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Karen Selden  
2019 Renee Chapman Memorial Award Recipient

The Technical Services Special Interest Section Awards Committee is pleased to announce that the recipient of the 2019 Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award for Outstanding Contributions in Technical Services Law Librarianship is Karen Selden.

Karen is the Metadata Services Librarian and Interim Head of Technical Services at the William A. Wise Law Library, University of Colorado Law School. Karen's extended and sustained distinguished service to law library technical services and law librarianship in general includes leadership roles at the local, regional, and national levels; active committee service; significant publications and scholarly work; and numerous conference presentations. As noted in her nomination, “One cannot come away from an encounter with Karen without an awareness of both her infectious personal energy and her dedication to law librarianship.”

Karen joined the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) in 1998 and currently serves as a Member-at-Large on the AALL Board where she brings to the Association a much-needed technical services perspective. On her path to AALL leadership, Karen brought her considerable skills and energy to both the Technical Services Special Interest Section (TS-SIS) and the Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS). As an active TS-SIS member, Karen serves on the Metadata Management Standing Committee and volunteers as a Classification and Subject Heading Ask an Expert. She served a term as AALL Representative to the American Library Association’s Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information (MARBI) Committee (2002-2004), where she brought the needs of the legal research community to a broader audience.

In 2017, Karen was a Member-at-Large on the TS-SIS Executive Board and a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on Standing Committees Structure. Karen held numerous key leadership positions in OBS-SIS, serving as Secretary/Treasurer
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Technical Services
Special Interest Section

Almost time for the 2019 AALL Annual Conference in Washington, D.C. Below are some of the TS-SIS sponsored sessions and meetings that will be of interest to some of you.

Saturday, July 13
Dine-arounds with TS, OBS, RIPS, & CS following the Opening Reception

Sunday, July 14
7:30am – 8:45am   TS-SIS Vendor-Supplied Records Advisory Working Group (VRAG) Meeting
12:45pm – 2:15pm  TS-SIS Metadata Management Committee Meeting
12:45pm – 2:15pm  TS-SIS Resource Management Roundtable
5:15pm – 6:15pm   TS-SIS Hot Topic Forum

Monday, July 15
7:00am – 8:00am   TS-SIS Heads of Cataloging at Large Libraries Roundtable
7:00am – 8:00am   TS-SIS Management Issues Roundtable
3:00pm – 5:30pm   Deep Dive: Things You Need to Know Before Moving to a New ILS
5:30pm – 6:30pm   TS-SIS Awards, Silent Auction, and Meet & Greet (celebration! light snacks!)

Tuesday, July 16
7:00am – 8:15am   TS-SIS Convention Conversations (roundtables on issues/ideas from the conference)
7:00am – 8:15am   TS-SIS Professional Development Committee Meeting
7:00am – 8:15am   TS-SIS Metadata Policy and Standards Advisory Group (MPSAG) Meeting

Remember to try a session or two that is out of your normal area of interest. Often sessions about management, legal research, and legal technology can inform the work we do acquiring, managing, and making resources discoverable. If you are involved in a session—or know of a session you think will be of interest to other TS-SIS members—please share about it in the TS My Communities group before the conference.

And get out there and meet people—I always challenge my colleagues to come back with “a favorite session, an interesting idea to try, something they learned from a vendor, and at least three people they made a stronger connection with.” Hope to see you in D.C.!

Wendy Moore
University of Georgia

Online Bibliographic Services
Special Interest Section

The ever-accelerating passage of time has cycled around yet another year. Spring is finally underway, and it will be July and Annual Meeting before any of us know it.

It is hard to believe that my time as OBS-SIS Chair will be ending soon; our Incoming/Outgoing Executive Board meeting is scheduled for late June. I would like to recognize the 2017-2018 Executive Board; Jessica Pasquale, Vice-Chair/Chair Elect; Kevin Carey, Secretary/Treasurer; Jason LeMay and Barbara Szalkowski, Members-at-Large; and Jennifer Noga, Past
Chair. The work of OBS relies on the contributions of each of these individuals. I am grateful for their help and guidance; it has been a pleasure working with you.

**Election results:** Congratulations to our incoming OBS-SIS officers. Kevin Carey, Technical Services Librarian at the Ohio State University Moritz Law Library, having completed his term as Secretary/Treasurer, will be Vice-Chair/Chair Elect. Elizabeth Manriquez, Research Librarian/Assistant Professor at the University of Nevada—Las Vegas William S. Boyd School of Law will take over from Kevin as Secretary/Treasurer. Our new Member-at-Large is Heather Buckwalter, Serials/Acquisition Librarian at Creighton University School of Law, Klutznick Law Library. Many thanks to Jason LeMay, Assistant Law Librarian for Cataloging & Metadata at Emory University Hugh F. MacMillan Law Library who completes his term as Member-at-Large.

**OCLC update webinar:** Our annual OCLC update will be delivered via webinar. Mark your calendars for Monday, June 17, 2019 at 2 pm EDT. Further information and registration details will be forthcoming. We hope that this pilot will both save time and provide additional flexibility for individuals interested in OCLC content.

**Annual meeting**
I hope you will be joining us at Annual Meeting 2019 in Washington D.C. The OBS-SIS Education Committee worked hard to facilitate programming designed to interest OBS Members. Here are some highlights:

**Saturday, July 13th**
- **Preconference workshop: Regex Rules! Using Regular Expressions with MarcEdit:** 9 am – 1 pm, Georgetown University Law Library
  Learn the basics of regular expressions (regex) and how to construct regular expression search strings for simplifying complex metadata cleanup projects.

- **Alphabet Soup Dine-Around:** around 6:45 pm
  Start the conference off right by catching up with colleagues over dinner. Look for more information on signing up, and especially look for the OBS-SIS hosted dine-arounds.

**Sunday, July 14th**
- **Deep Dive: DIY API: From Inception to (Successful) Implementation:** 2:30 – 5:00 pm, WCC Room 151AB
  How do you make an API that works? This session will provide a hands-on demonstration, allowing participants to experiment with creating their own APIs in a safe environment. Participants will learn what it takes to create a working API, where APIs can be most useful, and best practices for implementing. **To get the most out of this program, bring your laptop!**

- **OBS-SIS Business Meeting:** 6:15 – 7:15 pm, Marriott “University of DC”
  In addition to our regular Business Meeting agenda, we plan a substantive discussion of how to best position OBS-SIS for the future. Your input in this process is of the utmost importance.

**Monday, July 15th**
- **OBS-SIS OCLC Update slot:** 7:00 – 8:00 am, Marriott Gallaudet
  Join OBS leadership for a discussion of the future and focus of the OBS-SIS OCLC Committee.

- **Deep Dive: Clean It Up! Transforming Messy Data with OpenRefine:** 9:30 am – 12:00 pm, WCC Room 152 AB
  Hands-on practice to explore, manipulate, and transform real-world datasets using OpenRefine. This practice will ensure that participants know how to use OpenRefine’s feature set, and it will emphasize the types of data manipulation that is possible with the tool. **Attendees should bring their laptop with OpenRefine already loaded on it.**

- **OBS-SIS Hot Topic Forum:** “A continuing conversation on systems migration”: 1:30 – 2:45 pm, WCC Room 156
  Change is in the air! Continue where we left off last summer discussing systems migration with both new and continuing panelists. New systems and new migrations bring additional issues to consider or re-consider.

- **Deep Dive: Things You Need to Know Before Moving to a New ILS:** 3:00 – 5:30 pm, WCC Room 152 AB
  More and more libraries are moving toward or considering moving toward a new ILS… This program will present the pros and cons of technical issues during and after the data migration and system transition so that other libraries considering a move may be better prepared for all the challenges and surprises.
OBS-SIS Education Committee Meeting: 6:15 pm
Help craft programming for Annual Meeting 2020 in New Orleans! Join OBS leadership over dinner to start planning. Meet up spot and location TBD.

Tuesday, July 16th

OBS-SIS Local System User Groups Roundtable: 7:15 am, location TBD
Conversations will be grouped by library system to facilitate comparing notes and discussion of questions or problems. All are welcome regardless of the library resource management system you use and whether or not you are an OBS-SIS member. This roundtable is also a good opportunity to ask specific questions about a system that your institution might be considering.

I hope to see all of you in Washington D.C. this July!

Jacqueline Magagnosc
Cornell University

(DRAFT) MINUTES OF THE 2018 OBS-SIS BUSINESS MEETING
Monday, July 16, 2018, Baltimore, Maryland

Call to Order/Welcome/Introductions:
OBS-SIS Chair Jennifer Noga called the Business Meeting to order at 6:07 p.m.

Introductions: Jennifer Noga (Chair), Jackie Magagnosc (Vice-Chair), Kevin Carey (Secretary/Treasurer), Jason LeMay (Member-at-Large), Marjorie Crawford (Past Chair), Jessica Pasquale (Incoming Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect), Barbara Szalkowski (Incoming Member-at-Large).

Audience Introductions: Barbara Ginzburg, Michael Maben, Karen Selden, Pat Sayre-McCoy, Alan Keely, Corinne Jacox, Heather Buckwalter, Marijah Sroczynski.

Approval of 2017 Business Meeting Minutes:
Jennifer Noga called for a motion to approve the 2017 OBS-SIS Business Meeting minutes. Jessica Pasquale so moved, Barbara Szalkowski seconded, and the motion passed.

Officer Reports:

Secretary/Treasurer – Kevin Carey
Kevin reported on OBS finances for the year, which had a starting balance of $4,702.64, with expenses of $3,155.42 and revenues of $4,302.10, for an ending balance of $5,849.32 as of June 30. The 2017 Annual Meeting expenses totaled $2,106.76, with expenses for the 2018 Annual Meeting projected as $3,013.00. The 2018 OBS election ran from April 1-15, with 46 total responses, and resulted in the election of Jessica Pasquale as Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect and Barbara Szalkowski as Member-at-Large. That was out of a total of 205 OBS members as of May. Also, the Board agreed at their January 2018 meeting to post all regular Executive Board meeting minutes on the OBS website, as other SIS’s have done; the approved minutes from this year’s meetings have now been posted.

Jason reported on the OBS poster and the dine-arounds, which seem to have gone well this year: Patty did a good job setting that up, and it fulfilled its purpose of setting up attendees with members from other SIS’s.

Vice-Chair – Jackie Magagnosc
Jackie reported on the start of the repositioning effort and the upcoming work to update the OBS Procedures Manual.

Chair – Jennifer Noga
Jennifer reported on the continued excellent programming that OBS is known for, and that we have kept costs down to help maintain the budget by using speakers from the local area. We have also increased membership by 14 members, which was
an unstated goal for the year since membership has dipped in recent years. This year, OBS convened a Special Committee on Repositioning to look at questions of repositioning the section, and Jennifer gave a thank-you to its members Jason LeMay, Marijah Sroczynski, Barbara Szalkowski, John Vosmek, and Elizabeth Manriquez. There will be a vote later in the meeting on that committee’s recommendation to make a minor change to the bylaws. Jennifer attended the CONELL Marketplace on Saturday, and there was a lot of interest in OBS; she has the entries for the free membership drawing which will take place later in this meeting.

**Committee Reports:**

*Education Committee – Jennifer Noga, Chair*

Jennifer reported on the programming that OBS coordinated and sponsored at the Annual Meeting. There was the API program which was picked up and sponsored by AALL; there was the OpenRefine program which Jason LeMay coordinated and OBS sponsored and paid for; and there was the program on system changes, which was submitted but not picked up by AALL, so that was turned into a Hot Topic just before this meeting. Thank you to Jessica Pasquale for coordinating that, as well as the four really good panelists.

*OBS/TS FROG (Research Grant) Committee – Gypsy Moody, Chair (not present)*

Jennifer read Gypsy’s report on the FROG committee: they had a grant which had been awarded to Sarah Lin and was fully administered and completed this year, with a final report submitted to the committee. The FROG committee worked to increase awareness of the research grant, including printing up the stickers which have been distributed at the Annual Meeting.

*Local Systems Committee – Keiko Okuhara, Chair (not present)*

Jennifer read Keiko’s report on the Local Systems Committee, which is mainly focused on coordinating the roundtable session that will take place tomorrow morning. The discussion there will primarily focus on Alma, as there have been a lot of libraries moving to Alma in recent years, but all systems are welcome to the discussion.

*Nominating Committee – Georgia Briscoe, Chair (not present)*

Jennifer read Georgia’s report on the Nominating Committee, which put forth Jessica Pasquale and Barbara Szalkowski as candidates for the 2018 election.

*OCLC Committee – Emily Dust Nimsakont, Chair (not present)*

Jennifer reported that Emily had coordinated the OCLC Update meeting that took place this morning, and it was very informative and interesting.

*TSLL Report – Michael Maben, Editor*

Michael reported that TSLL had all four issues published on time, available on the TSLL website and on HeinOnline. Michael finished his fifth year as TSLL editor-in-chief, with thanks to Stacy Fowler, associate editor; Julia Stauffer, layout and design; and Martin Wisneski, web manager. Also thanks go to Sara Campbell and Sarah Lin, finishing two-year terms on the editorial board, and Larissa Sullivant and Elizabeth Outler, who joined the editorial board this year. TSLL is still looking for a new editor-in-chief going forward.

*Web Advisory – Barbara Ginzburg, Chair*

Barbara reported that AALL took over all postings of website materials, so now all updates go through AALL via Chris Siwa and his staff. This has not caused any problems for OBS, and all previously-uploaded materials are still available on the OBS website; Jennifer Noga and Marjorie Crawford have really helped in the past two years to fill in the gaps as much as possible. The Website of the Month page has been reorganized, and the archives have been separated out by decade: it may also be worth reviewing the archive for dead links and updating or removing outdated sites.

**New Business:**

Repositioning efforts/Vote on Bylaws change to OBS-SIS’s object:

Jennifer noted the efforts of the Special Committee on Repositioning, with a vote needed today to enact the changes to the bylaw language regarding the object (or purpose) of OBS. For context, the board had been looking into updating the section name, which has come up in membership surveys as a bit confusing or anachronistic, but first we needed to look at the language which establishes our purpose, and that is what this special committee looked at this year. Jennifer had previously sent out on the listserv the proposed change to the object in the OBS bylaws, which is as follows:
The object of the Online Bibliographic Services SIS shall be:

To provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and information on the use and capabilities of metadata, electronic resources, and library systems (defined to include library resource management systems, discovery systems, and bibliographic services and utilities); and

To explore ways that emerging technologies can be integrated with library systems and how these changes affect libraries and librarians; and

To communicate the concerns of its members to the governing bodies of those systems; and

To foster communication between all types of law librarians to explore ways to improve access to information for users; and

To represent its members’ interests and concerns within the AALL.

Jennifer called for a motion to approve the proposed change to the object language. Karen Selden so moved, Jackie Magagnosc seconded, and the motion passed.

AALL/ALA Liaisons:

Jackie reported that AALL declined to continue providing financial support to the liaisons. The SIS Council convened a group that examined the liaisons and put forward a resolution to AALL to continue to fund the liaisons with a suggested budget of $9000, but the AALL Board declined again to fund the liaisons. So the SIS Council convened a second group to develop a sustainable funding solution, as even the Board agreed that these liaisons serve an important function. The SIS Council is proposing the creation of a dedicated fund for the liaisons, and they have asked the SIS chairs to fund one more year until such a fund is hopefully authorized and created.

Procedures manual updating:

Jennifer and Jackie reported on the initiative to update the OBS Procedures Manual, which has become outdated, particularly in the calendar of activities. Alan Keely volunteered to lead this initiative.

Recognition of Outgoing Officers and Committee Chairs:

Jennifer recognized the outgoing board member, Patty Alvayay, and all the committee chairs and Michael Maben for their hard work, with a special thank-you to Emily Dust Nimsakont, who is leaving law librarianship. Gypsy Moody has volunteered to serve out the rest of the term as OCLC Committee chair. Jennifer passed out certificates of appreciation and thank-you notes to board members and committee chairs.

Introduction of the 2018-2019 OBS-SIS Executive Board and “Passing the Hat”:

Jennifer welcomed Jessica Pasquale and Barbara Szalkowski to the OBS Executive Board. She then followed the traditional “Passing the hat” from outgoing to incoming chair, a tradition which started with Kevin Butterfield, who received the hat when he was Chair and passed it along the following year. Jackie selected a business card for the free membership drawing, and the winner was Hannah Hartshorn. Jackie thanked Jennifer and presented her with a plaque and gift card.

Adjournment:

Jackie Magagnosc called for a motion to adjourn the Business Meeting. Barbara Szalkowski so moved, Jason LeMay seconded, and the motion passed. The meeting was adjourned at 6:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:
Kevin Carey
OBS Secretary/Treasurer, 2017-2019
The inaugural AALL state of the profession survey has been released and analyzed across the blawgosphere. The implications for library acquisitions? Budgets for government law libraries are relatively flat while budgets for academic law libraries are decreasing, especially those at public institutions. Corporate law library budgets have increased marginally. But within library budgets, the percentage set aside for electronic resources is rapidly increasing. That law libraries are spending more on electronic resources contrasts with the publishing industry as a whole, where e-book sales have been on the decline for several years.

It’s unclear at this point whether increased budgeting for electronic resources is due to user demand, price increases, or publishers discontinuing print versions. Research shows that while students strongly prefer print books for leisure and long-form reading, a plurality prefer electronic formats for research. The difference in budget changes between the three major types of law libraries deserves further research. A 3% increase in government law library budgets won’t cover the ever-increasing cost of materials without cutting from other areas. Major cuts to academic law library budgets present an even more unpleasant picture. These budget numbers put academic libraries in an impossible place. The majority of academic law libraries are either not filling open positions or laying off staff. Current trends view the library as a service institution whose most important asset is its staff. Cutting staff to maintain expensive subscriptions is then a bad idea for the long-term strength of the library.

Unfortunately, shifting to open access is not a panacea for law libraries. Shifting to relying on open access for law journals is feasible, but premier legal research tools like Lexis and Westlaw have no open access competition. Federal agencies consistently acquire Westlaw via sole source procurement, arguing that there are “… no peer equivalents to the uniquely held content, retrieval, and/or presentation features.” In fact, as Susan Nevelow Mart’s 2017 Law Library Journal article observes, there is so little overlap between Westlaw and Lexis search results that both services might be necessary for truly comprehensive legal research.

What this means is that, in the short term, the best solution for law libraries might be to accept that premiere databases like Westlaw and Lexis are going to consume an increasing percentage of the acquisitions budget. This means cutting commercial subscriptions where open access alternatives can be identified. As has been well documented, free resources frequently lack the highly refined search options and are harder to find than commercial products. To help deal with this issue, libraries should redirect some of the cost savings from eliminating commercial subscriptions to cataloging or other ways to increasing discoverability and access to open access publications.

Endnotes
1 See http://www.abajournal.com/web/article/law-libraries-chart-new-direction-for-the-future-aall-report-shows among others
3 See my previous column
4 Library Journal Academic student ebook experience survey, 2018
6 https://sparcopen.org/our-work/big-deal-cancellation-tracking/
7 https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=190117qssgoesa
10 As described in my December 2018 column or this 2016 article from Library journal: https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=making-open-access-content-discoverable
Classification of law pertaining to indigenous peoples

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

KF’s “Indian numbers” needed replacement

One might ask why we needed a new classification for indigenous law. There was always a range of numbers starting at KF8200, located immediately after military law. One might speculate that to the American legal weltanschauung of a century ago, it was logical to put “Indians” next to the military on the theory that the typical method of the government “negotiating” with Indian tribes involved the military. However, the Bureau of Indians Affairs, while originally part of the War Department, moved to the Interior Department prior to the Civil War, and the army hasn’t been fighting Indians since the 19th century, so whether done consciously or not, putting “Indians” next to “Military” was already anachronistic by the time KF was drafted in the mid-20th century.

The original KF had very limited numbers for Indians and almost no provision for laws adopted by tribes beyond a cutter for each tribe. Under American law, tribes are not agencies of the federal government nor are they in any way controlled by the states where their reservations are located. Since colonial times, Indian tribes are thought of as “domestic dependent nations” with a significant amount of sovereignty. Most importantly, Indian tribes are jurisdictions (they have boundaries, they make laws for their territory), and the core principle of law cataloging is to class law under the jurisdiction whose law it is. With the benefit of hindsight, KFY or KFZ could have been used for tribal jurisdictions (keeping them in American law while respecting that tribes are partially sovereign jurisdictions, similar to states); however, the original KF put Indian tribes (i.e. indigenous jurisdiction) in the main KF sequence.

Most topical subjects pertaining to Indians were dealt with by a single “Special topics, A-Z” at KF8210. When KF was written in the mid-20th century, it was widely believed that American Indians were going to assimilate into the general population, and perhaps it was felt there was no need for a detailed range of numbers for what was (wrongly) perceived as a subject about which there was not going to be much new literature. If so, this is simply an additional manifestation of the problem of KF being out of date since it reflects the perspectives of at least 70 years ago (or perhaps the failure of LC and AALL to require those writing classification schedules to be certified as prophets).

By the early 21st century, it was very clear that American Indians were not vanishing, were increasingly competent at litigating and legislating, and the amount of legal literature pertaining to their legal status was increasing and clearly did not comfortably fit in KF. The solution was to radically expand the numbers for “Federal” Indian law (under the Constitution, states do not have “Indian law,” but they do anyway, and there is still an unrevised range for the topic in Table KFA-KFZ 505). The additions to KF were a very detailed replacement for federal laws pertaining to Indians. KIA-KIX (law of the indigenous peoples of the Americas) was created for the law and legal system of indigenous peoples (which in the U.S. refers to “Indians of North America” though Canada has multiple indigenous peoples) with highly developed ranges for each Indian (i.e. indigenous, tribal, etc.) jurisdiction.

The KIA-KIX development includes numbers for comparative laws of indigenous peoples and will eventually cover all of Latin America. The numbers established are quite detailed, and perhaps too detailed for smaller tribes (while some tribes in the United States have populations, and patterns of publishing, similar to states, most tribes have a population similar to a non-urban town or county). There is also a problem because of terminology differences between the Name Authority File headings for tribes as jurisdictions (which are corporate bodies) and LCSH’s headings for tribes as ethnic groups.

Laws pertaining to indigenous peoples vs Law of indigenous peoples

One needs to distinguish between the laws of indigenous peoples themselves (i.e. tribal law) and government laws affecting indigenous peoples. The former are adopted by indigenous peoples by their own political and lawmaking processes, reflecting their own customary law. The latter are adopted by the federal government, often in disregard of what the affected indigenous people desire. A similar situation exists in discussing laws restricting the rights of religious minorities (e.g. KK4743), which class with the law of the country, as opposed to internal laws of a religious group that class in KB.

In the real “world,” these interact, e.g. a tribal law or custom (indigenous law) does not function independently of national laws governing the same subject matter (Federal “Indian” law). This is one heck of a conflict of laws (private international
law) problem, and one the lawyers (not to mention catalogers) may have trouble with. Due to the desire to keep federal laws in KF (since the US is the enacting jurisdiction), laws adopted by the government pertaining to Indians stay in KF, while laws adopted by the Indians go to KIA-KIX. Original sources are clearly differentiable as to whether they are “Federal” or “Indian” law; treatises and secondary materials are likely to discuss both.

“Treaties” involving tribes class in KIA-KIX, even though most everyone understands these treaties were imposed by the Federal government; though, in all fairness, many treaties (especially “peace” treaties) are imposed by winners on losers, and the gun or sword pointed at the loser is considered irrelevant from a legal (and cataloging) perspective. Such treaties often serve as constitutional documents of American Indian jurisdictions.

If the indigenous peoples in a place are a majority and are therefore in control of the local government (including Nunavut in Canada and arguably Bolivia in South America), and the laws govern everyone in that place (including non-indigenous residents), and both indigenous and non-indigenous residents participate in the process of creating the law, is this “indigenous law” (which classes in KIA-KIX), or simply law of the place? If one has a resource on the “customary law” of a place, and that place is inhabited by an indigenous population, is it “indigenous” law or “customary law?” Is “indigenous law” the “Customary law of indigenous peoples,” and how does this impact on classification (KIA-KIX for indigenous law, law of the country for “customary law”)?

Note that in the Afro-Asian schedules, there are specific numbers for indigenous peoples, such as KU350+ (for Australia) and KNS350+ (for India), as well as in regional schedules such as KQ9000 (for Africa). What happens when the “indigenous” or “tribal” law morphs into the local customary law, something that appears quite common when the majority of the population is indigenous (e.g. the tribal court applying customary tribal law evolves into the local court for trying small claims and minor offenses)? We should remember that the customary law (“indigenous law”) of the Anglo-Saxons evolved after the Norman conquest into our own Anglo-American Common law. Outside of countries where the indigenous population was largely “replaced,” there appear many places where similar evolution of “indigenous” law to non-ethnic “customary” is occurring. Fortunately, for most American law catalogers, this is not happening in North America, but this is an issue in some places in Latin America and in areas in the rest of the world in which the indigenous population is not a small, “replaced” minority. In my cataloging, if a “Customary law court” has been integrated into the national legal system, I regard it as such rather than as the indigenous courts from which it evolved (e.g. KL-KWX4 1588.8 rather than KQ9000).

**Who is indigenous?**

In North America, it is fairly straightforward. In the 15th century, one group of people were the only inhabitants of North America, and a few centuries later, someone else was in charge; the originals were not. The details of whether this occurred inadvertently due to diseased contagious Europeans, rather than willful genocide, is not important for law cataloging. Persons of mixed ancestry (many, if not most, of those whose ancestry in America goes back to the 18th century) ended up being defined either as “Indians” or “not Indians,” with a separate legal regime depending on how they were defined. Since the British (and their Canadian and American successors) saw the indigenous peoples as having governments to negotiate with, there were legal and political structures defining an indigenous community. It is easy to figure out. If all you work with is KE and KF, there will be few problems adding KIA-KIX to your repertory.

In Latin America, the Spanish approach to indigenous political structures was to obliterate them. Some North American indigenous political institutions pre-date the colonial period; however, the ones in Latin America do not, e.g. the Iroquois Confederacy (Haudenosaunee) still exists even though the Aztec and Inca political bodies have disappeared. In most of Latin America, there are still plenty of indigenous people and persons of mixed descent, but “indigenous” political structures recognized by governments are not as well established and do not have centuries of well-documented experience at co-existing with national governments. Indigenous peoples survived, but tribal governments did not, except perhaps as local governments, but without being officially defined as being indigenous. And that gets back to the question mentioned above: is a jurisdiction consisting primarily of indigenous persons, but defined based on residence rather than indigeneity, an “indigenous” jurisdiction, meaning we class it in in an indigenous number such as KIA-KIX? Or should it class with the law of the country?

For Anglo-Saxons, the indigenous peoples of England when they were conquered by the Normans, we would probably say the former, but they then lost that quality when England was again ruled by a government that spoke English and whose leadership perceived itself, and was perceived by others, as being English. We should note that, in the 21st century, movements asserting a desire to expel foreigners are more likely to be seen as nativists and racists, rather than as indigenous peoples defending their homeland, but is there a universal definition that catalogers can utilize?
So perhaps one element of being “indigenous” is one needs to have been displaced or ruled by others when previously you were “masters of your own house.” This works well in the United States and Canada (other than Nunavut), but not in Bolivia nor in many countries where the government by foreign occupiers and settlers has been replaced (or evolved) by one with local roots and where the indigenous customary legal systems are being partially absorbed into the legal mainstream. What if the indigenous majority wants affirmative action for itself at the expense of recent immigrants; is this indigenous rights or racism? Is it significant if the non-indigenous population arrived as legal immigrants rather than conquerors? Do we want to even consider “ancestry” or “DNA,” or should we understand that “indigenous” is a function of sociology and political science (and law) rather than biology? We certainly do not want to attempt to consider asking who has “pure blood,” which is scientifically absurd and legally discredited.

James Anaya, a leading scholar of the rights of indigenous peoples, has defined indigenous peoples as “living descendants of pre-invasion inhabitants of lands now dominated by others.” By this standard, the people in Bolivia and Nunavut (and the Anglo-Saxons at the end of the middle ages) lost their status as “indigenous” when by political processes, they ended domination by others. In Bolivia, this occurred by democratic processes; in Nunavut, they redrew boundaries so that the territory had an indigenous majority; in England, this occurred over many centuries in which the conquerors assimilated into those they had conquered. This definition would also preclude an “indigenous majority” supporting discriminatory laws against recent immigrants from claiming their policy is an assertion of indigenous rights. While discussing “indigenous law” for the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand is very straightforward, for the rest of the world, it gets complicated.

Full Court Press and the Law

Adrienne DeWitt
Campbell University

The last couple of columns I’ve written have been on our recent acquisition of Lexis/Thomson Reuter eBooks. I had planned to continue discussing the eBook/print collection debate until I read a recent Dewey B. Strategic post on new hardbound treatises from Fastcase.

Wait, Fastcase is publishing treatises? I knew that Fastcase was branching out into publishing, but it wasn’t that long ago. Was it? Maybe I had lost track of time. So I clicked on over and, sure enough, the Fastcase eBook store had increased in size to include four pages of titles. Last time I looked, they only had RAIL: The Journal of Robotics, Artificial Intelligence and Law. I was genuinely impressed.

And it is impressive, considering Full Court Press has only been in existence for little over a year. Besides the Full Court Press publications, Fastcase also houses an Independent Publisher page as well as a number of North Carolina Bar Association (NCBA) materials. To date, the Full Court Press holdings only number twelve (absent duplications). The majority of titles listed in the eBook Store are from the NCBA.

This does not diminish Full Court Press’s achievement. Since November 2017, Full Court Press has put out twelve original works, two of which are the hardbound treatises mentioned above. Not only are these treatises available in print, they can also be purchased in eBook format and used on the Fastcase legal research platform. Business Insurance and Insurance for Real Estate-Related Entities can be added to their existing legal research suite for $225. The eBook price also includes updates that occur throughout the subscription period.

After looking over Full Court Press, I checked out the Independent Publisher link. After seeing Full Court Press’s titles, I was a little disappointed. The only title listed was a free self-published legal thriller. I bought it because I like legal thrillers. Unfortunately, the book isn’t really an e-book, as it is only available in PDF format. I contacted Fastcase to see if they would be adding EPUB or MOBI formatting options in the future. They told me they would look into it.

Of all the available titles, however, I was most surprised to see NCBA materials available for purchase. I was curious to see if this was because I was in North Carolina or if these titles were available nationwide. I called Fastcase to find out. Fastcase told me it was nationwide.
Considering NCBA materials are also still available for purchase on their own platform, I wondered which was the better platform to use for purchase. Which platform was cheaper? Which one was more expensive? Which one was easier to use? I chose the 2011 *NC Small Law Office Resource Manual* as a test subject. It is available for sale on Fastcase’s website, but I couldn’t find it on the Bar Association’s publication page. So I contacted the NCBA, and the representative told me that they weren’t selling it anymore. Interesting. Maybe Fastcase was selling titles no longer available on the Bar Association website?

I chose another title. This time I selected *North Carolina Lawyers as Employers*. Both the Bar Association and Fastcase list the title. Fastcase’s price was $60 for the eBook version. The Bar Association also listed it as $60 dollars, but that was the non-member price. For members, the eBook version was $45, with the option to buy both the print and eBook for $70. So much for my theory that they were selling titles no longer available on the Bar Association website.

Now I was really curious. So I made a comparison chart. [Fig. 1] Of the twenty NCBA titles listed on Fastcase, six were not listed in the Bar Association’s online catalog (I would have called the NCBA for confirmation, but I felt like I was bugging them). For the most part, the unlisted titles were published in 2013 or earlier. The only exception was the *Guide to Student Advocacy in North Carolina*, which was published in 2015. [Fig.1]

Keep in mind that Fastcase’s NCBA collection is only a small part of what is listed on the Bar Association website. If you are looking for all NCBA publications, I still recommend going straight to the NCBA website. If, after checking there, you can’t find your title, then try Fastcase. As for pricing, there is no difference. Fastcase pricing is the same as non-members pricing on the Bar Association’s website. This would be a problem only if you were a NCBA member.

When it comes to ease of use, Fastcase wins hands down. Although Fastcase doesn’t have the print options that the Bar Association has, it is much easier to view descriptions and see the pricing. On the right side of the Bar Association’s website is a box titled CLE Premier Pass. Underneath it is a box titled Products. There’s a price there, but it’s unclear if it is referring to the CLE Premier Pass or to the book. For a clear pricing guide, you have to click on the In Depth tab. [Fig. 2] At the end of the day, I prefer my purchasing websites to have a price and a single purchase button.

All in all, the Fastcase eBook Store is showing promise, both with its original content and with its bar publication materials. Best of all, it is continuing to grow. In addition to their new hardback treatises, a March press release announced that Fastcase was partnering with the ABA to provide access to select ABA publications. The press release stated that Fastcase would integrate select ABA titles into their new Fastcase 7 platform. These titles would also be available for purchase “in conjunction with Fastcase’s other publishing partners, as well as its own publishing imprint, Full Court Press.”

Fastcase’s quick growth into the world of legal publishing shows their commitment to growing their brand. I’ll be paying much closer attention to them in the future.

For more information about Fastcase and Full Court Press, see the links below.


I have written several articles about our process of migrating and setting up the procedures and workflows for the Legal Information Archive (formerly the Chesapeake Project). Here comes another one—this column on the way in which e-resource access links are displayed to the user.

This project is for a small collection—compared to the overall records and materials in our collection represented in the catalog (in MARC). But it has proven to contain a bunch of educational moments for the department and for me.

This short column is about the public note commonly used over the years for electronic resources.

$z Connect to electronic version
$z Connect to electronic resources
$z Connect to full text
$z etc., etc.

For a long time in this library, we used the text: ‘Connect to electronic version.’ This was for a couple reasons that come to mind:

1. There were many instances of records doing duty for multiple formats (microform with digitized format linked / or print with link to e-book/ etc)
2. The language itself presupposes ‘othering’ of electronic resources (mostly due to habit and change itself while being in the middle of it)

I began using the standard $z text ‘Connect to electronic resource’ quite a while ago. But in the Legal Information Archive, the language had accrued over many years and signified that shifting mindset with electronic resources and the collection itself. It became standard procedure (in fact, it was in the procedures) to use ‘$z Connect to electronic version in Legal Information Archive.’

This language denotes the collection—but still has the word ‘version’ in it. This is strange since the entire collection is born digital materials and was specifically envisioned as a preservation collection of items that fit the mission statement. There were no non-born-digital materials in the collection. Even if physical material such as microform had also been published as a PDF or website, the collection itself was ONLY a digital preservation machine—thus my same objection above holds.

We started changing the ‘standard’ $z text to ‘Connect to electronic resource’ for other e-resources.

Officially, for everything in this collection, we have changed this text again (which has now been changed for every item in the collection by running a job on the collection of electronic resources) to ‘$z Connect to resource in Legal Information Archive.’

We have shed ‘electronic’ and ‘version’ in the language.

I have to say... I am still using the language ‘Connect to electronic resource’ for everything else. Some habits die hard! Eventually, all our language and habits of cataloging/metadata need to conform to the infrastructure of the networked environments in which we work, search, and retrieve the materials we wish to use.

Want to talk about the minutiae of display text? Reach out: jal360@georgetown.edu
Metadata guidelines case study: best practices for handling MARC to MODS mapping for a digital repository

Jake Kubrin
Stanford University

Introduction

Metadata for digital repositories cannot exist in a single silo or schema. The ability to map metadata schemas enhances discoverability of resources and value of these collections. However, transforming schemas can be challenging. It may be difficult to ensure the quality of metadata and also guarantee interoperability. With poorly developed workflows and no quality assurance mechanisms for metadata mapped from one schema to another, users will not find, identify, select, or obtain resources in digital repository, despite an institution’s investment and best intentions. This case study presents the best practices for maintaining the quality of metadata mapped from MARC to Metadata Object Description Schema (MODS) for a digital repository.

The digital repository looked at in this paper currently includes the oral history collection titled, “Women trailblazers in the law.”1 This collection contains about 100 oral histories of women pioneers in the legal profession. Oral history subjects provided a mix of cassette tapes, DVDs, photographs, and textual resources. MARC records were created after the materials were digitized and then mapped to MODS. A third party provided a discovery layer capable of replaying the digitized resources after the metadata was transformed.

Due to the diversification of schemas required by digital repositories today, evaluating best practices to maintain metadata quality when mapping from one schema to another is salient. Although this paper specifically deals with the mapping of metadata from MARC to MODS, strategies to ensure the accuracy, completeness, and consistency of metadata have emerged while participating in digital oral history projects for Stanford Law Library that can be applied to similar projects mapping metadata.

Literature review

When considering best practices for metadata quality for digital repositories that has been mapped from MARC to MODS, a review of the literature presents three distinct themes.

First, a number of articles have looked at strategic workflows and staffing necessary for describing resources and ensuring metadata quality in a digital repository. A 2010 survey of institutions managing digital repositories found that text, audiovisual materials, electronic resources, and digitized resources were the most common types of resources handled.2 The varied formats of resources demands that a discovery layer is capable of displaying and playing back these different digital objects, meaning metadata may have to be massaged or transformed in order to meet the requirements of this discovery layer. The 2010 survey then notes that traditional catalogers shouldered the majority of responsibility for creating metadata and performing metadata quality control in digital repositories, which makes sense given that this is their expertise.3 However, metadata quality could be best addressed with input from electronic resource libraries, digital project managers, and systems librarians. Since users expect to interact directly with the discovery layer in order to play back oral history audio, this additional expertise is highly valuable. As a matter of fact, Stovold notes that software issues, similar to those involving a new discovery layer, could be overcome if more staff, especially systems librarians, electronic resource librarians, and digital project managers, are collaborating on the project.4

The second theme from a literature review was a survey of metadata quality measurement methods and criteria. As a digital repository grows, it may be difficult to scale up metadata creation and quality control workflows. A solution sought out has been the use of algorithms and other automated mechanisms for quality control. These automated methods are great ways to get a snapshot of metadata quality and helpful in visualizing quality.5 On the other hand, these systems may be difficult or costly to implement and may still need further revision by librarians after reports are produced, in order to add more value.6 Metadata quality for digital repositories is also measured through the use of focus groups, assessment from experts, and peer review. This has been realized through formal training programs such as the Metadata Quality Assurance Program.7 Park also suggests inviting the document authors to be involved in the metadata creation and quality control.8 Given concerns about lack of controlled vocabulary, this is not a regularly seen practice. Yet, despite the various ways that have been sought to address metadata quality, Park found that nearly 84% of metadata quality control is still done by manual review.9 While manual review is not feasible for significantly large digital repositories, the survey shows that there are limited options, given that traditional catalogers are often working alone creating the metadata and performing quality control.
Criteria to define quality metadata has also been examined extensively. Park and Tosaka set out three distinct qualities for good metadata. The first category is accuracy, characterized by the correct representation of metadata, such as the absence of spelling and typographical errors. The second category is completeness. Park and Tosaka define it as “individual objects are described using all metadata elements that are relevant to their full access capacity in digital repositories.” Put another way, completeness is a full-level description that ensures users can find, identify, select, and obtain the resource from all access points. Finally, Park and Tosaka define consistency as the last element of metadata quality. Consistency is characterized by having the “same data values or elements...representing similar concepts in resource description.” Consistency quality concerns can be addressed with automated metadata generation as Park suggests in another study.

A final theme found in the literature review worth noting was the use of MODS and MARC for other digital repositories. Park and Tosaka found that MARC still represent the largest majority of metadata creation for digital collections, with MODS only accounting for 17.8% of metadata schema used. Given that traditional catalogers are mainly responsible for the metadata creation and quality control aspects, the consistent use of MARC records in digital collections aligns well with this group’s traditional expertise with that schema.

Despite some challenges incurred with the workflow involving two schemas, there are many advantages to a MODS environment. Created in 2002, MODS was developed with the goal of increasing the range of bibliographic metadata beyond MARC and also provide a novel way of describing digital objects. MODS has been able to successfully extend bibliographic metadata in a number of ways. One of the most pertinent ways has been MODS’ accommodation of Linked Data environments. It provides a means to attach uniform resource identifiers (URIs) to elements, which act as an anchor to related resources.

**Project description**

Beginning in 2005, the American Bar Association (ABA) began conducting a series of oral history interviews of important women lawyers, judges, and other leading American legal professionals. These oral histories cover unique and meaningful perspectives on gender inequality in the legal field. These resources offer powerful anecdotes for students and researchers interested in gender equality. In 2016, Robert Crown Law Library at Stanford Law School agreed to host, digitize, and make the oral histories available to the general public. Law library staff sought out a third party, Stanford Digital Repository (SDR), in order to facilitate access to the collection.

SDR backend software, called Argo, is capable of loading a MODS .csv file directly or ingesting a MARC record. The metadata is then mapped behind the scenes using Library of Congress’ MARC to MODS tool. Given staff’s expertise with MARC and MARC’s granularity, this standard was chosen by the library staff instead of only creating MODS records. Granularity was especially important given the variety of resource types associated with each oral history.

Ensuring that each of these resources was described accurately, consistently, and completely was a high priority for the team working on this digital collection. In fact, there were regular discussions about metadata creation and workflow reviews with other members of the team, including the library’s digital projects and continuing resources librarian, library technology specialist, and reference librarians. In consultation with cataloging colleagues from Stanford and abroad, local guidelines and MARC templates were created based on the types of resources included in each record. For instance, a template with the appropriate fixed fields and 3XX MARC fields for records with just audio and textual resources, audio and video resources, etc.

At this point, a workflow for developing and ingesting the approximately 100 oral history subject MARC records into Argo was developed. A MARC template expedited this otherwise time intensive step of the project. In order to fulfill the library’s agreement with the ABA to make these oral histories accessible to the general public, MARC records were created in OCLC’s union catalog. In addition, creating MARC records in OCLC’s Connexion allowed library staff to conveniently manage and deploy templates. As NACO members, the library also used this opportunity to create name authority records for oral history subjects or interviewers. At this stage, the full MARC records were brought into the library’s integrated library system and received a unique system identifier. These catalog keys were then submitted to the Argo system and the MARC record was mapped to MODS in order for the metadata and content to be displayed in SDR’s discovery layer.

The final step of the project was manual review of the records in SDR’s discovery layer by members of the oral history team. Although time intensive, this was a crucial step of the project. It provided the team a chance to double check the digitized audio, video, and textual resources and make sure they were accessible as expected. More importantly, it provided the team a chance to not only see how metadata was displayed, but also ensure that there was an accurate description. Given the many number of times content was either added or removed from the oral histories, participation of all team members allowed them to catch the greatest number of inaccurate descriptions.
Discussion of manual review

Manual review of the oral history highlighted three significant areas. First, the team found that the 300 MARC field did not properly display. As suggested by cataloging colleagues, resources with multiple resource formats used repeating 300 fields. However, after being mapped to MODS, all physical descriptions were glommed together in a single field without any spaces in SDR’s discovery layer. Given the importance of accuracy and eliminating typographical errors, the team reached out to SDR in order to correct this issue. Developers were quickly able to rectify.

A second problem highlighted by the team during its manual review was the poor display of alternative titles from the 246 MARC field in SDR’s discovery layer. Unfortunately, SDR developers were unable to implement any fixes. Despite wanting to have a complete record and providing all possible access points for users, the team was able to implement a comparable solution. The alternative titles were eliminated from local records so that it would display the full title properly in SDR’s discovery layer. Global OCLC records retained the alternative title for complete metadata.

Finally, the type of resource (fixed field leader 06 in the MARC record) displayed as “monographic” for oral history records in SDR’s discovery layer. Despite accurate terminology and mapping, the team found this to be potentially problematic for users. Given the value of the oral histories since they contain multiple types of resources, the term “monographic” might be interpreted by users to expect to find textual resources. Again, SDR developers were unable to determine any short-term fixes but underlined the consistency provided by the MARC to MODS mapping tool.

Conclusions

The oral history team took a lot of strides to ensure that the standards for high quality metadata were maintained. Taking a look at the issues examined during the manual review highlight some important strategies and priorities to consider when implementing metadata quality review guidelines. As mentioned above, the three standards defined for this project were accuracy, completeness, and consistency. However, there was not a way to accomplish all three standards as fully as possible due to external constraints, such as being unable to develop SDR’s discovery layer ourselves.

First, a high degree of accuracy can be obtained with collaboration. The biggest contributing factor to the project’s success was the team’s collaboration. By having all members participate in manual review, the team was able to efficiently catch and correct the display issues in the physical description field. Open communication with SDR developers enhanced the team’s work and allowed them to correct these typographical errors. This case study shows that accuracy can be achieved when reaching beyond the traditional catalogers usually responsible for metadata creation and review for digital projects. Folding in a diverse team with a collaborative culture ensures that accuracy is achieved.

The second component of quality metadata outlined above is completeness. As mentioned in the discussion of the manual review, a significant issue found was the display of the alternative title in SDR’s discovery layer. While a complete record is defined as having all fields and values present to enable the highest degree of access, the team looked for flexible and creative solutions after developers were unable to provide a fix. Eliminating the alternative titles from the metadata source of SDR’s discovery layer allowed us to provide a workable solution. This was mitigated by retaining the alternative title in OCLC’s master record so that global users may have this access point. Flexible and creative solutions are key to developing metadata guidelines that allow a digital project to be as successful as possible within each institution’s circumstances and environment.

Finally, consistency can be obtained by relying on what is the traditional expertise of catalogers. The use of controlled vocabularies, creating new name authority records, and applying metadata templates in the development of MARC records was an important aspect of achieving consistent records. Incorporating these workflows into the metadata creation process will allow users to better access these resources.

As digital repositories continue to have a higher importance in library’s collections, there is an increasing need to find helpful workflows, guidelines, and strategies that allow institutions to create quality metadata. Despite the added challenges associated with having to map metadata schemas, fostering a collaborative culture, finding flexible solutions, and maintaining other best cataloging practices allows digital projects to be successful.
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Find the tool here at http://www.loc.gov/standards/mods/v3/mods2marc-mapping-3-5.html


Creating a MARC record, also allowed us to retain a record in the ILS since bibliographic records can only be stored as MARC.
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Understanding Software

End of Life

Wilhelmina Randtke
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What is end of life?

While end of life sounds final and certain, it’s actually often a phased process, and even concrete dates are dates after which something can happen rather than dates on which something happens with certainty. This article will try and give a feel for end of life so that you can plan around it when an end of life date is announced for software you are using.

Wikipedia gives the following definition for end of life:

“End-of-life” (EOL) is a term used with respect to a product supplied to customers, indicating that the product is in the end of its useful life (from the vendor’s point of view), and a vendor stops marketing, selling, or rework sustaining it. (The vendor may simply intend to limit or end support for the product.)


The key point in this definition is that the software doesn’t magically disappear. Instead, the software doesn’t get updates, and changes in the world around the software eventually make it difficult to run, cause security issues such that running the software is a bad idea, or bring the world to a point where the output of the software is no longer useful.

Cloud hosted software.

Cloud hosted software includes tools like Google Drive, Adobe Creative Cloud, or MS Office 365. These run on a server held by someone other than you. You don’t and can’t own the computer that the code runs on.

For these, if the vendor takes down the server and eliminates your access, then that’s a concrete cut off unless the host gives an extension. The best you can hope for is some kind of export tool that gives you your information in a format you can use. For these services, an end date really is the end in a very concrete way.

Because fast internet connections make it possible, easy, and convenient to run software in the cloud, this is a huge issue that’s only going to get bigger. The ArchiveTeam, which is distributed web scraping (you can download Virtual Box then run their scripts to try and capture significant sites scheduled for demise), maintains a Deathwatch list of once popular sites
with user generated content which are now gone: https://www.archiveteam.org/index.php?title=Deathwatch. While that’s more focused on sites with a public presence and user generated content, software obsolescence and hosted software is a growing issue. Recently, Adobe announced that using older versions of software to access Creative Cloud is not allowed under the license. Under Creative Cloud, users pay a monthly fee to run software, which runs partially on desktop and partially in the cloud (it authenticates on an ongoing basis to make sure that the subscription is current). See Vice, Adobe Tells Users They Can Get Sued for Using Old Versions of Photoshop (May 14, 2019), available at https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/a3xk3p/adobe-tells-users-they-can-get-sued-for-using-old-versions-of-photoshop. The key point is that features or a whole platform can be removed on short notice, and there’s no stopping it.

**Desktop software.**

In general, desktop software should work as long as you have a computer that can run it. So, if you buy something fully run on your machine, for example, a license for MS Word that you install and run locally, then as long as you keep the files to install from and the license code and you have access to a computer that can run the software, you should be fine.

Maintaining a computer that can run the software may be trickier with increasing connectedness. There’s the physical hardware. In general, if you buy a computer and it plugs into a standard electrical outlet, then really all you need is the electrical outlet, and until the computer breaks, you are good to go.

But, it’s also very rare for a modern computer not to be connected to the internet. So, your desktop computer is interacting with other computers around the world, and that’s a built-in background thing that it does. Your computer also may pull updates, as when you go to restart and get a message about “Installing Windows Updates” and wait while your computer installs files it downloaded in the background.

Any desktop software is going to have a whole ecosystem it runs in, which is the operating system, and a modern operating system likely is grabbing some kinds of updates by itself without you actively doing anything. The issue here is that the operating system can become end of life. Windows XP was phased out by Microsoft in 2014 with end of support. Microsoft clarifies that this means no security updates or tech support and warns, “Security updates patch vulnerabilities that may be exploited by malware and help keep users and their data safer. PCs running Windows XP after April 8, 2014 are not considered secure.” Microsoft, Support for Windows XP ended, available at https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/windowsforbusiness/end-of-xp-support (last visited May 21, 2019). You can run Windows XP, then you can run software in Windows XP. But you don’t get background updates to protect against newer viruses, so if the computer you are using is internet connected, you are in a precarious position. End of support isn’t any kind of cut off, but it’s also the first day of a new level of risk. (And because of that, if you are using the software for work, it may be the case that your organization’s IT comes and shuts your computer down.)

This is extremely frustrating regarding software drivers for expensive machinery (for example, a microfilm scanner which is expensive, not heavily used, but allows access to materials that are even more expensive to rent electronically). When equipment is older, it’s common for software drivers to no longer be released for newer operating systems. This doesn’t immediately render the equipment unusable, but eventually, the equipment will be rendered unusable through software, not mechanical failure, due to circumstances surrounding an end to security updates for the operating system required to run that software and the fact that computers today are assumed to be internet connected.

**Server based software.**

Open source software is software where the source code is available to you. Generally, this is through an open license which allows anyone to run the software, but it also can be where when you purchase, you get a single copy of the source code licensed specifically to you or specifically for a certain use (i.e. licensed for a specific URL that you own). You download and own your copy of code. You can run it on someone else’s machine or your machine.

A significant example of server based software licensed for single use is CONTENTdm. A few years ago, OCLC provided two ways to run the CONTENTdm software: hosted through OCLC and running on OCLC’s servers for a subscription fee or licensed for running on a server within the organization purchasing the license. In killing off the in-house hosting model, OCLC stopped providing software updates.

This is very similar to desktop software, but run on a web server. Significant examples are WordPress and Drupal, which are licensed for open use.

If you are confronted with an end of life announcement for software you use, it may be written for someone with a different technical background or a wider/narrower focus relative to that software. An end of life announcement for Drupal 7 is posted
Drupal.org, Drupal 7 will reach end-of-life in November of 2021 - PSA-2019-02-25 (Feb. 25, 2019). It’s pretty standard for a software community announcement. It’s clearly written, but not easy to read for a regular person who is using the software as opposed to involved in open source development. Drupal has a critical mass of highly technical people implementing Drupal at their organizations but not already engaged in the conversations leading up to the end of life announcement. It’s written in a more technical way to give them the details. I am active with the Islandora digital library software community. Islandora 7, the dominant version of Islandora among the user community, uses Drupal 7 as a front end. In trying to communicate an end of life timeframe, the foundation coordinating releases and community tried to make clear the significant dates: dates on which “No new features will be added,” “No new bug fixes will be made,” and “No new security fixes will be made.” Islandora Foundation, Islandora 7 and 8: Version Support Timeline (Feb. 11, 2019), available at https://www.islandora.ca/content/islandora-7-and-8-version-support-timeline. This is an end of life announcement written specifically for non-technical users. Neither approach is better, but each is definitely geared toward a specific user community.

The really key thing to focus on in an end of life announcement is the timeframe in which security updates will be ended. That’s true for the high level view, where you can stop there, and for a more technical view, where you can go into details later.

Here’s why the date on which security updates will be ended matters. With no security updates, it may be the case that a vulnerability is discovered in part of the software, no patch is available, and so an organization hosting in house would have to either code a patch (potentially lots of staff time and not necessarily a possibility since you need staff with a specific skillset) or limit access to the software (for example, by limiting a website to visitors coming from a known IP range coming from within the organization). It’s common for the information technology (IT) divisions within large organizations to periodically scan web presences for security vulnerabilities, and if there’s a security issue that can’t be resolved, then that site will get shuttered. There is also security on the server that the software runs on. Wordpress, Drupal, and CONTENTdm all run on web servers. Over time, the background server architecture will have to be updated, at a minimum to address security issues. Common web server architectures, notably LAMP (Linux Apache MySQL PHP), are not backwards compatible. Code that runs on an older server architecture will not necessarily run in the newer architecture, and this means that eventually a necessary server update will make it to where the software cannot safely be run on a server that’s open to the web at large. Regarding server architecture, the key thing is that it can force a change to code, which won’t be coming once updates aren’t available, but updates to server architecture aren’t going to give you more time.
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Diving into the U.S. News’ New Scholarly Impact Ranking
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This past February, Robert Morse, chief data strategist at U.S. News, announced they were expanding their Best Law Schools data collection through a new scholarly impact ranking (Morse 2019a). The ranking measures faculty productivity and impact based on “a number of accepted indicators” and “other bibliometric measures” (Morse 2019a). The underlying data is HeinOnline’s Law Journal Library and Hein’s proprietary citation analysis tool, ScholarCheck. The new ranking will be published sometime in 2019, separately from their well-known Best Law Schools rankings. Since the announcement of the new ranking, both U.S. News and HeinOnline have responded to comments and concerns from the law school community (Morse 2019b) (Mattiuzzo 2019). What I hope to accomplish is to summarize the conversations that have taken place thus far and highlight some of the issues that I think would be of interest to the technical services community.

Methodology

The basis of the ranking’s methodology rests in three “phases.” Author information will be collected by law schools and submitted to Hein to be compiled in HeinOnline’s Author Profiles. Hein will cross-reference the data in their Author Profiles with the Law Journal Library database to compile citation metrics. Finally, the citation metrics will be provided to U.S. News for a final analysis to produce the official ranking.

As early as Summer 2018, law schools were asked to submit a spreadsheet with faculty information including: last name, first name, title, known name variations, e-mail address, birth year, affiliation, and an institutional website url. Only tenure and tenure-track faculty/librarians were included. These names/name variants are currently being recorded in Hein’s Author Profiles and associated in Hein’s name index. The next steps as summarized on the TaxProf Blog are: the names in the Author
Profiles will be cross-referenced using ScholarCheck to citations and publications that were published in HeinOnline over the past five years; using this data, Hein will compile indicators for each law school such as mean citations per faculty member, median citations per faculty member, and total number of publications (Caron 2019). HeinOnline lists that ScholarCheck also records the following statistics: “the number of times an article has been cited by other articles and cases, the number of times an article has been accessed by other HeinOnline users within a rolling 12-month period, the number of times an article has been cited by articles written in the past 10 years, and the number of times an author’s articles have been cited by articles written within the past 12-24 months” (Mattiuzzo 2018). It is unclear which or how many of those measures will be provided to U.S. News, who is responsible for creating the comprehensive scholarly impact ranking. Hein stated that they are not involved in the methodology used by U.S. News in analyzing the citation metrics, and they are not being compensated for their work on this project. (Mattiuzzo 2019).

**Issues and Concerns**

Notably, librarians have vocalized concerns about the methodology and identified critical problems with Hein’s datasets. While an alternative discussion could rightfully be had about the necessity and usefulness of this ranking (or its potential negative unintended consequences), I don’t foresee it going away, so instead, I will try to highlight two important issues that have been raised thus far:

**Lack of authority control and metadata quality issues**

Of primary concern to technical services librarians is an issue that many have reported regarding a lack of proper authority control and metadata errors with the Author Profiles and article citations. There are inconsistencies with how names are recorded, errors with name variants (maiden names, former married names, nicknames, etc.), and typos. Citation problems include instances where authors were not attributed to an article, OCR errors resulting in misspellings, and improper Bluebooking. These metadata errors cause problems when cross-referencing those citations to the correct Author Profile. Users can edit Author Profile pages that have already been enhanced and can email Hein directly to correct errors. However, perhaps a better solution to reduce these errors would be to use an existing authority file or name ID system such as ORCiD (https://orcid.org/). In a cursory review of HeinOnline’s author profiles, they do include ORCiD IDs for certain authors, but it is unclear if this information is added systematically. It is also unclear if HeinOnline’s author index is tied in any way to ORCiD, which might help to resolve the problem of claiming and updating author metadata. In my estimation, the cornerstone of the scholarly impact ranking is the ability to accurately identify authors, and it remains a mystery as to why Hein is attempting to reinvent the name authority wheel instead of leveraging identity data and name management systems that already exist.

**Incomplete data and poor indexing**

In a discussion thread through AALL MyCommunities, librarians have also observed that Hein’s Law Journal Library is incomplete, noting that works such as interdisciplinary articles, books, book chapters, working papers, briefs, and more are missing (Law Repositories Caucus Discussion Forum 2019). Also missing are “gray areas” of scholarship, which some might argue include opinion pieces, blog posts, or even audio/visual materials. HeinOnline’s Law Journal Library alone does not adequately represent the depth or breadth of faculty scholarship. As a result, faculty who work across disciplines or in other mediums may see a lower citation count than those whose scholarship more closely aligns with the Law Journal Library’s coverage. In a different thread through AALL MyCommunities, Bonnie Shucha, Associate Dean of Library & Information Services & Director of the Law Library at the University of Wisconsin, reported that, through her analysis, only about 35% of their faculty’s scholarship was represented in the Law Journal Library (Academic Law Libraries SIS Discussion Forum 2019).

The ability for Hein to properly index its own citations in the Law Journal Library is also concerning, especially when compared with other repositories such as Westlaw and Google Scholar. In one preliminary analysis, John Beatty, Faculty Scholarship Outreach Librarian at The University at Buffalo State University of New York, tested how reliably Westlaw, Google Scholar, and HeinOnline picked up their own citations using a small sample of ten authors’ law review citations. Out of 3,545 combined citations, Westlaw returned 87%, Google Scholar 75%, and HeinOnline just 64% (Academic Law Libraries SIS Discussion Forum 2019). These reports are obviously small samples and are not exhaustive, but they illustrate the issue that drawing conclusions from incomplete data and poor indexing is intrinsically going to produce flawed results.

**Moving Forward**

In mid-April 2019, Bonnie Shucha and others engaged with Hein in a phone call with Shannon Hein and Shane Marmion on the topic of the new ranking. With her and Hein’s permission, she agreed to share some highlights from her conversation:

“Hein was approached last summer by U.S. News and a group of law school deans and faculty seeking data to conduct a scholarly impact ranking. This group had examined several datasets, including other legal databases and Google Scholar, and
believed that HeinOnline’s data was best suited for the task. Realizing that this group could compile the data by searching HeinOnline with or without their help, Hein agreed to help facilitate the process. They believed that their participation would improve the accuracy of the data…They acknowledged that there were issues with the data - both errors in the data and, more fundamentally, lack of content…[and] are working to develop tools to better index the content. They are also working on expanding the content of what’s being indexed, both through licensing additional content and by reaching out to other publishers (Google Scholar was mentioned) to bring in metadata for content available outside of Hein. Hein stated that they won’t share the data with U.S. News until they and the law schools are satisfied with it. They plan to share the results with representatives from each school, including librarians, before sending to U.S. News. They didn’t know when this would be and are not subject to any deadline from U.S. News” (Academic Law Libraries SIS Discussion Forum 2019).

Additionally, U.S. News responded to concerns in an open letter dated May 2, 2019: “Although we will perform the analysis on an individual faculty member level, our rankings will be done at the law school level based on the aggregate results of the school’s faculty. This will allow for a more even comparison across schools” (Morse 2019b). In the same open letter, they acknowledge that neither the methodology nor the metrics for the proposed new rankings have been finalized. The TaxProf Blog reports that U.S. News, “will produce a detailed methodology at the time of publication on how the rankings were calculated, how the faculty scholarly impact indicators were calculated and weighted, a description of the legal periodicals and publications used in the analysis, and other pertinent details about how the rankings were developed” (Caron 2019).

My hope is that technical services librarians will engage with Hein on this issue and lend their expertise, especially concerning authority control and metadata quality. For those who are attending the upcoming AALL Annual Meeting in Washington D.C., there will be a program on this topic on Monday, July 15th at 11am titled, “Hot Topic: New Metrics for Measuring Scholarly Impact: Law Librarians, HeinOnline, and U.S. News & World Report” and will include speakers Shane Marmion, Shannon Hein, Robert Morse, Lisa Davis (Interim Director at FIU College of Law), and Bonnie Shucha (Library Director at the University of Wisconsin Law School).
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Most of us in the Northern Hemisphere really look forward to this time of year—warmer temperatures, blooming flowers, vacation planning—what’s not to like? Well, for those of us whose fiscal year closes June 30, this wonderful time of the year is marred by something that 25% of us dread more than anything else in our work lives: performance evaluations.¹

Not only can performance evaluations be emotionally draining, they are extremely time consuming. In their informative and genuinely entertaining book, Thanks for the Feedback, Harvard Law lecturers and business consultants Douglas Stone and Shelia Heen estimate that, across the globe annually, we devote 825 million work hours (94,000 years!) preparing for and engaging in performance evaluations.²

Central to performance evaluation drama is almost universal aversion to receiving feedback. We absolutely dread giving it because we know everyone absolutely dreads receiving it. And, even though supervisors traditionally give the feedback in evaluations, direct reports very often respond with their own:

Supervisor: Next year, can you manage the student workers’ schedules so we have more evening coverage?
Employee: Next year, can you manage the departmental budget so I can hire an adequate number of student workers?

…and off the rails it goes!

How can we better handle feedback? First, Stone and Heen remind us that receiving feedback well isn’t the same as accepting the feedback as true. Receiving feedback well just means:

• engaging in the feedback conversation skillfully
• making thoughtful choices about whether and how to use what you’re hearing
• managing emotions so you can actually understand what the other person is saying and
• being open to seeing yourself from a fresh perspective.³

The authors of Crucial Accountability believe that establishing a sense of safety sets the stage for important conversations, because when people feel unsafe, they can’t talk about anything, much less about something as crucial as their work performance.⁴ Moderating your tone, word choices, and delivery, and watching for fear and worry on the face of the other person, can help you maintain the safe setting necessary for productive conversations.⁵ In thinking about creating this sense of safety and comfort, I’ve decided to hold my upcoming evaluations somewhere other than my office, because anytime problems or stressful situations come up at work, my office is usually where we meet. Perhaps holding performance evaluations in an environment with no such baggage (coffee shop? the cushy chairs in the conference room?) will keep at bay the specter of past stressful situations.

Stone and Heen believe that ‘switchtracking’ is another obstacle to hearing and understanding feedback.⁶ We switchtrack when we introduce a new topic in reaction to something the other person said (see the student worker example above). This new topic could actually be more important than the original topic, or it could be just a deflection. When visited by the ghosts of performance evaluations past, I see that, many times, the conversations devolved because of exactly this issue—I didn’t graciously handle the introduction of a new topic. Next time this happens, I’ll try to say something like: “Okay, I see we’ve got another topic here. Let’s make sure we cover both. Which one would you like to cover first?”

The personality of the feedback recipient is also a factor. Stone and Heen highlight the importance of these aspects of our temperament:

• happiness baseline/set-point: our general level of happiness, based on genetics and conditioning
• swing: how far off our set-point we’re thrown by good or bad news
• sustain/recovery: how long we enjoy happy news or dwell on bad news.⁷

Thinking about these tendencies can help us control our initial feedback reactions. For instance, I know that even though I am lucky to have a high happiness set-point, I can quickly spiral downward when receiving negative feedback. In feedback situations going forward, I will try to be more mindful of this tendency and not overreact in the moment. In the past, I know
I’ve missed helpful advice because in my head I was hearing “You failure! You. Are The. Worst. Employee. Ever.” instead of the specific feedback that was being offered.

Author and business consultant Peter Bregman encourages us to frame negative feedback as an “irreplaceably valuable gift” and even offer our thanks to the feedback giver. He believes our ego blocks important learning as it tries to protect us from this terrible threat (aka constructive criticism), and he has put together a helpful list of our common feedback defenses which include:

- Play victim: “Yes, that’s true, but it’s not my fault.”
- Take pride: “Yes, that’s true, but it’s a good thing.”
- Minimize: “It’s really not such a big deal.”
- Counter: “There are lots of examples of me acting differently.”
- Attack: “I may have done this (awful thing), but you did this (other awful thing).”
- Deflect: “That’s not the real issue.”

Because our brain has gone off on the defensive, Bregman recommends defaulting to this simple response: “I really appreciate you taking the time and effort to tell me. Thank you.” This response doesn’t mean, of course, that you accept the feedback as true, but instead creates space for you to sit with the feedback and consider if there is any truth there (even if it is 90% wrong, what if the other 10% could be useful advice?) To naturally create this space, something I will try this year is to give written evaluations to my team at least a week before the formal discussions—giving them the time to work through the many emotions that go along with receiving evaluative feedback.

Even with employing all these tips, I can’t imagine I’ll ever really like giving (or receiving) performance evaluations—but at least I can dwell on them less and enjoy this otherwise amazing time of year!
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discussion when it did arise. Broadly, some of the topics covered were managerial leadership, engaging staff, developing effective interpersonal relationships, and organizational culture.

By far, the best aspect of the Management Institute was getting to know my fellow attendees. While there were some focused on INTENSE networking, most were happy to just chitchat. I did try to get some boots on the ground, inside scoop from my fellow attendees who worked for universities caught up in college admissions scandal. Sadly, no one had any tea to spill on Aunt Becky.

As anyone who has attended any professional development in any field knows, it cannot be done without writing on a giant piece of paper with a marker. While there were giant pieces of paper and markers (as is legally mandated), there were also many chances to get in small groups to talk through actual work-related issues we were having. Some people were a little too intense with their constant reminder of the “circle of trust” and the need for discretion. Imagine Robert De Niro in *Meet the Parents*, only more intense.

Another quirk of the Institute was the group hysteria that developed around the room’s single microphone. Even those with booming carnival barker level voices had to have the microphone in hand before they uttered a single word. By the third day, it was hard not to laugh at the over-the-top group enforcement of this rule.

The discussion around equity, diversity, and inclusion was the only time the official program felt superficial. Many participants had insightful personal anecdotes, but the Institute’s agenda and selected readings were lacking. Leading a meaningful discussion around equity, diversity, and inclusion takes a very specific set of skills and appropriate vocabulary. There is real potential for the development of this section of the Institute, though additional facilitators will be needed.

I look forward to meeting up with my fellow attendees at AALL’s Annual Meeting and Conference in D.C. this July. Thank you again to the TS-SIS Awards Committee for selecting me to receive the Management Institute grant.

---

**Announcements from OCLC**

**Gypsy Moody**

*Belmont University*

**End of Support for ILLiad version 8.7**

ILLiad version 8.7 will not work with OCLC as of December 31, 2019. You must upgrade to ILLiad version 9.0 (or later version) by December 30, 2019 so you do not lose access to OCLC interlibrary loan.


**EZproxy 6.5 available**

A new release of EZproxy took place on 21 February 2019.

This release contains an important feature that incorporates a real-time call out to a security API that validates the IP address of the requester and logs/denies access if the IP address is a known pirate/hacker. This greatly reduces the time-consuming and manual process of scanning log files for hacked credentials. The API calls out to a blocklist created by IP-intrusion.org and validated via theIPregistry.org, giving libraries the power to ensure that their verified IP addresses are never included on the list. TheIPregistry.org is a repository that contains over 1.5 billion verified IP addresses from 60,000 content licensing organizations worldwide. Both IP-intrusion.org and theIPregistry.org are maintained by PSI Ltd. PSI is an independent third-party organization which enables libraries, publishers, and membership societies to work together securely and confidentially towards the common goals of facilitating legitimate access to scholarly content, eradicating IP misuse, eliminating subscription abuse, and combating cybercrime.

Please see the release notes at [https://help.oclc.org/Library_Management/EZproxy/EZproxy_release_notes_and_known_issues/2019_release_notes/EZproxy_v6_5_release_notes](https://help.oclc.org/Library_Management/EZproxy/EZproxy_release_notes_and_known_issues/2019_release_notes/EZproxy_v6_5_release_notes) for more information and instructions for how to enable this new feature.
For those who don’t know about this little secret, I’m going to give you a gift today. It is a simple secret, but it has vast benefits which can take you far into the future and enhance both your success and your enjoyment of the Archivist’s profession and the field of Preservation.

It is a Google search; or more accurately, a search engine input. I simply prefer Google, as it gave me the most positive and relevant results for what I was looking for. What is the search? It’s in the title above, simply: “A Day in the Life of an Archivist.”

What will you find? There are literally pages and pages of resources, from videos to blogs to short staff features, detailing what it is like to be an Archivist. What do Archivists do? What do they share in common, and what is unique about each Archive and institution? Here you will find all the answers, although admittedly, there don’t seem to be a lot of law schools represented here.

Scroll down the list. You might start your travels in the far northwest—Alaska, in fact! One of my favorite reads details a Day in the Life of an Archivist at the UAA/APU Consortium Archives (University of Alaska at Anchorage/Alaska Pacific University). The Archivist records her daily activities hour by hour, but it is not a dry read. Her accounts of the items she processes and the collections she maintains (as well as the people she meets with during the day) give the reader a real flavor of the region and its unique culture. She includes photos and documents in the article to add to the general interest (the Lelon Alexander photographs are particularly fascinating). On top of this, we gain great tips on using the Archivist’s Toolkit, making decisions for arranging and processing collections, alternate methods of digital preservation featuring transferring digital material to Alaska’s Digital Archives, and many other helpful nuggets (https://archives.consortiumlibrary.org/2016/10/07/a-day-in-the-life-of-an-archivist/). In short, this one “Day in the Life” is a gold mine. But it is only the beginning.

If you want an engaging and humorous account of an “Archive Start-Up,” read Edna Fugate’s post “A Day in the Life of an Archivist” at Appalachian History: Stories, Quotes and Anecdotes (http://www.appalachianhistory.net/2014/10/day-life-archivist.html). Besides being an insightful piece about the Archival profession and what we do, it is an invaluable (though informal) guide to setting up a new Archives and sifting through a large amount of unorganized material. I also learned here that I am part of a small but growing branch of Archivists called Lone Arrangers! Putting aside the obvious pop-culture reference, it is a title given to those Archivists toiling in solitary anonymity at smaller institutions who have only themselves to rely on for guidance and doing the work. It is a title I wear proudly.

Then there is Andy Uhrich, Film Archivist at Indiana University (https://sice.indiana.edu/news/story.html?story~day-life-andy-uhrich-film-archivist). His love of film and the entertainment industry pops off the page (or the screen), and the article is just as entertaining. One begins to understand the connection between the archival collections we hold and our understanding (and re-understanding) of history. Especially interesting is the embedded commercial for Zephyr Gasoline! Check it out.

For an international flair, I enjoyed Gary Brannan’s post from The National Archives in the UK. His Day in the Life is a literary work in itself and quite funny (https://blog.nationalarchives.gov.uk/day-life-local-authority-archivist/?fbclid=IwAR3URO0c0AtxzLQFAxN1ZBb1w0uR5jZsxxsBSaZrPU_HMSmXemM4Vky_KHl).


Self-hosted libraries can go to the Update and Install EZproxy page at https://help.oclc.org/Library_Management/EZproxy/Install_and_update_EZproxy for Windows and Linux software. OCLC will reach out to hosted libraries about update scheduling.
The list goes on and on. These are my favorites, but see what interests you the most. You will no doubt have your own. And you will learn, learn more about the Archival profession and the art of Preservation than you ever dreamed. Not only that—you will feel energized, plugged-in, and most of all, CONNECTED! You will understand that we are not alone but instead are part of an ancient and noble profession rich in knowledge, camaraderie, individual expertise, and even humor! Just be warned; the results from A Day in the Life of an Archivist are long.

I consider these search results to be valuable resources for all Archivists, but they can be especially valuable for newer Archivists. Whether you want to expand your knowledge and your horizons at your current position or you are looking to make a change and move up in your career path, A Day in the Life will be invaluable to you. Most fledgling Archivists, especially those who call themselves Lone Arrangers like myself, are unsure of what they DON’T know and where the knowledge gaps are. If you put yourself in this category, and even many experienced Archivists do, you’ve come to the right place. These are the right resources to find out if there are other things you should be doing. How do the top accomplished Archivists spend their day? What are their workflows and to-do’s? What are the ways Archivists advocate and relate to the public? How does all this compare to what you do during your workday? Your way and your workflow will be your own, but these accounts and exposés will help fill in the missing pieces in caring for, nurturing, and promoting your Archives.

It can be a career-changing and even life-changing experience perusing these links. It will give us “Preservationists” an injection of vitality and an overview into the sheer breadth of our profession. You begin to realize just how broad our knowledge can be and how many hats we may wear during the course of a given day. We are Preservation Specialists, we are Advocates, we are Politicians, we are Historians, and a multitude of other things! Be Proud of your profession, and Happy Archiving!

---

Explanatory Writing Projects—It’s Elementary!

Molly Brownfield
University of Texas Tarlton Law Library

It’s not often that I look back to my elementary school days when contemplating writing guidance in law librarianship, but sometimes the simple logic of those early lessons is exactly what I need to get the job done. Some background before I launch into the specific memory—my technical services colleagues and I have been working on a project to update and expand our internal workflow procedures and documentation. In addition to time, collaborative review, and a mix of big picture thinking and attention to detail, this project has also required a degree of objectivity and humility to recognize that the short-handed jargon (e.g., “go to the module, enter the login, click on the saved search, change the dates, run it”) that works well enough for those of us who have done X task hundreds of times translates to nonsensical gibberish to someone looking at it for the first time.

Which brings me back to my elementary school epiphany! Going through the above-referenced process took me back to a second-grade lesson in which we were tasked with writing out instructions (in our finest cursive!) for how to make a peanut butter and jelly sandwich. Our teacher would then hilariously act out the instructions to illustrate where we left out important steps as well as the pitfalls of literal interpretation. Those of us who thought it was perfectly fine to write “put the peanut butter and jelly on the bread” and call it a day quickly got the point when our teacher placed the peanut butter and jelly jars directly on the bread slices and threw her hands up in mock confusion. It was a fun and memorable way to learn the importance of writing good instructions.

Explanatory writing is, I think, among the most challenging of writing projects. Just as it’s difficult for a 2nd grader to write thorough and specific instructions for making a PB&J, it is hard for us as law librarians to take a step back from something that might be very familiar to us and adequately break it down for an audience with little or no experience with the particular activity or task. Whether these projects are in the form of an article geared for a peer-reviewed publication and an external audience (explaining the steps of an empirical research project, for instance), or for documentation that lives on an internal wiki or intranet to instruct current and future colleagues, it is difficult and time-consuming to explain how X task was completed/how to complete X task and provide sufficient context without getting bogged down in the narrative details. But it helps to recall the PB&J example. Along with remembering to, metaphorically speaking, instruct the reader to first unscrew the jar lid and use a knife to spread the peanut butter, I try and follow the below guidelines when writing procedural documents:
A post on the TS-SIS listserv in early May 2019 inspired the following musings. The post was from Jacqueline Magagnosc, Continuations Management Librarian at Cornell University Law Library. It was about the elimination of print resources in law libraries in general. More specifically, the post was about the then active survey from the Federal Depository Library Program asking for feedback on a proposed elimination of printed annual supplements to the United States Code.

When TSLL is published online in June 2019, perhaps the results of the survey will have already been released. Nevertheless, the survey questions made me think more broadly. While the survey related to only one title, the United States Code, I thought about how it raises important issues about the elimination of print resources in law libraries in general.

For example, I found it helpful to reframe some of the survey questions more broadly to apply to many, many titles. Doing so made me more mindful of aware, access, bibliographic records, and website. As information professionals, we need to be on the frontline relating to the proliferation and ubiquity of online resources, rather than the rearguard.

1. Do you make users aware of online resources in lieu of the printed supplements or pocket parts—or even entire titles, for that matter—that your library has eliminated?
2. Do you offer assistance to users to access and use online resources?
3. Do bibliographic records in your library’s catalog provide links to individual online resources?
4. Does your library’s website (e.g. firm intranets, academic library LibGuides) provide links to individual online resources?

Today’s law libraries (including those in law schools, firms, and courthouses) can experience a variety of problems with print resources:

• They could easily be out of date by the time they are printed, received by the library, processed and shelved.
• They could be eliminated—and thus unavailable—by the publisher or vendor for a myriad of reasons.
• They could be weeded from a library’s physical collection due to budget cuts or shrinking shelf space (stemming from shrinking library square footage).
• They could be considered “too expensive” compared to actual usage, whereas decision-makers might view online titles from vendors offering a small number of “seats” as more cost effective.

What has been YOUR experience with the issue of eliminating print resources in law libraries? What do YOU think? I’d love to hear from you. Email me at rengsberg@sgrlaw.com!

Reference:
The following is a list of serials title changes:

No titles identified

The following is a list of serials cessations:

**Documentary History of the First Federal Congress of the U.S.A.**
*Ceased with:* v. 22
(OCoLC 402938)

**European Legal Book Index**
*Ceased with:* v. 25
(OCoLC 31534811)

**Journal of Contemporary Legal Issues**
*Ceased with:* v. 22 (2014-15)
(OCoLC 17198153)

**Journal of Halacha and Contemporary Society**
*Ceased with:* 2018
(OCoLC 7757050)

**Maryland Series in Contemporary Asian Studies**
*Ceased with:* 2017, no. 4
(OCoLC 44396502)

**Seton Hall Journal of Diplomacy and International Relations**
*Ceased in print with:* v. 18, no. 2
(OCoLC 875894214) Continued online at [http://blogs.shu.edu/diplomacy/current-issue/](http://blogs.shu.edu/diplomacy/current-issue/) and available on HeinOnline
(OCoLC 880308010)

**South Carolina Journal of International Law and Business**
*Ceased in print with:* v. 14, no. 2
(OCoLC 86111625) Continued online at [https://scjilb.org/](https://scjilb.org/) and available on HeinOnline
(OCoLC 429188918)

**Stanford Journal of Complex Litigation**
*Ceased with:* v. 4, no. 2 (spring 2016)
(OCoLC 809807593)

**Valparaiso University Law Review**
*Ceased with:* v. 53, no. 4 (2018-19)
(OCoLC 1586836)

**Subject Headings**

*Patrick Lavey*
*UCLA*

The heading “Illegal aliens” must be on some back burner. We might as well dive right in to the new or changed headings.

The term “Courtroom proceedings” found its way into several headings, such as “Audiotapes in courtroom proceedings,” “Closed-circuit television in courtroom proceedings,” and “Video tapes in courtroom proceedings.” As the heading is now “Court proceedings,” these other headings have been changed to reflect this. We now have “Audiotapes in court proceedings,” “Video tapes in court proceedings,” and “Closed-circuit television in court proceedings.”

The term “Tactical frivolity” is to be used in place of the more interesting “Laughtivism.” Both refer to political stunts developed to criticize candidates or governments and their agencies. The source cited notes provide definitions from several instances of this. Another recently created heading is “Independent candidates.” This one comes with a scope note that catalogers should consult. My favorite new heading is “Infotainment (Television programs).” Be sure to read its notes. Other media related headings include “Live streaming,” “Social media in sports,” and “Political art,” artwork designed for an explicit political purpose.
A number of new headings for classes of persons were created. These include “Children with Down Syndrome” and “Mothers of Children with Down Syndrome.” Another such new heading is “Television quiz show contestants,” which arrived shortly before the death of Charles Van Doren, America’s most famous quiz show contestant. “Iraqis--United States,” “Iraqi Americans,” and “Iraqi American women” may now be used, as can “African American women pacifists” and “African American women school administrators.” Several new headings in the area of gender were created. These include “Transgender women,” “Catholic lesbians,” “Catholic sexual minorities,” “Muslim lesbians,” and “Older transgender people.” Several new headings in the area of information technology merit mention. “Dark Web” has arrived, and its notes merit reading, as it is not the same as “Invisible Web.” Many illicit transactions take place on the Dark Web, but journalists and others not engaged in criminal activity also use it. “Voice computing” was established, as was “Graph databases.” “Virtual reality--Library applications” appeared out of nowhere and will perhaps be used by “Data services librarians” and “Embedded librarians.”

Let us get back to more strictly legal headings. “Demilitarization (International law)” expands our vocabulary in international law. “Electronic government information,” “Surety and fidelity insurance,” and “Street art” all now take “Law and legislation.” We now may use “Anti-copyright movement in art,” “Arts and transnationalism,” and “Prior art (Patent law).” “Post-pornography” is available and is used for “Feminist pornography.” A term from economics, “Poverty traps,” will be useful to law catalogers, as will “Atmospheric science.”

Finally, the December 2018 Genre/Form Terms list is worth reviewing. A number of headings that began with “Filmed” have been cancelled. New terms include “Television quiz shows,” “Letters to the editor,” “Press conferences,” and “Questionnaires.” Changes to the heading “Law materials” merit review, even though the term itself is not changed.

---

**Cataloging**

**Library of Congress BIBFRAME progress**

A recent ALCTS webinar, “Library of Congress BIBFRAME progress,” provided information on the current state of BIBFRAME development. Topics included fiscal year 2019 goals and achievements, an exploration of issues mapping MARC to BIBFRAME to MARC, explication of the issue of “blank nodes,” and developments in LC’s Linked Data Services. LC is particularly interested in mapping data both into and out of BIBFRAME to eliminate the need for staff participating in the BIBFRAME pilot to do double work. Currently, participating staff are required to describe a resource in BIBFRAME, then re-describe it in MARC. It will be necessary to provide full MARC and BIBFRAME resource descriptions for the foreseeable future. Sally McCallum described several complicated modeling issues that must be resolved before duplicate work can be eliminated. Many of these issues are related to modeling differences. MARC is a “unit record model” with data both from and about the resource integrated into a record; BIBFRAME splits the data about a resource into Works (RDA work/expression), Instance (RDA manifestation), and Items. Decisions are needed on how to present a BIBFRAME work as a MARC work. Use of vernacular scripts and URIs present additional issues. URIs are present in BIBFRAME descriptions in areas that are not currently supported in MARC. Use of URIs to represent concepts at the field level is pretty straightforward, but mapping of headings with qualifiers can be problematic. The goal is to produce structurally sound MARC records from BIBFRAME.

Kevin Ford addressed the issue of “anonymous resources,” also known as “blank nodes.” He described anonymous resources as a “fact of life” in the context of raw data transformations. Although it would be nice if all data points and concepts had URIs, not everything rises to a level where an entity is willing to mint and maintain a URI. LC is tackling some of this by creating an experimental “providers” file of publishers, available at https://id.loc.gov/entities/providers.
This presentation is available via the ALCTS YouTube channel at https://youtu.be/YltipGeoJ5Q. ALCTS webinars are generally made available via the ALCTS YouTube channel (https://www.youtube.com/user/alctscce/videos) six months after initial presentation. The Library of Congress makes presentations about BIBFRAME available via their Bibliographic Framework page (https://www.loc.gov/bibframe/).

**Measuring the value of cataloging**

A recent post by Karen Smith-Yoshimura on OCLC’s Hanging Together blog highlights the difficulty of quantifying the impact of cataloging work. The column is based on a discussion by OCLC Research Library Partners metadata managers. Smith-Yoshimura reminds readers that traditional methods of tracking cataloger productivity and statistics do not measure the actual impact of the cataloger’s work.

In many institutions, catalogers work in an environment where their efforts are undervalued by administration. In order to justify the effort involved to craft high quality bibliographic descriptions, we need to quantify how this work contributes to user’s success and how the metadata we create contributes to our organization’s strategic goals. Smith-Yoshimura highlights the need for a “culture shift” from “pride around production alone” to placing value on learning opportunities and experimentation. She emphasizes the need to “understand that improving all metadata is more important than any individual’s productivity.”

How any one technical services unit can convince their administration to provide time and space to pursue these kinds of opportunities in the face of staff reductions and continued pressure to maintain production is an open question.


**Preservation**

**Preservation Week April 21-27**

Preservation Week, April 21 – 27, is drawing near. Law librarians play a key role in preserving legal information and scholarship for the benefit of future generations. In a print environment, preservation may be as simple as protecting the binding of a book, repairing a ripped page, or ordering multiple copies of a well-used title. With the birth and growth of digital documents, the task becomes more complex and difficult to achieve, especially for smaller institutions and establishments. Without adequate resources to undertake the needed work, digital legal information becomes especially vulnerable to technological obsolescence and potential degradation over time.

In 2003, attendees at a conference sponsored by the Georgetown University Law Library and the American Association of Law Libraries recognized the challenging landscape and the need to establish long-term archiving and preservation support to institutions charged with overseeing legal collections. To address the concerns, conference participants established the Legal Information Preservation Alliance (LIPA).
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(2009-2011), Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect (2013-2014), Chair (2014-2015), and Immediate Past Chair (2015-2017), in addition to her appointments to the OCLC Committee and Education Committee, which she also chaired while a member of these committees. Karen’s service to AALL included membership on an AALL Special Committee on Cataloging and Intranet Access to Electronic Resources (2002-2004) and appointments to both the 2017 and 2018 AALL Annual Meeting Program Committees (AMPC) as a Team Leader.

In addition, Karen is active professionally at the local and regional level of law librarianship, serving in various leadership positions in the Colorado Association of Law Libraries (CoALL) as Secretary, Member-at-Large, Vice-President/President-Elect, and President (2007-2008), as well as chairing committees including Nominations, Public Relations, and Spotlight Educational Program. Other regional organizations in which Karen actively participates include the Society of Rocky Mountain Archivists, Southwestern Association of Law Libraries (SWALL), and Western Pacific Chapter (WestPac).

Since 1999, Karen has coordinated, moderated, or spoken at more than 15 educational programs at AALL annual meetings. She has contributed programs on cutting edge issues of importance to technical services librarians and public service librarians as well. Karen’s article, co-written with Georgia Briscoe and Cheryl Nyberg, “The Catalog vs. The Homepage: Best Practices in Connecting to Online Resources,” which was awarded the 2004 Law Library Journal Article of the Year, began as a presentation at the 2002 AALL Annual Meeting. Recent AALL programs that Karen presented include current topics such as data mining, linked data and BIBFRAME, discovery layer design, and digital archives. In addition, Karen developed and presented programs for CoALL, SWALL, and WestPac conferences.

Karen’s scholarly publications include co-authoring “The Accidental Archivists: Lessons Learned from a Digital Archive Project” in the academic journal Legal Reference Services Quarterly and “Cataloging @2000: Over 100 Years of Change at the University of Colorado Law Library” in Cataloging & Classification Quarterly. Additionally, Karen authored “Linking Globally, Coping Locally: Cataloging Internet Resources at the University of Colorado Law Library” and co-authored “The Catalog vs. The Homepage,” both of which were published in Law Library Journal. Karen also authored numerous columns for Technical Services Law Librarian as OCLC columnist, OBS-SIS chair, MARBI representative, and AALL annual meeting program reviewer on multiple occasions. Karen’s publications on practical technical services issues truly meet the Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award standard, as they “extend the theoretical foundations or practical elements of the bibliographic control and access to legal materials within and throughout law libraries.”

Colleagues who nominated Karen for this award all commented on the personal qualities Karen brings to law librarianship, noting Karen “to be a creative strategic thinker, an inspirational role model, a supportive, encouraging mentor, and a collegial and thoughtful peer.” Expressed by another colleague, “Ms. Selden’s creativity and innovation has elevated her to the ranks of a 21st Century thought leader in the profession.” A favorite quote from a colleague is this: “There is no one in the technical service law library arena of law librarianship more energetic, friendly, warm, welcoming, and enthusiastic than Karen Selden.”

In summary, Karen’s record of service to librarianship, especially law librarianship, is exemplary, consistent, sustained, and will leave a legacy of scholarship for future technical services law librarians. Karen’s leadership, continuing advocacy for technical services standards and excellence, willingness to make a difference, and significant contributions to conference programs and publications are all reasons why Karen Selden is very deserving of the Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award for Outstanding Contributions in Technical Services Law Librarianship. The TS-SIS Awards Committee is pleased to recognize Karen’s achievements with this award.

Congratulations Karen!

2018-2019 TS-SIS Awards Committee

Virginia Bryant, Chair
Kevin Carey
Rebecca Engsberg
Andi Molinet
Neil Pereira
Loren Stamper
Barbara Szalkowski
The TS-SIS Awards Committee is pleased to announce the following individuals received education grants for the Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C.

**Experienced member grant**

**Joy Humphrey**, Associate Director, Pepperdine University Harnish Law Library, a TS-SIS member for 13 years, who currently serves as Serials Titles columnist for TSLL and a member of the TS-SIS Membership Committee.

**New member grant (2)**

**Rachel Parks**, Head of Technical Services, Barry University Law Library, a TS-SIS member for 2+ years, who recently was promoted to her current position and is interested in professional development. This will be her first AALL annual conference.

**Sidney Lanier**, Cataloging and Archives Librarian, Syracuse University Law Library, a recent TS-SIS member, who is scheduled to graduate from SU iSchool in Fall 2019 and is interested in professional growth in technical services. This will be her first AALL annual conference.

**Marla Schwartz Award**

**Alicia Pearson**, Library Technical Assistant, Albany Law School, Schaffer Law Library, who is scheduled to graduate from University at Albany with her MSIS in December 2019 and is active in the Capital District Library Council activities. This will be her first AALL annual conference.

If attending the Washington D.C. annual meeting, please give a warm welcome to these TS-SIS grant awardees!

TS-SIS Awards Committee, 2018-2019

Virginia Bryant, Chair
Kevin Carey
Rebecca Engsberg
Andi Molinet
Neil Pereira
Loren Stamper
Barbara Szalkowski
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**Publication Schedule**

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

Deadlines (each vol/year):

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