

DATE SUBMITTED: Tuesday, October 03, 2017

SUBMITTED BY: Nicole Dyszlewski, Chair

ON BEHALF OF ENTITY: Council of SIS Chairs

BOARD LIAISON: Meg Kribble

REQUIRES: ACTION ITEM

TOPIC: SIS Council Request to Restore Funding for ALA Representatives

SUMMARY: The SIS Council urges the AALL Executive Board to reinstate financial support for the AALL Liaisons to the ALA's Subject Analysis Committee (SAC), ALA's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), and the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) to insure AALL's continued input on cataloging policy.

In the recent absence of AALL funding, several SISs have contributed financial support for the Liaisons. This is inadequate in both the short-term and the long-term, because there are inherent difficulties if SISs must consistently provide this funding. Exclusive SIS funding for Liaisons means betting this exceedingly necessary representation against each SIS's ability to obtain sponsorship for meeting activities and could result in the loss of AALL's voice within the larger cataloging community.

The services provided by our Liaisons are indispensable to all AALL members. Thus, the Executive Board should recognize that this funding should come from AALL itself.

MOTION FOR BOARD ACTION: That the Executive Board reinstate financial support (consisting of funds for travel, accommodations, and registration fees) for AALL Liaisons to the ALA's Subject Analysis Committee(SAC); ALA's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA); and the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC).

FUNDS REQUIRED: \$9000/year

Supporting Documentation for SIS Council Proposal - Fall 2017

1. SIS Concerns about Collaborative Funding for the Cataloging Committee Liaisons
2. AALL 2017 Business Meeting of SIS Council [Draft Minutes]
3. Resolution passed by the Academic Law Libraries SIS in August 2017
4. Letter from the AALL representative to the MAC to the AALL Executive Committee dated September 2016

1. SIS Concerns about Collaborative Funding for the Cataloging Committee Liaisons

Asking 14 SIS boards to vote on funding was a time-consuming and frustrating process this year. Replicating this process each year would be prohibitive. Several current SIS leaders have said they cannot commit long term funding without an affirmative vote from their entire SIS membership. Planning and administering full membership votes for 14 SISs would be an unnecessary burden.

SISs exist to meet the specific needs of subsets of our profession that differ across library types, functions, and other special interests. The need for law librarian representation on these rulemaking committees extends to all AALL members. Therefore, the burden of funding law librarian participation in these committees rightly belongs to the parent organization.

This year, at SIS Council Chair, Nicole Dyszlewski's request, TS-SIS made the following suggestions for funding contributions from the SISs by size:

small SIS (0-199) : \$75
medium SIS (200-499) : \$300
large SIS (500+) : \$750

If every SIS contributed, this would net \$5,325, which is far short of the \$9,000 allocated in previous years by AALL. To date, 8 SISs have committed to provide a combined \$2,650 for this year. Even if the remaining SISs do vote to provide funding, the uncertainty of future funding leaves the liaisons unsure whether to commit to travel plans.

There may be an erroneous perception that many SISs have extraneous funds just sitting in their accounts. Each year most SISs commit to expensive annual meeting receptions and other events. These events are often supported by vendor sponsorships but the SISs don't have confirmation of those sponsorship funds until well after food, budget, and space rental commitments are made. To the extent that SISs are holding onto money it is largely to ensure sufficient funds are available to cover those commitments should sponsorship funds not materialize.

The SIS Council stands united in asking the AALL Executive Board to reinstate ongoing funding and commit to the long-term participation of law librarians in these critical rulemaking committees.

2. AALL 2017 Business Meeting of SIS Council [Draft Minutes]

7/15/17 2:45 pm

Recommendations for further consideration

2. Reconsider liaisons/representatives issue.

Stefanie [Pearlman] moved, and Karen Wahl seconded, the motion to have this council revisit the ALA Liaison funding issue and to explore creative ways to fund the liaisons.

3. Resolution passed by the Academic Law Libraries SIS in August 2017

The Executive Board of the Academic Special Interest Section urges the SIS Council and the American Association of Law Libraries to revisit the July 2016 decision of its Executive Board to discontinue financial support (consisting of funds for travel, accommodations, and registration fees) for its members who serve on the American Library Association's Subject Analysis Committee (SAC), the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), and the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC).

The classification of legal materials is the foundation of our work. The participation of these representatives serves as a vital link between AALL and the larger library community focused on the future of information access and discovery. Without the work of these AALL representatives, law libraries and their unique technical needs would have no voice in national standards-setting and other crucial matters. Their efforts support, directly or indirectly, that of all law libraries and legal information professionals. Support for their work should therefore come directly from AALL, as the entity charged with responsibility for advancing the profession of law librarianship as a whole.

4. Letter from the AALL representative to the MAC to the AALL Executive Committee dated September 2016

To: The Members of the AALL Executive Committee

From: Jean Pajerek, AALL representative to the MARC Advisory Committee

September 27, 2016

The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) advises the MARC Steering Group concerning changes to the MARC 21 formats. The MARC 21 formats for Bibliographic, Authority, Holdings, Classification, and Community Information data are maintained for the MARC 21 user community based on open discussion of issues. The MARC Steering Group is an international body composed of the Library of Congress (LC), Library and Archives Canada, British Library, and the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek.

The membership of MAC includes eight national libraries and a long list of representatives from library association committees and groups, networks, and communities of users, of which AALL is one. Other groups represented on MAC include:

- Art Libraries Society of North America

- Association of College and Research Libraries, Science and Technology Section
- ISSN Review Group
- Music Library Association
- OCLC
- Online Audio-Visual Catalogers
- Program for Cooperative Cataloging
- Public Library Association
- Society of American Archivists
- Visual Resources Association

Law librarians have always recognized the crucial importance of enhancing the discoverability of legal information for our users. Currently, law libraries and libraries in general are poised at a pivotal moment in the history of our profession. The implementation in 2013 of a new metadata standard (*Resource Description and Access*, also known as *RDA*) by LC and many other libraries worldwide has generated tremendous interest in the deployment of library data as linked data on the World Wide Web. This migration of library data to the Web will only be possible if our “closed” MARC21 formats are replaced by a more open, Web-friendly communications format. The first steps in this direction were taken when dozens of new fields and subfields were added to the MARC formats, enabling more precise designation of the data entities contained within a MARC record. During my first two years as AALL’s representative to MAC, the Committee has considered and approved dozens of changes to the various MARC formats, many of which are intended to facilitate the eventual migration of MARC-based data to its intended replacement, BIBFRAME. As AALL’s representative to MAC, I was involved in the discussions of these changes and was able to vote on them, since I am a full member of the committee with voting privileges, not merely an observer.

The Library of Congress and a number of other libraries are already deeply involved in the development of BIBFRAME, which is based on linked open data principles, and is the intended successor to MARC. AALL must be involved in BIBFRAME development efforts to ensure that the law library community’s interests, and those of our constituents, are effectively represented and promoted. Now is not the time for law librarians to disengage from this vital task. For the hundreds of thousands of libraries worldwide that use MARC data, including thousands of law libraries, the plan to replace the MARC formats will completely revolutionize the experience of connecting users with information. We also need to keep in mind that the impact of the anticipated transformation of MARC-based data into linked open data will not be limited to library catalogs. It will pervade the realm of non-MARC metadata implementations, such as identity management services and digital repositories, as well. MAC is one of the primary groups leading the discussion about bibliographic data as linked open data; we cannot afford to forfeit AALL’s vote when decisions that will affect us for years to come are made.

In reading AALL’s stated Vision and Core Purpose, it is hard not to see a disconnect between them and the AALL Executive Board’s planned elimination of the cataloging representatives’ funding. The technical services representatives are literally the embodiment of the Association’s Vision (“AALL and its members will be the recognized authority in all aspects of legal information”) and Core Purpose (“AALL will advance the profession and the professional growth of its members”). We advance the excellence of law librarianship in our roles as representatives to national and international policy-making groups where decisions with enduring and wide-ranging impact on

our profession are made. We heighten the visibility of law librarianship when we share our expertise with those in other areas of librarianship. Eliminating the representatives' positions will in no way advance our profession; rather, we will become isolated and invisible to these policy-making groups and the interests of our community will no longer be taken into consideration.

Not that long ago, in March 2015, my fellow technical services representatives and I were informed that the funding for our positions was being cut from the AALL budget. Our AALL colleagues responded with tremendous concern and support for our work. We received many emails expressing the value of having AALL representation on national and international policy committees, both to report to law librarians on the deliberations of these bodies, and to bring law-related concerns forward to the committees. The cataloging representatives sent memos to the AALL board to explain the importance of our work and how its discontinuation would have negative consequences for AALL members. We were grateful when the board restored our funding.

Speaking as a technical services law librarian and member of AALL for over 30 years, I am very concerned when I hear from technical services colleagues who have either dropped their AALL membership, or are contemplating doing so. Their decisions are driven by long-standing feelings of being underserved by AALL, despite their best efforts to promote technical services within the Association in every way possible. The colleagues I hear this from are prominent leaders in technical services law librarianship with long histories in AALL as committee leaders, program presenters and proposers, and authors of professional scholarship. Can AALL afford to be abandoned by some of its most valuable contributors because their own professional organization does not support their needs? In doing so, we run the very real risk of not only losing our current leaders, but also of alienating new technical services law librarians, thereby losing the ability to develop future leaders, as well.

Law libraries do not exist in a vacuum. AALL's representative positions exist in recognition of the fact that law libraries function within the context of the greater library universe. We need to maintain the vital connections between AALL and other library organizations, or risk having law librarianship devolve into an isolated and irrelevant backwater. I feel certain that this is not the future of law librarianship to which AALL aspires.

We respectfully urge the members of the AALL Executive Board to reconsider their decision to withdraw support from the technical services representatives. The work the representatives do is too essential to abandon, especially at this time of ongoing and intense upheaval in the library profession.