Greetings TS-SIS!

It’s hard to believe that this is my last “From the Chair” column in TSLL. It’s been a crazy, hectic year, and our work in TS wouldn’t have been possible without all of you! As we enter Annual Meeting time, a new TS-SIS Executive Board will be taking over the reins for 2023-2024:

• Chair: Shawn King, University of Wisconsin
• Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect: Yan Yu, Notre Dame Law School
• Past Chair: Jason LeMay, Emory University
• Secretary/Treasurer: Kevin Carey, Ohio State University
• Member-at-Large: Rachel Decker, Chapman University
• Member-at-Large: Diana Dulek, University of Houston

I want to express my thanks to those who served on the board and as committee chairs this past year. I truly felt overwhelmed as the year began until I realized how much of the work was being done by everyone who served. You all have truly made this year possible for me, and I greatly appreciate every single one of you!

Now, on to the upcoming Annual Meeting information! As I write this, we are still finalizing our schedule for the 2023 Annual Meeting. We will be hosting several meetings virtually once again, including the TS-SIS Business Meeting. Virtual meeting information and registration links will be sent out via My Communities and will also be available from the TS-SIS page at https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/education-training/annual-meeting/2023-annual-meeting-information/.

We are also hosting four meetings on-site in Boston:

• Management Issues Roundtable
  • (Sunday, 7/16, 12:45PM-1:45PM, Hynes-201)
• TS and LSRD Hot Topic
  • (Sunday, 7/16, 5:30PM-6:30PM, Marriott-Suffolk)
• Resource Management Roundtable
  • (Monday, 7/17, 12:15PM-1:15PM, Hynes-201)
• Metadata Management Roundtable
  • (Monday, 7/17, 5:45PM-6:45PM, Marriott-Tremont)
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2022-2023 Officers, Committee Chairs, and Representatives

**LSRD-SIS:**
- Chair: Keiko Okuhara
  - University of Hawaii
- Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect: Rebecca L. Bearden
  - Boston University
- Past Chair: Larissa Sullivan
  - Indiana University
- Secretary/Treasurer (2021-2023):
  - Chris Todd
    - University of Pittsburgh
- Members-at-Large:
  - Keelan Weber (2021-23)
    - University of Nebraska
  - Bee Borheime (2023-24)
    - University of San Diego School of Law
- Education Committee:
  - Kevin Carey
    - Ohio State University
- Local Systems Committee:
  - Keiko Okuhara
    - University of Hawaii
- Nomination Committee:
  - Jessica Pasquale
    - University of Michigan
- OCLC Committee:
  - Christopher Thomas (2021-23)
    - UCLA
- Web Advisory Committee:
  - Kevin Carey
    - Ohio State University

**TS-SIS:**
- Chair: Jason LeMay
  - Emory University
- Vice Chair/Chair-Elect: Shawn King
  - University of Wisconsin
- Past Chair: Joan Stringfellow
  - Texas A&M University
- Secretary/Treasurer (2022-2024):
  - Kevin Carey
    - Ohio State University
- Members-at-Large:
  - Jessie Tam (2021-23)
    - Thurgood Marshall State Law Library
  - Rachel Decker (2022-2024)
    - Chapman University
- Awards Committee:
  - Keena Hilliard
    - Temple University
- Bylaws & Handbook Committee:
  - Joan Stringfellow
    - Texas A&M University
- Membership Committee:
  - Lisa Britt Wemke
    - University of Cincinnati
- Metadata Management Committee:
  - Christopher Thomas (2021-23)
    - UCLA
  - Rachel Decker (2022-2024)
    - Chapman University
- Nominating Committee:
  - Barbara Szalkowski
    - South Texas College of Law
- Professional Development Committee:
  - Jennifer Mart-Rice (2021-23)
    - University of Iowa
  - Jacqueline Magagnosc (2022-2024)
    - Cornell University
- Resource Management Committee:
  - Elizabeth Umpleby (2021-23)
    - University of Connecticut
  - Laura Fouladi (2022-2024)
    - University of California Irvine
- Website Coordinator:
  - Marijah Sroczynski
    - Morrison & Foerster LLP

**LSRD and TS-SIS Representatives/Liaisons**
- ALA MARC Advisory Committee (MAC)
  - Kate Peck, University of California Berkeley (2021-2024)
- ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)
  - Ryan Tamares, Stanford University (2021-2024)
- ALA Subject Analysis Committee (SAC)
  - Cate Kellett, Yale University (2021-2024)
  - Funding Research Opportunities Grant (FROG)
    - Chair, Jessie Tam, Thurgood Marshall State Law Library (2021-25)
  - Rep.-at-Large: Heather Buckwalter, Creighton University (2021-23)
- LSRD-SIS Reps:
  - Kevin Carey, Ohio State University (2021-23)
  - Corinne Jacon, Creighton University (2022-2024)
- TS-SIS Reps:
  - Jennifer Argueta, University of La Verne (2021-25)
  - Joe Anteau, Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone (2022-2024)

---

**Editorial Board SIS Representatives:**

**LSRD-SIS:**
- Rachel Evans (2021-23)
  - University of Georgia
- Chris Todd (2022-24)
  - University of Pittsburgh

**TS-SIS:**
- Keelan Weber (2021-23)
  - University of Nebraska
- Ismael Gullon (2022-2024)
  - Mercer University

---

**TSLL Staff**

**Editor-in-Chief:**
- Sara E. Campbell

**Associate Editor:**
- Stacy Fowler
  - St. Mary’s University

**Layout & Design:**
- Joan Stringfellow
  - Texas A&M University

**Web Manager:**
- Marijah Sroczynski
  - Morrison & Foerster LLP

**Contributing Authors:**
- Acquisitions:
  - Vacant
- CC:DA:
  - Ryan Tamares
- Classification:
  - Vacant
- Collection Development:
  - Adrienne DeVitt
- Conference Round-up:
  - Rachel Evans
- Description & Entry:
  - Vacant
- The Internet:
  - Wilhelmina Randtke
- Library Metrics:
  - Vacant
- Management:
  - Vacant
- MARC Remarks:
  - Rachel Decker
- OCLC:
  - Christopher Thomas
- Preservation:
  - Lauren Seney
- Private Law Libraries:
  - Vacant
- Research & Publications:
  - Elizabeth outlaw
- Serial Issues:
  - Paula Seeger
- Serial Titles:
  - Cindy Tian
- Subject Headings:
  - Patrick Lavey
- TechScans:
  - Travis Spence

---
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**LSRD and TS-SIS Representatives/Liaisons**

**ALC MARC Advisory Committee (MAC)**
- Kate Peck, University of California Berkeley (2021-2024)

**ALC Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)**
- Ryan Tamares, Stanford University (2021-2024)

**ALA Subject Analysis Committee [SAC]**
- Cate Kellett, Yale University (2021-2024)
- Funding Research Opportunities Grant (FROG)
  - Chair, Jessie Tam, Thurgood Marshall State Law Library (2021-25)
  - Rep.-at-Large: Heather Buckwalter, Creighton University (2021-23)

**LSRD-SIS Reps:**
- Kevin Carey, Ohio State University (2021-23)
- Corinne Jacon, Creighton University (2022-2024)

**TS-SIS Reps:**
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In addition to our meetings, there are a fair number of sessions scheduled in Boston that are likely to be of interest to our TS colleagues. Among them:

- **Selector School**
  - (Sunday, 7/16, 11:30AM-12:30PM)
- **Withdrawing Large Collections (TS-SIS Sponsored Program)**
  - (Sunday, 7/16, 3:15PM-4:15PM)
- **Batch Please: Leveraging Batch Record Loading…**
  - (Monday, 7/17, 9:30AM-10:30AM)
- **Discovering Diversity through Linked Data**
  - (Tuesday, 7/18, 11:15AM-12:15PM)

This is just a small sample of what’s available this year, so be sure to check out the annual meeting information on the TS-SIS website mentioned above for a complete list with registration links for virtual meetings and detailed information for in-person sessions. I hope to see all of you in Boston, but I know many of us are still facing tough budget situations with limited travel. For those who won’t be able to be there in person, I look forward to seeing you at the Business Meeting via Zoom!

Thank you all for making this an incredible year serving as Chair!

Jason LeMay

---

Library Systems & Resources Special Interest Section

**Keiko Okuhara, University of Hawaii**

Aloha to esteemed fellow LSRD-SIS members!

Summer is right around the corner! In the blink of an eye, it's time for the 2023 Annual Conference in Boston. If you are planning on attending the conference in July, please consider joining us for LSRD-SIS sponsored programs and meetings. I would like to thank the Education Committee, Executive Board, and committee Chairs who worked so diligently on the planning. There will also be OCLC and Education Committee Meetings as a Post-Conference. We hope these events are of interest to you. Here are some highlights.

**Sunday, July 16**

Incoming board meeting 7:30am – 8:45am EDT: Marriott-Orleans VIP Program on FOLIO 5:30pm – 6:30pm EDT: Marriott-Tufts

**Monday, July 17**

Batch Please 9:30am – 10:30am EDT: Hynes-309
Local Systems Comm. MTG 12:15pm – 1:15pm EDT: Hynes-105

**Tuesday, July 18**

Discovering Diversity through Linked Data 11:15am – 12:15pm EDT: Hynes-311

**Post-Conference --- August 8 @3:00 PM EST**

OCLC Committee Meeting <Register in advance for this meeting> https://hawaii.zoom.us/meeting/register/tJUvfu-vrj8H9ShVcr82Q1G6xncz30fgNEy

Using Google Scholar with WorldShare Discovery by Diana Reid, Electronic Resources and Discovery Librarian & Assistant Professor, University of Louisville

**Pre-Conference --- LSRD-SIS Business Meeting June 23rd at 2 pm EST**

We will host a virtual business meeting on Friday, June 23rd at 2 pm EST. At the annual business meeting, a vote will be taken to approve the minutes of the June 28, 2022 meeting as well as on the proposed amendments to bylaws. The draft of the minutes is included in this column for your perusal.

Proposed changes are:

- Update the LSRD-SIS object to broaden the scope of tasks
- Clarify the members of the Executive Board and their duties and terms
- Clarify the members who attend the board meeting

As the results of our recent LSRD-SIS election, it is my pleasure to welcome Joseph Cera and Danielle Elder. They are our elected incoming Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect and Secretary/Treasurer respectively. Congratulations to both of you! I would like to thank all of the candidates for running for this year's election and the Chair of the Nominating Committee for putting together such a fabulous slate of candidates, as well as all the members of the LSRD-SIS for taking time to vote! I look forward to serving on the board together. I am thrilled with the future of our SIS!

**Here is your incoming LSRD-SIS Executive Board for 2023-2024:**

Chair: Rebecca L Bearden, Boston University

Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect: Joseph Cera, UC Berkeley Law Library

Past Chair: Keiko Okuhara, University of Hawaii at Manoa

Secretary/Treasurer: Danielle Elder, University of Texas at Austin, Tarlton Law Library

Member-at-Large: Keelan Webber, Cassidy Cataloging

Member-at-Large: Bee Bornheimer, University of San Diego
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FROM THE CHAIR

(Cont. from p. 3)

I would like to thank our hard working board members who were a great support to me! I really appreciate all your help and assistance in making things happen and moving forward together. We are a wonderful team! It was indeed fortunate for me to work with you! I extend my hearty appreciation to our outgoing board members: Larissa Sullivan for providing excellent leadership for and making contributions to the board for the past three years and Chris Todd for managing a challenging dual role and doing an excellent job in handling our finances, meeting minutes, and elections.

In the last quarter’s column, our biennial membership survey was referred, which was efficiently administered by our Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, Rebecca L Bearden. Becky kindly summarized the results, which was posted on the LSRD list, but here are some interesting comparison and outcomes. In the last survey in 2021, over 40% of respondents have worked in law libraries for 20+ years, however in the 2023 survey, over 50% of respondents worked for less than a year or five years, indicating that there is a change in our demography. Plus, we found some positive feedback about our SIS. Over 80% of respondents were either satisfied or extremely satisfied with our SIS events to meet their expectation for networking; pertaining to their work interests or responsibilities; and keeping abreast with the law library systems and platforms. Although we know we need to improve, we are very humbled and encouraged by these responses.

Becky commented that “Our members provided us with some very helpful feedback and suggestions. Some comments educated the board on existing tools and information we can promote better to our members. Others made us aware of other issues of concern for our members. We also got many excellent programming suggestions, some of which we hope to take an action on in the coming year.”

Please support our great leader, Rebecca L Bearden, to make the LSRD invigorating for further improvement to serve you better. Thank you, Becky! This is a good occasion to remind you that our SIS is supported by you ---- your willingness to volunteer for a committee --- to share your ideas for innovation. In return, you will be given a chance to grow professionally and to cultivate leadership skills and furthermore to connect and network with your peers. I would like to encourage all of you to get involved with this evolving fun SIS!

As my tenure as Chair draws to an end, I would like to thank all of you for giving me an opportunity to serve you! I know I couldn’t have done so without the indispensable help from you and dedicated board members. Thank you so very much for all your support! It has truly been a precious and gratifying experience for me. I look forward to seeing many of you and getting to talk face to face! Please make sure that you will bring “favored sessions” back to your home institutions.

A hui hou!
Keiko Okuhara

THE INTERNET

Centralized Corporate Power and Artificial Intelligence

by Wilhelmina Randtke, Georgia Southern University

Introduction

These past few months there has been buzz about ChatGPT, which is one product controlled by two companies. And the buzz has been almost using ChatGPT as a synonym for artificial intelligence (AI). But, is that true? Well, for the specific kind of artificial intelligence, an implementation of machine learning that has enough detail to have a human feel, pretty much, yeah.

What is ChatGPT?

ChatGPT is an English language chatbot which writes freeform text. As opposed to having a decision tree and canned responses, which is one meaning of chatbot, it can write essays, news articles, and other texts that read fluidly.

Who owns the tech behind ChatGPT?

ChatGPT is built with 2 things. First, the algorithm, which is a proprietary codebase owned by OpenAI. There is a free of charge demo online interface to a ChatGPT service based on the GPT 3.5 version of the codebase. [1] There is also a fee based API to both the GPT 3.5 and 4 versions, with a higher cost for version 4 which is only available by API. [2] Second, the pretraining, which is a tremendously resource intensive process, such that even if the code were available, which it isn’t, there would still be a significant entry barrier for someone else to use the identical code to implement something similar.

For GPT 3.5 and 4 implementations powering the web based service which has gotten so much buzz, both the untrained and the trained algorithm are owned exclusively by OpenAI with Microsoft providing investment funding in exchange for exclusive access to the code. [3]


(Cont. from p. 4)
You might think, “OpenAI has ‘open’ in the name. What’s up with that?” Welp, OpenAI initially started as a nonprofit in 2015. Then in 2019, it reorganized as a for-profit. [4] Investors coming in could earn up to 100 times their initial investment, and then growth beyond that point reverts to the nonprofit entity.

Who owns the algorithm: The code used to run ChatGPT 3.5 and 4 is not available. But, it’s a little more interesting than that. There were two earlier versions, GPT1 and GPT2. You can get the GPT2 code at https://github.com/openai/gpt-2, and the license is here https://github.com/openai/gpt-2/blob/master/LICENSE.

Starting with GPT 3, OpenAI gave Microsoft exclusive access to the code. [5]

OpenAI has a GitHub, and when I researched this paper, I found some people citing specific repositories there as if they were code. Really, most of the GitHub account is a showcase of supporting documentation for academic research papers published by OpenAI researchers. For example, the gpt3 repository at https://github.com/openai/gpt-3 is a dataset, showing inputs and outputs from GPT3, and supports this academic paper analyzing the algorithm https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.14165. I saw some references online to the gpt-3 repository as a codebase, but it isn’t. Basically, after GPT2, the code isn’t available, although you can find sources saying that it is.

Who owns the pretrained algorithm: GPT stands for Generative Pre-trained Transformer. Pre-training is an extremely resource intensive process. Unlike a hard coded algorithm that has predefined decision points, a machine learning algorithm has pattern recognition to let it process data, and it trains on a set of data to begin recognizing patterns. Pretraining involves processing a whole bunch of data and finding patterns in it. For a chatbot, that’s processing a whole bunch of text written by people.

While OpenAI released the GPT 2 code, it did not release the trained algorithm. See https://openai.com/research/better-language-models. In order to implement that older version of code, someone would have to assemble data and then power enough computer processors for long enough to get through the training process.

Pretraining is resource intensive. When OpenAI gave Microsoft exclusive access to the code, it was part of a deal which involved Microsoft providing computer resources to do the training. Regarding the ChatGPT 4 implementation, OpenAI has said they won’t disclose what data it was trained on. [6] ChatGPT version 3 trained on a dataset of more than 570 GB of plain text consisting of web crawls, books, and the text of Wikipedia. [7] Costs to crunch the data and train the GPT 3 algorithm are estimated at more than $12 million. [8] Costs to train Hugging Face’s BLOOM, an academic chatbot based on machine learning, is estimated at no more than $10 million. [9] That seems to be an estimate of costs to run the computer chips doing the number crunching, but not salaries for technical employees and the whole organizational structure of it. The research paper describing development of ChatGPT 3 describes significant planning, structuring, and human labor in the training process. For example, the web crawl data in the ChatGPT 3 training set started at 45 TB but was filtered down to 670 GB, with people doing the data wrangling, then adjusting which data sources would be weighted most heavily. [10] While machine learning is heavy on computer resource requirements, employee time to implement technology is also a cost. For perspective, when I was project manager for the Florida Online Journals service at journals.flvc.org, annual costs to run the platform were about $30K annually with about $6K of that toward the hosting bill and the rest towards employee time. It’s apples and oranges with different kinds of technology, different industries (private vs government is a different compensation package; and different fields of technology impacts being able to recruit at various price points), and basically different operations. Nevertheless, staff time implementing the technology is an additional cost. ChatGPT 4 presumably had a bigger dataset for training than did ChatGPT 3, which means more computer number crunching costs and more staff time in data preparation and implementation logistics. It’s safe to say that it takes a significant amount of money to go from code to implementation because of the training costs. Entry costs limit which companies can enter the market and might be high enough to exclude academic entities from entering at all.


The computing power isn’t just a financial cost. Infrastructure is a requirement as well. Crunching numbers and processing data happens on a physical computer. If that computer is “in the cloud,” that really means that the computer is someone else’s servers. A computer “in the cloud” still exists in the real world. Microsoft contributed the investment resources to OpenAI in the form of cash and providing Microsoft Azure server time. Training GPT4 took 10,000 NVIDIA chips. These aren’t regular graphics cards like you would buy for your home use. These are specialized chips costing in the ballpark of $12,500 each. For perspective, gaming computers (ie. computers with a graphics card and capable of more intense number crunching) for sale at Costco range from $800 to $2,900 to the home and small business market. There are a limited number of companies offering cloud computing resources at that scale. Essentially, even with funding to pay the server bill, someone wanting to train an algorithm would likely have to partner with a large established incumbent because only a large established incumbent has servers to rent out at that scale. Limitations from the number of chips and computers required to work with machine learning AI applications can strain even large incumbents. Microsoft, which is huge, is reportedly rationing hardware resources internally because of the resource needs of OpenAI. And, the subscription based (fee based!) ChatGPT 4 API is not readily available. Instead, there is a waitlist.

Essentially, the nature of this style of AI, the machine learning style, with such high costs to train an algorithm and costs to keep the trained algorithm operating, means only a few large players can afford the entry barrier. In fact, the only other similar chatbot in existence today is Bard, launched by Google in March 2023 in order to capture some of the buzz caused by the OpenAI and Microsoft partnership with ChatGPT. ChatGPT got a lot of buzz, and Google was able to launch a similar product quickly, but, also, Google is really really big. For perspective, Microsoft has a market cap of $2,381,744,302,609. Alphabet (formerly Google) has a market cap of $1,602,292,321,804. And Walmart has a market cap of $400,636,923,620.

What companies are using ChatGPT?

ChatGPT has a fee based API that lets other companies tap into ChatGPT over the web. With the API, someone can send prompts and get the response back. For example, an advertising company can send a prompt automatically generate an email and use that for more interactive email campaigns or more closely targeted email campaigns. A company might also use the API to implement a first level of customer support. Obviously, feeding in the correct data to get a meaningful and accurate response is a challenge and a technical hurdle. But, many current AI which seems similar to ChatGPT are more than similar and actually is built on the ChatGPT API. Even as competitors emerge, the sheer amount of computations and number crunching to train a similar algorithm is so expensive that, by its nature, this kind of AI is going to be dominated by a very small number of large corporations.

What are the implications?

This specific style of AI is definitely not easy to implement. OpenAI’s product offering includes fee based API services. Because of that, there is a lot of buzz, and other companies are able to build products and services on top of ChatGPT. One of the dangers is that to a casual observer, it might look as if new AI implementations are broadly available. However, the truth is that this style of AI is heavily concentrated within just a few of the largest corporations. These few large incumbents control the access and steward the data used for training, and the nature of machine learning with high entry costs keeps the technology centralized.

---

[16] Alphabet (formerly Google) has a market cap of $1,602,292,321,804. [17] And Walmart has a market cap of $400,636,923,620. [18]
What’s More Fun Than Weeding in the Spring?

by Lauren Seney, University of Colorado

As I write this, spring has begun to emerge in Northern Colorado, which always triggers the urge for me to create order in my yard. I’m not sure if it’s because it’s so satisfying to clear a section of weeds or if it’s merely that I can finally be outside and enjoy the sun on a regular basis. It’s likely some of both. As a technical services librarian, I also see that there’s a strong correlation with my desire to tackle my library’s weeding project at the end of the spring semester. While the closing of the academic year feels like a good time to start a significant weeding project, the most successful approach to weeding is to incorporate it into your collection development policy and ensure it is being addressed throughout the year. Weeding is an important aspect of collection maintenance and can tie into many components of preservation. It’s also something that commonly stays on the back-burner until a mitigating factor makes it a necessity.

Weeding in libraries is inconsistently addressed, so identifying the best time to begin a project can be challenging. Weeding processes may be outlined in a collection development policies, but staffing constraints can make it challenging in practice. If your library is in the position where it can’t take on a large weeding project, regular interactions with the collection allow for some spot weeding as staff interact with high use areas, assess the condition of materials shelved there, and identify candidates for removal. In these interactions, library employees can also assess the condition of the facilities and determine if there is an environmental hazard that needs to be addressed or if there is a space issue that might necessitate weeding in a different part of the library. Small assessments of the collection also enable the library to prioritize areas with pressing preservation needs as well as those where the materials may no longer be relevant.

Advice from ALA for academic libraries states that “[t]he library’s collection should be reviewed on an ongoing basis to ensure that the collection is meeting the current curriculum, research and informational needs of faculty and students. Materials that no longer meet the needs of the university community may be removed from the collection. Librarians […] are responsible for tracking research trends and working with faculty in their assigned departments to ensure the library’s collection is maintained in a manner that meets the research needs of students, faculty, and staff.” [1] Components of this statement should ring true for all types of libraries, though the patrons and resources that meet their needs will vary. It’s important to know what local practice is in your library for deaccessioning materials as well as how weeding ties into your collection development and preservation policies. While some materials may be in rough shape, there may be reasons they are being kept, such as local historical significance or a lack of available copies elsewhere. Identifying these items during a weeding project allows for them to be given the appropriate preservation treatment to ensure they are accessible for the future.

Not everyone will share in my enjoyment of the weeding process, for either plants or books, but regularly reviewing your collection and deaccessioning materials as it ties into collection policies is in the best interest of all libraries. Sometimes, it’s a matter of finding the right person to undertake the project. Other times, it needs to be tied into other projects, such as a collection inventory or space assessment, to help incorporate it into existing workflows or priorities. By maintaining a consistent weeding practice, you can also hope that anything worthy of being submitted to Awful Library Books (https://awfullibrarybooks.net/) has already been removed from the shelves.


What are the most useful professional organizations to join when working with serials in law libraries?: Using AI for basic serials information

by Paula Seeger, Fox Rothschild, LLP

Here is a new twist on a “back to basics” question related to serials. I wanted to review the main organizations that are useful for workers dealing with serials in law libraries, both as an introduction for those with new staff responsibilities as well as a review for all. Rather than just a list and description, I thought it might be revealing to ask two different AI programs to tell us what they think are the groups that would be useful to join. I asked both ChatGPT (https://chat.openai.com/) and Google Bard (https://bard.google.com/) the same question: “What are the most useful professional organizations to join when working with serials in law libraries?”
Before discussing the results, perhaps you’re wondering why this is important. As AI services are incorporated more into search engines and common word processing applications, it will be crucial to understand how to interact with the programs to get the best results, as well as both what they mean for making work tasks more efficient and understanding how they introduce a nuanced and complex discernment that isn’t always involved with current internet searching. The use of these applications as a starting point, even an initial draft or introduction, seems to be safe to cautiously recommend, but each workplace will be determining the role as it applies to them. As of this writing, there is still a tremendous learning curve that is occurring to make the functionalities more reliable and accurate to be most beneficial.

Back to our question, I was both surprised and a little disappointed in the results. Both applications listed five groups, and not the same five. ChatGPT listed:

- American Association of Law Libraries (AALL)
- Association for Information Science and Technology (ASIS&T)
- Society for Scholarly Publishing (SSP)
- Special Libraries Association (SLA)
- International Association of Law Libraries (IALL)

The list included general information about how each membership might be useful, as well as certain benefits available to members. Similarly, Google’s Bard first listed the groups, but included a summary, then more information about each group, listing statistics such as membership numbers. They provided three different drafts, but each had the same information, just organized differently. Bard listed:

- The American Association of Law Libraries (AALL)
- The Legal Information Institute (LII)
- The Serials Section of the Association for Library Collections & Technical Services (ALCTS)
- The Law Library Association of the United States (LAA)
- The International Association of Law Libraries (IALL)

Both lists had a good start, including AALL, but why did they choose these five groups for each list? Some of the groups were obvious, but some were not as relevant as others, as if they used the key words “law libraries” but maybe not “serials” or skipped over the part about “professional organization.” I was surprised to see neither list included the North American Serials Interest Group (NASIG), one of the essential groups to consider, and perhaps this is because there is not a mention of “library” in the group’s name. Equally surprising was to see LII, which isn’t an organization for professional development and individual membership at all, and what exactly is LAA? I can’t even find a search result for this one in three different browsers. This illustrates how users need to be cautious with incomplete or inaccurate results.

Perhaps as important, how does this exercise inform the groups both included and left out of the resulting lists? Probably more than ever, search engine optimization tools will be critical aspects for AI applications and their engineers to “learn” how to improve results to queries. How will librarians be able to inform and assist with this process?

To sum up, both ChatGPT and Google Bard can be useful applications when getting started with various searches or drafting but are not reliable enough to be the only source used for work tasks. As the applications are more fully developed with library-related information, they can be one of many tools to use in the workplace or for personal tasks.

I open the question to readers: What do you find are the most useful professional organizations to join when working with serials in law libraries? Do you have an organization that you are a member of that is valuable for networking and consulting? I use AALL, NASIG, and the groups and lists associated with my integrated library system/library management system. If you have a recommended group or list not mentioned here, please message me, and I can share the results in a future column.

**Resources to Note**

Have you looked at the serials-related resources on the American Library Association’s website recently? Since this is a “back to basics” type of article, this is a good resource to mention for those needing a review or just starting out with serials-related work. This page includes links to articles, training, standards, and helpful guides. The page is a part of their Tools, Publications, and Resources tab and contains a handy A-Z guide to the contents.

**Call to Connect – A look ahead**

I invite you to offer your feedback and commentary on future topics of this column. If any specific serials issues are of interest to you, please take a moment to connect.
SERIALS TITLES

by Cindy Tian, University of Notre Dame

The following is a list of serials title changes:

Rocky Mountain Mineral Law Foundation Journal
v. 41, no. 1 (2004)-v. 58, no. 2 (2021)
(OCoLC)55538099

Changed to:
Foundation Journal for Natural Resources and Energy Law
v. 59, no. 1 (2022)
(OCoLC)1333205188

The following is a list of serials cessations:

National Disability Law Reporter
Ceased with:
completion of 2022
(OCoLC)23436341

Online Searcher
Ceased with:
v. 46, no. 6 (November/December 2022)
(OCoLC)812038505

Adelaide Law Review
Ceased in print with:
v. 43
(OCoLC)1461082
Continued online (free of charge) at
https://law.adelaide.edu.au/adelaide-law-review
(OCoLC)60615957

American Indian Culture and Research Journal
Ceased in print with:
v. 46
(OCoLC)1781938
Continued online (free of charge) at
http://www.books.aisc.ucla.edu/tocs.aspx
(OCoLC)609248081

Employee Rights and Employment Policy Journal
Ceased in print with:
v. 26
(OCoLC)38451971
Continued online (free of charge) at https://kentlaw.iit.edu/
(OCoLC)60620925

Hennepin Lawyer
Ceased in print with:
v. 91
(OCoLC)1752000
Continued online (free of charge) at
https://www.mnbar.org/hennepin-county-bar-
association/resources/hennepin-lawyer
(OCoLC)760002190

Mississippi College Law Review
Ceased in print with:
v. 40 (2022)
(OCoLC)4338905
Continued online (free of charge) at
https://dc.law.mc.edu/lawreview/
(OCoLC)60621766

University of Tasmania Law Review
Ceased in print with:
v. 41, no. 1 (2022)
(OCoLC)8592374
Continued online (as paid subscription) at
http://www.heinonline.org/HOL/Index?
index=jourrnals/utasman&collection=jourrnals
(OCoLC)60628612

Capitol Ideas
Ceased in print with:
v. 2022
(OCoLC)496286893
Continued online (free of charge) at
https://www.csg.org/work/publications/#tcs
(OCoLC)670449097

Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems
Ceased in print with:
v. 56, no. 1-2 (2022-2023)
(OCoLC)1564225
Continued online (free of charge) at https://jlsp.law.columbia.edu/
(OCoLC)54471083
A major change to a group of subject headings occurred recently. The former heading “Slaves” has been changed to “Enslaved persons,” and many related headings have been changed. Those libraries with authorities’ vendors will notice this gradually. Those who handle authority work in-house have a lot of work ahead of them. For example, “Indian slaves” has been changed to “Enslaved Indians,” “Child slaves” is now “Enslaved children,” and “Christian slaves” is now “Enslaved Christians.” Consulting the subject lists for December, January, and February will be helpful.

A new term, “Enslavers,” was established as a broader term for “Slave traders” and “Slave holders.” “Slave insurrections” has changed to “Slave rebellions.” This is going to be complicated. “Slave marriage” and “Slave narratives” remain the same, but “Slave soldiers” has changed to “Enslaved soldiers.” An unscientific survey I took while sipping coffee leads me to believe that more changes are coming, along with many changes in Used

For references. The next few months will be interesting.

New headings in law include “Originalism (Law),” a much written about and debated subject. “Integrated reporting” pertains to corporation reports. “Discrimination against dwarfs” and “Discrimination in the music trade” were added, as was “Gender expression—Law and legislation.” Heaven only knows what legal changes will result from “Chatbots.” “Railroad accidents—Ohio” and “Railroad accidents—Pennsylvania” have been much in the legal news. “Safe spaces” and “Space—Social aspects” are related and much discussed. “Climatic changes and war” finds its place under the existing heading “War.” “Conglomerate corporations—China” appeared, as did “Fosun International,” an example of such a corporation.

Several new topical headings appeared. “6G mobile communications systems” was established, this before I grew accustomed to “5G mobile communication systems,” established in 2019. “African American insurance companies,” “Historical commissions,” and “Post COVID-19 condition (Disease)” all appeared. “Arabs—Politics and government” and “Pre-Islamic prophets’ spouses” were added, as was “Kurdish nationalism” and “Kurds—Politics and government.” A long overdue heading is “Lynching victims.” In their honor, and in the cause of peace, The Equal Justice Initiative has built the “National Memorial for Peace and Justice (Montgomery, Ala.).” “Tiny houses” will help homelessness and the environment, it is hoped. A long overdue change related to slavery is the change from “Southampton Insurrection, 1831” to the more widely known “Nat Turner’s Rebellion, Virginia, 1831.”

Headings for classes of persons have expanded. “Asian American civic leaders,” “African American statesmen,” and “African American sexual minority women” were approved. “Lesbian prisoners” and “Sexual minority activists” also appeared.

New Genre/Form terms include “Incunabula,” “Autographs,” and “Manuscripts.” “Software” and “Transit maps” were approved.
LSRD-SIS 2022 Annual Business Meeting Minutes - Draft

(cont. from p. 10)

Vice Chair: Keiko Okuhara reports on the proposed merger with the AALL Law Repositories Caucus. While the merger was not approved by the caucus members, she points out that there are many options for future collaboration between the two groups. Keiko recommends expanding our focus to include a greater emphasis on non-ILS databases and non-MARC metadata. She asks the membership to contribute ideas for this expansion of our scope.

Secretary/Treasurer: Chris Todd reports that our balance stands at $5,471. In this fiscal year we have received $1,060 in dues revenue and spent $1,079 on SIS-related expenses. Our primary expenses for the year include the OCLC WorldShare training session at last year’s virtual conference, our recurring $300 donation to the AALL George A. Strait Minority scholarship fund, recognition gifts for the outgoing Chair, and LSRD promotional material for the conference in Denver.

The LSRD Executive Board election ran from May 5th to May 19th, returning 46 ballots and yielding the following results:

Vice Chair/Chair Elect:
Rachel Evans, University of Georgia, 2022-2025

Member-at-Large:
Keelan Weber, University of Nebraska, 2022-2024

Member-at-Large:
Becky Bearden, Boston University, 2022-2024

Members-at-Large: Keelan Weber joins the group by phone to introduce a report co-authored with Rachel Evans. This year, the Members-at-Large collaborated on LSRD branded buttons and promotional material that will be available at the annual meeting in Denver. Rachel and Keelan also organized a raffle to further drive interest in our recruitment table. Keelan is working on the LSRD Areas of Practice Libguide to encourage greater collaboration and informal mentorship throughout the SIS. She will be sharing a draft of this project with the membership soon.

Past Chair: Kevin Carey has participated in the board’s meetings and decision making throughout the year. His knowledge of the SIS and AALL has been crucial when advising the board on LSRD bylaws and procedures.

4. Committee Reports

FROG Committee: Jessie Tam reports on the committee’s work to promote the FROG grant via social media, online discussion, and the Technical Services Law Librarian. The committee received no new applications for the grant this past year. Jessie encourages the membership to submit research proposals and spread the word about FROG.

Local Systems Committee: Keiko reports on Local Systems Committee events over the past year. The July 2021 Roundtable meeting attracted 41 attendees and a recent session on normalization rules was attended by 26 participants. Keiko announces that the 2022 Local System Roundtable Meeting will be held in two sections: one in person at the conference followed by an online meeting at a later date.

OCLC Committee: Christopher Thomas reports on the outreach work of the committee via the OCLC Update column in the Technical Services Law Librarian and the LSRD discussion group. The committee will not be hosting an OCLC session at the annual meeting, but Christopher hopes this tradition will return for future meetings.

Nominating Committee: Jessica Pasquale organized and promoted the slate of candidates for this year’s executive board election.

Technical Services Law Librarian: Larissa reads a report provided by Editor Sara Campbell via email. Sara outlines the challenges facing the publication and the increased need for volunteer columnists. Despite these challenges, TSLL was issued on schedule in 2021/2022 and remains available on the AALL website and HeinOnline.

Web Advisory Committee: Kevin Carey reports on the committee’s work to keep the LSRD site updated and current. Along with members Keelan Weber and Ismael Gullon, the committee has focused on website improvements such as reviewing the procedure manual and updating committee pages. Kevin thanks Keiko for her ongoing contribution to the Website of the Month.

Discussion with Membership: Larissa opens the meeting to questions regarding the officer and committee chair reports. LSRD Member Pat Sayre-McCoy urges the group to consider donating to the newly formed Black Law Libraries SIS (BLL-SIS). Kevin notes some financial restrictions may inhibit this; the membership discusses the logistics of this donation.

5. New Business

Future of SIS: Larissa notes the need of LSRD to recruit new members, volunteers, and officers, all of which has been increasingly difficult in recent years. Despite these hardships, the distinct focus of the SIS remains important within the AALL ecosystem. Barbara Szalkowski notes the recent rebranding from OBS to LSRD was done with the longevity of the section in mind. Barbara acknowledges that many librarians are stretched thin, and often with limited resources for professional volunteering. Pat urges the group to use webinars to promote ongoing contact with members. Rachel notes collaboration with the Law Repositories Caucus should continue despite the non-merger. The officers share plans to staff the LSRD table at CONELL as part of the broader recruitment effort.
Please see the following research opportunity, and Don’t forget the FROG!

It's Quick, It's Easy, and Your Research Will Benefit Your Technical Services Colleagues.

The AALL LSRD-SIS and TS-SIS FROG (Funding Research Opportunities Grant) Committee is always accepting applications.

The FROG provides support for law librarians to perform research or assessment projects which will enhance our profession. FROG is open to all AALL members and must show evidence that their research will benefit technical services law librarianship. The LSRD/TS FROG Committee will award up to $1,000 in grants in a single year.

"AALL’s Strategic Plan envisions that AALL and its members will be the recognized authority in all aspects of legal information. AALL’s Research Agenda seeks to make that vision a reality by stimulating a diverse range of scholarship related to and supportive of the profession of law librarianship." – AALL Research Agenda 2013-2016.

For other research topic ideas, visit the FROG website and AALL’s Research Agenda page.

For more information on the grant and the application process, visit: Grant Guidelines

If you have any further questions, please email the FROG Committee Chair, Jessie Tam, at jessie.tam@mdcourts.gov
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