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Program Report

The Future of ILL: A Debate

Victoria Troemel
Indiana Tech Law Library

Mediators:
Wendy E. Moore, Acquisitions Librarian, University of Georgia Law Library
Francis X. Norton, Head of Public Services, Law Library of Louisiana

Warm:
Andrew Stamm, Reference Librarian for Foreign and International Law, New York University Law Library
Kristopher Turner, Reference and Technology Services Librarian, University of Wisconsin, Madison Law Library

Cool:
Meg Butler, Associate Director for Public Services, Georgia State University College of Law Library
Thomas W. Mills, Associate Director for Collections and Administrative Services, Cornell University Law Library

The program started with Wendy E. Moore stating this was not a formal debate, but somewhere between a spirited debate and a family feud. The panel discussed the following: if inter-library loan (ILL) is really the best way to provide resources to our patrons, do we need to evaluate the workflow, and what does the future hold for ILL. Francis X. Norton introduced the panel. They were broken into two groups: the warm, Andrew Stamm and Kristopher Turner, who love ILL; and the cool, Meg Butler and Thomas W Mills, who hate ILL. The mediators asked the panel members eight questions. Each side had a chance to respond to the question and then give a rebuttal.

Question 1: The panelists offered three things they liked or hated about ILL.

The warm side responded with:

- Enhances user experiences
- Libraries have to work together
- ILL can be adaptable
- One library cannot have everything
- Libraries can specialize with subject or format

Continued on page 34
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As the Incoming Chair of the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS), I want to express my deep appreciation to its members for this opportunity to serve you. In my first column, I will devote most of it to paying a debt of gratitude to the leadership team of 2014-2015. Then, I will conclude this column with a challenge to each of my colleagues to support the mission of the OBS during the next year.

As I reflect on the success of the 108th Annual Meeting of the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL), I would like to salute and recognize the extraordinary contributions to this endeavor by the OBS Executive Board and the Education Committee of 2014-2015.

The members of the Executive Board were as follows:

Karen Selden, Chair;
Katrina Piechnik, Past Chair;
Melanie Cornell, Secretary-Treasurer;
Jennifer Noga (2014-2015); Member-at-Large and

Last fall, the AALL Annual Meeting Program Committee (AMPC) selected three program proposals submitted by the OBS Education Committee for the 2015 programming track:

A6: Google Analytics: Using the Software, Using the Data
D7: Striking a Balance in Your Library Catalog: TMI vs. TLI Web
I1: BIBFRAME Deep Dive: How Did We Get Here and Where Are We Going?*

* OBS-SIS and the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) jointly sponsored this program. If you missed these excellent programs, along with others, the recordings are available at http://www.aallnet.org/conference/education/2015recordings.

The 2015 Education Committee was led by Karen Selden, Chair; and the members were Georgia Briscoe, Stephanie Edwards, Kathy Faust, Ruth Funabiki, Allison Jones, Caitlyn Lam, Sarah Lin, Jennifer Noga, Keiko Okuhara, Katrina Piechnik, Patricia Sayre-McCoy, and Christina Tarr.

In addition to the focus on professional development opportunities, the OBS Executive Board and the Education Committee executed successfully:

• the Conference of Newer Law Librarians (CONELL) Marketplace;
• the TS/OBS/Research Instruction & Patron Services (RIPS)/Computing Services (CS) SIS Joint Reception;
• the OBS Table in the Activities Area; and
• the user group meetings.

Next, I would like to thank the chairs and members of the other Standing Committees for their service this past year. These committees are the Local Systems, Nominating, OCLC, OBS/TS Joint Research Grant (now known as the Funding Research Opportunities Grant, or FROG), OBS Technical Services Law Librarian (TSLL) Editorial Board Representatives, and the Web Advisory.

In looking ahead to our new year, I challenge each of my colleagues to share your ideas for supporting the strategic direction of the OBS with the leadership team formally and informally. Furthermore, volunteers are welcome and needed to serve on OBS Committees. For the 2016 AALL Annual Meeting, President Keith Ann Stiverson has selected the theme “Make it New: Create the Future.”

Consequently, I encourage the members of the OBS to get involved in the program planning process for the 2016 Annual Meeting, which will open on September 8, 2015. For proposers, the timeline and proposal process information is available at http://www.aallnet.org/conference/education/future-meetings/program-proposers/timeline.html.
If you would rather submit a great idea or problem that you would like the Education Committee to consider for a program proposal, please contact me at mcrawford@kinoy.rutgers.edu.

Remember during the months ahead, the OBS needs your voice in order to communicate, educate, connect, and advocate on your behalf effectively!

Marjorie E. Crawford
Rutgers University

Technical Services Special Interest Section

From the Chair

BLAM! Let’s Do Great Things in 2015-2016!

When I was a doctoral student, I worked with an advisor who liked giving catchy names to projects. Every time we initiated a new study, we spent hours prior to starting on methodology or implementation making sure that the acronym used for the study name was just right. The name had to be catchy enough to get people’s attention, but the letters still had to make sense.

Because this is my first “from the chair” article, I wanted to come up with something catchy to represent the many ideas rolling around in my brain. I have so many things I want to convey to all of you about the current, plus near and far, futures of our profession and section. Luckily, this one came quickly to me. So here is…hope you are ready…..

BLAM!

BLAM! is an onomatopoeia used frequently in comic books for explosive sounds. I’m using it today to stand for four themes I would like to see inspire the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) this year:

- Balance
- Let’s Play the Game
- Action
- Moving On

B is for Balance

Balance may not seem very explosive, because it emphasizes mindfulness, reflection, and control. To me, balance in TS-SIS means making sure there is equity among our committees— that all our members feel heard and recognized. Balance means recognizing our traditional core values while still being flexible enough to evolve in new and exciting ways.

L is for Let’s Play the Game

Our profession and our law library community are changing. I know there is fear that people no longer see technical services librarians as relevant. Instead of trying to keep ourselves rooted in what we have always done, it’s time for us to play the game and show how vital and transformative we are as professionals. We need to be present at every American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) initiative, be a part of every decision, and communicate everything we are doing with everyone else in and outside of our organization. Part of playing the game means asking questions and respectfully disagreeing when we think people outside our group are interpreting our values incorrectly. Listening and respect are vital to playing the game. The way we mobilized on IdeaShare recently is an excellent example of playing the game well. Thank you! Let’s keep up the good work!

A is for Action

The worst thing we can do is nothing at all. Let’s take action—if we remain silent or are afraid to try new things or approaches, then we will be living up to all those negative stereotypes of unchanging technical services librarians. Action means forgetting about the possibility of failure or perfection. Action is about trying new things and learning. Action means having no fear and no regrets.
M is for Moving On

Sometimes things may not go our way. Maybe our SIS has not been treated as well in the past as we should. It’s important to acknowledge these times, but let’s not dwell on it. Let’s move on and do something great. We should spend our time wisely working towards the future and not complaining about past wrongs. Learning what we can from what has happened before is important and using that knowledge to better serve Technical Services law librarians is key.

! is for Energy, Excitement and Not Giving Up

While not listed in my four themes above the “!” has meaning too. I want us all to approach this year with energy, excitement, and a tenacious spirit!

Let’s BLAM! together. Let’s do great things!

Hollie White
Duke University

Technical Services Law Librarian (TSLL) Annual Report
July 2014-June 2015

The Technical Services Law Librarian (TSLL) volume 40 had four issues, published in PDF and available on the TSLL website at http://www.aallnet.org/sections/ts/TSLL/Issues, and on HeinOnline at http://heinonline.org/HOL/Index?collection=aallar. Michael Maben completed his second year as TSLL’s editor-in-chief and was very grateful for the excellent assistance provided by Sabrina Davis, Associate Editor; Julie Stauffer, Layout and Design; and Martin Wisneski, Web Manager. Staff published all issues for Volume 40 on schedule. The editor-in-chief greatly appreciates the work done by our dedicated columnists and editors.

There were a few columnist changes through the year. After the December issue, Lia Contursi stepped down from the co-authoring the Classification column. Beginning with the March issue, Aaron Kuperman agreed to co-author that column. Aaron’s switch opened up the Subject Headings column (which Aaron had authored for nearly 15 years). Patrick Lavey volunteered to write that column beginning with the March issue. Finally, Sarah Lin agreed to co-author the Private Law Libraries column after Erin Harper stepped down.

Concerning the editorial staff, Sabrina Davis took over the full task of Associate Editor from Michele Thomas.

Finally, with the Editorial Board, Barbara Szalkowski and Cate Kellett completed their two-year terms. The other Board members for 2014/2015 were Marijah Sroczynski and Corinne Jacox, and the staff greatly appreciates all their support.

TSLL also printed several guest columns and special reports. In December, there was a special report from the 2014 Charleston Conference written by Shyama Agrawal, Catherine Bye, and Eric Parker. In March, in the wake of the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Executive Board’s decision to end the support for the representatives to a number of other library organizations (including our representatives to the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC), and the Subject Analysis Committee (SAC)), TSLL published statements in support of the representatives program from the Technical Services (TS) and the Online Bibliographic Services (OBS) Boards, and from the current and past representatives to these three committees. This issue received wider recognition in the AALL community, including having the Editorial Director for AALL Spectrum personally contacting me. Finally, there were a number of guest columnists to some of the regular columns, including several members of the TS Preservation Committee that wrote the Preservation column, and a special edition of the Description and Entry column on Resource Description and Access (RDA) written by Melody Lembke (with assistance from John Hostage and Melissa Beck).

We will look forward to another publishing year, beginning with our Conference Issue in September.

Michael Maben, Editor-in-Chief
Indiana University, Bloomington
Jerome Hall Law Library
Minutes

Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS) 2015 Annual Business Meeting 
Monday, July 20, 2015, Philadelphia, PA

Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS) Chair Karen Selden called the official meeting to order at approximately 4:45 p.m.

Attendees approved the Business Meeting minutes of July 2014.

Officer Reports:

Treasurer/Secretary —Melanie Cornell: OBS-SIS net meeting expenses for 2014 were $3070.47. Membership fees received in 2014-15 totaled $2345.00. We started 2014-15 with a balance of $4924.66, spent $3095.51, received $3847.92, and ended with $4827.07 as of June 30, 2015.


Vice Chair—Marjorie Crawford: Marjorie worked with Patricia Sayre-McCoy and Jackie Magagnosc to create the joint OBS and TS BIBFRAME program proposal for the 2015 American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting. The proposal was accepted and it was a “deep dive” program on Tuesday afternoon.

Chair—Karen Selden: The OBS Education Committee for the 2015 AALL Annual Meeting in Philadelphia assisted with proposing seven programs, and three of those proposals were accepted. Sunday afternoon’s “Google Analytics: Using the Software, Using the Data” was well-received, and the audience for Monday morning’s “Striking a Balance in Your Library: TMI vs. TLI in the Catalog” was almost a full house. “BIBFRAME: How Did We Get Here and Where Are We Going?” (co-sponsored with TS-SIS) was scheduled as a deep-dive during the last 2 programming slots of the conference. In addition, the OBS Board agreed to self-sponsor and pay for an additional program during the OBS Local Systems Committee timeslot on Monday afternoon: “Migrating to Open Source: Koha and Kuali OLE in Law Libraries.” The OBS Education Committee also assisted OBS member Sarah Morris Lin with proposing a two-part User-Friendly Library Websites webinar for inclusion in AALL’s 2015 Monthly Educational Webinars series. Thanks to sponsorship from Wolters Kluwer Law & Business, these webinars were broadcast free of charge to AALL members in March and April 2015.

In the fall of 2014, the Task Force to Revise the Procedures and Guidelines of the OBS/TS Joint Research Grant submitted its final report to the OBS and TS Executive Boards. This report resulted in the creation of a new Guidelines document and a web-based application form. The contest to rename the grant ended in June 2015, resulting in the new grant name of FROG (Funding Research Opportunities Grant).

In March 2015, the Executive Board of AALL voted to discontinue funding several representative positions, effective in July 2015. Among them were the three TS-SIS representatives who also serve the needs and interests of many OBS members: the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC), and the Subject Analysis Committee (SAC). With a groundswell of support from many TS and OBS members, the OBS and TS-SIS Executive Boards asked the AALL Executive Board to reconsider this decision. 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. TS and OBS members should 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; and write for Technical Services Law Librarian (TSLL), Law Library Journal, Spectrum, and other professional publications.

Karen also thanked Katrina Piechnik, and Jackie Magagnosc for staffing the OBS table at the 2015 Conference of Newer Law Librarians (CONELL) Marketplace.
Committee Reports:

*TSLL*—Michael Maben: Michael distributed the *TSLL* Annual Report and he will have it posted to the *TSLL* website. *TSLL* published four issues on time, and there were some changes to the columnists and editorial staff during the year. Barbara Szalkowski completed her 2-year appointment to the Editorial Board—she has been serving on the Board since I became the editor-in-chief and I appreciate her support. Caitlyn Lam will be the new OBS representative on the Board. There were a number of guest articles and special reports during the year, but the March issue was the main event during the year with the response to the attempt by AALL to eliminate our representatives to the different library groups.

Education Committee (2016 Chicago)—Marjorie Crawford, Chair: The theme for 2016 is “Make It New.” The Education Committee will meet immediately following this meeting in the room next door, so please attend the meeting or let Marjorie know if you have any programming ideas.

Local Systems Committee—Kevin Carey, Chair: Karen Selden reported for Committee Chair Kevin Carey. The “Migrating to Open Source” program just prior to the Business Meeting was well-attended. The speakers were honest about the pros and cons of the software and migration process. Historically, the Local Systems Committee has sponsored a local systems roundtable at the AALL Annual Meeting, but in recent years OBS programming has filled that meeting slot. This year the Local Systems Committee had a request to organize an ALMA roundtable, which Kevin did. Because of demand for these sorts of roundtable opportunities, the OBS Board and Local Systems Committee will probably want to reinstate the Local Systems Roundtable meeting for the 2016 and future AALL Annual Meetings.

2014-2015 Nominating Committee—Betty Roeske, Chair: Karen Selden reported for Committee Chair Betty Roeske. The Committee came up with two candidates for each of the three offices, resulting in a very successful election.


Web Advisory—Tim Knight, Chair (not at meeting) continues to be very responsive and busy.

New Business:

2016 OBS VIP Ideas: AALL will be in Chicago in 2016; because this is the headquarters for the American Library Association (ALA), maybe this will give someone an idea for a Chicago-area choice for OBS-SIS VIP 2016.

Membership Decline—Recruiting Ideas? Several years ago we had approximately 300 members, where now we have closer to 230 members. OBS-SIS has evolved over time. We need to help potential members know better what OBS-SIS is, including considering a new name that is more self-evident, such as: SARD (Systems and Resource Discovery) or OSDR (Online Systems & Resource Discovery).

The meeting adjourned at approximately 5:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Melanie Cornell, Secretary/Treasurer, 2015-2016

---

**TS-SIS Acquisitions and Serials Standing Committees**

**Roundtable and Meeting**

**2015 Annual Business Meeting**

**Monday, July 20, 2015, Philadelphia, PA**

Jacob Sayward (Fordham University), Chair of the Serials Standing Committee, called the meeting to order at 4:30 P.M.

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

Alan Keely (Wake Forest University) moved to approve the minutes from the Acquisitions and Serials Standing Committees Roundtable and Meeting at the 2014 San Antonio AALL Annual Meeting. Julie R. Stauffer (University of Chicago) seconded and the motion carried.
1. Cancellations:
   a. Some libraries are in the middle of large cancellation projects which involve cancelling titles from their Library Maintenance Agreements (LMA) with Thomson Reuters and cancelling regional reporters and state statutes.
   b. A couple of the cancellation projects are due to building projects where the library is losing shelving space or is being relocated into a smaller space. One library involved in such a project mentioned working with campus sustainability to appropriately dispose of the books, which earned the school carbon credits.
   c. One table expressed concerns about how to display cancelled titles on the OPAC when its books are staying on the shelf. Perhaps the best option is to suppress the bibliographic records?
   d. Another table made an observation about how acquisitions staff can often be the last component of a cancellation project, and that it is very important to know who the cancelling decision makers are.

2. Moving to a Campus-wide Integrated Library System (ILS):
   a. A handful of libraries have had to integrate their ILS with their main campus library. One of these libraries commented that the claiming functions were not as robust when they had their own separate ILS, which is something to be aware of if there are discussions in your library about moving to a campus-wide ILS.

3. Additional Tasks Coming to Acquisitions:
   a. A common thread amongst the tables was staff issues such as changing workflows and acquisitions department structures. With less work coming in, acquisitions staffs have to take on other tasks beyond the traditional duties. Loss of staff and how to redistribute the work in that scenario was another issue discussed. One library mentioned having catalogers now do the claiming on their serial titles.
   b. Some acquisitions departments have taken on digitization projects as part of their duties.

4. “Work Smarter/Not Harder: More Tips for the Acquisitions Librarian” Continued Discussion:
   As part of a continued discussion of Ajaye Bloomstone’s (Louisiana State University), Jean Willis’ (Sacramento County Public Law Library), Alan Keely’s (Wake Forest University), and Rachel Decker’s (Chapman University Law Library) Sunday program titled “Work Smarter/Not Harder: More Tips for the Acquisitions Librarian,” each table was tasked to talk about one of three topics (Choosing and Getting Stuff to the Door; Management of People and Time; or Managing Staff) and report back to the group. Here are the ideas and tips that were shared to the group:
   - There is an AALL poster session on JTacq (http://www.jdata.com/jtacq.html), which is a free collection development/purchasing tool used by the University of Colorado Law School that might be useful to look at.
   - Alan Keely brought up a technique he uses called “coffee-pot meetings,” where you go with your staff to grab some coffee from the office coffee pot and then stand there and discuss an issue or topic for five minutes.
   - The importance of knowing how to prioritize work when you have been off or away for an extended period of time.
   - Public services should be more aware of what technical services does and what their work procedures are. For example, knowing the kind of notes to look for on bibliographic records in the OPAC or how they receive materials and enter them into the ILS.
   - The need for more professional development opportunities for para-professionals.
   - Moving away from a print form of record keeping to electronic. Some examples included scanning invoices and vendor contracts/documentation and archiving email exchanges between yourself and vendors.
   - The many benefits of using pivot tables such as improving workflows and using them as visual evidence to interested parties (finance, library director, dean, etc.) when asking for more resources or funds.
   - Rethinking technical services workflows in the current environment. One idea was to include non-traditional duties such as helping out in circulation, holding trainings with public services on technical services practices/procedures, archival work, and working on library displays and exhibits.

Closing Thoughts

At the end of the meeting, Diana Jaque (University of Southern California), Chair of the Acquisitions Standing Committee, thanked Richard Vaughan (Indiana University) for his great work in sending out the monthly acquisitions tip to the members of the Technical Services Special Interest Section during the past year.

The meeting adjourned at 5:32 P.M.

Submitted by Gilda Chiu
Collection Development/Acquisitions Librarian
Brooklyn Law School
American Library Association (ALA) Committee on Cataloging: Description & Access (CC:DA)

Governance Structure of Resource Description and Access (RDA)

Big changes to come in the governing structure of RDA: the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) has proposed a five-year transition period to become the RDA Steering Committee (RSC). They want to base the representation on UN regions rather than by library organizations. What this means is that instead of ALA having a representative who serves on the JSC, there would be one person representing North America on the RSC. The goal is to make RDA “truly international” and to expand the use of RDA to the archives, linked data, and museum communities. There was much consternation among CC:DA about this.

Impact of FR Consolidation

From the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) RDA Review Group’s Report of Activities 2013-2014:

“During the IFLA 2013 conference in Singapore, the FRBR [Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records] Review Group decided to form a Consolidation Editorial Group to lead the work of bringing the three conceptual models (FRBR, FRAD [Functional Requirements for Authority Data], and FRSAR [Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Records] models) together into one coherent model. [People often refer to this process as ‘FR consolidation.’] Consolidation work had reached a point where it required a small group to gather the results of numerous consultations, to identify areas that still needed attention, and to start giving shape to the consolidated conceptual model. The members of this group are Patrick LeBoeuf, Pat Riva, Miriam Säfström, and Maja Žumer. . . . During 2013/2014, the Consolidation Editorial Group held two series of meetings.”

From the RDA JSC meeting minutes, November 4, 2014:

“The JSC working principle during this time will be that extensive changes to RDA with high risk impact factors will not be implemented. Proposals may be accepted in principle, but suspended pending review. Proposals unlikely to be impacted by external factors -- which [Kathy] Glennan understood to include most FRBR Group 1 entities -- will continue to be implemented. The JSC is unwilling to spend resources on changing RDA structure and content where it is likely that those changes will be overwritten in the next year or two. For instance, extensive renumbering of instructions will be avoided for the time being. The JSC advised groups developing proposals -- such as CC:DA -- to take this working principle into account when prioritizing tasks. This should not hamstring CC:DA in its choice of issues to tackle. Rather, CC:DA should carefully plan the timing of its efforts.”

Law-related issued before CC:DA

Kathy Glennan (the ALA representative to the JSC) shared her draft of the “Laws, etc.” proposal. She changed nothing substantive from the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) proposal (which CC:DA approved at their ALA Midwinter meting), and John Hostage and I found no major problems with it. Kathy asked us about the maintenance/clean up aspects of the proposal. We both responded that it is a concern, but that it shouldn’t prevent the proposal from going forward. I’m wondering if the established “Laws, etc.” uniform titles can be flagged to not automatically convert to RDA as part of Phase 3B (they currently aren’t, unlike the Authorized Access Points (AAPs) for treaties). There are currently almost identical numbers of “Laws, etc.” and “Treaties, etc.” established uniform titles.

There has also been progress on the other AALL proposal that CC:DA approved at Midwinter, pertaining to numbering in the names of military units (RDA 11.2.2.22.1). Kate James (the RDA Examples Editor) continues to consult with Kathy Glennan, John Hostage, and myself about which examples to retain, add, or eliminate.

Folks at the Library of Congress (LC) presented a new fast-track proposal regarding the names of certain courts. LC didn’t like the wording of the instruction (fair point) and they noticed two anomalies in the examples. If you look at RDA 11.2.2.21.1, you will notice the two courts in India have qualifiers unlike any of the other examples. LC proposed changing all the other examples to follow this practice.

Instead of: France. Cour d’appel (Lyon)
you’d have: France. Cour d’appel (Lyon, France)
I balked at this because it creates ever more maintenance for little or no improvement in satisfying the FRBR user tasks. I again enlisted John Hostage, who independently reached the same conclusion, and he provided invaluable information about the historical context of this rule in the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, Second Edition (AACR2). Kathy took this back to the folks at LC, who changed their minds and agreed with us. They are still proposing improving the wording of the rule and making all of the examples consistent with current practice.

Contents notes

There was a change proposal that partly addressed the lack of instructions for contents notes. This is something CC:DA has been struggling with for a long time, and it got bogged down again. They are/were trying to fit it in to the chapters about relationships, but a better approach emerged that perhaps these instructions really belong in RDA Chapters two and six, as notes rather than relationships.

There was a proposal with many new relationship designators (some pertaining to jurisdictions) and it passed.

You can access the proposals and the online discussions from CC:DA’s Working Documents page.

Minutes from CC:DA’s Midwinter meeting

Random non-CC:DA notes

LC is working on developing controlled vocabulary for Demographic Group Terms (DGTs). The terms are capitalized, plural, faceted, and in natural language order. For example, if you wanted to apply the terms for African-American women, you would use two DGTs: African Americans; Women. The pilot phase 1 has about 400 terms, and they are working on a bigger list they hope to release by the end of 2015. The terms are visible in ClassWeb. They are not accepting suggestions for new terms until after the initial release.

LC plans to issue approximately 40 genre form terms for religious materials. This is from the Subject Authority Cooperative Program (SACO) announcement: “In September 2015 the meeting will approve approximately 40 genre/form terms for religious materials. The proposals appear on Tentative List 1518. [The Policy and Standards Division (PSD)] is requesting comments on the proposals; please email Janis L. Young at jayo@loc.gov through August 31, 2015.”

LC is working on refresher RDA webinars, cheat sheets, etc. that will be available “soon” as part of their Catalogers Learning Workshop.

There was discussion of three newish MARC fields (the links are to MARC bibliographic documentation, but the fields are valid in both bibliographic and authority records):

- 385 - Audience characteristics (“I want books written for Spanish speaking teenagers.”)
- 386 - Creator/contributor characteristics (“I want books written by Scottish women.”)
- 388 - Time Period of Creation (“I want books written during World War II.”) [Has not been implemented yet]

Name Authority Cooperative Program (NACO) Phase 3B

Gary Strawn has developed the software routine that will convert approximately 7.5 million authority records as RDA-compliant. These are all the remaining authority records that aren’t flagged with that cheery 667 note that they must be evaluated by a cataloger. 1xx AAPs will remain unchanged, blanks will replace all obsolete indicators, and many other ambitious automatic changes are in the works.

Report of the AALL Representative to the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) 2015 Annual Report

Jean M. Pajerek
Cornell Law Library


The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) convened two meetings at the ALA Annual Meeting in San Francisco. The Committee took action on one discussion paper and three proposals during the meetings. In addition, they considered an informal discussion paper.
Discussion Paper 2015-DP02
Coding 007 Field Positions for Digital Sound Recordings in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2015/2015-dp02.html
Source: Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM)

This paper proposes defining new values for some 007 field positions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to better accommodate coding for digital sound recordings. We cannot express some combinations of characteristics of digital resources with currently existing 007 values. This may be partially attributable to an uneven mixture of content and carrier characteristics encoded in the 007 configurations.

The scope of the paper is limited to bibliographic records for born-digital sound recordings that are available through a network. Specific questions discussed included whether to redefine the definition of value s (“Sound recording”) in 007/00 (“Category of material”) to include both physical and digital media, and whether to add a specific value for “Digital sound recording” to 007/01 (“Specific material designation”).

MAC recommends to develop the discussion paper into a proposal for the Midwinter meeting next January.

Proposal 2015-07
Extending the Use of Subfield $0 (Authority record control number or standard number) to Encompass Content, Media and Carrier Type
Source: British Library

This paper proposes the definition of subfield $0 (Authority record control number or standard number) in fields 336 (Content Type), 337 (Media Type) and 338 (Carrier Type) in the Bibliographic Format and 336 in the Authority Format. Subfield $0 contains the system control number of a related authority record, or a standard identifier such as an International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI). Definition of this subfield to encode the controlled vocabulary terms used in fields 336, 337 and 338 would facilitate the conversion of MARC data into linked data. MAC approved the proposal unanimously.

Proposal 2015-08
Recording Resource Description and Access (RDA) Format of Notated Music in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats
http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2015/2015-08.html
Source: Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange

This paper proposes defining a new field 348 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats for recording the RDA data element Format of Notated Music. Because this proposal has no applicability to law cataloging, suffice it to say that the committee approved it unanimously with an amendment.

Proposal 2015-09
Defining 670 $w (Bibliographic record control number) in the MARC 21 Authority Format
http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2015/2015-09.html
Source: Library of Congress, Policy and Standards Division

This paper proposes the definition of subfield $w (Bibliographic record control number) in the 670 field (Source of Data Found) of authority records to contain a bibliographic record control number (e.g., LCCN, OCLC record ID number) of the cited title. Janis Young, of the Library of Congress’ (LC) Policy and Standards Division, attended the meeting to answer questions about the proposal. Like many recently approved MARC proposals, its intent is to facilitate data manipulation by linked data applications. According to the background information provided in the proposal, “[i]t is Library of Congress practice to include an LCCN (Library of Congress Control Number) of a related bibliographic record in some authority records. Specifically, LC catalogers include the LCCN of the bibliographic record for the work being cataloged when creating proposals for LC subject headings and proposals for LC genre/form and medium of performance terms. The LCCN is now included in the 670 $a, which is a free-text field for the source citation; thus, the LCCN cannot always be located, identified, and acted upon programatically.” Encoding the information in its own subfield would allow for this kind of machine manipulation. The committee approved the proposal by unanimous vote.

Informal discussion paper:
URIs in MARC: A Call for Best Practices
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1fuHvF8bXH7ldY_xJ7f_xn2P2Dj8o-Ca9jhHgh1eUg/edit?pli=1
Author: Steven Folsom, Discovery Metadata Librarian, Cornell University Library
Technical Services Law Librarian, Vol. 41, No. 1


The MARC Advisory Committee convened two meetings at the ALA Midwinter meeting in Chicago. The committee took action on one discussion paper and six proposals during the meetings.

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

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

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

RDA added the element sub-type ‘Period of Activity of the Corporate Body’ as part of the April 2014 Update. To ensure the maintenance of the correlation between RDA and the 046 field, the British Library proposes defining new subfields to code separately dates relating to a period of activity from dates relating to the establishment and termination of a corporate body. The proposal recommends the definition of a new subfield $q for date of establishment and $r for date of termination. These subfields would then be used to code the definite start and end dates of a corporate body. Meanwhile, subfields $s and $t would be used for dates indicating the start and end of periods of activity, both for persons and for corporate bodies. The Committee approved this proposal.

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

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

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

Proposal 2015-04
Broaden Usage of Field 088 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
Proposed by Alaska Resources Library and Information Services
This paper proposes broadening the usage of field 088 (Report Number) in bibliographic records to include series numbers (in particular, for series in technical reports and government publications) by deleting the sentence “Not used to record a number associated with a series statement” in field 088’s field definition and scope. The Committee approved this proposal unanimously with little discussion.

Proposal 2015-05
Definition of New Code for Leased Resources in Field 008/07 in the MARC 21 Holdings Format
Proposed by the British Library

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

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

Report of the AALL Representative to the American Library Association (ALA) from the CaMMS Subject Analysis Committee (SAC)
Midwinter Meeting, Chicago, January 2015
Annual Meeting, San Francisco, June 2015

Lia Contursi
Columbia University

Summary of SAC activities and highlights from the reports of the Library of Congress (LC)

LC released The Classification for Law of Indigenous Peoples in the Americas, aka The KIA-KIX, last summer in June 2014, and now LC has added the expansion of KF8200-8578 (Federal Law related to Indians) to the schedules. LC catalogers are still required to refrain from using these new classifications until LC checks and harmonizes the captions and references in the schedule. This should be finished in August 2015.

Currently, the classification for the law of the Indians of Mexico is under development. The schedule for the Law of Hawaii pre-1900 has been added to Classweb and the Law School Library at the University of Hawaii is testing it.

Genre/Form. The Policy and Standards Division (PSD) of LC approved a list of 175 general genre/form terms which have been included in the authority file of the Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms for Library and Archival Materials (LCGFT). The catalogers at LC are not yet implementing the general terms, but libraries wishing to apply these terms are advised to do so in addition to the form subdivision ($v). At this time, PSD has no plans to cancel the form subdivisions or any Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) that overlap with the general terms.

Music Genre/Form. PSD approved 567 genre terms for music in February 2015, but about 100 more are still under discussion for approval. In April 2015, LC started to implement them.

Literature Genre/Form. In May 2015, PSD approved 230 literature genre terms. More terms are still pending. LC is not yet assigning the literature terms.

Religion Genre/Form. The tentative list proposed by the Religion Project Group is under revision and LC should approve it in September 2015.

SAC Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation (GFIS) Working Group on the Definition and Scope of Genre/Form for LCGFT. The working group prepared a proposal to review the current definition of genre and form, which some perceive as inconsistent and contradictory. A new definition able to expand the current restrictive semantics of genres and forms will give more meaningful guidance to the catalogers and a more appropriate understanding of the application of the genres in general. PSD is reviewing the proposal.

Library of Congress Demographic Group Terms (LCDGT). The Demographic Group is a list of terms describing the creators or contributors of a resource (coded in MARC field 386), or the intended audience of a work (coded in MARC field 385). These fields are available in bibliographic records as well as in authority records. PSD made their tentative list of terms available for public comments in May 2015, with the intent to make public the structure of this particular vocabulary. The
tentative list will now go through a second phase, during which PSD will further develop the vocabulary and enhance it with scope notes. PSD plans to finish the project by the end of the year. After the finalization and approval of the Demographic Group Terms, people can propose new terms.

Library of Congress Demographic Group Term and Code List (LCDGT) for Indian Tribes. The PSD asked the SAC Working Group on LCDGT to start a project and assist with the compilation of a list of endonyms for Indian tribes. PSD and the working group are acutely aware of the necessity of using the proper language because some perceive many current demonyms as pejorative. The reference sources suggested by PSD are works such as *World Book Encyclopedia* and *Encyclopedia Americana*, the *Gale Encyclopedia of Multicultural America* or then *Handbook of North American Indians*.

**FAST Headings.** Faceted Application of Subject Terminology (FAST) enrichment of new records has routinely excluded the FAST headings for a period of at least six months. However at the ALA Annual Meeting in June, it was announced that the moratorium period is now one month only.

**MAPFAST** is an experiment currently underway at OCLC which uses a Google map to provide map-based access to bibliographic records by way of searching FAST headings. Link to: [http://experimental.worldcat.org/mapfast/](http://experimental.worldcat.org/mapfast/).

**SAC-Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) Activities.** The Relationship Designators for Subjects are now located in Appendix M of *Resource Description and Access* (RDA).

The CC:DA Task Force on Relationship Designators in RDA completed a proposal to make revisions and expand the list of relationships between Persons, Families, and Corporate Bodies (Appendix K). Among many new terms proposed for this list, there are the Relationship Designators for Jurisdictions.

- **Capital**: A jurisdiction that is the official seat of the related government of the state, territory, nation, etc.
- **County seat**: A jurisdiction that is the administrative center or seat of government of the related county
- **First-order administrative division**: A primary administrative division of the related country, such as a state in Australia or the United States, or a province in Canada or Indonesia
- **First-order administrative division of**: A country in which the related primary administrative division, such as a state in Australia or the United States, or a province in Canada or Indonesia, is located.

Such designators are necessary for relationships between jurisdictions and the CC:DA proposed their addition to Appendix K in an earlier draft of the document. However, the committee thought that the JSC would likely prefer to class the RD for Jurisdiction with the Appendix L for places, which is currently empty.

**LCSH “Illegal aliens” heading revision – discussion.** In 2014, a group of students and librarians at Dartmouth proposed the replacement of LCSH Illegal aliens with Undocumented immigrants. SAC rejected the proposal, but the discussion will continue at ALA Midwinter Meeting in 2016.

---

**Marla Schwartz Grant Report**

As this year’s recipient of the Marla Schwartz Education Grant, I attended the 2015 American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting and Conference in the historic city of Philadelphia. I am very grateful to the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) for giving me this opportunity. Everyone was very welcoming and helpful throughout the entire conference, and I greatly appreciate all of the support.

I dedicated my first day at the conference to attending the Conference of Newer Law Librarians (CONELL). It was a great chance to meet new law librarians, as well as other library students like myself. I am forever interested in hearing about the various ways librarians have discovered the profession, and it is equally refreshing to speak with people who share my strong sentiment for librarianship. Spending the day with almost 100 other like-minded people generated a great sense of camaraderie. Not to be outdone by the “business” component of the day, the “fun” component was quite enjoyable too. The CONELL class was given a guided-tour of Independence National Historical Park, which included visiting Independence Hall and the printing shop where Ben Franklin began his career. It was interesting to learn how much of our nation’s early history was impacted by librarianship and how large of a driving force Ben Franklin was in the effort to popularize libraries.
and share and deliver information among the colonies. Fun fact: the entirety of the original Library of Congress, which sits inside Independence Hall, required only two bookcases.

Once CONELL was over, I attended the grand opening of the Exhibit Hall. Having never been to an AALL conference, or any conference really, I had only imagined what the Exhibit Hall would be like. The number and variety of exhibitors present truly surprised me. In addition to the more prevalent names, there were so many vendors, companies, and materials that I had never heard of. I was also impressed and fascinated by the different products and services companies are able to provide in the support of legal research. On a more ridiculous note, I later earned my first “selfie stick,” which was graciously provided by the fine people at the Thomson Reuters exhibit booth.

Throughout the conference I enjoyed quite a few programs. My goals were to focus on gaining insight on how to make myself more marketable and to diversify my skill-set. Therefore, I attended seminars focused on resume and cover letter etiquette, as well as effective writing. I also gravitated toward events centering on the role of technology within the field, including a seminar on coding for librarians, but I especially enjoyed the Cool Tools presentations. There are so many (mostly) free-to-use programs that cater toward the organization, outreach, and analytic needs of law librarians. The presentations focused on ease of access and use, bridging the gap between projects of different scales and priorities, and opportunities for application. It was interesting to see the many ways all sorts of law libraries are implementing these programs, by all sorts of collaborative groups, in the support of various initiatives.

I attended the TS-SIS Breakfast Business Meeting. During the event, I had the pleasure of meeting quite a few technical services law librarians who were very welcoming. As a recent graduate, there are still many uncertainties regarding my professional future, and I am very thankful for everyone’s kind words of encouragement! The support showed for the TS-SIS and its various initiatives was also impressive and moving. The appreciation everyone has for the hard work of one another in the efforts to keep the TS-SIS going and growing reminded me of why I am drawn to librarianship—everyone is invested in, and contributes to, the success of one another.

One of the bigger events, the Thomson Reuters AALL Member Appreciation Event, was one I had heard many stories about. Since I had cruised through the Reading Terminal Market a few times prior to the event, I was very excited to have the chance to enjoy it without the usual crowd and long lines. Exploring the Market and trying all sorts of local and international cuisine while in good company was definitely one of the highlights of my conference experience. If I learned anything at all that weekend, I learned that law librarians really know how to have a good time.

Of all the conference weekend had to offer, however, what I appreciate most was the opportunity to meet and learn from numerous law librarians and other people involved in the profession. Being able to soak up as much information and advice as I possibly could was invaluable. I am truly thankful to the TS-SIS and their support of the Marla Schwartz Education Grant, which helped me attend the conference and enjoy a weekend full of so many new and meaningful experiences.

---

**OCLC Update**

*Jason LeMay
Emory University*

**OCLC Update at 2015 American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting**

The Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS) held the *OCLC Update* from 11:30-12:45 on Sunday, July 19, 2015. This was the first *OCLC Update* held following Glenn Patton’s retirement. Rob Favini, OCLC Member Relations Liaison, provided news and information about organizational and cultural shifts at OCLC, Worldcat and WorldShare updates, information about the OCLC Community Center, and a brief update regarding OCLC and Linked Data.

**OCLC Organizational and Cultural Shifts**

OCLC has been undergoing some recent changes in the senior leadership team. Notably, they have added several new executives, including a Chief Information/Technology Officer. The organization is attempting to shift its culture in an effort to reduce overall development cycles and to stop saying yes to every request. The focus now is on speed, accountability, and execution.

Also new to the OCLC organization is a Membership division. This division will bring together member services, community relations, and research. OCLC will be seeking feedback from its members in most states during an upcoming series of Member Forums (http://oc.lc/memberforums). These will be full day forums to discuss OCLC services and provide members an opportunity to discuss their needs with OCLC staff.
Technology and Support are additional areas in which OCLC is making changes. OCLC is reviewing its technology readiness and strategy, as well as evaluating and updating staff skills. OCLC is converting support from a single-tier that deals with both customers and product teams to a dual-tier setup. Under the new configuration, front-facing support will communicate with the customer, while a second tier will communicate with product teams and the front-facing support teams.

**WorldCat Update**

Record counts in WorldCat continue to increase. As of early July, there were nearly 340 million records in WorldCat, with approximately 2.25 billion holdings. More than 77% of these records were from member libraries, more than 20% were from the Library of Congress (LC) and other national libraries, and the remaining 2% were from vendors or publishers.

WorldCat is also boosting its record quality this year. Members have already contributed 1.02 million improved records in 2015, easily on target to exceed last year’s 1.08 million records. OCLC staff have improved more than 64 million records so far this year, nearly four times the 17 million records improved in 2014.

**WorldShare Metadata Services**

Much of the recent development work at OCLC focuses on WorldShare Collection Manager and WorldShare Record Manager.

WorldShare Collection Manager (WCM) has replaced the WorldCat Collection Sets (WCS) and provides members with the ability to manage metadata for electronic and print collections. The base MARC records reside in WorldCat, with a central index (WorldCat Discovery) and knowledge base overlaid on WorldCat. OCLC is providing tutorials, webinars, and “Office Hours” to aid members in learning to use WCM. Additionally, the OCLC released its new OCLC Community Center to provide more centralized access to documentation and discussion forums related to both WCM and WorldShare Record Manager (WRM).

While the knowledge base has been growing and now contains over 13,000 collections from nearly 6,000 providers (see [http://oc.lc/indexDiscovery](http://oc.lc/indexDiscovery)), discussion and comments during the OCLC Update session related member difficulties in using WCM as compared to the now deprecated WCS for record delivery. Rob emphasized that the changes and enhancements to the organization of documentation (such as the Community Center) are to address these types of problems and improve usability.

WCM also provides members with the ability to cooperatively manage collections. While vendors and publishers provide many of the existing collections, member libraries contribute several collections. In addition to WCS, which has already moved to WCM, WorldCat Cataloging Partners is in the process migrating to WCM. If members have not yet migrated to WCM, they are encouraged to visit [http://oc.lc/wccstransition](http://oc.lc/wccstransition) for more information on starting the process.

Another aspect of WorldShare Metadata Services discussed was the WorldShare Record Manager, the new cataloging interface that is expected to replace OCLC Connexion at some point in the future (note that it was emphasized that there is no end of life date for Connexion at this time). WorldShare is currently improving Record Manager, with a goal to provide the functionality catalogers are used to getting in Connexion, as well as providing new functionality such as autocomplete of controlled fields. For more information on getting started with Record Manager, visit [http://oc.lc/getrecordmanager](http://oc.lc/getrecordmanager).

**Linked Data**

OCLC is currently looking at different possibilities of implementing linked data. While OCLC is developing a separate initiative, they are also keeping abreast of LC’s BIBFRAME project and emphasize that they will support BIBFRAME if it comes into full fruition. LC and OCLC co-authored a report, and the executive summary is available at [http://oc.lc/CommonGround](http://oc.lc/CommonGround).

**Announcements from OCLC**

**OCLC announced its 2015 OCLC Member Forums on June 24, 2015**

OCLC announced a series of member forums hosted by member libraries around the country:

“Join the second annual series of regional U.S. Member Forums to learn from colleagues and contribute to the future of your OCLC cooperative. You’ll gain updates and best practices on the OCLC services you use, including Cataloging and Metadata, Discovery and Resource Sharing. You’ll also have the opportunity to bring your ideas and discuss your library’s needs and opportunities with OCLC staff members.

“Hosted by member libraries across the U.S., the Forums start at 9:00 am local time and adjourn by 4:00 pm. These day-long
meetings are designed to be interactive and informative. Each regional meeting has a flexible agenda to ensure that together we engage in the topics that are most relevant to you. Come prepared to share and learn along with your colleagues so that together, we can make information more accessible and more valuable to our collective communities.”

For more information, check the web site at http://www.oclc.org/events/member-forums.en.html.

OCLC introduced the new OCLC Community Center on July 10, 2015

OCLC announced the new OCLC Community Center for users of WorldShare Collection Manager and WorldShare Record Manager:

“The new OCLC Community Center makes it easier for users of WorldShare Collection Manager and WorldShare Record Manager to find product updates, news, upcoming events and discussion boards all in one place.

“Anyone with a WorldShare account can sign in and create a profile to start collaborating. Plus, there are communities for users of WorldShare Acquisitions, Circulation, Interlibrary Loan, License Manager and WorldCat Discovery Services as well.

“With the new OCLC Community Center you can:

• Stay on top of discussions – Don’t worry, our existing listservs aren’t going anywhere. We know the listservs are very important to you. That’s why the new Community Center has e-mail listserv functionality that enables you to stay on top of discussions and news through email at either the forum or topic level. These capabilities allow you to reply to community topics directly from your inbox.
• Provide feedback – Your feedback and suggestions are very important to our product teams so we’ve created a space for you and your staff to share ideas and add ratings or comments to others’ suggestions.
• Make connections – With the “opt-in” directory, you can search for and contact peers who use the same OCLC services that you do
• Get the latest product information – Find up-to-date information on product releases and training

“Access is simple. Simply sign in to the OCLC Community Center at www.oclc.org/community with your existing WorldShare credentials to get started.”

Jay Weitz from OCLC sent out the following information about Tech Bulletin 265 on July 24, 2015:

OCLC-MARC Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Format Update 2015 will be installed in August 2015. All details are now available in OCLC Technical Bulletin 265: OCLC-MARC Format Update 2015 (https://www.oclc.org/support/services/worldcat/documentation/tb/265.en.html). This update implements format changes announced by the Library of Congress in MARC 21 Updates No. 19 (October 2014; http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc21_update19_online.html) and No. 20 (April 2015; http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc21_update20_online.html), including:

• Defining code “q” (Lease) in the Holdings 008/07 (Method of Acquisition).
• Implementing the First Indicator (Source of Acquisition Sequence), subfield $3 (Materials Specified), and subfield $5 (Institution to which Field Applies) in Bibliographic 037 (Source of Acquisition).
• Implementing subfields $q (Establishment Date) and $r (Termination Date), and redefining subfields $s (Start Period) and $t (End Period), in Authority 046 (Special Coded Dates).
• Broadening the scope of Bibliographic 088 (Report Number) to include series report numbers.
• Implementing Bibliographic 370 (Associated Place).
• Implementing subfield $e (Number of Ensembles) and making subfield $s (Total Number of Performers) Nonrepeatable in both the Bibliographic and Authority 382 (Medium of Performance) fields.
• Implementing Bibliographic and Authority 388 (Time Period of Creation).
• Invalidating the First Indicator in Bibliographic field 648 (Subject Added Entry: Chronological Term).
• Implementing field 884 (Description Conversion Information) in the Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings formats.
• Implementing the repeatable subfield $g (Miscellaneous Information) or making it repeatable in some 22 Bibliographic fields and 24 Authority fields.
• Implementing subfield $4 (Relation Information) in thirteen 7XX Authority fields.
• Implementing subfield $4 (Relation Code) in fourteen 7XX Authority fields.

We will also make additions to WorldCat indexing, validate all MARC Codes defined by the Library of Congress between July 2014 and June 2015, and implement subfields $8 (Field Link and Sequence Number) in some 46 Bibliographic fields.
OCLC plans to install the OCLC-MARC 2015 Update during August 2015 and will make announcements widely through the usual discussion lists and Connexion logon greetings at that time. Note that the implementation of Authority format elements must be coordinated with the Library of Congress [LC] and the Program for Cooperative Cataloging [PCC] and should not be used until LC, PCC, and OCLC announce that PCC testing of the new elements has been completed.

**OCLC announces July enhancements to WorldCat Discovery on July 29, 2015**

OCLC has announced that they added citations (APA, MLA, and Chicago) to WorldCat Discovery in July. Additionally, member feedback has led OCLC to push back the end-of-life date for FirstSearch for those libraries that have not yet transitioned to WorldCat Discovery. The new date has not been announced as yet, but is projected to be sometime in late 2016.


---

**Second time in Philly, First time at AALL**

**Sarah Lin**  
Reed Smith LLP

Attending the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting this year marked my second visit to the lovely city of Philadelphia. My first visit was during a college Model United Nations (U.N.) competition, and there was a similar amount of liquor and late nights, but far more lasting professional accomplishments this time around.

As a recipient of the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) Active Member Grant, you can imagine that the easiest way to describe my AALL experience is BUSY. I presented/moderated/coordinated the Google Analytics Panel on Sunday afternoon, and five other Reed Smith librarians attended the conference, so it was quite a mix of work obligations (see above re: late nights) and professional development opportunities.

Just as you might expect from a live event, seeing people in person was by far the best part of my trip to Philadelphia. I saw my current bosses, former bosses, current committee members, friendly vendor reps, and folks I’ve only ever known as email addresses, but now know as colleagues and friends. So awesome.

My favorite session was Legal Process Management and Legal Lean Sigma. With a predilection for following procedures, the idea of making a process map to reduce variation and improve workflows got me excited. The “why” from my notes of that session are: stakeholder inclusion, to prepare for change and make a case, and to identify areas for improvement and internal efficiency. I took this idea to my staff work day in our Philadelphia office the Wednesday after conference and had my team map out the acquisitions process for an attorney-requested book. It was something we’d never done and it presented several areas of questions for us to work out with our outsourced processing staff (which was rather surprising since we’ve been working with them for three years and thought we had all the kinks worked out!). We’ve also got a very long visual chart of just how involved a new order is--something I’ll be presenting to our reference team and library management at our next staff meeting (stakeholder inclusion!).

On a whim, I decided to attend the Vendor-Supplied Records Advisory Group (VRAG) meeting. We get MARC records from various vendors, so it seemed like it might be interesting—and was it ever! I’ve since joined the working group, and let me tell you: they are doing work that the rest of us simply cannot live without. Just one example: do you like MARC records with unique control numbers? I know I do and that I would bust a gasket if I ever got a file of vendor records that didn’t have them. From here on out, I’ll be sending a silent thank you to VRAG every time I load a new set of vendor files.

For anyone reading this who hasn’t been to an AALL annual meeting, my feeling is that I had a great time because I had put effort in beforehand working with and communicating with other AALL members, so it seemed I never turned a corner without coming across someone I knew and was able to cement that relationship with an in-person exchange. There’s my plug as your current Membership Committee Chair - this organization is really what you make of it!
I am honored to be the recipient of this year’s New Member Grant to attend the 108th American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting & Conference in Philadelphia. My sincere gratitude goes out to the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) for this opportunity and for all the support and encouragement they provide for newer and more experienced members.

At my first AALL conference, Boston 2012, I did not get a chance to attend the Conference of Newer Law Librarians (CONELL), because I was attending the all-day Resource Description and Access (RDA) cataloging workshop on that Saturday. It was somewhat intimidating as a total newbie to begin my AALL experience with an intensive workshop, but my fellow law catalogers were so welcoming, and a fun group of table-mates became the start of a broader professional network. This has been a constant with TS-SIS in the years since: we have had great leadership and a collegial membership that really wants to foster our development, to help us grow as professionals. So I want to encourage all newer members to “just say yes” to the many opportunities TS-SIS provides to get involved.

TS-SIS Chair Suzanne Graham had invited me to chair the 2014-15 Nominating Committee, which gave me the chance to see up close how the Executive Board operates over the course of the year. Nominating is a really fun committee for anyone interested in learning more about the people who make this group great. It is inspiring to see our dedicated leadership in action, and also to help shape the future of TS-SIS through the election process.

I had my first experience moderating a program in Philly, the Online Bibliographic Services (OBS)-sponsored “Migrating to Open Source: Koha and Kuali OLE in Law Libraries.” There are useful resources for first-time coordinators and moderators on the AALL website, but it’s the work of colleagues like Marjorie Crawford and Karen Selden that made my job easy and helped me feel comfortable up there at the lectern.

The schedule was full for TS-SIS attendees at this year’s conference, and there were a lot of times when it was difficult deciding which program or meeting to attend. For the second year, the “Hip Tips” acquisitions program was packed with practical advice for “working smarter” day-to-day; “TMI vs. TLI” really drilled down into the numbers of that big question we catalogers always ask ourselves; and the “Enough to be Dangerous” coding program inspired me to learn more about developing a new skill-set for the future.

The TS-SIS Annual Business Meeting & Awards Presentation has always been my favorite part of the conference, though, for the way it celebrates the people who make this section great and the work that we have all done together. I have yet to attend one of these meetings that did not include someone shedding tears of happiness—whether it is the Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award honoree or the outgoing Chair passing on the gavel—and these displays of emotion show the personal side of professional development in TS-SIS.

Thank you again to TS-SIS and the Awards Committee for awarding me the 2015 New Member Grant. I hope to see you all next year in Chicago!

**AALL Announcements**

1. The 2015 Executive Board Election Opens October 1. Online voting for the next AALL vice president/president-elect, treasurer, and Executive Board members opens Thursday, October 1, and runs through 11:59 p.m. (EDT) on Saturday, October 31.

2. Applications are now being accepted through November 4 for the 2016 AALL Leadership Academy to be held April 1-2, 2016, in Oak Brook, Illinois.

3. The AALL Rebranding Initiative has been moving forward using the results of the May member survey to inform the process. FAQs and a project update are available to keep you up-to-date on the progress of this project; see [http://www.aallnet.org/rebrand](http://www.aallnet.org/rebrand).
A large and very engaged crowd attended the 2015 American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting Opening General Session on Sunday morning, July 19, to hear keynote speaker Terry Gross, the host and co-executive producer of the very popular National Public Radio (NPR) *Fresh Air* program. Ms. Gross was an appropriate choice as the keynote speaker, because Philadelphia is the base of her NPR program and her interviewing style embodies the Annual Meeting theme of “The Power of Connection.”

A fun video montage that paid a humorous homage to Ms. Gross played on the big screens before she took the stage and set the tone for the entertaining presentation to follow. To open her presentation, titled “Off Air with Fresh Air,” she described how she balances the divulgence of private and public information of her interview subjects during her interviews. She tells her interviewees to let her know if any question is too personal, so it becomes their responsibility to decide what to share. She feels that everyone needs at least some privacy and the ability to set those limits, so her interviews are prerecorded to allow participants (except politicians) to re-record an answer if they wish. She likes to create open and honest dialogues with her interview subjects, so she is willing to talk about their dark thoughts if they are. She feels that there is value to personal narratives, and she likes to create connections between the artists that she interviews and how they accomplish or perform their particular crafts. She finds that childhood experiences particularly shape artists and their work.

Ms. Gross also touched upon journalistic ethics. For example, political figures can be evasive or give answers that contain too much “spin,” so she is not afraid to point out when they have failed to directly answer a question or to be persistent in getting an acceptable answer. However, one should apply this style consistently. Ms. Gross shared an anecdote about (and actual audio excerpt of) an interview she conducted with Bill O’Reilly during which he accused her of using a more challenging interview style with him than she used with Al Franken. An independent ombudsman reviewed the complaint and ultimately agreed with Bill O’Reilly. The source and context of “news” items was another issue that Ms. Gross tackled. As librarians, we know about evaluating the reliability of information sources, and Ms. Gross presented some anecdotes that reinforced this message within the scope of media outlets. She cautioned that some media outlets with hidden agendas will find unflattering quotes from credible sources (including her *Fresh Air* interviews) and then distribute them out of context or in a distorted fashion. Her examples included the America Rising website, which used portions of a *Fresh Air* interview with Hilary Clinton to try to discredit the politician, and media outlets that misrepresented quotes from a *Fresh Air* interview with George Clooney to create sensational headlines and innuendo.

NPR maintains a digital audio archive to preserve and access information and interviews from their many programs. In news that especially resonates with librarians, Ms. Gross announced that NPR recently received a grant to index this digital archive to improve retrieval of this information.

Throughout the program, Ms. Gross shared many anecdotes and used audio clips from her *Fresh Air* interviews to illustrate her points. Photos or time-lapsed caricatures of the interview subjects accompanied these anecdotes and audio clips on the large screens. Her anecdotes described a wide range of interviews, from humorous, to political, to obnoxious (Gene Simmons, of the rock band KISS), to poignant. In the latter category was her final interview with children’s author Maurice Sendak (author and illustrator of *Where the Wild Things Are*). He was approaching the end of his life, and his heart-felt observations about the blessings and challenges of getting old were extremely touching and moving, leaving audience members teary-eyed. This particular interview was turned into an animated video tribute to Mr. Sendak after he passed away (complete with some of his Wild Things), and that video was shown on the large screens.

This presentation was just as engaging, entertaining, enjoyable, and enlightening as *Fresh Air* itself. The audience seemed completely rapt; I did not notice any murmurs of conversation or anyone using a mobile device at any point during the presentation. While the presentation seemed a bit “canned” for use with any audience and would have been more relevant with explicit library-related “hooks” (such as anecdotes revealing how she approaches her research or specific ways NPR librarians have helped her), Ms. Gross certainly deserved the standing ovation she received, and her presentation was a wonderful way to start the 2015 AALL Annual Meeting. If you missed her presentation, I highly recommend that you view it on the AALL website, at http://www.aallnet.org/conference/more/past-meetings/2015-Highlights (your AALL member login is required to view this recording).
Elaine M. Knecht (Hiscock Barclay, LLP) moderated this discussion of how resources are generally described, stored, and made available by asking questions of three librarians working in diverse law libraries: Jacob Sayward (Fordham University Law Library), Janice Hyde (Law Library of Congress), and Kimberlee Hersch (Howard & Howard Attorneys PLLC).

Knecht began by asking the librarians what they most wanted in content management: regardless of any obstacles, what would perfect content management look like? Speaking from the viewpoint of the university law library, Sayward identified the goal as a single search-box standing between library patrons and library resources, those resources both within and outside of the library collection. Sayward also reflected, however, that such a search would be as complicated to maintain on the backend as it was to simply present on the frontend.

Much of the interest of the discussion came from the fact that while Hersch, working in a law firm, shared the same goals as her co-panelists—to describe, store, and make available legal resources—her methods for content management often differed. Instead of an integrated library system (ILS), Hersch maintains an Access database. She deletes a record after a title is withdrawn, while Sayward and Hyde suppress the record from public view (though Hyde mentioned she no longer suppresses superseded titles).

Asked how much of the catalog is public-facing, Hersch explained that the while the attorneys at her firm do not consult the Access database, they can look at printed inventories posted at corresponding shelves as well on the website. For Sayward and Hyde, all non-suppressed titles are public-facing, though Sayward added that catalog content often requires an intermediary - a librarian - to translate information to the patron.

Regarding records for electronic resources, Sayward said his goal was to have as much vendor-neutral MARC records for electronic resources as possible, with all of them stored alongside records for print resources. Rather than add records for electronic resources into her database, Hersch maintains an Excel spreadsheet of acquired and available electronic resource titles.

Concluding the program, Hyde stressed that content management systems and workflows are only as good as the people behind them, the librarians and library staff tasked with actively managing their content.

This was one of my “must attend” programs at the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting this year, because although I’d heard of Google Analytics, I had no idea what it actually was or what libraries did with it. It was one of the best programs I attended and I learned a lot that excited me and made me think of what I could do with Google Analytics.

Sean Chen of Duke Law School was the first presenter. He discussed the situation at Duke that led them to centralize their information collecting with Google Analytics. Duke had a suite of Google services, usually added based on institutional needs, which were then simply added to someone’s job description as the services were added. There was no central analytics collection and, although the services were widely used, no coordination of institutional accounts. Sean described it as “WTF [sorry, his phrase, not mine] has the access?”

Many different views of the institutional website were created using Google Analytics, but they weren’t shared and people didn’t know what was already available. Many people didn’t know how to create reports from Google Analytics or where to look for the information they wanted. People often didn’t know what Duke already had. For instance, YouTube is part of the Google Suite, but was not the default for posting videos. YouTube has to be linked to Google Analytics, but you have to know how to do it. There were also many social media accounts in Google Plus and no communication about them. Although the Webmaster Tools work with Google Plus and can provide good data if linked to Google Analytics, people didn’t know they should do this.

The Duke librarians met and decided on some guidelines and policies to follow to make sense of the access they had and to consolidate accounts whenever necessary. Several meetings were held to discover all the accounts used and who had access.
They delegated some responsibility for access to technical services to create annual reports and such. The Analytics Goals Group focused on several practices designed to increase understanding of Google Analytics, such as the capacity building to do analytics work, skills building (often seen as a barrier to using Google Analytics), and sharing and communicating use and results from Google Analytics.

Sean then discussed the features of Google Analytics they use at Duke:

- **Navigation Summary**—Tracks how user got to page on site and where they go next.
- **Event Tracking (ET)**—Tracks clicks, Duke uses Drupal for content management, ET can link use to the database used.
- **Segments**—Analyzes parts of tracking based on the attributes of users, tracking by domain helps with user identification.
- **Dashboards**—Share key performance indicators through Dashboard, main sharing method for Duke information users.
- **Experiments**—Sort of a sandbox, but live, they can use it to compare different versions of a website; can include questions like “which do you [user] like better?” Need to define “success” for test page—time on site? Number of clicks? Can pull catalog queried into Google Analytics and get emailed reports on a schedule—top search terms, common misspellings.

Andrew Sather, at Jenkins Law Library, discussed their use of Google Analytics. He stressed that although Google Analytics generates lots of data (it tracks 100% of all visitors’ data), it’s important to have a clear idea of the information you need from Google Analytics. Users need to determine what the question they are asking really is and what data is relevant. Otherwise, you end up with a lot of information and not answers—an example of information that is not an answer is “The library is closed until opening time.” This type of answer is easy to create if the question isn’t phrased clearly. Using Google Analytics is easy, and no customization was necessary.

At Jenkins Law Library, they set Analytics goals for the use of Google Analytics and decided to get as much out of Google Analytics as they could automatically. They established a set of steps to achieve information goals and let Google Analytics analyze it step by step. Some data they wanted was to track where people entered and left the library’s website. One project they tracked with Google Analytics was to compare success of library publicity from what was done on the site and determine the return on investment. They were also able to use basic browser comparison statistics to determine what browsers users preferred.

Sarah Lin of the law firm Reed Smith, said they used Google Analytics because the OPAC is compatible with Google Analytics, it is easy, scalable, and reliable. She discussed the simple steps to get started using Google Analytics:

- Get a Gmail account
- Put in the URL to track
- Put tracking ID on website
- Wait for data

Reed Smith also added **Search Site** to collect information on search terms used and what the results were, which they then used to see what went wrong in user’s searching and make corrections or changes on the site.

Sarah also stressed that determining what information you want is necessary by determining key performance indicators. First, decide on questions (such as number of files downloaded) and then determine what data is needed. This depends on the integrated library system (ILS) used and may require vendor assistance; data from their Citrix server was a challenge because the multiple law offices created different environments and Google Analytics conflated the results.

They did get good data on problems users were having using their site. Users were prohibited from using mobile devices at the firm, so that was one thing they did not have to accommodate on their website. Google Analytics identified misspellings that caused failed searches and staff added common misspellings to the online dictionary to prevent future failures. The most commonly-used resources were identified and added to more pages on the website to facilitate user discovery. They were also able to collect information about the users; for example, you can often determine place of origin of a user by URL segments. The data collected from Google Analytics was used to augment ILS reports.

**Q&A**

Dashboard is easily shared so many people can access the information. Sean is concentrating on widgets—there is a gallery of widgets for users to choose from. Questions were raised about search statistics and bots, but we learned that bots can be disabled and so don’t result in artificial counts.

Security issues are a big concern, especially because the data resides in the cloud. What is Google doing about security? Google puts their code on your page—what if Google is hacked? Sharepoint is especially a concern; one way to be more secure is to anonymize users. For now, the answer is to follow best practices for data security and be especially careful.
Debbie Ginsberg moderated “Technology Skills Law Librarians Need to Thrive – A Group Discussion,” which included panelists Alex Matamoros, Nancy Babb, Iain Barksdale, Jill Sonnesyn, and Philippe Cloutier. The program began with Ms. Ginsberg reading some of the skills required for a new position in a library, one of which was that a candidate should be “proficient in relative technology.” What does that mean? How can a librarian make sure that they are “proficient” when we are in an “evolving profession” with “major technological changes?” How can we maintain the competencies expected in law librarianship?

The panelists detailed several ways that librarians can make sure that they have the technological skills needed in our profession. The first way is to make sure that you know the basic technology your workplace utilizes: platforms used for web design, hosting electronic/digital books, circulation and cataloging software, and so on. A good way to also remain current with technology is to know technology literacy.

It is not enough to know what basic technology is used in your workplace, though. As a librarian, you also need to know technology literacy, which is not limited to definitions. Technology literacy includes knowing how to use the software in your library, including Microsoft products, what keyboard shortcuts you can use to make your work more efficient, coding for blogs, websites, etc., and also what aggregate tools are out there to feed you the information you need to remain technology literate. The panelists stressed that it is important for librarians to take every opportunity available for technology training. What are librarians supposed to do when there is no budget for training? One panelist even mentioned that we should not discount using YouTube as a training resource for new technology given to us, as it is very likely that someone has used the new technology already and has created a training video for it.

Another way to find out what is new in the world of technology is to look at emerging trends and research them. Make use of free training that is available on vendor websites. Many public libraries offer online training that is free if you are a member of that public library. Lynda.com is one example of a website available through many public that offers quality online training for emerging technologies; it is fee-based without a library membership. Monitoring technology literature is also very important, and there are several publications that the panelists recommend reading to stay current, including monographs and technology journals/newsletters. A couple of the highly recommended websites to monitor for technology trends and updates are WSJ Tech (http://www.wsj.com/news/technology) and The Verge (http://www.theverge.com). A more complete list of recommended resources can be found at https://goo.gl/TtWXWz.

As disseminators of information in a rapidly changing and evolving profession, it is important for all librarians to maintain our core technological competencies. In this program, the panelists and moderator provided many cost effective or free ways to remain current on technology trends. From free software to use for instructional videos and presentations, to articles and newsletters available for free from different technology websites, librarians have many resources available to them to help them become or continue to be current in technology. This program offered many useful tips, tricks, and resources for everyone. If you have the time, I highly recommend checking out the recommended resources in the link above.

---

Program Report

The Librarians Strike Back: Implementing Strike Teams to Get Stuff Done

Jen Fell
Sacramento County Public Law Library

Strike teams, as the presenters of this program ably demonstrated, can be a valuable tool to employ in libraries of various types and sizes. As the name suggests, strike teams attack tasks using an operational model that is less constrained than the garden-variety department team or committee. This departure from the standard allows strike teams to be “quick and nimble”
and provides greater flexibility to both team members and managers. Presenters TJ Striepe and Wendy Moore, both of the University of Georgia, and Christa Lange of Sidley Austin LLP, delivered a functional model as well as best practices for implementation, supported by their own experiences and insight gained along the way.

After giving a brief introduction, the presenters shared their institutions’ respective definition of a strike team; though they differed slightly, the overall concept was that of a team comprised of staff from more than one department or specialty and created for a specific outcome or goal. Essentially, a strike team should be comprised of members with various backgrounds and skills, rather than a subset of an established team or department.

Using case studies from their own libraries and audience polls, the presenters provided useful, real-world examples of how strike teams can best be used in libraries. After hiring its first firm-wide library director, Sidley Austin LLP created a strike team with sub-groups to review library functions, systems, and procedures across five offices for possible consolidation. The University of Georgia assigned a strike team to conduct a thorough review of the microform collection for retention and duplication, and they created another strike team for the blog redesign of “Calling All Papers!,” a blog that announces conferences, workshops, and symposium calls for faculty.

So why, they asked, use strike teams? The presenters shared the benefits they noticed after using the model in their own libraries. Boasting a low-maintenance and self-governing style, the strike team model is informal and easier for most people to manage in terms of scheduling. Staff is encouraged to propose, lead, and actively engage in strike teams, resulting in an increase in empowerment, leadership, and collaboration. Almost as a bonus, stuff gets done!

One interesting attribute of the presenters’ strike team model is its informal communication style. They emphasized that email, perhaps a dedicated wiki page, and brief meetings allow for quick discussion and agreement, while the individuals bear the brunt of project time. For those with meeting fatigue, strike teams can be a refreshing alternative.

After sharing their own positive experiences, the presenters cautioned against both real and potential pitfalls and polled the audience for other possible concerns. TJ Striepe pointed out that it can be challenging to find the “sweet spot” for accountability, and both teams and managers must adapt to this more independent model. In addition, it’s all too easy to go overboard and assign strike teams to all projects that crop up, when actually there may already be a policy in place or a designated staff member for such a project. Too many teams, teams that have “gone rogue,” and staff involvement are a sampling of issues discussed among the presenters and audience.

The presenters also noted that developing a method for progress reporting and documentation will require consideration and will likely need future refinement or tweaking. As an example, TJ Striepe and Wendy Moore shared their library’s method of documentation: a populated, custom form for all proposed strike teams, which includes: fields for suggested team members; goal(s); timeline; and status (e.g. proposed, completed, or denied). A staff index tracks all past and active strike teams assigned to a particular staff member and allows for a more equal distribution of project assignments across the board.

Developed from their collective experiences, the presenters then offered the five keys of a successful strike team: 1) Clearly define the purpose(s); 2) Set a firm timeline or deadline; 3) Limit the team from two to six members, maximum; 4) Keep communication informal and meetings to a minimum; and 5) Document the team’s progress and outcome. The program was an excellent look at a model traditionally used in the business world, adapted to suit projects in both firm and academic law libraries, and the presenters continually engaged the audience with polls and in-depth responses to questions.

---

**Program Report**

**Enough to be Dangerous: 00000110 Things Every Librarian Needs to Know About Coding**

Sean Chen  
Duke University Law Library

Many of us are familiar with the saying: “To err is human, but to really foul things up requires a computer.” Jason Tubinis and Leslie Grove, who both work at the University of Georgia Alexander Campbell King Law Library, presented the explosive topic of how to really foul things up with a computer in a session at the 2015 American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting called: “Enough to be Dangerous: 00000110 Things Every Librarian Needs to Know About Coding.”

The assumption made in that piece is that that software is ubiquitous in the modern world and that code permeates every part of an ordinary person’s life: from a device in a pocket, to work and business, and even to personal relationships.

So what does code (and software) have to do with libraries? All reading this article probably agree that we are completely dependent on what technology and software do for libraries. From running a library’s operations through an integrated library system (ILS) to starting a web browser to access a licensed database, every action, service, and task requires a software tool written using computer code. As Jason and Leslie put it near the end of their presentation, “There is no escape” from code.

Furthermore, we see code touching upon the expertise that we, as librarians, expect to have. An entire section of the AALL’s Competencies of Law Librarianship (available at http://www.aallnet.org/mm/Leadership-Governance/policies/PublicPolicies/competencies.html) is devoted to information technology, leading off with: “Understands the practical application of creating, accessing, and managing information.” With understanding underpinned by knowledge and familiarity that all of these applications are dependent upon software and code, it would be safe to say that nearly all of the other listed competencies depend upon computer systems, software, and ultimately, code.

Similarly, there has been a long tradition in library and information science (LIS) education to emphasize that students and graduates should have familiarity with the tools and practices needed in order perform as a librarian in the digital age. Nevertheless, even more, there is a growing recognition (and demand from students) that the skills and knowledge they get from a LIS program should touch upon coding and computer programming in some way.

Early in the session, the presenters explained that 00000110 is the binary representation of the number six (6), alluding to the fact that ultimately all computing machines are working in binary. The roadmap for the presentation then focused on teaching the audience six things about computer programming including:

1. What Code is? And it Isn’t
2. Important & Popular Programming Languages
3. Common Elements of Programming Languages (Features of Programming)
4. How to Evaluate Code
5. Where to Learn More
6. Why You Should Care

Of these sections, I thought that the first (What Code is?) and the last (Why You Should Care) were the ones that were strongest and most relevant for the general AALL audience, especially for those in the audience unfamiliar with programming and software engineering.

The core of the education program spent a large amount of its energy on the major ideas (and inside jokes) that concern programmers. The presenters talked about many common elements of computing, including variables, expressions, data structures, functions, and control structures. Talking about all of these was ambitious but was also important in my mind because a lot of the power and flexibility of a programming language come from these features. That said, many of these concepts end up taking a full week of coverage in an introductory computer science program, thus relating back to a law librarian audience is difficult and having examples that resonate with such a wide-ranging group of participants may have been futile.

Getting a non-programmer programming is extremely difficult. I have spent a bit of time teaching library student interns at my job some of the fundamentals of computer programming in order to build simple web applications or process MARC records. As a means of encouragement, “just google it” can be frustrating to the newbies out there. The tools and programs available are improving rapidly, but the assumption is the same in many places: learning to code is going to be something you have to bootstrap yourself.

Jason and Leslie then concluded on a high point reemphasizing the importance of code. One significant point that I came away from the meeting with was the need to be thinking computationally about the work in a law library. We already do that when we structure our data and work in a way that allows us to work on it in aggregate. A good example of this would be something like working with a set of MARC records in a batch way. A computational thinker would be thinking about loops and control structures through the MARC records or about the MARC record as an object with particular attributes and methods.

This thinking is the big takeaway from “Enough to be Dangerous,” where the emphasis may have been on writing computer code. However, the more important takeaway may be in rewiring our thinking so that we are empowered to look at our data, content, and processes in ways that are in alignment with computation—ways that enable working in aggregate, at scale, and efficiency.
“Striking a Balance in your Library Catalog: TMI vs. TLI” focused on a conundrum many systems and catalog librarians face: are we putting too much information in our catalogs? Georgia Briscoe, from the University of Colorado Boulder, outlined this problem before introducing a panel of experts. She provided the historical background needed to understand how catalogs evolved over time to where they are today. In the time of catalog cards, librarians attempted to cram as much information as possible in a very small space. Some thought even then that there was too much information (TMI), largely due to the manual upkeep required. Then integrated library systems (ILS) came along, allowing for even more information. There was pressure to add as many records as possible, so patrons could find everything in one place. The thought was, there was too little information (TLI) in the catalog. For example, MARC records for the Congressional Information Service (CIS) legislative history fiche collection made access quick and easy versus using the indexes. More recently, however, as the same collections became available electronically through ProQuest, and thus necessitated separate bibliographic records, some complained that there are too many records from the fiche “clogging up” the system. Ms. Briscoe mentioned that discovery platforms attempt to remedy this overflow of information by guiding the researcher to pertinent results through good facets, user-friendly interfaces, and one simple search box.

Karen Selden, also from the University of Colorado Boulder, reported on the results of a survey she and Ms. Briscoe ran to study librarians’ perceptions of the effectiveness of their catalogs’ primary public interfaces. The results revealed that librarians often feel frustrated by the ineffectiveness of discovery layers. Objections included poor relevancy rankings, too many results, display issues, and frustrating known-item searching, among others. Some respondents are concerned that the “Googlefication” of library catalogs has led patrons to over-rely on algorithms to do all the work. Instead of learning strategies to improve their search techniques, the simple search box misleads researchers into thinking their first results are the best. On the other hand, Ms. Selden noted that newer public interfaces do have benefits. They’re often simple, clean, intuitive, and easy-to-use. They are customizable and offer faceting and filters.

Scott Matheson, from Yale Law School, used his library’s catalog, MORRIS, as an example of trying to balance having enough information available with not including enough. Yale has 35 record sets - and counting – provided by or purchased from vendors. There are just under one million bibliographic records, of which half are traditional and half are licensed material for which they buy sets of records. MORRIS is supposed to be the database of record, meaning that there should be a record for every resource Yale owns or licenses. If you own a particular title in print, microfilm, and online through multiple providers, there could be five or more records for the same work. There is no easy way to de-duplicate the online records, and even if it were simple, you would have to remember to go back and update the records if you had to cut one of those online providers. Currently, it’s easier to delete a complete record set for one provider if you no longer subscribe. A new problem Yale is facing involves their new discovery layer, Quicksearch, which pulls together records from MORRIS and the main library’s catalog, Orbis. He decided not to send certain law record sets that were already in Orbis, to avoid duplicating hundreds of thousands of titles. Unfortunately, that means that a law student who decides to limit to all results to the location “law” will not see those records in Quicksearch.

Mr. Matheson ended his presentation with a list of five suggestions to consider if your library is making changes to record set policies or merging records into a discovery layer: (1) never fully delete records, rather suppress them or save them somewhere in case policies change; (2) keep up with catalog maintenance, otherwise encoding issues and other metadata errors will cause problems with facets; (3) experiment with different kinds of searches to test results and find possible problems; (4) think about the audience when deciding which sets to send; and (5) perhaps consider moving bigger record sets to a separate “scope” or section of the discovery layer that can be turned on or off by the user.
Bess Reynolds, from Debevoise & Plimpton, presented from the law firm perspective. She first noted that firm libraries are very different than others libraries because they are not accessible to outsiders, even the catalog. Her catalog philosophy was similar to the previous presenters, however, in that she wants records for everything that they pay for to be in the catalog so that patrons can find what they want. Her patrons can’t always remember which platform a title is on, so they use the catalog to then bring them to Lexis or Westlaw, for example. Unfortunately, she can’t accomplish her goal completely because she had to drop Serials Solutions because of link issues and incorrect coverage. She believes the OPAC is a useful tool for getting subscriptions, print, and digital materials out to the attorneys. She demonstrated how she is able to embed subscription content and self-service alerting tools within her catalog. The firm spends lots of money on the materials, so they should be accessible. She did note, however, that training users is a whole other issue.

All four speakers described the struggles their libraries have in balancing the pros and cons of cramming as much information as possible into their catalogs. They all agreed that they think of their patrons’ needs and tend to err on the side of TMI.

Program Report

Uncovering Discovery Systems: Digging Beyond the Hype and Gripe

Jennifer Robble
Boston University School of Law
Fineman and Pappas Law Libraries

The speakers began by defining what they meant by discovery, specifying that they were not going to discuss discovery during litigation, but the discovery platforms that allow users to search the contents of a local catalog and the indexing of a library’s electronic resources. They also defined the scope of their presentation to include only those discovery platforms they personally had experience with: Primo (Santa Clara), Encore Duet (Santa Clara), WorldCat Discovery Systems (Seton Hall and Georgetown), Summon (University at Buffalo and Georgetown), VuFind (University at Buffalo), and Encore Synergy (University of Alabama and Georgetown). A quick poll of the audience found many attendees had already implemented discovery systems, and many others were actively considering implementation.

The rest of the presentation looked at the discovery platform life cycle: selection, implementation, operations, and assessment. Prano began by raising some of the questions Santa Clara initially needed to address at the outset. These included: who should be part of the evaluation process; whether it would be a joint decision with the main library or whether the law library would have its own discovery platform; and, whether they wanted to consider open source products. Prano also described the task force Santa Clara used, which included student and faculty input about each of the discovery platforms considered. Matt described the features Georgetown looked for in a new discovery platform to replace Synergy: cost, mobile-friendly, deeper index, faster performance, and usability. Iain’s experience at the University of Alabama was unique in that he was able to single-handedly choose the discovery platform for the law library. He chose Encore Synergy so that he could work with a single vendor for both the integrated library system (ILS) and the discovery layer. It was very interesting to hear so many libraries were already moving away from their original selection. Santa Clara originally selected Primo, and is now moving to Encore Duet. Georgetown originally chose Encore Synergy, but is now implementing Summon.

Iain began the implementation discussion, noting they host their discovery layer so that they do not need a server in the law library. Nancy mentioned that the University at Buffalo uses a host for Summon as well. The University of Alabama also spent a year setting up the discovery layer before making it accessible to users. This setup involved working with public services staff and students to decide which databases to include, cleaning up metadata that would display within the facets, and working with the law school and university information technology (IT) departments to ensure off-campus access to e-resources. Nancy discussed the importance of catalogers during the implementation phase. Because catalogers understand the structure of the records in the discovery system, it is easier for them to test the system and explain why something may not be displaying as expected. Nancy also talked about the advantages of allowing users the option to choose the discovery layer or a traditional catalog search by putting them on separate tabs in the user interface. Prano commented on the difference between working with the sales team during selection versus the support team during implementation. Santa Clara was working with Ex Libris, and whereas library staff members were used to quick responses from the sales team in the United States, it sometimes took longer to hear from support analysts located in Israel.

Audience members were interested in how the various discovery layers interact with legal research databases. Kristina responded that WorldCat Discovery has a working Westlaw collection, and Seton Hall used Knowledge Base and Related Tools (KBART) loads to create a Lexis collection. Nancy noted that VuFind is still working with Westlaw to create usable indexing. Members of the audience added that HeinOnline works with EBSCO and not other vendors because of how they represent the metadata. There was also a question about mobile versions of discovery layers. Matt noted they had a mobile
version with Encore Synergy, but moving forward, they want their vendor to implement responsive design into the user interface, so that a user can immediately interact with the discovery layer regardless of whether they are using a computer or mobile device, obviating the need for a separate app.

Kristina kicked off the operations discussion by observing that an advantage of having the same vendor for your ILS and discovery layer is that you don’t need to refresh the data sent from the ILS to the discovery layer, and there is a simplified workflow in the backend because it is all the same system. Kristina uses the time saved by these efficiencies to encourage vendors to share their metadata with WorldCat Discovery. Librarians at the University at Buffalo send updates to the discovery layers daily, and each semester they do a full re-indexing. Because there is a delay in getting records to the front end, it is crucial that acquisitions librarians check the ILS before placing a new order. Nancy also reflected on the need to rely on IT staff at the main library to keep VuFind, an open source platform, up and running.

Even though WorldCat Discovery improves the discoverability of electronic resources, Seton Hall also maintains its A-Z list and finds that patrons use the traditional catalog search more heavily than the discovery layer indexing. Nancy noted that, at the University of Buffalo, they were promoting the discovery layer for interdisciplinary research, but they still directed users to the specialized databases for legal research.

Matt discussed Georgetown’s focus on assessment. As they move to a new discovery layer, they want to measure its impact. In order to do that, they first had to determine what a successful outcome looks like. They are implementing usability testing, looking at Google Analytics, and establishing a database usage baseline to see if usage increases after implementation of Summon. Seton Hall has also compared usage data for its old catalog and WorldCat Discovery, and they have found significantly increased usage of the new platform. Not only have they been able to harvest quantitative data, but they’ve also learned trends in what people are searching and which books they are ultimately selecting.

Handouts from this presentation, including a “Choose Your Own Discovery System” flowchart, are available at http://www.aallnet.org/conference/education/programs-and-workshops/aall2go.html, and there is a supplemental LibGuide at http://guides.law.shu.edu/Discovery. If you have already implemented a discovery platform, the presenters encourage you to share your information on the LibGuide so that libraries can reach out to others facing similar issues with their discovery system.

---

**Program Report**

**Migrating to Open Source:**

**Koha and Kuali OLE in Law Libraries**

---

Coordinator:

Kevin Carey, Technical Services Librarian, The 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

This session, sponsored by Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS) Local Systems Committee, was well-attended, indicating a strong interest in open source software even though the vast majority of law libraries are on proprietary integrated library systems (ILS). I randomly sampled several attendees and everyone was there for a similar reason: to be better prepared for the possible transition. With the rapid increase in popularity of open source computing, this program had good timing!

Kevin Carey (Ohio State University) coordinated the session and started the discussion by introducing the very representative panelists from three law libraries and a supporting company (in contrast to a vendor).

Nate Curulla, owner and CRO of ByWater Solutions, began with a brief introduction to open source computing in general and the Koha system, as well as its future development in particular. He covered some key features of open source software such as freedom, flexibility, security, and community, some of which were even more valuable than the obvious low cost. He gave an example to illustrate how a robust community makes the software full of life: a shelf-browsing feature was
developed over a weekend when it was first discussed on the discussion list that previous Friday. I came to understand more how the enthusiasm from a community would ensure superior security, frequent enhancements, confident customizability, etc. There are currently about 15,000 Koha library customers worldwide.

Jeff Gabel from Brooklyn Law School Library then gave a very informative presentation about his library’s experience with the migration four years ago and thereafter with the new system, Koha. Brooklyn Law School Library was the first III Millennium library and one of the first few law libraries to migrate to Koha. It was helpful to learn not only the positives, but also how the problems were resolved with the help from either the supporting company or from the community. Jeff also expressed what he would have done differently leading up to and during the migration and what he would like to see changed. Jeff’s impression of Koha generally complemented what Nate said about the advantages of open source software, for example, worldwide community, price, regularly-scheduled releases, etc.

Marjorie Crawford, Head of Technical Services at the Rutgers University Law School Library, presented on how her library integrated two library catalogs of the two law schools at two locations. Sure enough, the test site as the sandbox was extremely helpful. Marjorie emphasized the importance of staff management during the ILS migration project. Interestingly, the library uses another open source application, VuFind, as a discovery layer to optimize catalog search returns.

Pat Sayre-McCoy, Head of Law Cataloging and Serials at the University of Chicago D’Angelo Law Library, shared a lot of details of a very complicated case thanks to the size and diversity of the library data. The library switched from a dual system of Innovative and Horizon to Kuali OLE (an open source system). Though new issues never stopped emerging before old problems were resolved, the data curation, database management, and other functions of library system were on the whole improved.

The program concluded with a very short Q&A. Every presenter agreed that with open source system, the problems were easy to deal with. Thank you to Local Systems Committee for sponsoring this program and to every panelist for their firsthand information. My special thanks to Jeff Gabel who shared his enlightening notes to me, which to me was a great highlight to “the Power of Connection, AALL 2015”!

Program Report

Rebecca Martin
Boston University School of Law
Fineman and Pappas Law Libraries

Quality Digitization Projects On A Budget

Digitization projects can vary widely in scope, size and purpose, but nearly all require consideration of identifying collections, forming collaborations, securing staff and funding, and scanning and preserving content. This program took a panel format and included members of several different libraries currently undertaking digitization projects of varying sizes. The beginning of the program featured key resources that are helpful to any library considering a new project or reconsidering the approach of a project. These resources include a recorded American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) webinar entitled “Digitization is possible: Identifying and overcoming barriers” (February 2015) and the Legal Information Preservation Alliance (LIPA) toolkit that was covered in the webinar.

Marilyn Nicely, University of Oklahoma Law Library, provided an overview of her library’s efforts to digitize the materials referenced in the bibliography Guide to American Indian Documents in the Congressional Serial Set: 1817-1899. Nicely explained her library had a portion of the material referenced, but the focus was on locating “fugitive” materials that were proving harder to locate. A large portion of what was needed for the success of the project was endorsement and buy-in from various partners. Nicely described how her team created and provided a one page endorsement document not only to faculty, but also to the Oklahoma Department of Libraries, asking them to support the project. At the time, the reference documents were available only in expensive, subscription databases. Access to the material was of utmost importance to Nicely and her team; making the documents available for free online would enable tribes, researchers, students, and faculty to use the material.

Beth Williams, Louisiana State University (LSU), discussed the types of questions you should ask when considering staffing for the digitization project. A major initial consideration is whether to undertake the project in-house or to outsource the work to another organization. If keeping it in-house, you need to know how many project team members you require, and whether to reallocate or retrain existing staff or to bring new project-specific staff onto the team. In either case, consider the skills, education, expertise, and experience needed; perhaps a willingness to learn skills and best practices, rather than having a particular skillset or background, can be an asset to the project. There may also be roles that are appropriate for
student workers. Williams pointed to a white paper on effective staffing in digitization projects developed by the National Digital Stewardship Alliance as a key resource for her team at LSU in its own project. Williams explained that they took a team approach to that project at LSU.

Erik Beck, University of Colorado Law School William A. Wise Law Library, discussed the importance of researching and understanding approved standards for scan quality, image resolution, metadata, preservation, and storage. Beck encouraged audience members to take as much time thinking about how to digitize materials as what to digitize. Before making any investments, look into what standards are required and then move forward with needed software and hardware. Approved standards vary depending on the source from which you find them; examples of guidelines include the Federal Agencies Digitization Guidelines Initiative (FADGI) and Minimum Digitization Capture Recommendations from the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services. Beck also warned that aggressive deadlines should not sacrifice quality.

Once the panel discussion ended, the panelists had audience members break out into small discussion groups. Panelists joined audience members in conversation about topics including: hidden costs and roadblocks; selling a project; maximizing existing resources; digital asset management systems and interface design; and grants and maximizing campus connections. This reviewer joined the grants and maximizing campus connections group facilitated by panelist Melissa Bernstein.

Bernstein suggested one of the best approaches to any digitization project in an academic setting is to explore existing departments, individuals, and resources on campus and reach out, ask questions, and consider collaborative opportunities. First stops to check may be Special Collection staff or archivists, but there may be other groups within your school or university who are also working on digitization projects.

When developing a digitization project, consider what departments or offices on campus might be natural allies; having buy-in and support from outside of your library staff can be helpful for the longevity and accountability on the project. Bernstein explained that digitization projects need not only clear, viable goals, but a strong, committed network of interested parties and participants. Project organizers should try and identify someone on their team who can serve as a catalyst and connect project members with the larger academic community.

Verbal support and commitment from outside partners is helpful, but financial support is also an integral part of a digitization project. Many projects are funded by grants. Bernstein suggested looking into whether your law school or larger university has a grants office that helps with faculty research; there may be possibility for that office to help research and secure funding for law-related projects. Some group discussion members also suggested looking into collaborating with the Law Library Microform Consortium (LLMC) or W.S. Hein, both companies that may take on digitization projects on libraries’ behalf.

Additional ideas to explore for financial support or grants include: American Library Association, Institute of Museum and Library Services and its Library Services and Technology Act, John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, and the Society of American Archivists. There may also be state library associations in your area that can provide assistance.

---

**Program Report**

**BIBFRAME Deep Dive**

Melissa Beck  
UCLA Law Library

This three-hour “deep dive” session introduced attendees to the Bibliographic Framework Initiative (BIBFRAME), its proposed data structure, and some selected tools currently in development that allow users to explore the relationships between MARC and linked data. At various times during the two presentations, the subject matter became rather technical, and there were a number of live demonstrations of the discussed tools. This is a layperson’s summary; to do full justice to the presenters’ material, please view the recording of the session made available here: [http://community.aallnet.org/viewdocument/?DocumentKey=bf2aacc0-f7c3-4b37-b1d4-a83c4bce1111](http://community.aallnet.org/viewdocument/?DocumentKey=bf2aacc0-f7c3-4b37-b1d4-a83c4bce1111) [login required].

Nate Trail of the Library of Congress (LC) began the session by explaining the fundamentals of BIBFRAME, which will “re-imagine and implement a bibliographic environment for a post-MARC, networked world.” In practical terms, the goal is to move away from strings of information such as those found in a MARC bibliographic record, and break the metadata into simple separate statements so that a machine can quickly process each piece of information. Although not tied to any specific content standard, the model does take into account *Resource Description and Access (RDA)* cataloging and will eventually replace MARC.
For background, history, and explanations of the model and vocabulary for BIBFRAME, see: http://www.loc.gov/bibframe/.

For the official repository for the vocabulary, tools, and shared code in support of BIBFRAME, see: http://bibframe.org/.

BIBFRAME breaks information into core classes: Works (and Instances), Authorities (creators, places, subjects, etc.), and Annotations (local holdings and other external information). These core concepts are still under review, but they roughly mirror the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) concepts of work, manifestation, and item (although it is not always clear how the concept of expression fits into the model).

BIBFRAME currently converts MARC data into specific Resource Description Framework (RDF) data, with the generic format bf:[data element], e.g., bf: Title, bf: Creator. (A very helpful description of how the vocabulary works is available here: http://www.loc.gov/bibframe/docs/vocab-category.html.)

The goal in data conversion is to identify the MARC tags needed, and link them to existing BIBFRAME nodes for that information. For example, bf:subject “Police training—United States” links to a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) for the LC subject authority record at http://id.loc.gov/authorities/subjects/sh2008109503.

(For more examples and demonstrations of MARC21 bibliographic records converted into BIBFRAME resources see: http://bibframe.org/demos.)

The purpose of the BIBFRAME Pilot is to create native (new) BIBFRAME data rather than converting existing data from another source such as MARC or Metadata Object Description Schema (MODS). They cull information about Names, Titles, Works, etc. from authority files and other authoritative sources to form IDs stored at id.loc.gov. For each data element, the BIBFRAME Editor looks for matches and merges the same fields if found. It is somewhat the equivalent to copy cataloging: evaluating whether one can attach an instance to an already existing ID for a work.

Templates within the BIBFRAME Editor allow catalogers to plug in elements that match, but it is not easy to do anything beyond the choices when something does not match. Currently there is only a keyword search; preferred would be a left-anchored search, which developers are hoping to add in the future. One interface of the BIBFRAME Editor displays the descriptive element and the RDA rule together (by catalogers’ request). One can also build into the editor the ability to point to an authorities destination of choice.

There are still many issues to resolve in successfully “translating” bibliographic information into usable linked data, including URI maintenance, development of intuitive tools, and consistent authority sources for ID creation. The data conversion itself runs up against barriers of punctuation, typos, varying cataloging rules, and varying types of material. There are not a lot of reliable authority sources, and we are not all talking the same language. How do we wrangle all the available sources together into a cohesive community?

The BIBFRAME Pilot will start the data entry portion in September 2015, and “catalogers will experience the pain of this editor.” Developers will be seeking feedback on the vocabulary itself, the data entry tools, profiles, and the linked data repository at id.loc.gov. Major vocabulary changes are also coming; for more information see: http://www.loc.gov/bibframe/docs/index.html.

Questions and Answers:

Q: How can you link to the authority file from this editor?
A: This is still a problem and needs work.

Q: When I use existing MARC data to create a BIBFRAME model, it clearly can include subject subdivisions. [The Program for Cooperative Cataloging] PCC encourages use of facets (like [Faceted Application of Subject Terminology] FAST) to break up the strings of subject headings. Do you have any opinions about using FAST?
A: Yes, FAST is a better system for linking directly to different things. But catalogers want to put the strings in a certain order and they know what that means. We are stuck with needing to support cataloging rules and wanting to be able to link to things. There are URIs for each element in a subject string. [Library of Congress Subject Headings] LCSH was not designed for linked data, but for our editor we are going to put in the ability to say this is a “topic,” within which I have a temporal, geographical, or other subtopic.

Q: Right now the BIBFRAME editor is pretty self-referential. When will you link to outside sources like OCLC?
A: We do build URIs to specific OCLC records. But for right now we only link to id.loc.gov, because we can be assured that this resource is reliable. We have to find a way to support look-ups to other resources that will retrieve the correct information at least 90% of the time.
Q: Public services – how will this affect catalog display and also cataloging discoverability on the Web?
A: [Referred to Denver Public Library demonstration on Zepheira’s website] The Denver Public Library interface looks just like a library catalog. But the underpinning linked data allows people to come from outside and find it.

Terry Reese presented several hands-on tools that he has developed to support linked data, and these are available in the current version of his MarcEdit product. Currently, there are very few resources in development for practitioners; most are for developers which leaves librarians on the sidelines. MARCNext is an effort to create a set of tools that allows catalogers to test or implement linked data concepts within their current environments.

The MARCNext Toolset includes a BIBFRAME Testbed, which utilizes LC’s XQuery transformations to allow users the ability to visualize their own metadata within various BIBFRAME serializations. It can convert MARC data to RDF Extensible Markup Language (XML) with a few relatively simple-to-follow steps. Catalogers can clearly see linked data triples and nodes that result from the bibliographic input provided.

The Linked Data tool loops through a set of MARC records and resolves access points in the 1xx, 6xx, and 7xx data elements to their linked data end-points. It presently generates links to Virtual International Authority File (VIAF), id.loc.gov, FAST and Medical Subject Headings (MeSH), with multiple validation layers.

The SPARQL Browser is particularly good for MeSH subjects.

BIBFRAME Transform is available on Zepheira’s website. By utilizing a plug-in available through MarcEdit, users can push manipulated data up to the website and see how it might really look in a public interface.

Questions and Answers:

Q: Is there a down side to un-doing the strings? Are we dumbing down the information?
A: The only way that this data will be as complex as you want it to be is if you advocate for your favorite terms. We scaled it down to be able to start with something; then we can add to it, the same way we added to MARC. It purposely starts out small, so that we can get an ecosystem going at first.

After the two presentations, attendees formed into small groups to discuss what they had heard, and then shared their thoughts with the larger group:

How do we imagine the bibliographic/linked data world 20 years from now? Right now we have records and strings; what exactly will we have later?

We have so much data in our MARC records that might be lost because it’s not parsed in any way. When we convert, will we lose data? We will need to grow the BIBFRAME vocabulary to accommodate everything we want to record about our resources.

What actually goes in our local systems? A bunch of URIs? How does anyone search what we have? We will still need a mechanism to show that our resource is different from someone else’s. And how will we order something? How do we get away from the concept of “record”?

As law libraries, do we really want all of our data discoverable to everyone on the web, when our resources are not available to everyone? What is going to be linked data in the future and what will be local data, and how will we decide (and control) which is which? And will we be able to?

How can law libraries participate and contribute to the linked data effort? Maybe we could work on URIs for statutes and treaties, and other legal materials? We could contribute the unique knowledge we have in our collections to build authoritative databases of corporate bodies, persons, etc. connected with the law.

One attendee summed it up best when she noted that the timeline seems long for development and implementation, so she can only worry about what she needs to do now. The move from MARC to linked data will only happen in increments; even now, catalogers may see MARC in OCLC, but OCLC actually stores records in XML and simply provides the MARC interface. In the future, we will work with linked data using data input and conversion tools that will not require a degree in computer programming. The best way for us to prepare for linked data now is to educate ourselves about the basic concepts, understand the vocabulary and what it attempts to represent, and stay informed about the BIBFRAME Initiative and other projects that have successfully created linked data to represent library resources.
Improving, Maintaining, and Communicating Your Value with Metrics Analysis and Visualization

To remain sustainable in a time of declining budgets, librarians must effectively communicate the value and worth of libraries to their parent institutions and all other stakeholders. Preparing attractive, meaningful reports is the key component in achieving this goal.

The speakers engaged the audience by asking participants to take part in an online survey at poll maker, http://www.poll-maker.com. The answers to the questions revealed that most everyone gathered statistics, but a lively discussion concluded that few felt the numbers were meaningful to stakeholders. The crux of the problem is that most library reports do not effectively convey to decision makers the impact the library has in providing information and services. This underscores the need for librarians to review the types of information collected and to evaluate the effectiveness of reports presented to investors and supporters.

Joy Shoemaker shared with the participants that the 9th Circuit Library recently revised the types of information they gathered and updated data collection methods. In addition to the traditional reference and collection figures, reports now contain statistics for in-house item usage, facts about training sessions and visitors, reports on special projects, and narratives with patron endorsements. She stated that one important step in successfully collecting statistics is to simplify the process. Staff, previously using pen and paper, now enters data into an online Excel form which automatically performs the calculations. They export the computed information and create visuals, such as charts and graphs. Reports are now concise and successfully engage stakeholders.

Lila Faulkner and Jennifer McMahan from the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) reviewed the types of statistics being collected at their institution. They soon discovered that the reports did not reflect an accurate depiction of the complex services they offered. The services had evolved, but the statistics and reports had not kept pace. In addition, the inadequate reports were dull and did not hold the attention of decision makers. They set out to revamp the information gathering system to accurately reflect the services being rendered. They shared revised reports with stakeholders and included new categories of data, illustrations with charts and graphs, quotes from patrons, and narratives to illustrate impact. Future plans include allowing librarians and decision makers to search the collected statistics, further investigating e-resource use to determine useful data to collect, and doing a better job at showing return on investment (ROI). As a model for all academic libraries, the speakers pointed to Cornell University Libraries, Research and Assessment Unit’s Library Value Calculations at http://research.library.cornell.edu/value.


The Wonderful World of Metrics: Showing Your Value to Leadership

At this session, attendees acquired knowledge on how to effectively convey to stakeholders the value of the library through tracking, evaluating, and reporting metrics data. Although the session represented different types and sizes of libraries, common themes ran throughout the program. One theme was the need to gather and report metrics in addition to including anecdotal stories. Another was that reports must be brief, attractive, and of interest to the recipients. A third was to clearly communicate the value of the library to leadership.

Steven Lastres, Law Librarian at Debevois & Plimpton, addressed the need for and use of metrics in private law libraries. He emphasized the importance of aligning reported metrics with the strategic plan and goals of the firm. He advised the audience to confirm the importance of what the library is measuring by consulting with leaders. He further recommended customizing reports to meet the information needs of key leaders and specific groups of stakeholders. In addition to metrics, include narratives to strengthen the case for the library. To remain accountable and guarantee institutions are receiving value, information professionals must measure resource use and non-use. To accomplish this, he recommended implementing third-party statistical gathering tools.
Ashley Moye, Charlotte School of Law, presented material from the perspective of an academic law librarian. In addition to qualitative data, narratives are critical in conveying intangible value. She outlined three practical questions to answer when taking time to measure or include narratives:

1. Is it meaningful to leadership?
2. Does it show value from investment?
3. Does it tell the right story?

She recommended expediting the statistical gathering process by exploiting technology, such as by using data fields in the integrated library system (ILS) to gather routine statistics. LibGuides, LibCal, and Gimlet are useful products for capturing usage statistics of various types. Another suggestion was to talk with stakeholder groups to discover their definition of value, and then use this information to prepare targeted reports.

Marcia Burris works at Ogletree Deakins, a centralized library for a large law firm with offices across the nation. This library tracks research and technical services statistics, as well as financial data. With no additional cost to the firm, they use Outlook folders and calendars along with ELITE, an integrated business management system, to gather and store data. The primary purpose for reporting statistics was to quantify the services provided at individual offices to stakeholders. Questions to answer for each location included: the amount of time librarians were spending, what types of research the librarians were performing, and the documentation to justify the need for non-billable research. In addition to reporting the numbers, testimonials have proven valuable in providing leaders with decision-making information about the library’s positive impact on the firm.

Abigail Walters of Maslon LLP shared her experience as a small law firm librarian. She described a ticket-based system, Zendesk, they use to track reference questions. She conveyed to the audience that “more is not better.” Reports must be brief and attention-getting. She iterated the recommendations of the other speakers to talk to leadership, discover their values, and use testimonials in reports.

Highlights from a survey conducted earlier this year were among the handouts for the session. Categories included data collection methods, types of metrics collected, and reporting trends. The survey, the presentation, and other materials are available to American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) members at http://www.aallnet.org/conference/education/2015recordings/july21.

Continued from page 1

The cool side’s response was:

- User sees ILL as free but there are costs
- Multiple requests for the same item
- It may be cheaper to buy the item than it is to borrow
- Libraries will stop buying, which will lead publishers to increase costs
- ILL is not green, the carbon footprint is huge
- It is complicated to maintain digital rights for lending
- Takes work to keep licensing agreements straight
- Time and management for the bad borrowers. For example, so and so has been banned by a lender, request for a renewal after it is due
- ILL is not easily classified: who is responsible for it, Public Service or Technical Service?
- Are there better things staff could be doing with their time than ILL?

Question 2: The Curse of the Blue Book: When someone is trying to site a source they received through ILL, did they get an electronic version or the actual book?

The warm side said they keep track of who is requesting material, what they are getting and in what format they used. They have one member of staff as the point of contact for people when they have questions, and they also make sure the law review people are informed of proper procedure. The cool side was concerned with patron privacy and the time it takes staff to sort through information.

Question 3: The Moochers: How do we handle libraries that are always borrowing through ILL but never lend books?

The warm side had no problems with moochers. Libraries are there to lend books and if we are helping others meet the
needs of borrowers it was all good. The cool side felt if fewer libraries are collecting it will affect prices from the publisher. It costs a lot to ship to the other libraries. Specialized collections borrow a lot of books from others without lending, which leads to more net borrowers than lenders. This causes there to be a limited number of books available to borrow.

Question 4: G’day mate: How do libraries feel about other countries requesting books?

This was one of the only questions both sides agreed fully on. They both said it would be on a case by case basis. Warm felt we should share and you never knew who you were going to meet by agreeing to lend. Cool had many concerns about security, getting the item back, and which countries you would lend to.

Question 5: Barrier to access: Does ILL refine patron needs or prevent them from getting what they need?

Cool felt ILL created a barrier to access. They were more concerned with how fast and cheap they could get the material for their patron. Warm felt it could create a barrier, but if there are steps in place to get through the process of submitting and getting an ILL, then it would be less of a problem. Both sides agreed they would stop a patron from getting something if the cost was high.

Question 6: Living in the digital world

Both sides agreed more of our material is digital, and the digital rights access will become an issue. This will lead to ILL disappearing because our contracts won’t allow lending. The cool side felt we should be spending money on PALMPrint to archive and make resources available. The warm side felt it would be better to add what people are borrowing to the collection. They also noted that PALMPrint sounded like a mutated version of ILL.

Question 7: To buy or not to buy: How, why, and when should we integrate ILL with our purchasing?

The cool side felt their people were too busy working on ILL to put in a system to track which item to purchase. It is usually well after the fact they discover an item could have been purchased much cheaper than the cost of using ILL. The warm side said that if a request came in and fit their collection, they would purchase it. It should not matter if you can borrow it if it fits within the collection.

Question 8: What is the bottom line: Does ILL drain your library of staff resources and should there be limits?

The warm side felt ILL more than proves its worth and should stay. The cool side felt nothing is ever free. It costs money and resources and is bad for the environment.

Overall, the session was interesting to see the differences and similarities in opinions. I don’t believe anyone had their opinions changed by what was said in the debate. Libraries will still use ILL until something else is suggested and implemented.