Classification

Name Changes and Extinct Jurisdictions

Aaron Wolfe Kuperman
Library of Congress

The well-established “rule” in Library of Congress Classification (LCC) is that when a jurisdiction merely changes its name and perhaps its form of government (think of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which in the colonial period was known as the Belgian Congo, and at one point changed its name to Zaire and back again, etc.), while the name heading (governed by the descriptive cataloging rules) reflects the name at the time of publication, and the subject heading reflects only the current name (requiring substantial bib file maintenance when a country changes its name), we keep the same range of numbers but add to the caption to reflect both the current and past names. Thus the caption for KTX reads “Congo (Democratic Republic), Previously Congo Free State (Belgian Congo), Previously Zaire (1971-1997).” While all those names are in the name authority file (NAF) and are valid descriptive headings for works published when the name was in use, the subject cataloging rules result in a note on the name authority record saying to use the current name, and all the works class together.

A jurisdiction is “extinct” if there is no surviving jurisdiction. In theory, there should be headings for the jurisdiction in the NAF that are usable under Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH). Also, it should have its own numbers in the classification, with references to what came before and after. The model for an extinct jurisdiction is the Roman Empire, which has a valid heading in the NAF (“Rome”) and its own numbers in LCC (in the KJA schedule). Virtually no one would think that work on the Roman Empire should class in KKH9857 (for the modern city), though perhaps there should be a reference there just to be sure. Note that in that area of KKH, there are references from modern cities to extinct jurisdictions with similar names (e.g., from the modern city of Venice at KKH9858 to the Serenissima Repubblica at KKH8501-KKH8509), but when an extinct jurisdiction is considered to be reasonably the same as a modern jurisdiction, the modern number is used with an including note (cf. KKH9853, “Milan, Including the extinct Duchy”). This is how catalogers should deal with extinct jurisdictions.
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Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section

As the Chair of the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS), I am honored to welcome you to the 109th Annual Meeting of the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) in Chicago from July 16-19, 2016. As AALL looks outwardly in fulfillment of its mission, is it time to reflect on our professional practices? While librarians have led the way in curating, organizing, and facilitating access points to content, we have been remiss in reflecting on the transformative narratives of law librarianship.

Peter Brophy suggests in his book, *Narrative-Based Practice*, that “telling stories lies at the heart of human communication and underpins the development and cohesion of all societies and cultures.” Brophy reminds librarians also of the following expectation:

> Professional practice involves continuous learning. Every decision is itself an occasion for learning, involving the marshalling of evidence, analysis of significance, the choice of a course of action and evaluation of the outcome (p.51).

For the 2016 AALL Annual Meeting, the OBS-SIS Education Committee partnered with the Technical Services, Computing Services, and the Micrographics & Audiovisual SISs to design programing for the inexperienced as well as the experienced technical service law librarian.

In reflection, Marian Gould Gallagher, 37th President of AALL, wrote that May was a month for making reservations and planning the “absent-from-the-library-strategy” in anticipation of the 48th AALL Annual Meeting that was held in Chicago in 1955. Following Mrs. Gallagher’s lead, the leadership of the OBS-SIS encourages our colleagues to visit the 109th AALL Annual Meeting and Conference website now (available at [http://www.aallnet.org/conference](http://www.aallnet.org/conference)) and start planning your conference schedule ([http://eventmobi.com/aall2016/](http://eventmobi.com/aall2016/)). Hope to see you at the Annual Meeting in Chicago!

Marjorie E. Crawford
Rutgers University

Technical Services Special Interest Section

Our reality is that we live in an age when the “library job that pays you” takes up all of our time and leaves little left for professional development and volunteering for organizations. Employers have substantially cut travel budgets, so the expectation is that professional development must be focused and obviously beneficial in ways that relate to actual work. I know it’s hard to justify being involved in this organization, but my suggestion to everyone is to get involved and help make this experience more valuable for all of us. I know we are all busy, yet I can assure you from personal experience that by getting involved—not only in TS, but with other American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) sub-organizations—you increase your success in the workplace and professional appeal.

While I want TS members to be active within our Special Interest Section (SIS), it’s important that we are active outside of it, too. Holding positions and actively engaging in groups like AALL committees, taskforces, award juries, and caucuses benefits individuals and the SIS as a whole. We need non-members to know about what we do and how great it is work with us! The best way to do this is for many of us to get involved all at the same time. So the next time you see a call for volunteers or nominations, please submit your name or a name of a TS colleague. If you are afraid you don’t have enough time, then start small with an award jury or limited taskforce to see how a time-limited commitment works out. I promise these opportunities will allow you to grow as a professional and enhance your resume.
One person climbing the ranks of AALL isn’t going to make a difference. To really see sustainable change and impact policy, many of our members will need to make their way into leadership roles. To make this Association better for TS and TS-related jobs and to make sure you as an individual have the programming and types of opportunities you need to do the “job that pays you” better, I encourage everyone to get more involved. If we all work together, I truly believe we can make the large-scale changes we all desire.

Hollie White
Duke University

I’m Just a Poorly-Written Law Sitting Here on Your Library Shelf...

Sara E. Campbell
State of Oregon Law Library

Most of us are familiar with the Schoolhouse Rock! episode “I’m Just a Bill,” which first aired February 5, 1977 and discusses the American legislative process (with music and lyrics by Dave Frishberg, performed by Jack Sheldon). Unfortunately, not all bills that sit on Capitol Hill are well-written and not all lawyers take courses in law school to learn how to draft, interpret, or challenge legislation in court. Often, law schools push this type of curriculum into electives. I took both Advanced Legal Research and a separate class just on Legislation at the University of Missouri—Columbia, both of which were electives in small classes. Many in the legal profession depend on books, senior partners, or law librarians to teach them these invaluable skills that they did not have time to acquire in law school. I have seen plenty evidence of this while working in the Lubbock County Law Library in Lubbock, Texas, and in my current position with the State of Oregon Law Library.

In this column, I am writing about a book that gives a succinct but full and well-rounded look at the federal process between courts, Congress, and federal administrative agencies. I think most libraries should acquire this book, Judging Statutes by Robert A. Katzmann. This book fills in the gaps of legal education with illustrative and often witty examples that clearly delineate the fine lines between methods of judicial interpretation of statutes, including blended methods. The author is willing to dissect his own decisions with surgical precision to show the rationale behind the ruling in a way that he attempts to teach to others, whether drafting statutes or arguing points of legislative history in court, so that the whole process is elevated. The two appendices in the book shed further light on this federal judge’s views on statutory construction and statutory interpretation, while the Acknowledgments and Notes sections provide a particularly rich set of works cited for the serious researcher to find other resources to hone their skills in client advocacy. At 161 pages plus an index, this book delivers high-quality content in a quick-to-read single volume that actually teaches you as you read.

I was particularly impressed with the ability of the book’s author to discuss all methods of statutory interpretation without bias, including purposive, legislative history, textualism, cannons of statutory construction, and a mixed approached. I was pleased with the book’s common-sense approach that makes it suitable for either undergraduate audiences studying political science or sociology or for a lawyer trying a case where statutory interpretation might be the very thing that her case hinged upon. Although the book only discusses federal materials and subject matter, it would not be difficult to apply the same theory to state law. It would be rather nice if Katzmann, or state-level judges in all 50 states who have a similar set of credentials, would create such a work for each state. Thus far, this is the most relevant and most recent acquisition I can whole-heartedly recommend for help with statutory interpretation for any type of patron in any type of library. The author even goes so far as to suggest ways of making legislative history even more reliable. He suggests possible solutions to every possible objection, and he addresses the flaws in each argument he develops. He takes a truly adversarial and logical look at the topic of interpreting legislation, particularly poorly-written legislation that has become law. This is a quick read that will simplify the workload for every patron type. In this book, judges, court staff, professors, law students, paralegals, lawyers, staff of the legal profession, law clerks, law librarians, library staff, and members of the public will find answers to long-standing questions and interesting insights into why the law works the way it does. It is a satisfying read. This is my recommendation for an acquisition to your library regardless of whether your library is a law library or not.

1  http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1218484/?ref_=ttspec_spec_tt
2  http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1218484/?ref_=ttspec_spec_tt
After years of being overlooked, academic publishing has finally fallen victim to fraudulent publishing practices. Once thought of as too small or unimportant to defraud, criminals have discovered the big business behind the “publish or perish” crowd. Through the use of domain snatching and webspoofing, more and more serious academic journals are being “hijacked” by criminals with similar-looking pages and URLs for the sole purpose of cashing in on this academic publishing requirement.

“Hijacking” a journal occurs when someone purposefully creates a counterfeit website to divert traffic away from the actual journal in order to solicit manuscripts for submission. It also happens when journals forget to renew their domain names. Because scholars are often required to pay for publication themselves, these fake journals could not only harm their pocketbook but also impact their career path.

It used to be much simpler to determine whether an online journal was authentic. In the past, all one needed to do was to search a reputable journal-hosting platform, such as Thomson Reuter’s Web of Science, for the online journal’s information. If the website URL matched their records, that meant it was the correct website. Unfortunately, that doesn’t work if a journal fails to renew its domain name.

Author John Bohannon uses Euromed Communications as an example of this in his November 2015 Science article entitled “How to Hijack a Journal.” Through an oversight, Euromed Communications failed to pay its $10 domain registration fee. By the time the journal discovered the error, the original domain name was no longer available. The journal re-registered under another name; however, they soon began receiving complaints from researchers that the journal was not publishing their articles even though the researchers had paid subscription fees for publication. Bohannon went on to find that, in some cases, fraudulent journals were taking things a step farther and publishing the papers received. For example, the hijacked Mexican journal Ludus Vitalis actually started publishing the papers it received for $150 each.

Currently, this problem is having the most impact on the hard sciences. Initially, people who have to pay to publish as a job requirement could lose their money as a result of submitting to a hijacked journal; however, for those whose academic standings are based on peer review, it can also have a detrimental impact on their careers. Moreover, new articles could potentially cite these unreviewed articles, which could damage citation research metrics. (See the article “Journal Hijackers Target Science and Open Access” from Research Information, available at http://www.researchinformation.info/news/news_story.php?news_id=1660.) Further, hijacked journals could even go so far as to harm a country’s academic rating. (See Tomasz Maliszewski’s article, “Hijacked Journals – Threats and Challenges to Countries’ Scientific Ranking,” available at http://www.academia.edu/19806188/Hijacked_journals_threats_and_challenges_to_countries_scientific_ranking.)

In law, the problem of fraudulent journals has the potential to impact judicial findings. As noted by New York attorney Michael Hoenig, “articles may be published by journals with professional sounding names or by institutions or entities recognized in the technical world, thereby creating an aura of trustworthiness that masks the diminished quality of substantive content.” If courts are “predispositioned to infer reliability on an article because it was published,” as Hoenig claims, then the courts could potentially unknowingly rely on a source within a hijacked journal. (See “‘Unreliable’ Articles: More on Peer Review’s Frailties,” available at http://www.herzfeld-rubin.com/publ_complexlitigation_20140609.htm.)

Jeffrey Beall, academic librarian at Auraria Library, University of Colorado Denver, has created a blog titled Scholarly Open Access that tracks the progress of fraudulent academic publishing. According to “Beall’s List of Predatory Publishers 2016” (available at https://scholarlyoa.com/2016/01/05/bealls-list-of-predatory-publishers-2016/#more-6533), the number of hijacked journals has tripled since he first published it in May 2014. In 2014, Beall found 30 journals that fit the definition of a hijacked journal. In 2016, he has found 101 journals. Beall also publishes a list of hijacked journals, available at https://scholarlyoa.com/other-pages/hijacked-journals/.

For more information on hijacked journals, see the following articles:


---

Report from the American Library Association (ALA) Committee on Cataloging: Description & Access (CC:DA) meetings at the ALA Midwinter Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts, January 2016

**Governance Structure of Resource Description and Access (RDA)**

The five-year transition period changing the governance structure of *RDA* is underway. The Joint Steering Committee for Development of *RDA* (JSC) is now the *RDA* Steering Committee (RSC). As reported last time, representation on the RSC will be based on United Nations (UN) regions rather than by library organizations. The impact for U.S. catalogers is, instead of an ALA representative serving on the RSC, there will be one person representing North America on the RSC. Currently, “North America” includes Canada and the United States (and if they ever adopt *RDA*, then Bermuda, Greenland, and Saint Pierre and Miquelon). We should consider ourselves lucky—consider the logistics of the potential representative structures for Asia or Africa.


As you can see in Kathy’s slides, there will be a new entity in the hierarchy that will represent North American *RDA* users. This entity does not yet have a name, and they have not yet defined its structure/operations. There were a lot of unanswered questions about how this will work in practice, but for the foreseeable future, the structure of CC:DA will remain as it is.

The goals are to make *RDA* “truly international” and to expand the use of *RDA* to the archives, linked data, and museum communities. I could be wrong, but I detected a sense of, “Well, let’s try this and if it doesn’t work, we’ll try something else.”

**Structure of the *RDA* Toolkit**

The RSC is putting a lot of thought into the structure of the *RDA* Toolkit. Again, the goal is to make *RDA* the international metadata standard used by libraries, archives, museums, and linked-data communities. In his presentation (available at [http://www.gordondunsire.com/pubs/pres/RDADATACap.pptx](http://www.gordondunsire.com/pubs/pres/RDADATACap.pptx)), Gordon Dunsire said the basic structure of *RDA* will remain the same.

**Law-related issues before CC:DA**


There was little discussion and were no objections to the proposal, but Library of Congress (LC) representative Dave Reser did raise a question that required further consideration. We postponed the vote on the proposal until after the meeting. I looked into the question and concluded that the proposal should go forward as is. I assume the e-mail vote for CC:DA to approve the proposal will be a unanimous “Yes.”

**ALA Publishing’s Update on the *RDA* Toolkit**

In 2015, 35% of all subscribers and 50% of all users of the *RDA* Toolkit were outside the United States.
The Map is not the Territory

Dan Blackaby
Cornell University Law Library

To say that Google is everywhere is now akin to saying “the sun is bright.” The “Googlization” of thought, and particularly of searching for information, is a well-worn trope in both the popular news and in what passes for library science scholarship. The acknowledgement of the Googlization phenomenon does not, however, implicitly include the conclusion that Googlization is an improvement on information organization. For many people, Google searching provides a simulacra of information literacy, but it is ultimately one that is false. Being able to find a list of Bach cantatas does not give the searcher knowledge of where they fit into Bach’s work or even into classical music as a whole. Location is no substitution for learning.

From a legal research perspective, projects such as Ravel Law’s Case Analytics are trying to bridge that gap. Every first-year law student can tell you that finding the case and using it successfully in your memo are two different things. It’s not enough to simply cite a case or to note that there is a connection. Cases, like everything else, are only understood in context of not only other cases, but many other factors such as jurisdiction, tradition, outside circumstances, etc.

When using a database like Westlaw or Lexis, researchers use a lot of those assumptions and contextual limiters when they limit the database to jurisdiction, or to the Restatements, or to a specific date range. Such limitations require foreknowledge of the context and a general understanding of the problem.

By imposing these limitations, the searcher is trying to meld both search accuracy and search precision, something which the process of curation can do and often does from the backend. Some of the most important work librarians and information specialists around the world are doing today includes shaping databases and unique metadata schemas in order to augment the databases and to enable different types of searches. How do these efforts fit within a Googlized world?

Google is not a neutral arbiter of information. As a commercial enterprise, Google’s interests are not in finding the searcher the most relevant results for their search. There has to be a modicum of that for the user to deem the search of value, but Google has never made any pretention that commercial motivations do not influence its results or that its algorithm incorporates different metadata scheming or weighting priorities for different subject matters. While projects such as Google Scholar exist, they are still subject to the base Google algorithm.

So where do legal databases such as Westlaw and Lexis fit between the ubiquitous generality of Google and specialized databases such as the Old Bailey Online (http://www.oldbaileyonline.org), which focuses both on a certain subject matter and a specific corpus of documents?

In my experience teaching legal research, the homepage search box is difficult for students to resist. The idea of just plugging in a word and hitting enter to get all your answers is not only alluring, it’s what they’ve been conditioned to do. So, is all the work that librarians and information specialists put into these specialized databases the information equivalent of the band playing on the deck of the Titanic?

I would argue no. The more law students learn and the more specialized their own work becomes, the less likely they are to succumb to the Google generalization. Tax attorneys come to dwell in the tax databases, not only in terms of their searching, but in terms of their cultural legal language. As words such as “basis” start to mean different things to the students, they will alter their search techniques, and they will, in fact, demand more of the specialized work that is particular to each database or information source. Why? Because they ARE conditioned to Google. If Google were (self-driving?) cars, the drivers (searchers) used to Google get into more obscure roads, and the people maintaining the condition of those roads have to do an even better job of road maintenance, both in the condition of the information itself and in the directional signposts/user experience they provide. Librarian and information scientists’ worth may not be apparent to everyone, but that’s part of the job of making things easy for others.
Learn to Show Your Value to Leadership: 
A Guided Tour Through the Wonderful World of Metrics, Law Firm Edition

Ashley Moya  
Charlotte School of Law Library

As promised, this column features contributions from two of the three firm librarians I had the privilege of joining forces with last summer at the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting. Each of them offers additional insights on ways to more effectively communicate your value to your leadership. Firm librarians struggle with many of the same budgetary and manpower restraints that academic librarians do, but they have their own unique landscape in which they must balance their resources, seek to understand the perspective of their leadership, and track and support their value. That landscape is foreign to me, so I’m both delighted and endlessly grateful that two of my esteemed colleagues who navigate that world as native residents took the time to share some thoughts and experiences of their own.

First up is Abby Walters, the Library Manager at Maslon LLP, who has experience in academic and legal institutions. She has worked in nearly every library role, including shelving, circulation, cataloging, filing, interlibrary loan (ILL), e-resources, and management. Abby is a member of the Private Law Librarians & Information Professionals Special Interest Section (PLLIP-SIS), is active in the Minnesota Association of Law Libraries, and most recently has served on the 2016 AALL Annual Meeting Programming Committee (AMPC) and the Professional Engagement, Growth, and Advancement SIS (PEGA-SIS) Programming Committee. Abby offers some insight into a smaller firm library’s use of metrics:

“At the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) 2015 Annual Meeting, I had the great privilege to have my proposed program accepted. I was excited to have two firm librarians and one academic librarian onboard to discuss how librarians can communicate value to their leadership with metrics. We started by sending out a survey early in the year to gauge what metrics others are using.

“However, from the time my program proposal was accepted and the date of the conference, my professional world had shifted. I moved from working as an Electronic Resources Librarian to Library Manager, and my formerly three-person library was downsized to two. What I’ve learned from this program and my colleagues is that there is great value in learning how to communicate with leadership and that metrics can play an important part in telling the story of library within your organization.

“On January 1st, I became the new manager and was almost immediately put to the task of creating an annual report from the previous year. Thankfully, my predecessor had our team tracking time, research, ILL statistics, and other details. I was able see prior year’s reporting, but I wanted to make sure I was providing a valuable insight into the library’s accomplishments for the year.

“What to do first? I am a list maker so that is where I started. Thoughts on what I could include:

• Statistics on Research  
• Budget breakdown by group  
• Financial details  
• ILL statistics  
• Billing numbers for research  
• E-Resource usage statistics  
• Reporting on Library Projects

“A long list! This forced me to stop and think about what would be most important to my leaders. What information do they already have, and what unique information could I provide? What information would demonstrate how the library was contributing to the firm? This can be difficult to know, so consult your administrative colleagues for advice on gathering intelligence, and ask others what they report for their departments.

“I also wanted to be mindful that I would have only fifteen minutes to both present my report and discuss future plans for the library. In light of this, I decided to keep my annual report brief.

“What to do first? The key information I included:

• Executive Summary – essential for any report
• Resource Updates – any major changes from the year past
• Accomplishments – a look back at the year
• Key Goals – a look at the year ahead
• Ongoing goals – those accomplishments not yet completed

“What I left out:
• Spending – because these reports are provided by the accounting department. In 2015, I did include a pie chart for spending by Practice Group, a unique report that is not tracked by accounting.
• E-Resource statistics – because though it is important, I did not have a meaningful way to report this. This may be something to include in future reports.
• Billing numbers – again, it is important, but these numbers are reported by another department. Depending on the size of your firm or billing requirements, this may be a critical data point.
• ILL statistics – this is one metric I would like to include in future reports, because it shows a significant cost savings for the firm.

“I gathered the data from a number of places. We use a ticketing system for responding to research requests. This was helpful in creating the executive summary and accomplishments for the year. We track spending in an Excel spreadsheet, and I am able to see changes in print and electronic resource spending. Because we are a team of two, I was quickly able to create a list of major accomplishments and of goals for the upcoming year.

“The result—my leadership was pleased. We discussed the report and focused on what the plans were for the upcoming year. I had outlined the basics in my report, and we talked more about the details. It was a great way for the leaders to hear my suggestions on how the library should move forward and to set the stage for that direction.

“The results of the survey, which had been deployed as part of the AALL presentation preparation, were also helpful. One lesson learned from participating in this discussion is that metrics can be viewed as a risky endeavor. What happens if the reports are not favorable? One librarian who saw our initial survey reached out to warn me that collecting too much data can backfire. In my view, the metrics are not only providing valuable data to our leaders, but they should be providing valuable data to us! If we see a drop in research or an increase in spending, we should step back and look at what changes are happening within the organization. Do we need to reassess: maybe update trainings, market new tools, find other ways to advertise our services?

“Another frequent comment was that some libraries cut back on what they reported and no one cared. This would have prompted me to evaluate what I was reporting and whether it was valuable to my leaders. If appropriate, ask! Have the conversation with your leaders about what information would help them make decisions about the library (staffing, spending, etc.).

“In conclusion, reporting metrics does not have to require a complex tracking system, which many of us do not have anyway. Start small and use the data you have. Perhaps the most important advice I can offer is to know your audience. Think about the information they already have, the unique information you can provide, and consider the best way to present this information in a meaningful way.”

Thanks, Abby! I think that Abby provides some wonderful insight into achieving the appropriate balance of information within your presentations to leadership and ways that smaller libraries with limited bandwidth can leverage the power of the data they do collect every day to set a stage for the future direction and momentum of the library and its team.

Next up is Marcia Burris, a law library leader with experience across a variety of institutions, including government, corporate firms, and law firms. Also, for many years she operated a library management consulting firm focused on cost-effective staffing of library operations. Her first library job was filing looseleafs, and she most recently served as the department head for an Am Law 100 law firm. She is active in the PLLIP-SIS as a member of the Executive Board and co-chair of the 2014 and 2015 Private Law Librarians (PLL) Summits. Marcia is a volunteer on the American Bar Association (ABA) Law Practice Division Knowledge Strategy Interest Group. Marcia emphasizes that understanding what your leadership values and delivering those results is critical to the success of the library. Marcia writes:

“Many years ago a credit card company launched one of the most successful and memorable ad campaigns in recent memory. Each vignette featured a series of purchases of varying amounts and culminated by describing a moment or outcome that was described as ‘priceless.’ The ads have been much-parodied, but they hold a lesson for us as we talk about ways to demonstrate value. The individual purchases and costs listed—tickets to a ball game,
soft drinks, and hot dogs—are easily measured. However, they are not ends unto themselves. It is the time which
the father and son enjoy together at the game that is described as priceless.

“In our presentation at the 2015 AALL Annual Meeting, we discussed the importance of providing data and stories
to demonstrate the value of library services; thus, showing through both quantitative and qualitative measures
that, as librarians and information professionals, we are actively and substantively contributing to the successful
fulfillment of our organizations’ missions. We offered numerous options to capture and present data, ranging from
sophisticated software solutions to capture online research metrics to home-grown solutions such as using Excel
and firm billing systems to record and report on library activities. And we discussed keeping track of library-user
feedback, particularly those precious (and often rare) comments which describe the importance of our contributions
to specific goals, such as gaining work from a new client, achieving a positive outcome in a legal matter, or even
having our work acknowledged directly by the client as contributing to a successful outcome.

“A consistent theme across the panel of presentations was the importance of capturing and reporting on the
information which is most meaningful to our organizations’ leadership. We need to present the hard data (how
much we spent on hot dogs and soda) and also the story that makes that trip to the ballpark worthwhile. But we
also need to make sure that the investment in providing library services (or hot dogs) is well-spent.

“Demonstrating that we have been busy may be helpful, but it is even more essential to communicate that we are
contributing to the success of the firm and that the work we undertake is directly in support of—and effective in
achieving—firm goals. To this end, we need to be aware of what is most important to our firms and continually
align our work with those goals. It doesn’t benefit our organizations if we spend vast amounts of time working
diligently on the wrong things!

“A few years ago, a library director from a very large law firm told me her library team no longer spent time
checking in serials. That type of daily work simply didn’t contribute to the mission. That change in process may
seem shocking at first to many librarians. However, if we want to be well-aligned with our organizations’ goals,
we need to continually reassess the work we do in light of the firm mission. Do we need to do the same things we
have always done and in the same way we have always done them?

“As we consider the importance of library metrics, it is clear that we should be collecting data not only to report
up to management, but also for our own purposes in administering our libraries. The more we understand about the
time spent on various tasks, the better equipped we are to understand the return on that time investment in terms
of value created for the organization.

“But in addition to the raw data, we also need to understand what our organizations value most from us. We can
discern basic themes from our firms’ mission statements, and we may gain additional understanding from other,
more detailed materials which might be shared within the organization, such as a five-year plan. However, many
law firm librarians may not have access to firm management strategy or planning documents. Even if we are aware
of the high-level goals, we may lack understanding of how they might be implemented at the practice group or
local office level. So what is a librarian to do?

“First, seek opportunities to be included in communications that might not be directed to the library. Can you be
added to an all-attorney e-mail distribution list? Can a member of the library be embedded in a practice group?
Are there networking opportunities with other administrative departments? Consider the communication channels
in your organization and ask to be included.

“At Ogletree Deakins, librarian participation in an attorney e-mail distribution list positioned the library to respond
quickly to develop a new—and highly-valued—service to the firm and its clients. In April 2015, the National
Labor Relations Board (NLRB) implemented new rules which shortened the time between requests for a vote and
a union election. Since the full impact of the new rules was still to be determined, attorneys were using e-mail to
compare their experiences with timing in different NLRB Regional Offices across the country. Through the e-mail
exchange, the library became aware of this need for better data and offered to capture this information on behalf
of the firm. The Technical Services Librarian quickly created a database, which supported data collection and
reporting; this alleviated the need for further all-attorney e-mails on this topic and provided a comprehensive data
source regarding NLRB docket events across the country. This new information resource was quickly embraced
by attorneys and has been used widely over the past year.
“In addition to seeking to be included in formal communication channels, librarians also must strive to cultivate relationships with attorneys and other firm leaders, so that we have greater opportunity for informal communication. Many librarians shrink from doing this, particularly as we may feel that we have enough work already from our regular customers and out of respect for busy attorneys’ time. In these days of doing more with less, we certainly don’t want to be perceived as spending work hours in unproductive, idle conversation. However, we should consider how our firms’ most successful ‘rainmakers’ approach marketing. These attorneys build relationships, work to understand their clients’ business needs, and seek to understand how they can help. And this takes place not in a single meeting or call, but most often over many months and sometimes years of contacts. Building relationships within our firms so that we are thought of as valued resources when a need arises takes a certain time investment, but that investment is certainly worthwhile. Particularly when, at the end of the day, the library’s contribution to the success of the individual attorney, firm, or client outcome can be described as ‘priceless.’"

Thanks, Marcia. These are some wonderful avenues that firm librarians can explore in order to identify what’s most important to their unique audiences. They can then use that knowledge to align and guide future actions and data collection in a way that tells a clear story of the library, one which demonstrates their value. Building relationships within your larger organization is always important; when you understand the whole of your organization, you can communicate your value more effectively by tailoring your metrics to match up with greater definitions of value. Even more importantly, though, you have a wider perspective in which you can identify new opportunities to create immediate and tangible value for your leadership and your patrons.

As you can see, while Abby and Marcia may not share the same experiences concerning the size and types of libraries in which they’ve worked, they do not differ in their beliefs regarding the importance of communication, relationship-building, and using data to prove the value of their respective libraries. Again, I thank them both for sharing a more firm-centered perspective of using metrics to support value!

In the next column, we’ll be finishing up the tour with a few more tips and tricks from my own academic perspective, including real talk about desk tracking, consortia- and group-sharing, using statistics to support specific initiatives, and gathering direct feedback from your ever elusive clientele. Thanks to you all for sticking around for the journey.

The first article in the 2016 Harvard Business Reviews (HBR) 10 Must Reads is about a large consulting firm overhauling their “traditional” performance appraisal system. When I saw the HBR book on the shelf at my local public library, I smugly snatched it up with a sense of vindication. The timing was perfect because, since January 30th, I’d been receiving ALERTS from my university’s performance portal that I was OVERDUE on mid-year progress check-ins. As a direct supervisor of six and secondary supervisor of three, I actually do check-in regularly with everyone in my department. Also, I sincerely enjoy working with my staff. So why I am constantly OVERDUE with anything having to do with performance reviews? Because I HATE them.

I am not alone, of course. A 2014 Washington Post headline sums it up nicely: “Study Finds that Basically Every Single Person Hates Performance Reviews.” And, as it turns out, we can all hate them for different reasons. In his book, The End of the Performance Review, business consultant Tim Baker identifies eight main shortcomings:

- They are labor-intensive and thus very costly.
- They can be destructive to manager/employee relationships.
- They are often a monologue rather than a dialogue.
- The formality of the appraisal stifles conversation.
- They are too infrequent.
- They are an exercise in form-filling.
- People rarely follow up on them.
- Most people find them stressful.
In *Get Rid of the Performance Review*, UCLA business professor and consultant Samuel A. Culbert minces no words when he calls this “corporate sham” one of “the most insidious, most damaging, and yet most ubiquitous of corporate activities.” In conducting research for the book *Fake Work*, business consultants Brent D. Peterson and Gaylan W. Nielsen found that performance appraisals might be the single biggest contributor to fake work—the work that an organization does that is not aligned with the organization’s strategy. So why do most organizations carry on with this almost universally-hated process? According to Baker, we maintain the ritual because it provides a “legally defensible position” in case an employee is underperforming.

However, many organizations are making and/or considering changes to the performance review process. As a recent *HBR* article reports, by early 2015, 30 large firms with a combined 1.5 million employees were no longer using the traditional performance ranking system; by September 2015, 51 firms had moved away from them. The article also mentions a recent survey in which 70% of companies reported they were currently evaluating their performance management systems.

What is replacing traditional performance appraisals in these companies? Shorter, more frequent meetings often replace the biannual/annual review. The idea, according to Baker, is to have two-way feedback which is timely, specific, ongoing, and developmental. Baker recommends managers and employees sit down together once a month for five months and have the following 15-minute conversations:

- **Month 1: Climate Review** (Where are you now in terms of your enjoyment of the work you are doing?)
- **Month 2: Strengths and Talents** (What can you offer in terms of strengths and talents, and how can you harness them?)
- **Month 3: Opportunities for Growth** (What are some areas you recognize as weaknesses, and what can we do to improve them?)
- **Month 4: Learning and Development** (How can we capitalize on your strengths and minimize your weaknesses from a learning and development perspective?)
- **Month 5: Innovation and Continuous Improvement** (How can we do things better, faster, with less cost and greater output, more safely, and with enhanced communication?)

Culbert lobbies for switching from the performance review to a performance “preview,” in which manager and employee ask each other: “What’s the best way for the two of us to combine forces in giving the company what we are contracted to give it, as well as take care of our own needs for growth and well-being?” He recommends having regular conversations, during which manager and employees ask each other:

1. What are you getting from me that you like and find helpful? If relevant, comment on the bigger picture of how we are organized and how people and units interact.
2. What are you getting from me (and/or the system) that impedes your effectiveness and would like to have stopped?
3. What are you not getting from me (and/or the system) that you think would enhance your effectiveness, and tell me, specific to you, why do you need this at this time?

Culbert says performance previews—with their on-going feedback—are more effective because they do the evaluating before and during work production, while people can still make adjustments.

Even though my university isn’t likely to abandon the traditional performance review anytime soon (especially because we just started using fancy new software!), I do think many of the ideas above can help me. First, I should sit down more often with the people I supervise. I do check-in often as I am walking around the department, but that isn’t the same as both of us stopping work and sitting down, even for five minutes, and having a face-to-face discussion. I should ask some of the open-ended questions Baker and Culbert recommend to start a “real” conversation about what could contribute to short- and long-term happiness and success on the job. Also, I should encourage my team to come to me immediately when they have ideas and/or strong feelings about their jobs, specific projects, and the library as a whole. After reading these materials, I’m almost encouraged enough to face those OVERDUE progress check-ins. ALMOST.

The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) convened two meetings at the ALA Midwinter Meeting in Boston. MAC took action on 16 discussion papers and two proposals during the meetings. MAC voted on and approved one of the discussion papers on as a proposal (after discussion). The complete texts of the proposals and discussion papers considered at the 2016 ALA Midwinter Meetings of the MARC Advisory Committee are available at https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2016_age.html.

Proposal No. 2016-01
Coding 007 Field Positions for Digital Sound Recordings in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-01.html
Source: Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM)
This proposal defines new values for some 007 field positions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to better accommodate coding for digital sound recordings. The changes introduced by this proposal include a broadening of the definition of “sound recording” to include digital sound recordings and the addition of a code “r” for “remote” to the list of codes for specific material designation of sound recordings (007s/01). MAC approved the proposal with minor revisions.

Proposal No. 2016-02
Defining Subfield Sr and Subfield St, and Redefining Subfield Se in Field 382 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats
https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-02.html
Source: Music Library Association
Proposal No. 2016-02 has to do with field 382 (Medium of Performance) and has no applicability to law cataloging. MAC approved the proposal.

Discussion Paper No. 2016-01
Defining Subfields $3 and $5 in Field 382 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp01.html
Source: Music Library Association
This paper, submitted by the Music Library Association, deals with field 382 (Medium of Performance) and has no applicability to law cataloging. The paper will be developed into a proposal.

Discussion Paper No. 2016-02
Clarifying Code Values in Field 008/20 (Format of Music) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp02.html
Source: Music Library Association
This paper presents suggestions for clarifying four code values having to do with field 008/20 (Format of Music); it has no applicability to law cataloging. The paper will be developed into a proposal, incorporating some suggested changes related to piano scores.

Discussion Paper No. 2016-03
Recording Distributor Number for Music and Moving Image Materials in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp03.html
Source: Music Library Association, Online Audiovisual Catalogers
This paper recommends changes to field 028 in the Bibliographic format to allow for the recording of distributor numbers in this field, as well as publisher numbers, as is the current practice. It also recommends revising the existing definition of field 037 to clearly indicate that field 037 is not to be used to record music and audiovisual publisher and distributor numbers. The paper will be developed into a proposal.

Discussion Paper No. 2016-04
Extending the Use of Subfield S0 to Encompass Linking Fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
Source: British Library

This paper from the British Library discusses the definition of subfield $0 (Authority record control number or standard number) in linking entry fields 760, 762, 765, 767, 770, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 780, 785, 786, and 787 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format; the goal is to support linked-data applications. The easiest way to understand this concept is to look at an example supplied in the paper:

776 08 $i also issued as (manifestation) $0 (uri) http://rdaregistry.info/Elements/u/#P60195 $a Aylett, David. $t With voice divine. $d [England] : [D. Aylett], 2008

The example shows the relationship specified as text in subfield $i and also recorded as a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) from the Resource Description and Access (RDA) Registry in subfield $0. While supportive of the idea of recording relationship information as URIs, the Committee voiced concern that the use of subfield $0 for this purpose would compromise the definition of subfield $0 as a place to record entity information (as opposed to relationship information). A suggestion emerged from the discussion to redefine subfield $4 to accommodate the encoding of relationship URIs. This paper will be developed into a proposal, ideally with input from the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) URI Task Force.

Discussion Paper No. 2016-05
Expanding the Definition of Subfield $w to Encompass Standard Numbers in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats
https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp05.html
Source: British Library

In this paper, the British Library suggests that linked-data applications would be rendered more capable of exploiting MARC-based bibliographic data if the scope of subfield $w were expanded to encompass standard numbers, as well as bibliographic record control numbers. This would align subfield $w encoding practice with that of subfield $0 (Authority record control number or standard number). The paper will be developed into a proposal.

Discussion Paper No. 2016-06
Define Subfield $2 and Subfield $0 in Field 753 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp06.html
Source: Online Audiovisual Catalogers, GAMECIP (GAme MEtadata and CItation Project)

This paper recommends that subfield $2 (source of term) and subfield $0 (Authority record control number or standard number) be defined in field 753 (System Details Access to Computer Files). The focus of the paper is the encoding of computer game system details and playback information. After discussion, MAC voted on this paper as a proposal and approved it.

Discussion Paper No. 2016-07
Broader Usage of Field 257 to Include Autonomous Regions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp07.html
Source: Online Audiovisual Catalogers

This paper advocates broadening the scope of field 257 (Country of Producing Entity) to include autonomous regions so that regions with strong film cultures such as Hong Kong and Palestine can be encoded. This would entail changing the name of the field to “Country or Autonomous Region of Producing Entity.” The paper will be developed into a proposal.

Discussion Paper No. 2016-08
Remove Restriction on the Use of Dates in Field 046 $k of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp08.html
Source: Online Audiovisual Catalogers

The use of subfield $k (Beginning or single date created) in field 046 (Special Coded Dates) of the Bibliographic format is restricted because the standard states that “[d]ates contained in subfield $k may not be coded elsewhere in the formats.” There was discussion about the ambiguity of the meaning of the word “may” in this sentence and whether it is actually intended to be prescriptive (in the sense of “must” not be coded elsewhere). In order to facilitate the use of 046 $k to consistently record the original date of a moving image work, the Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC) recommend the removal of the restriction/ambiguity in the definition of subfield $k. The paper will be developed into a proposal.

Discussion Paper No. 2016-09
Coding Named Events in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats
Source: OCLC
The implementation of FAST (Faceted Application of Subject Terminology) headings in bibliographic records in OCLC has raised questions among catalogers about the use of the 611 field (Subject Added Entry-Meeting Name) to encode named events other than meetings, such as wars, hurricanes, earthquakes, battles, festivals, etc. In this paper, OCLC lays out two options for eliminating this confusion. The first option is to redefine the X11 fields to include named events; the second option involves defining a new X47 series of tags for the encoding of event-related information. MAC members generally preferred the second option, although the British Library favored the first option. The paper will be developed into a proposal.

**Discussion Paper No. 2016-10**
**Defining Field 347 (Digital File Characteristics) in the MARC 21 Holdings Format**
Source: CONSER, Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC)

The MARC 21 Bibliographic Format currently defines Field 347 (Digital File Characteristics) and allows for the encoding of information pertaining to the digital encoding of text, image, audio, video, and other types of data in a resource. The intent behind this paper is to allow catalogers to encode this information on holdings records as local information, in keeping with the spirit of provider-neutral cataloging (since different providers may use different file formats). There was discussion as to whether subfield $3$ or subfield $8$ should be used to make the connection between the 347 and the 856 fields in the holdings record. The paper will be developed as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper No. 2016-11**
**Punctuation in the MARC 21 Authority Format**
Source: German National Library

Because of differing practices between the German authority file and the Library of Congress (LC) Name Authority File (NAF) concerning the use of punctuation in authority records, the German National Library suggests defining MARC Authority Leader position 18 (currently undefined) as “Punctuation Policy.” The recommended code values would indicate whether the record includes or omits punctuation. This paper will be developed as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper No. 2016-12**
**Designating Matching Information in the MARC 21 Authority Format**
Source: German National Library

This paper recommends the definition of a new MARC field (possibly 887) to document the existence of a match between records that exist in an authority file and incoming records catalogers are adding to the file. After identifying a possible match, the cataloger would add the new field (“Matching information”) to the incoming record to facilitate resolution of potentially duplicate records. This paper will be developed as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper No. 2016-13**
**Designation of a Definition in the MARC 21 Authority Format**
Source: German National Library

This paper recommends defining a MARC field, possibly 668, to accommodate the encoding of definitions (intended for display to the end user) in the Authority Format. The Committee suggested using field 677 instead, because 668 was previously defined in MARC but is now obsolete; the repurposing of obsolete fields is generally avoided. Some Committee members felt the 680 field (Public General Note) could accommodate definitions, possibly with some tweaking to the subfields. Another discussion paper may be developed.

**Discussion Paper No. 2016-14**
**Designation of the Type of Entity in the MARC 21 Authority Format**
Source: German National Library

This paper considers the definition of a new variable field (075) in the Authority Format to accommodate coding to indicate the type of entity described in the authority record. Person, work, corporate body, and topical term are examples of the kinds of entity terms that catalogers could encode in the proposed field. This paper will be developed as a proposal.

**Discussion Paper No. 2016-15**
**Media Type and Carrier Type in the MARC 21 Authority Format**
This was the most controversial paper discussed at the meeting. It advocates for the definition of fields 337 (Media Type) and 338 (Carrier Type) in the MARC Authority Format to accommodate the encoding of this information in authority records for unique works. Media Type and Carrier Type are manifestation-level characteristics currently encoded in bibliographic records. When an authority record for a unique work (e.g., a manuscript) is needed to control subject access to works about that manuscript, it may be desirable to include media type and carrier type information in the authority record describing the single exemplar of that work. Creating a bibliographic record for the work and including media type and carrier type information in the record would not provide for authority control; it might not even be possible to create such a bib record if a library does not own the unique work in question. The issues raised during the Committee’s discussion were not resolved. This paper may be reworked into another discussion paper.

**Discussion Paper No. 2016-16**

**Extending the Encoding Level in the MARC 21 Authority Format**


Source: German National Library

The German National Library is seeking the extension of Leader position 17 (Encoding Level) in the MARC Authority Format to accommodate the encoding of seven levels of completeness and the editorial level of the staff that created or modified the record. As currently defined, Leader 17 has only two valid values, “n” for Complete authority record and “o” for Incomplete authority record. Discussion centered around the perception of the Committee members that the seven proposed new values indicate more about the staff creating or editing the record (and their authoritativeness) than the completeness of the data in the record. A suggestion emerged to use Field 042 (Authentication Code), with possible subfield tweaks, as an alternative location for this information. This paper may be reworked into another discussion paper.

---

**Announcements from OCLC**

**OCLC Announces November 2015 Enhancements to WorldCat Discovery**

OCLC announced they added new features and content to WorldCat Discovery Services in November 2015. New features include the ability to configure the display of availability information for a library’s users, if that library has purchased the real-time availability option. New content is available from providers (including Acquisdata, Adam Matthew Digital, Brill, and others), which covers areas such as religion, business, and oceanography (including maritime boundary information and the United Nations (UN) Convention on the Law of the Sea).


**OCLC Releases FY2015 Annual Report**

OCLC has released its 2014-2015 Annual Report. According to this latest report, there are now nearly 342 million records in WorldCat, with nearly 2.3 billion holdings attached. During FY2015, member libraries contributed more than 20 million records and more than 147 million holdings.


**OCLC Transitions WorldCat Cataloging Partners to WorldShare Collection Manager**

On January 24, 2016, OCLC sent out a notification that they completed the transition of WorldCat Cataloging Partners record delivery into the WorldShare Collection Manager. Libraries currently receiving records through the Cataloging Partners service are encouraged to transition to the WorldShare service within the next three months. OCLC will discontinue the existing WorldCat Cataloging Partners service on May 1, 2016.


The WorldCat Cataloging Partners transition guide is available at [http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/support/worldshare/wcp/wcp-transition.pdf](http://www.oclc.org/content/dam/support/worldshare/wcp/wcp-transition.pdf).
This is my last column; I hope everyone has found value in what I’ve shared in the past three years. I’ve covered a broad spectrum:

- Insight on developing a preservation plan;
- Ins and outs of weeding;
- Interviewed incoming preservation chair(s);
- Offered suggestions on year-end projects;
- Developed and shared results of preservation surveys;
- Highlighted American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meetings preservation activities;
- Reviewed AALL programming;
- Invited Preservation Committee members to serve as guest preservation columnists in 2014-2015;
- Introduced the Worst Book Contest;
- Shared tips, tricks and trivia;
- FAQs;
- Selected bibliographies;
- Promoted National Preservation Week;
- And more.

Had I continued, I would have liked to cover the following:

- Ethics in Preservation;
- Principles of managing a preservation program;
- Rising costs of storage facilities; and
- How to implement “preservation pen pal” program at your library.

Here are a few last minute comments:

National Preservation Week is April 24-30, 2016—get your staff involved with helping to preserve your collection. If you didn’t make a splash last year, this may be your year to toot your horn, in the name of preservation.

Spring is fast approaching—warm weather brings bugs and their friends; be sure to conduct regular inspections of your collection and schedule a routine visit with an exterminator.

I look forward to hearing who the new preservation columnist will be and to reading his/her column.

Don’t hesitate to reach out to me; while I am no longer Preservation Chair or Preservation Columnist, I am and will remain a member of AALL and the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS). To this extent, I am available, and you may reach me at mawr@loc.gov.

In the meantime, put your preservation cap on and start preserving.
Last October, the Special Libraries Association (SLA) put on a webinar entitled “Lawmageddon 2015,” with speakers Jean O'Grady and my colleague John DiGilio. While the main topic of the webinar was “disruptive technologies” like Research Monitor, the new Wolters Kluwer widgets, or IBM Watson—products that are not immediately relevant to technical services—I really appreciated the general tone Jean and John presented: we need to go beyond fearmongering when looking at new trends and realize that “this is where it is,” and we’d do better to stay on top of cutting-edge services and get out in front of the trends as they impact our institutions. The unstated alternative would be to stay well behind the curve, while fearing the future and wringing our hands—to our own detriment, of course.

I had an interesting application of these ideas in mid-February in a meeting with my boss, our National Library Manager. She went over the detailed department goals and timeline established by our Chief Knowledge Officer (CKO) for 2016 and listed which parts she needed me to complete. The tasks themselves are nothing earth-shattering, but the experience rocked my world just a bit. I generally think of my job in terms of keeping things orderly, getting books where they need to go, and making sure the catalog is “clean” and full of useful data; I have never, ever thought of my work in terms of how I support the CKO.

This year’s projects include: evaluating and documenting serials distribution for copyright compliance; process mapping all duties within the U.S. technical services department; writing (and implementing) best practices for departmental workflows; and planning and implementing e-books in the U.S. Not revolutionary by any means, but after looking at this list, I could see the definite impact of documentation. Reading through the lines, I can see I am delineating my team’s reason for existence and justifying why we do what we do with evidence to prove that we are doing it the most efficient way possible. Impressed by the scope of that task, I thought back to Jean and John’s presentation and realized there’s no use in throwing up my hands because this is new and different. This is what it is—I absolutely must document everything—and it is better for all of us in the long term to get to it. We know extra scrutiny is where we are at, so by overcompensating with documentation, I will do my best to stay on top of what the CKO needs (and hopefully slightly in front of that!).

The copyright compliance portion was the most eye-opening for me because, of course, I pay attention to whether we obey our licenses or not—it is second nature at this point. But I have never written down the titles under consideration or the extra copies we purchased when we felt it was necessary. Having that documentation would show my value and prove that I have already given this thought. I recall a case from a few years ago where a firm was charged a huge fine (hundreds of thousands of dollars) because they routed something electronically in violation of the license; that suit put the ball in motion for me and I have been especially diligent in monitoring copyright compliance since then. All in all, I feel it is a bit of a transition in my frame of mind. Instead of remaining “behind the scenes” as is usually my preference, I must get out in front and make technical services visible to our management. The future of my team may well depend on it.

User Experience (also called “UX”) comes from the Human and Computer Interaction Community (HCI) and, over time, it has become a popular area of interest for libraries, with many institutions creating new departments or groups to focus on this topic. In this brief article, I plan to give a short overview about what a user experience study is and how to conduct one.

User Experience Studies: Getting the Feedback from Library Users

The way a library describes and presents its materials impacts the way library users feel about the library and its value in general. Yet, how frequently do technical services librarians interact with library users and ask them about their feelings and impressions about the catalog? While this may seem like a silly thing to do, User Experience is a growing area of interest for libraries, with many institutions creating new departments or groups to focus on this topic. In this brief article, I plan to give a short overview about what a user experience study is and how to conduct one.
In June of last year, I had the great experience of working with the Duke Main Library to conduct a User Experience study that focused on understanding what users do when they encountered certain messages in the online catalog. For one day, I was able to interact with students, staff, and faculty to learn more about their research and online search behaviors. Since that time, I have been interested in conducting the same type of research in law environments. Here is a basic overview of how to conduct a user experience study:

• Identify an issue with a website or library task.
• Create questions related to that issue.
• Focusing on those questions, create real world tasks (like specific catalog searches) for users to perform.
• Test the tasks and questions on student employees or staff to judge how realistic the tasks are and to see if you need to revise the questions.
• After making revisions, start “lobby testing.” Lobby testing is when a table is set up in the main area of the library, and you ask people to take a few minutes to participate in a series of tasks and answer questions. Unlike a survey, this experience is more interactive.
• Recruit about 6-8 participants per session. To make the sessions run more smoothly, two people should be helping with conducting the study: one to ask questions and engage the participant and the other to take notes.
• After collecting the data, compare task completion, comments, and answers to the questions between all participants. Try to find similarities and patterns related to your initial issue. Based on these patterns, identify two or three recommended changes to address the original issue.
• Write a brief report about your findings; focus on method, participants, conclusions, and recommendations. Share this report with colleagues and administrators.
• After sharing the report, work to implement the changes identified from the study.

User Experience studies offer a different approach to getting user feedback about library resources and services. Because they are task-based, the researcher collects information about observed behaviors as well as what the user actually says during talk-aloud task completion. I’ve listed below a few resources for learning more about library-based user experience:


I am very pleased to be writing the Serials Issues column of Technical Services Law Librarian (TSLL). I’ve been the Serials and Acquisitions Librarian at the Young Law Library since 2013, and I deal mainly with print materials. I also worked as a serials assistant at the David W. Mullins Library while I finished my MLIS, and I’ve had various responsibilities in technical services at the Young Law Library as an undergraduate and graduate student. I look forward to working on this column and learning a lot more along the way.

Literature Review: “The Promise of the Future: A Review of the Serials Literature, 2012-13,” by Paula Sullenger finds that the focus of research is on the challenges of handling electronic resources; print resources are hardly mentioned at all. Sullenger’s review covers pricing models, open access, electronic resource management and discovery, licensing, bibliographic control, usage and analysis, physical holdings, and shared print. The review is limited to research that deals specifically with the work of serials and electronic resources librarians. It’s a thorough look at issues faced by serials librarians.

Mapping Studies: Two articles in the current issue of Journal of the Medical Library Association discuss mapping studies. A mapping study is a type of review that does not focus on the findings of the research, but instead on the process of the research. For example, a mapping study would determine where research on a given topic took place or which journals published research related to that topic. Cooper defines “mapping study” and compares it to other types of reviews, and she then provides examples and a description of the process by way of a hypothetical topic. Perryman’s article focuses on the
Nursing and Allied Health Resources (NAHRS) protocols for conducting mapping studies. The discussion of the process is more in-depth and provides recommendations for ensuring quality. Looking over the NAHRS protocols may prove useful if there are no established protocols in your discipline. Mapping studies can identify trends and gaps in research, and libraries can use them to make informed collection decisions.

**Book Review:** A review of *Meaningful Metrics: A 21st-Century Librarian’s Guide to Bibliometrics, Altmetrics, and Research Impact* is available on *Library Babel Fish.* Presented in an interview-style between the reviewer and the book’s authors, Robin Chin Roemer and Rachel Borchardt, the book answers questions about: newer alternatives to Impact Factor; productivity over reflection; privacy concerns; and the potential of altmetrics in supporting 21st-century researchers, among others.

---


---

**Serials Titles**

Barbara Bohl
University of California, Berkeley

---

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

**Georgetown international environmental law review**
Ceased with: v. 27, no. 4 (fall 2015)
(OCoLC 17997905)
**Changed to:**
Georgetown environmental law review
2015-
(OCoLC 914233092)
Available online: [https://www.law.georgetown.edu/academics/law-journals/gielr](https://www.law.georgetown.edu/academics/law-journals/gielr). Also available via print on demand.

**Lesbian-gay law notes**
Ceased with: December 2015
(OCoLC 10938096)
**Changed to:**
LGBT law notes
January 2016-
(OCoLC 935720365)

**Marquette elder’s advisor**
Ceased with: v. 16, no. 1 (fall 2014)
(OCoLC 53838111)
**Changed to:**
Marquette benefits & social welfare law review
Vol 16, no. 2 (spring 2015)
(OCoLC 920910607)

**Michigan journal of private equity & venture capital law**
Ceased with: Vol. 3 (2013)
(OCoLC 80934210)
**Changed to:**
Michigan business & entrepreneurial law review
Vol. 4, no. 1 (fall 2014)-
(OCoLC 893981474)

**Newsquarterly / ABA Section of Taxation**
Ceased with: Vol. 34 (2015)
(OCoLC 50956285)
**Changed to:**
ABA tax times
Fall 2015-
(OCoLC 926103512)
[http://www.americanbar.org/groups/taxation/publications/abataxtimes_home.html](http://www.americanbar.org/groups/taxation/publications/abataxtimes_home.html)

**Sri Lanka journal of international law**
Ceased with: Vol. 23 (2011)
(OCoLC 20127729)
**Changed to:**
Sri Lanka journal of international & comparative law
Vol. 1 (2015)-
(OCoLC 911399483)

The University of California, Berkeley Law Library serials and acquisitions staff identified the following serial cessations:
The subject heading “Illegal aliens” continues to generate debate. Some places, such as the New York Times, have changed the term to “Undocumented immigrants” and have shunned the use of the term “illegal.” A summary of the current discussion of the subject heading “Illegal aliens” since the Library of Congress (LC) Policy and Standards Division’s (PSD) December 2014 decision on a change proposal might be helpful.

One needs to carefully read the December 15, 2014, Summary of Decisions, Editorial Meeting Number 12 discussion of “Undocumented immigrants [and five related proposals],” available at http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/saco/cpsoed/psd-141215.html. The U.S. Code, Title 8, Aliens and Nationality, uses the terminology “illegal aliens,” as does Black’s Law Dictionary, Ninth Edition. The decision also notes that “immigrant” is not an inherently legal term. It emphasizes the policy against mixing legal and non-legal headings. As much as we may dislike the term “alien,” it is part of U.S. law. Simplifying the law so that all persons understand and approve of all its terms would present a very large number of seemingly insurmountable challenges.

Further discussions have taken place on the Technical Services Special Interest Section’s (TS-SIS) Classification and Subject Cataloging Advisory Group (CSAG) listserv. It might have been helpful to copy and paste this discussion to Autocat, as the heading “Illegal aliens” may be more unpopular among catalogers generally than among law catalogers. TS-CSAG discussions considered the proposed headings “Undocumented immigrants” and “Undocumented aliens.” Some object to the term “undocumented” as vague and contend not all undocumented immigrants are necessarily in a particular nation illegally. An example of this would be most welcome. TS-CSAG also considered the heading “Unauthorized aliens” and finds it promising. The term “Non-citizen” or “Noncitizen” appears to be a possibility. “Noncitizen” is a See reference from the Library of Congress Subject Heading (LCSH) “Aliens.” It would require changes in many LC headings to bring this into use. Another possibility would be to create the heading “Immigrants – Legal status, laws, etc.” LC would have to remove the See reference to “Emigration and immigration law,” which seems like a good idea in any case because current practice requires use of a more general term where specific terms could be helpful. “Aliens – Legal status, laws, etc.” is another possibility.

All these questions and more are currently under consideration by the Association for Library Collections & Technical Services (ALCTS) Cataloging and Metadata Management Section (CaMMS) Subject Analysis Committee’s (SAC) working group on the subject heading “Illegal aliens.” It will be interesting to see if a new proposal comes out of the group’s endeavors.
We need to remember that our primary patrons are members of the legal profession: lawyers, judges, professors of law, and law students. “Illegal” may be vague and subject to replacement; “aliens” is a legal term that long predates Star Trek and the Men in Black films.

We may now use several new subject headings. LC approved “Race in mass media” and “Sexual minority political refugees.” We now use “Flight delays – Law and legislation” instead of “Liability for flight delays.” Other new headings include “Interfaith marriage – Law and legislation” and “Military offenses – Investigation.” “Trade regulation,” already a legal concept on its face, has a See From reference added: “Trade regulation – Law and legislation.” We now have “Chinese American business enterprises” and “Indians of South America – European influences.”

Report from the American Library Association (ALA) Cataloging and Metadata Management Section (CaMMS) Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) at the ALA Midwinter Meeting, Boston, January 2016

Lia Contursi
Columbia University

Presentation on FRBR-Library Reference Model (Kathy Glennan)

Kathy Glennan (ALA representative to the Resource Description and Access (RDA) Steering Committee) gave a presentation about the changes to the governance of the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA, which has been renamed the RDA Steering Committee (RSC). The changes will occur within a time frame of three years. By 2019, the RDA Board will have one representative for each international region, and each region will develop its own structure. The North American Region will comprise Canada and United States (ALA and Library of Congress (LC)). If they adopt RDA, the following countries will also be included: Bermuda, Greenland, and Saint Pierre and Miquelon. The North American Region will have only one representative in the hierarchical structure of RSC.

Kathy Glennan gave a separate presentation on the FRBR-Library Reference Model (FRBR-LRM), available at [http://connect.ala.org/files/FRBR-Library%20Reference%20Model-%20to%20SAC.pptx](http://connect.ala.org/files/FRBR-Library%20Reference%20Model-%20to%20SAC.pptx). She explained that the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) reviewed Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR), Functional Requirements for Authority Data (FRAD), and Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data (FRSAD)—all of which are conceptual entity-relationship models—and consolidated them into one unified model called FRBR-LRM, which will be ready for worldwide release by the end of 2016.

The new model proposes fundamental changes in the entity-relationship framework as we know it. The changes will reflect the new focus on library users’ tasks exclusively (FRAD includes library operation tasks). The new model’s tasks will be: Find, Identify, Select, Obtain, and Explore. FRBR-LRM will retain the three original divisions of Groups of Entities. Group 1 remains unchanged: Work, Expression, Manifestation, and Item. However, there will be fundamental changes to Group 2 and Group 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current entities of Group 2:</th>
<th>Proposed changes to entities of Group 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>AGENT (superclass subdivided in):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate body</td>
<td>1. Collective Agent (Families &amp; Corporate Bodies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current entities of Group 3 (the subjects of works):</th>
<th>Proposed changes to entities of Group 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Time-span</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such conceptual changes will redefine the hierarchies between entities and will influence their reciprocal relationships. The newly redefined entities of Place and Time-span will have a significant impact on RDA and will also cause the disappearance in the RDA Toolkit of Chapters 13, 14, 15, and 33-36, which now function as placeholders for the deprecated entities Concept, Object, and Event. Potentially, the developments of the new FRBR-LRM model will have an impact on the application of
Presentation on LC Demographic Group Terms by Janis Young, Policy and Standards Division Specialist, Library of Congress.

Janis Young (LC liaison to SAC) gave a very comprehensive presentation on LC Demographic Group Terms (LCDGT) called, “By Who and For Whom? LC Demographic Group Terms” (available at http://connect.ala.org/files/By%20Who%20and%20For%20Whom.pptx). The LC Policy and Standards Division (PSD) has approved 800 terms divided in 11 different categories: Age, Educational Level, Ethnic/Cultural, Gender, Language, Medical/Psychological/Disability, National/Regional, Occupation/Field of Activity, Religion, Sexual Orientation, and Social. The project is now in Phase 3, and PSD has started to accept proposals from Subject Authority Cooperative Program (SACO) members through the official proposal system and from non-SACO members through SurveyMonkey (survey available at http://www.surveymonkey.com/r/LCDGTProposals). PSD is only accepting new proposals; they will not consider proposals that are retrospective in nature.

Janis Young’s slides clearly explained the purpose and the application of the LCDGT, which indicate creators, contributors, and intended audiences of a resource. She described the dilemma PSD is currently facing when confronted with the disambiguation of local demonyms, which are terms that belong to the National/Regional category. Initially, PSD had established terms that identify residents or natives of Continents, Supra-national Regions, Countries, Sub-national Regions, and First-level Administrative subdivisions. Subsequently, PSD decided to include local demonyms that refer to residents of Cities and City-sections. This decision is posing a difficult challenge that needs to be resolved. In a thoughtful paper distributed in November 2015 (available at https://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/lcdgt-demonyms.pdf), PSD has fully explained the obstacles of establishing headings for local demonyms and has provided possible solutions. At the SAC meeting, Janis Young exhorted all the library communities to send comments to that discussion paper. After ALA Midwinter Meeting, our AALL Classification and Subject Cataloging Advisory Working Group (CSCAG) prepared a response to the paper on demonyms, which it sent to PSD on January 29, 2016. Please find the feedback submitted to PSD by CSCAG at the end of this report.

Report of the Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation.

They sent the draft of instructions sheets for a manual of genre/form headings to PSD in October 2015. In early January 2016, LC announced the posting of the preliminary version of the Genre/Form Terms Manual (available at http://www.loc.gov/aba/publications/FreeLCGFT/freelcgft.html). The manual includes the draft instruction sheet J230, Legislation and Legislative Histories. Members of CSCAG noted that there are some discrepancies between the document J230 and the Best Practices document edited and adopted by the law catalogers at the 2015 American Association Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting. Janis Young, member of PSD and liaison to SAC, reiterated LC has not finalized the Genre/Form Terms Manual and people can send revisions to PSD by May 31, 2016. CSCAG is currently reviewing the instruction sheet J230 and is in the process of submitting an updated version to PSD.

Discussion of Illegal Aliens subject headings by Tina Gross, member of SAC.

Tina Gross continued the discussion on the Library of Congress Subject Heading (LCSH) Illegal aliens. Many perceive this subject heading as pejorative and offensive. Tina offered more literary evidence in order to prove the need of an appropriate alternative. She expressed her doubt that a discussion within SAC might be productive or even useful and proposed forming a taskforce. SAC gave a unanimous approval of such taskforce, which will investigate whether SAC should make recommendations to LC to change LCSH Illegal aliens and whether the alternatives proposed so far are the best options.

Submitted on February 8, 2016.


1. Is it necessary that all demonyms, at any level of jurisdiction, be eligible for inclusion as authorized terms? Or would upward references be sufficient? Or do you disagree with the basic premise that demonyms for lower-level jurisdictions need to be included?

In general, law catalogers think that it is not necessary to create demonyms for lower-level jurisdictions. However, in those rare cases when it would be desirable to link a legal work to a particular audience and place or an author to a place, this should be limited to the authority records. We can apply the principle of deriving place and type of audience from authority records to all levels of jurisdictions, but we find that the use of local demonyms is particularly challenging and we should minimize it.
2. If you consider it necessary to allow all demonyms to be authorized terms, is it necessary to disambiguate among them (e.g., separate terms for Parisians from Paris, France, and Paris, Texas)? If the project of establishing local demonyms will move forward, we believe we will need to separately disambiguate all demonyms.

3. Would post-coordination in bibliographic records and authority records for works and expressions be a workable solution? That is, local place names would not be disambiguated and would be assigned in conjunction with a demonym for the ADM1-level jurisdiction or country, as appropriate. The adoption of a post-coordination method in bibliographic and authority records could be effective for the most common demonyms, but it may lead to great confusion and possible errors for the lesser-known ones.

4. How closely should parenthetical qualifiers for demonyms adhere to the authorized Name Authority File (NAF) form of place name? Are any of the ideas for parenthetical qualifiers presented in the body of the paper acceptable? The parenthetical qualifiers should not adhere to the form of place name in NAF, especially when considering geographic abbreviations may disappear in the future and the relationships between smaller and larger places may change.

5. If you think that the [place] residents terms for local places should be disambiguated, do you prefer a parenthetical qualifier (e.g., Fairfax County residents (Fairfax County, Virginia)), or an internal qualifier (Fairfax County, Virginia, residents)? The use of an internal qualifier to disambiguate local places is more desirable.

6. Should qualifiers for places in the United States, Canada, and Australia include the name of the country? The qualifiers of places within the U.S., Canada, and Australia do not need to include the country, even though this may reveal a partiality of the Anglophone community.

7. Should conflict be anticipated (i.e., demonyms for all places at the ADM1 level and below would be qualified when first proposed), or should conflict be limited to LCDGT (existing terms would be qualified only as necessary when proposals for new terms create conflict situations in LCDGT)? We should definitely anticipate conflicts.

8. If you think conflict should be limited to LCDGT, what are your thoughts on providing context for the term? That is, how would we make it clear that Brandenburgers refers to residents of the state and not the city, or vice versa? We should always anticipate conflicts. Applying the correct qualifier or set of hierarchical qualifiers would provide context, thus clarifying what a particular demonym represents. Context and clarity are essential in equal measure for the users who execute the search and for the catalogers who need to apply the demonyms correctly.

While the use of demonyms may be very useful for the catalogers of most disciplines in the humanities, establishing local demonyms presents a real challenge and may not be cost-effective. However, if we must use them, perhaps choosing the form [Place] resident would be the most efficient solution, even though it is not the most elegant.
(ILL) reports, and lists of financial donors. Results indicate that gift books do circulate and required reading lists can be helpful in gift book selection.

**ALCTS e-Forum: How Library Technical Services Can Support OER Initiatives**

The American Library Association’s (ALA) technical services division, the Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS), periodically hosts e-forums (available at http://www.ala.org/alcts/confevents/upcoming/e-forum), which are “two-day, moderated, electronic discussion forums that provide an opportunity for librarians to discuss matters of interest on an ALCTS discussion list.” A recent e-forum held January 26-27, 2016, dealt with the topic of technical services and open educational resources (OER) initiatives.

If you are not familiar with the concept of OER, the OER Commons website (available at https://www.oercommons.org/) is a great place to get more information. According to their “About” page (available at https://www.oercommons.org/about), Open Educational Resources (OER) are teaching and learning materials that you may freely use and reuse at no cost. Unlike fixed, copyrighted resources, OER have been authored or created by an individual or organization that chooses to retain few, if any, ownership rights. In some cases, that means you can download a resource and share it with colleagues and students. In other cases, you may be able to download a resource, edit it in some way, and then re-post it as a remixed work. How do you know your options? OER often have a Creative Commons or GNU license to let you know how the material may be used, reused, adapted, and shared.

OER Commons collects resources such as this and makes them freely available to educators. Their resources reflect a number of subjects, including law (available at https://www.oercommons.org/browse?f.general_subject=law).

There are, of course, other legal open educational resources, such as CALI’s Free Law Reporter (available at http://www.freelawreporter.org/) and Harvard’s Free the Law initiative (available at http://librarylab.law.harvard.edu/projects/free-the-law). OER initiatives could have a big impact on law librarianship, and the ALCTS e-forum provided interesting insight into the role of technical services staff in these initiatives.

To participate in an ALCTS e-forum, you must sign up for their e-mail discussion list. Once you are a subscriber, you can also read the archives of previous discussions, like this one on OER. Instructions for subscribing to the list and managing your subscription settings are available on the ALCTS website at http://www.ala.org/alcts/confevents/upcoming/e-forum/sympa.

**Cataloging**

Steve Coffman, “The Cloud: One Catalog to Serve Them All”

*Online Searcher, November/December 2015: 38-51.*

As a whole, public libraries are the single largest supplier of books in the United States. But you’d never know it to look at them on the web. Although most public libraries carry popular titles, often no library sites come up in a first page of search results. This article proposes a universal catalog in which all libraries and booksellers participate, called the “Cloud Catalog.”

**Government Documents**

Government Publications in the Digital World: Enhancements, Changes, Partnerships and More

*Thomas and Congress.gov*

As THOMAS works its way towards its retirement, the Library of Congress (LC) is making a wide variety of enhancements to congress.gov in order to make the transition between resources as seamless and painless as possible for users. The latest set of enhancements includes a new quick search for legislation, the Congressional Record Index, and the history of bills from the Congressional Record Index, featuring search functionality similar to the “Advanced Legislation” search provided on THOMAS. To view a complete round-up of the latest enhancements to the congress.gov site, as well as a refresher on earlier enhancements you may have missed throughout the year, check out the LC blog, available at http://blogs.loc.gov/law/2015/12/new-end-of-year-congress-gov-enhancements-quick-search-congressional-record-index-and-more/?loclr=twlaw.

*United States Government Publishing Office (GPO)*

GPO is the first federal agency to become a member of the Technical Report Archive & Image Library (TRAIL). For those not familiar with TRAIL, it consists of approximately three dozen member groups, mainly federal depository libraries. TRAIL works to provide discoverable, permanent, and unrestricted access to U.S. Government agency technical reports. Obviously, these two groups share a number of common goals, and the stage is set for some major collaboration. To learn more about this partnership or TRAIL itself, start out with the official press release, available at https://www.gpo.gov/newsroom-media/presspage/15presspage27.
Circular A-130 & The White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB)

The public comment period recently closed on Circular A-130, “Managing Information in Strategic Decision Making” (available at https://a130.cio.gov/). This document establishes policies for the management of federal information resources; incidentally, if approved this would be the first update to the document in 15 years.

Imagine how much statutory requirements and technological capabilities have expanded and changed since 2000. At this point, our nation needs guidelines and policies to ensure the protection of our privacy and to maximize the ability to harness the power of today’s technology. In early December 2015, the Director of the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Shaun Donovan, delivered remarks at the Federal Privacy Summit and discussed the driving forces behind revising Circular A-130: “As technology and threats evolve, so must our policies. In order to meet today’s complex challenges, we must continue to double down on this Administration’s broad strategy to enhance privacy practices and fundamentally overhaul information security practices, policies, and governance” (available at https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2015/12/01/prepared-remarks-omb-director-shaun-donovan-federal-privacy-summit).

The new A-130 centralizes a wide range of policy updates on acquisitions, cybersecurity, information governance, records management, open data, and privacy; replaces a federated procurement approach with more directed guidance and ensured timeliness in IT acquisitions; delineates the responsibilities of various departments when it comes to securing our federal systems; and mandates government data that is public-facing be accessible, discoverable, and of usable quality.

While the public comment period is closed, rest assured that the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) did weigh in on the comments. AALL comments are available at http://www.aallnet.org/Documents/Government-Relations/Formal-Statements/2015/comments112515.pdf and at http://www.aallnet.org/Documents/Government-Relations/Formal-Statements/2015/lt112515.pdf. Currently, the OMB is analyzing all submitted feedback and revising the policy as necessary. Stay tuned in the coming months for the revised version of the policy, as well as an opportunity to comment on Circular A-108, which should help agencies promote transparency in and implement the Privacy Act.

Information Technology

Mashcat: Catalogers and Developers Working Together

If you are interested in the intersection of library catalog data and library computer systems, then the Mashcat movement is for you (information available at http://www.mashcat.info/). To quote their website,

“Mashcat” was originally an event in the UK in 2012 which was aimed at bringing together people working on the IT systems side of libraries with those working in cataloguing and metadata. Three years later, Mashcat is a loose group of metadata specialists, cataloguers, developers and anyone else with an interest in how metadata in and around libraries can be created, manipulated, used and re-used by computers and software. The aim is to work together and bridge the communications gap that has sometimes gotten in the way of building the best tools we possibly can to manage library data.

Most of the time, Mashcat exists mainly as a product of social media, which uses the hashtag #mashcat. There is also a monthly (approximately) Twitter chat, available at http://www.mashcat.info/twitter-chat/.

The first ever North American Mashcat event was held on January 13, 2016 (timed to coincide with the ALA Midwinter Meeting). A list of the events of the day and slides for most of the presentations are available on the Mashcat website, available at http://www.mashcat.info/2016-event/.

Don’t Forget to Tell a Story: New Ideas on Presenting Effectively Using Data Visualizations, Infographics, and More

Anyone who knows me knows I’m all about that data. With an educational background focused in mathematics and statistics, I find numbers thrilling and graphical and pictorial representations of them nothing short of magic. And yes, contemplating the scope and power of big data makes me a little weak in the knees. But I know that at least half (or more?) of the library profession approaches these topics with a more practical mentality—with a little less “starry-eyed wonder” than I and maybe even tinged with confusion and/or fear.

No matter what side of the spectrum you land on, it’s undeniable that data visualizations and infographics are powerful tools in your arsenal of “storytelling.” which is so essential to proving your value to leadership, stakeholders, administrators, patrons, co-workers, and more. This storytelling helps educate your audience on who you are, what you do, what services you provide, and how these are valuable to them.
So, I’ve described below a few links I’ve run across recently that could help you tell your own story in some new ways, which are as visually appealing as they are effective.

First up is a post from LAC Group entitled “We Help You Find Information – Now Some Data Visualization Tips to Present It” (available at https://lac-group.com/we-help-you-find-information-now-some-data-visualization-tips-to-present-it/), which offers a variety of resources and suggestions for data visualization. These are tailored for all audiences, including those with scarce graphical design resources and those limited to PowerPoint software. Check it out for a few tips and tricks, as well as a collection of curated links to resources offering basic data visualization advice and inspirational ideas and videos.

One of the LAC Group’s tips is to avoid overwhelming your audience with too much information; instead, focus on adding meaning and context to the right information. Jeff Bennion at Above the Law echoes this in his recent post, “How to Present Beautiful Evidence” (available at http://abovethelaw.com/2016/02/how-to-present-beautiful-evidence/?rf=1), in which he offers litigators ways to more effectively present evidence to their audience. The tips he offers resonate to librarians, who are presenting “evidence” of their services and their value to educate a variety of audiences. Bennion encourages you to kill the bullet-point approach and, instead, present your data in well-designed graphics.

So how to get these well-designed graphics? Well, if you’ve got Office 2016, you have access to a set of new charts that could help you with your storytelling. Take a closer look at the Office Blog’s recent post called “3 New Ways to Drive Business Decisions Using the New Excel 2016 Charts” (available at https://blogs.office.com/2016/02/04/3-ways-to-drive-business-decisions-using-the-new-excel-2016-charts/). They walk you through a few ways these charts can help you visualize gains and losses, show relationships between your data, and illustrate statistical patterns.

If you’re looking for infographics instead of traditional Excel charts, HubSpot has a current offer for 15 free infographic templates in PowerPoint, plus five bonus templates for Illustrator (available at http://offers.hubspot.com/how-to-create-infographics-in-powerpoint). These fully customizable templates will help give you some inspiration, along with a foundation to build upon on your own infographics directly in PowerPoint or Illustrator. Yes, it is absolutely free (if you are amenable to their privacy policy and fill out their fairly brief form, that is).

And if you don’t have a pile of data on hand, but you still want a chance to break your bad habits and introduce a little more pizzazz into your presentations, check out Kris Turner’s post on the RIPS Law Librarian Blog, “Presenting….Five Alternatives to PowerPoint” (available at https://ripslawlibrarian.wordpress.com/2016/02/01/presenting-five-alternatives-to-powerpoint). Turner lists five solid alternatives to PowerPoint that are definitely not Prezi—see if there’s something new to you. I’m looking forward to exploring EMaze myself! (Available at https://www.emaze.com/).

**Management**

**New Year, New Resources for Library Managers**

With 2016 now upon us, it seemed like a great time to scan the blogosphere and see what new posts and resources are out there that might help library managers increase both their own and their team’s effectiveness in the New Year!

**Training and Professional Development**

Tami Schiller offers a few tips on how to make 2016 a year of professional development and highlights some new and different approaches to learning (available at http://www.tutorpro.com/3-things-you-can-do-to-build-your-skills-in-2016/). Incorporate these tips into your new year, not only for your own growth, but for your employees’ growth as well. Her third tip, exploring at least one new training method this year with a pilot group, is a great opportunity for the library as a whole—pick a single topic relevant to their work and get moving. Tami provides links to additional posts detailing methods such as microlearning, formative assessment, and blended learning.

**Inspiration**

Need some quick and easy daily inspiration? Click over to Founder Mantras (available at http://foundermantras.com/) for your daily dose of mantras, quotes, and words to live by for founders, by founders. You can even add your own mantra to the list. For instance, on January 11, 2016, Alex Blumberg of Gimlet Media reminds us that “The first draft always sucks” (available at http://foundermantras.com/2016-01-11).

**Written Communication**

Speaking of first drafts, how often are you charged with creating an “official communication” from the library? Do you delegate this task, or do you take it on yourself? And how do you make sure that communications coming out of your library
resonate and bring the essence of your library to life through text? Some tips from Ryan LeClaire on writing with your
brand’s voice that may help you do just that are available at http://www.webdesignerdepot.com/2015/12/how-to-write-with-
your-brands-voice/. A key piece of this, especially for libraries, is understanding your customers themselves and telling
them what they want to hear in a way that reaches them. Having a relationship with your patron base and capitalizing on
the things you’ve learned about your patrons through this relationship is integral to your success!

Negotiating Contracts
We all know that walking away from a contract negotiation with a vendor is not always a realistic option in the library world,
which can often make you feel as though you’re powerless to affect the final outcome. However, Susannah Tredwell offers
librarians some advice on approaching negotiations you can’t walk away from, while still getting a result you’re happy with
(available at http://www.slaw.ca/2016/01/04/negotiating-contracts-not-fun-but-necessary/). With tangible questions to ask
yourself in preparation, important amendments you may be able to incorporate into your deal, and links to further reading,
this is a great resource to start your 2016 negotiations off on the right foot!

Faculty Orientation
Academic law libraries have regular influxes of new students, so year after year, student orientation remains a hot topic.
However, in this case, here’s some advice on something a little different—new faculty orientation. Tena Long Golding offers
a more interactive spin on the traditional talking head presentations by librarians, especially for dry topics such a syllabi and
policy statements. Their group created a video of student responses to questions such as “What one word describes a great
professor?” and “What advice would you give a new professor?” After the video, they continue the conversation using the
natural segue to key elements on a course syllabus. In Long’s own words, “What used to be a session of reading through
the requirements is now more of an open discussion on creative ways to communicate expectations and engage with our
students” (available at http://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/faculty-development/new-faculty-orientation-features-advice-
from-students/).

Collaboration
Let’s finish things out with a few links devoted to collaboration. We can all sing the praises of collaboration—coming
together often leads to new ideas, better ways of doing things, shared workloads, and more. But what about the darker side
of collaboration? Nick Milton recently wrote a piece stating that “Not all collaboration is good—some of it is a waste of
time or creator of unneeded confusion” (available at http://www.nickmilton.com/2016/01/too-much-collaboration.html).
To support this, he links to a recent article in the Harvard Business Review, which points out that usually only a handful of
employees carry the full collaborative load, and as a result, they become overloaded and disengaged (available at https://
hbr.org/2016/01/collaborative-overload). As managers, you have the ability to identify overloaded collaborators, to try to
shift their burdens, and to find ways to reward them for their efforts. Also, when assigning collaborative projects and roles,
don’t forget that increased headcount on a project doesn’t necessarily give you greater returns. Need proof? Casey Flaherty
makes some great points in his recent post that deserve a closer look. He says it best in his post tagline, “Nine Women
Can’t Make a Baby in One Month” (available at http://www.geeklawblog.com/2016/01/throwing-bodies-at-problem.html).
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A more modern, and troubling, example is British Somaliland, which dissolved into the current Republic of Somalia. The
colonial jurisdiction classes in KQP; however, its cities and towns class with the modern Somalia in KTK (a pattern found
elsewhere, the local places in extinct jurisdictions class only with the current number for the place). The complication
is that some Somalis are trying to re-establish a separate jurisdiction in what was British Somaliland (NAF: Somaliland
(Secessionist government, 1991- )). So far, the Library of Congress (LC) hasn’t received any law books from there, so they
haven’t addressed the K-class question yet. To handle this, one option would be to re-open KQP, and another would be to
establish a new range, and a third would be to establish the “separate” jurisdiction as a part of the “official” Somalia. Most
likely, the State Department’s official position will determine the decision.

So, the “rule” is if a jurisdiction stays intact and changes its name, then the classification accommodates the new name with a
change in caption, but the numbers stay the same. On the other hand, if it is determined that a jurisdiction is extinct, then the
numbers for the extinct jurisdiction are not used for a successor; instead, LC establishes new numbers for the jurisdictions
(usually more than one) that are carved out of the extinct jurisdiction, with appropriate references.

If only it was really that simple.
For starters, LC doesn’t recognize some extinct jurisdictions under descriptive rules, and the references point users to modern jurisdictions with perhaps only a tenuous connection, legally and historically, to the extinct jurisdiction. The Ottoman Empire was a very large multi-ethnic state extending over much of western Asia and northern Africa. However, the NAF has a Use For (UF) to Turkey, and there isn’t so much as a caption in KXX telling where to class Ottoman law, though catalogers have consistently classed works on Ottoman law in KXX as Turkish law rather than in KMC for Middle Eastern law. Similarly, the NAF and LCSH recognize the existence of the “Holy Roman Empire” (the one Voltaire purportedly said was neither holy, nor Roman, nor an Empire), but it classes in KK290+ (under German law), even though it appears that catalogers class some materials in KKK under Austrian law (since by its end, it was the de facto Austrian Empire). While the NAF recognized the “Austro-Hungarian Monarchy,” LCSH says to use “Austria,” and nothing in KKK indicates where the laws of that empire class. Further, it appears that catalogers tend to class works on the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Austria Empire, and the Holy Roman Empire during the early modern period under Austria; however, that is a result of catalogers’ judgments and not anything written in the schedules. In these cases, catalogers could address the problem with country-specific (“exception”) captions to the history number in European table governing both countries (in “KJ-KKZ1 120”).

Political perceptions (i.e., varying standards of whatever passes for being “politically correct” at the time, sometimes including complaints from the country involved) have resulted in various inconsistencies. For example, British India classes in KNS, along with the current and much smaller Republic of India. The schedules for Pakistan and other former parts of the “Raj” class separately, leading to interesting problems when dealing with their legal history. Interestingly, the British mandate in Palestine, which was partitioned at roughly the same time as British India broke up, is an extinct jurisdiction with its own numbers at KMQ1001-1499; these are distinct both from the numbers of the jurisdictions that replaced it and the numbers from the post-breakup region encompassing the same territory. Czechoslovakia (KJP1-4999) and the Soviet Union (included in KLA with imperial Russia), which also split up during the 20th century, are extinct; this means legal literature on the post-breakup countries classes differently than the extinct pre-breakup regime. For these countries, there are excellent notes in the schedule. However, for many smaller countries, one needs to consult the references in the name authorities (which may reflect a different take on the matter) or reference sources.

Whether a regime change results in a new classification should, in theory, reflect changes in borders and continuity of legal systems, but this is not always the case. England before and after the Norman Conquest is in the same schedule and with the same headings. Almost all European colonies are in the same schedule before and after they gained independence, unless the boundaries significantly changed. American states have the same numbers for their pre-statehood periods, even if the boundaries were radically different, such as for New York, Virginia, or Texas. The exception is Hawaii, whose pre-statehood number is in KJY. In almost all cases, the NAF (governed by Resource Description and Access (RDA), which in turns governs LCSH) ignores regime change even when the changes were quite radical, such as for the Republic of Texas or the Kingdom of Hawaii. There is an exception for “New York (Colony),” which is a valid descriptive though not a subject heading, perhaps to distinguish it from “New Netherland,” which was a much larger jurisdiction that is classed with New York State in KFN by cataloging tradition rather than by explicit instruction.

And of course there are exceptions. When Hong Kong changed from a British colony to a Chinese “special administrative region,” rather than changing the captions and indentations, the 500-number common law schedule in KNR was treated as an extinct jurisdiction, and Hong Kong law was henceforth put in a 100-number table at KNO9301-9399. The breakup of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia resulted in setting up new ranges for what were then newly independent countries (albeit with largely unchanged borders and government continuity), in part because it would have been difficult to provide adequate ranges in their former schedules. The former Yugoslav republics were each in 100-number tables not designed for independent countries, and many of the former Soviet Republics were in the Afro-Asian schedules, even though the countries were clearly in Europe. For a variety of reasons, the NAF reflects the regime change for Hong Kong, whereas it does not for the names for the former Yugoslav and Soviet republics (the former names being UF references to the current name).

Catalogers apparently class many extinct jurisdictions inconsistently because there is no explicit instruction on where to class them (e.g., New Spain). Especially for provinces, it is often easier to squeeze them into an existing number rather than to research what is happening politically in what is to most American catalogers a very remote part of the world.

One solution is for catalogers working with historical materials to not be content with fitting a resource into an existing number, caption, or heading, but instead, they should change the authority records and amend captions (or add numbers) to reflect the resource they are cataloging. At one time, checking the history of a jurisdiction required walking to an encyclopedia and a historical atlas, but now only a few clicks can clarify if one is dealing with a name change, a regime change, a boundary change, or a brand new or totally defunct jurisdiction. While there is a need to clarify the rules (and coordinate LCC with LCSH and RDA), which requires policy-level action, individual catalogers need to pay attention to history and current affairs and to make proposals if something doesn’t look right. (This is a plug for the Subject Authority
Cooperative Program (SACO) and the Name Authority Cooperative Program (NACO), or at least to contact someone at LC. If LC has already changed the name authority, then one can probably amend an existing caption without a formal proposal.

This article expresses my personal views and is obviously not a statement of official LC policy.