Catalogs as Big Data for Nineteenth-Century Publishers’ Series

Katie McGettigan
Royal Holloway, University of London

Editor’s note: This column was published in the American Antiquarian Society’s Past is Present blog on November 1, 2016. Although it does not discuss legal information, I found it interesting showing how scholars can use the MARC data in their research. We wonder how the work we do benefits scholars and researchers—this column shows us some of the possibilities. This is being reprinted with the permission of the American Antiquarian Society (http://www.americanantiquarian.org) and Dr. McGettigan.

Katie McGettigan is a lecturer in American literature at Royal Holloway, University of London. Her first book, Herman Melville: Modernity and the Material Text, is forthcoming from the University Press of New England, and she is working on a study of the publication of American literature in England, 1830-1860, funded by the Leverhulme Trust. Dr. McGettigan attended the American Antiquarian Society’s Digital Antiquarian conference and workshop in the summer of 2015.

Of all the things that I gained from attending the American Antiquarian Society’s (AAS) Digital Antiquarian workshop in 2015, a fascination with MAchine Readable Catalog (MARC) records was definitely the most unexpected. The workshop’s sessions on digging into and manipulating MARC records sowed the seeds of a research project that will, I hope, shed light on a neglected publishing genre of the nineteenth century.

Before attending the workshop, I’d given little thought to how a book is cataloged. I learnt that a cataloger enters information about the book in MARC format, breaking down its different attributes into individual fields: for example, the 100 field contains information about the author, and the 260 field contains publication information. Kathleen Haley, the AAS systems librarian, showed us that by downloading MARC records from the AAS catalog and loading them into MARCEdit, we could conduct more complex searches than were possible through the online catalog alone. She also showed us how these records could
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be exported into a Comma Separated Value (CSV) spreadsheet file for data analysis (there’s a great tutorial video on Past is Present if you want to try this yourself: http://www.pastispresent.org/2015/digital-humanities-2/convert-marc-records-to-a-spreadsheet-a-screencast-tutorial/).

The workshop set me thinking about problems I was having in researching publishers’ series as part of a project on the publication of American literature in Victorian Britain. Publishers’ series consist of volumes by different authors, issued by a single publisher under a general series title, often in a uniform format. It was a popular form of cheap publishing in the nineteenth century, and famous British and American examples include George Routledge’s “Railway Library,” published from 1849, and Harper Brothers’ “Family Library,” which grew to two hundred titles. British publishers often turned to American titles to fill their series because their U.S. copyrights did not apply overseas. George Slater, a London publisher who specialized in cheap print, reprinted Margaret Fuller’s Woman in the Nineteenth Century in his “Shilling Series” in 1850, following it with a volume on needlework.

While there were thousands of series published in the nineteenth century, trying to find which titles they included can be tricky. There are detailed and extensive catalogs of fiction series by successful publishers like Routledge, but these don’t exist for smaller publishers like Slater, and non-fiction series. Searching library catalogs for these smaller series is challenging because many catalogs don’t allow searching by series title only by the title of the text or the author (AAS helpfully catalogs publishers’ series separately: http://www.americanantiquarian.org/pubseries.htm). The Workshop showed me that downloading and searching MARC records directly could help me to locate more series titles, but I also wondered whether MARC records could be used as a dataset to enhance our picture of publishing in the nineteenth century.

Returning to the UK, I began to collaborate with Dr. Paul Rooney, an historian of British and Irish publishing at the National University of Ireland, Galway, on how we might use library metadata to fill gaps in our knowledge of nineteenth-century series. Helpfully for us, MARC records contain a field for “Series Statement” in field 490; if a title is published as part of a series and the cataloger includes that information, it should have an entry here. We thought that pulling MARC records of titles with a 490 entry, published between 1800 and 1900, would create an alternative dataset of publishers’ series that would allow us to explore trends at a much larger scale than individual series or publishers. We could chart, for example, whether certain authors tended to cluster together in series and how titles moved through different genres of series as the century progressed.

We received help from a Data Driven Discovery Grant from Nottingham University, and from the British Library Labs team, who gave us access to the catalog records for the library’s 1.8 million nineteenth-century titles in MARCXML format. We put these records into a MYSQL database, which we then queried for all titles published in London with an entry in the 490 field. Because this also gave us other types of publications in series (law reports, sheet music, parliamentary papers), we manually extracted these using data cleaning software called Open Refine, which also allowed us to regularize variations in, for example, the names of publishing houses.
Comparing our dataset to what we knew of the Victorian publishing landscape revealed a lot of publications missing. We’d been relying on the cataloging being consistent and complete, but information about the series title might not have been included when the book was first cataloged, or might have been entered in a different part of the MARC record when catalog cards were digitized. To compensate for this, we revised our query to search for known titles in other parts of the MARC record (series information is often in the 500 “notes” field), and we’re working on refining our searches further. But there will also be books that aren’t in the British Library, which is why we hope to collaborate with other libraries and introduce their records into our dataset. But our research thus far is a reminder that working with library records reveals as much about collecting and cataloging priorities as publication history.

Nevertheless, we have started thinking about how to analyse the data we have produced. We are experimenting with network graphs of authors whose works were issued by the same publisher, or in the same series; this works best for fiction titles, which were often reprinted in several series. From the early graphs that we’ve produced, distinct groupings of authors are emerging. Eighteenth-century authors, whose works were out of copyright, tend to cluster together, as do authors of contemporary fiction. This suggests that publishers specialized in particular types of fiction series, offering either classic titles or the latest productions. Some authors, like Daniel Defoe, connect both groupings, pointing to the appearance of Robinson Crusoe in series aimed at many different audiences. These results are, of course, skewed by cataloging priorities. Our database queries returned large numbers of titles by writers like Charles Dickens and Thomas Hardy, whose canonical status means that more care is likely to be taken with the cataloging of their work; this might lead to them seeming more well-connected in author networks than they actually were. As we add more library records, we expect our groupings of authors to shift.

As we grow our dataset, we hope that our digital approach will further illuminate how Victorian publishers constructed their series, and how this publication genre evolved across the century. As I learned from my week with AAS catalogers, we must also remain mindful of the decades of work that went into creating this big data for the nineteenth-century book. Like any work that spans time and place, inconsistencies are inevitable, and we must account for them as we analyse and interpret our findings.
From the Chair

Technical Services
Special Interest Section

Like most of you no doubt do, as we contemplate the end of 2016, I have a lot of different things on my mind. In this column, I want to focus on a few ongoing issues before our Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) through the lens of dollars and cents.

As a section, we receive a portion of the annual dues each of you (or your institution) pays for your TS-SIS membership. I believe TS leadership has a strong history of trying to be good stewards of those funds, attempting to expend them in ways that will benefit its membership.

As I have written on the TS “My Communities” list, we are still in the process of trying to come up with a long-term, sustainable solution to the issue of funding the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) representatives to the three cataloging and metadata-related committees: Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), MARC Advisory Committee (MAC), and Subject Analysis Committee (SAC). While I wish this was all settled in a way that will sustain the work of our representatives for the longer term, I am encouraged that leaders outside of our own SIS are willing to work on this issue and have expressed their support for this important work. On its November conference call, the TS Executive Board agreed to authorize up to $1,000 (one-time) this fiscal year to support our representatives while we work on a longer-term solution to their support. Our representatives, Robert Bratton, Lia Contursi, and Jean Pajerek, do important work, and we would like to have that work continue on our behalf.

One area we have given additional support to in recent years is funding our members’ attendance at the AALL Annual Meeting and (possibly) other events. As we know, attendance at the Annual Meeting is getting more and more costly, and members sometimes find it difficult to be able to afford to go if institutional support lags. So, in addition to the Marla Schwartz Grant discussed below, we have committed to grants for AALL Annual Meeting attendance to a new member, an experienced member, and an active member. To encourage the development of leadership and management skills among our members, we also provide, in alternate years, grants to attend AALL’s Leadership Academy or Management Institute.

Finally, we are trying something a bit different this year with regard to the Marla Schwartz Grant to support newer members or graduate students attending AALL-sponsored educational events related to technical services. In the past, we have raised funds for it through the silent auction (held at the TS-SIS table in the AALL Annual Meeting’s exhibit hall) and through an online auction. This year, in conjunction with Giving Tuesday on November 29, we encouraged our members to donate either via the AALL website or via mail. Hopefully, you have seen the emails from our Member-at-Large, Carol Collins! If you have made a donation already, thank you! If you haven’t had a chance yet, please consider donating before the end of the year. We have over 550 current TS-SIS members. If even 10-20% of our members contribute $20 each, that’s a nice amount of income to help support up and coming technical services professionals—the future of our little corner of law librarianship, as well as the larger profession.

Online donations for the Marla Schwartz Grant can be made at https://www.aallnet.org/assn/member/contribution.aspx (login required).

You can also make a mail contribution using the form found at http://www.aallnet.org/Documents/Giving-Opportunities/giving-opp-mail.pdf. If you choose that route, please inform our Secretary/Treasurer, Diana Jaque (djaque@law.usc.edu).

Thank you for your continued membership in TS-SIS. My sincerest best wishes to each and every one of you for the remainder of 2016 and for 2017.

Eric Parker
Northwestern University
Is It Time to Untether Technical Services Librarians?

With the ease of access to information in the online environment, the role of the legal information professional is being redefined in the information-seeking process. As the world shrinks, we have expanded our law library collections exponentially. Although there are various types of law libraries, they all serve a population that requires a considerable amount of value-added or interpreted information in order to make a decision or solve a problem.

Despite the tremendous changes in how we conduct legal research online, legal researchers are unable to search content managed by the library effectively and efficiently. Critics continue to complain that the legal academy and the profession need to improve targets and outcomes of mission-critical services (see, e.g., the MacCrate Report, Educating Lawyers: Preparations for the Profession of Law, Report of the Outcome Measures Committee, among others).

The library and information science studies by Lev Vygotsky and Carol Kuhlthau offer a potential framework for technical services librarians to engage in an open-ended conversation regarding the use of the Zones of Proximal Development and the Zones of Interventions theories to encourage experimentation in the expansion of our role in the profession. The thinking process in interpreting and connecting disparate pieces of information in the research process is complex. By using a legal information team that includes a technical services librarian as an integral member of the team, the researcher’s perspective of the information search process would be vastly improved in the learning and work environments.

I hope by now I have raised more questions in the minds of my colleagues that will lead to exploring and experimenting with some of the learning theories from other disciplines. Technical services librarians are experts in managing content in our libraries. Considering the pressures and challenges in the workplace today, there is an opportunity—a zone of intervention—for technical services librarian to redefine their role and enable legal researchers to do with professional advice what they are unable to do alone!

Marjorie Crawford  
Rutgers University

Fear of Commitments: An Acquisitions Librarian’s Troubled Relationship with Standing Orders

At some point or another, every acquisitions librarian has experienced a fear of commitments. Establishing a healthy relationship with encumbrances or commitments for a library budget is no easy task because future spending can be uncertain.

We can fairly easily project subscription costs for periodicals and databases based on previous year expenditures, economic conditions, and national price indexes such as the Consumer Price Index, Library Journal Periodicals Price Survey, and The Library and Book Trade Almanac (formerly The Bowker Annual). With the exception of shipping fees, we can also predict costs for firm orders. Standing orders or continuations are the unknown factor and where the fear strikes. These can arrive as part of a monographic series, analyzed titles, periodic supplementation such as for multi-volume sets published over time, or new editions of publications. The question is, how can something unpredictable be predicted? The short answer is, not easily. It is this unknown that strikes fear in an acquisitions librarian. Aside from budget cuts, projecting costs for standing orders remains one of our most difficult tasks. (For the purposes of this article, I am using the terms standing order and continuation interchangeably.)

One example in our own library was a recent receipt of LexisNexis’ Shepard’s New York Court of Appeals Citations, 8th edition. Our library pays annually for supplementation (12 issues per year) at a cost of about $1,200. We update each edition of this publication with the aforementioned monthly cumulative supplements, which bound volumes replace from time to
time. This new 8th edition (2016), issued in 23 volumes, cost over $10,000. Previous editions were the 7th ed. (2004), 6th ed. (1993), 5th ed. (1987), and 4th ed. (1972). Clearly, there is no discernible pattern of publication for new editions issued under this title. We usually pay for subscriptions once a year for a predetermined period of time, say January through December; by contrast, we generally pay for standing orders or continuations per item as the publisher releases them. Some standing orders have an established frequency of publication, while others do not. They may be published multiple times per year, once a year, every few years, or any combination of these, as in the above example. For this reason, establishing encumbrances or commitments for standing orders can be both tricky and anxiety-inducing.

As with any fear, the best way to tackle it is to try to understand it better. Following are steps we can all take to ameliorate the fear of commitments when it comes to continuations.

Step 1, clearly differentiate between subscriptions and standing orders. In his article “Hunting in the Shadows for Savings: Reevaluating Standing Orders,” Roger L. Cross asserts “the shadowy dual-nature of standing orders means that tracking them down and evaluating their role in the collection is initially very labor intensive” (92). To begin this discovery, some pertinent questions to ask are:

1. Are we billed for a predetermined amount of time or per receipt?
2. Are we billed regularly or on an irregular basis?

Review the order records of all continuations to determine whether or not there is a clear pattern of billing. For those with a pattern, you would likely be able to predict monthly expenditures throughout the year, which would then help you in establishing encumbrances. Is the invoice issued every year during the same month or couple of months? In our library, we use a fixed field in the order record to indicate the renewal/billing month for each continuation title on order, while we mark those paid at various times throughout the year as “multiple payments.” We code those with no pattern as “irregular.” Most integrated library systems (ILS) will allow the user to run a report based on fixed fields. You could then run a report on those records with multiple payments throughout the year to gauge the average spending for those titles over a three-to five-year period. Depending on the ILS, you may even be able to narrow down the information to provide an average dollar amount per month based on invoice date. Even if your library’s ILS is not able to generate such reports, if you can export information from your system to a spreadsheet, then there are ways to manipulate the raw data to gather in the information your library needs. Then, the more problematic items are those “irregular” titles.

Step 2, working with your serials or continuing resources librarian (if you are not the person who handles serials in your library), become more aggressive with your claiming for these irregular titles in order to determine whether or not: (a) they are still in publication and (b) the vendor or publisher shows your library as being on standing order for the title(s). The goal here is to turn encumbrances into expenditures or cancellations (Cleary, 163). During the claiming process, it might be necessary to consult with subject selectors on unfulfilled orders to gauge the importance of any particular orders to remain open.

Step 3, periodically review vendor subject profiles for selection slips and, if your library has any, your approval plans to refine changing collection development needs. Titles your library once had on standing order because someone deemed them indispensable to the collection may no longer be as relevant as new series are published, or they can be deduped as you make them available in electronic databases or e-journal collections.

Using the steps above (in addition to any other local processes your organization has already put in place) should help ease the trepidation of miscalculating your library’s level of encumbrances for standing orders. There is no fail-safe method for predicting future costs; however, with a sound plan, thorough review and maintenance of records, periodic reporting, and communication between acquisitions, serials, and selectors, the fear should turn into confidence about a healthier relationship with your library’s budget.

Reference List


If the resource (“book”) you are cataloging is some sort of statute, in most situations, Library of Congress Classification (LCC) attempts to bring together the texts of the law and commentaries about the law, while keeping them separate from general works on the subject. For primary legislation (in the U.S., that refers exclusively to statutes enacted by Congress), KF6 (the single number table) uses .A328XXXX, where the Xs represent the enactment date of the statute and a sub-arrangement to separate texts from commentaries. The equivalent in K11 (the most common single number table for non-U.S. law) is .A31XXXX. Note that at one time, LCC used an exceedingly complex and somewhat incomprehensible cutter to arrange the statute chronologically, but they replaced it with a simpler arrangement based on date. For secondary legislation (in the U.S., that includes regulations, administrative law, and executive orders—enacted by anyone or anything other than Congress), KF6 uses .A369XXXX and K11 uses .A35. For all tables, there are nearby cutters for collections of multiple statutes on the subject.

Distinguishing primary (statutes) and secondary (regulations) enactments is critical. If you work exclusively in KF, you can probably skip this column. American law is extremely simple. Article I of the United States Constitution gives Congress the power to make “all laws,” so if it isn’t enacted by Congress, it is not a “statute.” If something appears to be a law of some sort and is enacted by an agency (usually by the head of the agency), it is not a statute. That includes executive orders issued by the President.

To fully understand the distinction between primary and secondary legislation, one needs to visit the “pre-history” of American law, the law of Britain/England during the centuries preceding American independence. In theory, the power to make laws in Britain (the power the U.S. reserves to Congress) is reserved to the king, and the king as a matter of law could do no wrong (which translated into the idea of parliamentary supremacy, which was not received into the American version of the common law). All laws issued by the king were primary legislation and were by definition “constitutional,” so their legality could not be questioned in court (because the king, who in theory enacted the laws, never was wrong). However, anything issued by the king’s ministers (i.e., delegated, secondary legislation) could be challenged on the grounds the ministers were not following the king’s instructions, as represented in his laws. This is the distinction between “administrative law” (laws enacted by the king’s servants, or in our case, by executive branch officers or civil servants) and “statutory law.” In the U.S., it led to the regime of administrative law, which is in many ways an entirely separate legal system from the usual common law-based legal system. While this distinction is used in every country’s table, it may be less meaningful in civil law (Roman law-based) systems, which had a very different legal evolution.

To determine if something is regulatory/delegated/secondary legislation, the key element is whether it is issued pursuant to a statute, rather than in accordance with the constitution (which in Britain is somewhat vague, but usually it is clear). In addition, knowledge of the local legal system is essential to know whether the author of the document is allowed to enact statutes (Parliament, Congress, etc.); if not, it is secondary legislation.

In the U.S., anything issued by the President, a department head, or an agency is clearly secondary. In Britain, the king couldn’t just announce a “law” while hunting or partying or hanging out with his mistress—laws were enacted by the king in Parliament (with the “advice” of the Lords and Commons) or in his “Privy Council” (something which was not carried over in the United States Constitution, but survives in some states in a modified form). While some kings tried to ignore Parliament and enact serious legislation in Privy Council, this practice ran into opposition (which in turn led to the king’s untimely demise—a long story, classed somewhere in DA rather than KD). The king enacts major legislation in Parliament, and the legislation enacted in the Privy Council tends to concern less glamorous matters (similar to the many non-controversial laws Congress enacts, even when everyone thinks they are hopelessly deadlocked). The fact that the monarch is no longer involved in the legislative process, beyond signing documents, is irrelevant to classification.

Secondary legislation approved by the Privy Council includes some indication of the minister who drafted the legislation (even if nominally issued in the name of the monarch) and will include language showing the Council issued it pursuant to statute. This makes it secondary legislation. The KD (British law) schedule deals with this for collected enactments, but by subject, a cataloger needs to make the distinction.
In the former British Empire, especially in places that never had a freely-elected legislature (i.e., the “non-white” colonies), most legislation took the form of an enactment of the king in Privy Council (the role of the monarch taken by the local governor). These laws look like British “orders in council,” but they are clearly statutes. In some places, they were called “ordinances,” probably to confuse catalogers who wrongly assume that an “ordinance” refers to a city’s legislation. After independence, these former colonies often preserved a system whereby the Chief Executive (at this point, usually a president, sometimes elected, often not) would serve as a one-man legislature, and one finds statutes enacted by the single person. These are clearly “laws” (.A31 cutter in K11), even in a one-man legislature that seems very “un-American” (which is why you won’t see this in KF). A well-known example would be the Pakistani “Hudood ordinances” of 1977, entered during a period when Pakistan’s parliament was not meeting (not their choice). If in the same jurisdiction a putative law states it is being issued pursuant to a statute and the issuing body or person is not arguably the legislature (or even a dictator claiming to be authorized to make laws), then it is secondary legislation (.A35 cutter in K11). The general “rule” always applies: secondary (delegated, administrative) legislation is issued pursuant to primary legislation and almost always by someone whom the cataloger knows (from our knowledge of each country’s legal system) doesn’t have the authority to issue primary legislation.

It isn’t uncommon to encounter a proposed law. Ideally it will clearly indicate that it is a “bill” (a proposed law introduced in, but not enacted by, the legislature). We have no problem classing those in KF6 at .A23 or .A25 and in K11 at .A2, etc. A “bill” by definition needs to say where it was introduced—otherwise it is a private proposed law. Any person is free to create a resource (write a book or an article) saying what they think the law should be and to draft a proposed law. If it hasn’t been officially proposed, it remains a private proposal, which classes as general works.

This includes the well-known “model codes” written by the American Law Institute, such as the Model Penal Code. They are private works, even if they look and sound like statutes. Other sources of “model laws” include texts published by trade associations (such as the International Code Council, an American building industry trade group) and professional associations (e.g., the American Bar Association) that look “legal,” but are only private proposals that don’t become statutes or regulations until and unless the appropriate bodies choose to enact them. As private proposals, they class as general works, not as statutes, or regulations, or even bills.

Uniform laws are similar to private proposals, but they are proposed by a governmental or quasi-governmental agency, giving them a more important legal status. In the U.S., the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws issues uniform laws, which states are encouraged to enact. Elsewhere one finds global or regional efforts to draft uniform laws for enactment on a national level, such as the Organisation pour l’Harmonisation en Afrique du Droit des Affaires (OHADA—serving Franco-speaking, meaning civil law, African countries) drafting proposed uniform commercial laws. Cutters such as .A44 in KF6 or .A4-.A46 in K11 are available for “uniform laws” in countries, but there is no clear place for them in K8 used for K-general or in the regional schedules such as KQC (meaning they class as general works, though LC could easily change this).

If there is doubt if the work in hand is the “official” text of a statute, it is very easy to confirm it online. Usually putting some key words from the document one is working with into a search engine will pull up the official text. For the U.S., that is probably at http://www.Congress.gov (maintained by the Library of Congress). For the United Kingdom, it is at http://www.legislation.gov.uk, maintained by their National Archives. A good global source for official texts is located at http://www.loc.gov/law/find/gazettes-online.php. In all fairness, some choice words from the resource in front of you will usually take you to an official source to confirm what you have is the honest-to-goodness statute, or a regulation, or maybe a bill, or maybe somebody’s bright idea of what the law should be. Remember that these distinctions are all critical to LCC, because they are critical to the user group we serve.

This is not an official statement of LC policy.
I love free stuff. Whether it is food samples at Costco or a month of HBONow on Roku, I’m all about those little perks where you get something for literally nothing. This continual quest for that which is free has carried over from my personal to professional life; as a result, I’m always looking out for databases that provide accurate and authoritative information that require no subscription, renewal, and are generally free for anybody to use. Listed below are a few that I have found to be particularly useful. Keep in mind, this list is not comprehensive.

MUSIC COPYRIGHT INFRINGEMENT RESOURCE: [http://mcir.usc.edu/purpose/Pages/default.html](http://mcir.usc.edu/purpose/Pages/default.html)

Sponsored by Columbia Law School and the University of Southern California (USC) Gould School of Law. This specialized database is positively magical. It not only lists cases of music copyright infringement, but also includes recent and ongoing disputes and cases with snippets of the infringing section. Anyone working with music copyright infringement issues understands that sometimes it’s simply a bar or two of music, and this database does the work of providing a sound recording of the parts in dispute. Plus, it’s fun listening to Led Zeppelin at work.

THE SUPREME COURT DATABASE: [http://scdb.wustl.edu/about.php](http://scdb.wustl.edu/about.php)

Hosted by Washington University Law in St. Louis; supported by the National Science Foundation. The Supreme Court Database provides case-centered and justice-centered data from 1945 to the present. The analytic search form allows you to search by citation, case name, or docket number. You can search for information on a single case, or you can create a subset to search. A quick caveat: Take time to read the instructions. This is a dense database with a lot of information, and it takes a little practice to get it down.


Created by The Washington Post. In 2015, The Washington Post began compiling a list of fatal shootings by police officers in the United States. The data includes race of the deceased, circumstances surrounding the shooting, whether the person was armed, and other characteristics of note. You can search by name, state, gender, race, and other identifying factors. You can also download a spreadsheet with all of the information.

THE RECAP ARCHIVE: [https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/](https://www.courtlistener.com/recap/)

Have you RECAPped lately? RECAP (PACER spelled backwards) is a database of federal district court and bankruptcy court documents that users have donated to the RECAP archive. Unlike PACER, RECAP is free; however, because it is a donation-only database, not all court materials are represented. The advanced search form allows you to search by jurisdiction, docket number, date of filing, case name, and judge.

THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION (WTO): TRIPS (TRADE RELATED ASPECTS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS)

In the field of international intellectual property (IP) research, the TRIPS information on the WTO website is a good resource for beginning this type of research. You can find news, the TRIPS Agreement, the Uruguay Round Negotiations, specific TRIPS issues, and disputes. It has a nice illustrative model for notifying under the Paragraph 6 system. There are also videos.

LAW LIBRARY LIBGUIDES

Did you think I would leave out all your hard work? I love LibGuides. They are my go-to resource for when I need a refresher, a reminder, or a new idea altogether. More importantly, having made a few myself, I know how much time and effort they take to make and to keep up. This is my shout out to everyone out there who has made, is making, or is updating a LibGuide. Your work is noticed and appreciated. Thank you.

If anyone knows any free resources I haven’t mentioned, feel free to email me at dewitt@campbell.edu. Have a great winter break, and I will see you in 2017!
Authorized Access Points, Authority Records, and the User

Robert Bratton
George Washington University Law Library

What is an authorized access point (AAP)? According to the Resource Description & Access (RDA) glossary, it is “A standardized access point representing an entity.” AAPs used to be “headings,” and before computers they were simple text strings. In the best of all possible worlds, each AAP was a unique string of text that differentiated it from all other AAPs. Today, our AAPs look much like they did in the card catalog. Personal names are inverted (assuming left-anchored searches), and RDA currently preserves the preference of using a person’s birth and/or death dates over qualifiers like profession or occupation. Should we be moving beyond this?

When we think about what is most useful to users, let us think about two possible search results for Terry Jones.

1. Jones, Terry, 1942-

Unfortunately, most of the software used in libraries today would return the first result rather than the second. This is doubly sad because there is no need to wait for a replacement for MARC to achieve the second result. With robust authority records populated correctly with relevant data, the second result is possible, even with MARC. Currently, in the name authority file there are nine “Jones, Terry,” all differentiated by birth dates (another one was also born in 1942).

This example illustrates why we must move beyond thinking of access “points” as a single string of text. Furthermore, we must move beyond authority records consisting of two lines of information. Authority records are now the storehouses of machine-actionable data pertaining to the entities they represent. In the past, many catalogers considered the job of creating an authority record complete so long as the AAP was unique and there was a brief citation of where it came from. Moving forward, we owe it to ourselves and our users to do more. If we take the long view, doing this work up front will save everyone time later.

The Marrakesh Treaty for the Blind Enters into Force

Wilhelmina Randtke
Florida Virtual Campus

The Marrakesh Treaty to Facilitate Access to Published Works by Visually Impaired Persons and Persons with Print Disabilities (Marrakesh Treaty) addresses copyright as a barrier to accessibility. A treaty to ensure copyright law does not interfere with accessibility has been more than a decade in the making. The World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) initially adopted the Marrakesh Treaty in 2013. This June, the twentieth country ratified the treaty, and the treaty entered into force on September 30, 2016.

History

As books and other print materials are increasingly published electronically, digital rights management (DRM) is often used to lock down content. The goal of DRM is to prevent copying, and jurisdictions can use copyright law as an additional layer to impose penalties for breaking DRM or providing software for copying. The WIPO Copyright Treaty was adopted in 1996 and entered into force in 2002. That treaty includes a requirement to “provide adequate legal protection and effective legal remedies against the circumvention of effective technological measures that are used by authors in connection with [copyright].” In the United States, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (DMCA) implements treaty provisions prohibiting anti-circumvention of DRM.

Electronic text is inherently more accessible than printed books. Think of a blind person in a physical library—black ink on a white page requires the ability to see to read it. The only way for a blind person to read that information would be to
have it transcribed or read out loud, which is labor intensive and hence expensive. Now, think of a text file. It is possible to send that text to a braille display or use text-to-speech software to read it out loud. It is possible to search across electronic text files using a braille- or sound-based interface. Compared to paper and ink, text files are wide open to the blind. But, DRM can restrict those uses. Prohibiting accessibility wasn’t the goal, but it happened, just as the Internet was picking up.

Beginning in 2004, WIPO examined access to print works for the blind, and a series of discussions over the next decade led to the Marrakesh Treaty in June 2013. This treaty requires its contracting parties to adopt exceptions to their copyright laws to allow making, distributing, exporting, and importing copies in accessible formats. The treaty limits who countries must allow to make the accessible copies (nonprofits and government bodies) and on who they must allow to access the copies (visually impaired persons).

The U.S. signed the treaty in 2013, but it has not yet ratified the treaty.
The treaty became effective after 20 countries ratified it. In June 2016, Canada became the twentieth country to ratify, joining India, El Salvador, United Arab Emirates, Mali, Uruguay, Paraguay, Singapore, Argentina, Mexico, Mongolia, Republic of Korea, Australia, Brazil, Peru, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Israel, Chile, Ecuador, and Guatemala.

What the treaty means for U.S. law libraries
The U.S. hasn’t yet ratified the treaty, but 17 U.S.C. § 121 allows some exceptions to copyright protection for purposes of accessibility. The U.S. could ratify the treaty with only very narrow changes to existing law. U.S. law is not likely to change drastically as a result of this treaty.

The biggest change coming may be that, as people create accessible copies, they can share them across borders. A WIPO study leading up to the Marrakesh Treaty estimated that only about five percent of published books are available in an accessible format. For the rest, if the book is to be read, someone must convert it into an accessible format. When people can share accessible copies across borders and between organizations, that means the cost and effort to convert something to an accessible format is less likely to be duplicated globally. One library can invest the time and effort to reformat a work for a visually impaired patron, and then it can share the accessible copy with other libraries serving visually impaired persons. The Marrakesh Treaty was slow in the making, but countries ratified it at a fast clip. As countries change their laws to allow making accessible format copies of works, this will allow the conversion of a greater portion of works to accessible formats.

Visualize This: Best Practices for Effective Story Telling Using Qualitative and Quantitative Data

While working with Marcia Burris on our recent Spectrum contribution, “Using Metrics to Communicate and Deliver Value” (http://epubs.aallnet.org/i/741285-aall-spectrum-november-december-2016-volume-21-number-2), one of our focuses was providing a variety of tangible examples of metric usage in real-life library situations. When reviewing current literature on the topic and spreading our net across colleagues and polling them for ideas, best practices, and anecdotes, it became clear that when it comes to using metrics to prove your value to leadership in libraries, sometimes it’s more about the presentation of these metrics than the tables of numbers. Providing relevant qualitative and quantitative information to leadership that speaks directly to their own goals and initiatives in both a language and format they can understand is imperative, but pages and pages of raw data and summary counts of things like gate traffic and LibGuide hits fall short when telling our stories of value. Your audience doesn’t care about the data, per se—what they really care about is the narrative.

In this respect, visualizations and infographics can be leveraged as powerful story-telling tools, increasing rapid perception by readers and aiding in a variety of things ranging from idea illustration and idea generation to visual discovery and communicating statistics. Both visually appealing and traditionally more concise than tables, visualizations and infographics are some of the best ways to discern information and make decisions. One can easily use visualizations to illustrate library spending, usage statistics for databases, comparative availability of resources, cost recovery, and more. They have even begun cropping up within legal research tools alongside some big names, with both Westlaw and Lexis Advance getting in on the action.
However, while infographics and visualizations can put statistics into context and tell a story more effectively and dynamically by offering summaries, making information cleaner, and effectively assisting in both communication and problem solving, they can also be taken out of context, provide misleading information, or leave your audience feeling confused and overwhelmed. So in this column, let’s take a moment to focus less on the nitty gritty of the data and more on the presentation and story-telling side of things, as we review some best practices for creating visualizations and infographics from your data in a way that resonates with your audience and they can clearly understand.

Your first step seems somewhat counterintuitive. For a moment, stop focusing on all the data you have available to you, and instead focus on what your audience is interested in learning and what you’re interested in teaching. Remember, great visualizations and infographics are all about telling a clear, high-impact story that challenges and inspires your audience.

Once you know what kind of story you’re hoping to tell, match it with one of these common approaches. See a few different ones that might look appropriate? When in doubt, always err on the side of simplicity.

- **Statistical** summarizes data through graphs, tables, and lists.
- **Research-based** summarizes research findings through graphs, tables, and lists.
- **Informational** summarizes a topic and provides some extra tidbits of information.
- **Compare and Contrast** points out similarities and differences with a “this vs. that” approach.
- **Hierarchical** illustrates various levels through a chart.
- **Timelines** demonstrate a progression of information over a time period.
- **Geographical** highlights data on a location map.
- **Process** illustrates either linear or branching processes, with branches representing choices and decision making.
- **Word clouds** illustrate associations and relationships between words and concepts.
- **Interactive** places control in the hands of the user with web-based interactive dashboard features.

Once you have an idea of your message and your approach, it’s time to turn the raw data and tables that support your story into graphs and charts.

How do we know what the best types of charts to use are? By understanding the size and cardinality (uniqueness) of your data sets as well as understanding your audience, what you’re trying to communicate with them, and how they process information visually. You’ll be led to certain visuals because of your data format and others for specific audience needs, but again, when in doubt, always try to choose the best and simplest form for your audience. Remember that while complex charts may look pretty, they aren’t necessarily readable or understandable, and you don’t want your audience to become disengaged or miss the crux of your story by having to zoom in and out repeatedly or pore over legends.

When you only have a single important number to display, such as a percentage, count, or ratio, focus on using large fonts or labels for the number instead of burying it within a larger chart; big numbers standing all by themselves pack a definite “wow” factor. For percentages or ratios, you can supplement the number with a simple pictogram, like an icon chart featuring two different color tones to help your audience visualize the value.

For quantitative and qualitative data sets of varying sizes, choose instead from one of these common chart types:

- **Line graphs**: Used for tracking changes or trends over time or for comparing the changes and trends of multiple items within the same time frame. Your data will need to feature a continuous value, such as time for the X-axis, as well as a significant number of data points.
- **Non-numerical visual timeline**: Have trends without numerical data? Try using a vertical or horizontal central line with text and images that help illustrate qualitative trends over time, by adding data points along this line at each “time period.”
- **Bar charts**: You can display bar charts either horizontally or vertically, where the length or the height indicates the value, and use them to illustrate comparisons of things counted and categorized when values are distinct enough to compare using the naked eye. You can demonstrate rankings or order using a bar chart sorted along a particular category. Avoid using these charts when your values are close together or if you need a large number of bars, and remember, stacked bar charts may inhibit readability. Color your bars differently if you’re indicating different ranges or statuses, but otherwise keep the colors consistent throughout.
- **Waterfall bar chart**: Also known as a progressive or periodical change bar chart, each bar represents the change between the current and previous time periods and shows how your initial value increases or decreases through a series of transactions, leading to the final measure at the end of the chart. For a more in-depth view, overlay the waterfall bar chart on a line graph to show the overall total activity and trends across time.
- **Scatter plots/XY plots**: In this two dimensional grid-style chart, every marker represents an observation. This view helps examine correlations between your x and y values—are they being influenced by each other and, if so,
how? To further analyze the behavior and relationships within your data, you can apply statistical analyses, such as regression or correlation. Scatter plots are best used when your goal is to see how widespread your data is and to identify patterns in your data quickly. When demonstrating these patterns to your audience in your communications, be sure to also explain the conclusions in plain language through headers or labels and include highlighted markers or lines to help illustrate your point.

- **Bubble plots**: Similar to scatter plots, bubble plots use various sized “bubbles” instead of single-sized markers or dots. With the introduction of size variations, these plots can represent relationships between three measures at once, with two measures creating the x- and y-axes and the third controlling the area of the bubble itself. These are best for bringing out contrast with a dominant category or value and identifying outliers within big data sets. You can also include visual representations of additional measures by animating your bubbles to show change over time, using color to represent a fourth measure, or overlaying the plot on a geographic map to indicate locational data.

- **Pie or donut charts**: While it can be difficult for human eyes to estimate angles or compare non-adjacent slices, and some claim these large round graphs are space wasters in dashboard and newsletter layouts, as long as you limit your components and use text labels and percentage numbers to describe each piece of the pie, these simple charts can be powerful tools for illustrating either comparisons or shares of a total.

- **Box plots**: Box (or box and whisker) plots clearly illustrate five major statistics for a dataset within a single chart. The bottom line of the box is created by the lower quartile, the upper quartile creates the top line of the box, and the median is represented by a central line through the box. “Whiskers” illustrate the data’s extremities, or outliers, by indicating the minimum and maximum values.

- **Word clouds**: These visualizations allow you to call out high and low frequency words and trends within unstructured qualitative data, such as comments on surveys.

- **Network diagrams**: In these relationship diagrams, nodes represent people or players and ties represent the relationships between these individual nodes. Superimpose these diagrams on a geographic map to facilitate additional insights.

- **Histograms**: These charts are best for providing focus within big data, by showing visual distribution and providing cues on how the overall picture of your data changes with filtering on various measures. When using these more complicated visuals, be sure to also clearly indicate patterns in your text headings, labels, or call-outs, instead of leaving the onus of interpretation on your audience.

- **Decision/classification/regression trees**: These trees represent influences by breaking down processes or workflows into individual cause and effect relationships through each branch, and they allow you to analyze problems and predict behaviors more effectively.

- **Sankey diagrams**: Analyzes the path of transactions through a system, where the width of nodes indicate the frequency of occurrence at each of these values.

You can share the images, charts, and diagrams you create to help tell your stories with a variety of audiences in many different ways, including email newsletters, blog posts, other social media channels, and direct delivery to leadership and stakeholders. No matter how you’re delivering the content, though, try to follow these best practices:

- Focus your message, and present “useful” information that clearly demonstrates effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and value, and which aligns with your organizational strategy.

- Simple is best. Be as concise as possible to avoid overwhelming your readers.

- Organize your message in a hierarchical format, putting the most important information first. Use the size of text and images to draw the reader’s eyes to the most important parts.

- Start out with a headline or story title, and then create headings, subheadings, and bullet lists if necessary to break up your content. This approach will help you align with the learning styles of scanners in your audience.

- Use only one or two colors, limiting yourself to three at most, and brand your messaging and images to help drive home your library identity. To choose colors, keep an eye on other marketing materials for combinations your like or use online color pickers and palette tools. Colors can be subconsciously associated with certain emotions or statuses, so leverage the fact that colors like yellow and red grab attention and create urgency, while blue and green create sensations of trust and relaxation, and orange is seen as a call to action.

- You’re presenting this story to the audience as a representation of the truth, so use care and invest significant time and energy into the completeness, accuracy, and styling of the piece. Properly size your images, photos, and more, and don’t forget to proofread your materials.

- Maintain white space and keep your alignment consistent; symmetry and even margins are a must.

- For maximum readability, use 14-16 point fonts, restrict yourself to using either serif or sans serif fonts exclusively within the piece, and use no more than two of either type within the document. Serif fonts give off a feeling of sophistication through their old-school style, while sans serifs are viewed as more casual, giving off a modern, digital feel.
• Take into account the audience’s preferred delivery method, whether it be print or electronic, and, if appropriate, ensure that your presentation is mobile device-friendly. In electronic format, a full infographic has highest readability when its length is between 5-9 times longer than the width.

• If possible, provide external links to learn more or access additional data. This will help you align with those in your audience who prefer to draw their own conclusions from a greater depth and breadth of content.

• Save your templates for consistency and ease in future reporting and trend monitoring. This also allows you to preserve clear lines of communication as your audience becomes familiar with the outline and format of your story-telling approaches.

Free infographic and visualization tools as well as fee-based products abound, empowering all of us to take advantage of their story-telling features, no matter how small a scale. The ability to convert pages of data and columns into a visual demonstration of our purpose and value and to use as a tool to spark future action means your audience can see more options, ask more questions, and make better and quicker decisions—and your audience can more clearly hear, see, and feel your story of value.

**Management**

**Fight Knowledge Pollution Now!**

Beth Farrell
Cleveland-Marshall College of Law Library

According to a 2015 survey quoted in the *Harvard Business Review (HBR)*, we send over 108 billion email messages every day. The average worker sends and receives 112 emails per day—spending almost a quarter of their workday managing email—and this email overload results in “knowledge pollution.” In his book *Writing Without Bullshit*, Josh Bernoff says that technology has made it “breathtakingly easy” to create and deliver content with the click of a button, but, because no one taught these creators how to compose good content, “we’re stuck wading through a deluge of drivel.”

In *Message Not Received: Why Business Communication is Broken and How to Fix It*, Phil Simon shares some grim results from the 2010 LexisNexis International Workplace Productivity Survey. A majority of professionals from all markets surveyed reported that, because of their 24/7 accessibility and unending flow of email, they struggle to stay focused on their work. To try to manage this information overload, a large majority delete or discard work communications without completely reading them. Finally, 52% report feeling demoralized when they can’t manage all the information thrown at them.6

Sadly, while we can’t reduce the quantity or improve the quality of emails that appear in our inbox, we can strive not to become “knowledge polluters” ourselves. Taking the time to write and re-write our messages not only shows our readers that we respect their time, but sending a better-crafted message makes it more likely that it will be understood and read . . . all the way to the end!

One big problem, Bernoff believes, is that many of us use the same verbose prose in business communications that we use in academic writing. We should try to impress our busy audience with our email’s content and meaning, not its literary prose.

The most important rule of business writing (Bernoff calls it “The Iron Imperative”) is: “Treat the reader’s time as more valuable than your own.” Similarly, in “The One Unbreakable Rule in Business Writing,” Tucker Max says “It has to be about the reader, not about you.”

2 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 Bernoff, 4.
8 Ibid, 108.
9 Ibid, 5.
Think before you write, advises Bryan A. Garner, author of many writing guides, including *HBR Guide to Better Business Writing*. “Ask yourself: What should my audience know or think after reading this email . . . if the answer isn’t immediately clear you are moving too quickly.” 11 Max recommends a three-step process to help clarify intentions:

- Why am I writing this?
- What audience do I want to reach?
- Why will they care?12

Once purpose and audience are clear, compose a subject line that clearly articulates the purpose of the email, immediately informing recipients if any action is expected of them. In “Before You Hit ‘Send,’ 13 Steps to Emails That Don’t Suck,” Ann Handley encourages us to think as carefully about the subject line as we do about the body of the email.13 Picture busy recipients asking you “So what?” while slogging through their overstuffed inboxes—how can you grab their interest?14 Bernoff says to better reflect the final message, you should reconsider the subject line after writing and editing the body of the email.15

“Front-load” your message, says Bernoff. “Put the conclusion up front . . . start with bold statements and conclusions. Then follow with the reasoning that got you there.”16 This is the inverse of what we all learned in college—where we saved conclusions for our papers’ ends—but front-loading our writing allows readers who don’t make it all the way to the end of the email to still benefit from reading our conclusions.17

When writing the body of the email, trim the fat, says Kara Blackburn, a senior lecturer in managerial communication at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) Sloan School of Management: “Don’t use three words when one would do.”18 Bernoff recommends keeping emails under 250 words.19 Using fewer words, he believes, is the single most effective way to communicate powerfully in our noisy world.20

Garner suggests using short words and sentences in business communications; he says research consistently shows that 20 words is the optimal average for readability.21 To trim extra words, Garner recommends, whenever possible:

- delete prepositions (point of view to viewpoint)
- replace –ion words with a verb (was in violation of to violated)
- replace is, are, was and were with stronger verbs (is indicative of to indicates)22

Bernoff advocates pruning sections and arguments—can you get by with three sections instead of four? Two examples instead of three?23 Consider using bulleted lists to compare or describe three or more things.24 Also, we tend to hedge our bets in business communication—often using passive voice excessively—in an attempt to avoid risk: “Clarity can be dangerous because people who read what you wrote might disagree with it.”25 Because passive voice is ambiguous, it can be disconcerting to the reader.26 If you say “Attention must regularly be paid to the sometimes excessive shipping costs from Vendor X,” are you saying all the recipients of your email must now pay attention to this issue? Some more than others? It’s better to spell it out exactly: “I recommend that our Acquisitions Clerk always check for excessive shipping charges when unpacking boxes from Vendor X.”

Finally, Bernoff encourages us to further eliminate hedging by never using “weasel words”—adjectives, adverbs, or nouns that indicate quantity or intensity but lack precision—such as “many,” “few,” “rarely,” “millions,” “cheap,” and “countless.”27 Replace weasel words with bold statements, which include actual numbers or other specifics.28 For instance, instead of

12 Max, “The One Unbreakable Rule in Business Writing.”
14 Ibid.
15 Bernoff, 57.
16 Ibid, 56.
17 Ibid.
18 O’Hara, “How to Improve Your Business Writing.”
19 Bernoff, 45.
20 Bernoff, 43.
22 Ibid, 52-53.
23 Bernoff, 46.
24 Ibid, 111.
26 Ibid, 61.
27 Ibid, 76.
28 Ibid, 79.
saying, “This year’s collection development budget was affected tremendously by rising shipping costs,” say “In Fiscal Year 2015, shipping costs increased $1,200 from Fiscal Year 2014, a 20% increase.”

French scientist and mathematician Blaise Pascal, in corresponding with one of his compatriots, wrote apologetically, “I have only made this letter longer because I have not had the time to make it shorter.” 29 If you spend time crafting brief, well-written emails, your “information-overloaded” colleagues will thank you. You may even inspire them to do the same, eventually reducing the knowledge pollution in your own inbox!


Announcements from OCLC

OCLC has completed the installation of changes related to the OCLC-MARC Update 2016. This update included changes announced by the Library of Congress in MARC21 Updates 21 and 22, as well as validation of new subfields and the conversion of field 305 to 300. Member libraries are encouraged to correct or report for correction any 300 fields that were not converted correctly.

More details about the changes may be found at the links below. The changes in Tech Bulletin 266 will be incorporated into the Bibliographic Formats and Standards (http://www.oclc.org/bibformats/en.html) and the OCLC Local Holdings Format and Standards (http://www.oclc.org/holdingsformat/en.html), but until this is complete users may need to reference the Tech Bulletin for details.

OCLC Tech Bulletin 266: https://www.oclc.org/support/services/worldcat/documentation/tb/266.en.html
MARC21 Update 21: http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc21_update21_online.html
MARC21 Update 22: http://www.loc.gov/marc/marc21_update22_online.html

OCLC Releases FY16 Annual Report


The New Archivist’s Initial Checklist (Part I): Securing Your Collection and Preparing the Way

In my previous column, I stated I would treat this Preservation Column as an ongoing journal or diary, recording my adventures and misadventures while launching and maintaining our new archives at the University of New Hampshire School of Law (UNH Law). This is still true to a certain extent, but in the interest of time, I have decided to make this column more about what WORKS than what does not work. Perhaps a book might be down the road somewhere detailing my misadventures as well. It will be in the comedy section of your local bookstore.

At the outset of this initiative to launch the Gire Archives at UNH Law, I decided to keep an ongoing checklist or to-do list, recorded in the order I thought of them. This would allow me to chart my progress and keep track of what I had accomplished and what I still needed to accomplish. Needless to say, the list will never, and should never, be complete.

With this in mind, I decided to draw from my own checklist, the advice of other archivists, archival literature, and the findings of good old hindsight to develop a master list or meta-checklist for new archivists to follow at the very, very beginning. The primary goal here is two-fold: (1) to secure your collection in an immediate way, pre-preservation, arrangement, permanent
storage, etc., so as to protect it from the elements and reduce the influence of decay and environmental influences on ephemera and perishable materials as quickly as possible; and (2) to best prepare the way and lay the groundwork for your permanent archives and/or special collections. I hope other, more experienced archivists, can add to this checklist in a meaningful way and point out aspects of initial preservation I missed. Here is what I came up with for our archives:

**Preliminaries**

1. Before you begin accessioning and processing items for your archives, **spend a day or two disinfecting and otherwise sanitizing the space(s)**. Start by vacuuming the carpet thoroughly with a machine that has a HEPA filter. Wipe down tables and other surfaces with a cleaner that does not contain harsh chemicals. We use Seventh Generation products, as one good choice. Make sure your archives space is free of mold,funguses, mice droppings, and other pathogens. Do a close examination of every corner, shelf, table, and chair. Don’t let up until you are satisfied and can give your personal stamp of approval.

2. After you have sufficiently eliminated sources or potential sources of bacteria, fungus, mold, and dirt, the next priority is to **secure your collection(s)**, meaning either all your archive materials or at least those that are most vulnerable, as soon as possible. What does this mean? It means temporary storage—plastic bins, archival-grade containers, new storage boxes—whatever. The idea of this temporary storage, without regard for arrangement or description (yet), is to secure all things perishable from “weather” and normal environmental pressures, which can cause decay. Our Gire Archives does not currently have its own climate control system; it is at the mercy of the same elements as the rest of the school. That is why my first goal was to halt the slow march of decay, which environmental pressures, minimal as they might seem, were putting on the collections. We had plastic storage bins aplenty, so I relegated the vast majority of our items there, sealed with a secure lid, with most items in standing acid-free folders or accordion files. One issue I came across here was something many new archivists deal with: whether to use silica-gel packets or some other humidity-reducing substance in the boxes and bins. I started out doing this; I don’t now. Thankfully, I found out in time from our UNH Archivist, Elizabeth Slomba, that silica is a no-no in confined (and tight) spaces like this. The micro-climate inside a container can become too dry, causing papers, photos, etc. to become brittle or crack. If you think the general humidity is too high, leave a silica gel packet in for no more than a day, then remove it and reseal the container.

While you are securing your collection in temporary containers, parse out what archival items are most vulnerable to decay and/or damage from the elements. These include your oldest objects and those that are already in some stage of decay or damage. Also, remember that photos, slides, and microfiche, especially, are a priority, and you should secure them in a microclimate. Secure all these items separately in one or more containers. You will need to attend to these first.

3. **If you haven’t already, determine your supply needs and container requirements (in addition to what you already have in your inventory) and order.** Most likely, you may not have a complete idea of all your supply needs until you actually unpack, inventory, and really take a good look at the sum total of your archival items (knowing that your collection will grow over time). What sort of—and how many—archival-grade folders, containers, and boxes do you need? How will you store your items within each box or container? What other supplies do you need—tabs, binders, scissors, pencils, rulers, frames, etc.? We usually order through either Demco or Gaylord, but these are not our only options. Amazon can work quite well and is usually more cost efficient, and eBay can give you a lot of bang for your buck with custom orders—though you have to be careful.

4. **Create your master record groups and subgroups (and possibly records series).** This can be a difficult task when first launching your archives for a number of reasons. Traditionally, the general rule has been to create and arrange groupings based upon the administrative structure of the parent institution (Maher, p. 78). This makes it fairly simple and straightforward for the archives to reflect the major and intermediate campus organizational units likely to generate records. In other words, the archives becomes a mirror of the greater institution(s) it serves. A good example can be found in William Maher’s nuts-and-bolts manual, *The Management of College and University Archives*: 0/ External Sources of Information about the University, 1/ Board of Regents (or in our case Trustees), 2/ President’s Office, 3/ University Senate, 4/ Campus Committees and Boards, 5/ Financial and Business Affairs, 6/ Provost, 7/ Graduate Programs, 8/ Public Affairs, etc. (Maher, p. 82). It is then easy to transform this structure into a classification system using assigned numbers for each body or level (0/, 1/, 2/, 3/, etc.). The problem we ran into at our own institution requires more space than is available in this column, but suffice it to say, most of our historical and archival materials came to us all at once from different offices, departments, closets, empty buildings, etc. Provenance is hard to come by for a great deal of our materials, plus many are not clearly identified. The other problem is that the vast majority of our identified items are related to EVENTS in the school’s history, both as Franklin Pierce Law Center and as the UNH School of Law. Some examples: commencements, the Robert Rines Award and Dinner, the Kenison Room Dedication, the Buck Building addition, the Center for Intellectual Property addition, early history on Mountain Road, Franklin Pierce Law Center items, UNH School of Law items, the graduate programs photos, alumni photos, sports team’s photos, library-related events and photos, etc. For us, the primary theme running through our
archives is all about chronology—the school as defined by events and finite time periods in our school’s history and culture. A relative few have to do with administration, the Board of Trustees, Faculty Senate, etc., though this could change with more discovery.

I am in that part of archiving we call arrangement, and my inclination is to arrange our holdings chronologically by decade—1970s, 1980s, 1990s, 2000s, 2010s. We are a part of UNH, but separate from our parent institution at the same time. We have our own, shorter history, our own chronology, and our own school culture. Comments and advice on this would be welcome, as it is hard to undo a method of arrangement once we put it in place.

5. **Create a classification scheme for your archives.** This is, of course, tied closely to #4 above. There are almost as many classification systems for archives as there are archives. The one tried and true maxim here is that your classification scheme should closely reflect your arrangement. Both arrangement and classification are in the percolation stage at UNH Law right now.

Here ends Part 1 of my Checklist. With these five steps completed, you are ready to begin describing, accessioning, preserving, and storing your collections in a more permanent and professional way. Part 2 of this column will mostly involve the bigger picture steps pertaining to the launch of a new archives—description metadata, accessioning and accession records, creating a Collection Care Prioritization Plan (CCPP) (with kudos to former columnist Maxine Wright!), creating your mission statement, creating your strategic plan, and even seeking and applying for grants! A quick note before I go: I highly recommend another manual by Pam Hackbart-Dean and Elizabeth Slomba, titled *How to Manage Processing in Archives and Special Collections*. It is one of the few texts on archiving that gets into the fine minutiae of preservation and managing an archive. Very step-by-step stuff that many of us new archivists need when we feel directionless and drifting. Of particular note are both Chapter 3 and the Decision-Making Tree for Processing an Individual Collection (Hackbart-Dean, p. 26). It guides you in chart form through every phase of processing, and it can be very valuable as a referral even for experienced archivists. The chapter goes into more detail, and you should use it simultaneously with the chart. Invaluable for me, personally, and not something I’ve seen elsewhere.

That should do it. Please let me know of anything crucial that I may have missed, and Happy Preservation!

**References**


With larger databases, we have to decide what content would be the most useful to attorneys or librarians because including it all leads to overwhelming search results lists. We have decided not to purchase third-party MARC records for Westlaw or Lexis, as we believe that neither research librarians nor our attorneys are likely to go to the catalog to see if we have access to a title through these databases. They are much more likely to browse the source list in the database itself. We have made two exceptions to this rule. The first is for a small number of frequently-used titles that the attorneys regularly ask us about. The second is when canceling a print West or Lexis title. In those cases, we add a note to the print record along with a direct link to the title. We want to make sure that we direct individuals who are looking for a print set or book that they are familiar with to the up-to-date electronic version. If we remove these print materials from the collection entirely, we will have to decide if we still need a record for the electronic resource.

For HeinOnline, we order MARC records from a third-party vendor for the major collections in our subscription. When we initially started purchasing these records, we loaded all of them into our catalog. However, over time, we found that a good portion of them (typically the historical resources) were not what people were looking for when searching our catalog. This left users weeding through a long list of results to find relevant resources. As a result, we have become more selective with which records we load. We now mainly include records for law reviews and a few other resources that we know get significant use.

Our final category of electronic resources is e-books. In the last two years, we have added both Lexis and PLI e-books to our collection. For Lexis, we receive free MARC records from Overdrive, which we customize. We list all of our Lexis e-books in our catalog, with a direct link to the title in Overdrive. For PLI, we have chosen to only include the treatises in the catalog because of the sheer volume of course handbooks. We want to promote usage of our e-books and help individuals who are used to using the print version discover when an e-book is available.

For now, this is the system for handling electronic resources that is working for us. I imagine that will change as we add new resources and as library software evolves.

---

**RESEARCH & PUBLICATIONS**

**Time Motion Studies**

*Hollie White*  
*Duke University*

Using data/metrics to show value has been a recent topic of interest in law library publications and presentations. In libraries we collect a lot of data about how much items cost and how many items we collect, but do we really examine time expenditures at the same level?

In October, I had the pleasure of hearing Bob Dugan, Dean of Libraries at the University of West Florida, discuss how he uses time motion studies to understand the cost of answering a reference question or requesting a book through interlibrary loan (ILL). The same month, I heard Cassandra Laskowski present about a time-tracking tool called Toggl. Putting these two ideas together, I thought it would be interesting to suggest collecting data in Toggl to affirm the value of technical services work through time motion studies.

**What is a Time Motion Study?**

Time motion studies look at the amount of time it takes to do certain jobs or tasks. These studies have been around since the 19th century, but they have transformed from a productivity measure of individuals into a study of task/activity time. They can focus on a task, individual, or process.

**Setting Up and Using Toggl**

Toggl ([https://toggl.com/](https://toggl.com/)) is a time-tracking tool available both online and via mobile app by registering with an email address. Basic plans for teams of five or fewer are free! Toggl has a video to go over the basics of using the tool at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Uvoquw9cupk](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Uvoquw9cupk).

**Example of Personal Time Motion Studies and Why?**

Tracking your own daily work can be good for understanding how much time you spend doing different parts of your job. Just sign into Toggl when the work day starts every day for one week, and then look over the results at the end of that week.
Can you identify any patterns? Did you find anything surprising? Many job descriptions break down work by importance, time spent, or even percentages. Tracking your own time allows you to see how well your job description actually matches what you do. Tracking time also allows for a chance to reflect on your personal work day, workflows, and habits.

**Example of Departmental Time Motion Studies and Why?**

Ever wonder how much it costs to purchase a book? Of course it is easy to see the price of the item, the shipping, and supply costs for processing, but what about the cost of all the hands that deal with that book before it is on the shelf and ready for patrons to use? Tracking how much time staff spends on selecting, purchasing, describing, processing, and shelving an item will give a better estimate about the true cost of technical services. Other examples can include how long it takes to prepare and run batch imports or create training materials for new staff.

**Caveats and limitations**

While the process of being able to quantify daily activities or processes may seem interesting, there is also a human component not expressed through numbers. Quantitative data like the ones suggested above do not reflect qualitative aspects of the work. When presenting these numbers to others, be sure to also include stories about how the work is important. You can incorporate comments from users who have benefited from technical services work. How valuable was the obscure piece you processed to a professor’s research or an associate’s case? Getting that type of feedback may be difficult, but it adds a balance to the stories metrics tell. As information professionals, we should always be collecting information about our own work and evaluating how to make it better.

I haven’t started doing my own time study, but hope to do one soon to learn more about the way I work and how much time I spend doing certain tasks. Feel free to contact me if you conduct your own time motion study, and let me know how it turns out!

---

**The Future of Libraries**

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) published a preliminary report by the Ad Hoc Task Force on the Future of Libraries (https://www.pubpub.org/pub/future-of-libraries). The Task Force is led by Chris Bourg, Director of Libraries. The Task Force proposed ten recommendations in the categories of Community and Relationships, Discovery and Use, Stewardship and Sustainability, and Research and Development. Faculty, staff, students, and alumni who communicated with the Task Force expressed the importance of librarians as partners and the library as a physical space. The preliminary report incorporates this into its recommendations for a library with a global reach. The report envisions the library as both a physical and virtual space that provides access to information and serves as a hub for scholars and developers to find each other. The Task Force envisions communities of users as a series of concentric circles. These concentric circles begin with the campus community and expand outward to ultimately include the global community. Open access is a recurring theme throughout the report. The Task Force recommends comprehensive access to digital collections, which means collections should support a diversity of users and be accessible on a variety of devices.

The vision is not just to make openly available what was once behind a paywall. The Task Force recommends librarians, scholars, and students contribute to efforts to develop platforms and metadata schemes that will make digital resources available to all, regardless of format or available devices. The report is specific to MIT Libraries and this particular Task Force’s vision of the future of libraries; however, there are takeaways for all of us. The library of the future will require us to examine the places where public services, technical services, and information technology intersect.

The report is published at PubPub (http://www.pubpub.org), which is an open collaborative tool operated by MIT. Digitally native works, called Pubs, are published on the site, which allows for open review and comments. Contributors can update their work, which shows a versioned history that reveals research as a process rather than a single instance of publication.
The serials staff of the University of Washington School of Law, Gallagher Law Library, recently identified the following serial title changes:

**Human Rights & Globalization Law Review**
Ceased with v.6 (fall/spring 2015/16)  
(OCoLC 276864372)

**Changed to:**
Howard Human & Civil Rights Law Review
Forthcoming

**The McGeorge Law Review**
Ceased with v.46 no.4 (2014)  
(OCoLC 37623674)

**Merged with**
Pacific McGeorge Global Business and Development Law Journal
Ceased with v.28 no.2 (2015)  
(OCoLC 76874669)

**To form:**
The University of the Pacific Law Review  
(OCoLC 910624071)
Began with v.47 no.1 (2015)-

The serials staff of the University of Washington School of Law, Gallagher Law Library, recently identified the following serial cessations:

**Alberta Law Review**
Ceased in print with: Vol. 53, no.2 (December 2015)  
(OCoLC 01479040)
Continued online: http://www.albertalawreview.com/index.php/alr  
(OCoLC 53322528)

**Arizona Summit Law Review**
Ceased in print with: Vol. 8 no.4 (spring 2015)  
(OCoLC 863457839)
Continued online: http://www.arizonasummitlawreview.org/  
and on HeinOnline  
(OCoLC 896365965)

**Asian Yearbook of International Law**
Ceased in print with: Vol.15 (2009)  
(OCoLC 27607314)
Continued online: http://www.dilafoundation.org/about-the-asian-yearbook-of-international-law.html  
(OCoLC 847627511)

**The Entertainment and Sports Lawyer**
Ceased in print with: Vol. 31 no.4 (winter 2015)  
(OCoLC 8320374)
Continued online: http://journals.uchastings.edu/journals/websites/race-poverty/index.php  
(OCoLC 60627701)

**Glendale Law Review**
Ceased with: Vol. 21, no. 1-2 (2008)  
(OCoLC 02438862)

**Hastings Race and Poverty Law Journal**
Ceased in print with: v.12 no.2 (summer 2015)  
(OCoLC 53017493)
Continued online via HeinOnline Law Journal Library  
(OCoLC 173396096)

**Hastings West-Northwest Journal of Environmental Law and Policy**
Ceased in print with: Vol. 21 no.2 (summer 2015)  
(OCoLC 30372340)
Continued online: http://journals.uchastings.edu/journals/websites/west-northwest/  
and on HeinOnline  
(OCoLC 60648941)

**Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning**
Ceased in print with: Vol. 22, no.2 (2016)  
(OCoLC 30370974)
Continued online: http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/mjcsl/issues  
(OCoLC 607383438)

**Michigan State University Journal of Medicine and Law**
Ceased with: Vol. 18 no.1 (spring 2014)  
(OCoLC 37642167)

**National Wetlands Newsletter**
Ceased with: May/June 2016  
(OCoLC 4571695)

**New England Journal on Criminal and Civil Confinement**
Ceased in print with: Vol. 42 no.2 (spring 2016)  
(OCoLC 09355506)

**Changed to (forthcoming as a companion to New England Law Review)**
New England Law Review Offer to Proof  
Continued online: http://www.nesl.edu/students/ne_journal_ccc.cfm
I’ve noticed in my cataloging the term “International commercial arbitration” still causes confusion among some catalogers, presumably non-law catalogers. I have seen catalog entries with “Arbitration and award,” perhaps because the cataloger feared “International commercial arbitration” was too specific and didn’t read into the work beyond a glance at the title. Regardless, all catalogers have the opportunity to correct such mistakes, especially with OCLC’s Expert Community Program. Do those of you who do your cataloging locally and simply send your holdings to OCLC via batch load correct errors such as this one? It is really simple and helpful to the rest of us. Most of those reading this column know, in 2012, the Library of Congress (LC) changed “Arbitration and award, International” to “International commercial arbitration.” In addition, LC changed the heading “Arbitration, International,” used to describe arbitration between nations over matters of international public law, to “Arbitration (International law).” These distinctions continue to be lost on some catalogers, and this requires us to watch for instances of this confusion. “Arbitration and award” continues to apply to commercial arbitration in one nation or, in comparative law, several. “Arbitration agreements, Commercial” applies more narrowly to the increasingly popular (among businesses) practice of requiring consumers to agree to arbitration and not class action when signing commercial agreements and warranties, written or online.

There are many new subject headings of interest to law catalogers. In the area of Islamic law, catalogers may now use “Personnel management (Islamic law),” “Medicine in the Hadith,” “Causation (Islamic law),” and “Nursing (Islamic law).” In Jewish law, new subject headings include “Informers (Jewish law),” “Kibbutzim – Law and legislation,” and “International law (Jewish law).” “Cold war – Law and legislation,” “War damage compensation – Law and legislation,” “Hybrid warfare” (be sure to read the scope note) are available for use. In the area of gender and the law, several headings are now available, including “African American sexual minorities,” “Asexual people,” “Asexuality (Sexual orientation),” “Discrimination against intersex people,” “Hispanic American gay men,” “Hispanic American bisexual men,” “Bisexual men – Relations with women,” and “Bisexuality and education.” A number of nations have electoral courts, and so the Library of Congress

**SUBJECT HEADINGS**

Patrick Lavey  
UCLA
(LC) created the heading “Electoral courts.” LC has also created the heading “Soccer commissioners,” almost certainly because several soccer commissioners around the world find themselves in need of legal assistance.

Speaking of criminal law, several new headings are worthy of note: “Stop and frisk (Law enforcement),” “Stop and frisk (Law enforcement) – Law and legislation,” “Child sexual abuse in sports,” and “Young male prisoners.” The subject heading “Libel and slander” no longer takes the subdivision “Law and legislation,” and indeed we may wonder why LC added this heading in the first place. Perhaps it was during the rush to add “Law and legislation” to the headings for individual criminal acts?

In the area of civil procedure, LC created the heading “Lawfare” for catalogers to use for “Legal warfare (Public interest law).” Its scope note states: “Here are entered works on the use of legal methods to damage an opponent, usually with the intent of winning a political or public relations battle.” The heading “Vaping,” used for “E-smoking,” may lead to Lawfare; who knows? Those interested in the legal aspects of crowdfunding now have “Crowdfunding – Law and legislation.” Finally, catalogers may use “Financialization” to describe works on the dominance of the financial services industry as the primary creator of wealth within an economy.

---

Watch the Librarian of Congress Ceremony!

The Library of Congress (LC) streamed Carla Hayden’s swearing-in on its YouTube channel (https://www.youtube.com/LOC). Hayden, who became the 14th Librarian of Congress, took the oath using the Lincoln Bible from the LC’s collection. Watch the swearing-in at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lvNuPcftWYE. The video has closed captioning.

This historic ceremony marks not one, but two milestones: Hayden is both the first woman and the first African-American to serve as Librarian of Congress. Want to learn more about the journey? Check out this round-up of resources from the past few years:

- “Five Things to Know about Carla Hayden, America’s First Black, Female Librarian of Congress” (http://fusion.net/story/273365/carla-hayden-librarian-of-congress-nominee-facts/): July 13, 2016, Fusion.net offers a few interesting facts about Hayden and what her appointment means
- “‘No’ on Nomination of Carla Hayden to Be Librarian of Congress” (http://heritageaction.com/key-votes/no-nomination-carla-hayden-librarian-of-congress): July 13, 2016, Heritage Action for America takes issue with the president’s nomination

Prefer to watch instead of read? Take a moment to meet President Obama’s Nominee for Librarian of Congress through this short video, posted on The White House’s YouTube channel in February 2016: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RnlJzccjNqE.

**Acquisitions**

**Project COUNTER and Hidden Metrics**

With the increasing diversity of scholarly communication systems providing us with a constant influx of new ways to share information with one another, search out content, and access materials, traditional usage statistics may fall short in telling the story of the value of research and scholarship—from the perspective of those conducting the research and producing the scholarly pieces, those providing online access to these works, and those using the associated usage statistics to inform collection management decisions and calculating cost per use.

A publisher’s content can be scattered across multiple platforms (including institutional repositories, scholarly social network sites, and aggregators such as EBSCO and ProQuest), so single-platform usage metrics may be limiting. Additionally, alternative metrics such as likes, shares, tweets, and citations on Wikipedia can communicate important information to both consumers and providers.

In response to the landscape changes that result in increasingly hidden usage, Counting Online Usage of NeTworked Electronic Resources (COUNTER; see https://www.projectcounter.org/) worked with Information Power Limited to undertake research into a new method of reporting called “Distributed Usage Logging,” which enables publishers to provide reports on “total usage” regardless of where that usage happens. Such reports could also provide more details in the emerging altmetrics field, such as shares and tweets.

Lorraine Estelle, Director of COUNTER, provided some background information about the project as well as a link to the following resource: CrossRef Distributed Usage Logging Pilot presented at Fall SSP Seminar on September 16, 2015, in Washington, D.C. (http://www.slideshare.net/VictoriaRaoMS/crossref-distributed-usage-logging-pilot).

For additional information about hidden usage and metrics from a law librarian perspective, check out what some of our AALL colleagues have to say:

  http://www.slideshare.net/KAtieBrown1/altmetrics-how-to-aall-2014
  http://www.aallnet.org/mm/Education/aall2go/webinars/2016/aallwebinar201609.html

**Cataloging**

**Building Bridges with Logs: Collaborative Conversations About Discovery Across Library Departments**

The process of implementing a discovery tool can be filled with questions, and even after its implementation, questions about its efficacy and the quality of search results can remain. This article describes an interesting approach to evaluating a discovery tool.

According to the article’s abstract: “This article describes the use of discovery system search logs as a vehicle for encouraging constructive conversations across departments in an academic library. The project focused on bringing together systems and teaching librarians to evaluate the results of anonymized patron searches in order to improve communication across departments, as well as to identify opportunities for improvement to the discovery system itself.”
The authors of the article conclude that, overall, the experience was a positive one for the staff members involved and it led to some valuable insight into the quality of the search results retrieved by the discovery tool.


Cataloging Legal Literature, 4th edition, now available

Hein has announced the availability of the online portion of Melanie Lembke and Melissa Beck’s revised fourth edition of Cataloging Legal Literature. The text has been upgraded from an image-based pdf version to an interactive, searchable resource. The title is designed to be used in conjunction with the Resource & Description Access (RDA) Toolkit, and it features links from the text directly to relevant instructions in the RDA Toolkit.

If your library has a standing order for the AALL publications series, you will be authenticated into the HeinOnline database version of the title.


OCLC Research announces Faceted Controlled Vocabularies List

OCLC Research has announced a new electronic discussion list focused on faceted-controlled vocabularies. As technical services librarians, we are most familiar with FAST (Faceted Application of Subject Terminology) and LCGFT (Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms).

Full text of OCLC Research announcement:

We are pleased to announce the debut of a new electronic discussion list hosted by OCLC.

FACETVOC-L (Faceted Controlled Vocabularies discussion list) is a discussion list focused on faceted controlled vocabularies used in libraries, archives and museums. This includes vocabularies such as FAST (Faceted Application of Subject Terminology), AAT (Art and Architecture Thesaurus) and LCGFT (Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms). The list will be a point of focus for discussion and exchange among librarians, archivists, museum professionals, controlled vocabulary specialists and other professionals engaged in the creation, maintenance, study, and—especially—the application of faceted vocabularies in a variety of contexts including as part of cataloging and metadata editing work and/or deployment in information retrieval and discovery systems.

The FAST (Faceted Application of Subject Terminology) team at OCLC will monitor and participate in the list. OCLC extends a special invitation to other agencies responsible for publishing faceted vocabularies to join FACETVOC-L to monitor and participate in FACETVOC-L discussions.

To subscribe to FACETVOC-L, go to http://listserv.oclc.org/archives/facetvoc-l.html and click on the “join or leave the list (or change settings)” link. Once your subscription request has been approved, you will receive a welcome message.

To send messages to FACETVOC-L, go to http://listserv.oclc.org/archives/facetvoc-l.html and click on the “post to the list” link, or email the post to: facetvoc-l@oclc.org (note: you must be a subscriber to post to the list)

To search the FACETVOC-L list archives (available to subscribers only), go to http://listserv.oclc.org/archives/facetvoc-l.html and click on the “search the archives” link.

OCLC Research extends a special thanks to the ALCTS CaMMS Faceted Subject Access Interest Group (a unit of the Association of Library Collections and Technical Services, a division of the American Library Association) for encouraging OCLC to establish FACETVOC-L.

ISNIs and ORCIDs – the impact of identifiers

A recent post in The Scholarly Kitchen, “Why Persistent Identifiers Deserve Their Own Festival” (https://scholarlykitchen.ssnet.org/2016/09/12/why-persistent-identifiers-deserve-their-own-festival/), got me thinking about the use of identifiers and how these might transform traditional technical services tasks. A post by Karen Smith-Yoshimura in Hangingtogether.org, “Impact of Identifiers on Authority Workflows” (http://hangingtogether.org/?p=5603), describes explicitly how the use of identifiers could simplify and enhance the process of associating works and creators. In fact, we are told that use of identifiers is essential to shifting bibliographic description out of MARC into a Linked Data environment. The implementation
of personal identifiers is strongest in the sciences, but their use is expanding into the social sciences and humanities.

According to their website (http://www.isni.org/), ISNI (International Standard Name Identifier) is an ISO certified global standard number for identifying the millions of contributors to creative works and those active in their distribution, including researchers, inventors, writers, artists, visual creators, performers, producers, publishers, aggregators, and more. It is part of a family of international standard identifiers that includes identifiers of works, recordings, products and right holders in all repertoires.

The Name Authority Cooperative Program (NACO) and OCLC plan to incorporate ISNIs in the 024 field of LC/NACO authority records as part of the long delayed RDA authority file conversion phase 3B.

ORCID (http://orcid.org/) is a subset of ISNI—a block of identifiers reserved for authors and researchers. ORCID’s mission is to provide an identifier for individuals to use with their name as they engage in research, scholarship, and innovation activities. We provide open tools that enable transparent and trustworthy connections between researchers, their contributions, and affiliations. We provide this service to help people find information and to simplify reporting and analysis.

Authors and researchers can register with ORCID, then share their ORCID ID with their institution. My institution, Cornell University, is actively encouraging faculty in all fields to establish ORCID IDs. Use of identifiers makes it possible to precisely identify authors without the squishy ambiguity of parsing out character strings.

**Information Technology**

NISO Launches New Project to Create a Flexible API Framework for E-Content in Libraries

On August 25, 2016, the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) announced a new project relating to Application Programming Interfaces (API) and data about electronic content in libraries.

Full text of the NISO announcement:

Voting Members of the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) have approved a new project to modernize library-vendor technical interoperability to improve the access of digital library content and electronic books. Building upon a set of API (Application Programming Interface) Requirements (http://virtuallibrary.queenslibrary.org/library-api-draft) developed by Queens Library, a new NISO Working Group will create a foundational API set that the library community can build on. This set will fulfill an array of user and library needs, including quicker response times, flexible item discovery and delivery options, improved resource availability, and more seamless integration of electronic and physical resources.

Library patrons should expect an excellent user experience and requisite level of convenience should be built into all customer-facing tools that service library patrons. This project is being undertaken to bring patrons’ library experiences in line with the modern tools and technologies—especially mobile technologies—they are accustomed to using in other areas of their lives. Currently, libraries use varied technologies, some of which rely on outdated and slow communication protocols, to provide services to users. By establishing standards on RESTful Web services APIs as well as standard mobile extensions, the library industry will leave many archaic, difficult-to-use tool sets behind, and allow libraries more flexibility in meeting local needs.

"11.2 million patrons visited the Queens Library in 2015,” says Kelvin Watson, Chief Operating Officer, Senior Vice President, Queens Library. “It’s imperative that we keep them coming back by providing fast, efficient service that rivals what they experience in the commercial world. Queens Library, which serves one of the five most diverse counties in the United States, has a vested interest in undertaking this work to customize library operations for specialized local needs. We are excited to have initiated this project at NISO and we look forward to working with other participants to actualize our draft framework.”

Volunteer working group members will deliver a foundational framework, in the form of a NISO Recommended Practice, that will communicate an understanding of how libraries should provide and receive data. These library-related communications and functions could include customized genre or category views for browse, search, and discovery of collections; user authentication; transmission of account information; management of barcodes; check out and return of items, streaming of online material, and other requirements as determined by stakeholders. Work will also include the creation of several proof-of-concept services that use the proposed approach to deliver services and a registry to enable supporting data providers and system vendors to communicate their support of the
framework. The full work item approved by NISO Voting Members is available on the NISO website (http://www.niso.org/apps/group_public/download.php/16796/Library%20Services%20API-for%20VM%20Approval.pdf).

NISO's Associate Director of Programs, Nettie Lagace, comments, “NISO is eager to begin this work to improve library-patron interactions. Advancing vendor-library communication processes through consensus discussions and agreement is a natural fit in our portfolio of work. NISO’s mission is to streamline the work of libraries and other information providers to get content into the hands of consumers.” Lagace continues, “We encourage working group participation from libraries, library system providers, providers and distributors of e-books, recorded books, and other forms of digital content and media. We are looking forward to hearing from interested volunteers who can dedicate their technical talents to this important effort.” Those who are interested in participating in the E-Content API Framework working group should contact Lagace at nlagace@niso.org.

**Government Documents**

**Preventing Digital Government Information from Falling Through the [Preservation] Cracks**

In the analog world, the preservation of government information has a clear flow. A federal agency creates content. When the need arises for distribution, it is sent to the Government Publishing Office (GPO), and when the time comes to archive materials for the permanent record, they go to National Archives and Records Administration (NARA). Today this workflow is still effective for print materials. However, much of the content government agencies produce is no longer in an analog form, which means that the flow of content through GPO and NARA doesn’t happen in the same way—and potentially not at all.

To address these concerns, the Digital Preservation of Federal Information Summit was held in San Antonio in early April 2016. This meeting looked at the need for cross-sector collaboration to preserve and provide access to digital government information that may be falling through the cracks without an updated workflow to address the temporariness of web-based content. The end result was a report that outlines the events’ sessions and outcomes, including discussions about the need for an environmental scan, development of a coalition of interested institutions representing the public and private sectors, and the need for a common vocabulary. The report is available at http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc826639/m2/1/high_res_d/2016_Digital_Preservation_Summit_ReflectionsReport.pdf.

**Say Goodbye to THOMAS…**

THOMAS.gov, the online legislative information system, officially retired July 5, 2016, completing its multi-year transition to Congress.gov.

THOMAS originally came on the map in 1995, launched by the Library of Congress as a bipartisan initiative of Congress. Over the years, the system has been updated, but eventually its essential foundation couldn’t accommodate the desires and expectations of modern users—somewhat similar to our cataloging-world outgrowing the framework of AACR2 and beginning fresh with RDA. The Congress.gov system, launched in beta in September 2012, offers mobile-friendly access, single search across all collections and all dates, meaningful persistent Uniform Resource Locators (URLs), faceted search, and other new features such as videos explaining the legislative process.

All available THOMAS data is available to users at Congress.gov, and both Thomas.loc.gov and www.thomas.gov now redirect visitors to Congress.gov. Although many THOMAS URLs will be automatically redirected, updating your links is a recommended best practice, as THOMAS URLs that are not redirected to a specific page will go to the Congress.gov homepage—so don’t forget to update your bookmarks, LibGuides links, and more. You can find a chart providing Congress.gov URLs for popular THOMAS pages, as well as additional information about link updating and redirects, at https://www.congress.gov/help/faq.

Want to learn more about Congress.gov? The Law Library of Congress offers webinar and in-person orientation overviews of Congress.gov focused on searching legislation and Congressional member information, as well as highlighting new Congress.gov features. To register for a webinar, complete their seminar form at http://www.loc.gov/law/opportunities/congress-form.php.

**Fall Fashion from .gov: A New Look for the Library of Congress and a New View of Government Open Source Projects**

Cold weather inevitably means trading out summer garb with new looks and new fashions for autumn and winter, and this year .gov is getting in on the action with a huge homepage redesign for loc.gov, as well as the launch of a new repository site for federal agencies’ open-source projects, which gives us a peek behind the curtain at their custom codes. So let’s celebrate our own mini .gov fashion week with a closer look at both of these projects as they strut down the catwalk.
Library of Congress Homepage Redesign

The web team at LC has been hard at work transitioning their online collections into a new, more consistent format that’s both mobile friendly and allows for faceted searching. To help promote and encourage access to all of this content, they’ve created an entirely new homepage for loc.gov that is more dynamic and offers more ways to highlight their extensive collections, services, and programs.

Highlights include:

- A top carousel that displays topical content, which they will update monthly.
- A trending section that includes top searches, recently published blog posts, and featured items.
- A section about “Your Library” that gives you information for planning a visit, provides access to online reference services, and lists current exhibitions and upcoming events.
- A free to use and reuse section towards the bottom of the page that features items from the digital collection that are freely available for you to use in your own projects.

To learn more about the homepage, check out their recent blog post (http://blogs.loc.gov/loc/2016/11/a-new-homepage-for-loc-gov/) or go directly to the new homepage (http://www.loc.gov/).

Code.gov

The White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) recently launched code.gov to serve as a repository for federal agencies’ open-source projects and to serve as a one-stop shop for exploration, improvement, and innovation on the existing code for a variety of government platforms. Other government agencies can also use the code and resources on this site to assist in implementing new policies, designing metadata schemas to build code inventories, and creating successful open-source projects.

The code of this site is a part of the new federal source code policy, which requires agencies to release at least twenty percent of their custom code as open source. Currently, there are almost fifty different projects available, organized by agency, and more will be added in the coming months.

To learn more about this project, check out fedscoop.com’s recent post (http://fedscoop.com/repository-for-government-open-source-projects-code-gov-launches) or go directly to the site itself (https://code.gov/#/).

Metadata

NISO Virtual Conference: BIBFRAME & Real World Applications of Linked Bibliographic Data

In mid-June, NISO hosted a virtual conference, “BIBFRAME & Real World Applications of Linked Bibliographic Data.” The theme of the conference was explorations of Bibliographic Framework (BIBFRAME) and related approaches to sharing and interacting with bibliographic data. The morning presentations concentrated on providing an overview of BIBFRAME, Linked Data development, and available resources for learning to work with Linked Data. The afternoon sessions concentrated on competencies and Linked Data applications. Presentation slides are available via NISO’s SlideShare page (http://www.slideshare.net/BaltimoreNISO/presentations).

The introductory presentation, given by Georgetown University Library’s Shana L. McDanold, covered the somewhat familiar background of Linked Data and the development of BIBFRAME. She reminded attendees of basic Linked Data concepts: the web of data, which is structured and machine readable, composed of triples constructed using dereferencable Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) and controlled vocabularies. An addition to the subject-object-predicate triple was “context,” which morphs the triple into a quad. This was the first time I had heard this concept mentioned, and it became an “a-ha” moment for me.

The second speaker, Carolyn Hansen from the University of Cincinnati, covered the evolution of BIBFRAME from the initial concept through BIBFRAME 1.0 to BIBFRAME 2.0 and BIBFRAME Lite. She described the differences in core concepts between the versions, shared graphics of the effects of these differences in modeling the same bibliographic object, and discussed the pluses and minuses of BIBFRAME Lite.

The third presentation, by Ted Lawless of Thomson Reuters, discussed some of the skills needed to navigate the world of Linked Data.

Melanie Wacker, Metadata Coordinator, Columbia University, spotlighted the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Standing Committee on Training’s efforts to develop and document training materials to help library staff navigate the
Linked Data landscape. While there is a wealth of introductory and advanced materials, there is a little appropriate to the intermediate Linked Data learner. The PCC plans to work with the Cooperative Online Serials Program (CONSER) and others to provide discussion platforms, sandboxes, and testbeds for experimentation with Linked Data.

Mike Lauruhn from Elsevier Labs presented on project planning and Linked Data competencies, specifically the Linked Data Competency Index (LD4PE) and the Linked Data Exploratorium.

The remaining presentations covered specific Linked Data projects. Tim Thompson, Princeton University Library, demonstrated the use of Linked Data concepts to encode annotations and other information about their recently-acquired Derrida collection. Beecher Wiggens provided an update on the LC BIBFRAME pilot. A representative of Zepheira provided an overview of their Library.Link Network (http://library.link), which is designed to enhance the collective visibility of libraries and their resources on the web. The final presentation focused on University of California (UC) Davis’ experimentation with bibliographic description in a Linked Data environment, with a particular focus on authorities.

Preservation

Review of OAIS (ISO 14721)

The International Organization for Standardization (ISO) standard for an Open Archival Information System (OAIS) Reference Model will be up for its five-year review in 2017. This standard lays out the framework for an archive that will maintain the long-term preservation of information and make this information available to a designated community. More information about OAIS is available from the Society of American Archivists’ Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology at http://www2.archivists.org/glossary/terms/o/open-archival-information-system.

Preparation for this process involves making revisions to ISO 14721 (available at http://www.iso.org/iso/home/store/catalogue_ics/catalogue_detail_ics.htm?csnumber=57284) and the identical text in the Consultative Committee for Space Data Systems (CCSDS) documentation (at 650.0-B-1, available at https://public.ccsds.org/Pubs/A02x1y4c2.pdf). The process of revising these standards is complex, so the review process has already begun. If you would like to take part in the review, or just keep yourself appraised of its progress, you can access the information and documentation on the OAIS five-year review website at http://review.oais.info/.
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