Melissa Beck
2022 Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award Recipient

The Technical Services Special Interest Section Awards Committee is pleased to announce that the recipient of the 2022 Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award for Outstanding Contributions to Technical Services Law Librarianship is Melissa Beck. The award is presented to an individual or group in recognition of achievement in an area of technical services, for services to the Association, or for outstanding contributions to the professional literature. The characteristics that the Chapman Award recognizes are embodied by Melissa’s extensive contributions to AALL, the Technical Services and Library Systems Resources & Discovery Special Interest Sections, and technical services law librarianship in general.

Melissa was the Head of the Cataloging Section, Bibliographic Service, Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library, University of California, Los Angeles until she retired in June 2021. Since joining AALL in 2008, she has brought her invaluable knowledge, innovation, dedication, and commitment to law librarianship and technical services in particular. The breadth of her contributions has been demonstrated by her contributions to professional literature; her many years of service and leadership on committees; teaching and presenting at local, regional, and national conferences and workshops; and her kindness which was a theme throughout the nomination letters received by the Awards Committee.

Even before entering law librarianship and joining AALL in 2008, Melissa had already made major contributions to cataloging and technical services. For example, she was the original author of Module 31 of the CONSER Cataloging Manual in the 1990s. This module described how to catalog electronic resources before we even knew what those were! All right, maybe not, but this was very early -- before the widespread use of the web and HTTP addresses that are so ordinary to us today. She was also in the group that designed the CONSER Standard Record back in the early 2000s. Her work on the CONSER Cataloging Manual continued with major revisions to accommodate RDA in 2013-2014. She was on the teams for Module 3: Chief Source and Other Sources of Information; Module 34: Legal serials; and Module 35: Integrating Resources. She also served as the lead editor for Module 35.
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Library Systems & Resource Discovery Special Interest Section

Keiko Okuhara, University of Hawaii

Aloha to esteemed fellow LSRD-SIS members!

It was great to see those who attended the conference in Denver and catch up face-to-face! We missed those who didn’t attend the conference… It was quite an experience after two years of virtual conferences. I was pleased to see our poster station in the Exhibit Hall; thanks to the artistry and brilliance of board Member-at-Large Rachel Evans who produced a lucid poster and Keelan Webber who created cute lizard buttons. Also, our SIS hosted two educational programs. They were “You Too, Can YouTube: Making the Case for Law Library Channel” and “Marketing Sustainable Mid-Size Institutional Repositories with No Pennies.” In addition, there was an in-person Local Systems meeting. We had lively discussions to generate delightful energy and ardent synergy to share common interests.

A big thank you to departing officer Keven Carey, Past Chair, for his dedicated service and hard work, and to Jennifer Garafolo for completing her term as LSRD Representative for the FROG Committee, much of it unseen but always appreciated. Kudos to Rachel Sherie Evans and Keelan Webber for continuing on the Executive Board as Vice/Chair/Chair Elect and Member-At-Large respectively. Kudos and welcome to Rebecca L. Bearden for being elected as Member-At-Large. Many thanks to Corinne C. Jacox for serving as LSRD Representative to the FROG Committee to replace Jennifer. Thank you also very much to all committee chairs for their kind willingness and continued devotion to serve. It is my utmost pleasure to be part of the following 2022-2023 Executive Board members who are dynamic and enthusiastic. I look forward to working with all returning and new officers.

- Larissa Sullivant, Immediate Past Chair;
- Rachel Sherie Evans, Vice/Chair/Chair Elect;
- Chris Todd, Secretary/Treasurer (2021-2023)
- Keelan Webber, Member-At-Large (2022-2024)
- Rebecca L Bearden, Member-At-Large (2022-2024)

The theme of the Library Systems and Resource Discovery Special Interest Section (LSRD-SIS), for this year is “collaboration.” We look forward to coordinating events and programs with AALL Law Repositories Caucus to look into the metadata curation for Institutional repositories (IRs) and to explore variation of systems, such as open-source and proprietary digital repository platforms, Integrated Library Systems (ILSs), and Discovery platforms, to foster scholarly communication and improve discoverability of library resources and to enhance user access to scholarly publications. We will have more information to share as the year unfolds.

As the incoming Chair of LSRD-SIS, I would like to convey my deep appreciation to its members for the opportunity to serve. I take this privilege with anticipation and humility. Since I did not expect that the day would come to assume this office, it is an incredible honor to carry the torch and traditions which were established by many LSRD peers. We are at a junction where we need to be relevant and innovative. At times, it requires changes, but we will take that challenge to combine strengths and to be collaborative. Although I know everyone already feels stretched thin and doesn’t have the capacity to put more on your plates, our SIS will prevail with your gracious volunteerism and impressive expertise. Volunteers are appreciated and needed to accomplish our common goals. As the new chair, I realize that I have a lot to learn as we head into the future; however, I have confidence that with our capable and diligent team, we will be able to work together to fulfill our mission. I welcome and am grateful for your suggestions, feedback, and cooperation. I encourage you to join us to make our SIS the best it can be for each member. Please speak up and be heard. I eagerly look forward to working with all of you, and I hope you share my excitement about the upcoming year.

Please enjoy wearing that cute lizard button if you have one!

(Photo by Keelan Weber and button designed by Rachel Evans.)

Technical Services Special Interest Section

Jason LeMay, Emory University

Greetings TS-SIS!

It’s hard to believe as I write this that I got back home from the Annual Meeting just a couple of weeks ago, the first in-person meeting in three years! It was great to see everyone who was able to attend in person. Zoom is useful, as it allows us to have meetings when we’re scattered across the country, but it just doesn’t compare to being able to see everyone in person.

(Cont on p. 4)
As the COVID pandemic continues, I know we are all struggling with reduced budgets, concerns about getting sick, and worries about our loved ones. While a lot of people are acting like everything is back to normal, it’s not quite there yet. Most of us have returned to the office, at least part of the time, while others are still largely working remotely. No matter where we are currently working, we are all hoping that “normal” isn’t too far away.

If you were able to go to Denver in July, you got to see some great programming. TS-SIS was able to get several items on this year’s conference schedule, and we hope to do the same again next year. “Wikidata: A New Tool to Enhance Access to Law Library Collections,” “Collection Development and Acquiring with a Conscience,” “Beyond ‘Change the Subject,’” and “Documenting for Your Successor” were just some of the programs our members took part in.

We hosted four meetings on-site this year, and we successfully avoided scheduling the dreaded 7AM time slots! We did somehow end up with two of our own meetings conflicting with each other, though, and we will try to avoid this in the future. If you have suggestions or comments on this year’s on-site meetings, let us know!

Even though it’s only early August, AALL and TS-SIS are already starting the planning for next year. Must-have topics are currently being submitted by AALL members, and by the time you read this, the program proposal process will likely be underway. Our TS committees will be turning to you, our members, for ideas and proposals to submit for AALL 2023 in Boston.

As we work on planning for Boston, we will also be putting together programs for throughout the year as we did last year. Keep in mind that without the hard work of our members, we would not be able to provide these programs. Our committee volunteers are working hard to provide webinars, round tables, and other educational opportunities for us, and more volunteers are always welcome. If you are interested in joining one of our committees, don’t hesitate to contact the committee chair(s) to volunteer. Committee chairs are all listed on our TS-SIS Leadership page at https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/about-us/leadership/, and information about our committees can be found on the Committees page at https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/about-us/committees/. You don’t have to wait for the next Volunteer Survey to join!

I’m looking forward to serving y’all this year. I always welcome feedback, so please feel free to reach out anytime.

Another major contribution was her work with Melody Lembke in 2016 to write the 4th edition of Cataloging Legal Literature, which some call the “Cataloger’s Bible.” This was a major endeavor since the 3rd edition was published in 1996. Melissa wrote the chapters on serials and electronic resources, which had significantly changed since 1996. As noted in one nomination, “It was a herculean task, undertaken for the betterment of the entire legal cataloging community.” She continued that community betterment by also co-writing the 5th edition in 2021. If that wasn’t enough, in 2021, Melissa and Melody were awarded the AALL Joseph L. Andrews Legal Literature Award for their work on Cataloging Legal Literature, 5th edition.

As an active member of TS-SIS, Melissa has made enormous contributions to making life better for technical services librarians. Melissa served on the Cataloging and Classification Standing Committee (CCSC) from 2008 through 2018 and continued her work when the new Metadata Management Standing Committee (MMS) replaced the CCSC. During her time on the MMS, Melissa and other members of the committee worked tirelessly to reorganize the advisory groups. When three of the advisory groups were disbanded, Melissa not only volunteered to chair the newly created Metadata Policy and Standard Advisory Group (MPSAG), but she also volunteered to draft its purpose, mission, membership responsibilities, and structure. It was mentioned in her nomination that, “It is not an overstatement to say that the transition from the old leadership to the new leadership and the current organization of the MMS wouldn’t be possible without Melissa’s indispensable contributions.”

In the fall of 2014, during her time on the Descriptive Cataloging Advisory Working Group, she worked with two other members when they were tasked with developing best practices for constructing and qualifying authorized access points. This was an area where guidance and best practices for law catalogers were needed. During the 10-month project, it was determined that with the many complex issues uncovered in the investigation, they shifted their focus to creating a discussion paper rather than a best practices document. It was stated in yet another nomination letter that “Melissa’s contributions to this project were invaluable: carefully researched, thoroughly thought-out, and well documented.” The final version was submitted in July 2015.

Melissa also demonstrated her commitment to the profession by teaching and helping her peers learn to understand and catalog under the new Resource Description and Access (RDA). Many were anxious about using this new cataloging code after using AACR2 for so many years. She was the Coordinator and Presenter for two day-long preconference workshops before the annual meetings in Boston in July 2012 and again in Seattle in July 2013. She also served as UC CONSER Funnel Training
Coordinator from 2006 until she retired in 2021. In this role, she trained serials catalogers at various campuses in CONSER cataloging.

In addition to the kudos mentioned above from her colleagues who nominated her, there was one theme that stood out throughout the letters which you will appreciate after reading some of the comments. One colleague said, "Throughout her career, Melissa has been unfailingly generous to the library community and the library community at large with her time and expertise." Another expressed, "Melissa is a wonderful colleague and mentor to many in the profession. She is extremely kind, modest, gracious, good-natured, knowledgeable, approachable, and has a great sense of humor." This last one sums up the theme: "Melissa is one of those librarians that you feel lucky to know and feel even luckier to have worked with or learned from. There are just not that many technical services law librarians like her."

Joan Stringfellow, TS-SIS Chair, 2021-2022 on behalf of the TS-SIS Awards Committee:

Wendy Moore, Chair
Wendy Law
Jennifer Mart-Rice
Patricia Sayre-McCoy

**Congratulations Melissa!!**

---

**COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT**

State Libraries, Agencies, and State Legislative History Online Resources

by Adrienne DeWitt, Campbell University

Recently, I have been compiling a list of resources for a new U.S. Federal and State Legislative History LibGuide I plan on creating this fall semester. Although there are several excellent law library-created legislative history LibGuides out there, having a guide tailored to our own institution’s holdings is always preferable. Also, it has given me the opportunity to do an evaluation of our legislative history materials and find other useful open access online resources.

On the federal side, the major resources are well established. These include ProQuest Congressional and Legislative Insight, HeinOnline’s Compiled Legislative History Library, Westlaw Next, and Lexis Plus. There are also some open access materials that I will include, such as Congress.gov and the Congressional Research Service archive. Finally, there are some excellent open access instructions on how to compile a federal legislative history, including the Library of Congress’s Compiling a Federal Legislative History: A Beginner’s Guide and the Federal Legislative History Research page from the U.S. Department of the Interior.

As for individual states, I have been pleasantly surprised by the amount of content online. In our subscription resources, HeinOnline’s U.S. State Library and State Statutes: A Historical Archive are robust collections of historical content. Along with HeinOnline, HathiTrust has also proven helpful in state historical legislative research. Westlaw Next and Lexis Plus can be helpful for late 20th century forward materials.

One item I want to include is an articulated set of legislative history instructions comparable to the Library of Congress’s federal legislative history research. I have found some excellent examples in individual state library and agency materials. See, for example, the State Library of Massachusetts Guide to Compiling a Legislative History (link below). Also, here in North Carolina, our North Carolina Legislative Library has a webpage dedicated to N.C. Legislative History Materials, including step-by-step directions on how to conduct legislative history research in North Carolina (link included on the N.C. Legislative History website).
Besides having a downloadable legislative history how-to, the N.C. website also includes links to Bill Histories, General Statutes Commission Reports, Study Reports to the North Carolina General Assembly (back to 1966 and some earlier reports), and other useful materials. Best of all, the N.C. Legislative Library is working with the State Library to digitize North Carolina’s superseded statutes. While this is a work-in-progress—more years will be added, and the site features and functionality are still evolving—it is already an excellent resource for attorneys who might need to see the text of a superseded statute but do not have access to HeinOnline or other subscription resources. The link to the work-in-progress page is below.

Other state libraries and agencies have similar information. Fortunately, law libraries, such as the Georgetown Law Library and the Jerome Hall Law Library at Indiana University, have compiled excellent LibGuides on where to find these state-specific legislative histories.

**Links:**

Georgetown Law Library Research Guides: https://guides.ll.georgetown.edu/home

HathiTrust: https://www.hathitrust.org/

Indiana University Jerome Hall Law Library State Legislative History Research Guides Inventory: https://law.indiana.libguides.com/state-legislative-history-guides


North Carolina Legislative History Resources: https://sites.ncleg.gov/library/legislative-history-resources/


State Library of Massachusetts: Guide to Compiling a Massachusetts Legislative History: https://www.mass.gov/guides/guide-to-compiling-a-massachusetts-legislative-history


---

**CONFERENCE ROUNDUP**

**Conference Report:**

**Code4Lib 2022**

**by Rachel Evans, University of Georgia**

Established in 2003, Code4Lib welcomes hundreds of developers each year to their annual conference. The overarching theme of the group is to bring together program-centric librarians who are committed to the creation and use of open technologies. As you might imagine, this attracts all sorts of librarians from various environments including academic, public, and corporate sectors, and individuals carry a mosaic of titles including systems and electronic resources librarians, metadata and cataloging librarians, faculty services and research librarians, and those who work with discovery layers, online collections of all shapes and sizes, and many who care deeply about open access. There is a strong DIY spirit to the conference, similar to several others with the ethos of open access, and they extend this to making all conference session recordings and materials like slides and handouts fully available for free online. Additionally, Code4Lib has its own quarterly journal, founded by the community in 2007, that publishes peer reviewed articles about libraries and technology under a CC license. Outside the annual conference, you can take part in and find lots of support from Code4Lib year round by engaging in
their Wiki, joining their mailing list, utilizing their jobs board, or signing up to be a member of their ongoing chat groups. For more information about the Code4Lib community, visit https://code4lib.org/about/. For 2022, the Code4Lib conference was intentionally hybrid, inviting presenters and attendees to participate according to their comfort levels. Many attendees and presenters convened in Buffalo, NY, where virtual presenter sessions were live-streamed to the in-person audience. Throughout the multi-day conference, Code4Lib organizers invited and moderated continuous chat including session-specific discussions. Below are a few short reviews of my favorite sessions. I encourage you to explore the sessions for yourself, which are all now freely available on YouTube at: https://www.youtube.com/code4lib

Opportunities and constraints using artificial intelligence in metadata creation: A case study

Presenter: Ingrid Reiche, Digital Metadata Librarian, University of Calgary

This was my favorite session out of the entire conference. Using artificial intelligence or machine learning to generate metadata for item descriptions is definitely not a new concept, and perhaps strides have not been made as rapidly as they could be due to the fears some librarians have about this sort of automated cataloging work being a potential threat to jobs. Personally, I find this use of technology extremely fascinating. There is a continuing theme throughout many conferences that does more than hint at librarians continuing to do more with less out of necessity for many reasons (insufficient funding, unable to replace librarian positions, increasing workloads, the nature of our work shifting and the number of staff unable to keep up, etc.). What was interesting about Reiche’s presentation were the examples shared and how it was delivered as a case study comparing various AI models for automated image descriptions. The models covered each create metadata for images using a combination of keyword generations and object detections. Project Sheeko is one of these models, built on open-source machine learning and deployed as packages on local computers. It was designed to produce metadata for historical images using a sample of one hundred images from the digital collections at the University of Calgary.

The results were very interesting, as seen in this screen capture of one of Reiche’s slides, a methodology of the rank assigned to the accuracy or appropriateness of each metadata generation per image.

Reiche also used the case study to consider the technological requirements a library would need to implement this type of AI model, including hardware, software, and IT support. With an open source tool like Project Sheeko, there is time required to train the machine learning model which must be compared to the accuracy and a smaller amount of time for deploying a pre-trained model. There are also several ethical implications of using AI programs in a locally hosted environment compared to those available through cloud-based solutions, all in addition to the quality of machine-generated metadata itself, to consider. All in all, the rankings from this study are certainly promising. Not surprisingly, historical images of people and places have much higher rankings than historical objects. One funny example was of a cassette tape which both AI models had issues describing. I watched Reiche’s presentation just as I was beginning to work on my own digitized historical images project for my library, and let me tell you that even though we had metadata services included in our project grant so someone else was describing the majority of our images, the time it took me just to review and make minor updates to the metadata formatting was an huge amount of time. Original descriptive work like this is tedious, and time-consuming, but critical to any items being discovered in the first place (no matter where they are hosted). I, for one, am excited about the possibility of utilizing AI models for descriptive image metadata work! If you are interested in checking out Reiche’s code for Sheeko, you can find it on Github at: https://github.com/marriott-library/sheeko-vagrant.

The Fickle, the Federated, the Frustrating: Library Search Experiences

Presenters: Margaret Heller, Digital Services Librarian, Loyola University Chicago
Eric Phetteplace, Systems Librarian, California College of the Arts
Bohyun Kim, Associate University Librarian for Information Technology, University of Michigan

This session was very refreshing. As any librarian who has worked with formatting their own ILS online catalog search box in their website or LibGuides site knows, OR any librarian who maintains their respective discovery layer service knows, it is very difficult to understand how we got to where we are now – let alone why any given library has ended up with the version of searching (or...
multiple!?) that we have today. The presenters shared our collective frustrations across library types about the promised improvements for usability and searchability from modern discovery layer interfaces and expressed their experience with “old, clunky federated search” versus bento box styles while acknowledging that “many of those are still chugging along.” Then it gets good when they dare to ask “is seamless experience a fool’s errand?” After a decade of trying to understand and fix their own search experiences, the trio offers a down to earth, candid glimpse into the history of our current state of searching in libraries. They asked many vital and thought provoking questions and invited the audience to discuss them, including: “Have we advanced beyond silos, and when it comes to information seeking behavior, are silos so bad?” Each presenter shared how they adapted search interfaces to become more personal and localized throughout the pandemic and how many of those changes are likely to become permanent.

Converting Excel Files into XML: Two ways explained

Presenters: Amy Jiang, Head of Emerging Technologies and Digital Initiatives at the Wilson Library at the University of La Verne
Bryan Haley, University of La Verne

This session was a super practical one. How many of us feel like we basically live in our Excel spreadsheets, am I right?? Well, if that is you, then watching this session is well worth your time. The two presenters share their favorite ways to convert Excel files into XML. As with several sessions at Code4Lib, this one really resonated with me because the presenter backgrounds to creating this session were because of an Esploro implementation at their University. For those who don’t work with repositories as much, it is one of the popular institutional repository platforms. My own University has been migrating from open source D-Space to Esploro, too, and while our law library repository still exists in bepress Digital Commons, most repositories (including Digital Commons) rely on batch uploading and metadata revisions and management using CSV or XML sheets. In the midst of my own batch metadata revisions (and going in circles with CSV raw data, to Excel to work with formatting and clean up, and then to XML to upload back into my own repository), these two methods really hit home for me. As I do and probably most of us do, the two presenters share how they, too, usually gather data in Excel format initially, so converting Excel into XML was a routine task for their migration project. Throughout the session, they shared how they worked with student workers to come up with two separate ways of converting Excel files into XML formatted ones. The first version they shared is more of a traditional programming approach using Python, while the second version uses Excel’s built in functionality so that non-programmers could create an XML file (spoiler alert – this approach takes only a few minutes!). They then took turns discussing the pros and cons of each method as well as sharing the code for other institutions to use or adapt.
documents (.docx, .pptx, .pdf, and spreadsheets) more accessible and which tackle accessibility in a modern and practical way that accounts not just for plain old hypertext markup language (HTML) but also for the variety of uploaded files and content management systems that we use. This is important because websites splash pages are just the tip of the iceberg for accessibility. On a day to day basis, a person might spend more time in email, on a shared drive, or other digital environment where files matter more than splash pages. And for website creation, most of us are likely using a blogging platform or content management system (CMS) provided by our employer, and broad principles that apply to looking for software settings translate well to editing in a CMS. The approaches on section508.gov mesh well with how electronic documents and websites are created and used today.

What is section508.gov

Section508.gov is run by the United States General Services Administration and is geared towards helping federal agencies comply with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act is electronic and information technology accessibility, and it encompasses web accessibility. The section508.gov website is more than 20 years old, and content has been changed and updated over time to keep up with technological and legal changes. Section 508 requirements are written into federal funding eligibility requirements, including funding to federal agencies and funding distributed through federal grants. The federal government has significant interest in putting out clear guidance and training, and enough money is tied to the requirements to ensure resources are available to create, review, and maintain centralized information.

Training Modules on Accessible Content

One of the major issues that comes up in web publishing is addressing uploaded documents, as opposed to the splash page, for a website. This is an issue with purchased databases. The library website is one layer, and there's relatively plentiful training and awareness about accessibility for web design. Then there are the vendor hosted search interfaces, which librarians don't tend to focus on because there isn't any direct way to control or improve accessibility issues but where general web accessibility knowledge makes it possible for libraries to understand the issues and quality and to meaningfully ask vendors about accessibility while investigating purchase decisions. Then there are the final research sources. Often, those are PDFs or other files. Likewise, in digital publishing, a publishing platform will have a splash page for publications, then a search engine or content management system to find publications, and then the publications, which are often PDFs or other files. In overseeing publishing technology in Florida, often the uploaded files of publications were both the "last mile" and the overwhelming majority of the content. Meanwhile, most library training on accessibility focused on the web splash pages that linked in to books, pdfs, Word Documents, images, and other content. Often the actual meat was downloadable files. There's definitely a need in the library community for easy concise training on how to prep and assess files for accessibility.

Section508.gov has concise training courses at https://www.section508.gov/create/ for building accessibility into documents created with Microsoft Word, Adobe Acrobat DC, Microsoft Excel, and Microsoft PowerPoint. Common themes between the trainings are how to use built in templates and features to ensure accessibility is met. Accessibility requirements have existed for so long that built in software features tend to have been designed with accessibility in mind, such that using built in features tends to improve accessibility. For example, built in templates that ship with PowerPoint tend to have sufficient contrast and clear fonts.

Training courses on creating content were created between 2016 and 2019, and a date of publication is provided for each. Each training course has short videos broken out into topics, and watching all videos for any given course takes about an hour. Each course also has a Tips and Tricks section, with a short list of key points for that format, and links to relevant additional training resources from other federal agencies. Essentially, each training module has about an hour of video content which overviews that format and highlights basic settings that will improve accessibility. It's something anyone working in publishing, or in library IT, can work through and can assign or promote within an organization because the total time commitment is less than five hours. The guidance is generally relevant (training modules have been updated as software versions change). Themes overlap from one software platform and format to another. For example, using headers and using the header features built into the software, rather than choosing a different font, comes up in Microsoft Word and Adobe Acrobat DC. Working through training modules for multiple document formats gives concrete examples and repetition of themes for better remembering. These aren't detailed courses, but rather something that is manageable for almost anyone to work through due to a small time commitment, a clear, easy to follow format, and something that can be assigned or promoted within an organization for better training. Essentially, videos can be assigned for a 5 hours total time commitment that both improves accessibility training and provides training in basic office software (for employers using Microsoft and Adobe products).

Training Modules on Testing for Accessibility

The Training, Tools, and Events section at https://www.section508.gov/training-home/ includes links to the content creation trainings discussed above and also includes training modules on software tools that can be used for accessibility testing of websites. These tools are generally free of charge to install. They are not necessarily made available through the federal government but are recommended through the section508.gov website, which potentially makes it easier to get
any security approvals to install them on a work computer. The testing section is organized more as laid out tools and instructional materials on using those tools and less like a course. In order to work through these, someone would have to install the software and try it out, and the time commitment will vary from testing tool to testing tool and person to person. Testing tools slant towards testing traditional website splash pages and HTML pages, although color contrast checkers can be used to assist in testing any formats that display on a screen.

Some Section508.gov Content is for Federal Employees Only

Most of the site is free-of-charge and readily available to browse. Some resources are restricted to federal employees only. For example, a Join the 508 Community page at https://www.section508.gov/manage/join-the-508-community/ promotes a listserv which is only open to federal email addresses and links out to ways for employees of specific agencies to connect with resources within their agency.

Some content also is geared towards government operations, rather than content creation or software and authoring generally. For example, some sections are about financial workflows, such as funding sources and grants and applicability of accessibility requirements. These are practical for enforcing requirements or determining legal requirements for a government agency distributing funding, but for libraries and library employees outside of government, the specifics of tying accessibility to funding is less of interest than is information about how to make websites more accessible and how to measure accessibility within a website or database.

In general, training materials and practical guidance on accessibility testing are of broad interest to libraries, while financial or law and policy areas of the website are specific to federal agencies or grant recipients.

There is also a small amount of training content that is for federal employees only or has a cost associated with it. These are generally in person trainings or live online events.

Conclusion

Section508.gov has been around for decades. It’s been updated over time and has high quality concise training materials about accessibility that can benefit anyone authoring digital content, including file uploads, email attachments, and traditional websites. In particular, the concise training modules about authoring accessible content are valuable for having a manageable self-contained training course with a low enough time commitment that almost any role within an organization can find the time to work through them.
Transforming metadata
July 13, 2022

This virtual meeting was a reprise of an in-person panel discussion at the ALA Annual Meeting. The panel discussed the implications of Linked Data and how Linked Data will enhance the user experience. Speakers included Melissa James from Central Michigan University, Melanie Wacker from Columbia University, Kyla Jemison from University of Toronto, and Anne Washington from OCLC, facilitated by Rachel Frick from OCLC. The session recording is available at:

https://vimeo.com/731804417/863cfedd94

Encoding level conversion

OCLC has been working on a project to convert OCLC-specific alphabetic encoding level codes to MARC21 numeric encoding level codes. OCLC converted level K to blank, 7, or 3, based on an algorithm that determined fullness of the records, and a similar process is under way to convert level I records. Recently, OCLC has begun working on level M records as well and is adding 936 to preserve the indication that they are batch loaded records. OCLC members are encouraged to use numeric codes in newly contributed records.

Genre term "Electronic books"

In consultation with the ALA Core Subject Analysis Committee, OCLC has decided to delete the 655 “Electronic books” from WorldCat records. This has never been a valid LCGFT term, and there are other data elements which indicate a resource is electronic (e.g. 006, 007, 300, 33X). WMS libraries who wish to continue using this term may use Local Bibliographic Data for this purpose. Several OCLC members also inquired about the 655 “Electronic journals,” and OCLC plans to remove these as well. OCLC will begin removing these headings in September 2022. OCLC is also planning to update the "Generate Erecord" macro, so that it will no longer add 655 “Electronic books.”

Format Migrations: Thoughts on Preserving Access as Resources
Go Digital

by Lauren Seney, University of Colorado

The TS-SIS Hot Topic at the Denver Annual Meeting discussed the migration of physical materials to electronic-only access and the impacts of this on the library and its services. One of the challenges we have faced over the last two years is this rapid conversion to digital-only materials. There were some vendor shifts before 2020; however, the harsh realities of the last two years are that many of us had to choose between formats, and we had to make that decision quickly! This very engaging conversation at the annual meeting gave many of us things to consider as we move forward.

One conversation point was that over the last two years, preservation of access to superseded versions of materials was not a priority. Libraries were trying to provide access to current materials as quickly as they could, so continued access to prior editions or superseded content may not have been negotiated as a component of the contract for electronic access. Even if it was on our radar, the rapid closing of many of our buildings, coupled with time and personnel constraints, impacted our ability to effectively advocate for this sustained access. Now that we are [hopefully] on the other side of the pandemic, it is time to think about how to address preservation for the future. As libraries, we have a collective obligation to preserve access to historic content for the researchers of the present and the future and to address concerns resulting from the last two years.

We cannot change the past, though the recent past should be a lesson that we need to be more prepared to advocate for the future. There have been missteps to ensuring access to historic content in recent years, but there is still time to advocate for change in how access to legal content is preserved over time. There are projects specific to legal materials that should be on everyone’s radar. One tool, developed by the New England Law Library Consortium (NELLCO), is the Preservation, Discovery, and Accessibility (PDA) Toolkit1. This was developed over the
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last year and provides talking points to help guide conversations with vendors about the preservation of digital materials. It is a useful resource to both start and continue the conversation at your institution and with vendors.

A different route is to investigate collaborative or consortial projects such as PALMPrint\(^2\) (Preserving America’s Legal Materials in Print), which is a joint collection of legal materials that is available to member organizations. This preservation project allows libraries to retain access to print copies of specific titles while removing the copies from their shelves. While the PALMPrint project encompasses a large geographic area, many libraries enter into agreements with nearby institutions to help mitigate space constraints over time.

These are just two examples of ways that we can work to overcome recent preservation-related challenges. Also, keep in mind that collaborative agreements across campuses, consortia, and states can help support long-term access to materials for all researchers while avoiding every library needing to maintain current access to the materials on their shelves.

---


2 https://www.lipalliance.org/palmprint

_**Documentation: Applying Best Practices**_

_by Paula Seeger, Fox Rothschild LLP_

On February 3, 2022, the Winter webinar presented in the Technical Services – Special Interest Section (TS-SIS), “Documentation: Downloading Our Brains for the Greater Good of the Library,” covered the basics of the what, where, when, who, why, and how of documenting library workflow and information, with a useful checklist of a suggested documentation process. The speakers also provided templates for formatting written documentation. The speakers’ slides and templates are in the files section under the webinar details in the TS-SIS My Community:


As the speakers mentioned, technical services lends itself well to documentation since the work often follows an order of steps to provide the most efficient result. Some time was spent discussing “exceptions,” and serials can be full of exceptions. One of the factors is to whether exceptions are mentioned in documentation or added to specific catalog records is how many exceptions exist for any one resource or process, the very meaning of “when the exception becomes the rule!”

There are certain times that seem to work better for the creation, review, and update of documentation. Recently, our firm experienced one of those: the onboarding of new staff. Before the new staff started, we reviewed the documentation related to the essential functions of the new person’s position, with the goal of having it updated before the start date. This process involved editing/drafting by the person who performed the task most recently, review by supervisors, and linking to referenced documents and a larger procedures manual. No less than three or four people were involved in this update. This is a sure way to ensure the content is thoroughly reviewed but also to reinforce
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Another scenario I’ve experienced is to assign a point person for assisting with drafting and updating documentation. At the onset, the point person “interviewed” every staff member to identify essential tasks, reviewed existing documentation, and suggested drafting new documentation. The point person took notes and started a draft, with the staff person reviewing and editing, then the point person produced a final draft. It was a truly collaborative effort that eased the staff person from any burden of solo drafting, formatting, or editing. The point person was familiar with most, if not all, of the library teams and their major responsibilities and truly enjoyed the process of technical writing and interviewing during the collaboration.

Personally, I love technical and business writing and welcome the opportunity to document workflow, update records and training documents, and provide a snapshot of business operations in the form of annual reports or strategic plans, but I know this feeling might be unique. Documentation is a form of communication, and workflow is benefitted from being clear, accurate, and current. I recommend reviewing the templates and slides from the webinar as a resource for starting a documentation project or as another resource to consider for established documentation tasks.

by Cindy Tian, Notre Dame

The following is a list of serials title changes:

Marquette Intellectual Property Law Review
v. 1 (1997) - v. 24, no. 2 (summer 2020)
(OCLoC)36313022

Changed to:
Marquette Intellectual Property & Innovation Law Review
v. 25, no. 1 (winter 2021)
(OCLoC)1310709562

Harvard Latino Law Review
v. 1, no. 1 (fall 1994) - v. 24, no. 1 (spring 2021)
(OCLoC)32377824

Changed to:
Harvard Latin American Law Review
v. 25, no. 1 (Spring 2022)
(OCLoC)1330537832

The following is a list of serials cessations:

American Association of Law Libraries Spectrum
Ceased in print with:
January/February 2021
(OCLoC)35149713

Continued online (free of charge) at:
https://www.aallnet.org/resources-publications/publications/aall-spectrum/
(OCLoC)1298030353
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“Homophobia in criminal justice administration” and “Homophobia in law enforcement” are welcome additions. In Los Angeles, one candidate for the city council favors abolishing the police department, doubtless part of the “Police abolition movement.” The former heading “Primitive property” has been cancelled and added as a reference to “Property.” “Online manipulation” is an interesting new heading, as is “Ritual murder.” The heading “Slurs” is available, with the scope note “Here are entered works on terms that are often offensive or derogatory and are used to describe, target, or denigrate groups of people.” “Discrimination in the civil service” and “Dog racing tracks” may now be used. “Social media in government” will prove interesting. “Digital libraries—Law and legislation,” “Language and peace,” and “Shipwrecks (Roman law)” round out topics of immediate legal interest.

Some interesting classes of persons appeared. “Chinese American actors” and “Immigrant nannies” may now be used, as well as “Bank robbers” and “Women bank robbers.” The heading “Brothers and sisters” has changed to “Siblings” as the preferred term, and headings using “Brothers and sisters” have changed as well. In some major cities, “Celebrities’ spouses” are frequently in the news. Indeed, some have their own television shows. “Girls, Black” has appeared, as has “Indigenous Peoples’ Day.” The heading “Problem youth” has been changed to “At-risk youth.” We may now use “Child kings and rulers” and “Middle Eastern American college students.” We can also use “Pregnant college students” and “Mothers of disappeared persons.” Two classes of Jewish women were added, “Ex-Orthodox Jewish women” and “Ultra-Orthodox Jewish women.”

COVID-19 continues to generate interest and new headings. “COVID-19 Pandemic, 2020—Religious aspects,” and “COVID-19 vaccines” appeared, as did “mRNA vaccines.” The pandemic may have inspired “Drive-in worship services.”

Headings for a variety of topics appeared. “Fugitive slave communities—America” and “Maroon communities” describe groups of blacks who escaped slavery by migration into the interior of the nations they had been captive in. “White privilege (Social structure)” has been established. Read the heading in authorities.loc.gov as the term has an interesting history at the Library of Congress, having been rejected twice before. “Multi-tiered systems of support (Education)” is almost self-explanatory. “Aquarium animal trade,” “Indirect translation,” and “Gender euphoria” were established, and “Negro Bill Canyon Wilderness (Utah)” has been changed to “Grandstaff Canyon Wilderness Study Area (Utah).” The established heading “Disinformation” has been added to and should be read before use, and the heading “Misinformation” has been established and again merits reading. “Mockbusters (Motion pictures)” and “Mudlarking” have appeared, and “Bromance (Male friendship)” has been added as a reference to “Male friendship.”
Workshop W2: Legal Fundamentals When You Don’t Have a JD
Saturday, July 16, 2022

by Kate Peck, University of California Berkeley

On a hot summer day in Denver, we gathered. Most of us were unknown to each other, but all of us shared one important trait: we do not have law degrees. It’s not a shameful secret, something we hide from our colleagues, but it does put us at a disadvantage, whether we are providing reference assistance, doing research for a law firm, or handling the materials received by our institutions and organizations. We gathered for the purpose of plastering over this hole in our knowledge - obviously we couldn’t fill it in one day, this is something that law students spend three years on - and it was good to know that we had comrades in our quest.

The morning started with an energetic welcome by Jenny Silbiger (Hawaii Supreme Court Library), who led us in an ice breaker where most of us agreed that if we could have a superpower, teleportation was probably the way to go. Perhaps an unsurprising response from the jetlagged attendees.

The first session of the day was an introduction to jurisdiction, hierarchy, and terminology, delivered by the tag team duo of Lisa Davis (Florida International University) and Ana Ramirez Toft-Nielsen (Greenberg Traurig, P.A.). This pair of long-time collaborators laid the foundation that all legal research is built on by explaining the basics of jurisdiction and how it can affect which resources we need to consult in order to be effective researchers. We explored the concepts of “area of law” and “jurisdiction” and the interplay that those two concepts exhibit. Other topics covered included court hierarchies versus hierarchies of authority, primary versus secondary authority, and binding versus persuasive arguments. The session ended with an all-group activity that had us trying to match terminology with their definitions.

The second session was an introduction to the mystifying and arcane objects known as dockets. Our guide to this hidden knowledge was Heather Joy (Stanford University), who led us with an excellent balance of explanations and exercises. We were invited to reflect on how much (or how little) we knew about dockets, then kindly did not have to divulge the depths of our knowledge. We were supplied with a packet of the first pages of a case’s materials and worked with our tablemates to determine what order we thought they should appear in and what information we would expect to find in a docket to identify those materials. We were finally provided with copies of the actual docket, were able to compare our expectations to reality, and clarified the differences between the two. We wrapped up with a discussion of how to read a docket number and the best places to look for dockets and track them as they’re updated.

After a welcome break for lunch, Deborah Hamilton (Pikes Peak Library District) provided an introduction to codified law. For many of us, this was a welcome review of civics that was necessary since the School House Rock song about making a law is only a hazy memory at this point. We heard a very concise summary of the variety of laws, regulations, and codes, who creates them, and how they interact with each other. We were presented with a variety of legal topics and asked to determine whether they were administered at the federal or state level (or both) and what type of law were involved. We reconvened as a group to discuss the answers and were introduced to some of the voluminous sources that can be consulted to learn more about the texts and histories behind the myriad rules and regulations that govern this land.

The culminating session of the day was an introduction to the legal reference interview by Diana Koppang (Neal, Gerber, & Eisenberg LLP), a fascinating insight for those of us who do not work regularly with attorneys or professors. It was clear from the outset that establishing boundaries and clear expectations is an important part of any interview. Those expectations can be clarified by establishing a shared understanding of terms, the deadlines, results deliverable, what format those results should be in, to whom they should be delivered, whether there is a cost limit, and whether there is a need for follow-up. It is important to have the confidence to ask clarifying questions, as well as to push back when expectations are unreasonable, and we were encouraged to consult with colleagues, especially those with JDs, if we have questions.

And so our pre-conference adventure drew to a close. I would like to extend my gratitude to Alyson Drake (University of Houston), who organized this excellent workshop, and to my supervisors, who encouraged me to attend. I feel like this was a valuable workshop with tangible benefits that I have already been able to use in my day-to-day work, and if it is offered again in the future, I would encourage attendance for anyone who is new to the world of law libraries.

Session A3: Law Librarian as Algorithmic Skeptic
Saturday, July 16, 2022

by Keelian Weber, University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Presenters:
Sarah Lamdan, Professor of Law, CUNY School of Law
Susan Nevelow Mart, Professor and Director of the Law Library, University of Colorado Law School (absent)
Sarah Sutherland, President and CEO Canadian Legal Information Institute

Moderator:
Kim Nayyer, Edward Cornell Law Librarian, Cornell University

Law Librarian as Algorithmic Skeptic was one of the first presentations of the Annual Meeting and was heavily attended by members interested in learning more about the biases inherent in algorithms. The panelists discussed how many algorithms we encounter are proprietary, but there are also open-source algorithms. They may be very similar in design, but the difference in outcome is how they’re deployed. Algorithms now are designed by defining the desired output and subsequently training the
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system to produce that outcome. Training the system also means testing for edge cases. Sarah Sutherland provided an example of a self-driving car that worked perfectly by using grass as the main indicator for where to drive. When the car went onto a bridge, the car crashed. This is a striking example of the importance of testing for edge cases – if changes happen in the law, how can the algorithms adapt?

Consider needs for different user groups
Consider who the audience is. If the audience is professionals, the risks are not as high because this user group is trained to analyze results. If the audience is not trained to review information beyond the first few results, then there is more risk involved, and a higher standard of care should be taken when creating and maintaining algorithms.

Bias in algorithms
While Susan Nevelow Mart was unable to present, Sarah Lamdan shared her notes. Susan indicated that people are satisfices; satisfied with the first search result. Pairing that with information beyond the first few results, then there is more risk. If the audience is not trained to review the risks are not as high because this user group is trained to analyze results. If the audience is not trained to review.

Other issues
Sarah Lamdan mentioned the disparities between those who can afford information-rich analytics and those who can’t. This may enable some people to game the system, while others are left disadvantaged. There were challenges raised in the area of public data. It isn’t possible to have good analytics with bad data. Some communities will have more data than others, so it becomes a bias data set.

Thoughts for the future
Sarah Sutherland stated that there is a case for computational literacy among legal professionals. One idea presented was that a group, like AALL, could provide quality assurance vetting for database algorithms.

Lamdan discussed the need to work together with vendors in a way that is equitable, transparent, and fair, and make concerns known, for example, ask vendors not to use a patron’s data on their research side and not to sell the patron’s data to government agencies. With a better understanding of the system in place, librarians can better educate our patrons.

---

Statements are an area that was not fully explained, and I still don’t quite understand what they are. However, the presenters stated that items are organized by triple statements: item statements, property statements, and value statements.

Properties are the categories of data. Each property is identified by a unique P# and has labels, descriptions, and aliases, just like items. The properties tell you about the item, such as if it is an organization, idea, professor, etc. Properties can also include other Wikidata items as their values. Like properties, qualifiers provide more information about the item, such as the dates the American Revolution started and ended. Start and end dates are the most common types of qualifiers.

Finally, references are exactly what it sounds like. These are citations to sources you used to compile the data in the entry. These sources can be anything from documents to websites. References are not required but do make the entry appear more legitimate.

There are several programs that can be used to create and edit Wikidata. Of course, if you don’t want to use a third-party program, you can go directly to the Wikidata website. The presenters introduced three different free third-party tools that they recommend for working with Wikidata: OpenRefine, SPARQL, and QuickStatements.

OpenRefine works inside your web browser, so it doesn’t require any programs to be installed and can work with any OS via Google Chrome or Firefox. All of the work takes place on your personal machine, and nothing is uploaded to the internet until you tell it to export your data to Wikidata. Of the three, it is the most user-friendly, but that is not saying much. The interface is confusing, and you will probably spend hours on the internet looking up tutorials. However, it is more forgiving if you mess up. Unlike OpenRefine, QuickStatements is very unforgiving and appears to have issues with dates. If you need to write queries, then SPARQL is your best bet, but you will need to watch tutorials to figure out how to use it properly.

Data security is also a concern since Wikidata can be edited by anyone and is open access. However, all the presenters had little to no malicious data tampering. Usually, incorrect data was due to mistakes made to the record by various users instead of malicious tampering.

While the information I gained is informative, it is not what I really was hoping to gain from the session. I wanted more information about how to use these tools, not just an introduction to them. Hopefully, the next deep dive will provide more of a tutorial on how to correctly utilize these tools.

Session C3: Cool Tools Café
Sunday, July 17, 2022

by Kate Peck, University of California Berkeley

The Cool Tools Café session on Sunday offered a rapid-fire introduction to twelve different digital tools being used by academic librarians in a variety of different roles, then had the presenters spread out across the room and answer questions from those who were interested. The applications described can be divided into three rough categories - scheduling, research organization, and instructional.

The scheduling tools demonstrated were:

- Calendly (free version available) - a vendor neutral tool that allows varying lengths of meetings, syncs with your calendar, and allows you to build buffers in between meetings.
- RescueTime (free lite version available) - an automatic time tracking software that helps the user focus and manage their time.
- Timely (paid annual) - marketed primarily towards small businesses, this software helps schedule meetings and appointments, track projects, and monitor costs.

The tools that can help users organize research or projects were:

- PowerNotes (1 free project) - use simple cards to collect data and insights, then re-arrange them as you see fit; allows multiple collaborators with varying levels of permission.
- Workflowy (free version available) - a minimalist tool that allows infinitely nested outlines, with options for tagging and creating kanban boards.
- Airtable (free version available) - a powerful and flexible database tool with numerous premade templates that can handle large scale projects such as the publication permissions management demonstrated by the presenter.

The tools that could help librarians in instruction were:

- Tango (free version available) - a straightforward and easy-to-use tool that allows the user to make screenshots and arrange them into workflows.
- Screencastify (free version available) - a web-based tool that makes it easy to create, edit, and share short videos.
- Prezi Video (5 free projects up to 15 minutes long) - capture onscreen content together with video of the presenter or give live presentations alongside your content.
LibWizard (SpringShare product, paid) - a tool for building interactive self-paced tutorials, it can work in tandem with their other products, most notably LibGuides.

Goose Chase (limited free version available) - create missions such as checking in at certain locations, taking photos, or answering questions for students to complete; organizer can track progress in real time.

Perusall (free) - a discussion forum for class readings that allows social annotations and deep reading as a way to engage students before they reach the classroom.

There is a serendipity that often happens in one-on-one conversations between librarians, where one mentions a tool or app that they are using and which the other realizes would fit their needs perfectly. The Cool Tools Café condenses that serendipity into a 60 minute session that all of us can benefit from. Many thanks to the organizers and all ten of the presenters.

Session D1: Collection Development and Acquiring with a Conscience
Monday, July 18, 2022

by Jacob Nunnally, Hofstra University

Coordinator and moderator:
Ajaye Bloomstone – Acquisitions Librarian, LSU Paul M. Hebert Law Center, LSU Law Center Library

Panelists:
Dawn Smith – Associate Director for Technical Services, Yale Law School, Lillian Goldman Law Library
Jessica Ugstad – Collections Management Librarian, University of Arizona James E. Rogers College of Law, Daniel F. Cracchiolo Law Library
Anna Lawless-Collins – Associate Director for Systems & Collection Services, Boston University School of Law, Fineman and Pappas Law Libraries
Elisabeth Umpleby – Head of Technical Services, University of Connecticut School of Law, Thomas J. Meskill Law Library

The academic law librarians who presented in this insightful program described how they approach the acquisition of diversity, equity, and inclusion titles. In addition to relating their approach to DEI acquisitions, each panelist discussed how their work fits within the larger context of social justice efforts in law school libraries. After the presentations, attendees were given the opportunity to chat with nearby colleagues in a breakout session to see what others are doing pertaining to DEI acquisitions and social justice projects.

Panelist Dawn Smith began the program by exploring ways to approach thinking about diversifying collections. She asked: can folks in tech services do DEI? The answer: “Yes!” Everyone in tech services can contribute to diversifying their print and electronic collections. We don’t have all the answers, she asserted, but that’s okay; being “intentional” in one’s work – approaching the acquisition of DEI resources purposefully – is the starting point. Many technical services staff have become used to purchasing titles “on auto-pilot,” and thinking critically and purposefully about what we acquire and why we acquire it is a mindset that can counteract the tendency some have developed to habitually acquire the same kinds of traditional resources year after year.

Next, Anna Lawless-Collins described Boston University’s experience diversifying their collection. In the wake of the George Floyd protests and the rise of Black Lives Matter, Anna and her colleagues began evaluating their collection to see how they could contribute to diversifying it. They believed such an approach was, morally, the right thing to do. Anna used Alma Analytics to determine collection strengths and weaknesses and consulted resources such as the RIPS-SIS metaguide for diversifying collections and GOBI DEI lists to find inspiration for new acquisitions and new workflows. In line with what Dawn previously mentioned about being intentional, Anna and her BU colleagues updated their collection development policy to include an emphasis on diversifying their collection and an anti-racism statement. Acquisitions, of course, require funding, and Anna conceded that “for libraries with just in time collections, this could be difficult.” This challenge notwithstanding, Anna’s presentation included a great deal of helpful and inspiring information.

The third panelist, Jessica Ugstad, discussed her experience acquiring with a conscience at the University of Arizona. In 2019, she and her colleagues elevated in importance their acquisition of tribal law resources. In 2020, they placed an emphasis on anti-racist and social justice resources. Like Anna, Jessica mentioned she received institutional support for these efforts – support from her library director, the law school dean, and other decision-makers on campus. Jessica described how she and her colleagues went “broad” in terms of the scope of their DEI acquisitions: they included subjects such as immigration, indigenous activism, and other similar topics in their diversification activities. They promoted their work via presentations, displays, a blog, and an anti-racism and social justice statement placed prominently on their law library homepage. Jessica concluded her presentation by stating that she and her colleagues are in the process of updating their collection development policy.

The final panelist, Elisabeth Umpleby, began her presentation by observing that she and her colleagues at the University of Connecticut weren’t quite as far along as some of the other presenters in diversifying their collection. Nevertheless, they began looking critically at their collection to learn where they were so they could see where they needed to get to. While Anna and Jessica received institutional support for their efforts, by contrast, Elisabeth reports there is “zero interest on our campus” for
diversifying collections or emphasizing social justice acquisitions. Even so, Elisabeth searched for information sources that could help: she consulted GOBI lists, various DEI LibGuides, Elgar’s DEI package, and the NELLCO “Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging in Library Collections Toolkit,” a copy of which was given to each attendee. To conclude, Elisabeth asked two thought-provoking questions: (1) “If we buy it, will they come?” In other words, what will be the end result of the time, effort, and money spent on such efforts be? Since there is limited interest in diversifying collections at her institution, how do they assess what they’re doing? (2) The second question is a practical yet important one: “How do we continue to pay for it?” Many academic law libraries have flat budgets, and while we want to create diverse collections, they must be sustainable. Tracking expenditures and comparing with the interest level on campus will be an important part of assessing their efforts in future years.

The program ended with a breakout session that gave attendees time to discuss collection development and acquisitions projects at their respective institutions. This was a great way to end a timely and insightful program.

Session E1: Beyond “Change the Subject:” Cataloging with a Conscience for Sustainable Inclusive Descriptive Practice Monday, July 18, 2022

by Patricia Sayer-McCoy

Speakers:
Laura Daniels, Assistant Director, Metadata Production, Cornell University Library
Julie Hardesty, Metadata Analyst/Associate Librarian, Indiana University Bloomington
Ryan Tamares, Head of Collection Services, Stanford Law Library
Jackie Magagnosc, Moderator, Cataloging and Continuations Management Librarian, Cornell Law Library

This program was a follow-up to the “Change the Subject” discussions. Each speaker talked about their understanding of the idea of updating subject headings to be less offensive and more inclusive, and then discussed projects they are working on at their libraries.

Jackie Magagnosc talked how subject analysis is the next step in DEI since developing a DEI policy means that the catalog must also include DEI principles. But controlled vocabularies of large groups are hard to change, and, like LC, are highly structured and may have many gaps.

Laura Daniels talked about how her library is updating the “Illegal aliens” subject headings by adding new terms to the records or replacing outdated ones. Since LC is slow to change, they looked for processes that can be done outside the LC structure. They have a model process that can be applied to other subject headings, too. They use a local authority file to collect new headings and link them to the ones they want to change. Then their discovery layer uses redirects from the old headings to the new ones. Although local authority files can be overwhelming and inconsistent without good maintenance, they do bypass LC and can be developed for the local library and community. By redirecting the headings in the catalog record, the manual work of changing the records is eliminated and can be updated as needed. The offensive headings are still in the MARC record but do not display in the public record.

Creating a local authority file can be complicated because local terms need to be thoroughly researched and several questions arise, like whether to use the legal or common terms for subjects and how to get community members involved. The local community determines the “authority” of a term. This makes creating terms easier since LC has a strict process to create new subject headings and are based on “literary merit.” If there aren’t many publications on the topic, LC may not accept the term. LC itself is problematic because it excludes individuals’ culture and their terms. LC also does not use individual’s names for themselves although this is being challenged now. However, there are multiple “right” ways to create new terms.

In order to get administrative support, she started with the “low hanging fruit” to show how the changes support the mission and values of the University and why they should make the changes.

Julie Hardesty emphasized that LC headings are white, cis, heterosexual, Christian, and male in structure and centers power and control, therefore, they are not neutral. This makes LC headings judgmental as well as offensive. This problem was identified (at least in print) at least ten years ago, but not much has been done. Catalogers have limited time and money to either update LC headings or create new vocabularies though, so changing each term individually isn’t feasible. Another issue is that communities are not monolithic, so often there is no single heading that can replace the LC heading.

At her library, they use JavaScript to link LC gender/sexuality terms to similar terms in Homosaurus. Matching LC terms or near matches can be replaced with the Homosaurus term. This is a “proof of concept” project right now and is not automated yet. It has only been tested with Homosaurus, but other thesauri should work, too. She reached out to Homosaurus to create the API for their project. She suggests that librarians encourage Linked Data in many vocabularies as well. Using non-LC vocabularies requires examining all incoming records, either manually or automatically, and then updating as needed. Some vendors are also using non-LC vocabularies. Batch updating can be difficult if the headings are not one-to-one replacements, so some headings may need more work than others.
She expressed concerns about the political aspects of the "Illegal aliens” subject change process and wonders if other headings may likewise be affected. SAC (Subject Action Committee) is looking into creating an LC advisory group that is not just catalogers to examine these questions. Ryan Tamares talked about DEI efforts at his library. Their DEI Committee had showings of the film “Change the Subject” for students and panel discussion following the showing. They have other plans to continue the panels—the next one planned is on Patsy Mink, the first woman of color to be elected to Congress. Program planners need to be prepared for difficult, emotional discussions, though. The library also plans to finish the “illegal aliens” headings updating. Ryan said that they had to start small but still wanted to show results in order to demonstrate the need and process to change headings.

He also discussed the newly emerging issue of LC classification and DEI, especially the Cutter numbers pre-assigned in the schedules that also use offensive language—N instead of B. for example. These cutters are mostly found in the E-F and H schedules, although they are used in other classifications too. There is a lot of work to do in order to change the Cutters since the changes also have to go through an LC approval process. However, there is a new legal schedule for American Indigenous people, Kl-KiX, so LC is aware of the need for changed classification schedules as well as headings.

With the close of volume 47, columns that have remained vacant include Acquisitions, Classification, Description and Entry, Management, and Private Law Libraries. Several regular columnists were unfortunately unable to provide articles in their field due to the pandemic. There was nothing of note happening to report. This is expected to happen less as the profession recovers from the pandemic and events resume. I plan to reassess content over the next year to allow for change with volume 49 in 2023. I will be looking at columns that are vacant as well as columns that have assigned columnists but articles were not provided for substantial duration in 2021-2022 volume 47. I plan to keep current columns in volume 48 but I will discuss the need for volunteers with relevant caucuses and create a plan to weeder irrelevant or otherwise vacant columns for volume 49.

The only Editorial Staff change was Joan Stringfellow taking over in June as Layout Editor for Carol Morgan Collins. Board members remain unchanged with outgoing members agreeing to stay on for another term. All other board members are continuing their terms.

As we look forward to another year shaped by the likely decline of the Covid-19 pandemic, we look to volume 48 to find strength in our membership. Participation in authoring permanent or guest columns declined with the added burdens of the pandemic. We hope to move forward with the support of our membership. TS-SIS and LSRD-SIS members are talented. We encourage members to compose guest articles on a topic of their choosing or to fill in and write a vacant column on an issue-by-issue basis. We call upon our knowledgeable, well spoken, creative capabilities to fill vacant columns. For TSLL to remain a forum for the open exchange of ideas in technical services, we must have columnists willing to rise to the occasion to write about current topics relevant to their craft. We need people to write about problem solving, current projects, and bring current issues of relevance to the table for discussion. We must have content to have a publication, and now is the time to volunteer to contribute. Those wishing to volunteer to write a column may contact Sara Campbell at saracampbell2@my.unt.edu. I also welcome input regarding the relevance of vacant or missing columns.
I look forward to another great year supporting our columnists’ efforts as Editor-in-Chief. The current climate is a transition with which we look to volume 48 to serve as a guide for the post-pandemic library’s development. Volunteering to write for TSLL is an opportunity to shape the future of the publication and the profession. I need you to take the initiative as Elizabeth Outler, Rachel Decker, Aaron Retteen, Stuart Zimmerman, and Cindy Tian did over the course of volume 47 this year. I need more people writing special lead columns, authoring a one-time column for an issue that is vacant, volunteering to take up a vacant column on a regular basis, and providing valuable feedback on the annual TS-SIS Management Institute Grant. We all have a story to tell professionally, and I want to hear yours.

Sara E. Campbell, JD, MLIS
TSLL Editor-in-Chief (July 2020-present)
Technical Services Law Librarian Annual Report
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