same as succession planning, which involves staff development to allow promotion and growth of existing staff into new roles. I don’t have a younger protégé who might move into my position when I leave, but there is definitely a transition in the works that needs to be planned. At least I have the luxury of several months to get what’s in my head shared in documentation and training.

My transition planning is about finding a structured way to brain dump procedures, responsibilities, relationships, problem solving, and long-term analysis in a way that allows someone else to pick up and move forward. The details of how a process works aren’t as important as understanding the “why” behind the choices that were made. Blindly following any procedure isn’t healthy and some of the best changes come when someone asks, “Why do you do that?” and you realize you don’t know.

So as I look at my transition, think about yours. Don’t wait until you are ready to retire or are preparing for a move to a new position. What’s in your head that needs to be captured? Here are some categories:

- **Timetables**: Know what happens when. Think of periodic events such as course reserves, summer associates onslaught, budget requesting deadline, fund reporting requirements, statistical reports, system upgrades. Map them onto a schedule and indicate what it is, who is responsible, and what’s involved.

- **Money**: Dealing with budgets is core for acquisitions work. Know the fund structure and the rules for each spending source. How is spending tracked? Do you have to return unspent funds? What happens to encumbrances at fiscal close? What are your checks and balances? Where are the files kept, by whom, and for how long? Know what reports are generated at different levels of your system and organization. Make sure your audit trail is clean and that you follow general accounting principles.

- **Vendors**: Who are your primary vendors for domestic and foreign/international material? Do you use the same sources for both monographs and continuations? Are there special arrangements for long-term pricing? Are there approval or package plans in place that must be considered? Legal materials are standard across libraries, but the way we acquire and manage them isn’t.

- **Collections**: Describe what the library collects and how it has changed/is changing. What decisions have been made about print and online? Who negotiates licenses and where are they retained? What retention decisions have been made about print if the transition is to electronic formats? Describe your role.

- **Staff**: Written job descriptions aren’t enough. Create a job chart of tasks done in the unit and assign each to a person. Have completed, written performance appraisals for each person. If you have union staff, be sure there’s a copy of the contract available.

- **Statistics**: What do you collect and why? Do you report them to outside organizations such as the American Bar Association (ABA) or are they internal to your institution? If you use your online system to generate numbers, be sure to write an explanation of how you devise them if it’s not obvious. Reports we run monthly become routine until someone else has to do them and doesn’t know how to replicate results.

- **Procedures**: Current documentation is important. If you have staff, ask them to help you write or revise what you have. At least be sure there are outlines for what needs to be considered or included if you don’t have time to write up everything.

- **Outside contacts**: You have a network of contacts that help you do your job, be they in accounts payable, the business office, the general counsel’s office, or your best vendor customer service buddies. Record names, contact info, and why those people matter.

We live in a constant state of change these days with our organizations, our profession, and our lives. Give yourselves permission (after fiscal close!) to spend time preparing transition materials. If you’re lucky, you can use them to help train and develop your staff as well as position yourself for new directions.

For more information on succession planning, join me in Philadelphia at program D6, “Using Succession Planning and Knowledge Transfer to Connect the Generations,” on Monday, July 20, 2015, 10 a.m.-11 a.m., PCC-Room 204A.
Regardless of how one views the “entanglement” of church and state, when law and religion come together, it poses many problems for classification. Should a work class in K (for law) or B (for religion) – the answer may reflect the specifics of a library, but at the Library of Congress (LC) (which determines the LC classification policy), law usually trumps religion (remember that the Congress is in the law-making business and is dominated by lawyers rather than theologians). Then one needs to consider if a book should class in the almost finished KB schedule (religious law) or with the law of a particular country.

**Jurisdiction trumps religion**

First and foremost, if a book discussing “law” and “religion” is country-specific, it classes with the law of the country. The reason is that real-world clients and the lawyers representing them are concerned with getting results under the law of the jurisdiction. Even in a very secular jurisdiction that claims to ignore “religious” law, real-world cases arise that result in “religious” law impacting the secular legal system.

One can find similar classification numbers for inheritance, marriage, and divorce for works on how religious law co-exists with a secular legal system that doesn’t recognize its validity (such as the United States). A book on how to write an Islamic will (one written in accordance with Islamic law) that can be probated in the United States classes in KF760.R44, and a book on how to arrange a Jewish bill of divorce (or any other religion’s divorce procedures) when operating under New York law is KFN5126.5 or K695.5 if not country-specific. The relationship between religious and civil marriage goes to KD755. If there is no similar classification number for any of these topics in a given schedule or table, then LC establishes one. These numbers assume the existence of a secular legal system – in countries where the governing law is the religious law, such a work is treated as “normal” – so getting an Islamic will probated in Saudi Arabia would class in KMT785, just as a work on the established church’s law of marriage in colonial Virginia would class in KFV because that was the state law governing marriage in that period.

While the rule that marriage involves the permanent union of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others (i.e., no gay marriage, no divorce, no polygamy, and implicit criminalization of adultery and fornication) is a rule of the Church of England’s canon law adopted into the Anglo-American legal system over 200 years ago, once it has been “received” it becomes the law of the jurisdiction. That an American law had a religious origin is irrelevant. As we see, if the work is about the law affecting actual clients, it classes with the jurisdiction, meaning anywhere in K other than KB.

In some countries (not the United States, at least since the late 18th century), the “religious law” is the “law of the land.” In some cases, this means that a country adopts the law of a singular religion and enforces it as the “secular law.” In other cases, religious laws govern individuals (often referred to as their personal law, which has nothing to do with the American procedural concept of personal jurisdiction). Thus, in many countries, Islamic law governs Muslims while the local version of canon law governs Christians, etc. For matters such as marriage and divorce, this makes a real difference (because Islam allows polygamy and divorce, and Christianity bans polygamy and often divorce). Yes, this gets confusing depending on whether one can change one’s religion (note that in many countries, changing one’s religion away from the established religion is tantamount to treason and sometimes leads to capital punishment). Personal jurisdiction based on religion, ethnicity, or tribal affiliation is the norm in most predominantly Muslim countries, most of Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia. In the past, this was also the case in Europe, but for the most part, it is not any more. In the United States, at one point (perhaps still) American Indians were subject to their own personal law, and during the colonial period, Jews (in those colonies they were allowed to live) were subject to Jewish law in matters pertaining to marriage and divorce; however, this concept is totally alien to contemporary American law.

A rule of thumb might be if you can determine that the book is specific to one country, class with the country. For example, Islamic law in India is clearly country-specific, and if India considers this to be the law governing Muslims, it classes as a general work on the topic under Indian law in KNS, rather than with Islamic law in KBP (subject headings are needed to bring out the group the work is discussing). A book would go to KB only if it appears to be addressing a “religious law” topic that would apply equally anywhere in the world. The reason is that once the book is discussing how the law is implemented under one country’s law, it becomes worthless elsewhere (e.g., a book on Islamic marriages in India is meaningless to someone in Nigeria or Pakistan, even though those countries have common law-based legal systems that recognize religious marriages).
“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof…”

For the purposes of this article, freedom of religion refers to the “free exercise” part of the First Amendment, while the separation of “church and state” refers to not establishing a state religion. In all schedules, these concepts are both included under civil rights (though “Church and state” may be in an adjacent area, next to administrative law, depending on the history of the country). The topics are distinct, even though the line between them is often unclear in the United States and the topics have radically different treatment in other countries. “Freedom of religion” (cf. KF4683) deals with the rights of individuals, typically of religious minorities, to follow the teachings of their religion, especially when they are not part of the norm in that country. “Church and state” (cf. KF4685) issues involve the status of various religious groups under the laws of the country.

“Ecclesiastical law” (called “Religious laws and legislation” in non-Christian contexts) typically involve government laws regulating established or recognized religious bodies, and as such, it should never occur in the modern United States. In countries with an official religion, one encounters law on matters not governed by statute in the modern U.S., e.g., terms of employment of clergy, which religious doctrines the official church embraces, etc. There really is no place for them in KF because the United States hasn’t had ecclesiastical laws since the late 18th century, but for England there is very large range (KD8600- KD8790).

A religious perspective on a country’s legal system classes with the legal system, e.g., KF358 for the United States or KU469.5 for Australia. If on a topic, it goes with the topic. The class number reflects the legal topic, and subject headings bring out the religious aspect. The same holds true for general works on how a religious system has influenced a country’s legal system. From a classification perspective, the law of the jurisdiction is determinative.

**KB: Religious Law in General**

So what is KB for? KB has several different components. One is KBR/KBU for the Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church, which also includes KBS and KBT for other somewhat-related (depending on the year) Christian Churches. KBM and KBP are for Jewish and Islamic law respectively, and are based on the Afro-Asian civil law table rather than traditional Jewish and Islamic arrangements of law (the primary audience being western legal scholars looking at the traditional system). These schedules are very complex relative to the needs of the handful of non-specialist libraries. They also differ as to what goes in them because the canon law governs a wide range of topics that would not otherwise class in K, whereas KBP and KBM only have numbers for “secular” topics. In theory, this leaves the more purely “religious” materials in B, even though Jewish and Islamic legal systems integrate the “ritual” and the “civil” law.

The KB schedules are for “pure” religious legal materials, i.e., how the laws exist in the vacuum of that religion without pollution from another legal system’s influence. If the work concerns the implementation of religious law under a given legal system, it classes with that system under the jurisdiction. If you can tell from a putative KB book which country it pertains to, it probably belongs in the schedule for the jurisdiction.

LC treats “Hindu law” as the historic law of India rather than a religious system. It remains unclear how LC will treat Protestant “canon law,” especially the de facto “canon law” of those protestant churches that reject the concept of “canon law,” but sometimes have books addressing the same subject matters as traditional canon law materials. Finally, if a religious community in a country does its own traditional dispute resolution (which Jews have done traditionally), LC treats this as arbitration and it classes with the law of the country.

---

**Save the Date: AALL Business Skills Clinic to be Held October 16-17**

Save the date for the AALL Business Skills Clinic, a two-day intensive experience designed to give you skills in strategic planning, managerial finance, human resources, negotiations, and marketing/communications. The program will be held October 16-17 at the Hyatt Chicago Magnificent Mile Hotel in Chicago. Contact Katie Brown, Chair of the Business Skills Education Task Force or Celeste Smith, AALL’s director of education, for more information.
The Most Wonderful Time of the Year!

It may sound strange, but the end of the fiscal year, despite its stresses, is a wonderful time. The pressure cooker that is closing provides a strange clarity, helping me find cracks that need repairing, collection areas to bulk up, and future collections projects to tackle.

It’s that last part that is most enjoyable, especially with the recurring (and never realized) fantasy of a “quiet summer.” This summer brings a bit more breathing room, so I’m hoping to tackle a comprehensive collection review, a few weeding projects, a full rewrite of the collection development policy, a cancelation project, and some acquisitions clean-up. We’ll see.

Also on the summer list is attending the 2015 American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting in Philadelphia. There’s a lot of programming that is worth a look, and here are some collections-related sessions that might be of interest:

- Committee on Relations with Information Vendors (CRIV) Vendor Roundtable
  Sunday, July 19, 2015, 11:45 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
  Marriott-Grand Ballroom Salon A
- Academic Law Libraries Special Interest Section (ALL-SIS) Collection Development Round Table
  Monday, July 20, 2015, 3:15 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
  Marriott-Grand Ballroom Salon E
- “Work Smarter, Not Harder - More Hip Tips for the Acquisitions Librarian”
  Sunday, July 19, 2015, 2:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m.
  PCC-Room 108AB
- “Confronting the Future of Information Policy”
  Monday, July 20, 2015, 2:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m.
  PCC-Room 204A
- “Strategic Integration of E-books and Digital Content in Law Libraries”
  Monday, July 20, 2015, 2:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m.
  PCC-Room 103A
- “Increase Your Library’s Resources and Enhance Your Outreach Efforts Without New Funding: Using the AGLI Model”
  Tuesday, July 21, 2015, 2:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m.
  PCC-Room 201A
- “Transitioning to the Revised ABA Law School Accreditation Standards”
  Tuesday, July 21, 2015, 4:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.
  PCC-Room 113BC

Hopefully, we’ll see each other there. I’d love to hear what you’re planning on tackling this summer while students are gone and the courts are moving a bit more slowly!

Register Today for the 2015 Annual Meeting

Registration is open for the 108th Annual Meeting & Conference in Philadelphia. Join us July 18-21 for four full days of exciting learning opportunities, from the keynote address by Terry Gross to the dozens of “must-have” programs on timely topics that AALL members have identified as vital to their professional education. Check out all the sessions, and start making plans to join us.
As many of you know, the Descriptive Cataloging Advisory Group has been advocating changes to Resource Description and Access (RDA) to make law cataloging “better” under RDA. One current success is simplifications for court reports and treaties, and the elimination of “Laws, etc.” is working its way through the RDA revision process now.

But an issue that remains and continues to cause consternation for law catalogers is the decision-making related to when a revised edition of a law treatise is a new work. The current interpretation and examples that we are seeing in OCLC are not happy-making examples (my high-school-teacher sister deplores the use of certain “terms,” so I hesitate in a reputable publication like Technical Services Law Librarian (TSLL) to be so blunt, but what is happening with legal editions under RDA “sucks”).

Currently, a revised edition is not considered a new work unless there have been some “creator” changes. This is a simplistic explanation, but: if creators are the same, but the title changes, use a 240 for the earlier edition. Why does this strict RDA/ Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) interpretation not work for law treatises? Blame it on the law itself. The reason law has so many of these revised edition situations is that the law changes and texts incorporate this new “law.” For example, one of my law school’s faculty collects every new case in the area of copyright law to make sure he has the best examples for analysis of changes in the law for each edition of his casebook.

I believe that law cataloging should brave the current interpretations and flatly say that a new edition of a law treatise is a new work. Robert Maxwell in, FRBR: A Guide for the Perplexed, says this:

Most people would agree that at some point a line is crossed and a new work is created: it is no longer the same work. But where is that line? FRBR points out that this is a cultural question: “The line of demarcation …between one work and another may in fact be viewed differently from one culture to another…” (p.17).

We’ve had several years now to realize that our “culture,” a cataloging community that lives with the changes that law brings, means that editions should not be treated like works of fiction. Each should be treated as a new work. Later in his book, when Maxwell is writing about relationships, he says, “Different communities might make different decisions depending on the needs and wants of their users” (p.73). While I absolutely believe we need to make good, linking relationships between these “editions as new works,” “identifying” new editions under what may have been the first or an earlier edition title is so not in our patrons best interests.

I believe that one of the other realities of what makes our literature and cataloging “culture” different is good old supplementation. We really have works in transition in our collections: supplements and/or replacement volumes that record the changes that have taken place since the last expression of the current work (whatever “edition” it is called) was published. We don’t want our staff and patrons to have a title in an authorized access point (AAP) other than the current one by which it will appear in the mail to be checked in and cited by our faculty and reference librarians.

My favorite recent terrible example is the following OCLC record 896850864: 2nd edition with title International financial and monetary law has a 240 for the 1st edition title: Legal foundations of international monetary stability. If one reads the preface, the author Lastra clearly says this edition reflects “a fundamental revision of the architecture that safeguards monetary stability.” How is this 240 a benefit to our users? It is not; it is totally misleading. For a fiction work that may appear in various later iterations, it makes FRBR sense to tie them together via a 130 or 100/240. However, the law’s reaction to the changes in our world have changed the intellectual content of this Lastra “work.”

This title change draws attention to how wrong it is to be using a routinized application of FRBR/RDA to treat new editions as the same work. Even titles that haven’t changed, such as the new edition of Alternatives to Litigation, have clear explanations in them of change to this “work.” Writing on a legal concept such as Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in its infancy and writing now in the third edition demonstrate how this field has expanded tremendously, not to mention the
inclusion of state and international law in the third edition. Another recent example from a California title says that “This new edition incorporates the most recent developments in California statutory, regulatory, and case law…It also reflects changes to California practice areas resulting from legislative, administrative, and judicial action.” All of these changes make the latest “edition” of such titles new works.

Are my observations new? No. Jean Pajerek pointed out in early RDA training for law cataloging that we were seeing some very jarring interpretations of RDA 6.27.1.5 (Adaptations and Revisions): “If the work is presented simply as an edition of the previously existing work, treat it as an expression of that work. Use the authorized access point representing the previously existing work.”

RDA 6.27.1.5 does include the following language: “substantially changes the … content of that work.” We certainly don’t want to count pages of change, just have it accepted that the current interpretation of what is a new work, does not “work” for law treatises and our users of the data we create. It definitely does not support the FRBR principles of Find, Identify, or Select. And don’t get me started on what our poor interlibrary loan (ILL) staff is undergoing to “Obtain” a latest, new edition of a law resource. I’d have to repeat the five-letter word used above.

Why am I writing this here and now? This is by way of a “heads up” for a push for a Library of Congress/Program for Cooperative Cataloging (LC/PCC) Policy Statement for this rule. Remember FRBR is a model, and RDA is an attempt to apply the model. Law cataloging and its users are a community that needs LC/PCC to recognize this area of legal literature is very different from fiction and the application of RDA rules. But I don’t want law cataloging to have to go back to being “special” with special rules; I just want those applying the rules to adjust to the right! By the right, I mean, if you have seen Barbara Tillett’s relationship figure explaining when a resource becomes a new work, we’d need only to add to the right of the dotted line in the figure: Editions, with new content.1

What if we could work on best practices and official policy statements that allow for different criteria for works of fiction versus works of non-fiction and that discuss specific examples of when a new edition does cross that line of demarcation and become a new work? Not just for law materials, but for all materials in which frequent updating of the discipline’s changing landscape is warranted? Surely, we are not alone in this “winter of our discontent” and other catalogers dealing with areas such as science may have similar concerns that should be brought to LC/PCC’s attention. Here’s hoping for a “glorious summer” in Philadelphia and with more acceptable (i.e., no more five-letter words meaning, according to the OED, very bad, disagreeable, or disgusting) authorized access point’s for editions of legal works.

1 See the figure from “Bibliographic Relationships” by Barbara B. Tillett (in Relationships in the Organization of Knowledge, eds. Carol A. Bean and Rebecca Green, Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001).
There have been a number of interesting articles of late regarding the Internet and library resources in general, but I’m going to discuss two. The first is a blog post on Scripting.com regarding the degradation of HTTPS, and the second is the news of Elsevier’s new policy on open access and sharing.

Just to refresh your memory, HTTPS is the secure form of your standard HyperText Transfer Protocol, which most people recognize as the beginning part of most web addresses. It really is a layer of a HTTP protocol over a Secure Socket Layer or Transport Layer Security Protocol—essentially, it’s supposed to make your connection and, implicitly, that website more secure.

Google and Mozilla have recently made moves to encourage and even enforce the use of HTTPS, with Google even going so far as to add HTTPS as part of their ranking criteria. Supposedly, this is to increase the overall security of the Internet, and particularly to address the idea that Internet Service Providers (ISPs) have been gathering, and possibly (and more nefariously) modifying, the content that passes through the Internet on sites that don’t have HTTPS enabled.

What the Scripting.com article (http://scripting.com/2015/05/17/somethingDoesntSmellRightAboutTheRushToDeprecateHttp.html) points out is that simply putting HTTPS on your site does not prevent people from snooping and modifying content. Ironically, Google and Mozilla do it themselves all the time through their browsers. Google Chrome and Firefox both have the capability to modify the content that comes through their browsers. In fact, that’s often the function of many add-ons and extensions.

Also important to point out is that if you are really concerned about security, you can take other steps, such as using a VPN, a proxy, or simply adding HTTPS yourself, such as with HTTPS Everywhere (https://www.eff.org/HTTPS-EVERYWHERE).

So really the question becomes, who are you worrying about modifying and collecting your content? If you are in a law firm and require full security, HTTPS is a simple step, but it is only an initial one, akin to buying an umbrella in case in might rain. If you’re interested in true security as to who sees your content, there’s a number of other methods and precautions that need be taken, and worrying about ISPs seeing your content is just one of the concerns you should have.

The other news that struck my interest recently was Elsevier’s announcement of their new “attitude” toward open access and sharing (https://www.elsevier.com/connect/elsevier-updates-its-policies-perspectives-and-services-on-article-sharing). It has not gone over as Elsevier might have hoped.

Groups such as Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC) and the Scholarly Communications@Duke have come out with pointed criticisms of the policy (see, e.g., http://sparc.arl.org/news/new-policy-elsevier-impedes-open-access-and-sharing and https://blogs.library.duke.edu/scholcomm/2015/05/04/stepping-back-from-sharing/), pointing out that “The policy imposes unacceptably long embargo periods of up to 48 months for some journals. It also requires authors to apply a ‘non-commercial and no derivative works’ license for each article deposited into a repository, greatly inhibiting the re-use value of these articles” (http://sparc.arl.org/news/new-policy-elsevier-impedes-open-access-and-sharing).

The Scholarly Communications@Duke take on it is particularly interesting, as it generated a response from the general counsel of Elsevier, where they state that “mandates with short or no embargo periods represent to us (...) a competitive concern.” As Mike Taylor of the “Sauropod Vertebra Picture of the Week” blog points out, this makes you wonder what the actual value added by Elsevier is if they’re worried about the competition from pre-prints available on SSRN and other available Open Access journals. What’s to prevent school’s scholars from publishing their work directly on the web? If the value added by the publisher is simply collocation, then that’s something that librarians and others are more than able to do. If it is editorial/peer control, then that’s also not out of the realm of possibility for scholars to handle. Discovery layers such as Summon and Blacklight could serve to obviate some of the difficulty if stronger organizational taxonomies and other such structures are used.

Most academic scholars I know do not get paid by the journals for their contributions, so what exact added value is it that Elsevier and its cohorts bring that makes publication in their forums preferable? Cachet? Distribution? Traditional inertia? If so, we might reexamine that structure.
In my last column, we left off with how Project Counting Online Usage of Networked Electronic Resources (COUNTER) is transforming the usage statistics landscape, making usage reports a simple and effective tool for comparing and contrasting patron behavior and preferences in databases across the board. A great weakness in legal databases, however, is the lack of COUNTER-compliant reporting, and sometimes the lack of any reporting at all, leaving us with a big question. How can I take the statistics available to me, regardless of compliance, and transform them into a viable assessment tool, especially in regards to the subscription cancellation decisions that currently haunt the landscape of law librarianship?

There are obvious difficulties in choosing whether to cancel or keep databases when usage data is not standardized. Unless reports are COUNTER-compliant, there is no way of knowing if “Searches” on one report is equivalent to “Searches” on another report, much less how to compare “Searches” to completely dissimilar terms. What about “Visitors”? Are these the total number of separate accesses, the number of “unique” visitors, or something else entirely? One of the first steps during and after gathering your usage reports is to identify the definitions of particular words. If you cannot find definitions for the terms on your report somewhere in an FAQ or a Help link on the database site or administrative portal, then reach out to customer service or your own school’s representative and find these definitions.

But, an even more practical step is gathering the reports to begin with. Some databases have usage reports available in an administrative portal, others have a portal dedicated specifically to usage reports, others have an interface built in to the database itself, and still others require you to directly contact your representatives. The best options are those which let you create custom reports or at least run standardized reports yourself on demand, from both off and on site; contacting representatives presents its own brand of unique challenges. Any time your representative changes, either your interim or replacement representative will need to figure out how to complete your request, and this may produce a set of entirely different reports. If you have a particular way you are accustomed to seeing the data, send that to your new representative when making requests. This tactic can also be useful with older reps if you only ask for this data annually and want to ensure consistency.

While your institution can run monthly statistics and create a variety of visually appealing comparison charts, at the very least, you should gather and compile available usage statistics for each database at least a month before renewal. When COUNTER reports are available, some of the most popular and useful reports include Journal Report 1, which contains successful full-text article requests by month and journal, and Database Report 3, which contains searches and sessions by month and service. COUNTER 4 compliant sites offer Platform Report 1 instead of Database Report 3, containing total searches, result clicks, and record views by month and platform. Turnaways are useful when you’re assessing potential ways to grow your collection, as they demonstrate what content your patrons are trying to access that is unavailable with your current subscription. When COUNTER reports are not available, you’ll have to familiarize yourself with each database’s unique capability and assess your preference individually.

Here are some of the major players in law schools and how to access their reports. I cannot claim that this is a completely accurate list, as it has grown, morphed, and changed over the years to reflect database capabilities. Despite all of my efforts to stay current, I’m always learning things I didn’t already know could be done or my representatives weren’t aware could be done. If you have anything to add or information on other databases that would be of interest to law librarians, please send it to amoye@charlottelaw.edu and I’ll add an update to my next column, as well as my own personal records!

- Bureau of National Affairs (BNA) – BNA requires contacting the representative directly, and reported usage is broken down by quarter, including email alerts, visits, and page views. The cumulative quarterly report makes it challenging to add BNA into any sort of comprehensive monthly database usage report. Bloomberg BNA does not have usage reporting capabilities at this time.
- Center for Computer-Assisted Legal Instruction (CALI) – With CALI, you must contact your representative directly, and you can obtain the total number of lessons accessed by month.
- Commerce Clearing House (CCH) – CCH has changed over the years. When I first started my usage statistics journey eight years ago, reports came through your representative. Then, there was a separate interface where, after requesting access, you could create your own reports. At this point, CCH again requires you to request reports
through your representative. Representatives can create a variety of reports, so I usually send our preferred report when I send in a request; this report indicates page hits, users, days, and devices, all separated by month.

- Chronicle of Higher Education (CHE) – CHE has a link for reporting ([http://chronicle.com/campuswide/reports/](http://chronicle.com/campuswide/reports/), requires login), and it gives you a HTML summary of page views, searches, and visitors by month.

- Chicago Manual of Style – You can request these statistics directly at cmoshelpdesk@press.uchicago.edu or access the report yourself at [http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/reports/index.epl](http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/reports/index.epl) (requires login). The linked report shows successful title requests by month.

- eLibrary – This database has a variety of options available at [http://library.bigchalk.com/reports](http://library.bigchalk.com/reports) (requires login), such as database activity and document usage, as well as a handful of reports in COUNTER format. It’s important to note that eLibrary is COUNTER-compliant to the 2003 code of practice, not the current code, meaning that even comparisons with a current COUNTER-compliant report from another database are flawed. eLibrary also allows you to schedule regular delivery of specific reports directly to your email inbox.

- HeinOnline – You can request usage statistics directly from techsupport@wshein.com, and they are also delivered automatically in quarterly installments. Statistics reported include hits, articles, page views, visits, and searches by month. Unfortunately, HeinOnline does not separate by library within their statistics, making it impossible to support cancellation decisions within the database using these reports. These reports also provide a good example of the difficulties of matching reported terms with COUNTER-compliant terms for comparison across databases. A natural inclination would be to match Page Views with Record Views, due to similarity in language, but “Page Views” counts each and every page view. If a user reads three pages of an article, it counts as three page views. However, these Page Views are from the same article, creating a single “Article” count, which makes “Articles” more consistent with the concept of “Record View” under COUNTER 4 compliance.

- JSTOR – Historical JSTOR usage reports, running through 2009, are available at [http://stats.jstor.org/](http://stats.jstor.org/). Access newer usage statistics directly from your individual JSTOR login. In order to be set up as an administrator of the system and have the “Usage Statistics” feature available to you, contact JSTOR support at support@jstor.org. COUNTER 4 reports are available from January 1, 2015, and earlier reports are compliant with COUNTER 3 standards. In addition to the COUNTER reports, you can run a variety of other custom reports, and you can schedule your reports for automatic delivery to your email inbox.

- Gale (includes LegalTrac, Making of Modern Law, United States Supreme Court Records & Briefs) – Reports are available at [http://admin.galegroup.com/](http://admin.galegroup.com/) (requires login). Be sure to click on “Location” instead of “Institution” to get your full range of admin features, including reporting. Reports are COUNTER 4 compliant, and additional reports are available as well. Gale also links to helpful resources, definitions of the reports, and more; and you can schedule automatic reports.

- ProQuest – You can access usage reports and schedule reports to run automatically at [http://admin.proquest.com](http://admin.proquest.com) (requires login). Some reports are currently COUNTER 4 compliant, while others are COUNTER 3 compliant, and you have a variety of other reporting options, including frequency format. ProQuest also has an informative LibGuide on gathering usage information for ProQuest libraries ([http://proquest.libguides.com/gis_usage](http://proquest.libguides.com/gis_usage)). One tricky facet of these reports at my institution is that certain data is broken up by library. While it reports the number of regular searches and federated searches consistently across collections, result clicks and record views are specific to the portion of the database clicked and viewed. In cumulative reporting, we total these values for the entire database.


- LexisNexis & Westlaw products – These reports create a special challenge for law schools because they bill student accounts and law firm accounts differently, and it is rare for law schools to debate cancelling these products in their entirety. Students typically need to be familiar with both products, as they don’t know which platforms their future employer may have available to them. In addition to providing access to our students, my institution also provides legal resources to the public through a public patron account at Thomson Reuters. For this account, our representative gathers total usage annually, patrons’ monthly usage, and warning screens for content outside the
plan. We also request usage statistics of specific academic products, such as the West Study Aids collection, by emailing our West Academic representative directly. These reports contain document views by month, unique visitors by month, top functionality, unique students accessing or favoriting, and the top five document views by series. For Lexis products, I contact our representative for reports on document views, searches, alerts, Lexis.com links, printouts, and Shepard’s. It’s important to note that usually the representative is getting these statistics from someone else at the company, so it’s a slow process. Contact them far enough in advance of your deadline to avoid being stuck in a crunch without the data.

At my institution, we not only use these reports internally, but we also compare our statistics to the other schools within the consortium. We have a Best Practices group for Electronic Services, and one of our deliverables is a quarterly report for our consortia Library Best Practices team, comparing usage of shared databases such as HeinOnline, Gale, and ProQuest across the databases and across the consortium. We also include data on our schools FTE (full time enrollment) and the costs of databases, which may be drastically different for each school and should be accounted for in summary statistics. A bonus of sharing data, either formally or informally across schools, is tracking usage trends and marketing practices. Certain schools may have higher usage on specific products due to marketing initiatives or training provided through the library, and the group can discuss best practices on promotion. Members should house and maintain shared spreadsheets on a system such as SharePoint, Google Docs, or Dropbox, where all members using the report can drop in their data at their own convenience.

For those libraries offering federated searching through the catalog, please note that certain reports do not separate out federated searching from their statistical reports. These searches may inflate hits and accesses, so pay close attention to metrics available that indicate patron usage of the information. Again, the key to using reports successfully is identifying what available activity metrics are best at reporting the true value of the database to your patrons.

Web Access Management Reports and similar reports, available to you through your integrated library system, usually track every page clicked. Keep in mind that clunky or difficult to navigate databases, and even users working in the database that are not particularly savvy at searching, can inflate these statistics easily. Despite their problems, Web Access reports are more useful than not having any metrics at all, and they provide unique supplemental data to traditional reporting, especially if you can track specifics about the patron types accessing information.

Database costs are a simple way of turning the numbers you obtain in these reports into measures of value. Take the amount you pay for the database each year and divide it by the number of searches, giving you a cost per search metric to compare across databases. Again, when you’re trying to compare usage without COUNTER compliance on both sides, do your best to define equivalents in terms and be transparent and mindful about the assumption of equivalents when weighing out your numbers.

If no similar equivalents exist in usage reports between two databases you wish to compare, take a look at the statistics available and isolate which one is the best measure of value. Take this factor and calculate “cost per x.” Supplement this value comparison with qualitative data, such as direct surveys of patrons and experience testing from staff and faculty.

Finally, take a look at training materials and database support available. Perhaps you could cancel an expensive database with middling usage and use it as an opportunity to market a similar, lower priced product, thus increasing its usage and value. At that point, any increase in your usage and value statistics supports the value of the database itself, as well as the value of your efforts.

You can then use these increases in usage statistics to prove the value of the library staff to leadership. For example, after subscribing to West Study Aids at my institution, we did a marketing campaign including regular blog posts highlighting specific subjects, digital signage throughout the school, promotional bookmarks in printed study aids, a dedicated LibGuide, and more. Within the first semester, ninety-nine percent of our students had logged in to the Study Aids, giving us powerful statistics demonstrating the value of the librarians and staff that assisted in the promotion, especially when compared to usage of students at other schools who did not engage in similar promotions.

Overall, the legal usage statistics world is behind the curve in many ways. However, we can still transform the usage data we do have available to us as law libraries into an effective tool for assessing and proving the value of our expenditures, our resources, and sometimes even our own activities.
Empower yourself!

A recent study in *The North American Journal of Psychology* found that an empowering work environment can improve employees’ work outcomes and productivity as well as enhance career satisfaction.¹ Another study by Gretchen Spreitzer and Christine Porath showed that employees at every level who are given decision-making discretion feel more energized in the workplace.² In *Principles of Organizational Behavior* (2012), James Quick and Debra Nelson note that employee empowerment cultivates a sense of belonging and encourages job enrichment.

Managing a group of energized, productive, and happy people sure sounds sublime – so, should we stand up at our next departmental meeting and proclaim “You are now all empowered: work accordingly!”? Of course, it’s not that easy. The bureaucratic culture of our libraries and law firms is partly to blame. Also, tension between rigidly-defined library departments (public services vs. technical services vs. information technology etc.) impedes empowerment. However, the biggest barrier to empowerment is that it’s not something leaders can actually give.

Business coach Marshall Goldsmith says “It isn’t possible for a leader to ‘empower’ someone to be accountable and make good decisions – people have to empower themselves.”³ However, Goldsmith notes, managers can and should cultivate a “decision-making environment” and supply employees with all the tools and training they need to feel empowered. But in our bureaucratic, often budget-challenged organizations, how can we do this?

Information sharing is a priority. Make sure your staff knows your organization’s vision and goals and help them connect their work to them. For instance, if your staff knows that your affiliated law school is focusing on upping students’ bar passage rate, they will expedite the receipt, cataloging, and processing of books about studying for the bar. If they are inventorying the study aid collection and notice the bar exam books are all ancient, they can inform collection development staff so more current titles can be ordered. When new bar exam books arrive, they can let reference staff know so the titles can be recommended to students or put on the blog.

Openness and teamwork are also key. Spreitzer and Robert Quinn found that empowered employees believe people in their unit can work together to solve problems and that their ideas are valued and taken seriously.⁴ Jointly solve departmental problems, and suppress the urge to solve all problems quickly by finding solutions yourself or by just consulting with one or two of your most trusted staff members. To encourage an overall sense of belonging, nudge your staff to attend firm/university-wide events or serve on joint committees such as hiring or policy revision committees.

Support cross-training when possible. My library’s technical services staff is cross-trained to work at the circulation desk. Not only might this make them feel as if they are more valuable part of the team because that they can step in and help run the desk at a moment’s notice, I believe working directly with patrons shows them how their “back-of-the-house” duties connect to the library’s business of serving patrons.

Support continuing education opportunities. Spreitzer and Quinn found that empowered employees recognized the importance of a continuous learning mind-set and the need to remain flexible. Remind staff that we don’t have to order, catalog, process, and inventory materials the same way we did ten years ago – or even last year – and encourage them to think of ways to increase efficiency. Lobby for continuing education money for all your staff, paraprofessionals as well as professionals. If money is tight, look for free webinars or even TED Talks (they have great short pieces on topics such as decision-making, communication, and personal growth). Watching the webinar/talk as part of a staff meeting can also cultivate a sense of teamwork.

When empowered employees make a decision that doesn’t quite work out, don’t overly criticize them. As much as possible, Spreitzer and Porath say we should adopt Facebook’s motto – Move fast and break things – which encourages employees to make decisions and act. They also note that providing your staff with clear goals, lines of authority, and task responsibilities helps them to place their autonomy within boundaries of decision-making discretion, reducing the uncertainty and ambiguity often accompanying empowerment efforts.

Finally, Spreitzer and Quinn invite managers to examine our own sense of empowerment by asking ourselves the following questions:
To what extent do I have a sense of meaning at work and what can I do to increase it?
To what extent do I have a sense of impact, influence and power, what can I do to increase it?
To what extent do I have a sense of competence and confidence to execute my work, and what can I do to increase it?
To what extent do I have a sense of self-determination and choice, and what can I do to increase it?


**Annual Meeting**

Our 2015 OCLC Update will be on **Sunday, July 19, from 11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m. in PCC Room 112**. This session is open to anyone who uses OCLC products or services, and it will feature Rob Favini, OCLC Member Liaison, Northeast region. The session will cover OCLC’s new, enhanced services, as well as planned future developments. Audience members will have time 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.

As a reminder, the Online Bibliographic Services (OBS) OCLC Committee is open to any OBS member with an interest in OCLC, its products, or services.

**OCLC programs at ALA**

OCLC has many program sessions scheduled at the American Library Association (ALA) meeting June 25-29 in San Francisco. These programs are available to ALA conference registrants, but they will record many for later viewing.

One session, “OCLC Symposium: Millennials in Transition,” will be live-streamed. You will be able to attend the OCLC Symposium virtually even if you did not register for the conference, just register and indicate you will be attending virtually. You will receive virtual attendance instructions on a date closer to the event.

The largest single generational cohort in America (15–35 years old) is moving fully into adulthood, the workforce and positions of responsibility. In fact, Millennials have exited childhood and are experiencing all of the major transitions of early life: college, first jobs, first management positions, building a family. And, like every other generation, they are dealing with these challenges in ways that are sometimes puzzling to their older counterparts. This is the first generation to face life’s changes having grown up entirely in a highly technological, connected, multiscreen world. And this impacts their expectations of how libraries should help them navigate these transitions.

Symposium keynote speaker Kim Lear, from the generational think tank BridgeWorks, will explore how Millennials are approaching watershed moments in their education, careers, and family lives. Kim will also help provide some context for how other generations can better work alongside Millennials as they process these changes. A panel of library researchers and practitioners who are working with Millennials in libraries will discuss ways in which traditional library services can be positioned, adjusted—and maybe even discarded—when it comes to Millennials.

Please confirm whether you will attend in-person or participate via live-stream video.
Friday, June 26, 1:30 – 4:30 p.m.
San Francisco Marriott Marquis, Yerba Buena Salon 7
OCLC FirstSearch and WorldCat Local migrating to WorldCat Discovery Services

OCLC has announced that access to OCLC FirstSearch will end in December 2015. A description of the scope of WorldCat Discovery Services is available at http://www.oclc.org/en-US/worldcat-discovery/resources.html. A webinar, “Ready, Set, Go: Making the move from FirstSearch to WorldCat Discovery,” is scheduled for June 10. Registration is available at http://www.oclc.org/en-US/events/2015/readysetgowebinar061015.html. Previous sessions of this program are available via OCLC’s recorded webinar site at http://www.oclc.org/events/webinars.en.html.

OCLC is taking a new approach to Institution Records

Irene Hoffman of OCLC Member Relations provided the following information about OCLC’s plans to discontinue Institution records:

“Institution Records allow libraries to create, store, and manage a copy of a bibliographic record specific to your institution at OCLC. Changes to Institution Records are managed at your library. The ability to create Institution Records via batchload will conclude in December 2015. Connexion will support creation of Institution Records until June 2016 when support for Institution Records will end. OCLC is offering you the opportunity to transition information in Institution Records to Local Bibliographic Data prior to this date.

“Local Bibliographic Data enables master record data to be cooperatively managed by thousands of experts and OCLC staff while providing library-specific information for discovery applications. Also, Local Bibliographic Data supports future linked data initiatives and entities-based cataloging workflows.

“We are providing 2 options to aid you in this change. We can:

• Delete your existing Institution Records
• Create Local Bibliographic Data from your existing Institution Records or from your local system records

“What would you like us to do with your Institution Records? Send an e-mail to IRInfo@oclc.org to let us know how you would like to proceed.

“For more information, please review this FAQ http://www.oclc.org/connexion/resources.en.html#questions.

OCLC is contacting the heads of technical services at affected institutions directly.”

In addition, OCLC posted the following announcement to a number of listservs. OCLC’s website indicates that the webinars were recorded, but I have been unable to locate the recordings. When I find a link to the recording(s), I will post it to the OBS and Technical Services (TS) lists and include it in a future OCLC column.

“Thank you for your comments and questions about OCLC’s recent announcement regarding Institution Records (IRs) and the option to migrate to Local Bibliographic Data (LBD). We understand that many of you have questions and we want to hear your feedback.

“We will be hosting three webinars on May 13 (at 8:00 AM EDT, 11:00 AM EDT and 8:00 PM EDT) to answer questions and provide guidance to those who elect to migrate their Institution Records to Local Bibliographic Data.

“In this webinar, we will discuss:

• OCLC’s support for Institution Records and Local Bibliographic Data
• Options and timelines to help you prepare
• How your institution can get started

“Plus, members of the OCLC team will be on-hand to answer any additional questions.

“Register now for one of the May 13 webinars listed below, and for more information, please see the FAQ, http://www.oclc.org/connexion/resources.en.html#questions, or send a message to IRInfo@oclc.org.

“Sandi Jones
Product Manager, Metadata Management
Voice: 614.764.6082
E-mail: joness@oclc.org”

OCLC webinar “Linked Data in the Cloud”

OCLC has announced the following educational opportunity:
“Attend Library Linked Data in the Cloud webinar to learn more about OCLC’s contribution to library linked data. This webinar held Thursday, 21 May from 11:00 am - 12:00 pm EDT was intended to expose OCLC’s contributions to the transformation of the Internet from a web of documents to a web of data as described in the forthcoming book, *Library Linked Data in the Cloud: OCLC’s Experiments with New Models of Resource Description*, written by Carol Jean Godby, Shenghui Wang and Jeffrey K. Mixter.

“Librarians, archivists, computer scientists, and other professionals interested in modeling bibliographic descriptions as linked data are invited to attend this webinar in which the authors will describe the conceptual and technical challenges involved in publishing linked data derived from traditional library metadata. This transformation is urgent because it is now common knowledge that most searches for information start not in the library, nor even in a Web-accessible library catalog, but elsewhere on the Internet. Modeling data in a form that the broader Web understands may help keep libraries relevant in the Digital Information Age.

“Join us to gain more insights into linked data from the authors, including what lessons they learned about linked data as they wrote the book, and how these lessons helped them to identify and prioritize the next steps for library linked data.

“The slides from and recording of the webinar will be available online shortly at [http://oclc.library-linked-data-webinar](http://oclc.library-linked-data-webinar).”

**OCLC Research recordings available via iTunes Store**

In addition to their webinar recordings available at [http://www.oclc.org/research/events/webinars.html](http://www.oclc.org/research/events/webinars.html), OCLC Research has made a selection of webinar recordings and podcasts available via the iTunes store. See [https://itunes.apple.com/podcast/oclc-research-podcasts-webinars/id284764834](https://itunes.apple.com/podcast/oclc-research-podcasts-webinars/id284764834) for a list of recordings.

---

**Preservation**

Maxine Wright  
Georgetown University

Summer is fast approaching and this could only mean one thing, year-end projects. However, if you are lucky, it could also mean a vacation to Tahiti.

Here are some preservation projects to consider as you rally your team and gear up for summer cleaning.

1. Pull out your hepa vacuum and start getting rid of all that dust on the top of your books; if you don’t have one, borrow from a colleague or rent one.
2. Set aside a few days to do simple book repairs. It may not look bad now, but that’s the point-let’s do some preventative work.
3. Form a book splint group and start making splints. It is good to have them handy.
4. Designate one day as “equipment day.” Yes, assemble your equipment and start cleaning. You would be amazed at how much dust and dirt accumulate on equipment.
5. Sharpen all the tools in your book repair kit.
6. Tighten the screws and wheels on your book trucks.
7. Check in on your collection and see if it is well; are there any signs of mold?
8. Start reviewing and removing tons of paper tucked in the corners of your office, back of the storage room, and any other places where dust and dirt has built up this past year. You will breathe much better and feel good too.
9. Walk through your collection and make sure every shelf has a book-end that is the right size.
10. Walk through your collection and replace labels that are partially falling off; pests love to hide behind the gooey label. Close the door to pests by replacing those labels.
11. Take a look at all the plants around your library and make sure they are healthy. In the warm months, bugs love to settle into plants, and eventually they’ll settle into your books.
12. Get rid of half-filled boxes lying around; less boxes = less dirt = less chances of invasion of bugs.
13. Dedicate some time to cleaning your storage space.
14. Locate and remove all harsh chemical cleaners from your library.
15. Create a staff Wiki page on preservation; assign one staff person to update it every quarter.
16. Add a few lines about collection care to your webpage; add a few pictures too.
17. Compile a list of preservation questions and test the knowledge of your staff.
18. Arrange a visit to your regional storage area.
19. Arrange a visit to a local conservation lab.
20. Set aside some time to talk collection care with staff that handles books the most. It may be time for a refresher.
21. Revisit all the “Preservation Tips of the Month” posted by Lauren Seney on behalf of the Preservation Committee: [http://www.aallnet.org/sections/ts/Resources/Preservation-Tips](http://www.aallnet.org/sections/ts/Resources/Preservation-Tips)

I hope your books have a great summer.

**Worst Book Contest 2015**

The Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) Preservation Committee is pleased to keep the momentum going with the 4th Annual Worst Book Contest. Once again, we are interested in seeing photos of some of the worst books in your collection. And remember we want to help you out, too. We are giving the winner of the contest $150.00 preservation bucks! Stay tuned for the official announcement and entry requirements in the coming weeks.

In the meantime, put your preservation cap on and start preserving.

---

**Private Law Libraries**

Sarah Lin  
Library Systems Librarian  
Reed Smith LLP

In last issue’s column, I discussed my thoughts on the OPAC and its waning role in end-users’ search strategies. In my mind, the OPAC is entirely separate from the integrated library system (ILS), which I view as a vital piece of the 21st century library. That ties in to what I would like to focus on in this column: how technical services (TS) adds to the law firm’s bottom line. Clearly, the library is overhead in terms of firm finances, but I like to think there are least two ways the TS team helps the bottom line: clerical work that leaves the researchers free to generate revenue for the firm (independent of whether or not that cost is actually even billed or recovered) and tracking every single dime that is spent for information services.

Adding and removing users from various databases and news alerts systems has always been the domain of the research team at Reed Smith, but as part of a recent push to get a handle on our online news/ejournals/alert titles, it occurred to me that it would make a lot more sense if the TS team removed users and their logins. Because the TS staff does not bill time, it makes the most sense that the folks who do bill time spend their time doing just that, rather than doing administrative tasks that we can do. Researchers still add users to various electronic resources as part of the on-boarding process, but the removal of users is now part of the general removal we do from the ILS, along with checked-out books, routing lists, and licenses.

Circling back to the ILS, I really cannot imagine a future without it. Indeed, when we migrated to a new ILS in 2011, the main reason we chose the system we did was because of its acquisitions capabilities. At Reed Smith, we want to be able to track the cost of each title and be able to relate the cost to usage data. It is not enough for us to know the aggregate costs to a vendor or to a practice group; we need to be able to take the total spent to a practice group leader and show them exactly where that money is going. When desk sets came under scrutiny a few years ago, we had the data to put a total spent per user on desk sets. Based on the desires of the practice group leaders, our librarians were able to offer alternative publications in some instances in order to bring that cost down. Other attorneys decided to place a limit on the number of “personal” copies an attorney in their group could have. But none of this would be possible without detailed spending data present in our ILS and our TS team.

One of the real victories we have had in acquisitions over the eight years I’ve been at Reed Smith was getting our monthly Library Maintenance Agreement (LMA) bill entered into our ILS. Entering a large line-item invoice was not so much the feat, but rather devising a dollar amount for each shipment that in some way reflected the price we wanted to share with our stakeholders. When you have entered into a multi-year subscription and pricing agreement, showing a practice group leader a list of subscriptions gets a little harder to explain. Although we still have giant invoices to enter monthly, we now have a reasonable idea of the annual cost of a title to take to the table at budget time. Of course, print copies continue to decline, but it is helpful to see what we use versus what online packages are at our disposal.
Lastly, technical services staff and the ILS are our last bastion against the chaos of electronic resources at the law firm. Too small with too many idiosyncratic titles, an electronic resource management (ERM) system is too expensive and too cumbersome for our needs. So, we are making our ILS do the heavy lifting, tracking the ejournals that get pushed out to which individuals and groups, which attorneys have licenses to which products, and we’re thinking of adding information on who is also getting curated news/docket alerts from which services. This is, I believe, where order-loving, procedure-following technical services librarians and staff really thrive and help get the most out of the firm’s dollars.

Do you agree? Disagree? I’d love to hear either way: slin@reedsmith.com. See you in Philadelphia!

RESEARCH & PUBLICATIONS

Using Suma: Testing Observational Study Tools and Methods

Hollie White
Duke University

To continue the observational study theme from my last column, this time I wanted to share my library’s experience conducting a collaborative observational study that used Suma to collect data. Suma is “a tablet-based toolkit for collecting, managing, and analyzing data about the usage of physical spaces” that was created by North Carolina State University a few years ago (http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/reports/suma). As an open-source product, it is available to any institution that can install it and has an active GitHub community. To start the project, the library had to install its own instance of the Suma program on our servers. Once that was running, a few test studies were created as examples. Next, a group of interested department representatives met to plan the parameters of the test project. This group discussed the frequency of data collection, data collection schedules, and what the names of different seating areas would be called. Overall study goals were established as well. This study was designed as a test to: 1) understand more about the use of library seating by law library patrons in relationship to time of day, and 2) experiment with observational studies for gaining information about law library patron behaviors.

After finalizing collection details and tweaking the names of the collection areas, we had one session where we all walked around the library with iPads collecting data to determine the ease of using Suma while a systems analyst watched the log files. Data collection began in earnest the first week of finals. Once the collection began, we were able to start thinking about our two study goals.

The goals of understanding the use of library seating and experimenting with observational study techniques were both met. By the end of the week, the whole library had a better sense of where people were sitting and which floors were more popular than others. Gathering data using Suma was much simpler than we originally thought, and the people who participated in the data collection actually enjoyed the experience. The biggest challenges actually occurred during data analysis. The Suma-provided reporting tool did not tell us the type of information we were interested in knowing, so library staff had to work together to devise a way to get the raw data out, coded, and analyzed. While study development and data collection took about one week each, data extraction and analysis took over three weeks before a report could be finalized for review.

In the end, the library now has another research method in our assessment toolkit. People who participated had fun trying something new and have scheduled “walks” to collect data during the days. We also now have a small set of observational data to share with other departments and the dean if asked about student use of the library.

More information about Suma can be found at the following websites:

Suma Github: https://github.com/cazzerson/Suma


Suma Report: http://www.lib.ncsu.edu/reports/suma
Gov Docs Serials Cataloging: The Government Publishing Office’s (GPO) Library Services & Content Management (LSCM) staff presented the free webinar “Cataloging Government Serial Publications Using RDA” on May 26. Never fear, if you missed the webinar, you can access it and other past GPO webinars at [http://login.icohere.com/public/topics.cfm?cseq=1172](http://login.icohere.com/public/topics.cfm?cseq=1172). Using practical tips and examples, the webinar discusses GPO practices in determining if a publication is a serial, as well as the processing and cataloging of serial publications following Cooperative Online Serials Program (CONSER) and Resource Description and Access (RDA) standards.

Learning to Embrace Lots of Records: A nice overview of a library switching over to using a multi-record approach to cataloging resources in various formats in the article “Changing from Single to Separate Records: A Case Study from the University of Nevada, Reno” by Amalia Beisler and Katherine Dirk, published in Serials Review, Volume 41, Issue 1, 2015 at [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2014.997653](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2014.997653). Even though I work at a library that has embraced the multi-record approach for a long time, the article still provides a lot of insight and processes to consider.

Stop Putting the “End User” at the End: Check out the invited article/opinion piece “Closing the Gap” by Andrew Pace, Executive Director of Networked Library Services at OCLC, in Serials Review, Volume 41, Issue 1, 2015 at [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2014.999854](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2014.999854). It is an engaging and challenging look at “closing the content providers’ gap in order to fulfill the needs of the end user.” He examines serials, ebooks, electronic resource management (ERM), and discovery issues, focusing both on what libraries, as well as content providers, can each do to improve access to resources.


Books and Journals and Discovery Services – Oh My! (Part II): In the March newsletter, I wrote about the purchase of YBP Library Services by EBSCO. Well, that type of business acquisition must have looked like a great idea to the folks at ProQuest because on April 30 they announced that they were purchasing Coutts Information Services from Ingram, including the MyiLibrary ebook platform and the customer acquisitions system OASIS. Like EBSCO, ProQuest is already a major supplier of ebooks to libraries, having added ebrary and EBL to the ProQuest family in recent years. Adding the delivery of print books, serial standing orders, and fulfillment tools from Coutts fills in the pieces missing from ProQuest’s library collection services. In the meantime, ProQuest is still planning on launching their new ProQuest Ebook Central platform sometime mid-2015 (which seems like that should be anytime now).

The Big Get Bigger: In early May it was announced that Springer Science+Business Media, Palgrave Macmillan, Macmillan Education, and Nature Publishing have been cleared to merge and form a new company called Springer Nature. The newly formed company has put its well-known journal brands in the forefront in its new name. As our friends over at The Scholarly Kitchen noted in a post from January 20, “Now, along with Elsevier, Wiley, and Taylor & Francis, we have another multi-billion-dollar publishing behemoth on the market — the combined entity is valued at $5.8 billion.” Read more from their detailed post “Macmillan + Springer: Some Lessons to Learn, Some Twists to Watch” at [http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2015/01/20/macmillan-springer-some-lessons-to-learn-some-twists-to-watch/](http://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2015/01/20/macmillan-springer-some-lessons-to-learn-some-twists-to-watch/).

“Who ya gonna call?”: Speaking of vendors, our colleagues on the Committee on Relations with Information Vendors (CRIV) have once again updated their CRIV Tools “Vendor Contact Information” section on AALLnet. You can find the browsable list of publishers and vendors with links to their websites at [http://www.aallnet.org/mm/Advocacy/vendorrelations/CRIV-Tools/vendors.html](http://www.aallnet.org/mm/Advocacy/vendorrelations/CRIV-Tools/vendors.html).
The Power of Connection: If you are attending the 2015 American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting in Philadelphia, please put the following two Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) meetings on your conference calendar:

- TS-SIS Business and Awards Meeting (with real breakfast!), 7:15 a.m. on Monday, July 20
- TS-SIS Acquisitions and Serials Meeting and Roundtables, 4:30-5:30 p.m. on Monday, July 20

There are new times for these TS-SIS meetings this year, so don’t expect the same schedule as the past 10 years or so. TS-SIS meetings are a great way to connect with each other about serials and other aspects of our jobs in the ever-changing technical services. In addition, here are a few 2015 AALL sessions that may be of interest to serials enthusiasts:

- B2: “Work Smarter, Not Harder - More Hip Tips for the Acquisitions Librarian” (Sunday, July 19)
- C4: “Enough to Be Dangerous: 00000110 Things Every Librarian Needs to Know About Coding” (Sunday, July 19)
- D7: “Striking a Balance in Your Library Catalog: TMI vs. TLI” (Monday, July 20)
- E1: “Uncovering Discovery Systems: Digging Beyond the Hype and Gripe” (Monday, July 20)
- H2: “The Future of ILL: A Debate” (Tuesday, July 21)
- I1: “BIBFRAME Deep Dive: How Did We Get Here and Where Are We Going?” (Tuesday, July 21)

Hope y’all have a great summer and hope to see many of you at AALL in Philly!

---

Serials Titles
Barbara Bohl
University of California, Berkeley

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

**Industrial & labor relations review**
Vol. 1, no. 1 (Oct. 1947)-v. 64, no. 5 (Oct. 2011)
(OCoLC 1753069)
**Changed to:**
ILRReview
Vol. 65, no. 1 (Jan. 2012)-
(OCoLC 860715439 : online version, print record not yet updated)

**Pacific Rim law & policy journal**
Vol. 1, no. 1 (winter 1992)-v. 23, no. 3 (June 2014)
(OCoLC 25734715)
**Changed to:**
Washington international law journal
Vol. 24, no. 1 (January 2015)
(OCoLC 900613239)

**Vestnik Vysshego khoziaistvennogo suda Respubliki Belarus’**
95, 1-2013
(OCoLC 37512175)
**Changed to:**
Sudebnyi vestnik plius: ekonomicheskoe pravosudie
2014/01 (يناير 2014)-
(OCoLC 904803783)

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

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

**Annals of air and space law**
Ceased in print with: Vol. 38 (2013)
(OCoLC 3183621)

**Berkeley business law journal**
Ceased in print with: Vol. 10 (2013)
(OCoLC 54441942)
Online version: (OCoLC 62878431)

**Berkeley journal of Middle Eastern and Islamic law**
Ceased in print with: Vol. 5 (2012)
(OCoLC193999472)
Available online: [http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu](http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu)
(OCoLC 301811961)

**Berkeley La Raza law journal**
Ceased in print with: Vol. 24 (2014)
(OCoLC 49231318)
Available online: (OCoLC 55603120)
FAST Headings

FAST headings are a regular part of OCLC bibliographic records now. Faceted Application of Subject Terminology (FAST) began life as a way of providing an easy-to-learn set of subject headings for metadata creation outside the catalog department, such as with Dublin Core. The OCLC site at http://www.oclc.org/research/themes/data-science/fast.html is worth a look for those curious about FAST. Why are these headings in our bibliographic records, and what do catalogers do with them? Leave them in the master record and delete them locally? Keep them? Different departments probably answer this question differently.

We are frequently using faceted subject searching in database searching and in the linked-data environment. Presumably, this will include BIBFRAME. Combing facets will supplement our traditional ways of searching for bibliographic data. Remember, in this environment we will have, apparently, not our traditional bibliographic records, but rather a presentation of linked data from many sources. Overcrowded bibliographic records or displays will presumably not be a problem. Of course this belongs to cataloging’s future, even though some of our systems do have faceted searching capabilities now.

For the time being, we can delete FAST headings locally, or not, in either case leaving them in the master record. We might also read up on faceted searching as it is now part of our daily work.

FAST headings are system-supplied, and this does present catalogers with at least one problem. If we modify or add subject headings to the master record, or delete them from it, OCLC Quality Control has requested that we also delete the FAST headings. This will cause our improved record to be repopulated with FAST subject headings which match our changes to the record. If you come across records where the FAST headings include headings not reflected in the existing subject headings, this record was probably handled by a cataloger unaware of this need to delete the FAST headings after modifying the subjects in a master record. For example, in one instance I added the subject heading “Patent infringement – United States” to a newer master record without FAST headings. Another cataloger later decided that this heading was not pertinent and deleted it. This cataloger did not delete the FAST headings which had been added in the meantime, so the two sets of headings are now in conflict. Remember, any changes to the subject headings should be accompanied by deletion of all the FAST headings; OCLC will add FAST headings appropriate to your subject analysis later.

Shifting gears to individual Library of Congress subject headings of interest, “Social rights” deserves a look. Before the creation of this heading, works on this subject were assigned the heading “Social legislation” or, sometimes, “Social security.” While similar, “Social rights” may be used for works discussing the supposed right to social goods, such as food, water, shelter and jobs. Although little discussed in American law, it is a concept debated frequently in European law and has philosophical implications not inherent in “Social legislation.”
Contributing authors: Marlene Brubrick, Jackie Magagnosc, Jean Pajerek, Lauren Seney

Do you find this column and the associated 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

Highlights of the RDA Toolkit update published April 14, 2015


Below are some changes that may be of particular interest.

What some of us refer to fondly as the “cascading vortex of horror” is gone! That is, “[t]he distribution statement and its sub-elements are no longer required, even if [X of publication not identified] is recorded in one of the sub-elements of the publication statement” (Resource Description and Access (RDA) 2.9). Furthermore, “[t]he manufacture statement and its sub-elements are no longer required, even if [X of publication not identified] is recorded in one of the sub-elements of the publication statement, and distribution information is not recorded” (RDA 2.10). The distribution and manufacture statements may be included at the cataloger’s discretion.

RDA 9.4.1.1 (Title of the person) now includes abbreviations indicating academic degrees or organizational memberships as “other terms indicative of rank, honour, or office.” An example has been added at the renumbered instruction 9.19.1.7 (Other Term of Rank, Honour, or Office; formerly 9.19.1.6), illustrating the use of “Ph. D.” as part of the authorized access point for a person.

RDA 16.2.2.8 (formerly “Place Names for Jurisdictions”) has been renamed “Terms Indicating Type of Jurisdiction” and they deleted sub-instructions 16.2.2.8.1 and 16.2.2.8.2 (relating to place names that indicate a type of jurisdiction). This change is a “clarification” that does not constitute a change in LC/PCC practice.

There is a brand new Chapter 23, “General Guidelines on Recording Relationships Between Works and Subjects.” This is a short chapter that documents what most libraries already do. There is also the new Appendix M, “Relationship Designators: Subject Relationships.” They moved the descriptive relationship terms from Appendix J (e.g., “Commentary on”) to Appendix M.

The RDA index is no longer available in the Toolkit because it was too “burdensome” to maintain. Toolkit users will also notice that it now says, “[This instruction has been deleted as a revision to RDA. For further information, see 6JSC/LC/27/Sec final.]” The idea behind using this so-called “deprecated” text instead of actually deleting instructions is to avoid extensive renumbering of the instructions.

Fans of the RDA Toolkit index, rejoice!

There’s good news for those who were dismayed at the removal of the index in the latest update of the RDA Toolkit. Today the RDA Toolkit blog (http://www.rdatoolkit.org/blog/7768) announced that the RDA Toolkit was reinstating the print index! As stated in the blog post:
“In the weeks that followed the April 14 release to RDA Toolkit, we heard from a number of users who were unhappy about the removal of the index from the Toolkit. In response to that feedback, we have added a PDF of the RDA Print index to the Tools tab of RDA Toolkit. This PDF file contains the index that will be part of the 2015 revision of RDA in print. The index has been revised and updated to reflect the changes to the RDA standard that were made since the April 2014 release and through the April 2015 release. The PDF is not hyperlinked, but it is downloadable and may be printed for personal use.”

**Government Documents**

**GPO announces name change, new logo**

In recognition of their 154th anniversary, the GPO has announced their official name change to the U.S Government Publishing Office (GPO) and has launched a new logo. The name change acknowledges the shift GPO has made from being primarily a printer of official United States government documents to being a provider of official United States government information.

Congress approved the name change in Section 1301 of H.R. 83 (http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-113hr83enr/pdf/BILLS-113hr83enr.pdf).


**Information Technology**

**Video Digitization**

Videos are a challenging format to work with, especially when it comes to reformatting video from analog to digital. In addition to staffing this kind of a project, there are also hardware and software concerns: Is the appropriate player available for this VHS (BETA, U-Matic, etc.)? Is there a way to connect it to a computer for conversion? Do I have the appropriate software for import and/or manipulating files?

Once you’ve addressed those concerns, then things get hard. You must address the output format as well as long-term preservation concerns. Let’s talk about the output first. Is your newly digitized item going to stay a digital file? Do you need to stream it? Do you need to burn it to a playable DVD? All of these impacts the output file format you will need…and may necessitate multiple formats depending on your end goal(s). And to tie into preservation, is the output format one that is sustainable over time?

To assist in making these decisions, the Federal Agencies Digitization Guidelines Initiative, recently developed a guide for Digital File Formats for Videotape Reformatting (http://www-digitizationguidelines.gov/guidelines/video_reformatting_compare.html?loclr=blogsig). This guide consists of five documents that have table components for easy comparison among digital file wrappers (more commonly known as formats/file extensions) and encodings. If you’d like a more detailed description of the project’s parameters, check out Comparing Formats for Video Digitization (http://blogs.loc.gov/digitalpreservation/2014/12/comparing-formats-for-video-digitization/) on The Signal.

“**The Law Library in an Information Age**”

**Jonathan Germann, Irell & Manella LLP**

His premise: It is time libraries stop investing in a local public online catalog, a century old device used to facilitate access to physical holdings within a library. Instead, it is time for libraries to become experts at helping patrons navigate the world of the anti-library by creating original content in the form of subject guides. It is also time for libraries to focus on owning digital resources that computer algorithms can manipulate.


**Management**

**American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Representatives Program**

We’ve all seen the recent announcement (http://www.aallnet.org/mm/Publications/AALL-E-briefing/2015/March-11-2015.html) from the AALL Executive Board of plans to discontinue funding for many of our representatives to external library organizations. These include the American Library Association Subject Analysis Committee, Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), the Subject Advisory Committee (SAC), and the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC), among others. As technical services law librarians, we understand and appreciate the vital importance of our involvement with these committees. Our representatives bring the concerns and interests of the law library community to these organizations and bring the concerns of national and international policy-making bodies back to our organization. One example of our
representatives’ significant accomplishments is the development and implementation of a law-focused form/genre term vocabulary to enhance discoverability of legal resources. This positioned the law library community at the forefront of the Library of Congress’ ongoing effort to establish form/genre vocabularies across disciplines.

Identification by our CC:DA representative of an unworkable instruction in RDA concerning treaties led to a revision of the RDA instructions in that area. Without this change, absurdly, we would have to catalog dozens of multilateral treaties under Albania. Additionally, this change brings consistency to the treatment of treaties, facilitating discoverability by our users. More recently, our current CC:DA representative successfully put forth an RDA revision proposal to eliminate the conventional collective title “Laws, etc.,” which most law catalogers felt had long outlived its usefulness. The impact of this work extends well beyond law libraries to any library collecting treaties or laws and cataloging them in accordance with RDA.

MAC and its predecessor, MARBI (Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee), have been responsible for creating dozens of new MARC fields and subfields to accommodate RDA-related content designation, allowing for greater metadata granularity, with an eye toward eventual deployment as linked data.

The movement of bibliographic data to a linked data environment seems inevitable. Elimination of our presence on the national and international policy-making bodies that are steering the larger library world forward will place law libraries at a severe disadvantage. We cannot afford to isolate ourselves during this time of rapid transition, when what is called for is full participation and involvement in the organizations making decisions that will affect our libraries far into the future.

The Executive Board’s regrettable decision undermines the Association’s mission to be “the recognized authority in all aspects of legal information.” At a time when many technical services law librarians already feel marginalized and underserved by AALL, the Executive Board is unfortunately sending a message that further validates those concerns.

[Editor’s note: The AALL Executive Board rescinded their decision and reinstated the representatives to CC:DA, MAC, and SAC.]

**Metadata**

http://www.dlib.org/dlib/may15/papadakis/05papadakis.html


The linked data movement is a relatively new trend on the web that, among other things, enables diverse data providers to publish their content in an interoperable, machine-understandable way. Libraries around the world appear to be embracing linked data technologies that render their content more accessible to both humans and computers. This paper focuses on linked data uniform resource identifiers (URI) that refer to authority data. It identifies the specific MARC fields that are capable of hosting linked data information. Additionally, it examines seven major national libraries to determine to what degree they have adopted the fundamental linked data principles.

**Preservation**

**Emergency Preparedness**

In 2005, not long after a series of strong hurricanes struck the gulf coast, the Heritage Health Index, a National Collections Care Survey, reported that few of the institutions they surveyed have disasters plans. Even when an institution did have a disaster plan in place, it was often out of date. In response to that, the Society of American Archivists (SAA) supports the idea of MayDay (http://www2.archivists.org/initiatives/mayday-saving-our-archives), a grassroots effort to save archives celebrated annually on May 1.

However, archives are not the only institutions that need to have a current disaster plan on file. Natural disasters, as well as equipment failures, can lead to a loss of materials in the library. To help any institution prepare for a disaster, SAA provides a list of ideas for MayDay activities (http://www2.archivists.org/initiatives/mayday-saving-our-archives/ideas-for-mayday-activities), though it’s important to remember that these activities don’t have to take place only on May 1.

**Preservation Week 2015**

Preservation Week this year was the week of April 26 - May 2. Sometimes the preservation activities of an institution are not visible to the users of the library’s materials, so this week was a great time to promote the activities your institution is undertaking to ensure continued access to its collections - both analog and digital.
It’s also a great time to take advantage of preservation training. This year ALA sponsored three FREE webinars on different preservation topics:

- Moving Image Preservation 101
- Digital Preservation for Individuals and Small Groups
- Disaster Response Q&A

There are additional preservation videos available on the ALCTS Preservation play list at https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLA5BAB085DF728BD4.

Feedback on Library of Congress’ Recommended Format Specifications
Last year the Library of Congress released Recommended Format Specifications (http://www.loc.gov/preservation/resources/rfs/) (see post here: http://tslltechscans.blogspot.com/2014/07/library-of-congress-recommended-format.html) to serve as a guide for long-term preservation and access to both analog and digital materials. As they move forward, and to maintain the currency of the guide, they will implement an annual review of the formats. To this end, they requested feedback before March 31, 2015, for this year’s review. You can send feedback at any time to one of the email contacts here: http://www.loc.gov/preservation/resources/rfs/contacts.html.

Additional information about the review process is available on The Signal (http://blogs.loc.gov/digitalpreservation/2015/03/reaching-out-and-moving-forward-revising-the-library-of-congress-recommended-formatSpecifications/).

Serials
Open access (OA) publications may be a partial way to ease library serial budget woes. There are many high quality open access publications, but predatory open-access publishers present a continuing issue. Predatory open access journals are journals that exist for the sole purpose of profit. They can misrepresent their review process/board, location, and/or affiliations.

Jeffery Beall, a librarian at the University of Colorado-Denver, maintains a blacklist of predatory publishers (“Beall’s List”). The Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) maintains a “white-list” of open access journals meeting base line criteria, such as being chiefly scholarly, providing quality control through an editor, editorial board, or peer review, and having a registered ISSN. Another organization maintaining a white-list is the Open Access Scholarly Publisher’s Association. Publishers must apply and pledge to adhere to a code of conduct to become members.

As librarians, we can take an advisory role, assisting our patrons as they navigate the OA landscape. The following articles provide a more detailed, but still quick, overview of the issues surrounding OA publishing:


2015 OBS-SIS and TS-SIS Annual Meeting Information
Programs and Meetings

Programs and meetings are listed in alphabetical order with content drawn from information available from OBS-SIS, TS-SIS, and AALL’s website, particularly information relevant to the 2015 conference, “The Power of Connection” in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Formatting is by Michael Maben.

**Acquisitions Standing Committee and Serials Standing Committee (TS-SIS)**
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 4:30 p.m.-5:30 p.m.
PCC-Room 105B
- Diana Jaque, Acquisitions Committee Chair, University of Southern California
- Jacob Sayward, Serials Committee Chair, Fordham University

**Bibframe Deep Dive: How Did We Get Here and Where Are We Going? (Program I1)**
Please Note: This deep dive session is scheduled for 2.5 hours, running across both the “I” and “J” time slots.
Tuesday, July 21, 2015 – 2:30 p.m.-5:00 p.m.
PCC-Room 201BC

The Bibliographic Framework Initiative (BIBFRAME) will reimagine and implement a bibliographic environment for a post-MARC world. The relationship between linked data and BIBFRAME, as well as how BIBFRAME differs from linked data, will be explained. The program will include a demonstration of a BIBFRAME editor and other tools currently in development, and an examination of the BIBFRAME data structure and its relationship to MARC. Attendees will be introduced to MARCNext, a new metadata research toolkit developed to expose user-friendly tools for exploring and testing linked data/non-MARC metadata concepts using local MARC data.
- Jacqueline K. Magagnosc, Coordinator and Moderator, Cornell University Law Library
- Nate Trail, Speaker, Library of Congress
- Terry Reese, Speaker, Ohio State University

**Business Meeting (OBS-SIS)**
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 4:45 p.m.-5:30 p.m.
Marriott Room 303
- Karen Selden, Chair, University of Colorado

**Business Meeting and Awards Presentation (TS-SIS)**
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 7:15 a.m.-8:30 a.m.
PCC-Room 112AB
- Suzanne Graham, Chair, University of Georgia

**Cataloging & Classification Standing Committee Meeting and Roundtable (TS-SIS)**
Sunday, July 19, 2015 – 7:30 a.m.-9:00 a.m.
Marriott-Grand Ballroom Salon C
- Lia Contursi, Chair, Columbia University

**Classification and Subject Cataloging Advisory Working Group Meeting (TS-SIS)**
Tuesday, July 21, 2015 – 12:30 p.m.-1:30 p.m.
PCC-Room 102B
- Yael Mandelstam, Chair, Fordham University

**Collection Development Roundtable (ALL-SIS)**
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 3:15 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
Marriott-Grand Ballroom Salon E
- Theo Belniak, Chair, University at Buffalo, State University of New York
Descriptive Cataloging Advisory Working Group (TS-SIS)
Sunday, July 19, 2015 – 11:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
PCC-Room 105A

• George Prager, Chair, New York University

Education Committee Meeting for 2016 Annual Meeting in Chicago (OBS-SIS)
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 5:30 p.m.-6:30 p.m.
Marriott-Room 302

• Marjorie Crawford, OBS-SIS Chair 2015/2016, Rutgers University

Education Committee Meeting for 2016 Annual Meeting in Chicago and the Professional Development Committee (TS-SIS)
Tuesday, July 21, 2015 – 7:15 a.m.-8:15 a.m.
Marriott-Room 309

• John P. Jensen, Chair, Education Committee, Southern University Law Center
• Stephanie Schmitt, Chair, Professional Development Committee, University of California, Hastings

Effective Content Management for Improved Patron Service (Program A7)
Sunday, July 19, 2015 – 1:00 p.m.-2:00 p.m.
PCC-Room 113BC

Although the physical footprint of the library is shrinking, the concept of the library as a hub of information and services dictates that its resources – in all formats – are appropriately described, cataloged (if a catalog is available), stored, and made available to patrons. Panelists will share the more (and less) detailed processes that they use to organize print, digital, and other resources.

• Elaine M. Knecht, Coordinator and Moderator, Hiscock Barclay, LLP
• Jacob Sayward, Speaker, Fordham University Law Library
• Kimberlee Hersch, Speaker, Howard & Howard Attorneys PLLC
• Janice Hyde, Speaker, Library of Congress

Enough to Be Dangerous: 00000110 Things Every Librarian Need to Know About Coding (Program C4)
Sunday, July 19, 2015 – 4:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.
PCC-Room 204BC

You can code; you just may not know it yet. This presentation will cover the fundamentals of coding by looking at some of the most popular and important programming languages used today. By looking at different examples and the ways in which they share key commonalities, participants will learn about the concepts necessary to read and understand a block of code. The session will conclude with an opportunity for participants to create and execute a simple script. (Please bring your laptop if you would like to get some hands-on coding experience.)

• Jason Tubinis, Coordinator and Speaker, University of Georgia
• Leslie Grove, Speaker, University of Georgia School of Law

Executive Board Meeting, 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 (OBS-SIS)
Sunday, July 19, 2015 – 5:15 p.m.-6:30 p.m.
Marriott-Room 302

• Karen Selden, 2014/2015 OBS-SIS Chair, University of Colorado
• Marjorie Crawford, 2015/2016 OBS-Chair, Rutgers University

Executive Board Meeting, 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 (TS-SIS)
Sunday, July 19, 2015 – 5:15 p.m.-6:30 p.m.
Marriott-Room 309

• Suzanne Graham, 2014/2015 TS-SIS Chair, University of Georgia
• Hollie White, 2015/2016 TS-SIS Chair, Duke University
**The Future of ILL: A Debate (Program H2)**
Tuesday, July 21, 2015 – 11:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.
PCC-Room 201A

Inter-library loan – relic of the 20th century or asset of the 21st century? Hear two experts vigorously debate the future of ILL – one will expound upon the virtues of ILL, while the other advocates for its demise. Explore the positives and negatives of ILL, and gain insight to help you establish best practices at your institution. Who will win? Participants will determine the winner of the debate.

- Wendy E. Moore, Coordinator and Moderator, University of Georgia
- Francis X. Norton, Jr., Moderator, Law Library of Louisiana

**Google Analytics: Using the Software, Using the Data (Program A6)**
Sunday, July 19, 2015 – 1:00 p.m.-2:00 p.m.
PCC-Room 103A

The first part of assessing ROI (return on investment) for online resources is identifying your users and how they use the virtual library. Google Analytics is free software that can help answer those questions, giving libraries of all sizes hard numbers that enable data-based decision making. Program presenters will discuss how to install and use Google Analytics on your library’s web pages and OPAC, what data it does and does not provide, and what decisions their libraries have made as a result of the data gathered.

- Sarah Morris Lin, Coordinator, Moderator, and Speaker, Reed Smith LLP
- Andrew J. Sather, Speaker, Jenkins Law Library
- Sean Chen, Speaker, Duke University School of Law

**Heads of Cataloging Roundtable (TS-SIS)**
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 12:45 p.m.-1:45 p.m.
PCC-Exhibit Hall

- Christina Tarr, co-organizer, University of California, Berkeley
- Michael Maben, co-organizer, Indiana University-Bloomington

**Improving, Maintaining, and Communicating Your Values with Metrics Analysis and Visualization (Program I2)**
Tuesday, July 21, 2015 – 2:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m.
PCC-Room 204BC

In an era of declining budgets and increased reliance on “easy” answers via online search tools, librarians need to effectively communicate their value to stakeholders and show the indispensable service that they provide. This session will demonstrate how to identify key metrics, capture them, and use them to raise the profile of your organization. You can also use metrics to address the challenges of staff workflow, support, and resource sharing across multiple locations. Learn how you can apply metrics to create a more efficient, adaptable organization, and anticipate future needs.

- Jennifer McMahan, Coordinator and Moderator, U.S. Department of Justice
- Lila Faulker, Speaker, U.S. Department of Justice Libraries
- Joy Shoemaker, Speaker, U.S. Court of Appeals Library

**Innovative Law Users Group Annual Meeting**
Saturday, July 18, 2015 – 8:00 a.m.-2:00 p.m.
Marriott-Grand Ballroom Salon CD

- Ismael Gullon, Chair, Mercer University

**Legal Project Management Deep Dive: The Basics and Beyond (Program D2)**
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 10:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
PCC-Room 201BC

Building on your experience and organizational skills as an information professional, this session will introduce concepts and best practices that can immediately be applied to any project. The session will start off with an overview of standard project management methodologies employed in many organizations. Participants familiar with the Project Management Institute,
the professional organization that sets the standards for the globally recognized PMP (Project Management Professional) certification, will recognize these concepts, but no prior project management training is required. These concepts will be illustrated in action, drawing on numerous examples from law firms and other legal organizations, to demonstrate that the practice of law can greatly benefit from LPM.

The second part of the session will dive into project management tools. First, learn about a selection of easy-to-create tools to support a project across its life cycle, including scope and task planning, issues and risk tracking, and project execution. Next, explore agile and “crum” project management techniques, which are designed to enable collaborative teams to meet business needs quickly, using less process and documentation. Gain an understanding of agile principles and techniques and develop a basis for deciding when these approaches might be suitable for a project.

- Janice E. Henderson, Coordinator
- Timothy B. Corcoran, Speaker, Corcoran Consulting Group

**The Librarians Strike Back: Implementing Strike Teams to Get Stuff Done (Program B6)**
Sunday, July 19, 2015 – 2:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m.
PCC-Room 103BC

Want to get more projects and initiatives accomplished without overhauling your entire management organizational chart? Strike teams can add the flexibility you need to foster new endeavors, meet evolving demands, and complete tasks faster. A great way to increase collaboration, strike teams allow you to tap into the strengths and knowledge of all members of your law library and get stuff done! Participants will discuss different ways to use strike teams at their libraries, identify solutions to obstacles arising from forming strike teams, and have the opportunity to create strike teams for their own libraries.

- Thomas Striepe, Coordinator and Speaker, University of Georgia
- Wendy E. Moore, Speaker, University of Georgia
- Christa M. Lange, Speaker, Sidley Austin LLP

**Local Systems Committee (OBS-SIS) Program: Migrating to Open Source: Koha and Kuali OLE in Law Libraries**
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 3:15 p.m.-4:30 p.m.
PCC-Room 111A

Curious about open source integrated library systems? Wondering what it takes to migrate to one? Hear an overview of what open source is, why a library might choose it, and how a vendor might help with migration. Then hear the experiences of three law librarians who helped the following libraries migrate to open source systems: Brooklyn Law School (III to Koha); Rutgers Law School (III to Koha); and the University of Chicago’s D’Angelo Law Library (Horizon to Kuali OLE).

- Kevin Carey, Chair and Moderator, Ohio State University
- Nate Curulla, Speaker, ByWater Solutions
- Jeff Gabel, Speaker, Brooklyn Law School
- Marjorie Crawford, Speaker, Rutgers University
- Pat Sayre-McCoy, Speaker, University of Chicago

**OCLC Update (OBS-SIS)**
Sunday, July 19, 2015 – 11:30 a.m.-12:45 p.m.
PCC-Room 112B

- Jacqueline Magagnosc, OCLC Committee Chair, Cornell University

**Preservation Standing Committee (TS-SIS)**
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 3:15 p.m.-4:15 p.m.
PCC-Room 105A

- Maxine Wright, Chair, Georgetown University

**Quality Digitization Projects on a Budget (Program H1)**
Tuesday, July 21, 2015 – 11:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.
PCC-Room 201BC
With library budgets being cut all over the country, creating quality digitization projects for low cost and with minimal staff time can be challenging, but not impossible. Panelists will share tools they leveraged to bring their materials to a broader audience, including identifying high-demand collections for digitization, forming collaborations funded through grants, creative use of student help to create professional-level metadata for digital collections, and much more.

- Marilyn K. Nicely, Coordinator, University of Oklahoma
- Camilla Tubbs, Coordinator, University of Maryland
- Erik Beck, Speaker, University of Colorado
- Victoria K. Trotta, Speaker, Arizona State University
- Melissa J. Bernstein, Speaker, University of Utah
- Beth Williams, Moderator, Louisiana State University

**Rare Book Cataloging Roundtable (LHRB-SIS)**
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 4:30 p.m.-5:30 p.m.
Marriott-Room 304
- Susan Karpuk, Chair, Yale University

**Strategic Integration of E-books and Digital Content in Law Libraries (Program F5)**
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 2:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m.
PCC-Room 103A

As content is increasingly created and used digitally, and as cost and space considerations continue to grow, law libraries must explore new models to strategically increase e-books and digital resources. This program is designed to assist law library management and staff in anticipating the considerations when designing and implementing a new delivery model of resources and services. Understand the best practices for communicating with patrons and vendors to integrate and customize law library resources to meet the information needs of specific environments.

- Darla Jackson, Coordinator, University of South Dakota
- Sandra B. Placzek, Moderator and Speaker, University of Nebraska-Lincoln
- Bess Reynold, Speaker, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP

**Serials Standing Committee Meeting and Acquisitions Standing Committee (TS-SIS)**
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 4:30 p.m.-5:30 p.m.
PCC-Room 105B
- Jacob Sayward, Serials Committee Chair, Fordham University
- Diana Jaque, Acquisitions Committee Chair, University of Southern California

**Striking a Balance in Your Library Catalog: TMI vs. TLI (Program D7)**
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 10:00 a.m.-11:00 a.m.
PCC-Room 113BC

With catalog records available for individual titles of large databases, such as ProQuest, HeinOnline, LLMC, and MOML, are we creating catalogs with “too much information (TMI)” in the form of overwhelming search results? Conversely, without many “go to” Westlaw and Lexis titles in our catalogs, do we offer patrons “too little useful information” (TLI)? Is it possible to provide TMI and TLI simultaneously? Hear the results of a recent survey of both public services and technical services law librarians on this topic, as well as the experiences of a law firm librarian and an academic law librarian in evaluating and addressing issues of TLI and TMI in their catalogs.

- Georgia Briscoe, Coordinator, Moderator, and Speaker, University of Colorado
- Karen Selden, Speaker, University of Colorado
- Scott Matheson, Speaker, Yale Law School
- Bess Reynolds, Speaker, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP

**Technology Skills Law Librarians Need to Thrive – A Group Discussion (Program A3)**
Sunday, July 19, 2015 – 1:00 p.m.-2:00 p.m.
PCC-Room 113A
With technology constantly evolving, it is difficult to identify the specific technology skills in which law librarians need to be proficient versus those skills that merit only a general understanding. Becoming adept at new technologies can require a large investment of time – not to mention money. Librarians must identify those technology skills that provide the greatest return on their investment.

In this panel discussion, several librarians will discuss how to keep skills from becoming obsolete. The panelists will address questions such as: What skills do all librarians need, and what skills are not as reasonable to expect from everyone? How much are advanced technology skills worth in the business world? How do technology skills in law libraries differ from other industries? And how do libraries manage technology skills training and development?

- Deborah Ginsberg, Coordinator, Moderator, and Speaker, IIT Chicago-Kent College of Law
- Alex Berrio Matamoros, Speaker, CUNY School of Law Library
- Nancy Babb, Speaker, University at Buffalo, State University of New York
- Iain W. Barksdale, Speaker, University of Alabama School of Law
- Jill T. Sonnesyn, Speaker, Stinson Leonard Street
- Philippe A. Cloutier, Speaker, Lane Powell PC

TS/OBS/RIPS/CS-SIS Joint Reception
Saturday, July 18, 2015 – 7:00 p.m.-9:00 p.m.
Marriott-Grand Ballroom, Salon CD
- Sponsored by Innovative Interfaces, Inc.
- Eric Parker, Coordinator, Northwestern University

TSLL Editorial Board Meeting (OBS-SIS and TS-SIS)
Saturday, July 18, 2015 – 1:45 p.m.-2:45 p.m.
Marriott-Conference, Suite 3
- Michael Maben, Editor-in-Chief, Indiana University-Bloomington

Uncovering Discovery Systems: Digging Beyond the Hype and Gripe (Program E1)
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 11:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
PCC-Room 204BC
A panel of presenters representing IT, public, and technical services will share their from-the-trenches experiences in analyzing, choosing, implementing, and managing discovery systems, including comparison to traditional integrated library systems, with special consideration for law libraries and legal services. The program will take a “what you need to know now” approach to the state of discovery systems in order to explore the pros and cons of discovery, with helpful tips and tricks for anticipating, avoiding, and addressing system pitfalls. Attendees will have the opportunity to participate in the discussion through active brainstorming activities, adding their own experiences and ideas.

- Nancy Babb, Coordinator, Moderator, and Speaker, University at Buffalo, State University of New York
- Iain W. Barksdale, Moderator and Speaker, University of Alabama Law Library
- D. Prano Amjadi, Moderator and Speaker, Santa Clara University
- Matt Zimmerman, Moderator and Speaker, Georgetown University Law Library
- Kristina Anderson, Moderator and Speaker, Seton Hall University Law Library

Vendor-Supplied Bibliographic Records (TS-SIS)
Monday, July 20, 2015 – 3:15 p.m.-4:15 p.m.
PCC-Room 102B
- Angela Jones, Chair, Southern Methodist University
- Caroline Walters, Chair, Harvard University

What’s New at OCLC: Sharing Resources and Managing the Library in New Ways
Sunday, July 19, 2015 – 2:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m.
PCC-Room 112B

The Wonderful World of Metrics: Showing Your Value to Leadership (Program J5)
Tuesday, July 21, 2015 - 4:00 p.m.-5:00 p.m.
PCC-Room 103A
Tracking reference requests, usage statistics, and other metrics can be a challenge in any organization. Before relying on this data to make decisions, you must fully understand what the metrics represent. Participants will review reference metrics collection standards and tools available, such as Gimlet, EOS, and Zendesk. Panelists will also discuss usage statistics from vendors, such as Smart Recharge, Research Monitor, and OneLog. Participants will learn how to use the data to demonstrate value to leadership in their organization. Handouts will show comparisons of available products.

- Abigail Walters, Coordinator, Moderator and Speaker, Masion LLP
- Ashley Brooks Moye, Speaker, Charlotte School of Law
- Steven Antonio Lastres, Speaker, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP
- Marcia Burris, Speaker, Ogletree, Deakins, Nash, Smoak and Steward, PC

**Work Smarter, Not Harder – More Hip Tips for the Acquisitions Librarian (Program B2)**

Sunday, July 19, 2015 – 2:30 p.m.-3:30 p.m.
PCC-Room 108AB

This program, a continuation of 2014’s well-attended ‘Hip Tips’ program, is relevant whether you attended last year or not! Acquisitions education and training is not addressed much in library schools – it's mostly on-the-job training. Acquisitions librarians will share tips and tools used effectively on a daily basis, as well as advice for some of the more perplexing issues and the steps taken toward their resolution. Participants will learn in a collegial, communal atmosphere, with the opportunity to share questions, answers, and experiences with other attendees.

- Ajaye Bloomstone, Coordinator, Moderator and Speaker, Louisiana State University
- Alan Keely, Speaker, Wake Forest University
- Jean L. Willis, Speaker, Sacramento County Public Law Library
- Rachel Decker, Speaker, Chapman University Law Library

---

Continued from page 1

Brian has tirelessly and effectively advocated for better communication among technical services law librarians, promoting innovative tools and solutions to make it possible. He created TSLAWCHATS on Facebook as a venue for technical services law librarians, even those outside AALL, to chat and exchange ideas. Brian started a Twitter account for TS-SIS and was one of the original co-hosts of “The Law Librarian on Blog Talk Radio.” Additionally, he co-founded the popular “RDA Café” on Facebook, a resource that now has over 1,300 members from all types of libraries. In his five-year tenure as Editor of **TSLL**, he helped to transform the publication from a newsletter to a professional journal. He also successfully led **TSLL**’s transition from print to an online publication, resulting in significant cost savings for the sections.

His service to professional organizations goes above and beyond taking on active leadership roles. Brian has consistently proposed important programs for the AALL annual meeting. The list of sessions where he has presented or moderated is lengthy and impressive. He is known as a “go to” person for presenting, soliciting a speaker, or coordinating an effective program. He is well-regarded as a gifted presenter and educator. Many colleagues note that he is able to make the most boring of topics interesting and fun with his unique style and infectious enthusiasm.

The list of Brian’s accomplishments, contributions and leadership roles are too lengthy to list here. Put simply, as one colleague said, Brian’s involvement has benefited our profession. He is representative of the best of technical services law librarianship. The TS-SIS Awards Committee is pleased to recognize Brian Striman with this award.

Congratulations Brian!

**TS-SIS Awards Committee:**
Jennifer Noga, Chair
Jim Braden
Sue Kelleher
Ted Pitts
George Prager
Lauren Seney
Lorna Tang
Antionette Vanterpool
Marla J. Schwartz Silent Auction Donations

Please consider making a donation for the 2015 Marla J. Schwartz silent auction, which will be held at the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) activities table at the 2015 American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting in Philadelphia. We welcome any fine piece of craftwork or handiwork. Donations may be dropped off directly at the activities table. The earlier in the conference, the better, so there’s more time to increase bids. The exhibit hall opening reception starts on Saturday at 5:00, so if you want to drop yours off early, feel free! Whenever you bring your donation, we will be sure to keep it in good hands for you.

The proceeds from the silent auction go to help fund the Marla J. Schwartz Grant, given to assist newer law librarians and graduate students in library/information studies programs to attend AALL-sponsored events in technical services areas.

Feel free to share this information widely with anyone who could donate. If you will not be attending the conference and still wish to make a donation, or if you have any questions, please contact Ashley Moye at amoye@charlottelaw.edu.

Thank you in advance for your donations. See you in Philadelphia!