Technical Services Law Librarian

Volume 43 No. 1
September 2017

http://www.aallnet.org/sections/ts/TSLL
ISSN: 0195-4857

INSIDE:

Program Report

Linked Data, Your Library, and You

Shawn King
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Scott Carlson, Rice University Fondren Library, gave a presentation that asked: What do we want from Linked Data for libraries? In the beginning, Rice University created a Linked Data experimental project that added Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) to MARC data. They used MarcEdit to make a task list that added valid URIs into their library system data. The next question was: what do we do with our data once we have added Linked Data elements? We have to wait for library systems to catch up with the Linked Data technology. Rice decided to experiment with a concrete practical usage of Linked Data in their library metadata to allow their library resources to be discoverable in a Google search.

A survey of library users and input from the reference staff revealed that library users start their searching with Google; however, library data is currently not discoverable outside of its library system discovery silo. More vendors are offering the ability to add Linked Data to a library's metadata to make it more discoverable by web robots; however, Rice University decided to experiment by adding Linked Data on their own to test the effectiveness in Google searching for library resources. They created an intermediary webpage that pointed to the web-version Online Public Access Catalog (OPAC).

Scott then gave a quick overview of Linked Data and the different data formats being used to code and display the metadata. He discussed the difference between RDFa (Resource Description Framework in Attributes) and JSON/JSON-LD data coding as well as BIBFRAME and schema.org markup standards. For the project, Rice chose to use JSON-LD as well as schema.org as those are the data format and language preferred by Google.

The project workflow involved first exporting their library data from the SirsiDynix library system into MarcEdit; using the MarcNext tool, they then added URIs to the name headings and subject headings, as well as the URI that points to the Worldcat entity. The data was then exported as tab and comma separated data to edit in Open Refine, where they used templating into XML to transform the data with a script into JSON-LD and HTML, adding them to

Continued on page 32

A Publication of the Technical Services Special Interest Section and the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section of the American Association of Law Libraries

2017-2018 Officers, Committee Chairs, and Representatives

TS-SIS

Chair:
Lauren Seney
William and Mary
Vice Chair/Chair-Elect:
Wendy Moore
University of Georgia
Secretary/Treasurer:
Diana Jaque
University of Southern California
Members-at-Large:
Carol Collins (2016-2018)
University of Tennessee
Emily Dust Nimsakont (2017-19)
University of Nebraska
Acquisitions Committee:
Marijah Sroczynski
Milbank,Tweed,Hadley & McCloy
Awards Committee:
Kevin Carey
Ohio State University
Bylaws Committee:
Alan Keely
Wake Forest University
Cataloging & Classification:
Keiko Okuhara
University of Hawaii
Membership Committee:
Kerry Skinner
Arizona State University
Nominating Committee:
Katrina Piechnik
Jenkins Law Library
Preservation Committee:
Sharon Bradley
University of Georgia
Professional Development Committee:
Ajaye Bloomstone
Louisiana State University
Trina Holloway
Georgia State University
Serials Committee:
Patricia Roncevich
University of Pittsburgh

OBS-SIS

Chair:
Jennifer Noga
Wake Forest University
Vice Chair/Chair-Elect:
Jackie Magagnosc
Cornell University
Secretary/Treasurer:
Kevin Carey
Ohio State University
Members-at-Large:
Patty Alvayay (2016-2018)
University of Kentucky
Jason LeMay (2017-2019)
Emory University
Education Committee:
Jennifer Noga
Wake Forest University
Local Systems Committee:
Keiko Okuhara
University of Hawaii
Nominating Committee:
Scott Matheson
Yale University
OCLC Committee:
Emily Dust Nimsakont
University of Nebraska
Web Advisory Committee:
Barbara Ginzburg
Washburn University

OBS and TS-SIS Representatives/Liaisons

ALA MARC Advisory Committee
Jean Pajerek, Cornell University
ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)
Robert Bratton, George Washington University
ALA Subject Analysis Committee (SAC)
Lia Contursi, Columbia University
Funding Research Opportunities Grant (FROG)
Chair, Gypsy Moody, Belmont University (2017-2019)
Representative-at-Large, Rebecca Domm, Bass, Berry & Sims (2017-19)
OBS SIS Reps: Lisa Watson (2017-2019); Rachel Decker (2017-2019)
TS SIS Reps: Kevin Carey (2016-2018), Jesse Lambertson (2017-2019)

From the Chair

Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section

In this, my first column as the new Chair of the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS), I want to take some time to re-introduce myself, explain what drew me to this section, effusively thank many wonderful people, and look forward to the next year. For those who do not know me, I have been a member of both the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) and OBS-SIS for six years. That's the amount of time I've been in law libraries as well, having started in my current position as Technical Services Librarian at Wake Forest's University School of Law Professional Center Library in 2011.

As a new member of AALL, I was especially drawn to get involved with OBS-SIS. The focus of this section aligns with my job responsibilities and interests. I have a background working with library systems and was previously a system administrator for a consortium of community college libraries. I currently have some responsibilities for administering the system for the law library and am part of a university-wide task force evaluating our shared ILS. When I first joined AALL, I knew that I needed to learn more about how systems fit into the law library landscape, and OBS has already helped me with that immensely. Things I've learned in the OBS Local Systems Committee meetings alone have been worth the price of admission.

Likewise, this section coordinates some stellar professional development opportunities. If you weren't able to attend "Linked Data, Your Library, and You," the program in Austin presented by OBS-SIS's VIP Scott Carlson, I encourage you to listen to the recording. In an accessible and engaging way, Scott described a project that he helped implement at Rice University that incorporated Linked Data elements. Mind you, it is not something we will be doing at my library any time soon, but it helped crystallize my understanding of the kinds of things that are possible using Linked Data. Every year, OBS's Education Committee has consistently developed fine programs and educational offerings like this. A huge thank you to the members of the committee for all their hard work in organizing the programs, with special thanks going to the 2016-2017 Education Committee Chair, Marjorie Crawford, and Barbara Szalkowski, who coordinated the Linked Data program.

Help us build on the success of the programs presented at the 2017 Annual Meeting in Austin. Must-have program ideas, many of which are pertinent to the interests of OBS members, have already been collected through AALL's IdeaScale website. I encourage everyone to get involved in the program planning process for the 2018 Annual Meeting, which opened on September 5, 2017. Information regarding the timeline and proposal process is available at http://www.aallnet.org/conference/education/future-meetings/program-proposers/timeline.html. The Education Committee will be working hard to coordinate insightful programming that will benefit OBS members. Please let us know if you have any ideas or issues that you would like the Education Committee to consider for a program proposal.

In addition to OBS's focus and its pertinent programming, the section's officers and members are incredibly welcoming and enthusiastic. It was clear to me soon after I joined that I wanted to be a part of this group of people. This is the part where I get to wax poetic about all the outgoing officers, especially our outgoing Chair, Marjorie Crawford. At the OBS-SIS Business Meeting in Austin, I had the privilege of presenting Marjorie with a plaque honoring her leadership. This plaque was a small token compared to all that Marjorie has done for OBS, including steadfastly leading the section for not one, but two years. OBS was extremely fortunate to have her at the helm during a difficult time, and we will still benefit from her wisdom and expertise as she continues in her role as Past-Chair. I think I can speak for all of OBS when I say how much we deeply appreciate Marjorie's commitment and leadership.

I also want to recognize and thank the other outgoing officers, including Melanie Cornell, who diligently served as Secretary/Treasurer of the section for many years. And, of course, outgoing Past-Chair Karen Selden deserves much recognition and gratitude for being an unstoppable force in moving OBS forward for many years now.

Looking forward, it is a true honor to be part of the 2017-2018 Executive Board that includes Jackie Magagnosc as Vice-Chair, Kevin Carey as Secretary/Treasurer, and Patty Alvayay and Jason LeMay as Members-at-Large. They all come to the Board with an impressive record of involvement and contribution to this section. It has been a privilege getting to work with this excellent group of people already. I look forward to continuing to learn from them as we work together on behalf of OBS. I also want to thank all the new OBS committee chairs and committee members. With all of these fine folks collaborating together, I feel sure that OBS can accomplish great things this year.

Although I've had the pleasure of working with OBS-SIS off and on for the past few years, I still consider myself a relative newcomer to the scene. I am truly honored to be serving as Chair of OBS-SIS this year. However, I know that I have a lot to learn, and I am counting on all OBS members to get me up to speed. Over the next year, I want to kick off a plan to evaluate our positioning, some of our processes, and . . . something else I'll think of that starts with "p." Anyway, I'll discuss these initiatives and more in upcoming columns and through My Communities. I'll rely on the input and feedback of OBS members this year to guide our course, so I implore you to call me, email me, text me, whatever. Just let me know your thoughts and feedback so that we can be responsive to the needs of OBS-SIS members. Here's to the next year!

Jennifer Noga
Wake Forest University

From the Chair

Technical Services Special Interest Section

The month following the Annual Meeting is often a chaotic time. Returning to work after traveling can be busy enough, but conference travel is frequently just plain exhausting! Once you are back on your feet and preparing for the upcoming year (academic, fiscal, or just conference scheduling), it is uncanny how quickly summer is over. Many of my friends think that because I work in an academic environment, I have the summer off or that it is a slow. The truth is that I usually find myself busier during the summer months and looking forward to the return of students and the fall season just to catch my breath.

This year, however, the annual meeting proved to be revitalizing. Despite the Business Meeting being scheduled at 7:30 am, we had a packed room to discuss the Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Standing Committees (if you haven't read it, check it out at http://www.aallnet.org/sections/ts/Documents/Committees/TSSIS-AdHocCommitteeonStandingCommitteesReport20170705.pdf). These enthusiastic discussions have given us focus for the coming months, and the Professional Development Committee will host a series of e-forums for all Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) members to discuss the report and help guide the direction of the Section for the future.

Another breath of fresh air has come from promising conversations with Chairs of other SIS's who have pledged support for the Cataloging Liaisons to the Subject Analysis Committee (SAC), the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC), and the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA). We are working with the SIS Council on a multi-pronged approach to support the liaisons this year while also developing a more sustainable approach for the future. As much as I want to say that everything has been resolved, we still have an uphill battle—but now there are others climbing the hill with us!

While we continue to discuss the long-term outlook for TS-SIS, there are more pressing deadlines. The call for proposals went out in early September, and the Professional Development Committee would love to help you cultivate your proposal for Baltimore 2018. In addition to annual conference planning, the Webinars and E-Forum subcommittees are also open to your thoughts for ongoing education throughout the year. Planning for TS events at the Annual Meeting is also on the horizon. If you have any feedback from previous years, please get in touch with me! Appointments to both standing and administrative committees are now happening. If you would like to join a working committee or take part in the discussion forums of our standing committees, please get in touch with the committee chair or me. We have much to work on and look forward to in the coming year, and I thank you all for your continued dedication to TS-SIS.

Lauren Seney
William and Mary

Technical Services Law Librarian (*TSLL*) Annual Report July 2016-June 2017

The *Technical Services Law Librarian (TSLL)* volume 42 had four issues, published in PDF and available on the *TSLL* website at http://www.aallnet.org/sections/ts/TSLL/Issues. They are also available on Hein Online at http://heinonline.org/HOL/Index?collection=aallar. Michael Maben completed his fourth year as *TSLL*'s editor-in-chief and was very grateful for the excellent assistance provided by Sabrina Davis, Associate Editor; Stacy Fowler, Associate Editor; Julie Stauffer, Layout and Design; and Martin Wisneski, Web Manager. All issues for Volume 42 were published on schedule. The editor-in-chief greatly appreciates the work done by our dedicated columnists and editors.

There were a few columnist changes through the year. Two columnists, Sarah Lin and Sara Campbell, were appointed to the Editorial Board, and according to *TSLL* policy, we needed to find new authors for their columns. Luz Verguizas took over the Acquisitions column, and Amber Hawkins agreed to co-author the Private Law Libraries column. Dan Blackaby stepped down from the Internet column, and Wilhelminia Randtke agreed to write it. After the December issue, both Ashley Moye stepped down from the Library Metrics column and Robert Bratton stepped down from the Description and Entry column. Beginning with the June issue, Emily Dust Nimsakont picked up Library Metrics, and Jesse Lambertson is now writing Description and Entry (after Melody Lembke guest-authored the column for the March issue).

Concerning the editorial staff, Sabrina Davis stepped down from the Associate Editor position. Stacy Fowler agreed to fill this position. Sabrina worked with Stacy on the March issue, and then Stacy took over the full task of Associate Editor beginning with the June issue.

Finally, with the Editorial Board, Caitlyn Lam and Jennifer Fell completed their two-year terms. The other Board members for 2016/2017 were Sara Campbell and Sarah Lin, and I appreciate all their support.

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

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

New Member Grant Report

Erica Nutzman
Minnesota State Law Library

Thank you so much to the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) for awarding me the New Member Grant and giving me the opportunity to attend my first American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting this year in Austin, Texas. It was a great experience to be able to meet people in person whose names I have seen on the TS email list and to meet so many other law librarians. While I am a new law librarian, I am a librarian with previous conference experience, and this helped me to get the most out of this opportunity.

I began my AALL conference with the Conference of Newer Law Librarians (CONELL) and ended up meeting another TS grant award winner there. It was a great introduction to the conference and a good way to meet other librarians. In addition, I went on a couple dine-arounds, and these dinners were a great opportunity to get to know people better. It is often a struggle to meet people in the larger conference context, so the smaller setting helped me connect more personally with other librarians.

The keynote address from Bryan Stevenson was incredibly moving. He hit on so many important points, some of which I have noticed in my time working for the court and some I have not. The line that really stood out to me was "courts are more committed to finality than fairness." I have worked with patrons who had circumstances beyond their control cause them to miss court-imposed deadlines, and this critique felt quite accurate. On the way out after the speech, I heard several people mention that they had cried during the session. The stories he told were heart-rending and memorable.

I attended a number of TS sessions, including Linked Data, the Business Meeting, and the Management Issues Round Table. I met a number of people at these sessions who offered to be resources for me in the future, particularly with an upcoming integrated library system (ILS) migration. I felt welcomed at the Business Meeting, and the Management Round Table was interesting. Hearing management horror stories always makes me appreciate my own team even more. It was great to meet so many other technical services law librarians.

For me, the highlight of the conference was touring the Texas State Law Library and Texas Legislative Reference Library. Both libraries were unique and beautiful. It was my first chance to visit and meet someone working at another State Law Library. The Law Library showed off some of their featured services and projects, and I was inspired to try some of them at my home library. Their off-site database access was especially exciting, since we have been thinking about offering this for a while. The Legislative Reference Library is working on a big digitization project, which is an area that I will be delving into soon. Seeing their workflow, process, and equipment was quite helpful for my project planning.

Attending the AALL conference has given me renewed enthusiasm for a project I had set aside, a better direction on a digitization project, a great respect for all of the librarians working to support access to justice for underserved patrons, and an increased desire to share with other law librarians. Thank you again for making it possible for me to attend the 2017 AALL Annual Meeting in Austin, Texas.

Experienced Member General Grant

Heather Buckwalter
Creighton University Law Library

Relevant useful
Data data everywhere
Benchmarking keep up

Having attended the *Internal Assessment and Peer Benchmarking in Academic Law Libraries* workshop will greatly help me to gather and assess data relevant to my library and institution. Learning the history behind the ALLSTAR Benchmarking was a fundamental piece as to why this initiative started and why it is important for academic law libraries to use the platform. The hands on training course included in this workshop will be invaluable to me in analyzing the information from over 3,000 data points. As the American Bar Association (ABA) has changed the Annual Questionnaire regarding Law Libraries, it is imperative that academic law libraries use a consistent method for gathering information, generate meaningful metrics, and be consistent with standards.

There were so many great instructional programs and meetings this year, it was difficult to attend everything I wanted to attend. My personal focus this year for choosing programs and meetings seemed to center on how I could help my library stay relevant and how I, as a librarian, could stay relevant to my institution. Programs such as the *Linchpin Librarian* and *Introverts as Leaders* have given me some insight on how to stay relevant. I truly enjoyed the meetings and round table sessions I attended. I met new people, reacquainted myself with old friends, and learned so much from interacting with others who share my concerns. The chance to exchange ideas and network at the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) Annual Meeting with colleagues is important and valuable.

I am grateful to receive the Experienced Member General Grant to attend the 2017 AALL Annual Meeting this year in Austin. As our staffs shrink, we are all taking on new duties and responsibilities. This usually means learning a new skill or expanding your knowledge in an area you have not worked in before. Metrics, statistics, data analysis, and benchmarking are areas where I have to expand my knowledge. I am used to thinking (hoping) one day to get useful, relevant usage statistics for our electronic resources, but now I need to go beyond usage statistics and gather useful data related to all aspects of my library, learning how to use that data to make sure my library is relevant to my institution.

Workshop Report

Crystal Alberthal
University of Washington
Gallagher Law Library

Not Pie in the Sky: Practical Strategies for Embracing Change in Technical Services

This workshop gave Technical Services librarians and professionals an opportunity to explore solutions and consider other libraries' experiences in working to respond to their own changing workflows and technology. The goal was to give participants the ability to see areas where they can effectively collaborate interdepartmentally, leveraging their expertise and establishing new roles.

Following is a review of the four sessions that made up this workshop. A review for the fifth session, which was a "choose-your-own-adventure" round table, where speakers from the day facilitated breakout sessions focused on their presentation topics, was not included.

Using metrics to prove your value

Marcia Burris, Research & Information Services Consultant, HBR Consulting, LLC

HBR Consulting, LLC works with law firms and legal departments to help clients be more productive and profitable by using data driven metrics. Marcia suggests that Technical Services departments, whose infrastructures are set up to provide and meet people's information needs, have a unique opportunity as data gurus to gather, assess, and deliver this data to the organization they support. Ultimately, this process can help build relationships between libraries and stakeholders of the organization by demonstrating the added value of the library.

The metrics are gathered using a six-step measurement process:

1. Decide *what* to measure.
    a. Usage? Patrons? Withdrawals? Volumes? Traditional statistics might not be reported to the American Bar Association (ABA), but are they still important for the library/organization? What are the implications? What are your values? How will they be interpreted?
    b. Finances: Cost per resource? Cost per user? Savings/revenue?
    c. Work and product outputs: Hours of faculty research? Number of transactions? Population served? Utilization of resources? Compare to peer organizations.
    d. Define what the organization's goals are through conversations with stakeholders.
    e. Do the department's tasks align with the organization's goals?
2. Decide *how* to measure.
    a. How does the organization measure output? Can you measure the library's output the same way?
    b. What proxy values can be used? Use proxy data with caution. Marcia recommended reading "Weapons of Math Destruction" by Cathy O'Neil (https://weaponsofmathdestructionbook.com)
    c. Define process decisions for measurement.
    d. Best practice for measuring intangibles: Collect testimonials to illustrate value provided and tie them to the organizations goals.
3. Measure!
    a. Capture data in real time, if possible. Data collection tools can be research trackers, resource-monitoring apps, budget analytics platforms. Ex: Onelog (http://www.onelog.com), Zendesk (http://www.zendesk.com), Priory Solutions (http://www.priorysolutions.com).
    b. Use consistent methods across team
    c. Measure impact
    d. Tips from Marcia
        i. Use this as a branding opportunity with vendors for patrons to know who is providing access (library vs. law school).
        ii. Consider using visuals to report data to the parent organization
4. Analyze (this should be happening all the time!)
    a. Look at your data in different ways: goals vs. actual, year over year.
    b. Visualize your data to help show patterns. Are the patterns meaningful?
    Caution: know how your vendors are relaying the data. Know the trends; does it make sense with the data you are seeing?
    c. Benchmark your data against similar organizations (American Bar Association, NELLCO, American Association of Law Libraries, Harvard Business Review Library survey, custom peer surveys).

5. Identify actions
   a. Decide what you are going to do with the data. Be strategic with how you respond.
   b. Consider time investments. Are the actions supporting your organization? Marcia says, "Be brave! Be creative!" An example of this at an academic library is no longer checking in serials.
6. Report the data to stakeholders
   a. Include your data, analysis, and recommendations. Share your insights.
   b. Use meaningful language, not library/industry jargon.
   c. Solicit feedback

Challenges: Consider that sometimes what is easy to measure is not valuable for the organization. How do you know what is high value? How do you prioritize resources? You want to consider the "data trackability," stakeholder needs, and prioritize within the context of those that have high impact and low effort vs. low impact and high effort.

Marketing tips: Take the time to understand the stakeholder group. Step back and read what they read. Take an opportunity to connect.

Marcia closed by encouraging technical services departments to embrace non-traditional library opportunities to prove their value. Our new mission should include providing the infrastructure for our organization's mission. Marcia says that this requires being brave and moving away from "all the things we've always done. Think about the information needs in the organization. They may be different than they were. Be creative! You can drive value!"

Both sides now: a conversation about vendor records and VRAG

Joni Cassidy, President/CEO, Cassidy Cataloguing Services, Inc.
Yael Mandelstam, VRAG (Vendor-Supplied Records Advisory Working Group), Head of Cataloging, Fordham University Law Library
Alan Keely, Assoc. Director for Collection Services and Systems, Wake Forest University School of Law

This was a moderated, Question & Answer conversation led by Alan Keely between Joni Cassidy, a MARC record provider, and Yael Mandelstam, a Catalog Librarian. Participants were given an opportunity to hear: 1) how vendor records are created and distributed by a MARC record provider, and 2) best practices by a catalog librarian for evaluating and editing MARC records in a multi-vendor bibliographic environment. Following is a summary of the conversation.

Alan began by asking how technological advancements have changed their work. Joni replied that instead of hosting many servers, they now have their database on three servers, all backed up to the cloud. They also use Share File to deliver record files to clients in a simple list. Yael said that technology has helped by "discontinuing byzantine local practices!" They now go to a web browser to load records and have an ILS that does global updating. A major advancement has been using MarcEdit (http://www.marcedit.reeset.net), which has made a huge difference in their batchloading process of vendor-supplied records.

Alan asked how Cassidy fit into providing vendor records. Joni replied that they are a group of eight contract catalogers and independent law librarians; three work full time in their office and five work remotely. They work for a whole slew of different clients using a Union Catalog, mostly doing original cataloging, with some copy cataloging and cloning. She compares Cassidy to "Special Libraries Cataloguing" in Victoria, British Columbia (http://www.slc.bc.ca/). When deciding if they should create records for a new database, they first have to establish an audience. When new records are created, they can tag them for a group of subscribers. To fulfill record customization requests from customers, Cassidy has profiles set up with vendors to assist with partial selection of collections, requests to add suffixes, proxies and adding "z" in the URL, as Yael's library does.

In responding to a question about serial title changes, Joni said that they create "umbrella records," one record that covers many titles, with the exception to this practice being special titles. For electronic serial records, Cassidy tends to catalog them determined by how the vendor has them available. For example, Hein has "umbrella records," linking the titles changes in a 247, whereas LexisNexis and Westlaw may have up to three separate records because each title exists separately with separate URLs, so Cassidy catalogs three records.

To Yael, Alan asked how they identify "good" records and data sets when the library subscribes to a new database. Yael replied that her library has developed a batch loading method that begins by looking at a few sample records in the file to determine if are they full *Resource Description and Access (RDA)*, if they have subject headings, and if they are provider neutral. They then load them into MarcEdit and open the files to determine if the records are missing any important fields and if there are any duplicate fields. They also view the fields in isolation, such as the 245, 856, etc., to see if they are structured properly.

With a staff of two, Yael states that it is efficient to spend time with the first load from a new dataset because you can create macros to edit records within MarcEdit when loading subsequent files. 70% of their database records are batchloaded through MarcEdit. With the first load of records from a new vendor, they add a 001 so there are no overlays, put in their own 856z language, remove non-provider neutral fields, and do an analysis of the changes in MarcEdit load table/profile. This is where the records go through the table profile during the loading process and make changes to the records.

Alan stated that in an ideal world, records would have "all" the fields, but many vendor supplied records are now machine generated and fields are missing. How do you deal with these? Joni stated that none of their records are machine generated; they do all original cataloging by humans. Yael replied that they *want* print, provider neutral records, and as long as the original record is good, they do not have a problem with machine-generated records. They have encountered some issues with e-book vendor records without subject headings. For these, they export the records out of the system and clean them up in MarcEdit. They then merge them with a subject headings file in MarcEdit and reload them into their catalog.

When addressing the concern of authority control on subject headings, Yael stated that they do not really bother with them too much. They might send them to Cassidy or the vendor record supplier, but they have learned to live with a certain degree of imperfection: "If it's findable, it's fine." The Vendor-Supplied Records Advisory Working Group (VRAG) analyzes records and contacts vendors as a group to update these. Joni stated that they do authority control work in new records, and they update and correct records that they then send via Share File to their clients.

Alan asked if catalogers or system people within the library should load records. Both Joni and Yael agree that this should be a cataloger's job. Yael emphasized that it is important to have a cataloger be involved in the analysis of vendor-supplied records. She also encouraged catalogers to be creative and remain relevant to their organizations by investigating ways in which they can use technology to be more efficient, such as MarcEdit. From the vendor side, Joni emphasized the importance of having a cataloger on the subscriber end that "speaks MARC."

Wrapping up the conversation, Alan asked Joni and Yael, "What can vendors and subscribers do to create good relationships?" Joni referred back to the importance of working with a cataloger who knows important things like how to set 001 or 035 fields to be the main match field for batchloading. She also emphasized that she likes to hear from her subscribers about issues or problems that they are experiencing so that they have an opportunity to talk about them.

Yael replied that she wants responsive vendors and vendors who make batchloading as easy as possible. She also emphasized the importance of vendors following cataloging standards.

BIBFRAME beginnings - educating ourselves for the Linked Data future

Amy Brown, Monographic Cataloging Unit Head & Metadata Coordinator, Harry Ransom Center
Melanie Cofield, Head of Access Systems, University of Texas (UT) Libraries
Ann Marchock, Coordinator of Digital & Monographic Resources, UT Libraries
David Melanson, Coordinator of Online & Continuing Resources, UT Libraries
Alisha Quagliana, Discovery & Access Coordinator, UT Libraries
Alan Ringwood, Coordinator of Music & Multimedia Resources, UT Libraries

Colleagues from three University of Texas-Austin (UT) campuses (UT Libraries, the Harry Ransom Center, and the Tarlton Law Library) came together to develop knowledge and skills in BIBFRAME and Linked Data for libraries. Their collaborative experience included in-depth discussions of current publications and resources; formal training strategies; and hands-on experimentation transforming local metadata to BIBFRAME. Results include insights on mapping complexities, data loss, false transformations, potential new metadata displays, and the limitations of the tools involved. Overall, the experimentation process helped raise new questions about what is needed to move towards Linked Data and the frontier of Technical Services staff skillsets.

Following are highlights of what the panelists reported during this session. It includes approaches to maximize the group learning experience; lessons learned from grappling with new concepts, data models, terminology, and tools; and what they see as emerging questions, challenges and next steps. (Excerpt adapted and edited from AALL workshop agenda document.)

BIBFRAME defined:
Presented by Ann Marchock, Coordinator of Digital & Monographic Resources, UT Libraries

Ann introduced this session by explaining that a data management company called Zepheira conceived BIBFRAME as a possible alternative to MARC. BIBFRAME clarifies and expands on relationships that exist in MARC between entities and explains the differences between content and form. It also uses Resource Description Framework (RDF) triple statements. One of the current challenges of moving toward BIBFRAME is that Linked Data is not fully integrated into library catalogs.

She further talked about the history of BIBFRAME and its evolution: BIBFRAME 1.0 used Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) work + instance and BIBFRAME 2.0 uses FRBR work + instance + core class item. Challenges with BIBFRAME implementation include difficulty in planning because of the unknown direction of Linked Data, aligning FRBR models and other bibliographic models, and idealized world vs. real world models. The real world requires a stabilized model that we can build a tool from; this does not exist with BIBFRAME due to the unknown future of Linked Data.

BIBFRAME Discussion Group (BFDG):
Presented by David Melanson, Coordinator of Online & Continuing Resources, UT Libraries

David discussed the BIBFRAME discussion group that existed from fall 2014 to spring 2016. It included thirteen participants from UT Libraries, Harry Ransom Center, and Tarlton Law Library. The goals of the group were to work to understand BIBFRAME and Linked Data, explain and evaluate BIBFRAME transformation processes and related tools, and identify and monitor Linked Data projects such as LD4L (Linked Data 4 Libraries: http://www.ld4l.org) and Bibflow (https://bibflow.library.ucdavis.edu/).

The group used Sharepoint to share online documentation; they had monthly meetings that consisted of critical discussions around training experiences and reporting, monitoring developments, and synthesizing findings.

The group learning successes include effective learning through group collaboration and experience, broadened perspectives beyond BIBFRAME, and fostered and strengthened relationships with other groups across campus.

The group learning challenges revolve around Linked Data, trying to find out how to keep up with the constant changes in Linked Data, and struggling to begin conversations with the rest of the library about Linked Data.

Experimentation, Process, Tools & Results:
Presented by Alan Ringwood, Coordinator of Music & Multimedia Resources, UT Libraries

Alan shared the two phases of experimentation that the group went through using BIBFRAME 1.0. The goals of this phase were to learn about the BIBFRAME 1.0 translation process, learn clean up tools for record migration into local catalogs, and learn about BIBFRAME 1.0 translation tools.

Initial steps required gathering metadata with different types of tools and cleaning MARC data sets. They used Sierra (https://www.iii.com/products/sierra-ils/), MarcEdit (http://marcedit.reeset.net/), and Open Refine (http://openrefine.org/). Assessing the results was overall very messy and confusing. The Open Refine tool only accepted data files of limited size, it was difficult to assess the translation of multiple records, and the display of entities (works, instances, items) was not meaningful. The MARC record conversion was generally good, although there were many problems with non-MARC conversions to MARCxml such as significant data loss, lack of granularity, and incorrect mappings. The process also required customizing MARC Edits XSLT style sheets (style sheet translation language).

Phase two of the experimentation focused on BIBFRAME 1.0 editors: LC BIBFRAME Editor 1.0 (http://bibframe.org/tools/editor/) vs. Zephira Scribe (http://editor.bibframe.zepheira.com/static/). Both editors have incomplete profile lists, and Zephira has unconventional profile names. LC uses FRBR and *RDA* terminology, and Zephira uses BIBFRAME Lite. Both require consultation and input from catalogers for meaning.

Experimentation outcome successes were that they have a better understanding of Linked Data and an increased knowledge of translation tools. Challenges were keeping up with changes in BIBFRAME and Linked Data and effectively training staff to build Linked Data knowledge and skills.

Outcomes (BFDG)
Presented by Melanie Cofield, Head of Access Systems, UT Libraries

Melanie reported that outcomes of BFDG strengthened the relationships among partners and institutions on campus, created stronger relationships with IT units, and formalized unit participation and activities beyond MARC. It further built knowledge and skills through the BFDG training groups and experiments, participation in certifications in XML and RDF based systems, Library Juice Academy (http://libraryjuiceacademy.com/), on-going engagement in the Fedora User Community, and expanding metadata outreach.

Additional outcomes include continuing to monitor Linked Data development via LC, PCC, OCLC and National Projects, as well as ongoing national initiatives and discussions, vendor products and services, research, initiatives and collaborative opportunities.

Melanie reported that the lessons learned in this process emphasize that coordinated efforts can have significant impact and gain; organizational priorities can shift; champions and advocates in leadership are key to success; and grabbing the low hanging fruit is a practical focus.

Lingering questions include: How do we maintain momentum and keep up with BIBFRAME and Linked Data? How do we establish a strong Linked Data expertise and develop services around Linked Data in our organization?

Possible next steps and answers to these questions include serving as beta-partners with vendors for Linked Data products, engaging in metadata outreach, creating workflows for batch metadata enhancement and translations, and exploring new areas of authority work, such as using persistent identifiers instead of text strings.

Repositories, taxonomies and non-traditional roles

Lauren Seney, Digital Initiatives Librarian, College of William & Mary
Slides available at http://scholarship.law.wm.edu/libpubs/126/

Lauren presented ten areas of a law library that technical services librarians and professionals can become experts in and utilize their skills as metadata and information organization professionals. These provide opportunities for fulfilling non-traditional library roles and emphasize the transferability of traditional technical services skills into other library and law school initiatives that are valuable to the larger organization's mission and goals.

One area Lauren highlighted is Institutional Repositories (IRs) and Digital Archives (DAs). Lauren emphasized that dealing with digital collections is a good way to get involved with metadata. Both IRs and DAs require preservation planning and administration in the following areas: Producers (provide the initial description), Managers (archival storage, additional description), and Access (queries from end users).

Learning new metadata standards is required for both IRs and DAs. Two examples are Dublin Core and METS (Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard). Platforms for IRs and DAs are divided into two categories: Open Source such as DSpace and LawArXiv (project by NELLCO, LIPA, MALLCO, and Cornell Law Library; competitor of SSRN), and Proprietary (Content DM, Digital Commons, and SSRN).

IRs and DRs also include Linked Data such as DOIs (digital object identifiers: doi.org)—permanent link to information, and ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID: orcid.org)—permanent and unique identifier to differentiate between names associated with authors. These are associated with headers.

A second area that Lauren highlighted is Scholarly Communications. Technical services librarians often already know your rights and author's rights to this group of resources, so this makes a great fit. Lauren gave an example from the University of Tennessee LibGuide: "What's in the Scholarly Publishing Toolkit" (http://libguides.utk.edu/scholarlypublishing).

Lauren highlighted faculty bibliographies as a third non-traditional role. If you are working on bibliographies, she says this is a great way to get involved with website management for library pages, faculty pages, and possibly the entire institution! You can push out new titles into blog posts or websites that all link to the library catalog.

Additional roles include website management, institutional archivist/historian, researcher, and software specialist. Lauren stated that competitive intelligence and data management is a potential area for a non-traditional role as it includes harvesting the institution's statistics. Compare yourself to yourself!

A final role Lauren listed is documentation. All institutions need written documentation. Consider writing procedures using a wiki and no screenshots; systems and programs often change too fast for images or saved word documents.

Group ideas from participants of the workshop for other non-traditional roles included: proofreader, managing library/office moves, managing print and electronic CLE material, managing library SharePoint site and password tool, or anything that looks like it is a data entry/input project. Get creative!

Opening General Session/Keynote Speaker – Brian Stevenson

Jacqueline Magagnosc
Cornell Law Library

The Opening General Session/Keynote speaker for the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) 110th Annual Meeting was Brian Stevenson, Founder and Executive Director of the Equal Justice Initiative (http://eji.org/). Mr. Stevenson is a graduate of both the Harvard Law School and the Harvard School of Government; he is the author of *Just Mercy: a Story of Justice and Redemption* (New York: Spiegel & Grau, ©2014), and he was recently named to Fortune's 2016 World's Greatest Leaders' list.

The title of Mr. Stevenson's inspiring talk was **"American Injustice: Mercy, Humanity, and Making a Difference."** His focus was on the opportunities law can provide for justice, with an overall goal of creating more justice and becoming a society governed by the rule of law, with the expectation that we can create more justice. It is difficult to convey the spirit of this talk in a narrative, and it is well worth the time to view the session recording available via AALLnet (http://community.aallnet.org/viewdocument/opening-general-session-with-keynot, login required).

Mr. Stevenson began by reminding the audience that in 1972, 30,000 people were in jail; today, that number is 2.3 million. The United States has the highest rate of incarceration in the world. There are 70 million Americans with criminal arrests. 70% of women in jail/prison are single parents, and it is more likely these children will themselves become prisoners. Thirty percent of the black male population in Alabama has lost the right to vote due to incarceration. One in three black males is likely to go to prison in the 21st century; the likelihood of a Latino boy going to prison is one in six.

So, what can we do? How do we think about this? Each of us can play a role. Mr. Stevenson argues there are four things each of us can do to improve justice.

First, if we are teaching/active in opening minds, we must get closer to those suffering from injustice. We must find ways to understand more intimately the problems of the poor or incarcerated. We must understand things about the rule of law and our capacity to change the world. We have been taught to stay away from "bad parts of towns," but it is better to get closer; there is power in proximity to the poor and excluded. Mr. Stevenson spoke to the power of proximity. Proximity leads to understanding and answers.

Second, we must change the narratives that sustain inequality and injustice in order to change the policies sustained by that narrative. In the United States, we have mass incarceration because of the misguided war on drugs. We could have made drug dependency a health issue instead of a criminal justice issue. A narrative drives this policy: alcoholism is a disease; drug addiction is a crime. The policies in this space are driven by the politics of fear and anger, creating threats to a just society. As a society, we cannot protect governance by rule of law if we are governed by fear. Changing the narrative is key; we must be critical players in this change.

Third, to be custodians of justice, we must be hopeful about what we can do to create a healthier, more just society. Hopelessness is the enemy of justice; you are either hopeful or part of the problem. Hope is what makes you stand up. Hopefulness is key, but difficult, and you have to do it.

Fourth, we must be willing to do uncomfortable things. We must make decisions to do the uncomfortable things; sometimes we must position ourselves in uncomfortable places and take the risks needed to promote justice and opportunity.

Mr. Stevenson concluded his talk by reminding the audience that each of us is more than the worst thing we have ever done, and justice requires that we are more than our acts. He stated that the opposite of poverty is not wealth; it is justice. We cannot measure ourselves the way others want to measure us. Our capacity to change the world cannot be measured by grades, income, etc.—it is reflected by our willingness to get close, to speak to narratives, to be willing to do uncomfortable things. Our character and commitment to the rule of law and the qualities that define us cannot be measured by how we serve the rich and powerful, but rather by how we treat the poor, condemned, disfavored, and excluded.

Program Report

Deep Dive: You've Heard the Jargon, Now Play the Game: Linked Data on Your Laptop

Rachel Decker
Chapman University
Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library

Program files and slides are available for download at http://tinyurl.com/ybodlyst.

For years, we have been learning about Linked Data; however, many programs frustratingly lack practical application. Stretching two and a half hours, this session gave ample time for a new and substantive examination of Linked Data through an in-depth look at ontologies. The presenters were Jean M. Pajerek, Associate Director for Information Management at Cornell University Law Library, Jacqueline K. Magagnosc, Continuations Management Librarian at Cornell University Law Library, and Anna-Sophia Zingarelli-Sweet, Cataloging and Metadata Specialist at California State University, Northridge. The program began with a primer on Linked Data concepts and a demonstration of a pizza ontology. Second, there was a hands-on exercise using the Protégé ontology editing software, followed by a summary of how to query unstructured data using SPARQL. Finally, the presenters closed the program by discussing how knowledge of ontologies can give us an insight into existing library Linked Data projects.

Part One: A Review of Linked Data Concepts and the Pizza Ontology

Jean Pajerek opened the program by explaining that structured data, or data contained in records often found in relational databases, is something we are all familiar with, but it has its limitations. Unstructured data, such as Linked Data, offers much more flexibility, especially when it comes to relationships, which are the cornerstone of the semantic web. These relationships are the basis of the Resource Description Framework (RDF) triple, subject/predicate/object, of which most of us are now familiar. In order for the relationships, or assertions, made in a triple to be a part of the "web of data," they must be expressed in a semantic web language. An ontology allows us to do just that: define classes and properties of things in order to establish relationships between resources using semantic Web Ontology Language (OWL). Moreover, Linked Data programs have the ability to take those relationships and build on them to create new information, called inferences. To summarize, "vocabularies and ontologies:

1. are necessary for discovering relationships on the semantic web
2. define classes and properties
3. define relationships between resources
4. facilitate 'inference' discovery of new information."

So, what does an ontology look like, and how is one created? Anna-Sophia Zingarelli-Sweet introduced Protégé (freely available from http://protege.stanford.edu/), which is a utility that provides an interface for viewing and editing unstructured data using OWL. She used the classic Pizza Ontology example, originally created by the University of Manchester, to illustrate the basics of ontology building as well as to orient users to the Protégé software. Ontology building is, at its core, a demanding mental exercise and can be especially intimidating with dense and complicated concepts. However, this example uses the humble idea of a pizza to explain the intellectual process of breaking something down into discrete classes and subclasses and show how assertions/relationships are defined.

Using Protégé, Anna-Sophia began to build her conceptual "pizza" by first defining sibling classes that make up a pizza: *Pizza*, *PizzaBase* and *PizzaTopping*. Then, she created the subclasses *VeggieTopping*, *MeatTopping*, and *CheeseTopping* under the *PizzaTopping* class. Likewise, she created subsclasses *HawaiianPizza*, *MargheritaPizza*, and *PepperoniPizza* under the *Pizza* class. To round out the concept of pizza, she created additional subclasses to each of the *VeggieTopping*, *MeatTopping*, and *CheeseTopping* subclasses.

Once the classes and subclasses were created, she defined assertions/relationships between the different classes, also known as assigning object properties. For example, the object property *hasIngredient* was used to define the asymmetric relationship between *MozzarellaTopping* and *HawaiianPizza.* In other words, *MozzarellaTopping* is an ingredient of *HawaiianPizza*. Even more relationships could be defined which serve to fully realize the concept of pizza (in all its various incarnations). This ontology is available for download, and instructions are available on the Protégé Wiki: https://protegewiki.stanford.edu/wiki/Protege4Pizzas10Minutes.

Part Two: The Artworks Ontology Exercise

In the second part of the program, participants worked through a self-directed ontology-building exercise. Attendees were provided the artworks.owl ontology file ahead of time, along with step-by-step instructions, and given 40 minutes to complete as much of the exercise as possible.

The artworks ontology was noticeably more complex than the pizza ontology. In addition to Classes and Object Properties, the exercise focused on Individuals and Data Properties. Participants worked in groups, following the instruction sheet, while the presenters offered assistance when needed. Below is a sample of steps in the exercise:

1. Make an object property assertion that Michelangelo worked in Florence.
2. Add Frida Kahlo as an individual entity.
3. Add an entity called *Work9876*, also called *The Love Embrace of the Universe*.
4. Make an object property assertion that Frida Kahlo created *Work9876 (The Love Embrace of the Universe)*.
5. Make a data property assertion that Frida Kahlo's birthdate was 1907-07-06.
6. Add *Artwork* and *Institution* as subclasses of owl:Thing.
7. Assert that *David* and *The Love Embrace of the Universe* are instances of the class *Artwork*.
8. Add a new object property named *hasStyle/Period*.
9. Assert that *NaiveArt* is a Style/Period.
10. Assert that *GalleriaDellAccademia* is an Institution.

At the end of the 40 minutes, Jean demonstrated how to take the assertions/relationships in the ontology and run it through HermiT, a reasoner built into Protégé. A reasoner enables inferences to be made about the data, based on the assertions we put in. To further enable inferences, Jean demonstrated the concepts of *domain* and *range*. Domain indicates that the *subject* of a property must be a member of a specific class. Range indicates that the *object* of a property must be a member of a specific class. The concepts of domain and range can apply to both object properties and data properties. Doing so allows the ontology program to infer that if Michelangelo created *David*, and *David* is an artwork, then Michelangelo must be an artist.

Part Three: Viewing and Querying Ontologies

In the third and final part of the program, the presenters demonstrated ways of viewing existing ontologies. One way is to serialize the ontology, which "is the process of translating data structures into a format that can be stored or transmitted across a network connection link and reconstructed later in the same or another computer environment." The practice ontology was shown in Terse RDF Triple Language (Turtle). The Turtle language allows RDF triples to be written in a natural language format, but it is not really meant to be read by humans this way. For those interesting in complex ontologies, Protégé can also be used to view the Getty Vocabularies (http://vocab.getty.edu/ontology) and BIBFRAME 2.0 (http://id.loc.gov/ontologies/bibframe.rdf).

Creating and viewing ontologies gives us a way to see how Linked Data is structured; however, without the ability to query it and receive results, Linked Data is rather useless. Just as SQL is the query language for relational databases, SPARQL is the query language for RDF data. This allows a user to "ask" questions of the data. Instead of filling in all pieces of the triple, you substitute a variable, and SPARQL will look for the variable based on the assertions and inferences in the ontology. There is a SPARQL Query function within Protégé that can be used to query the ontology. Included in the instruction document is a sample SPARQL query for the artworks ontology. Admittedly, the SPARQL query language is not particularly user friendly. The Wikidata Query Service (https://query.wikidata.org) and Sparklis (http://www.irisa.fr/LIS/ferre/sparklis/) are examples of places to learn and experiment with writing SPARQL queries.

More interestingly, perhaps, is Casalini Libri's SHARE-VDE (Virtual Discovery Environment) project (http://share-vde.org), which "is a platform which allows the browsing of library collections organized according to the BIBFRAME data model." They experimented at converting MARC data from 13 participating library institutions into XML and plugging it into a searchable catalog.

What does this have to do with us?

Since its debut in 2012, many librarians have struggled to grasp the particulars of BIBFRAME. Without training to use the BIBFRAME Editor, non-metadata specialists have few tools to understand the details of creating library Linked Data on their own. An objective of this presentation was to provide an understanding of the fundamentals of ontologies, which provided insight into the burgeoning relationship between Linked Data and libraries. Similarly, this program gave a new perspective to initiatives like BIBFRAME and others. Those who were unable to attend the program and those who want a refresher will benefit from being able to download the files and slides online and doing the exercise at home. The self-directed format inspired me to further explore ontologies and play with existing Linked Data projects with a newfound sense of understanding and confidence.

OCLC Update Session

Sherri Nicole Thomas
University of New Mexico Law Library

This year's update was all about technical advances at OCLC. The irony is that there was no technology setup to display the PowerPoint presentation prepared for the session. Without the distraction of graphics, a lot of information was given, so I have compiled a list of highlights and links from the session, annotated with my notes to help you decide whether you want more information.

Session Highlights and Links

Celebration of OCLC's 50th Anniversary: https://www.oclc.org/en/fifty.html
OCLC has been celebrating their five-decade long relationship with libraries this year. They have highlights and stories posted on their website.

OCLC Next: http://www.oclc.org/blog/main/
Blog hosted by OCLC to keep users up-to-date and connected to libraries and the progress of library projects from around the world.

OCLC Abstracts: https://www.oclc.org/en/publications.html
If you are into receiving OCLC updates or want keep up-to-date on "the latest developments in the technology, economic or social landscapes" in the form of weekly "light reading" emails, sign up for OCLC Abstracts.

Apple Cake Recipe: http://www.oclc.org/blog/main/the-legendary-apple-cake-record-story/
The April 20, 2017 post titled "The legendary 'apple cake' record story" gives us the history of the "WorldCat Cookbook Finder" and the spotty history of the 1974 MARC record created for an apple cake. How good is this recipe? There were mixed reviews, but the consensus was "good."

Connexion
If you did not know, Connexion is going away. No exact date was given in the update, but it makes sense given the Metadata and Acquisitions components of WorldShare Managements Services (WMS).

PSWeb: http://www.oclc.org/support/software-reports.en.html
This service is now available at Download Software on Support Services at http://oc.lc/downloadsoftware. Software reports and date are still currently available on the PSWeb site, but this functionality will cease. Batch loading via PSWeb and FTP will soon also be defunct, so you will need to use WorldShare Collection Manager to datasync collections.

WorldCat Search API: http://www.oclc.org/developer/develop/web-services/worldcat-search-api.en.html
This is in development for those of you interested in developing software that integrates WorldCat information. You can request "sandbox" access to this product.

DevConnect – OCLC Campus used to be Developathon: https://www.oclc.org/developer/news/2017/devconnect-2017.en.html

WMS Global Community and User group Meeting – September 26-29, 2017 – Dublin, Ohio: https://www.oclc.org/en/events/conferences/wms-global-comm-user-grp-mtg/2017.html
The keynote speaker is Librarian of Congress Carla Hayden!

Membership and Resources: http://www.oclc.org/support/home.en.html
There is a continued push to use the discussion listservs. These discussion lines are among users, and OCLC development and technical support staff are monitoring them to implement changes and address ongoing issues. A hard reminder was also given that both live and recorded trainings, in addition to written process aids, are available on the OCLC website.

OCLC Americas Regional Council Meeting – October 30-31, 2017 – Baltimore, Maryland: https://www.oclc.org/en/events/2017/ARC-annual-meeting-2017.html

Linked Data: http://www.oclc.org/research/themes/data-science/linkeddata.html
This is a new topic page where the latest requests for upgrades and reporting of problems can be made for this topic. It was developed to help users get a sense of "the state of Linked Data." OCLC does not have anything really in production,

but there are reports that they are working with the Library of Congress on the BIBFRAME. For those of you who do not know, it is the further development of controlled language for data description. Examine schema.org for more information.

Digby App: http://www.oclc.org/en/news/releases/2017/201717dublin.html
For those of us that have been using the WorldShare Management System (WMS), being able to use laptops and tablets in the stacks for inventory control has been amazing. In this time of ever shrinking budgets, some libraries have had some challenges regarding buying and upgrading their devices. It looks like a solution to this is "Digby," a mobile device app designed so student workers can use their phones to check-in books in the stacks.

Resource Sharing: https://www.oclc.org/en/resource-sharing.html
Goodbye, ILLiad! Hello, Tipasa!

There are four big announcements regarding resource sharing. First, a reminder that as of June 20, 2017, OCLC ceased support for ILLiad. This leads us right into the second announcement, the rollout of OCLC's new interlibrary loan product, Tipasa. For those libraries that were already using WorldShare ILL, Tipasa is the high volume cloud-based ILL system to bring ILLiad users over. Tipasa is an add-on option for current WorldShare ILL users. For now, WorldShare ILL is not going anywhere and will continue to evolve and be updated as a product. Third, OCLC acquired Relais International, a Canadian-based company that facilitates consortial borrowing, earlier this year. OCLC will be utilizing the expertise of Relais to continue functionality development of both Tipasa and WorldShare ILL. Lastly, the 2018 OCLC Resource Sharing Conference will be held March 13-15, 2018 in Jacksonville, Florida.

GreenGlass: http://www.oclc.org/en/sustainable-collections/features.html
Print Collection Maintenance Visualization Tool

Having issues managing retention agreements? GreenGlass will help create lists for preservation and withdrawal projects, using your OPAC's records and usage data at the item level to aid in retention decisions. In addition, you can check the holdings of peer libraries and HathiTrust. For those of us that keep ourselves up at night worrying about weeding projects (I do), it looks like GreenGlass will help us make better logistical plans and lists for our staff and students. I do not think it will replace me walking through the stacks, pointing out areas and referring back to the diagram I am holding in my hand, and re-measuring the same shelves that get measured every time there is a move, but it will help get to the physical moves and processing faster.

WorldShare Discovery: http://www.oclc.org/en/worldcat-discovery.html
Before I get down into the nitty-gritty of the OCLC Discovery layer, if you or your Public Services/Research people have not noticed, there is a citation option for the 20th edition of the Bluebook for catalog items. Pull up a book, and look at the citation options. It is awesome. Make sure you tell them about it.

This part of the update is going to start with some bad news, but I promise that by the end, you will feel less depressed about your discovery layer options with OCLC. First, WorldCat Local will most likely be ending by the end of this calendar year. Before you burst into tears, there is some good news for those of us that have been struggling along with OCLC Discovery. The message sounds like a repeat of the past few years: OCLC is working on it. However, there is now proof. More specifically, the technical team has been focused on improving 5 versus 3 word searching and addressing issues with retrieving known items via search. Many libraries were reporting the inability to find items via title searches. To improve results, the search algorithms are now focused on retrieving items with terms that are actually the "best match" and not just "relevance." Therefore, instead of looking for items with highest number of terms (relevance), retrieval depends more on proximity and placement of terms (best match).

I have saved the best news for last. Do you remember back when we all loved searching WorldCat using FirstSearch (maybe you never abandoned it)? FirstSearch is NOT going anywhere. If you took the link off your sites, you can put it back on! Please note that while the interface is not going away, it will be changing. It will probably start looking more like Discovery, but we will see as the product evolves. So why was there such a big difference between FirstSearch? First Search uses MARC records to search, but Discovery was originally designed to be a one-stop, "Google-like" search for end-users. I will probably get in trouble for invoking the "G" word, but it is what it is.

Program Report

From Authority Control to Identity Management

Thomas Ma
Harvard Law Library

Moderator: Suzanne Graham, Metadata & Analytics Librarian, University of Georgia
Speakers: Hannah Taver, Supervisor, Digital Projects, University of North Texas (UNT) Libraries
Dong Joon Lee, Researcher Information Systems Librarian, Texas A&M University
Erik Radio, Metadata Librarian, University of Arizona

Presentations

Suzanne Graham started by saying that like other programs this year, there is a Linked Data slant to this session. Suzanne shared that many libraries are working more with identifiers, especially in institutional repositories. Unlike Library of Congress authorities, identifiers are much more extensible. The presenters will share their experiences with their identity management related projects.

Hannah Taver

Hannah spoke about and demoed a locally developed UNT names app for a digital collection. The created name authorities are publicly available on the web, and the code for the app is available at GitHub. The unit normally creates the names as needed, but focus is primarily on their Scholarly Works Collection. The form allows a user to input "authorized" forms of names, variant names, affiliations, and subject areas. In addition to the aforementioned content, users can input various identifiers such as ORCID (Open Researcher and Contributor ID), Twitter handles, Scopus IDs, as well as the more traditional Library of Congress (LOC), International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI), and Virtual International Authority File (VIAF). The records are also stored as structured data using schema.org relationships.

DJ Lee

DJ states that he has two primary roles at his institution. First, he maintains his institution's Research Information Management (RIM) system called Scholars @ TAMU. Secondly, he studies researchers' engagement in Research Management systems. Scholars @TAMU uses an open source software and the VIVO ontology for maintaining faculty profiles, with the goal of enhancing scholarly identity and impact. Various benefits for the faculty include enhancing discoverability of their expertise and finding potential collaborators. For administrators, the system can support research, collaboration, and generate organizational reports to support strategic decision-making.

DJ also spoke about his current research as Co-PI of an Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) project on how we increase faculty engagement in curating identity information. This is important because many universities now maintain and try to integrate RIM systems, Institutional Repositories, and Data Repositories. In maintaining these systems, there will always be issues. For RIMs, the main issue is quality data. Three ways in general to improve data quality: computer algorithms, curator-created data, or researcher-created data. The ultimate goal is to determine what motivates researchers to curate their own identity data. In the end, DJ reminds us that, in the past, they used to control identities when there were names only. Currently, identity data is so much more diverse that it is very hard to control, so they strive towards management rather than control.

Erik Radio

Institutional repositories have many issues. One in particular is trying to standardize the data. As an experiment, he identified three collections from DSpace repository with assigned subjects. Students or the faculty entered the subjects themselves, so there was not controlled vocabulary. Erik imported the subjects into Open Refine to normalize the terms. Staff matched those terms manually to FAST (Faceted Application of Subject Terminology) subject headings. They were looking for one-to-one relationships or related terms or no matches. Once they had the terms, they added the uniform resource identifiers (URIs) to specific fields and reimported them back in Dspace. They then "added schema.org markup language around the identifiers." Erik monitored the usage for four months to see if the use of schema.org had enhanced user discoverability. There was no real change in discoverability within the short time frame. There could be a noticeable change over time; however, he was no longer at the institution to know. Although it was not a "watershed" moment for him, the project still resulted in a great opportunity to clean up data. Additionally, the resulting product could be coordinated with other Linked Data activities in the future.

Questions (not all)

In response to “what does identity data look like, and where do you draw from?” Erik responded that ORCID, LOC, and VIAF are key sources for the data. He emphasized that reusability was of high importance as there is currently no one standard used. DJ stated that at his institution, they pull from internal and external sources and store them in a triplestore. Suzanne added that ORCID and ISNI seem to be developing into major players as sources of identifiers.

Hannah responded to the “key threshold decision(s)” questions by saying that she needed to make sure that things were done right so there would be no regrets in the future. One issue she tackled is that of the 5 star Open Data and how open their data should be. They decided to be as open as possible, ensuring that data are open and shareable. The key threshold decision that DJ encountered was the issue of name disambiguation. He had to decide whether to create local identifiers or use preexisting identifiers. Which to use? He decided against ORCID as the standard faculty URI as they could not have 100% participation from faculty. They currently have about 20%-30% and could get up to possibly 60%. They decided that they needed to create local identifiers to do proper disambiguation

Regarding “bringing together a team,” Hannah said that an administrator presented the idea for the app, so there was not a need to get buy-in. In her unit, they already had developers to maintain the infrastructure, and they became involved in developing the UNT Names app. DJ responded that, for them, they have an expensive system that requires developers, curators, an ontologist, and a point person to liaise with leadership. They needed buy-in from the Dean and Provost to support the program. They have 3 FTE to maintain the system. For Erik, determining external partners and getting buy-in from administrators is very important. It is critical to outline the roles that will impact the program.

Conclusion

For most technical services staff, the authority record with its authorized form of a name or subject heading is deeply ingrained in us. The concept that a “person” may have more than one acceptable form may be new to many of us. However, for our presenters, who work with metadata in institutional repositories or RIM systems, the concept of having multiple identifiers representing a particular name is a reality. In the Linked Data world, there are many identifiers attached to a “person” with no “authorized” form, so controlling may not preferable or even possible. Identity management is the direction towards which we should strive.

Program Report

Disaster Planning in an Hour

Corinne Jacox
Creighton University Law Library

Rebecca Elder, Elder Cultural Heritage Preservation, discussed disasters and the basics of preparing a disaster plan. She began by saying, “Emergencies are not a matter of if. They’re a matter of when.” The rules of emergencies are that they happen on weekends and holidays, when key staff are on vacation, and small man-made emergencies are more likely to happen than large natural disasters.

A variety of disasters can happen. Floods result in wet and heavy books that expand and can fall off the shelves. Additionally, mold can develop if the humidity is at 65% or more for three days. Many times, water from flooding is dirty and poses a health hazard, which makes it imperative for staff to protect themselves. Fires also become water disasters, whether from the water from fire hoses or from sprinklers in the building. It takes an average of 45 minutes to locate where to turn off the sprinklers, so it is important to know where the shut-off valve is before a disaster happens. Other disasters include tornadoes and hurricanes, earthquakes, hazardous material accidents (particularly in science departments of academic institutions), transportation accidents (such as with railway cars), pest invasion, vandalism, and bomb threats.

The emergency planning process involves first establishing a response team. It should include someone from every department in the building and should also be written into job descriptions. A risk assessment should be made of possible disasters based on geographical location. In addition, look at the building. Can some potential disasters be fixed? Know the emergency history of the building and plan accordingly.

Writing the disaster plan comes next. Rebecca included a helpful packet of materials for this step in her handouts. Determine who to call and include their contact information. Include the architect of the library as they will have the building plans. Have contact information for conservators and specialists, as well as where freezers are available. Remember to include first responders, city emergency services, and the institution’s facilities and insurance contacts as well. If choosing a recovery service, pick a company that specializes in collections and have a contract in place before a disaster happens. Part of putting together a plan includes setting salvage priorities. Questions to consider are: is it critical for ongoing operations, can it be replaced, what is the replacement cost, is it available in another format, is it available in another collection, and what is the value to the collection? When possible, it is usually cheaper to replace an item, rather than trying to restore it. Rebecca included a handout for a "Pocket Response Plan," which is small enough for all library staff to keep in a wallet. A more extensive resource for putting together a disaster plan is available at http://dplan.org/. Finally, implement the plan and update it once a year.

Some of the supplies that are helpful in case of a disaster are: clipboards with floor plans, surgical gloves, white paper towels, N95 masks, duct tape, masking tape, and plastic sheeting. Rebecca suggested putting the supplies in a large garbage can and duct taping it shut as these materials tend to disappear. A more extensive list of disaster supplies is included in Rebecca's handouts.

It is important to train for a disaster. Know how to handle wet materials. Know evacuation routes. Practice, practice, practice! Rebecca recommended taking the FEMA Incident Command training (training.fema.gov) to become familiar with the terminology used by responders in an emergency. During an emergency, it is important to remember that first responders are in charge. Provide any information they request and respect their orders. Most importantly, remember that human life is more important than collections, and be sure to take care of your own health after an emergency.

Program Report

The Power of the Crowd: Crowdsourcing Metadata for Library Materials

Jennifer Noga
Wake Forest University

Crowdsourcing is one of those buzzwords that can take on different meanings depending on context. For this program, "the crowd" in crowdsourcing refers to groups of people outside the libraries' purview helping to complete large-scale projects. The presenters each gave an overview of the projects they were involved in and then took turns answering questions from the audience. I will provide a summary of each of the three projects discussed in the program. The scale of these projects is too large for most small libraries. However, it's interesting to consider how smaller projects could be implemented in a similar manner, using volunteers and easy and accessible online tools.

Jennifer Gonzalez talked first about a recent project at the Library of Congress involving a large collection of U.S. Reports. This collection consisted of 542 volumes containing 36,000 cases spanning 1754 through 2003. She estimated that creating metadata for this collection would take at least three years and over 10,000 hours of work to complete. Because that timeline was unacceptable, they enlisted 75 volunteers, otherwise known as remote interns, to get the job done. Volunteers, consisting of both library and law school students, were recruited through online job postings. The students were organized into subgroups that focused on material organized by time period. Jennifer and three temporary staff helped to manage the interns.

She explained how they used a WordPress website to coordinate the project. Interns access the site for instructions on creating metadata. When an intern completes one volume, he or she sends it to another volunteer that is a designated "team leader" for review. The volume may then be reviewed by one of the temporary staff and Jennifer. The site is also used for communicating with and among the volunteers who can post questions and comments about applying metadata.

The project is still in progress and is scheduled to be completed by the end of the summer when the U.S. Reports collection will come online. At the time of this program, metadata had been completed for 75% of the volumes. Jennifer deemed the project a success and said it received overwhelmingly positive feedback from the interns. One even said that they had learned more working on this project than in two years of classes.

Ching-hsien Wang of the Smithsonian Institution described the next crowdsourced project, which had similarities to the first one but a very different type of collection. The Smithsonian Transcription Center is a platform that allows the institution to load Smithsonian images online. The challenge they faced, however, was that the digitized materials were viewable but not searchable, and some collections were hidden from the public. They wanted to increase the public's ability to access and discover the images, but there were hundreds of thousands of pages of documents that consisted of diaries, hand-written letters, manuscripts, field books, etc. that needed to be transcribed.

The solution was to marshal thousands of volunteers to transcribe and review image data using an online, template-driven system. The system presented volunteers, who were not required to have any specific level of expertise, with structured formats and very specific data elements from which they could choose when transcribing an image. The process also included a data review step, whereby volunteers could review others' work but not their own. Wang noted that crowdsourcing the review process ensures quality control. The project has resulted in 287,300 pages of collected data that are now searchable and accessible.

Cindy Etkin of the U.S. Government Publishing Office (GPO) discussed the Federal Information Preservation Network or FIPNET. This project differs from the first two since it focuses more on crowdsourcing as manifested in a collaborative network. The goal of the project is to ensure access to the national collection of government documents. The challenge, however, according to Etkin, is that GPO does not have a tangible collection. Resources are in federal depository libraries distributed across the country.

The project seeks to leverage existing activities of libraries to build a collaborative, scalable, and flexible preservation model for the government information resources contained therein. Federal, state, and local libraries, as well as anyone else interested in preserving government information, can participate. The GPO provides support services like paying for shipping costs when materials are offered and assisting with cataloging, condition assessment, and preservation efforts.

In the question and answer round, presenters agreed that elements of a successful crowdsourcing project include: planning and organization, anticipation of problems, mission alignment, and being able to leverage existing activities. Quality control can be handled through systems that have help text or pre-populated lists. Having metadata standards and other guidelines in place is also important for maintaining quality. They all learned a lot with these projects and advised that it's important to have team goals for volunteers and organize the work into smaller chunks so that volunteers are able to finish tasks and feel a sense of accomplishment. Advice on how to select and structure a project ranged from starting small and determining a need that you cannot do with existing resources to considering other types of projects and resources that are suitable for crowdsourcing, not just metadata.

Program Report

Digital Repositories, Law Libraries & the Future of Open Access

Jennifer Robble
Boston University
Pappas Law Library

This session, moderated by Margaret Schilt, featured presentations by Carol Watson (University of Georgia), Gregg Gordon (SSRN), and Corie Dugas (LawArXiv). These presentations outlined the landscape of institutional repositories, the future of Open Access, and the opportunity for law libraries to participate in LawArXiv. The presenters then took questions from the audience.

Before diving into the current state of repositories, Carol Watson surveyed the audience, asking how many people currently have a repository. Nearly everyone raised his or her hand. Carol noted that law libraries have been involved in repositories for about 10 years. In 2007, approximately 75 schools had SSRN series, and a couple of schools had Digital Commons repositories. In 2008, Harvard issued its open access mandate. Although most of the audience members had a repository, slightly less than half of American Bar Association (ABA)-accredited law schools have an institutional repository. SSRN participation by ABA-accredited law schools is a little higher; slightly more than half have an SSRN series.

The discussion then turned to systems. Carol polled the audience about whether their repositories were standalone or in conjunction with their larger university. There were slightly more standalone installations, but there were also a significant number of law libraries that used the university's institutional repository. The question of how to get numerous systems, such as the repository, faculty reporting systems (i.e., Symplectic Elements), Archive-It (https://archive-it.org/), media servers, and self-publishing sites (i.e., ResearchGate and Google Scholar), to work together was mentioned as something everyone is trying to figure out.

Once a system is selected, standards, impact, content, and options should be considered. It is important to adhere to Open Archive Initiative (OAI) standards to share data between systems. Using controlled vocabularies is also important for creating clean facets. When communicating impact to constituents, both quantitative and qualitative evidence should be used. Harvard uses not only download statistics but also displays a slideshow of user stories on its repository home page. In addition to the traditional faculty publications housed in most institutional repositories, one must determine what the public will want to be able to download. Decisions must be made as to whether audio, video, datasets, teaching materials, and other niche materials will also have a home in the repository. Finally, because most libraries do not have the resources to maximize all of their systems, priorities need to be established. Once these priorities are determined, they must be explained to faculty members. Carol finished her presentation with a plug for the Law Repositories Caucus (https://www.aallnet.org/Documents/Member-Communities/Caucuses/caucus-websites/LRC).

Gregg Gordon began his presentation by observing that librarians and open access sites play similar roles: they stand in the background and help others obtain the information they need to further their goals. Both promote sharing information with everyone. SSRN, a repository of both refereed and non-refereed papers, has over 325,000 authors from countries all over the globe and over 725,000 papers, which are revised about 50,000 times per year. Once SSRN had days with more revisions than submissions, it saw itself as an evolving discussion.

Open Access is changing the volume of information and provides new opportunities for those who manage it. Gregg noted that the concept of scarcity does not exist for information; the floodgates have been opened. The number of journals has doubled every twenty years, creating more places for authors to put their content. The volume of information has also increased dramatically because multiple versions of a paper, from an idea paper to the post-publication, are being "published" to sites like SSRN and ResearchGate.

This mass of information needs to be organized for people to be able to access and learn from it. It is important that it is not siloed so that interdisciplinary connections can be made. For example, if an author posts a paper on bioethics law, it should be in a space that includes both law papers and biology papers. Gregg's final thought was that maybe scholarly research has just had a bad user interface, and that once reorganized, it can be used more efficiently to build new connections.

Corie Dugas, as executive director of the Mid-America Law Library Consortium (MALLCO), was one of the founders of LawArXiv (https://osf.io/preprints/lawarxiv). LawArXiv, a collaboration between MALLCO, NELLCO, the Legal Information Preservation Alliance (LIPA), and Cornell Law Library, is an open access repository that uses the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/). She acknowledged that LawArXiv started out as a reaction to SSRN's acquisition by Elsevier, but now it has become a proactive project designed to empower the legal community to provide open access to scholarship indefinitely. There is greater promise for maintaining openness in a system like LawArXiv, where the platform and content are owned and maintained by members of the scholarly legal community, and funding has been set aside to maintain the platform for at least 30 years. LawArXiv's board will be scholars and law librarians. The technical advisory board will also be comprised of librarians who upload materials in different repository spaces and know the challenges posed by various technologies. Corie is confident LawArXiv will continue to meet the needs of scholars and member institutions because the Open Science Framework is constantly adding new features.

Next came the pitch as to why libraries should participate in LawArXiv. Corie stressed the platform's commitment to remaining free and that this is an opportunity to help shape LawArXiv development. Although it is called LawArXiv, it does contain multiple communities (as of 7/19/17: Arts and Humanities, Business, Education, Law, Medicine and Health Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences), allowing for collaboration amongst disciplines. The backend of LawArXiv also has the functionality we are accustomed to with other platforms, namely allowing multiple versions of a paper to be stored and posted, the ability to decide what will be publicly visible, and storage for datasets.

Corie then demonstrated how to submit a paper, with the caveats that the preprint terminology will change and batch uploading is not currently available. Once a user signs in, s/he can add a preprint by uploading a file, adding the title, discipline (from the same taxonomy as bepress), copyright license, digital object identifier (DOI), keywords, abstract, and authors. There is currently no citation field, so users are asked to put the citation in the abstract field, and authors are added by email address. New addresses will be sent an email so that the faculty member can create an account.

The panel then took questions from the audience. Ben Keele mentioned that he has uploaded to LawArXiv, and it is easy. He also said that Gregg's comment about a bad user interface resonated; it is much easier to find information on SciHub with the DOI. There was another question about whether content on LawArXiv is fully indexed by Google. Corie replied that the content in LawArXiv is fully indexed through SHARE (http://www.share-research.org). Gregg mentioned that as more content is included in LawArXiv, the more often Google will crawl it. He identified some factors that make a repository more Google-friendly: a critical mass of information (the more the better), open content that does not present barriers to accessing it, and, most importantly, recentness (Google is most interested in new content.)

Nick Szydlowski asked what the role of a journal is in the digital open access environment. Gregg opined that the journal as a format is dated, but that journals are useful as gatekeepers for quality content. Carol asked Gregg about Elsevier's business model and if the content on SSRN will remain free. Gregg admitted he was not sure, but he said that Elsevier considers itself a data company more than a publisher. In light of Elsevier's recent acquisition of bepress, the answer to this question has become even more important to libraries. Although most contributions on SSRN and LawArXiv are from academic institutions, firm librarians were reassured that law firm publications would be welcome as well.

Femi Cadmus commented that budget is a huge difference between LawArXiv and other platforms; there is no subscription fee for LawArXiv. Someone agreed with Gregg that journals are gatekeepers of quality content and asked: in an open access world, how do you check the authority of things posted to make sure you do not become a forum for fake scholarship? Gregg said that in SSRN, they review scholarly submissions for completeness, and submissions are also reviewed when they are classified and disseminated by a thought leader or e-journal editor. SSRN also has an "other papers" category for blog posts and other writings, which signals to readers that these submissions may not be as credible. LawArXiv does not have a peer review process and relies on the Open Science framework to keep spam out.

The final question, from Margaret Ambrose, responded to Gregg's comment that Elsevier considers itself a data company. She asked about the ethical concerns surrounding the monetization of data about research and the potential to try to influence how research is done. Gregg responded that Elsevier has helped SSRN improve their privacy policies by leveraging the expertise of others in the company who focus on privacy and complying with more demanding regulations in the European Union. Overall, this session was informative and thought provoking.

Setting the Law School Apart with Library-Led Initiatives, presented by Berkeley Law, Cornell Law, and UNC Law

Rachel Purcell
University of Florida Levin College of Law
Lawton Chiles Legal Information Center

This program had so many attendees, there were literally librarians standing along the wall at the back of the room. It was not just the yummy lunch that drew observers, but also a panel stocked with interesting leaders at top universities. The panel consisted of:

Marci Hoffman, Lecturer in Residence and Associate Director of the Law Library at the University of California, Berkeley, School of Law,
Julie L. Kimbrough, Clinical Assistant Professor of Law and Deputy Director of the Law Library at the University of North Carolina (UNC) Chapel Hill School of Law, and
Jean Pajerek, Director for Information Management at Cornell Law School.

Moderator Casey Busher, Director of Communications at bepress, started the program with a nod to the law library's ability to adapt its role within the law school. She then got down to some bepress specifics at each represented university. Marci explained how the institutional repository (IR) at Berkeley proved to be more important than initially anticipated. The primary purpose was to host content from their thirteen law journals as they moved from print to electronic access. The platform was especially beneficial during a recent American Bar Association (ABA) inspection when Selected Works was used to mine answers on faculty scholarship. Jean and Julie said bepress met their level of expectations with regard to how important the platform has become for their respective law schools. There were varying levels of experience with their respective institutional repositories, as well as differing numbers of documents and downloads, but all agreed that the repositories provided extended worldwide access to university scholarship.

The funding discussion brought out a number of interesting ways the universities implemented repositories and prepared faculty. Jean explained how Cornell was able to get into the IR game early—fourteen years ago! Cornell currently engages faculty by showing new features of the repository during Friday lunch presentations. An endowment given to the UNC Chapel Hill allowed Julie and the law library to implement their recent IR. Julie credited her director and other library staff with the tremendous planning done to engage faculty before implementation. The Berkeley Law Library secured a portion of the money for their IR from the law school when the library took over journal administration. All agreed that the law school repositories had significantly different needs and expectations than the main campus and therefore need customization to ensure the law library had control of their content and features.

The best line of the program went to Marci for explaining how the IR was "free… free like a puppy," wherein the repository offered a huge benefit but came at a cost. Although not monetary, the panelists remarked this cost was high in labor, especially during implementation. One to several librarians and staff handles continuing efforts for maintenance and IR marketing. Usually repository management, updating, and monitoring is one piece of several people's job descriptions and could range from technical services to reference librarian to outside the library.

One important question from the audience asked the panelists for advice in speaking to law school administration about implementing an institutional repository. Jean remarked that faculty buy-in is a struggle, and the law school dean's requirement that faculty upload scholarship was the true motivation in the beginning. Obviously, support from the top is extremely helpful. Julie mentioned it was a good time to persuade law school administrations of IR benefits, as there are multiple great examples of successes from other law schools. Marci suggested using the journal angle as a potential way to persuade the administration.

Overall, this program was a success! The intricate look into the way these three top law programs implemented and currently maintain their institutional repositories proved to be thought provoking and full of helpful advice for smaller universities hoping to follow in their footsteps. The benefits of an IR were obvious and stated clearly from the beginning of the panel. However, the most valuable guidance pertained to the more logistical elements of funding, faculty buy-in, and staffing. I would recommend this program for a university considering implementing or updating their current IR.

Program Report

Law Libraries Collaborating to Steward National Legal Collections

Carol Morgan Collins
University of Tennessee Law Library

Speakers at this informative session discussed ways groups are collaborating to provide a framework to protect official publications in a time of mass discarding. At the end of the presentations, participants talked amongst themselves and reported back ways their institutions could participate in efforts to preserve key legal publications.

Peggy Jarret from Gallagher Law Library opened the session by encouraging participants to sign up and participate in a new discussion list, National Legal Collaborations, which is located in the American Association of Law Libraries' (AALL) My Communities. She expressed concern for the increasing loss of both digital and print legal collections. The intention for this session was to start a conversation among librarians on how to begin taking action to address the crisis. Three speakers presented overviews of current efforts to preserve legal publications.

Margaret Maes from Legal Information Preservation Alliance (LIPA) described LIPA and its current initiatives: (1) Palm Print is a print preservation project that facilitates sharing primary Federal and State legal material among subscribers. (2) Legal Information Archive, formerly known as the Chesapeake Project, captures and preserves born digital content in a dark archive. (3) Law Review Preservation Program automatically archives law reviews using the Digital Commons platform. (4) Web Archiving is a subscription service that uses Archive-It to capture and preserve an institution's web presence and other digital content. (5) Digital Registry is a registry of law library digitization projects with the goal of sharing expertise and avoiding duplication of effort. (6) LawArXiv is an open access repository of legal scholarship that serves as an alternative to SSRN and Digital Commons. This is a collaborative effort developed by LIPA, MALLCO, NELLCO, and Cornell Law Library.

Beth Williams of Stanford University spoke about the benefits of being a preservation steward for Government Publishing Office (GPO) collections. Two steps are involved. The first is a commitment to retain, preserve, and replace agreed upon materials. The second step is signing a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with GPO. Eight libraries have committed to being a preservation steward.

Kim Dulin, Harvard Law School Library, spoke about the Caselaw Access Project in partnership with Ravel Law. The effort digitized over 42,000 volumes of State, Federal, and Native American Reporters beginning with Pre-colonial times until 2016. Dulin asked that libraries hold on to reporters from their states and jurisdictions beginning with 2016 going forward. The audience learned that there are opportunities to participate in initiatives to reduce digitization gaps by facilitating courts in adopting a model of issuing official opinions online that are comprehensive, free and open, citable, and machine readable. Illinois and Arkansas are currently providing opinions in this format.

Participants held ten-minute round table discussions on how libraries may participate in efforts. Groups reported on conversations held at each table. Most reported collaborations and digitization projects of state level material.

The speakers acknowledged a process challenge in the current digitization efforts but stressed that this should not slow down the efforts in preserving legal information.

As a note, Harvard Law Library has access to a high-speed scanner for another year and is interested in digitization projects. Steve Chapman is the person to contact.

Program Report

Digitization is Done—Now What? Understanding Metadata, Online Delivery, and User Experience

Molly Brownfield
University of Texas

Janice Hyde, Director of Global Legal Collections at the Library of Congress, was the program moderator. Janice introduced the program and presenters and gave a brief overview of her experience at the Law Library of Congress receiving random digitized collection materials—including collections contained on DVDs and flash drive—and dealing with the challenges of making those materials discoverable and accessible to a wider audience.

Chelsea Dinsmore, Director of Digital Production Services at the George A. Smathers Libraries, University of Florida, spoke next and talked about planning for the unexpected. Chelsea discussed the value of planning but noted that challenges frequently arise when presented with a project that is not in the planning stage. For example, someone retires, an urgent need arises, etc. In those instances, we need to take a step back and figure out where we are trying to get to. Chelsea talked about needing to make sure we know our systems and standards, know our system workflow (consider putting together a flowchart), know our standards (e.g., basic institutional requirements, etc.), and know our metadata standards (e.g., our minimum requirements and where we can allow for more than the minimum). Chelsea noted that it is important to be flexible in our thinking, always consider the end-user experience, and thoroughly understanding our systems helps in dealing with surprises.

Erik Beck, Digital Services Librarian at the William A. Wise Law Library, University of Colorado Law School, followed Chelsea and talked about metadata from a systems standpoint. Erik said to bear in mind that the library is the publisher in many instances for digital collections, and with that in mind, we need to make systems that suit the metadata we want to use rather than making metadata that suits the systems we have to use. As an example, Erik described a project involving a digital collection of Colorado Session Laws and how a description of the law itself could be included in the MODS (Metadata Object Description Schema) record—as opposed to a MARC record that describes the books which contain those laws. Erik talked about the dilemma of interoperability when metadata tailor-made for one system may not work in another system. He noted that an integrated library system (ILS) is mostly invisible to the worldwide web, but digital repositories can be open to the web through institutional repositories and publishing software suites like Digital Commons. Erik pointed out administrative concerns with metadata, including intellectual property rights and restrictions, technical issues such as technical provenance, structural considerations such as information about relationships between objects, and preservation concerns like keeping track of everything because every use contributes to an object's eventual destruction. Erik concluded by noting again that digital collections make the library into a publisher.

Jennifer González, Legal Information Specialist at the Law Library of Congress, was the final presenter. Jennifer's presentation focused on the end user and identifying user personas (e.g., Law Librarian/Legal Scholar; Law Student; Legal Professional; and Novice) to help better identify and understand user needs. She pointed out that challenges can become opportunities—for example, collaborating with other departments at an institution. She encouraged attendees to find opportunities for creativity and to be flexible. Jennifer also noted that getting over the finish line can be one of the hardest parts of working with digital collection projects, and she emphasized the importance of staying focused and pushing through to get the job done.

The program concluded with attendees being given a written exercise regarding the receipt of a DVD with a collection of digitized material, along with questions and suggestions designed to guide them through thinking about the steps necessary to make that collection—and their own digital collections—more accessible. Attendees were encouraged to work through the exercise and discuss with their colleagues and the presenters.

The OCLC ILL User Experience: Is it Working for You?

Linda Wen
American University Washington College of Law
Pence Law Library

Discussion host: Merle J. Slyhoff, University of Pennsylvania Law School

Merle Slyhoff from the Document Delivery Caucus opened the session by describing to the group the intention of the topic: general discussion about OCLC and its interlibrary loan (ILL) services—what works and, maybe more importantly, what does not. The participants applauded the idea that OCLC will receive the feedback from the group. The Document Delivery Caucus will post the feedback and comments from OCLC on their community page. The Document Delivery Caucus, by the way, is available free of charge to any interested librarians and vendors. The host encouraged the participants to include a best practice tip in their self-introduction, which sets a constructive tone to the discussion.

Eight librarians took part in the discussion, including the host. The attendees were all from academic libraries and evenly represented the three OCLC Interlibrary Loan systems: WorldShare ILL, ILLiad, and Tipasa.

The participants shared that, as a best practice, it is important to cooperate among members in local library networks, communicate with loan requesters, and collaborate with catalogers to work on inaccurate local holdings. One librarian recommended two purchase options: Get It Now by Copyright Clearance Center and British Library on Demand, as well as those well-known vendors such as Amazon or Barnes and Noble.

The discussion focused on what the librarians liked or did not like about the OCLC ILL systems and what features they wanted to see added. The most welcome functions with WorldShare ILL and Tipasa included Article Exchange, Direct Request, Tag Me, and the prepopulated menu or shortcuts of the request form. Librarians appreciated the shortened learning curve with WorldShare ILL and Tipasa, as compared to ILLiad. One librarian recommended ScannX book scanner that, when integrated with ILLiad or WorldShare ILL, could save several steps in the ILL workflow. The attendees also exchanged ideas on conforming to fair use, statistics recording, slips printing, loan or purchase decisions, etc.

There were questions over such functions as receiving items by lending library's barcodes or manually clearing the print queue. The librarians also wished that, for archive or statistical purposes, the default setting was not the deletion of closed requests. Several libraries mentioned that their libraries could not justify the cost of ILLiad with the amount of ILL transactions.

The participants agreed that there should be more discussion of interlibrary loan topics and issues at the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) conferences. They also wished that OCLC would dedicate more effort to Interlibrary Loan.

This session was one of eight discussion chats, alternatives to regular programming, in the dedicated "Discussion Den." Unlike its predecessor from previous AALL annual meetings, Coffee Talk, which held all talks at the same time on one morning, the Discussion Den chats occurred at various intervals throughout the conference to allow more participation. I enjoyed the 45 minutes of this well-facilitated discussion that proceeded in an inclusive environment. I feel the small group talk was an effective mechanism for active learning and professional networking. One improvement I would suggest would be to find a way to cut down on the background noise as the den is in the middle of the exhibit hall.

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) Report
American Library Association (ALA)
Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS), Cataloging and Metadata Management Section
Annual Conference, June 2017, Chicago, Illinois

Robert Bratton
George Washington University Law Library

I. Law Cataloging and General Cataloging Issues before CC:DA

With the *RDA Toolkit* frozen until April 2018, there were no change proposals or discussion papers for CC:DA to consider and comment on at this meeting.

The *RDA* Steering Committee (RSC) wants more input from "specialist" metadata communities, and the Monday morning meeting time reserved for CC:DA was devoted exclusively to this. People from various cataloging communities (cartographic, audiovisual, rare materials, music, etc.) all gave feedback, and there were many interesting discussions. Two significant things that came up in this meeting: 1) some in the serials community think we need to revisit the instructions for major/minor title changes for serials, and 2) instructions for subject analysis remain out of scope in *RDA* for the near future.

II. *RDA Toolkit* Restructure and Redesign Project (3R Project)

The 3R Project is roughly one-quarter complete. Many of the changes are of the under-the-hood variety to make the *RDA Toolkit* more of a web-based resource and less like a book. One improvement will be that when you log out and then back into the *Toolkit*, it will take you to where you last were. Content changes to *RDA* are based on implementing the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records-Library Reference Model (FRBR-LRM). The FRBR-LRM is an attempt to consolidate the three separately developed conceptual models (FRBR, Functional Requirements for Authority Data [FRAD], and Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data [FRSAD]) into a single, consistent model. The LRM offers a "four-fold path" for metadata:

1. Unstructured. Ex.: A note. Ex.: The author writes in English. [Text string]
2. Structured. Ex.: An authorized access point. Ex.: English. [Text string]
3. Identifier. Ex.: An identifier. Ex.: eng [Text string]
4. International Resource Identifier (IRI). Ex.: http://id.loc.gov/vocabulary/languages/eng [Thing]

This approach will allow *RDA* to use four implementation scenarios: 1) flat-file, 2) linked authorized access points between bibliographic and authority records, 3) relational or object database, and 4) Linked Data.

Some changes have already been incorporated into the *RDA Toolkit*, such as changing "the authorized access point" (AAP) to "an authorized access point." This shifts emphasis from a single AAP to the ability to have multiple AAPs (such as the name clusters in VIAF [Virtual International Authority File]). In addition, the phrase "person, family, or corporate body" has been replaced with "agent" based on the LRM.

While there are many changes coming to the *RDA Toolkit*, Gordon Dunsire (Chair of the RSC) assured us that catalogers will be able to continue to work as we currently are, if we choose to do so. There was supposed to be an official update in June, but as of this writing, it has not been posted in the Toolkit. The initial status report from February 28, 2017 is available at http://www.rdatoolkit.org/3Rproject/SR1.

III. Governance Structure of *RDA*

The five-year transition period changing the governance structure of *RDA* is underway. As reported last time, representation on the RSC will be based on United Nations regions rather than by library organizations. The impact for U.S. catalogers: instead of an ALA representative serving on the RSC, there will be one person representing North America on the RSC. Currently, North America is Canada and the United States (and if they ever adopt *RDA*, Bermuda, Greenland, and Saint Pierre and Miquelon).

III. NARDAC (get used to saying that)

Kathy Glennan (the current ALA representative to the RSC) reported that progress has been made, but many details remain unresolved. The North American *RDA* Committee (NARDAC) will be comprised of at least six members: two from ALA, two from the Canadian Committee on Cataloging (CCC), and two from the Library of Congress. It could be seven members if the Chair decides that s/he cannot also serve as a community representative, and it could be up to nine members if NARDAC decides it needs to co-opt two additional members. ALA still has to decide on the process for nominating and appointing the proposed two representatives, determine the length of the appointments, and review the role of CC:DA in relation to NARDAC. ALA, at the highest level, has the responsibility for approving the final terms of reference, and the ALCTS Board will approve the ALA representatives to NARDAC. The *RDA* Board has requested that everything relating to NARDAC be finalized by the end of the 2017 calendar year.

The governance structures for the European *RDA* Interest Group (EURIG) and the Oceania *RDA* Committee (ORDAC) have been finalized.

For further reading, please see Kathy's full report (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/RSCrep-2017-1.pdf) on all RSC activities.

IV. Library of Congress Report

Dave Reser gave the Library of Congress report (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/LC-2017-06.pdf). Jane Sánchez was appointed Law Librarian of Congress, effective Feb. 5, 2017.

V. LC BIBFRAME Update

From Dave Reser's report:

> [Network Development and MARC Standards Office (NDMSO)] revised BIBFRAME extensively and published BIBFRAME 2.0 in March-April 2017 … In June 2017, ABA [the Library of Congress Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate] began training the 40 former pilot participants in BIBFRAME 2.0. In July, an additional 27 cataloging staff will be trained in BIBFRAME 2.0. By August, the BIBFRAME Pilot will resume with approximately 65 catalogers and copy catalogers using BIBFRAME 2.0. In contrast to the 2016 pilot, the BIBFRAME 2.0 phase will feature a simulated dynamic BIBFRAME environment, achieved by converting all bibliographic and authority records in the Library of Congress Online Catalog to BIBFRAME 2.0. The new phase of the BIBFRAME Pilot will test: input of bibliographic data using BIBFRAME 2.0 vocabulary; name authority work (using *RDA* as the

cataloging standard) with MODS vocabulary; and non-Latin bibliographic description in native scripts. Participants will create descriptions of each resource in both MARC 21 and BIBFRAME 2.0. To encourage experimentation with BIBFRAME by the community, BIBFRAME 2.0 and all BIBFRAME tools developed at LC are made available for download on the software sharing site, GitHub.

VI. PCC REPORT

Lori Robare submitted the report from the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) (http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/PCC-2017-06.pdf). A few highlights:

- At the request/nagging of American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) catalogers, LC revised the LC-PCC Policy Statement (PS) regarding omitting information from statements of responsibility. It now reads:

  > LC practice/PCC practice for Optional omission: Generally do not abridge a statement of responsibility. Essential information that should not be omitted includes words or phrases that are considered part of a person's name or provide identifying elements often used in an authorized access point. (For example, terms indicating a familial relationship such as "Jr." or a title of nobility such as "Duke of Norfolk.")

  This implies that we can choose to omit things that are not "essential information" as defined by the PS. Victory!
- "The PCC is moving forward to implement the recommendations of the PCC ISBD and MARC Task Group, which call for eliminating ISBD punctuation that coincides with MARC coding. As a first step, OCLC and LC are creating test sets of records and a small group is being formed to track the testing and analyze results." My understanding is that some punctuation will have to remain, such as " : $b" and " = $b" in the MARC 245, but the objective is to eliminate most pre-ISBD and ISBD punctuation from MARC records. Please see the Task Group's revised final report (http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/documents/isbdmarc2016.pdf).
- "Work will resume on implementing a new approach to authorized access points (AAPs) for translations once the process for posting PS changes during 3R is clarified. In summary, existing expression authority records qualified only by subfield $l will be regarded as undifferentiated. Catalogers may continue to create authority records for specific expressions but will no longer create undifferentiated authorities. A work authority will be required in all cases to support the AAP in the bibliographic record, and a language qualifier added to a work AAP in a bib record will not require a separate authority record. Some outstanding issues are still being resolved before implementation."
- "The Task Group on Supplements and Special Numbers has drafted a revision to LC-PCC PS 2.12, (which instructs to treat a supplement or a special number to a serial as a series, while other policy statements prescribe either series treatment or other methods) and is gathering examples."
- The PS at *RDA* 9.19.1.1 was revised to clarify when an *RDA* AAP can be revised (e.g. adding a death date or correcting an error).
- "Series Policy Task Group. This group has finished its review of series-related LC-PCC PS and sections of DCM Z1. The group submitted a successful revision proposal of the DCM Z1 manual on what should be done when Subject Authority Record (SAR) information is needed on a work/expression record that already has been established as a Name Authority Record (NAR). The group proposed that a pre-existing NAR should be coded as a series authority record so that it can validate the authorized access point whether it appears in the 1XX/240, 7XX, or 8XX. This policy change is now reflected in the DCM Z1 1XX section. Additional proposals still under review include LC-PCC PS 1.8.2, 2.12.9 and 24.6.1.3 (explicit instructions to add parentheses in chronological designation of series AAPs; additional examples of recording numbering in series AAPs) and sections of LC-PCC PS 6.27 and 24.6 relating to One or several series authorized access point: language editions."
- "Bob Maxwell is working on a white paper to identify outstanding issues related to aggregate works. Once completed, a joint SCS-SCT task group will be formed to resolve any remaining issues and to develop guidelines or best practices. Timeframe: summer-fall 2017." I will note that there is also an RSC Working Group (http://www.rda-rsc.org/aggregates-wg-summary) examining aggregates.
- The Report does not mention it, but there is a white paper hot off the presses: Linked Data Infrastructure Models: Areas of Focus for PCC Strategies (https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/documents/LinkedDataInfrastructureModels.pdf).

VII. CC:DA Meeting Agenda

Many of the proposals, papers, and reports are available on the CC:DA's posted meeting agenda at http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?cat=33.

MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) Report
American Library Association (ALA)
Annual Conference, June 2017, Chicago, Illinois

Jean Pajerek
Cornell Law Library

The MARC Advisory Committee convened two meetings at the ALA Annual Meeting in Chicago. Action was taken on three discussion papers and five proposals during the meetings. The complete texts of all proposals and discussion papers considered at the 2017 ALA annual meetings of the MARC Advisory Committee are available at http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/an2017_age.html.

The following proposals were discussed; the majority were approved:

Proposal No. 2017-08
Use of Subfields $0 and $1 to Capture Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) in the MARC 21 Formats
http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-08.html
Source: Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Task Group on URIs in MARC

This proposal outlines a method to capture URIs in the MARC 21 Formats in a manner that clearly differentiates between URIs that identify a "Record" or "Authority" entity describing a Thing (designated by $0), and URIs that directly identify a Thing itself (sometimes referred to as a Real World Object or RWO; designated by $1). As more libraries experiment with Linked Data, it is becoming clear that MARC data cannot be transformed into Linked Data without some refinement of existing MARC structures and the implementation of new fields and subfields. A key area in which Linked Data require more semantic precision than is specified in MARC is the distinction that must be made between what are called "Real World Objects" (RWO) and records (like authority records, which are also RWOs) that describe other RWOs. This proposal would have an impact on dozens of fields in all of the MARC formats.

This proposal generated a great deal of discussion. Issues raised include:

- How much Linked Data can we (and should we) fit into our existing standard?
- Should RWO information be linked to from authority records but not bib records? What if transformation processes do not look at authority records?
- Is this just too difficult and expensive to implement?
- Should difficulty of implementation prevent us from moving forward?

A number of amendments were proposed and accepted, and the proposal was approved as amended.

Proposal No. 2017-09
Defining Field 758 (Resource Identifier) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-09.html
Source: Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Task Group on URIs in MARC

Proposal No. 2017-09 recommends the definition of a new field 758 (Resource Identifier) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. It is intended to be used in cases where a resource identifier (or URI) is available but not explicitly associated with an authorized access point or other title construction (e.g., a Wikidata URI or OCLC work entity).

According to the proposal, enhancing MARC records with Linked Data identifiers is a way of facilitating the eventual transformation of MARC data into Linked Data: "Relating bibliographic descriptions to the appropriate work or other resource entities is a major challenge in transforming MARC bibliographic data to Linked Data. Recording the URI for a related resource in a MARC record makes the URI available for inclusion in an RDF statement as the object when the MARC record is transformed into a Linked Data representation."

The proposal was approved with three abstentions.

Proposal No. 2017-10
Rename and Broaden Definition of Field 257 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-10.html
Source: Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC), Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM)

Currently, Field 257 (Country of Producing Entity) is used by the film and video cataloging community to indicate the country where the production companies associated with a film are located. This paper proposes "renaming and broadening the definition of field 257 … in the Bibliographic format so that jurisdictions that have strong film cultures and are often treated as countries can be used in this field, even if they are not legally recognized as countries." While the proposal recommends changing the name of Field 257 to "Area of Producing Entity," the Committee suggested it be changed to "Place of Producing Entity." The proposal was approved.

Proposal No. 2017-11
Defining New Fields to Record Accessibility Content in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-11.html
Source: Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM), Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC)

This proposal recommends the definition of two new fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format: the 341 (Accessibility Content), "to indicate accessibility features and/or assistive technology provided for a resource, or parts of a resource, for example, embedded video, audio, text, in an electronic resource;" and the 532 (Accessibility Note), which would be used to "provide a human-readable summary of the accessibility features or deficiencies of a resource." Committee members felt that the instructions in the proposal were too confusing and required clarification. After considerable discussion, this proposal was tabled for additional community input.

Proposal No. 2017-12
Defining Subfields $u, $r and $z in Field 777 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-12.html
Source: Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM)

The Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange proposes that subfields $r (Report number), $u (Standard Technical Report Number), and $z (ISBN) be defined for use in Field 777 (Issued With Entry) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. The three subfields in question are associated with monographs, while the 777 field was originally created to express a serial-to-serial relationship. Even though format integration eliminated most format-based restrictions on the use of MARC data elements in describing various types of materials, the subfields associated with field 777 were never updated and still do not include the three monograph-related subfields in question. This proposal was approved unanimously.

The following discussion papers were considered:

Discussion Paper No. 2017-DP06
Coding 007 Field Positions for Digital Cartographic Materials in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp06.html
Source: Canadian Committee on Metadata Exchange (CCM) and the ALA Map & Geospatial Information Round Table (MAGIRT)

This discussion paper proposes the creation of new values for some 007 field positions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format to improve description of digital cartographic resources. Several suggestions for improving the paper were made; this paper may return as a proposal.

Discussion Paper No. 2017-DP07
Repeatability of Subfield $s (Version) in MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Format Fields
https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp07.html
Source: Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Standing Committee on Standards

The use case presented for making $s (Version) repeatable in fields X00, X10, X11, and X30 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats, and fields 240 and 243 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Formats, focuses on the need to distinguish among multiple expressions of a work translated into the same language (i.e., "a version of a version" of a work). Properly encoding a version of a version of a work is not possible unless the subfield used to designate versions ($s) is made repeatable. There being no opposition to this idea, the discussion paper was converted into a proposal and approved unanimously.

Discussion Paper No. 2017-DP08
Definition and Repeatability of Subfield $d in Field X11 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats
https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2017/2017-dp08.html
Source: Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) Standing Committee on Standards

Although $d in X10 fields (Corporate Name) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats is defined as "Date of meeting or treaty signing" and is repeatable, $d in X11 fields (Meeting Name) is defined as "Date of meeting" and is not repeatable. This discussion paper recommends changing the definition and repeatability of $d in X11 fields to align its use with the treatment of subfield $d in X10 fields. The use case presented in this paper has particular resonance for law catalogers because it accommodates a situation in which it might be desirable to create a name/title cross reference for a treaty under the name of the meeting at which the treaty was negotiated or authorized, e.g.:

130 #0 $a Act of the International Conference on Viet-Nam $d (1973 March 2)
411 2# $a International Conference on Viet-Nam $d (1973 : $c Paris, France). $t Act of the International Conference on Viet-Nam $d (1973 March 2)

This discussion paper was converted into a proposal and approved unanimously.

Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) Report
American Library Association (ALA)
Annual Conference, June 2017, Chicago, Illinois

Lia Contursi
Columbia Law School Library

Highlights from:

- Policy and Standards Divisions of LC (PSD) (Janis Young)
- FAST Report (Diane Vizine-Goetz)
- SAC Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation (Lia Contursi)

The special program presentation was, "Subjects in Authority Records: Looking Towards a Linked Data Future" (http://connect.ala.org/node/268214), by Robert L. Maxwell and Adam L. Schiff. [see below for summary]

1. Library of Congress Policy and Standards Division

In March 2017, the Law Section of the Library of Congress started to host a regional quarterly Law Cataloging Forum. Typically, members of Georgetown University Law Library, George Washington University Law Library and American University Law Library, as well as representatives of LC Policy and Standard Division (PSD), attend the meeting. However, this year, the May Forum intentionally coincided with the Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC) BIBCO/OpCo meeting to allow the participation of other law catalogers from outside Washington D.C. At the Forum, discussion focused on the issues and ideas concerning law cataloging. At the May meeting, it emerged that there is a need to encourage more proposals for new classifications, new subject headings, and new genre form terms for emerging contemporary topics.

Cataloger's Desktop (CD) is working on a special project called ***Classification Web Integration***, which will allow subscribers of CD and ClassWeb to search both resources concurrently. This new feature will be available in late June or early July.

LC has accomplished the work of updating the Bulgarian jurisdictions called ***oblast*** (province) and ***okrug*** (district). Their use has alternated during the period between 1987 and 1999. There is now an accurate application description in their respective authority records.

The online training for Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH) has advanced substantially since last year. The program now includes six units, incorporating 51 separate modules. The training modules are available in Catalogers Learning Workshop (CLW) (https://www.loc.gov/catworkshop/).

The Subject Headings Manual now includes the new instruction sheet **H 204 - *Evaluating Subject Proposals***. This document helps understand the process followed by the specialists at PSD when they review new proposals. The instructions will help catalogers to be better prepared when they decide to submit a new heading. Download H 204 from the Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate of the Library of Congress (ABA) website: H 204 (https://www.loc.gov/aba/publications/FreeSHM/H0204.pdf).

Among the newest LCSHs added to the authorities' database, there is a noteworthy law heading: **Civil rights of corporations**. This heading is cross-referenced with **Corporate law**.

The Library of Congress Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate (ABA) has not yet decided when it will start to implement the general, religion, and literature genre form terms, nor has it decided on the implementation of the Demographic Group Terms. However, these vocabularies are freely available for use by other libraries, as many catalogers are already doing.

The Library of Congress Demographic Group Terms (LCDGT) Manual is still in its draft form and is available on the ABA LCDGT web page at https://www.loc.gov/aba/publications/FreeLCDGT/freelcdgt.html.

2. FAST/OCLC

OCLC is working on a project that will allow users to propose new personal name headings as well as new topical headings as FAST (Faceted Application of Subject Terminology). When the method for the submission of new proposals is ready, the announcement will occur on the FASTVOC-list. This is the discussion list managed by OCLC Research, which focuses on all issues related to the application of FAST. To subscribe/unsubscribe to the list, send an email to listserv@oclclists.org with the message "Subscribe facetvoc-l [your first name][your last name].

3. SAC Subcommittee Genre/Form Implementation (SAC GFIS)

This past winter, two working groups have labored on two projects.

The Working Group (WG) on Genre/Form of Videogames selected 75 terms from an initial list of hundreds. The WG proceeded to create authority records for 55 of the 75 terms. By ALA Midwinter 2018, the WG plans to add scope notes to all authority records. Conceivably, the specialists at PSD will not be ready to incorporate the production of this new vocabulary to their current list of priorities in the near future. However, the WG on Genre/Form (G/F) of Videogames has been offered the option to consider adding the vocabulary to the Open Data Registry under the sponsorship of Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC). In that case, the G/F of Videogames would be published under the patronage of the Subject Analysis Committee (SAC) and the sponsorship of OLAC. The source code to use in bibliographic records would then be $2 olac. There might still be a chance that PSD will make a favorable decision by the time ALA Midwinter 2018 opens.

Following up on the comments and recommendations received at the Midwinter Meeting, the WG on the white paper *A Brave New World: Towards Full Implementation of Library of Congress Faceted Vocabularies* has incorporated new edits to the essay. The WG asked and obtained the approval of SAC. The Chair of the editorial board is now planning to submit the document to the Library of Congress, to the Program of Cooperative Cataloging (PCC), and to OCLC for their endorsement. After receiving the approval from these institutions, SAC GFIS will distribute the document to the entire library community in order to obtain more feedback from cataloging colleagues in all types of libraries.

The purpose of the essay is to point out the issues hindering full implementations of all three new faceted controlled vocabularies: LC Genre/Form Terms (LCGFT), LC Demographic Group Terms (LCDGT), and LC Medium of Performance Terms (LCMPT). The document advocates for the development of a training plan and identifies possible solutions for a full-scale application of these faceted vocabularies.

SAC GFIS feels that the conclusion of the white paper also ends the mission of the subcommittee. However, after long discussions, SAC GFIS identified the need to articulate best practices and training for the future full-scale implementation of the three LC non-topical faceted vocabularies. GFIS asked SAC for permission to transform itself into a new subcommittee working on best practices and training. Hopefully, current members will remain, thus continuing their contribution with the considerable experience gained so far, and expectedly new members will join. GFIS will submit a proposal to SAC for the support of a new subgroup with focus on best practices of LC Faceted Vocabularies.

Other News

Illegal aliens.

There is no current decision on the proposed changes. The executive management at the Library of Congress is discussing the issue.

International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) 2017 Subject Analysis and Access Standing Committee (SA&A) Meetings and Open Programs

The IFLA 2017 (http://2017.ifla.org/) will be held in Wroclaw, Poland from August 19-25. Download the full program at http://2017.ifla.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2017/01/ifla-wlic-programme-2017.pdf.

Maxwell/Schiff Presentation: "Subjects in Authority Records: Looking Towards a Linked Data Future," by Robert L. Maxwell and Adam L. Schiff

The excellent presentation of Maxwell and Schiff very skillfully demonstrated new and enhanced ways to create authority records. The presenters showed alternative ways to create more effective authority records, often expertly visionary, sometimes arguably problematic.

They argued that *RDA* and FRBR (Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records) allow catalogers to think at entity-relationship structures, even in the traditional environment of current databases in MARC format. Now, exclusively bibliographic records can be linked among themselves. We continue to create authority records as traditional static description of access points. However, authorities can also describe entities and can be used to link much enhanced bibliographic records.

In fact, with the use of relationship designators in authorities, and with the use of faceted vocabularies such as LCDGT, we could enrich our NARs (Name Authority Record) and link them to other appropriate entities, including related works.

The presenters gave ample demonstrations of enriched authorities and demonstrated how they can better connect bibliographic descriptions. They showed a number of records before and after enhancements. The reaction of the audience was enthusiastic, but some pointed out a few less convincing details that should be discussed and resolved if the library community moves forward to adopt the suggested enrichment process. For example, Maxwell and Schiff suggested enhancing the authority for ***Card, Orson Scott. $t Ender's game*** with mention of the literary awards obtained for the title. These would automatically link to any bibliographic record describing the numerous editions of the same title. However, there are cases where a title would cause problems, such as *Gone With The Wind* (movie), which won many Academy Awards. The novel would not need the link to those awards, and such connections would be misleading. More brainstorming is necessary to resolve any issues generated by unintended links among entities, but the presentation proposed a very stimulating and innovative way of cataloging and was a great success.

Continued from page 1

the library's website and sending it to Google. A displayed example of the end result showed the schema.org markup of a particular book. They ended up with 50,000 initial records displayed on their website to see what would happen with the data.

The results of the project showed 95% of the 50,000 records were found to be the first or second search result when user experience staff searched for known items by title and library name. While very happy with those results, the findings were mixed. Some issues they discovered: Schema.org is not ready to describe all library content. Some library material types do not have comparable detailed description terminology (for example: databases, streaming videos, electronic resources), which may make our descriptions less useful than in the library catalog. Secondly, they had to describe the availability of the thing being described like a business would, as the schema.org model is an internet-business model, using cost, for example, in the description. And third, Google is not a reliable partner to advertise our services. Things can disappear over time, and there is no control over when or what disappears; it constantly fluctuates. Currently, there is 70-74% indexing of the Rice University library catalog website—less than 100% is a real problem.

Brigham Young University (BYU) conducted a similar project where they did extreme search engine optimization—not necessarily using Linked Data, but using URIs and Dublin Core. It has resulted in between 200,000 and 1 million records indexed by Google out of 4.657 million records submitted. That is less than 25%. BYU reported on their case study at the 2017 American Library Association (ALA) Annual Conference.

Google is still a mystery in how it discovers data. It is a big black box. There is, however, still value in getting our library data ready for the Linked Data environment. How can we get schema.org to add better description language of library materials? There are working groups out there to join or provide input, or specifically create one for law within the schema.org community.

TSLL EDITORIAL POLICY

Technical Services Law Librarian (ISSN 0195-4857) is an official publication of the Technical Services Special Interest Section and the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section of the American Association of Law Libraries. It carries reports or summaries of AALL annual meeting events and other programs of OBS-SIS and TS-SIS, acts as the vehicle of communication for SIS committee activities, awards, and announcements, as well as current awareness and short implementation reports. It also publishes regular columns and special articles on a variety of topics related to technical services law librarianship.

Statements and opinions of the authors are theirs alone and do not necessarily reflect those of AALL, TS-SIS, OBS-SIS, or the *TSLL* Editorial Board. AALL does not assume, and expressly disclaims, any responsibility for statements advanced by contributors. *TSLL* editors reserve the right to edit contributions for style and length. *TSLL* has the privilege to reproduce and distribute authors' contributions as part of the issue of *TSLL* in which they appear. All other rights remain with the author. Prospective authors should contact the editor for content and style information.

Publication Schedule

Issues are published quarterly in March, June, September, and December.

Deadlines (each vol/year):

no. 1 (September)..............August 21st
no. 2 (December) ....November 21st
no. 3 (March) .... February 21st
no. 4 (June)............................ May 21st