CARBONDALE INSTITUTE UPDATE

CASSETTES OF SPEECHES & QUESTIONS/ANSWERS

Audio cassettes of the Institute on AACR2 for Law Catalogers held at Southern Illinois University in June of 1980 are now available from Information Field, 11 Stonecrest Dr., Dewitt, N.Y. 13214. The set of 6 cassettes is priced at $3.00 with individual tapes available for $1.50 each.

A brief description of the tapes follows:

Unedited speeches (4 tapes):

Prof. Ronald Hagler, School of Librarianship, Univ. of British Columbia -- philosophical basis and development of new code presented by an excellent speaker.

Helen Schmierer, University of Chicago Library System Development Office -- presented a paper on changes in the rules for legal materials, also pointed out problem areas.

Lois Upham, School of Library and Information Sciences, North Texas State University -- detailed information on cataloging serials under AACR2.

Ben Tucker, Library of Congress, Office for Descriptive Cataloging Policy -- covered LC's choice of options and rule interpretations.

Two tapes consisting of questions and answers selected from the lengthy question/answer sessions are available. Included in the selections are the "How to Cope" session.

REFERENCE HANDBOOKS FROM THE INSTITUTE

Because of the number of requests that have been made for the reference handouts from the Carbondale Institute they are now available from two sources. These handouts are not examples of how to catalog under AACR2 but are examples of references that might be used to connect pre-AACR2 headings with AACR2 headings depending on how a library chooses to cope with the new rules. The 15 sheets include references for those libraries that choose to stay with a single catalog and those that have made the decision to begin a new catalog when they implement AACR2. (Those who attended the Carbondale Institute already have these handouts, so there is no need for them to order the examples.)

If you live in Canada and wish to order the examples, please send a check for $2.00 made out to the University of Victoria Law Library to:

Ann Rae
University of Victoria
Law Library
P.O. Box 2300
Victoria, B.C., Canada V8W 3R1
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SUGGESTED CHANGES FOR AALL

David Thomas in a September 1980 letter to Robert Oakley, Chairperson of the AALL Constitution and Bylaws Committee, proposed some amendments to the organization and governance of AALL regarding special interest sections and chapters. The chairpersons of all chapters and special interest sections received a copy of these proposals from Francis Gates and were advised to bring them to the attention of their members. Your comments on these ideas can be sent to:

David Thomas
Brigham University Law Library
Provo, Utah 84602

Robert Oakley
Pappas Law Library
Boston University
765 Commonwealth Ave.
Boston, MA 02215

Mr. Thomas proposed the following:

1. Under guidelines adopted by the association, law librarians should be invited to seek certification and recognized specialization. Requirements for these designations would be a combination of education, experience, in-service continuing education and examination. The executive director, in consultation with all interested members and groups, would be responsible for proposing designations, requirements, standards and evaluation instruments and procedures. As general guidance, it would be specified that new members would be simply designated as 'members' and would be granted a period of time in which to either certify or move into 'associate member' status. Certified members would have full activity and voting privileges. Members with lesser formal education attainments could achieve certification by meeting heavier continuing education and examination requirements. Present members would face less onerous requirements for achieving certification and specialization, but should in most cases probably not be altogether exempt therefrom.

2. The chapters would be the primary instrumentality for administering the certification and specialization programs, both in the educational and evaluation aspects. The special interest sections would remain extant only in those subject areas reflected in the recognized specialties and certification requirements. They would be the resources used by the executive director in refining the educational requirements and programs, and section members in each of the chapters would be the primary resources for providing specialized continuing education within the chapters. Probably the present type-of-library special interest sections would no longer exist. Chapters would also assume association responsibilities for recruitment and placement.

3. Chapters would retain much autonomy, but their creation would be more closely governed by the association officials, and, in order to be recognized as chapters they would have to make commitments to fulfill specified educational, recruitment and placement functions for the association. It would probably be appropriate to require the chapter officials be certified librarians and members of the association. To confer some guidance as to chapter creation, it could, for example, be specified that:

a. A proposed chapter cover an area that includes no less than 5% association members;
b. Petitions for any such new chapter contain signatures of at least one-third of the association members in the proposed chapter area;
c. Existing chapters affected by such a proposed chapter would include at least 5% of association membership immediately after such a division;
d. A chapter should include the area of at least one state, should have boundaries conforming to state lines and, if it includes inter-state metropolitan areas, should include the entire states involved in those areas;
e. The executive board may consider creation or dissolution of chapters on its own initiative or in response to member petitions, but should only take action if it is in the best interest of the chapter involved and of the association as a whole. The action of the executive board could be submitted to the members for final disposition.

4. The chapter presidents should all serve terms of the same length and season. Each term the group of immediate past presidents should select two of its members to serve a term of the same length on the executive board. The board should further consist of four at-large members (for two staggered terms) and the officers as now constituted.

5. Nominations for officers and at-large board members should be by an anonymous, self-nominating process with primary elections administered by the chapter. In this way, more willing and able candidates will
be exposed to the election process and the nominating committee's twin problems of excessive influence and insufficient acquaintance with the membership would be eliminated along with the committee.

6. After the matter of membership certification and specialization are stabilized, the executive director could turn attention to the matter of "certifying" or "rating" law librarians based on criteria of quantity and quality resources and services with respect to the user base being served.

If all of this seems drastic, at least the changes could be gradual. Failure to move at least a little in these directions will consort law librarianship to more years of malaise.

***************
ON-LINE BIBLIOGRAPHIC SERVICES SIS NEWS

ORG/SIS CONSORTIUM PROGRAM REPEAT

The joint meeting of ALLUNY and SNEELA (Association of Law Libraries of Upstate New York and Southern New England Law Library Association) held September 26-28 at Lake George, New York, was the scene of a modified repeat of the successful ORS/SIS program on cost effective use of bibliographic utilities by small libraries. Jacqui Paul, of the Delaware Law School Library, spoke to an interested audience on the experience of the Delaware Library Consortium, in sharing the use and expenses of an OCLC terminal between a number of small, specialized libraries.

She described the financial and time allocation arrangements of the Consortium and passed out detailed breakdowns of each library's use and costs of the system. Use ranged from a high of 5000 titles cataloged per year, at a cost of $250.13, to 125 titles cataloged per year, at a cost of $209.26. The Consortium is somewhat unique in that several different kinds of libraries are members, including medical libraries, a law library, a museum library, and two community college libraries. This model could prove very attractive to law libraries in a community without other law libraries to work with on similar projects.

Ms. Paul also described the consortium's use of other OCLC subsystems, primarily Interlibrary Loan, which is currently done on a centralized basis, by Consortium staff. She also described other possibilities for access to OCLC, such as dial access, through a multi-purpose terminal. Such a terminal could be used to access other data bases as well, including Westlaw and other business and general data bases.

Further information on the Delaware Library Consortium may be obtained directly from Jacqui Paul, Delaware Law School. Information about dial access to OCLC may be obtained directly from them, or from Margie Axtmann, National Center for State Courts, who is a dial-up user.

***************
TECHNICAL SERVICES SIS NEWS

This special Interest Section is continuing to experience growing pains. Much of the activity of the Executive Board since June 1980 has been toward continued organizational development. Chairperson Colleen Faller submits the following report on the organizational and program planning efforts to date.

MEMBERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

In order to understand the needs of the section, the membership must first be identified. The questionnaire distributed at the beginning of November to all 159 members named on the Technical Services SIS membership list received from AALL headquarters will be used for this purpose. The information on those
questionnaires returned by December 31, 1980 will be used to compile a membership directory, which will be distributed in February 1981 to all Section members. As of December 15, 1980 ninety-seven (85%) of the forms have been returned. There are 144 members with responsibility for TS as a whole, 13 acquisitions librarians, 42 monograph & serials catalogers, and 8 serials librarians. These total more than 97 because some members (other than TS supervisors) are responsible for more than one category.

The directory will be indexed by institution, member's name, and area of responsibility. The institutional index will be divided into three sections: academic libraries; state, county, court, and federal libraries; and private and corporate libraries. If your name is on the TS/STIS membership list it will appear in the membership directory even though you have not returned the questionnaire. Your entry in this case, however, will not include your telephone number or area of responsibility.

The Secretary of this Section will continue to send questionnaires to all new members. We hope to update the annual directory between publication dates by providing information on new members in the TSLL.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Tabulation of responses to the questions on the membership questionnaire follows. In addition to providing information for the membership directory the questionnaire also communicates your interests for future programs and projects. Your suggestions for this year's programs on legal subject headings and record keeping systems in technical services have been forwarded to the program directors.

Question six asked for suggestions for future program topics. Your responses are listed below. The popularity of each topic is indicated by the number.

Acquisitions
- Automated acquisitions systems 5
- Collection development 4
- Acquisitions encumbrance systems 2
- Accepting and evaluating gifts to the library 1
- Acquiring o.p. Items 1

Cataloging
- Serials cataloging 3
- Automation of serials cataloging 4
- Legal subject headings 3
- Converting card catalog to on-line catalog 3
- Impact of AACR2 3
- Cataloging for non-catalogers 1
- Classification and foreign law classification 3

Serials
- Serial record keeping systems 5

Preservation and Binding
- Preservation 2
- Binding 2

Technical Services
- Administration and management of Technical Services 5
- Workflow and record keeping procedures 2
- State of the art on automation in TS / future of TS 9
- Technical services in small and medium size law libraries 1
- Comparing automated bibliographic utilities and circulation systems 2

Other
- Microforms; care, maintenance and access 1
- Automation of in-house documents, i.e. briefs, legal research, memos 1

The following is a list of members' responses to question eight concerning tasks the Section should undertake.
- Authority files: how they are kept, what purpose do they serve.
- Directory of book vendors.
- Directory of persons to contact when you have various technical services questions.
- Directory of who is creating serials holdings lists; union catalogs available, cooperative acquisitions projects.
- Development of independent (non-LC) subject heading list.
- Survey of cataloging and record keeping practices.
- Survey of workflow procedures.
- Development of manual for small libraries.
- List of aids in applying new AACR2 rules.
- Solving problems of application of AACR2 chapters 21 & 25.
- Format for SIS programs and how they might be improved to encourage participation.

Question ten investigated the interest in having a public relations booth in the exhibit area at the 1981 annual meeting in D.C. Of the seventy-three people who responded to this question, forty-one favored a TS/SIS booth and thirty-two rejected the proposal. Thirty-four people volunteered to work at the booth if they attend the annual meeting. These results will be discussed with the Executive Board, and someone will be appointed to organize this project.

Membership interest in forming additional TS/SIS Standing Committees was examined in question eleven. Members' responses were divided into their technical services areas of responsibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Services as a whole</th>
<th>Need additional crude</th>
<th>Do not need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging (monographs &amp; serials)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials (other than cataloging)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONVENTION AND POST-CONVENTION PLANS**

The TS/SIS Sunday program on record keeping systems will be divided into three parts: Part 1. Manual serial record keeping, i.e. bound and unbound volumes, added vols./copies, withdrawals, replacement vols., etc. Part 2. A discussion of the record keeping system at SUNY Buffalo Law Library that permits monitoring of acquisitions by subject area. Part 3. Discussion of the automated serials record keeping system at Brigham Young Univ. Law Library, and a discussion of the use of word processing equipment for record keeping. Gall Daly, University of Minnesota Law Library, is the program director.

Meeting rooms have been reserved at the convention on Monday for the Cataloging and Classification Standing Committee and for those interested in forming an Acquisitions Standing Committee and a Serials Standing Committee. (See also TS/SIS COMMITTEES below)

Heads of Cataloging of Large Libraries Discussion Group (300,000 plus vols.) will also meet on Monday under the chairmanship of Lee Leighton, Harvard Law Library. Other discussion groups may be started by informing the Section chairperson of this interest.

This year TS/SIS business meeting will be on Tuesday, OBS/SIS business meeting on Wednesday. Separate times were approved by the Chairperson of the annual meeting.

Technical Services SIS program on subject cataloging is tentatively called "Legal Subject Headings after Day 1." The title of the program is deliberately vague. A representative from the Subject Cataloging Division of the Library of Congress will help us find answers to questions such as: what changes can we anticipate in the short and long term, how can we cooperate with the Library of Congress toward standardization and desirable changes in legal subject headings? An opportunity to discuss problems in applying subject headings in our daily work will also be provided. Peter Ewying, Los Angeles County Law Library, and John Zenelis, Columbia University Law Library, are co-directors of the program. The co-directors request from members planning to attend the program suggestions as to additional topics to be covered and any questions.
members may want raised during the discussion period. Please, contact either
of the co-directors about the program.

"Update on AACR2" is scheduled for Thursday's post-convention workshop.
The program will seek to address those questions and concerns which have come
up in the first six months of implementation of AACR2. A staff member from the
Library of Congress Office for Descriptive Cataloging Policy will be on hand
to discuss these questions, along with Program Director, Phyllis Marion, Univer-
sity of Minnesota Law Library and other panel and audience participants.
Anyone encountering difficulties with AACR2 after January 1, 1981. is encouraged
to contact Phyllis so that specific problems can be addressed by the group.
Projected time and cost: 10-2:30 am, $25.

TS/SIS COMMITTEES

At the present time the only authorized Standing Committee is Cataloging
and Classification which is chaired by Curt Conklin, Brigham University Law
Library. The names of the forty-three TS/SIS members who indicated on the
questionnaire their interest in serving on this committee have been forwarded
to Curt.

In spite of a majority of negative answers to the question concerning
the need for additional standing committees, the TS/SIS Executive Board consi-
siders it important for a Technical Services SIS to organize committees in
all areas - not just cataloging. Some Section officers and members have been
asked to contact acquisitions, serials, and technical services librarians to
identify common problems in their respective areas of responsibility. Those
members interested in preparing a written proposal to form an Acquisi-
tions Standing Committee and/or a Serials Standing Committee will meet at the AALL
1981 meeting on Monday, June 29, 1981 at 10:30-11:15. These proposals can
then be presented at the TS/SIS business meeting at 7:30 am-8:45 am on Tuesday,
June 30, 1981.

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

At least two TS-SIS members will be nominated for each of the following
offices: chairperson-elect, secretary/treasurer, and two members-at-large.

If you would like to submit a name, including your own, to the nominating
committee, please send it to one of the nominating committee members. If you
are nominating yourself include a statement regarding your willingness to
serve in the office and on the executive board.

Members of the nominating committee are Jacqui Paul, Chair (Delaware Law
School Library, Box 7475 Concord Pike, Wilmington, DE 19803); Mary Cooper
(University of Virginia Law Library, Charlottesville, VA 22901); Gall Daly
(University of Minnesota Law Library, Minneapolis, MN 55455); Malinda Lee
(George Washington University, National Law Center Library, 715 20th Street NW,
Washington, DC 20052); Merle Szykoff (University of Pennsylvania Law Library,
Philadelphia, PA 19104).

The slate of candidates for 1981/82 and the decision on whether the
election will be by secret ballot at the annual meeting or by mail ballot will
be published in the next issue of TSLL.

***************

ALA /CCDA REPORT

SHORT REPORT OF THE CCDA MEETINGS AT THE ALA ANNUAL MEETING, JUNE 1980

From the many hours of meetings, the following three items emerged as
the most relevant to law catalogers. First, there was discussion of the problem of cataloging microform reproductions of already existing works. Briefly, AACR2 provides for describing the item in hand, i.e., the imprint and collocation reflect the microform. (AACR1 describes the original item in the imprint and collocation and describes the microreproduction in a note.) Many groups, including the Library of Congress, have voiced concern about this approach in AACR2. Many catalogers seemed to favor some sort of rule that gave primary emphasis to the original item while still giving the bibliographic information concerning the microreproduction. Three alternative proposals were presented; all were voted down by the Committee. No further action was taken.

Second, the Joint Steering Committee, at its meeting in Vancouver just prior to the ALA meeting, announced that it will continue to receive and discuss proposals for rule change. However, it does not anticipate acting on any such proposals during 1981. It feels that the rules should be applied for a period of time before any revision is made.

Third, a Task Force was appointed by the chair to review the controversial rules 24.13, type 3 and 24.18, type 3. It will submit a report on these rules at the Midwinter, 1981 meeting.

PREPARATION FOR ALA MIDWINTER, FEBRUARY, 1981

The microreproduction cataloging issue didn’t die. LC announced that it would not use AACR2 for description of microreproductions, but would consider using AACR2. (For LC’s announcement see Information Bulletin, Vol. 38, no. 1 Nov. 21, 1980, p. 498) Many other organizations indicated that they wished to continue discussing the problem. (It was pointed out that just because three proposals on how to handle the problem were voted down at the annual meeting, it didn’t mean that the problem had gone away.) So, it has been announced that a special session on the question will be held at ALA midwinter. Organizations have been asked to submit written presentations which will then be read at the meeting. Discussion will take place as time allows. Based on a vote taken among the members of the 1979/80 Cataloging and Classification Committee, the following statement will be made by the AALL representative.

In February, 1980, the American Association of Law Libraries Cataloging and Classification Committee polled its members concerning the cataloging of microforms under AACR2. The specific question raised was whether the bibliographic data in the imprint area of the cataloging description for a microreproduction of a previously published book or serial ought to represent the original publication or the microreproduction. At that time the Committee indicated, in a seven to three vote, a preference for describing the original publication in the imprint area, with the physical description of the microform being given elsewhere. It should be further stated, however, that the Committee members were not in agreement as to the exact presentation of the information. There was only agreement that primary consideration should be given to the description of the original item as to place of publication, publisher, and date of publication.

At this time, the American Association of Law Libraries Technical Services Special Interest Section Cataloging and Classification Standing Committee would like to state that position for the record.

A second proposal, from the ALA Task Force on Rules 24.13, Type 3 and 24.18, Type 3, should be of great interest to law catalogers. There has been
m much dissatisfaction with these two rules dealing with form of headings for corporate names. If you'll get out your rule book and follow along, I'll attempt to explain the controversy.

AAUL rules 24.13, type 3 and 24.18, type 3, while differing slightly, both call for the cataloger to enter a subordinate body that has a name that has been, or is likely to be, used by another body as a sub-heading of the body to which it is subordinate.

The objections to these rules center on the following:

1. This rule is contrary to the general provisions for form of corporate name headings. The general rule calls for entry of corporate body under its name. This includes subordinate bodies and independent bodies. However, there is recognition of a long tradition of entering some subordinate bodies under a main body because the name implies a certain type of subordination or because the quality of the name makes it indistinctive. This was the kind of problem that was thought to be answered by the types in these two rules. However, type 3 is too broad. Given enough time, any name could conflict with another. The "or is likely to be" clause leads the cataloger to presuppose conflict in the off chance that there might be conflict.

2. The application of type 3 will lead to different results for similar names and even different treatment of the same names by different cataloging agencies. A good example is the National Portrait Gallery and the National Collection of Fine Arts, both subordinate bodies of the Smithsonian Institution. The National Collection of Fine Arts is a unique name so it can be entered independently under its own name (unless one supposes that someday there will be a conflict). However, there is also a National Portrait Gallery in London, so the Smithsonian subordinate body of that name must be entered subordinately under the heading for the Smithsonian. Will the user be aided by such subtelities? Another problem exists. What if a cataloger at one agency knows there is a conflict and a cataloger at another agency does not? This would lead to different entries.

3. There is difficulty interpreting "or is likely to be". This brings up the old argument of "generic" vs. "distinctive" names, often called "strong" vs. "weak" names. The phrase as given in the rule not only asks the cataloger to make this distinction, but also gives leeway as to deciding that stronger or distinctive names might also conflict in the future.

4. There is a problem of confusion between this rule and 24.4C which tells you to differentiate between bodies by adding a parenthetical qualifier. Which takes precedence? If type 3 does, and under that rule you decided that there was not conflict, why would you apply 24.4C since it is another rule that resolves conflicts and you just decided a conflict didn't exist?

The Task Force was in general agreement that rules 24.13, type 3 and 24.18, type 3 should be rewritten. (Some members favored dropping the rules altogether.) Therefore, it is recommending to the COCA that the rule be revised to read:

"A name that indicates no more than a type of body and therefore requires the name of the higher body (government) for identification." The phrase, "no more than a type of body", could then be given an interpretation such as those LC has issued for the present type 3. The other types listed under 24.13 and 24.18 would not be changed.

As AALL representative to COCA, I will be asked to comment on the above two issues. If you have objections to the statement on microforms as given above and have not yet voiced them, please let me know. As to the rule change concerning "type 3" subordinate body, I will be consulting with the Executive Board of the TS/SIS Standing Committee on Cataloging and Classification. I
would welcome the opinions of any other law cataloger as to the proposed change. If you wish to speak out on these items, let me know by January 25, 1981, and I will relay your thoughts to the AIA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access.

Submitted by Phyllis Karlon, AALL representative to ALA/CCDA, University of Minnesota Law Library, 229 19th Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

****************************
DASHED-ON

by Pat Callahan...[et al.]

By the time this issue of TSLL reaches everyone, DAY ONE will probably have come and gone and we'll all be cataloging (or trying to) according to AACR2. Maybe by now each library has decided how to cope with the changes, but, somehow, that seems to be wishful thinking, since we're not even sure at this point just what to expect. This seems like a good time to begin sharing ideas on what people plan to do in their libraries to implement the new rules. Included here are some of the procedures we've discussed and what we've done already at Biddle Law Library, University of Pennsylvania. Please feel free to share your ideas with other STS members via the newsletter. (See other libraries' decisions on pages 12-16)

Our library is fairly large (over 3000,000 volumes) and we have a divided card catalog. Although still cataloging manually, we will join RLIN within the next few months. We have decided not to close our catalog.

Before we received our copy of the LC Name Authorities on microfiche, we took the lists of heading changes published in the LC Cataloging Service Bulletin and checked them against the entries in our catalog. From this we were able to determine both the number of changes and the size of the files we will need to change. We have also checked the work cards our cataloging department has generated over the past few months against the LC Name Authorities and have determined that the majority of our access points are personal name entries. The largest percentage of changes we make will be related to jurisdiction and uniform titles. A smaller percentage are corporate entries. We plan to set up a desuperimposition file and batch our changes as they occur. One day a week will be spent deciding whether the size of each file that needs to be changed warrants changing all of the cards or setting up a split file. If a major shift would be required in the catalog if we either changed the old headings or input them with the new headings it might be better to set up a split file. We will use raised guide cards to alert users to the split files and in cases where we change the whole file to conform to the new entry we will make a cross reference to prevent the start of a second file in case a card with an old heading slips through. We have decided not to change the tracings at the bottom of the card, since these will be covered by cross references. On the subject side of the catalog we will change the subject headings but not the main entries that don't conform to AACR2. To make such a change would be very time-consuming and we feel that when a user is doing a subject search s/he is not usually looking for a specific entry and would be more likely to flip through the whole file. Therefore, a variation in main entry would be less of a problem.

We have decided that except for the changes involving jurisdictions, which we will make gradually, and the "university" file, which we have already shifted, we will continue to use any LC copy we receive with old entries, rather than change it to the AACR2-compatible heading. We are able to do this because we are not closing our catalog and we feel that the other changes we will be making will take up enough staff time.
There are other problems that will have to be dealt with after access points are changed. The reserve files will still be under the old main entries and the staff will have to be aware of this when patron requests from entries they have found in the catalog that have been changed. Most of the kardex records in our library are under title, but for a library using main entry, records will have to be changed. This also includes binding records.

As we all begin to implement the new rules we will probably encounter other problems we haven't even anticipated. Let's use the newsletter to share our solutions.

Publications of interest: The Nature and Future of the Catalog. Proceedings of the ALA's Information Science and Automation Division's 1975 and 1977 Institutes on the Catalog is edited by Maurice J. Freedman and S. Michael Malinconico and available from Oryx Press, Phoenix, for $16.50 (1979). As reviewed by James Thompson in the Journal of Academic Librarianship, November 1980, "this volume records the carefully edited proceedings of two LITA colloquia, no less valuable for its having appeared several years after the institutes...While some of the papers show their age, the analyses of cataloging principles and their relation to automated access have not been superseded in print...It is time library administrators regained control of their catalogs, and this excellent work offers much to incite them."

Retrospective Conversion (SPEC Kit no. 65), $7.50 for ARL and SPEC members, $15.00 for others, prepaid from SPEC, ARL, 1227 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. "This kit proposes guidelines for implementing retrospective conversion projects based on the experiences of others. Several questionnaires, statistical overviews, and interviews are shared from a variety of academic institutions. This is important, timely reading." (Journal of Academic Librarianship, November 1980).

Alternatives for Future Library Catalogs: A Cost Model. by Robert R.V. Wiederkher, is available from King Research, Inc., 6000 Executive Blvd., Rockville, MD 20852, for $12.00 and $3.00 postage. The Association of Research Libraries sponsored the Library Catalog Cost Model Project to which the 68 university libraries that participated submitted detailed data and computer runs that contributed to the development of this publication. Instead of resulting in general conclusions about which alternative card catalog form (if any) would be least costly, the study found that "local factors so greatly influenced an individual library's costs that even size and geographic location did not distinguish groups of libraries conclusively...Preparing cataloging records was found to be the most dominant cost of developing and maintaining a catalog. The results indicate that, in most cases, AACR2 implementation will account for less than 10 percent of those costs." Also included in the report are a description of the model and an analysis of costs for various alternatives. (CRL News, Oct. 1980).

Two AACR2-related articles dealing with the future of card catalogs and bibliographic networks appear in the Journal of Library Automation, Vol. 13/2, June 1980. In "The Catalogs of the Future: a Speculative Essay", Norman D. Stevens suggests that the on-line catalogs of the future ought not to have a single format, but should vary in size and form to meet the needs of different types of users. Paul J. Fasana discusses the impact AACR2 and LOC's decision to close its catalog will have on the on-line catalog and the "all-purpose" national library network in his article "1981 and Beyond: Visions and Decisions."

are local, vendor, and network acquisitions systems; the compatibility of an acquisitions system with cataloging or circulation systems; and three case histories, including a specialized fund accounting system.

Oryx Press in Phoenix is publishing a technical services newsletter called *Technic*alities. It is a national newsletter "dedicated to the exchange of facts and opinions in the information field...and will endeavor to find alternative solutions to the problems faced by the information industry." Active reader participation is encouraged. Price: $36.00 for 13 issues.

The LC Cataloging Service Bulletin will no longer be available free of charge after issue no. 10, Fall 1980. Due to budget constraints imposed by Congress the CSR will be available beginning Jan. 1, 1981 at the following annual subscription rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Package Type</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single subscription</td>
<td>$10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package of 5 to same address</td>
<td>$14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package of 10 to same address</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Package of 25 or more</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Address questions or comments to:
Cataloging Distribution Service
Library of Congress
Building 159
Navy Yard Annex
Washington, D.C. 20541

The following manuals of AACR2 examples compiled by the Minnesota AACR2 Trainers are or will be available from Soldier Creek Press.


* A Manual of AACR2 Examples for Legal Materials. Compiled by Phyllis Marion (Minnesota AACR2 Trainer). Contains 64 examples for legal materials, each including a copy of the chief source of information, information as to choice of access point and form of heading, and applicable rule numbers. (These examples do not have complete descriptive cataloging.) ISBN 0-936996-08-0 PUBLICATION IN JANUARY $6.00.

All manuals are available from Soldier Creek Press, Box 863, Lake Crystal, MN 56055. If you prepay, you will save postage and handling charge.

The OCLC database can now be searched more efficiently thanks to new search retrieval enhancements that include retrieval by Government Document Number and retrieval by publication date and record type. OCLC has also made it possible to retrieve more records with a derived search key (author, author/title, title) up to 256 records to 1500.

OCLC has created a Research Libraries Advisory Committee to provide a voice for its 73 research library members.

The Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York have provided the Research Libraries Group with capital loans of $2.2 million in support of
RLG's Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN). The funds will be distributed during 1980/81.

Beginning Friday, January 2, 1981 RLG will adopt AACR2 as the RLG standard for cataloging. In order to allow for a smooth transition for RLIN users, records cataloged according to either AACR or AACR2 will be considered standard records between January 2 and the installation of the RLG Authority System.

The Law Library Association of Greater New York will present two programs in February 1981: Feb. 4th, an overview of catalog options; Feb. 18th, AACR2. Nancy Meyrich may be contacted at Weil, Gotshal and Manges, 767 Fifth Avenue, New York 10022 for further information.

FEDLINK, the OCLC regional/Federal network, is sponsoring a series of AACR2-3 day workshops. For more information on dates and locations see Library of Congress Information Bulletin, Vol. 39, no. 47, Nov. 21, 1980, p. 47.

California Library Authority for Systems and Services will sponsor "Starting and Managing a COM Catalog: from Retrospective Conversion to Production" at the University of Southern California Library School. The seminar will provide a practical approach to the management and production options for librarians planning a computer output microform catalog. The first day's discussion will concentrate on retrospective conversion; the second day will cover COM catalog production. Some of the topics included: how to prepare a request for proposal for a vendor; a comparison of batch and online ReCon methods; the relevance of COM and ReCon for small and special libraries. Contact Vonda Schnitger at CLASS, (408) 289-1756, for registration information.

**********************************

LIBRARIES IN ACTION

Are you curious about the decisions of other law libraries with regard to AACR2? If so, read on and you will find out what some libraries have decided to do.

At CORNELL LAW LIBRARY the old catalogs will be closed on December 31, 1980. Card sets produced through Dec. 31 will be filed in the old catalogs. Any cataloging done after that date will be represented in the new catalogs. Locational and holdings information will continue to be updated in the old catalogs and card sets for material withdrawn, lost, or recataloged will be pulled.

In Cornell University libraries links should not be made between new and old catalogs. Signs and handouts should be used to explain the need to search in both catalogs. A user searching in either direction between the catalogs should be guided by cross references to the appropriate entry if the headings differ in the two catalogs. Work has been going on in Central Technical Services since the fall of 1979 to upgrade the reference structure in the existing catalogs.

Because it is our eventual aim to discard those cards in the new catalogs which are represented in the RLIN on-line data base, we recognize the problem of interfileing cards in a single catalog when some have machine-readable records and some do not. Although thought has been given to starting one or more catalogs for non-romanized records, the Subcommittee recommends instead that a single integrated new catalog be opened in each library. All cards in non-roman form will be marked on the back in a color and symbol to be agreed upon. Then in the future the cards representing machine-readable records are to be discarded, a person working from the back of each drawer will be able to identify the marked cards as being those which should be retained.
The Serials Catalog in the Olin Library will continue as a unified catalog containing both AACR2 and pre-AACR2 entries. It has been recommended that the other serial catalogs on the campus also be maintained as unified catalogs.

(Submitted by Diane Hilleman)

DELAWARE LAW SCHOOL began to produce AACR2 forms of headings beginning in July 1980, following the AACR2 Institute. AACR2 forms were not input into the OCLC data base. Original cataloging records were reformatted following input into the data base to then be edited to AACR2 form before the cards were produced.

Catalog headings are being changed as time permits using as authority Cataloging Service Bulletin AACR2 headings, "Revised Headings for 1981." (Submitted by Jacqui Paul)

At the LOS ANGELES COUNTY LAW LIBRARY the following decisions have been made. A new card catalog using AACR2 will be established. Cards for works cataloged by LACLL in machine-readable form will be filed in the new catalog. Therefore, cards representing items in the library's RLIN file will be updated to AACR2 form and transferred to the new catalog as part of a project to begin in mid-1981. At this time cards in non-Roman scripts that cannot be put into machine-readable form will be filed in the old catalog.

No links will be made between the new and old catalogs. Each catalog will have a full internal cross-reference structure. Differing form of entries are added as references in both catalogs.

Locational and holdings information will continue to be updated in the old catalog. Changes in LC subject headings other than form will be made in the old catalog.

The new catalog will be a divided catalog. The new subject catalog will contain unmodified Library of Congress subject headings. Pencil marks and stamps will not be used on cards in the new catalog.

A four hour session on AACR2 was conducted for the LACLL staff followed by two hours on implementation and the new catalog. More extensive instruction was given to technical services staff.

The staff at the UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA LAW LIBRARY has been involved in planning for the implementation of the new rules for the past several months. Training for the catalogers was facilitated by attendance at the LC/ALA Regional Institute, followed by refresher courses within the Department. Our para-professional and part-time catalogers were included in the training sessions provided by the main library on campus, and received basic instruction in the general rules of description and entry. In December, the Cataloging Department held a series of four training sessions for all staff members in the Library, providing them with a general overview of the rules and our plans for implementing them.

Strategy for accommodating the new rules in our present catalog was coordinated with Technical Services personnel from the main campus library, and modified for our own use during weekly meetings of our professional catalogers. Guidelines were established for changing or splitting files of obsolete headings, establishing a reference structure, and filing within the Catalog. Heading Request Change forms were designed, to be filled out when a conflict first occurs, and reviewed weekly by the professional catalogers for decisions. Coordination with other Departments was begun, and assistance offered in helping them cope with the new rules in their own files. (Submitted by Gail M. Daly)

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY LAW LIBRARY has decided to close its author/title catalog while leaving the subject catalog open. At the present time the subject catalog combines Library of Congress and local headings. The new author/title catalog will include all items cataloged according to AACR2 with links
between the old and the new catalogs. The Catalog Dept. is holding workshops for Public Services librarians and staff and working on handouts for students explaining the new arrangements. (contributed by Phoebe Ruiz-Valera)

At RUTGERS LAW LIBRARY in NEWARK a part of the decision for implementation of AACR2 has been dictated by considerations of University-wide bibliographic access plans.

As a result of an extensive study by the University's "Committee on the Future of the Bibliographic Record" last year, it has been determined that the user's best interest is served by neither closing nor freezing the card catalog. It was felt that requiring the user to look in two catalogs would be a greater burden than adapting the existing catalog by means of linking references. With this policy as a guide, the catalog at Rutgers Law will follow, to a large extent, a similar pattern. Some minor modifications however, will be made at the Law School since the smaller catalog will lend itself to the possibility of providing additional assistance to the user. Suggestions have been sought from the full library staff to assure that not only Technical Services concerns will be met, but also those of Public Services.

At this writing, it is expected that the catalog will be accommodated to the new rules by a combination of the three most obvious options. In most instances, links between old and new forms of a heading will be provided to guide the user.

For entries which are fewer than ten in number, attempt will be made to change to the new form of heading. It is anticipated that this will be done by recataloging whenever possible since such an effort will contribute to the store of retrospective records in the machine readable files. The University Library System is projecting an operational on-line bibliographic record for public access within about five years. Although retrospective conversion of all records will not be attempted, additional law library records in the data base will increase its utility as a searching device for our users.

Interfiling of new headings with superseded ones is the alternative which will probably be least used since it is the view held by the Public Services staff that this may prove the most confusing. However, it is expected that there may be instances where this interfiling, together with appropriate guide cards may be the best choice.

The Technical Services staff will undertake an effort to publicize the catalog changes to the faculty and students. A brief announcement is being prepared for the Law School newspaper and flyers will be distributed to faculty members. It is hoped by these means to make borrowers aware that changes may be encountered so that they may approach the Public Services staff for assistance. (Report by Erma Hahn)

The STANFORD LAW LIBRARY card catalog will remain open after January 1, 1981. In an effort to estimate the impact of implementing AACR2 on the catalog, Stanford law data base was sampled, i.e., samples were taken from all titles cataloged in the library since 1977. This brief study revealed that the rate of necessary changes will be somewhere between 8 and 10%, a little lower, but still very comparable to the results of recently published studies.

The outline for implementing the changes in the catalog was set up in the following way: INTERFILING: AACR2 headings will be interfiled wherever the filing rules allow. If the interfiling cannot be done without modification of filing rules, use of guide cards, etc., the files will be split or changed; SUBSTITUTION: When a heading can be updated to AACR2 form by crossing out, erasing, or otherwise removing the obsolete portion of it, one of these will be done. In cases where this handling of cards would not be satisfactory or would be confusing to the user, the headings will be retyped and cards will be reproduced;
SPLITTING FILES: Established headings completely different from AACR2 form will be changed or the files will be divided. The determining point for splitting files will be 20 cards. Cross-references will be made for split files. Titles for which the main entry is changed will be recataloged and changes will also be marked in the books; **UNIFORM TITLES AND FORM SUBHEADINGS:** When the uniform title can be simply created by crossing out a portion of a form subheading, this will be done. All other uniform titles will be applied retrospectively. Depending on the amount of cards in a file, guide cards will be used or, with a lesser number, individual cards will be retyped and reproduced; **SUBJECT HEADINGS:** Name subject headings will be changed to AACR2 form.

Beginning January 2, 1981, all the Library descriptive cataloging will follow AACR2. Pre-AACR2 records obtained from main data base or other sources will be updated.

Changes in the catalog will be implemented in two parallel ways:
- when a conflict arises;
- by systematic revision of the catalog using LC revised headings published in the Catalog Service Bulletin. Established headings which are in conflict with LC list will be changed by the Cataloging Dept. as time permits.

The workload will be carried by the present staff of the Catalog Department with an additional two hours a day provided by a current library employee. (Summary of Guidelines for the Implementation of AACR2 submitted by Eliska Ryznar).

The U.S. DEPT. OF JUSTICE LIBRARY is currently on line with a private ERS file and is planning to change those headings to AACR2. The card catalog will be the recipient of many explanatory notes. Most cards will be refilled under the new AACR2 heading. (submitted by Linda Proudfoot)

ON SUBJECTS

The following questions were submitted by Peter Eningi to Mary Pietris, Chief of the Subject Cataloging Division, Library of Congress:

1. We have noted the subject heading JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF -- UNITED STATES -- DECISION MAKING (LCCN 78-20348, OCLC 4513099). The subdivision DECISION MAKING does not appear in the LCSH or its supplements under JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF. Is this a free floating subdivision?

ANSWER: Yes, DECISION MAKING is a free floating subdivision.

2. Would LC consider establishing a reference from PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY to LEGAL ETHICS? This heading is used in the titles of law school courses, seminars and in book titles, and many law library patrons search the catalog under this heading.

ANSWER: We have a reference PROFESSIONAL ETHICS see also LEGAL ETHICS. Perhaps a reference PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY see PROFESSIONAL ETHICS would lead users to the LEGAL ETHICS heading rather than attempting to equate all professional responsibilities with legal ethics.

3. The last LRTS Newsletter carried a report on subject heading practice at LC as affected by AACR2 stating that while geographic names capable of authorship will be established by AACR2 the form of subdivisions will remain unchanged. Do we understand correctly that it will be SOVIETS UNION—CONSTITUTIONAL LAW but
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW—RUSSIA? Or, will there be some exception to the rule?

ANSWER: There seems to be some misunderstanding here. The AACR2 heading will be Soviet Union. We will use SOVIET UNION—CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, ADMINISTRATIVE LAW—SOVIET UNION, but ADMINISTRATIVE LAW—RUSSIAN S.F.S.R.—MOSCOW.

4. I cannot find instructions or think of rationale for the LC practice of local subdivision UNITED STATES—CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—STATES and CANADA—CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—PROVINCES and not UNITED STATES—STATES—CONSTITUTIONAL LAW and CANADA—PROVINCES—CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

ANSWER: Our rationale for saying UNITED STATES—CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—STATES is to keep all topical material on the United States and state constitutional law together in the file. If instead we used UNITED STATES—STATES—CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, the state material would be separated from the United States material.

5. The scope note under ADAT LAW says that "Here are entered works on the native customary law of Indonesia ..." Why is there not an x reference Customary law—Indonesia under ADAT LAW? There are numerous LC entries under CUSTOMARY LAW—INDONESIA. Are they mistakes or is there a distinction between these two subjects which is not apparent? If so, a scope note would clarify this situation.

ANSWER: The scope note under Adat law is being enlarged to read "native customary law of Indonesia and Malaysia." See references from both CUSTOMARY LAW—INDONESIA and CUSTOMARY LAW—MALAYSIA to ADAT LAW—INDONESIA and ADAT LAW—MALAYSIA, respectively are being made. The LC entries under CUSTOMARY LAW—INDONESIA are being corrected to ADAT LAW—INDONESIA.

6. With the newly established subject heading LAW FIRMS there are three headings with somewhat overlapping scope, namely LAW FIRMS, LAW OFFICES and LAW PARTNERSHIP. A scope note would be helpful to clarify the exact meaning of each of these subjects.

ANSWER: We use the heading LAW OFFICES for works with a management concept. The headings LAW FIRMS and LAW PARTNERSHIP indicate the kind of business organization involved, either a partnership arrangement or an employment arrangement. We feel a scope note is unnecessary.

7. Abrams, Norman Administrative process alternatives to the criminal process (LC card no. 79-38660) has two subject headings assigned to it by LC: 1. CRIMINAL JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF—UNITED STATES and 2. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES—UNITED STATES. How is the second subject heading justified? The paper deals with the introduction of a non-criminal enforcement-sanction system which prohibits certain conduct but imposes non-criminal sanctions on violators. Would it not be useful to establish a new subject heading for this concept or use ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE—UNITED STATES instead of ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES—UNITED STATES? The subject of decriminalization is also discussed in the paper but that concept has no appropriate subject heading either.

ANSWER: The heading assigned to LC79-38660 is being corrected to ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE—UNITED STATES. Currently we are considering establishing headings for material discussing enforcement sanctions and decriminalization.

**********************
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ON DESCRIPTION

Curt Coaklin, Chair of 75/SIS's Cataloging and Classification Committee, would like TOLL readers to take note of and react to a tentative decision by LC to not apply the optional rule AACR2 1.4P5 and to not apply rule 1.4P6 (which is not an optional rule, by the way!). These rules deal with the recording of a copyright date. See Cataloging Service Bulletin, no. 10, Fall 1980, p. 15 for details. Direct comments to Ben Tucker, Chief, Office for Descriptive Policy, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C. 20540, or forever hold your peace (or at least until the post-convention workshop on AACR2)!

The following questions were submitted by the editor to Mr. Tucker:

1. On LC card 80-469905 the uniform title appears to duplicate the title proper. Can you explain this?
   Great Britain
   [Banking Act 1979]
   The Banking act 1979

   ANSWER: We delete initial articles and for that reason we have to make a uniform title in order to do so.

2. LC has treated Iowa Law School Continuing Legal Education in several different ways: ignored it, described it as a series and traced it, and on LC card 79-21396 made it an added entry in the form Iowa University Continuing Legal Education. Is it or isn't it a corporate body? Los Angeles Co. Law Library has been making an added entry in the title form Iowa Law School Continuing Legal Education. Any guidance as to how we should be treating this entry?

   ANSWER: It is a corporate body, but we only just decided that; older records may take some time to correct. We agree in principle with the direct form, but we have a "superimposed" heading so it comes out as you see it on 79-21396.

3. Loose-leaf publications are notorious for starting out with one title and then slipping in a new title page on you after a few years. At LACLL we have followed LC's lead and treated such a change as found on LC card 61-6677.

   The following card was cataloged: Medical jurisprudence, by David W. Lovell and Harold Williams. 7 v. ; 24 cm. 1st ed. 1950. 2nd ed. 1967. New York: Grune & Stratton. LC 61-6677. LC class. medical jurisprudence. Main entry: Lovell, David W. Title of medical jurisprudence. LC 61-6677.

   However, we cataloged the Administrative Rules of Montana using LC MARC data. This item was treated as a completely new work with no reference made to the earlier title.

Quote from letter with Administrative Rules: "Because the name is now Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM), we are enclosing stick-on labels to cover the old wording of 'Montana Administrative Code.'" Any comments on LC's policy concerning title changes of loose-leaf items?

ANSWER: We have made no change in policy. The difficulty lies in recognizing the new item as related. We easily fall down there.

On page 13 of TSIL vol. 6, no. 1, Sept. 1980, information about formulating uniform titles for constitutions was relayed to readers as presented at the Institute in Carbondale. Since that time, however, Mr. Tucker has issued another statement on uniform titles for constitutions which hopefully will eventually be included in a rule interpretation.

If a constitution is treated under 25.3A, note that this will frequently mean shortening the title to the word "constitution" (or its equivalent in foreign languages). Omitting the statement of responsibility according to this rule will usually leave only the word for "constitution," as when "Constitution of the United States" becomes "Constitution." For another illustration, see the first example at the top of p. 445, where the possessive "Kongeriget Norges" is omitted, leaving "Grundlov."

Of course, it is possible for 25.3A to apply to constitutions, as when one long title becomes well-known, by repeated appearances in manifestations of the constitution or by similarly consistent appearances in reference sources. We do not think it likely that very many such cases would materialize even if we made an effort to ferret them out. If such an unusual case does come to light, calling attention to itself unmistakably, then consult 25.3A. Otherwise, more or less routinely accept the word "constitution" (or its equivalent) as the complete uniform title by virtue of 25.3B.

The following statement concerning serials and AACR2 is a fuller explanation of information conveyed to participants both at the AALL and the RTSD/ALA Institutes on AACR2.

Level of Description for Serials under AACR2

The Library of Congress will apply Chapter 12 of AACR2 to serials in the following way: augment level one (1,00) by adding to its schema the following elements:

GMD (when required by the options decision)

Parallel title(s)

First statement of responsibility (always, no matter what the choice of main entry)

First place of publication, etc.

Other physical details: dimensions

Series

Subseries

In other words, this means chiefly that other title information and secondary statements of responsibility would be omitted from the second level of description. We feel constrained to do this for two principal reasons. One relates to the fact that other title information and secondary statements of responsibility on many serials is lengthy. Long strings of words of this type between the title proper and the publication, distribution, etc., area would tend to obscure other data, e.g., the numeric and/or alphabetic, chronological, or other designation area. The second principal reason results from a consideration of the possibility of change in these same long strings of words as serials continue to be issued but adopt new ways of stating other title information or the various secondary statements of responsibility. The Library of Congress has identified only two exceptions that we need to make to this policy. Both relate to other title information (1E, 1E1):

1) For any serial that carries both an initialism and a full form of the same title, we shall routinely give the initialism as other title information when the full form is chosen as the title proper or the full form as other title information when the initialism is chosen as the title proper.

2) Whenever the statement of responsibility for the serial is embedded (inseparably) in the other title information, the whole will be included as it appears.

Important information on uniform titles for serials entered under title can be found in RTSD Newsletter, vol. 6, no. 1, Jan./Feb. 1981.
I. Up to this point TSSL has never carried job announcements. Should it?
SIS members think this comes under "current awareness," who should be responsi-
bility for deciding the content of such announcements? The following is the first
maybe the last job announcement in this newsletter:

CATALOGER. Responsible for original cataloging of law monographs and serials.
Requires MLS from ALA accredited school plus 2 years of professional catalog-
experience. Available Jan. 1, 1981. Salary open. For more information con-
tract Joe Ciesielki, Head, Marvin Kratter Law Library, University of San Diego, San
Diego, CA 92110 (714) 293-4541.
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NEXT TSSL DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSIONS IS MAY 1ST, 1981!!

LOS ANGELES COUNTY LAW LIBRARY
301 W. First St.
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Curt Conklin
Brigham Young University
Law Library
Provo, UT 84602