Managing people is hard. Personalities, responsibilities, expectations, hierarchy, location, and accessibility are just a few managing aspects that are magnified when trying to manage a staff scattered across 50 states. Who knew that quick time zone calculations could become a necessary skill for a manager? If it is 8 a.m. CST in Chicago, what time is it in London, Los Angeles, and Shanghai? Thank goodness there is an app for that!

As I explained in the last column, our technical services functions are centralized in Chicago, our headquarters office. As a result, we rely heavily on outsourced staff in all of our other physical libraries to take care of mail receipt, shelving, filing, and handling special projects. Going forward, I will refer to the outsourced staff as the remote team. The remote team is vital to our library operations. Making sure they understand that they are considered part of our team is essential.

Regular meetings are held with remote team members based on the level of activity in that location. For the busy offices, I hold weekly conference calls, while in smaller offices we may talk formally once a month. I always like to hear about how warm it is in Los Angeles when it is -10 degrees in Chicago. Contact with Library Operations is not limited to these scheduled phone calls. The remote team members are encouraged and expected to reach out to me or other members of the headquarters staff about anything. Our mantra is, “if in doubt, ask.” Headquarters staff are also expected to reach out to remote team members in the same way that they would any colleague with questions relating to the collection in their location.

As a manager, it is as important for me to provide direction, coaching, and support for the remote team as it is for the rest of Library Operations. My management style with remote teams focuses on directing. Working with the research manager in each location, we set goals and priorities for the remote team staff, as well as boundaries. I am responsible for providing training to remote team staff on the
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From the Chair

Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section

It is hard to believe that Spring is on the way when the temperature is 16 degrees here in the Finger Lakes, but the calendar assures me that this is the case. Spring means that it is time for OBS-SIS board elections and our biennial member survey, and of course, summer and Annual Meeting are right around the corner.

Programs in Washington D.C.:

The AMPC approved a number of programs that should interest OBS-SIS members. These include further exploration of OpenRefine, a deep dive centered on systems migration, and hands on exploration of APIs. A pre-conference workshop on regular expressions in MarcEdit is also being offered. Full program details can be found on the Annual Meeting Conference Agenda page (https://www.aallnet.org/conference/agenda/). Stay tuned for information on the OBS-SIS Hot Topic program, Systems Roundtable, and OCLC Update.

OBS-SIS Election

Spring means it’s election time again. The OBS-SIS Nominations Committee has put forward an excellent slate of candidates for the positions of Vice Chair, Secretary/Treasurer, and Member-at-Large. Many thanks to committee chair Jennifer Noga, Marjorie Crawford, and Tina Dumas for the efforts putting together this slate of candidates. If serving OBS-SIS as an officer is not your cup of tea, we have many other opportunities for involvement.

Here are the candidates for 2019-2020:

**Vice Chair:**
Kevin Carey  
Technical Services Librarian  
Ohio State University Moritz Law Library

**Secretary/Treasurer:**
Elizabth Manriquez  
Research Librarian / Assistant Professor  
University of Nevada - Las Vegas William S. Boyd School of Law

**Member-at-Large:**
Heather Buckwalter  
Serials /Acquisitions Librarian  
Creighton University Law Library

OBS-SIS Member Survey

The OBS-SIS conducts a member survey in alternate years. The survey is currently open at http://umich.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_08JO1SHTXUOORh3. Please take the time to complete this survey by March 13, 2019. Your feedback about the activities and programs of OBS are essential for future evaluation and planning.

Re-positioning and re-thinking OBS

The 2019 OBS member survey asks the question “Does the name of our Special Interest Section, ‘Online Bibliographic,’ convey the nature of the work you’re involved in at your organization?” Starting with your responses to this question, and keeping in mind the revised OBS-SIS objective and description centered on providing a forum for the exchange of ideas and information on the use and capabilities of metadata, electronic resources, and library systems, exploring ways that emerging technologies can be integrated with library systems, and how these changes affect libraries and librarians, we hope to have a substantive conversation during our business meeting in Washington. We look forward to hearing your thoughts as we work through ideas for the future of OBS.

Jacqueline Magagnosc  
Cornell University
The calls to register to attend the 2019 AALL Annual Conference in Washington, D.C. have begun. So have the laments concerning programming and scheduling.

During my twenty years as an AALL member, I have seen the technical services programming ebb and flow. In St. Louis in 2006, I remember a great deep dive session on RDA, TS-SIS roundtables talking about vendor agreements, as well as a session on legal publishing that turned into a heated debate that were all solid technical services programming. But then, the 2007 meeting in New Orleans programming was announced, and the conventional wisdom on the TS-SIS listserv was to just stay home—not enough programming of interest for technical services—maybe we should go to other conferences, some said. So, I stayed home.

That was the last time I stayed home.

Because while I could have learned about RDA in an article or discussed vendor relations on a listserv, being at AALL in person gave me people. People who I have learned from, people who have shaped my thinking, people who have become part of my larger professional network. Because my real lasting take-aways from that 2006 conference in St. Louis were the people I met, like Rhonda Lawrence, Carol Avery Nicholson, Alan Keely, Keiko Okuhara, Ajaye Bloomstone, Pat Roncevich, Catherine Bye, and even a slightly bemused Phil Rosenthal who was attending his first library conference with his then new start-up company Fastcase.

I, too, have looked at program selections for AALL conferences and other conferences wondering if there was really enough of interest for me to attend. What I started doing was using the conference opportunity to go to sessions about management, legal research, and legal technology—broadening my understanding and helping me to think about how technical services can play a role in these areas. I make a point to spend several session blocks in the Exhibit Hall, where I can talk to vendors as well as other librarians in depth—so much so that I now get excited when I find a session time where I don’t see programming of interest because I know I can spend that time making connections with people.

For better or worse, no one understands your technical services experiences in a law library in quite the same way as another technical services law librarian. For me, the experiences I gain and the people I interact with at the AALL Annual Conference make attendance more valuable than the sum of its parts.

Hope to see you in D.C.!

Wendy Moore
University of Georgia

On January 29, 2019, Ithaka S+R published the results of their Library Acquisitions Patterns (LAP) project, a years-long study of academic library acquisitions. The study was to examine whether or not the popular wisdom that academic libraries were acquiring fewer books was actually true. A preliminary report was published in July 2018, which concluded that at least some of the apparent decline in book purchases was because rather than purchasing fewer books, academic libraries were purchasing a higher proportion of their books from Amazon and that those sales were not being captured by traditional acquisitions metrics.

The preliminary report focused on the finding that Amazon was the second largest supplier of books to the libraries that participated in the study. In a point not included in the final study, the preliminary report states that “Amazon holds nearly...
34 percent of the STEM market.” Amazon’s market share is smaller in other fields, with less than 25% of the market for all other categories. Law is not included in the breakdown by discipline for the preliminary report, falling into the “other” category for which Amazon has a 23% market share. The final report states that Amazon accounts for only 7-9% of one-time print purchases and a statistically insignificant number of e-book purchases.

Because the study is focused on all types of academic libraries, the implications for law libraries are somewhat limited, but within the data, there are some counterintuitive findings worth investigating. The raw data has not been released, and the majority of findings are broken down only by type of degree-granting institution rather than discipline. According to data in the appendix, expenditures by academic libraries on print legal books fell by 9% from 2014 to 2017. This is consistent with the general perception that law libraries are relying less on print books and more on electronic resources, but what is initially counterintuitive is that the volume of purchases declined by less than 1%, and the reduction in expenditures is actually due to an 8.2% reduction in the average cost per book.

That the average cost per print legal book actually fell appears to contradict the findings of the 2017 Library Materials Price Index, which shows around a 3% increase in the cost of hardcover legal titles from 2013-2016 and a 2.5% decrease in the cost of North American academic law books. This discrepancy is explained by the different focus of the two lists: the LMPI looks at the cost of books, while the Ithaka study looks at actual acquisitions. So while the number of books being acquired by academic libraries and the price of print legal monographs has remained relatively consistent, libraries are choosing to acquire less expensive titles.

One finding that is unlikely to be surprising to anyone working in a law library is that academic libraries are spending a much larger percentage of their budgets on continuing resources than they do on standalone title purchases. The proportion of expenditures on continuing resources remained fairly consistent throughout the time period studied. What did change was the cost of continuing resources, which is increasing significantly faster than the cost for monographs. The runaway price increase for continuing resources is well documented, both by library journals and by vendors themselves. The 25% increase in the cost of U.S. titles is a stark contrast to the 5% increase in the Consumer Price Index for 2013-2017.

Perhaps the most striking finding from this study is academic library spending on legal e-books. While e-book spending rose for most disciplines, expenditures on legal e-books actually decreased by 37.2% from 2014-2017. Unlike for print books, more than half of the reduction in spending is due to a reduction in the number of books acquired.

There is a major limitation to this study that should be considered carefully before relying on its conclusions: the LAP project only looked at books purchased on a title-by-title basis, meaning that all books purchased as part of Library Maintenance Agreements or other subscriptions were excluded. This could also explain the significant reduction in number of e-books acquired – if libraries are increasingly acquiring e-books as part of package deals, then those acquisitions would have been excluded from this study. This does indicate that a follow-up study that includes monographs acquired as part of LMAs and similar agreements would be necessary to get a complete picture of acquisitions trends.

The Library Acquisitions Patterns study, while not exclusive to law libraries, does provide a reasonable benchmark for academic law libraries looking to assess their relative expenditures on continuing resources and standalone titles. It also provides a useful benchmark for institutions looking at their expenditures by subject area. The results may not be earth-shattering, but they at least provide statistical support for trends in collection development and acquisitions behavior, rather than simply looking at pricing à la the LMPI.

Endnotes
3 Preliminary Report, Figure 6
4 Preliminary Report
5 Preliminary Report, Figure 8
6 LAP
7 LAP, Table 1A
Report from ALA Midwinter Meeting
CC:DA, January 26, 2019

Report from Library of Congress representative, Kate James—Highlights

BIBFRAME

- More cooperation, work, and testing by Network Development and MARC Standards Office (NDMSO) and the Cooperative and Instructional Programs Division (COIN)
- Ca. 60 Library of Congress catalogers are currently participating in BIBFRAME Pilot Phase Two; During fiscal 2019, the number of participants to be expanded to 100.

Descriptive Cataloging Manual (DCM)

New section added: Z12. Special Projects involving Name Authority Records and Bibliographic Records. Notes compiled from 667 practices, among others.

Work has been undertaken on the following LCSH areas:

- Qualifiers in Subject Headings for Individual Kurd, Arab, and Berber Groups—more consistent practice
- Sexual Minorities—hierarchy modifications for consistency
- Added: Statistics in summaries of LCSH proposal decisions
- Updates on other LC Vocabularies
- Moratorium on LCDGT Proposals—PSD evaluation


A few notes from correspondence with Kate James

- Full report mentioned above taken from https://www.loc.gov/librarians/american-library-association/midwinter/lc-update/
- No timeline given for BIBFRAME Pilot Phase Two; pilot will expand in the next year

Report of the ALA Representative to the North American RDA Committee, Dominique Bourassa—Highlights

- NARDAC already celebrating 1 year
- NARDAC held virtual monthly meetings
- Review of Terms of Reference (ToR) (including French courtesy Canadian colleagues)
- RSC membership and governance changes
- New logo for NARDAC unveiled
- Western biases in RDA addressed
- RDA regional groups to be formed: Latin America, Asia
- Beta Toolkit releases—changes frequent—strongly encouraged to provide feedback
- RDA models—see Resource description guidance chapter, Beta toolkit
- RSC Communication and work process

Comment from Kathy Glennan, NARDAC 2018 ex-officio representative to CC:DA: NARDAC formed to serve as an umbrella organization.

**Other important notes about future RDA**

RDA structural changes will determine proposal process. There is even talk of reviewing proposal process and possibly a use of new nomenclature more in keeping with the new structures. *Beta Toolkit feedback, whether individual or more formalized group feedback, is very important.*

### Report of the PCC Liaison, Everett Allgood – Highlights

- **PCC directory online**—please submit statistics regularly
- **Standing Committee on Applications (SCA)**—ISBD punctuation, others
- **LRM Training Task Group**
  - “Training is envisioned as a set of short modules (10 minutes or so) that concentrate on one aspect of the model. For all of LRM and especially the complex areas such as serials and aggregates, this training is aimed at an introduction to the basic concepts, not an in-depth class in applying the model.”
- **URI Training task group**
  - “The work of this task group was put on hold until after ALA Midwinter 2019, when the work of the PCC Task Group on Linked Data Best Practices is further along.”
- **NACO Training** for replacement of Connexion (Record Manager) to be made available


### Report from ALA Publishing Services and Presentation on RDA Toolkit changes, James Hennelly – Highlights

- **RDA Taskforce**—anecdotal *and* group feedback important (especially through the BetaToolkit feedback mechanism for individual feedback)
- **Discussion about focusing on Latin America as next regional group; forming group based on ABINIA [Asociación de Bibliotecas Nacionales de Iberoamérica]**
  - Struggle with some university/smaller libraries to connect to RDA umbrella groups et al., e.g., Costa Rica (national library does not lead in this area of development)—Also, open question: how to make this work in Africa and Asia?
  - Agreement with a Brazilian university for Portuguese translation
- **Slightly higher subscription numbers, mostly from overseas**
- **LIS schools pricing changed, substantial financial hit to ALA Publishing; evaluation to be made of how LIS education is utilizing Toolkit (why not greater participation with lower pricing?)**

### Beta Toolkit

- **Beta site has led to increased visits**
- **Feedback feature** (beta site) has given much good information for development/correction
- **Shared with ALA Publishing and RSC**
- **A number of translations being done, including boilerplate**
- **Policy statements/mark will be discussed at length in Monday’s meeting**
- **Graphic browser still in development**
- **Will show relationships with elements, entities, etc.—intended to help educate users about structure/function of RDA; slated for April delivery, possibly as late as June**
- **Citation structure to be added, randomly assigned/not in a particular order, but to be permanent**
- **Stabilized English release as part of April release**
- **Print concept TBD**—may be a 2 v. work; other ways being explored to make it succinct
- **RDA Essentials to be updated**
- **RDA for the post 3R world to be published in Fall 2019**
- **Orientation/training material after April release**
  - Material geared toward trainers/LIS teachers to be made available
  - Online course on application profiles, among others
- **3R project not to be complete until early 2020**
- **Policy statements will be affected by new structure, i.e., more like application profile**
- **Ways to share local practice as well as globally in current and beta toolkits**—new admin tools coming (groups/group roles?)
- **Accessibility rating for next beta release to be reported**
A question was asked on tagging for individual/specific formats/audiences. Answer: Supposed to be added post 3R, supposed to be more modular. Not yet in present Beta.

Due to the 3R Project/freeze on current RDA toolkit, the usual CC:DA Monday meeting was cancelled in lieu of the presentation, “A Deeper Dive into RDA,” sponsored by members of the RDA Steering Committee.

A Deeper Dive into RDA
Presented by members of RSC, January 28, 8:30 – 11:30

Presentations included the following:

- A deeper dive into nomen and appellations / Gordon Dunsmore
- Appellation elements / Thomas Breundorfer
- RDA-ONIX Framework: New content types and new carrier types / Thomas Breundorfer
- Relationship elements / Kate James
- Deeper dive into application profiles and policy statements / Gordon Dunsmore
- Policy Statements Planning Group / James Hennelly
- New ways of working? The RSC in the Post 3R Era / Kathy Glennan

These presentation videos and their associated slides are available via the RDA-RSC site: [http://www.rda-rsc.org/node/589](http://www.rda-rsc.org/node/589)

The videos are also posted on the RDA YouTube channel: [https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCd5pa3AoQIr17wESE9YHcnw](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCd5pa3AoQIr17wESE9YHcnw)

Wars and Emergencies

This article is not a policy statement from the Library of Congress.

While it probably disappoints some people (particularly those living in very nice government housing on Pennsylvania Avenue in the District of Columbia), the United States Constitution has no provision for “emergency powers.” There are some implied emergency powers (or so most presidents starting in the 20th century have believed), in part derived from the President’s role as “Commander in Chief,” and Congress can pass “emergency legislation” (subject to the ordinary constitutional limits). In many, if not most other countries, the situation is different, with significant “emergency powers” available to the government expressly authorized by their legal system.

KF reflects this with three distinct numbers: KF5060: “War and emergency powers” indented under the powers of the President; KF5900+: “War and emergency legislation” (a large range with the caption “Government measures in time of war, national emergency, or economic crisis. Emergency economic legislation” as a top indentation located between the ranges for “Public property. Public restraints on private property” and “Public finance”); and KF7220+: “Wartime and emergency legislation” (a large range indented under “Military law”).

In all fairness to the people who “own” the Library of Congress, no one appears to be certain what exactly “emergency powers” are in the United States. There are “war” powers exercisable by the President as “Commander in Chief,” a position not defined in the Constitution, used most famously to abolish slavery in rebel states during the Civil War and also to remove Japanese Americans from the west coast during World War II. Congress did enact the National Emergencies Act in 1976 (which was after the publication of KF), which sort of defined what the President can do upon declaring an emergency, leaving open whether everything in KF5060 should really be in KF5900, though one can argue that the President still has some emergency powers in addition to those authorized by the statute.

For Great Britain, there are three sets of emergency numbers similar to the United States, under “Royal perogative” powers in KD4440, Government emergency measures (KD5110), and Military law (KD6004), though this is dubious, since under British law, the executive (the Prime Minister acting through the King or Queen) can enact Orders in Council which are not the equivalent of American executive orders or regulations but are full-fledged legislation equivalent to acts of Parliament (and not subject to judicial review), so there is arguably no difference between “emergency powers” exercised by the Prime Minister (in the name of the monarch) and “emergency legislation” enacted by Parliament. In fact, in many—if not most—countries, there are clear constitutional provisions allowing the Head of State (Head of government, King, chief whatever,
etc.) to issue legislative enactments without parliamentary approval, raising the question as to whether for those countries, there is a meaningful distinction between the “War and emergency powers” as indented under the Head of State (Executive branch) versus “Government measures in war and emergencies,” which in all schedules is a highest-indentation caption in the public law part of the tables and schedules.

Only the United States, Canada, and Britain have places for emergency legislation under the range for “Armed forces” and “Military law;” the remaining schedules have a reference from the “Armed forces/Military law” area to the nearby “Government measures in war and emergencies” area. Interestingly, both the United States and Britain have developments by time period under the military law war legislation number (KF7221-KF7224.5 and KD6005-KD6012). While books on more specific topics should class with the topic, a general work on the legal aspects of a war under national (as opposed to international) law would probably class here (and in all fairness, the only other possibility would be to class it as a general work on the legal history of the country). This area has not been updated, so in both KF and KD, everything is lumped together in a post-World War II number (captioned 1945-) which probably is a mistake since, at least for KF, there is probably a need for a number for legal aspects of the “Cold War,” and there is definitely a need for a number for the ongoing “Global War on Terrorism” (as the Defense Department has called it for what is now approaching 20 years and is the term used by many authors of books, though LCSH demurs) since otherwise, the books which are clearly on American military law end up being misclassified into the number for the crime of “terrorism” in the criminal law area or in the public international law area (which is not the place for a work on a country’s national law).

In KZ, there is a very large range for topics pertaining to wars, but these all refer to public international law, the law of nations. The law of a single country is still law of the country, though if one feels the book better belongs in KZ, the cataloger should make the first heading reflecting KZ (with no geographic subdivision) and a second subject heading with a geographic subdivision. So, while the legal status of prisoners of war in general and/or under international law classes in KZ6495, a book on treatment of prisoners of war under American law is classed at KF7698.

There is also a range for the legal status of specific wars (or groups of war) at KZ6795 at the end of the “Law of war” area, with each war listed alphabetically, usually by LCSH form. This number was needed since many books are being written on the legal aspects under international law of specific wars, something that apparently wasn’t true in the past (probably due to the great expansion of public international law in this area since World War II). If a book is on how a conflict affected the law of a country, it belongs with the law of the country. So, a legal history of the American Civil War, or the Rwandan Civil War, etc., from the perspective of national law, does NOT belong in KZ. Books on the “War on Terrorism” (which LC insists ended ten years ago, if it ever really existed) from the perspective of a country belong with law of the country, whereas a book from the perspective of international law classes in KZ6795.T47. There probably should be better numbers for specific wars in the classification schedules and tables since books are written on the legal history of named wars, and we should have numbers for them.

In the United States, reasonable legal scholars disagree on the nature of emergency powers, and it is unreasonable to expect catalogers to consistently distinguish between “Government measures” in time of war and emergencies and inherent powers exercised by the President independent of those authorized by the Congress. Works discussing the current debate on the use of emergency powers to build a border wall probably should be classed in the number for immigration since that is most specific, perhaps in KF4829 or a number specifically for the “wall.” A theoretical discussion of emergency powers based on statute (i.e. the National Emergencies Act) should be classed in “Government measures in time of war, national emergency” in KF5900 or in a yet to be established “general works” number for the post-1945 period (probably KF6051), on the theory that once the President is acting pursuant to a statute, one is discussing “government measures” rather than presidential powers. For both the United States and other countries, there should be a better differentiation between executive emergency (“Prerogative”) powers and government measures during an emergency, and arguably for many countries, this is a distinction without a difference.

---

**Collection Development**

**Ebooks and the Law, Part 2:**

**Thomson Reuters' ProView**

**Adrienne DeWitt**

**Campbell University**

In my last column, I discussed my library’s recently acquired Lexis eBook Collection. In this column, I am going to discuss Thomson Reuters’ ProView eBook collection.
ProView is billed as “not just any eReader—it’s a platform with the busy professional in mind.” This is true; it is a platform housing Thomson Reuters’ content that can be accessed on a variety of devices. It does allow you to view your eBooks on and offline. You can bookmark pages, create notes, highlight passages, and search across a library of secondary sources without having to access the main Westlaw research platform.

That was a real selling point for us. With ProView, we could now provide access to online secondary sources to the attorneys who use our library, something we couldn’t do before because of our subscription packages. We now have a designated computer with a ProView app that attorneys can use to find Thomson Reuters materials we no longer subscribe to in print. Best of all, ProView allows our attorney patrons to create a PDF of a page or a section in a book that they can download and save on a USB device or email to themselves.

Like Lexis eBooks, ProView gives you the option to either download content using the ProView app or ProView online. Starting first with the online version of ProView, I must note that it is similar to the Lexis eBook online format, with one big exception: ProView does not require users to check out materials. To “check out” a book in ProView, simply click on it. The book is now available for you to use in all formats. Moreover, because there is no formal “checkout,” there is no due date. A ProView book will stay on your page until you have finished with it.

Checkout procedures notwithstanding, both platforms feature similar functions. ProView allows readers to highlight text, annotate readings, and share or send snippets or entire sections of text. You can download by page or by section. You can bookmark your place so you can return to where you left off. Finally, both platforms feature hyperlinked text to either Lexis Advance or Westlaw. Because both Lexis eBooks and ProView are separate research platform, you will need to sign in for access.

Now, let’s talk about the app. As I mentioned in my last column, Lexis eBooks are hosted by OverDrive. The big difference between the two is that ProView is its own app. You can download the ProView app from the Apple Store or Google Play. To use the ProView app, you may need to sign in with your ProView username and password. Once in the app, you can pick up where you left off from another device or start a brand-new research project. Like the online version, all you need to do to select a book is click on it. The same features you have online—highlighting, annotating, and sharing—are available within the app. Also, you can create a PDF of a page or of a section. All in all, ProView provides a consistent research experience between its app and its online platform.

As for a comparison between the ProView app and OverDrive, I personally like ProView as a research app better, but that could be a matter of taste. There is no doubt that OverDrive is a hugely successful eBook platform. OverDrive reported that, in 2018, it was used by over 40,000 public libraries and schools worldwide. In 2017, the Los Angeles Public Library had over 3.7 million digital checkouts, the Toronto Public Library had 4.6 million digital checkouts, and the National Library of Singapore had 1.5 million checkouts. On a side note, I can proudly say I contributed to my local library’s OverDrive digital checkout statistics.

However, OverDrive’s success as a library app does not mean it is a research app. Back in 2002, OverDrive announced the development of the precursor to its current app, the Digital Library Reserve, as an app for libraries “to develop and manage a circulating collection of eBooks.” OverDrive was developed as a content management tool, not a research tool, which would explain why one of OverDrive’s features is a link to Wikipedia. In a side-by-side comparison of the two apps, you can see the difference between the two. OverDrive is tailored for the casual reader, whereas ProView operates like a research platform because it is a research platform.
That being said, OverDrive’s development as a collection management tool does not detract from its ability to host Lexis eBooks. There are those who may prefer one app for all library materials, regardless of whether they are public, academic, or law libraries. As for me, I like ProView’s single focus. It keeps me from hopping over to my public library’s OverDrive page to see if my holds are in.

For more information about ProView, see https://info.ProView.thomsonReuters.com/en.html.

For more information about Lexis eBooks, see https://www.lexisnexis.com/en-us/support/totg-ebooks/faq.page

**Endnotes**


2. Id.
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### DESCRIPTION & ENTRY

#### A Task in Preservation Workflows: Digital Preservation of Legal Materials

**Jesse A. Lambertson**  
Georgetown Law Library

I wrote in a Description & Entry column in 2018 about the effort of delving into Simple Dublin Core vs. Qualified Dublin Core and that I would hope to revisit this. Well, herein I revisit the project (just not the reexamination of the Dublin Core itself right now).

Anytime files and records have to be exported or imported for specific reasons, we learn something about our data and our systems—whatever they are.

In this case, we learned that our new ILS/LSP (Alma) reads the LDR and thus the fixed fields more stringently that our last system—where a standard template opening for a ‘book’ (print) was used often for cataloging electronic resources without any trouble or confusion for the user.

For instance, we would put Type ‘a’ for ‘Language material’ where we should have entered type ‘m’ for ‘Computer file.’ We have a cleanup project related to this on the horizon.

The new system reads these MARC standards more closely—which is a good thing.

Let me offer an example of a recently catalogued item we sent to the preservation platform—but that also has a MARC record in our catalog.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computer Files</th>
<th>Rec stat</th>
<th>Entered</th>
<th>Replaced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type m ELvl l Srce d Audn</td>
<td>Otr</td>
<td>Lang eng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLvl m Form o GPub</td>
<td>MRec</td>
<td>Ctry xxu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desc i File d DTS</td>
<td>Dates 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One can see the entry of the ‘Computer File’ and the ‘monograph/item,’ as the item was catalogued as a standalone PDF. The Website that presented the PDF also got crawled separately in order to preserve a WARC file—but we are not currently cataloging websites.

The PDF takes Form 'o' and File 'd' for document.

Most of the rest of the LDR content follows the normal protocols—and I won’t dig into the RDA application here (which could be a fun column all by itself).
I will, however, discuss the procedure for converting the cataloging to the Dublin Core and the way in which these files are loaded as a ‘deliverable unit’ to the preservation platform.

Once the cataloging is done, the record exports through the ‘gateway’ in Connexion to our Alma instance and is given a record ID. This record ID is then used to retrieve that record back into MarcEdit using the API integration with Alma (using the Z39.50 protocol).

The resultant record is returned and then ‘saved as’ [ ].mrc to wherever your favorite spot is for your own personal work-speed.

Closing the MarcEditor, we click on ‘Tools/Marc =>Dublin Core’

This is where we cross-walk the file—and set up the next steps for the upload of the xml file to the preservation platform. I won’t describe that whole thing here, but I want to highlight the specifics of our platform of choice.

The ‘deliverable unit’ has a script in the Creator tool that reads the metadata as metadata—as opposed to as a file to be preserved—which means the metadata must be given a new extension: .metadata

This is not an editable file per se, but a way to tell the SIP Creator to handle the Dublin Core a certain way.

In addition, so we can tell the software that the included metadata is intended for the objects at-hand, the ‘folder’ in which the cataloged object(s) and the metadata are must have the same name as the metadata itself.

For instance:
The ‘folder’ is called: IncomePolarizationInTheUnitedStates
The metadata in that ‘folder’ is then renamed: IncomePolarizationInTheUnitedStates.metadata
This process, which includes the destination collection in preservation platform, eventually loads a digital object and metadata to the collection for access.

At this point, we produce an electronic resource record, called a ‘portfolio’ in Alma, and use as the access link the preservation copy instead of the original resource link.

The result is a growing collection of digitally preserved legal materials described in Dublin Core. The workflow itself for getting these items in the collection will probably be tweaked in the future—but under the current architecture of the preservation platform, this procedure will accomplish the necessary tasks.

Want to talk more about digital preservation or programmatic interactions with metadata of any sort? Don’t hesitate to reach out: jal360@georgetown.edu.

---

**RightsStatements.org**

*Wilhelmina Randtke*

*Florida Academic Library Services Cooperative*

This column discusses a relatively recently released standard for marking up reuse rights on digital objects and examples of how it’s currently being used in search.

**Creative Commons**

To start, a much older standard exists for marking up reuse rights. Creative Commons licenses were released in 2002. Those allow an author, photographer, or other creator to indicate in a standardized way that a computer can read what reuse rights the author allows in a work. Creative Commons drives things like the usage rights (“free to use or share,” “free to use, share or modify, even commercially,” etc.) in Google Advanced Search, the license filter in Flickr, and generally allows searching images and creative works by reuse rights. The huge significance of the licenses, beyond someone writing out a full sentence or page into a work, is that the Creative Commons licenses can be meaningfully read by computer to allow search by reuse rights.

Creative Commons licenses are licenses. The actual license is a URI, which is a URL referencing an actual license saying in legalese: “I own it, and I’m granting these specific permissions.”

The limitation here is that someone has to own the item to be able to license it for reuse by others.

**RightsStatements.org**

The core of RightsStatements.org statements is that they are computer readable markup about copyright status and that they aren’t licenses. A RightsStatements.org markup on a work is a URI referencing a URL which says something to the effect of: “This is what we believe the copyright status of this work to be, and here are several disclaimers that this might not be accurate and you may want to do your own additional research to verify this.”

For example, here are two similar statements regarding items that can be reused noncommercially:

Creative Commons license: Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported (CC BY-NC 3.0)
URI: [http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/)
Full text of license: [https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/legalcode](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/legalcode)

RightsStatements.org statement: IN COPYRIGHT—NON-COMMERCIAL USE PERMITTED
URI and Full text of statement: [http://rightsstatements.org/vocab/InC-NC/1.0/](http://rightsstatements.org/vocab/InC-NC/1.0/)

Comparing the language of the full text of the license or statement will show that Creative Commons is built on assurances of ownership, while RightsStatements.org is built on disclaimers.

For a website or digital library sharing material gathered from a variety of sources, it likely isn’t possible to add a Creative Commons license for the vast bulk of materials. This is because Creative Commons is built on the premise of ownership.
RightsStatements.org solves that problem for large digital archives that hold content from a variety of sources. The RightsStatements.org statements do not require or imply ownership of copyright in order to apply to a digital object.

By being computer readable, the RightsStatements.org statements theoretically allow for faceting and search by reuse rights similar to that allowed by Creative Commons licenses in searches like Google Advanced Search. RightsStatements.org is also interoperable with Creative Commons licenses—both can be used across a set of records, with Creative Commons in use for items which can be licensed and RightsStatements.org in use for items which are marked up by someone other than the author and therefore can’t be licensed.

**RightsStatements.org history, adoption, and use in search**

RightsStatements.org is a relatively recent standard compared to Creative Commons, which was released in 2002. See Creative Commons, “History,” [https://wiki.creativecommons.org/wiki/history](https://wiki.creativecommons.org/wiki/history) (last visited Feb. 23, 2019). In April 2016, the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA) and Europeana jointly launched RightsStatements.org and the RightsStatements.org controlled values. See Julia Fallon, Senior Policy Advisor, Europeana Foundation, “Rightsstatements.org launches at DPLAfest 2016 in Washington DC,” Apr. 14, 2016, [https://pro.europeana.eu/post/rightsstatements-org-launches-at-dpla-fest-in-washington-dc](https://pro.europeana.eu/post/rightsstatements-org-launches-at-dpla-fest-in-washington-dc) (last visited Feb. 23, 2019). At the time of launch, both federated search projects emphasized a RightsStatements.org value as a pending future requirement for all items contributed to DPLA or Europeana. In the case of DPLA, this requirement is coming soon and has been since the April 2016 introduction. Many contributing digital libraries are still in the process of implementing this. In the case of Europeana, the requirement was to have either an existing statement in the Europeana Licensing Framework or to have a RightsStatements.org value.

As of 2019, Europeana is the only major digital library search to use the RightsStatements.org values as part of the interface. The history of Europeana, including the early standardization of copyright statuses within Europeana materials in 2012 using the Europeana Licensing Framework, is the most likely reason for this. See Europeana, “Archives Europeana Rights Statements - for reference only,” [https://pro.europeana.eu/files/Europeana_Professional/IPR/archivedrightsstatementspages-2.pdf](https://pro.europeana.eu/files/Europeana_Professional/IPR/archivedrightsstatementspages-2.pdf) (last visited Feb. 23, 2019). Before RightsStatements.org was released, Europeana had a critical mass of existing items with a controlled copyright statement in the Europeana Licensing Framework, and contributing digital libraries had existing statements that could be mapped to or combined with RightsStatements.org. Significantly, not all items in Europeana have a controlled rights statements. As of February 2019, running searches on Europeana will result in more “hits” than are available by summing together rights statements statuses within that set of hits (i.e., a search locating 290,000 hits might have 287,000 hits with a copyright statement and a handful of hits without). For many searches, it is also the case that approaching half of existing statements are “Copyright Not Evaluated.” Nevertheless, Europeana has a critical mass of controlled copyright statements to allow meaningful faceting by reuse rights and has incorporated those into the search interface.

You can see this by going to Europeana ([https://www.europeana.eu/portal/en](https://www.europeana.eu/portal/en)) and running a search. Along the left hand side of your search results, there is a facet for “Can I Use It?” This facet is built on the controlled rights statements, and it maps both Creative Commons licenses and RightsStatements.org statements to broad categories of reuse—Free Re-use (public domain or attribution required), Limited Re-use (educational or nonprofit use allowed and contractual/legal restrictions), and No Re-use (in copyright or copyright not evaluated).

Meanwhile, in the U.S., the controlled RightsStatements.org copyright statements are new and are gaining traction. As they are adopted and implemented by different libraries, a critical mass of content is building in the form of digital objects labeled with a RightsStatements.org statement. Assuming implementations of the RightsStatements.org statements are generally accurate, these may soon be incorporated into existing searches and into digital library interfaces to allow search by reuse. The interface on Europeana shows the kind of application that is possible with widespread adoption of the rights statements as digital library technologies begin to incorporate this information into the interfaces.

---

**Combating Bias in Data-Informed Decision Making**

In the last issue, I explored the concept of data-driven decision making and argued that *data-informed* decision making (DIDM) is a more preferable balance of data analytics and individual expertise or judgement. Assuming one can navigate the minefield of bad data (collection methods can be a topic for another issue), there still lingers a hidden weakness with
managerial insights: bias. Data use is always susceptible to bias, and unacknowledged bias arguably leads to bad decisions ranging from allocating resources improperly to, at worst, inadvertently breaking the law (Smith 2018). The goal, then, is to recognize bias in order to have a more holistic understanding of data and insights.

**Types of Bias**

Psychologists have identified that bias arises as a result of several processes in the brain, including: heuristics (mental shortcuts), coping with information “noise,” coping with the brain’s limited capacity for processing information, emotional or moral motivations, and societal influence (Korteling, Brouwer and Toet 2018). For the sake of this article, we’ll look at two broad categories of biases: individual and organizational.

Individual Bias is a tendency, reaction, or assumption that is based on your own perception of reality. This can take the form of repeated patterns of thinking that lead to inaccurate or unreasonable conclusions. There are many different types of cognitive biases; one which is becoming more well-known is confirmation bias (Baer and Lubin 2014). This is where an individual seeks out information that matches what they already believe to be true while ignoring information that contradicts it.

Organizational bias is a set of factors such as institutional culture, leadership, strategic goals, and team organization, that influence data selection and use to a point where it can no longer be interpreted or analyzed on its merits. For example, leaders may explicitly or implicitly tell their teams to prefer one data source over another. Another example may be an enforced goal or strategy based on a specific insight or source rather than a comprehensive evaluation.

**Tips to Limit Bias**

**Acknowledge that biases exist, and work to keep an open mind.** There are unintended consequences of bias, and first acknowledging they exist can help keep them in check.

**Use a decision making framework.** Set your decision criteria in advance, and resist temptation to change them later. The framework should incorporate strategies to assess and mitigate bias. You may need to brainstorm different questions and allow for different opinions to be raised of what the data needs are and which collection methods should be used (Hayden and Jacobs 2015).

**Think about whether or not your data set is complete.** Think carefully about the process that generated the data, and focus on completeness. Was there a bias in how the data was selected? Is something missing? What additional data can be gathered to complete the picture?

**Ask questions of your data set.** Data and data sets are created by humans and by definition are going to be biased (paraphrased from the “All Models Are Wrong” concept). Asking questions can help expose these biases: Are there gaps in the data? Who gathered the data? What are their goals? Questioning interpretations of the data set can also expose implicit biases (Hinnefeld 2018).

**Provide democratic access to data.** Allowing more individuals to access data quickly and uniformly improves information insights. The more individuals using and interpreting the data can expose blind spots and allow you to improve both the quality of the data set and the insights gleaned.

**Build a process for external evaluation and monitoring of bias.** Consider this a standardized test for your data. Having external stakeholders evaluate your data explicitly for bias (possibly using the framework you put into place originally) can help round out your data set and identify where you may need to improve the process or the results.

**References**


Feel as if you’re always knee deep in work conflict? You’re not imagining it—studies show that conflict absorbs 10-25% of your working hours! In her excellent addition to the *Harvard Business Review* Guide series, *HBR Guide to Dealing with Conflict*, Amy Gallo reports that the average worker spends three hours per week dealing with conflict, while managers spend 18-26% of their work time in conflict situations. Managing conflict this frequently is not all bad, however, because productive conflict can actually be constructive to individuals and organizations. Benefits of productive conflict include: better work outcomes, because issues are more thoroughly explored; personal and professional growth, because ideological challenges present learning opportunities; improved relationships, because productively working though conflict helps you better understand your colleagues; and greater job satisfaction, because you don’t fear disagreement when it arises.

If conflict has such a great upside, why do most of us think of it so negatively? Liane Davey, author of the engaging and practical management book, *You First: Inspire Your Team to Grow Up, Get Along, and Get Stuff Done*, reports that many of us are just flat out opposed to conflict. We deeply believe that conflict can be avoided because intelligent, civilized people should be able to sort out problems composedly. She also says our busy lives are partly to blame—when we’re rushed and stressed out, we just want to speak our peace and not spend precious time considering others’ perspectives. Finally, we feel so exposed when hearing ideas that differ from ours, we prefer to shut down a discussion rather than risk the chance of hearing that we’re wrong.

Gallo says that categorizing conflict can aid in its resolution, and she offers four broad categories for labelling conflicts: task, process, relationship, and status. In conflict situations, we can be so overwhelmed with fear, frustration, and feelings of disrespect, we can’t articulate what the conflict is really about. Classifying a conflict will help sort through “that quagmire of feeling…[and] dissect the conflict so you have a starting point at which to resolve it.” Ultimately, Gallo says, conflict can feel less scary and more manageable when you tackle it methodically.

A task conflict is a disagreement over the ultimate goal or outcome of a situation. For instance, if your library’s budget manager retires, you might want to fill the position, while the library director wants to redistribute those budget duties and hire another IT person. Process conflicts occur when both parties agree on the goal but have different ideas about how that goal should be achieved. While you agree on replacing the retiring budget manager, you might want to open a nationwide search, while the library director wants to promote someone on staff. Relationship conflict results from a personality clash or other interpersonal conflict. We often label every conflict as a relationship conflict because we are clashing with another person; however, Gallo says many relationship conflicts actually start as task or process conflicts. Finally, a status conflict occurs over decision-making hierarchy. For instance, on a search committee, the head of the committee, a recently-hired librarian, wants to set the agenda while a committee member with more tenure thinks she should really be running the show.

Conflicts rarely fall into just one category, Gallo says, so try to label each type of conflict as you prepare to deal with the issue. List out all areas of conflict, but also note areas of agreement—leading the discussion with these areas of agreement can help a discussion get off to a good start. Additionally, Gallo believes you should consider if your counterpart is generally a conflict avoider or a conflict seeker, and does he seem to prefer to address problems directly or indirectly (if at all!). Also, be honest about the difficult nature of the conversation, but try to frame it in a more positive way, such as, “We may have to talk about difficult things, but we’ll work through them together because [we] have always respected each other.” Finally, you may wish to set up an initial meeting to share thoughts and then schedule a follow-up meeting in which you discuss the issue in detail.
Davey believes that the key to avoiding unproductive conflict is to accept the idea that when you disagree with someone, you are not invalidating her opinion, and that each of you can actually be ‘right’—from your own perspectives. Presenting and considering multiple points-of-view allows you to deeply examine an issue and ultimately arrive at a stronger solution than if you employ tunnel vision throughout the discussion. Practice thinking methodically about conflict by analyzing past conflicts you’ve experienced—this might actually be helpful going forward if it uncovers patterns of behavior in your workplace. Analyzing the conflict, preparing thoughtfully before addressing it, and keeping an open mind during discussions can help even the biggest conflict avoiders (guilty as charged!) handle conflict more gracefully and effectively.
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Report of the AALL Liaison to the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC)
American Library Association, 2019
Midwinter Meeting
January 27-28, 2019, Seattle, Washington

The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) convened two meetings at the ALA Midwinter Meeting in Seattle, Washington. Action was taken on three proposals and three discussion papers during the meetings. This report is organized with each discussion paper/proposal in bold and a short summary underneath of the related discussion.

The complete texts of all discussion papers and proposals considered at the 2019 Midwinter meetings of the MARC Advisory Committee are available at [http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2019_age.html](http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/mw2019_age.html).

**Proposal No. 2019-01: Designating Open Access and License Information for Remote Online Resources in the MARC 21 Formats**


Source: OCLC and the German National Library, for the Committee on Data Formats

This proposal suggests changes to the MARC 506, 540, and 856 fields in order to indicate open and restricted access for remote online resources. Current guidelines do not provide for any indication of open access in a machine-readable form.

In field 506, concern was raised about changing both the labels and definitions of the first and second indicators. Consensus was that changing the labels did not sufficiently improve their clarity, and it was recommended to change only the definitions of the indicators as proposed.

Field 540 is not used according to PCC Provider-Neutral guidelines ([http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/pcs/documents/PN-RDA-Combined.docx](http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/pcs/documents/PN-RDA-Combined.docx)), and no changes to the proposal were discussed.

In field 856, two new subfields were proposed: $7 and $e. As it relates to the proposed $7, discussions circled around the definition of “open access” and the repeatability of $7. The Committee found the proposed definition for $7, which cited...
the Budapest Open Access Initiative, to be too restrictive and advised removing this reference in order to allow for future improvements on the definition. Additionally, as proposed, the $7 would be repeatable and “must follow directly the subfield $u to which it applies,” which the committee found to be problematic. The sequence of the $u and $7 implies a relationship. If multiple $u’s are present and are each followed by repeatable $7, they may get re-sequenced during an import or export process by a third party and therefore lose their meaning. The committee suggested changing the $7 to non-repeatable and applicable to all $u and $e in the 856.

This proposal was approved unanimously with the changes suggested.

Proposal No. 2019-02: Defining Source for Names and Titles in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
Source: PCC Task Group on URIs in MARC, Program for Cooperative Cataloging (PCC)

This proposal suggests adding $2 to the MARC bibliographic fields for name and title access points (1XX, 240, 7XX, and 8XX) in order to specify a source vocabulary. Historically, defining a source vocabulary was unnecessary because these headings were generally sourced from a single authority file within a catalog. The proposal argues that multiple alternative controlled vocabularies are now in use, and there is no longer a presumption of which authority file is being used. Additionally, it argues that designating the source vocabulary facilitates management of name authority data and can be useful in applying URIs in a linked data environment. The PCC acknowledged that $2 exposes some longstanding structural problems within MARC, such as field 240, but it neither creates new problems nor solves the existing issues in MARC.

This proposal sparked a lengthy discussion. Concerns were raised that inclusion of $2 would change the nature of the bibliographic record to an authority record. In response, the PCC argued $2 only labels the data source and therefore assists with authority management, not identity management. $2, in the bibliographic format, cannot be repeated and therefore cannot “cite” multiple sources for a single name/title.

Additionally, issues were raised about using the $2 in a shared cataloging environment. For example, in the case that a name in the LCNAF does not exist, a non-NACO library could use a non-LCNAF name heading, then a NACO library could go and change the heading to an authorized LCNAF heading; presumably, another library could then go and change it back. How would this cycle end? In response, this scenario might already exist, and without $2, there is no way to know which authority file the access point was taken from. $2 offers greater provenance for a chosen name authority and would help to provide clarity. To remedy the above scenario, the suggestion was made to draft a policy indicating a default authority file to use. This is in line with the suggestions made when this proposal was a discussion paper to include recommended best practices for the use of subfield $2. The reliance on best practices for effective implementation troubled some of the committee.

The presence of $2 does not fix the ambiguities of name or name/title access points, such as: 1) that a heading is established in an authority file and 2) that the heading is established according to the rules of the authority file. Rather, this proposal is a step in the direction of identifying sources that aren’t controlled, rather than leaving it ambiguous.

Finally, based on current cataloging practices, the PCC clarified that $2 would not apply to certain parts of the field (830 $v, for example). $0 and $1 are under consideration by the PCC Linked Data Best Practices Task Group, and $2 will be part of the same discussion if approved.

This proposal was approved with nine votes.

Proposal No. 2019-03: Defining Subfields $0 and $1 to Capture URIs in Field 024 of the MARC 21 Authority Format
URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2019/2019-03.html
Source: PCC Task Group on URIs in MARC

This proposal defines two new subfields, $0 and $1, in field 024 of the MARC Authority Format, changes the title and definition of $2, and changes the 024 field definition and scope. Adding URIs in the 024 field to the authority record is increasing in popularity. However, the MARC standard only currently provides for $a for standard numbers. Some of the URIs in $a represent authorities, and some represent real world objects. The addition of the new subfields facilitates conversion from MARC to RDF by disambiguating standard numbers and codes that are not machine-actionable, URIs for authorities, and Real World Object URIs.

The Committee did not find this proposal to be problematic, and this proposal was approved unanimously.

Discussion Paper No. 2019-DP01: Coding Externally Hosted Online Publications in the MARC 21 Holdings Format
Source: British Library
This discussion paper suggests adding a new code “6” labelled “External Access” to the Holdings Format 008/06 for online publications accessible through a third party. This proposal mostly applies to serial publications, and the Committee found the solution in Holdings 008/06 to be somewhat problematic. Several representatives commented that the code for “external access” seems more suited to Holdings 008/07. The suggestion was made to look at the current definitions in 008/06 and 008/07. The existing values need to be defined better (e.g. what “received” means, especially in light of linking to something hosted by a third party). The Committee’s suggestion is to articulate this in a forthcoming proposal.

Discussion Paper No. 2019-DP02: Subfield Coding in Field 041 for Intertitles and Transcripts in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
Source: OLAC Catalogers Network

This discussion paper proposes adding two new subfields in field 041, $i and $t, as well as changing $g and $m. OLAC argues that the suggested changes will allow MARC to more accurately convey accessibility information. There were very few issues with this paper. During the discussion, the distinction was made that these changes only apply to silent films. The committee advised OLAC to work with MLA on revising the language referring to $e so it is clearer, as well as working on the language referring to “printed text” in a forthcoming proposal.

Discussion Paper No. 2019-DP03: Defining a Field for a Subject Added Entry of Unknown Entity Type in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
URL: http://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2019/2019-dp03.html
Source: German National Library, for the Committee on Data Formats

This discussion paper stems from a practical issue when adding subject access from a thesaurus called the Gnomon Thesaurus (http://www.englisch.gnomon-online.de). In this example, there is not a way to derive controlled subject headings from the terms in this thesaurus, nor are the existing 6XX fields able to be used. To solve this problem, they suggest either adding new subfields $0, $1, and $2 to the existing 653 field or defining a new 6XX field.

This paper generated an extensive discussion. The Committee acknowledged there is a nuanced difference between a subject term being from an “unspecified” source rather than it being “unknown.” The Gnomon Thesaurus is not actually unknown, it is just unspecified in any standard subject authority file. Similarly, there is a distinction between a subject term being “truly uncontrolled” versus “controlled” versus “controlled in a non-standard way.” Several people commented that there is already a MARC field for “truly uncontrolled” subject terms, field 653, and making the proposed changes to this field would be so radical, it would end up becoming a new field anyway. As a result, the option of modifying the 653 field was rejected.

Instead, the Committee asked the German National Library representative to find out whether the Gnomon Thesaurus can be parsed into topic, name, title, etc., and whether authority records might be created for this particular use case. The option of creating a new field will be investigated, with advisement that it either be in the 66X, 67X, or 68X range and that it must not intentionally “rhyme” with any other existing MARC field. The paper will be reformulated into a forthcoming proposal.

Announcements from OCLC

OCLC Validation Update
OCLC installed changes to WorldCat validation. The new features and enhancements include:

- A new validation requirement for field 040 subfield $b (Language of Cataloging) to be included in every WorldCat bibliographic record.
- Validation of the alphabetic prefix “cash” for Library and Archives Canada Subject Headings, as well as adjustments to authorizations used by LAC (OCLC symbol: NLC).
- Additionally, the relationship rules for bibliographic field 046 were corrected to allow subfields $c and $e to coexist in the same field.
See the WorldCat Validation Release Notes for December 2018 at https://help.oclc.org/Metadata_Services/WorldShare_Record_Manager/WorldCat_validation_release_notes_and_known_issues/2018_release_notes for more details.

OCLC Important Update about ILLiad and Tipasa

OCLC and Atlas Systems have a long-standing partnership, and both companies are focused on putting library needs first. As a result, in addition to continuing the rapid development of Tipasa, the industry’s first cloud-based ILL management system, OCLC and Atlas Systems have decided to continue to develop ILLiad for the library community.

Tipasa will continue to evolve to meet the needs of more and more of the community, with the goal of becoming the preferred solution for ILL workflow management.

The latest enhancements for Tipasa include WorldShare Management Services OPAC integration in lending, WorldShare Acquisitions integration, bulk patron deletes, and patron data retention. In December, we will release staff notes and UI changes for easier purchase workflows. You can review the current Tipasa roadmap on the ILLiad to Tipasa Community Center for more information.

Atlas will also continue to provide periodic updates to the ILLiad software. ILLiad 9.0 … includes:

- Security Enhancements
  - FIPS (Federal Information Processing Standards) can now be enabled
  - Password changes for basic authentication and staff passwords include updated hashing, expiration, and complexity options
  - Patrons using basic authentication (and staff) will be prompted to update their password upon login after ILLiad 9.0 update
  - SymphonyAPI authentication is now available for ILLiad authentication using SIRSI Symphony
- New look and feel for the ILLiad client with choices for additional interface styles
- Many bug fixes

Visit https://support.atlas-sys.com to see the Release Notes and an ILLiad 9.0 FAQ.

Preservation

Explore, Learn, Connect: Part 2
(An Archivist’s Library)

In Part 1 of this article, our focus was mainly on web resources for Archivists, finding the best practical sites and meta-sites for all aspects of Archiving. Here in Part 2, we will explore the physical, print side of this topic. Some of these are “classics,” well-prized and well-known tomes considered vital to an Archivist’s library. They are timeless, and the information contained in their pages has never become obsolete (well, mostly). However, others are more contemporary and pertinent to our times, challenging modern theories of Archiving and how we process “archival objects.” They provide views of Archiving and the Archivists at the cutting edge, giving us a glimpse into the future(s) of our profession and what we do. With apologies to other reference sources, I have provided links to their respective Amazon pages, with descriptive metadata, reviews, and other title info. I have divided the titles into sub-categories, depending on their focus, as follows:

Nuts and Bolts

The Management of College and University Archives by William Maher (1992)
https://www.amazon.com/Management-College-University-Archives/dp/0810839873

Description: “Maher introduces the basic elements required for an archival program to meet the documentary needs of a college or university. Both archivists and their administrative superiors can obtain a thorough understanding of archival work and its importance to their institution. Beginning archivists, experienced academic archivists, archivists outside academe, and related professionals will all benefit from this book, which assesses the current status and conditions of academic archives, articulates the basic principles that should determine the operating goals for academic archives, and synthesizes external professional standards and techniques with a systematic overview of what is practical for academic archivists.”
Though by no means ancient, this is one of the Bibles of Modern Archiving. It is a no-nonsense, nuts and bolts, straight ahead primer for new Archivists, and a decent reference tool for experienced Archivists. A standard for any Archivist’s library.

*Developing and Maintaining Practical Archives* by Gregory S. Hunter (2003)

Description: “*Library Journal* and other review journals raved about the first edition of this now-standard guide. This new edition has been completely updated and expanded to include crucial new information on digital records, encoded archival description (EAD), copyright issues, post-9/11 security concerns, international perspectives—content that makes this manual essential for archivists of all backgrounds. Setting up archives, appraisal and accessioning, acquisition strategies and policies, arrangement, description, reference and access, preservation, and electronic records are just some of the topics covered in both theory and practice in this clear, comprehensive, and practical guide.”

Another, more recent “Bible” of Archiving, this covers practical concerns and discusses issues on the digital side as well. Highly recommended.

*Archives and Recordkeeping* by Caroline Brown (2013)

Description: “A groundbreaking text designed to simplify and demystify archival and recordkeeping theory and its role in modern day practice. Its great strength is in articulating the core principles and issues that shape the discipline but also the impact and relevance they have for the 21st century professional. It will outline and explore what practitioners do as well as why they do it and how critical this underlying rationale is to their success using an accessible approach.

This is essential reading for students and educators in archives and recordkeeping and invaluable as a guide for practitioners who want to better understand and inform their day-to-day work. It is also a useful guide across related disciplines in the humanities such as history, philosophy and literary studies.”

*Archives: Principles and Practices* by Laura A. Millar (2017)

Description: “Written in clear language with lively examples, the book outlines fundamental archival principles and practices, introduces core concepts, and explains best practices to ensure that documentary materials are cared for as effectively as possible. This revised edition contains expanded discussion of the impact of digital technologies on archival materials and archival practice and an examination of the changing role of the archivist in the digital age, as archival professionals find that they need to be directly engaged with the creators of records in order to help ensure the preservation of valuable archives, for the present and for posterity. Topics addressed in the book include:

- the nature of archives and archival institutions;
- the role of archival service as a matter of trust;
- core archival concepts such as provenance, original order and respect des fonds;
- practical guidance in the execution of central archival tasks, including appraisal, preservation, arrangement, description, reference and access; and
- discussion about the changing role and responsibilities of the archival institution and archival practitioner, as digital technologies fundamentally transform how records and archives are created, captured, preserved, used and shared.”

This is a much newer nuts and bolts guide to archiving, written for the modern age. Highly useful.

*Varsity Letters: Documenting Modern Colleges and Universities* by Helen Willa Samuels (1992)

Description: “A study of the functions of colleges and universities, *Varsity Letters* is intended to aid those responsible for the documentation of these institutions. Samuels offers specific advice about the records of modern colleges and universities and proposes a method to ensure their adequate documentation. She also offers a method to analyze and plan the preservation of records for any type of institution.”

This was my first academic text on archiving and is still one of my favorites. Highly accessible and easy to read, it offers flexible plans and ideas which can easily be catered to your individual institution.
Academic Archives: Managing the Next Generation of College and University Archives, Records, and Special Collections by Aaron D. Purcell (2012)
https://www.amazon.com/Academic-Archives-Generation-University-Collections/dp/1555707696

Description: “Today, the field of academic archives is more expansive and complex than ever before. In addition to college and university archives, academic archives encompass records management programs, special collections departments, and other campus archival repositories. This new definition of academic archives programs has redefined the role, and training, of academic archivists. This book gives you the tools to fill that role, including collection strategies, a management plan for electronic records, and development strategies for starting a campus records management program, and an understanding of the emerging trends affecting all archivists.”

More up-to-date than Varsity Letters, this text is strongest in the areas of collection strategies and managing electronic records. Highly recommended.

The Archives as a Physical Space
Archival and Special Collections Facilities—Everything About Archives as a Physical Space by Michele F. Pacifico (2009)
https://www.amazon.com/Archival-Special-Collections-Facilities-Guidelines/dp/0838910629

Description: “Required reading for archivists, librarians, and the building professions planning a new or remodeled archival facility, this SAA-approved standard provides guidance on site evaluation, construction, environmental systems, fire protection, security, lighting, materials and finishes, equipment, and the functional spaces for an archival facility that meets the needs of staff and researchers and ensures the preservation of the collections.”

This manual has the distinction of being the only one that I’ve seen of its kind, whose sole concern is of the physical space which houses your collections. Unusual and essential at the same time.

The Archivist as Caretaker and Historian
Processing the Past—Archival Management and Historical Thinking by Francis X. Blouin and William G. Rosenberg (2011)
https://www.amazon.com/Processing-Past-Contesting-Authority-Archives/dp/0199964084

Description: “Processing the Past explores the dramatic changes taking place in historical understanding and archival management, and hence the relations between historians and archivists. Written by an archivist and a historian, it shows how these changes have been brought on by new historical thinking, new conceptions of archives, changing notions of historical authority, modifications in archival practices, and new information technologies. The book takes an ‘archival turn’ by situating archives as subjects rather than places of study, and examining the increasingly problematic relationships between historical and archival work.”

Highly interesting critical theory and work that may have implications for the future of how we process Archives.

From Polders to Postmodernism—the Different Theories of Archiving Throughout History and How They Have Influenced What We Do Today by John Ridener and Terry Cook (2009)

Description: “From Polders to Postmodernism is a broad ranging history of the conception and development of the theories that have guided archivists in their work from the late 19th through the early 21st centuries. Narrated through the controversial thread of archival appraisal theory, the book examines how archivists have engaged with theory through the tension between keeping records that reflect objective history ‘as it happened’ and subjective decision making in the archive. Through an interpretive reading of archival theory, distinct periods emerge, with each paradigm contributing unique responses to difficult archival, historical, and theoretical contexts.”

An interesting look at the history of Archiving as a practice, focusing on the theory of Objectivity versus Subjectivity and where the two intersect.

https://www.amazon.com/Future-Archives-Recordkeeping-Reader/dp/1856046664

Description: “How are archivists and archives evolving to adapt to technological developments and the information explosion? What other disciplines have a stake in the archival teaching and practice? What are the common versus the unique interests among archivists and records or information managers? Author Jennie Hill’s timely new reader examines the roots, current
state, and forward progress of archives and records management, and gives professionals the essential keys to remaining current and relevant in the 21st century.”

Heavily geared toward technology and the cutting edge of Archiving, perhaps the title’s only drawback is that it was written in 2010. Still popular, though.

**Inspirational—The Archivist as Mover and Shaker**


Description: “Grounded in historical and social theory, this analysis of the power of archives and the role of archivists in society calls for renewed emphasis on remembrance, evidence, and documentation as a means of securing open government, accountability, diversity, and social justice, within an archival ethics of professional and societal responsibility.”

The most relevant and timely book on our list.

As an Addendum, my PERSONAL FAVORITE is:

*The Lone Arranger: Succeeding in a Small Repository* by Christina Zamon (2012)


Description: “A significant portion of U.S. institutions charged with the preservation of our cultural heritage are small repositories and one-person shops. Rapid advances in technology, increasing regulation on institutional records, and exponential growth in the volume and variety of cultural resources being collected put added pressure on these lone arrangers to find efficient and effective ways to manage their archives. *The Lone Arranger: Succeeding in a Small Repository* offers guidance on how to handle common work demands while promoting archives best practice. Author and lone arranger Christina Zamon uses a deft touch to address a comprehensive range of topics, including administration and budget, fundraising and donor relations, information technology, collections management, records management, preservation, reference and outreach, facility management, disaster preparedness, and internship and volunteer programs. In addition, case studies by a dozen practitioners representing diverse backgrounds, institutional settings, and geographic locations discuss the challenges they faced when they found themselves responsible for the full spectrum of archives work with limited or no paid staff to assist. Seasoned archivists and newcomers to the profession will benefit from the practical tips, sound advice, and resources shared throughout the volume, as well as the opportunity to connect to the broader community of professional archivists. If you’re a lone arranger, with this book you’ll find yourself less alone!”

This pretty much describes our Gire Archives, and much of the information this book contains is unique to small repositories. I consider this title an essential tool and refer to it frequently. Very highly recommended!

Well, that’s my list and my Library. You will no doubt have your own. Other suggestions are welcome and encouraged. Happy Archiving!

---

**Research & Publications**

**Publication Inspiration is all in a Day’s Work**

Molly Brownfield
University of Texas Tarlton Law Library

In December, I had the pleasure of attending the AALL webinar program titled *Editor Insights: A Webinar Panel on Publishing Your Writing* ([https://www.aallnet.org/recording/editor-insights-a-webinar-panel-on-publishing-your-writing/](https://www.aallnet.org/recording/editor-insights-a-webinar-panel-on-publishing-your-writing)). The panelists shared wonderful insights as they addressed questions within the broader themes of the importance of publishing, sources of inspiration, and the editorial role and relationship. In particular, their discussion about how publication inspiration can come from everyday experiences – reference questions, troubleshooting, projects, etc.—motivated me to take a closer look at what my colleagues in Technical Services were working on around the library. A lot, as it turns out! From consideration of a new authentication platform to team communication tools to catalog improvement projects, there was no end of interesting
material that could generate an article, paper, or blog post. It was a great reminder to me that publication inspiration can be found in our daily work and discussions of the same with our colleagues. As an example, I am sharing a Q&A with one of my colleagues, Dana DeFebbo, our Web Services Librarian, who recently conducted usability studies of our library website and graciously agreed to share about her process and findings. As Dana notes in the end, her initial usability studies might lead to future studies she could publish.

Q: How did you come up with this study?
A: I have been aware of usability studies for a number of years, but this particular method of conducting short 5-10 minute tests came from a presentation by Zoe Chao that I attended at the 2016 LITA Forum (LITA stands for Library Information Technology Association; the forum is their annual conference) called Designing 5-minute UX Studies.

Q: What did you hope to learn from the study?
A: I met with circulation and reference staff to identify processes on our site that they notice students and patrons having difficulty using/finding, etc. Once we identified potential pain points, I selected a test to (1) confirm this was an issue, (2) determine why it was an issue, and (3) solicit feedback from participants on what would make it better in their eyes.

An example of one thing I tested was the Map It function in our catalog. Another test was to evaluate the information architecture of our website navigation. For some tests, I used an observational method, whereas with others, I employed some tests available from OptimalWorkshop, which is an online usability-testing platform.

It is important to note that these tests are testing the website, not the user. This was a distinction I made clear to each participant.

Q: What sort of logistics/planning did the study entail?
A: Administratively, first, I wrote up a brief proposal which outlined the scope of the testing, a brief schedule, and a budget. This was approved by the library director. Once I had approval, I met with some library staff to identify pain points, selecting and creating suitable tests, and then testing the tests with library student workers.

Q: How long did it take you to plan it—from idea to the first student interview?
A: The planning happened quickly, just a few weeks, but it was over the summer, so I waited until the 2nd week of classes to start conducting the tests. The time from idea to first interview was a few months.

Q: How many students participated?
A: I conducted 6 different tests, and we had an average of 8 students per test. Most of these were unique participants, but we had a few, about 5 students, that participated multiple times. So, about 55 unique participants total.

Q: Was there any response in particular that stood out to you?
A: No one individual response stood out, but the most interesting was when I tested the site navigation and found that most students didn’t really use or think to use the student tab on our site where we have placed the majority of our student content. This was a complete surprise to me. I had a number of students thank me for getting their feedback. They were happy that we wanted to know what they thought.

Q: What was your most valuable take-away?
A: Being surprised by some of the results we got from the testing very much reinforced the notion that we as an organization, but me in particular as the designer and developer of our site, should constantly test and evaluate our assumptions with regards to how our site ought be organized. We are not our users, so it is important that we solicit their feedback when providing a service to them in order to offer them something that is best suited to their needs and not what we think is best suited for them.

Q: Do you plan to publish about the study and/or your results?
A: No, these tests were intended for internal use only. Perhaps in the future I will conduct some studies that I can publish, but that would require more planning because IRB approval would be needed.

Endnote
1—My sincere thanks to the panelists, Kristina L. Niedringhaus, Mike Chiorazzi, Susan Nevelow Mart, Tom Gaylord, James Levy, and moderator, Michele A. L. Villagran, both for the excellent program and for kindly agreeing to let me reference it in this column.
This month’s column addresses some ideas to consider when making patrons aware of online-only serials.

A previous column addressed the issue of “Serials Librarians are not Electronic Services Librarians.” However, there IS some overlap. For a specific example, Serials Librarians, Technical Services Librarians, or anyone in the library who works with serials SHOULD be conversant in the different options to disseminate online-only serials (an example of electronic resources). How can we achieve this, you ask? Read on.

**Be proactive. Reach out.**

We can’t afford to be passive (e.g. waiting for patrons to come to us) in the current environment of:

- Increasing reliance on technology
- Decreasing sizes of hard copy collections
- Decreasing budgets
- Decreasing library footprints
- Shrinking numbers of library personnel

Keep in mind, however, that what librarians used to consider “being proactive” may not work now. We need to find new ways to reach out. Here are some ideas to consider:

1. Replace distribution lists with emails (that contain clickable links to online-only serials) to attorneys (or faculty or other patrons) formerly on distribution lists.
2. Talk with—or otherwise contact—colleagues to learn more about what they do or are planning to do. In other words, ask them about issues they have faced / are facing / will face. Nevertheless, be inclusive. Don’t limit yourself to neighboring colleagues in the same kind of institution as you.
   
   Aim for geographic as well as institutional diversity. For example, if you work in an urban law firm, talk to a colleague in a suburban law school library in another state.

   Take advantage of listservs—they can accomplish this kind of diversity in one fell swoop, whether national, regional, local, or subject-specific. Although posting on a listserv doesn’t guarantee a response, it does guarantee that your post reaches all the diverse (as described above) members of the listserv.
3. Communicate with vendors—as well as publishers—to learn about available options. What do they recommend?
4. Communicate with your Integrated Library System (ILS) support team to learn more about the options available to you to provide good service to your patrons.
5. Perhaps even communicate with your patrons (GASP!) about what would be preferable to them.

**Here are some Takeaways regarding this topic:**

One size doesn’t fit all. As a former cataloger, I am reminded of the phrase “cataloger’s judgment.” Perhaps you’re familiar with this phrase, too. When I googled the phrase to find a general, accessible explanation, I found instead many references to the phrase relating to cataloging minutiae. Consequently, I’ll provide a broad-brush interpretation suitable for this column: Do what best serves your patrons.

Frontload the work. Doing so saves time in the long run. Do your homework beforehand. Plan what you’re going to do.

Following this advice may realize a couple of inadvertent benefits: (1) it shows the library’s value; and (2) it shows your value.

Here’s a parting thought, to continue the December 2018 “Serials Issues” column’s focus on sayings that can relate to serials issues:

Don’t let the perfect be the enemy of the good (https://www.entrepreneur.com/article/249676).
The following is a list of serials title changes:

**IDEA: The Journal of the Franklin Pierce Center for Intellectual Property**
  **Changed to:**
- IDEA: The Law Review of the Franklin Pierce Center for Intellectual Property
  - v. 59, no. 1 (2018)- (OCoLC 1607064)

**IRB: Ethics & Human Research**
- v. 1 (March 1979) – v. 40, no. 6 (November/December 2018) (OCoLC 5255051)
  **Changed to:**
- Ethics & Human Research
  - v. 41, no.1 (January/February 2019)- (OCoLC 1033410447)

The following is a list of serials cessations:

**Fordham Environmental Law Review**
- *Ceased in print with:* v. 28, no. 2 (spring 2017) (OCoLC 57304630)
  - Continued online at [https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/elr/](https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/elr/)
  - and available on HeinOnline (OCoLC 70213764)

**Intellectual Property Law Dictionary**
- *Ceased with:* Release #27 (OCoLC 54503516)

**NLADA/Cornerstone**
- *Ceased with:* v. 2018 (OCoLC 6507977)

**Privacy Journal**
- *Ceased with:* v. 44, no. 9 (July 2018) (OCoLC 2251780)

**University of Western Sydney Law Review**
- *Ceased with:* v. 18 (2014-15) (OCoLC 49571806)

**Yale Journal of Health Policy, Law, and Ethics**
- *Ceased in print with:* v. 18 (2018) (OCoLC 47032755)
  - Continued online at [https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/yihple/](https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/yihple/)
  - and available on HeinOnline (OCoLC 61314162)

Still no word on the replacements, if any, for our much-debated subject heading “Illegal aliens.” Congressional attempts to proscribe any change seem to have died down, although perhaps there is some sort of gentlemen’s agreement (person’s agreement?) not to consider this matter for the time being. In any case, there has been no word from LC in quite a while. Perhaps an e-mail from this columnist to the proper authorities will provoke action. Be sure to watch for the next Subject Headings column.

The Library of Congress continues work on its project to cancel multiple subdivisions, such as the former subdivision “Buddhism [Christianity, etc.]” and to establish strings individually. This is explained in section H1090, “Multiple...
Subdivisions” and is key to understanding why so many seemingly older subject strings, such as “Industrial management—Religious aspects,” continue to appear on the Monthly Lists.


New headings in the general area of politics include “India—Politics and government—2014–,” “Mass shootings—California” (here in southern California, to be exact), “Bombings—India,” and “Mumbai Attacks, Mumbai, India, 2006.” “India—Economic Policy—1991–2016” closes off an earlier heading and is followed by “India—Economic policy—2016–.” “Strikes and lockouts—Teachers—Mexico” and “Teachers’ Strike, Mexico, 1930” have been added, as has “Great Britain—Colonies—Intellectual life.” An interesting heading is “Demonetization,” defined as the act of a nation stripping its currency of its status as legal tender, as was done not long ago in India; with this act, new currency is issued to replace it. To end politics on an ominous note, we now have “Nike—Zeus missile” to describe a recent new weapon. Perhaps just as toxic, “Fishes—Heavy metal content” is available for use. No wonder my wife avoids seafood.

A few legal headings appeared. “Recessions—Law and legislation” has appeared. “Legal ethics—United States—Examinations” and “Multistate Professional Responsibility Exam” were established. “Regenerative medicine” now takes the subdivision “Law and legislation.” “Social media—Authorship” and “Social media and history” are interesting new terms that will have legal implications.

A number of terms in computer science have appeared, terms with which we may be vaguely familiar. Their scope notes merit attention. These include “Data libraries” and “Data sets,” as well as “Regular expressions (Computer science),” “Blockchains (Databases)” and “Blockchains (Databases)—Law and legislation” are available for use.

Under classes of persons, we now have “Transgender men” and “Transgender singers.” Be sure to check the scope note for the former. “Minority women law teachers” has been established.

Contributors: Carol Collins, Jackie Magagnosc, Annie Mellott

Acquisitions

Counting Online Usage of Networked Electronic Resources (COUNTER) R5 Update effective January 2019

COUNTER, founded in 2002, is a non-profit organization supported globally by a community of library, publisher, and vendor members. Members contribute to the development of the Code of Practice (COP) through working groups and outreach. The Code of Practice provides guidance and enables content providers to produce consistent, comparable, and credible usage data for their online content. This allows librarians and other interested parties to compare the usage data they receive and to understand and demonstrate the value of the electronic resources to which they subscribe. In 2014, the organization developed and implemented COUNTER Release 4 (R4) as the Code of Practice for information providers. With the rapid development of technology, this rendition soon became outdated and complex. A working group of librarians, publishers, representatives of ERM systems, and other usage service providers came together to meet changing needs and reduce complexity. The aim was to simplify reports, increase consistency, and clarify metric types and reports. The group released a new iteration, COUNTER R5, which replaces the former release and becomes mandatory for content providers beginning January 2019. See COUNTER’s online guide, The friendly guide to release 5 for librarians (https://www.projectcounter.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/Release5_Librarians_PDFX_20180307.pdf), and read more at the COUNTER website (https://www.projectcounter.org/).

New Study Released by ITHAKA S+R on Library Acquisition Patterns

Researchers at ITHAKA S+R, with support from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, conducted a study and released a recent report analyzing purchasing trends in two areas at U.S. academic libraries. One area of the project relied on 2017 data from 124 libraries using Ex Libris’s integrated library system, ALMA, or OCLC’s WorldShare Management Services (WMS). A second area concentrated on print and e-book purchasing trends of 51 U.S. academic libraries for fiscal years 2014 through 2017.

Two interesting findings from the 2017 report:

• On average, the libraries within the sample spent $3.61 million in 2017 and added 4,750 print books and 345 e-books acquired on a one-time, title-by-title basis.
• Ongoing resource expenditures account for three-quarters of total materials expenditures, with one-fifth going towards onetime purchases.

Two interesting findings from the 2014 to 2017 trend analysis:

• The average cost of an e-book in the sample rose by 35 percent between 2014 and 2017, while the cost of print books remained stable.
• GOBI and Amazon were the leading vendors of print books in the sample. GOBI was the leading vendor of e-books.

With a mission to broaden access to higher education by reducing costs and improving student outcomes, ITHAKA S+R is a nonprofit organization that partners with a wide range of organizations in the academic community, including foundations, universities, libraries, colleges, scholarly societies, publishers, as well as with individuals.

Read the full report at DOI: https://doi.org/10.18665/sr.310937

Cataloging
New Updates to MarcEdit 7

Creator Terry Reese has been investing his time and efforts into upgrading the already powerful MarcEdit 7 to better fit the needs of users. By working to improve how manual and global updates are carried out, Reese has improved how fast records load, how changes are tracked (undo!), and rewritten the code to make further edits to the program easier. Read more about the changes that have been made here: https://blog.reeset.net/archives/2762.

As of Feb 18, 2019, Reese has also added a custom report writer that can, “search for specific data, either as a match case or regular expression, and return back a report noting # of times in the file and # of records.” For more about the new tool and an example: https://blog.reeset.net/.

The Library of Congress’ Policy and Standards Division (PSD) announces the cancellation of “multiple” subdivisions http://www.loc.gov/aba/cataloging/subject/Multiples-project-announcement.pdf

Beginning December 2018, the Library of Congress’ PSD announced the cancellation of “multiple” subdivisions from Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH).

Established LCSH multiple subdivisions are identified by the presence of [square brackets] and followed by “etc.” The concept allowed catalogers flexibility in creating and maintaining LCSH heading strings, as catalogers can “fill in the blank” and substitute any word, phrase, or other information that fits the instruction without seeking PSD approval. Unfortunately, the use of multiple subdivisions, which are not fully authorized, presents obstacles in implementing linked-data projects. Using multiples to generate free-floating lists under individual headings creates headings without identifiers and heading strings that cannot be machine-validated.

The announcement, which contains the project plan and instructions for catalogers, is found at http://www.loc.gov/aba/cataloging/subject/Multiples-project-announcement.pdf

Coming to terms with the IFLA LRM

In early December, ALCTS sponsored a webinar entitled The IFLA LRM Model: An Introduction, presented by Thomas M. Dousa of the University of Chicago Library. The webinar attempted to distill the concepts embodied in the IFLA Library Reference Model for an audience just beginning exploration of the model. Since the revised RDA Toolkit is organized in alignment with IFLA LRM entities, understanding of the model should aid use of the new toolkit.
Dousa explained that the IFLA LRM represents a harmonization of the three conceptual models sometimes referred to as the “FRAMILY”, that is FRBR (Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records), FRAD (Functional Requirements for Authority Data), and FRSAD (Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data). In the training period leading up to the introduction of RDA, many of us spent time wrestling with the FRBR WEMI model and the FRBR user tasks of Find, Identify, Select, and Obtain.

The LRM presents an expanded suite of user tasks:

- Find - bring together information about one or more resources of interest
- Identify - clearly understand the nature of the resources found and distinguish between similar resources
- Select - determine the suitability of the resources found
- Obtain - access the content of the resource
- Explore - discover resources using the relationships between them, placing the resources in context

And a consolidated list of entities:

- Res
- Work
- Manifestation
- Expression
- Item
- Agent
- Person
- Collective Agent
- Nomen
- Place
- Time-Span

These entities function in an “is-a” hierarchy, where entities inherit the characteristics of entities further up in the hierarchy. Practically, all entities are subcategories of “res,” and “person” and “collective agent” are subcategories of “agent.”

The definition of “work” has been adjusted to read “the intellectual or artistic content of a distinct creation.” It should be noted that works are modeled as coming into existence with the creation of an initial expression; there is no work without at least one expression of the work. The definition of “expression” has been adjusted to account for simultaneous creation with a work; the definitions of manifestation and item have also been adjusted.

Some additional things to keep in mind include the definition of “person” in a way that prohibits the treatment of fictional beings as persons, the concept of “nomen” defined as “an association between an entity and a designation that refers to it,” and the idea of a “representative expression” as essential to characterizing a work.

The concept of relationships is central to the LRM. Currently, 36 have been declared in the format [Entity A]<Relationship>[Entity B]. Relationships among the various WEMI entities form the core of the model.

How any of this will play out in the daily work of bibliographic description remains to be seen. The RDA Steering Committee has yet to finalize revisions to the RDA Toolkit, but it is my understanding that many cataloging policy decisions will be governed by application profiles.

As a reminder, ALCTS webinars are made available at no cost on the ALCTS YouTube channel (https://www.youtube.com/user/alctsce) six months after original presentation.
TS-SIS EDUCATION GRANTS FOR AALL AVAILABLE—PLEASE APPLY

Did you know that education grants from TS-SIS are available for attendance at the 2019 AALL Annual Conference, held this year in Washington, D.C. from July 13-16? You have a short time left to apply for any of the following grants by the deadline, Thursday, March 28, 2019.

Here are several opportunities depending on your level of TS-SIS membership:

Are you a library science student interested in a career in technical services?
New to AALL, and interested in attending CONELL?
Then, apply for the Marla Schwartz education grant, which awards incurred expenses up to $700.
For this grant, you do not have to be a TS-SIS or AALL member. For additional information and an application, see: https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/awards-grants/marla-schwartz-grants/

Have you been a TS-SIS member for 5 or fewer years and interested in becoming more involved in the SIS activities?
Then, apply for the New Member general grant, which awards incurred expenses up to $1000.
For information and an application, see: https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/awards-grants/new-member-general-grant/

Have you been a TS-SIS member for 6 or more years, and interested in professional development opportunities available with attendance at AALL?
Then, apply for the Experienced Member general grant, which awards incurred expenses up to $1000.
For information and an application, see: https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/awards-grants/experienced-member-general-grant/

Are you an active TS-SIS member, involved as a participant or a chair in SIS or AALL activities?
Then, apply for the Active Member general grant, which awards incurred expenses up to $1000.
For information and an application, see: https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/awards-grants/active-member-grant/

You can find more information about the 2019 AALL conference at https://www.aallnet.org/conference/

Reminder, the application deadline for all grants awarded to attend the 2019 AALL Annual Conference is Thursday, March 28, 2019. A grant recipient receives reimbursement for incurred expenses and must present receipts for payment.

For more information, contact the TS-SIS Awards Committee chair Virginia Bryant at (202) 994-1378 or vbryant@law.gwu.edu

Virginia Bryant
Chair, TS-SIS Awards Committee
Continued from page 1

tools they will be using, as well as introducing them to the operations and security requirements of the particular office, floor, etc. where they will be stationed. Most of this training I do remotely by screen sharing or webcasting. I also make sure that the remote team member’s employer also knows the goals and priorities that have been set and the training that has been received or scheduled. I also provide their employer with feedback on how well the staff member is performing or not. Not all filers do well at serials check-in, for example, or vice versa.

Building relationships with remote staff that are generally in the office a few hours a day or week is a challenge. Managing remote staff isn’t a good fit for every manager. Solid communication skills are essential. Disclosure: I am still developing my communication skills; it is a life-long journey. Encouraging small talk helps to connect with someone you may never meet face-to-face. As much as I might want to jump right to the reason for my weekly call, I also know that it essential for me to connect with that individual providing necessary support for the team in the Texas office. I usually start my conversation with everyone with, “So, what is new and wonderful?” This week, that question provided me with, “We haven’t told anyone yet, but we are having a baby!”

Building a remote team also requires an understanding for different communication patterns and work habits. Availability is also required, and by that, I mean my availability to the remote teams. The remote team does not have the opportunity to pop by my office for a quick question. They may also not realize that I’m not going to be upset if they need to send me numerous follow-up emails. I share my work schedule with all co-workers, including the remote teams, and maintain a regular schedule of check-in communications (both phone calls and emails). We encourage questions, and we encourage suggestions from both local and remote team members.

Several remote team members started working here before I joined the firm and have had a front row seat to the evolution of the firm’s library operations. Managing this remote team is not always easy, but their contributions to the success of library operations are essential.