

THE CRIV SHEET

THE NEWSLETTER OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS
WITH INFORMATION VENDORS

VOLUME 43, NO. 2 / FEBRUARY 2021



**Committee on Relations with Information
Vendors (CRIV) Members**

Deborah L. Heller
CHAIR

Ashley Ames Ahlbrand
VICE CHAIR

Steven P. Anderson
Jane Bahnson
Margaret M. Bartlett
Cynthia Condit
Thomas E. Hemstock
Saadia Iqbal
Donna M. Lombardo
Elizabeth Outler
Matt Timko

Published by the American Association of Law Libraries
105 West Adams Street, Suite 3300
Chicago, Illinois, 60603
www.aallnet.org

© 2021 by American Association of Law Libraries

CONTENTS

Editors' Corner	4
From the Chair	5
Vendor-Provided Accessibility Documentation	6
Replacing PACER: The Open Courts Act of 2020	8
Understanding & Tracking Presidential Transitions	10
Law School Immigration Clinics Have the Potential to Make Magic with AI	12
The Importance of Images	14
HeinOnline Updates	16
Updates from the Government Publishing Office Online	17
CRIV Liaisons to Vendors	19
Bloomberg BNA Semiannual Call	19
Thomson Reuters Semiannual Call	20

EDITORS' CORNER

ASHLEY AMES AHLBRAND

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR PUBLIC SERVICES
INDIANA UNIVERSITY MAURER SCHOOL OF LAW

MATT TIMKO

ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGIES AND OUTREACH SERVICES
NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY DAVID C. SHAPIRO
LAW LIBRARY

The CRIV Sheet

Ashley Ames Ahlbrand

Matt Timko

CO-EDITORS

CRIV Page & Tools

Deborah L. Heller

Matt Timko

Education

Ashley Ames Ahlbrand

Deborah L. Heller

Marketing

Deborah L. Heller

Matt Timko

Member Advocacy

Margaret Bartlett

Deborah L. Heller

Saadia Iqbal

Matt Timko

Welcome to a new year and a new *CRIV Sheet*! As 2021 begins, many things are still the same (disappointingly so). This issue of *The CRIV Sheet* offers some wonderful articles, reviews of new features in some of your favorite databases, and a summary of a recent call with Thomson Reuters.

The featured articles in this issue include a look at the accessibility documentation provided by vendors, the Open Courts Act of 2020, resources for exploring and understanding the Presidential transition process, and how artificial intelligence (AI) can be used to help immigration clinics. We also would like to welcome first time *CRIV* authors Jennifer Rochelle (new to the law library profession) and Alex Hutchins (a student at the University of Arizona College of Law).

Enjoy this issue and Happy New Year to all!

FROM THE CHAIR

DEBORAH L. HELLER

ACTING DIRECTOR OF THE LAW LIBRARY

PACE UNIVERSITY ELISABETH HAUB SCHOOL OF LAW

Hello *CRIV Sheet* Readers,

Let me be one of the last to wish you a Happy New Year!

This issue of *The CRIV Sheet* is packed full of some great content thanks to the efforts of Ashley and Matt to solicit articles! Many of the articles in this issue relate to one of the largest information providers: the U.S. government. Todd Venie outlines digital accessibility documentation from vendors, I look at the possible replacement of PACER with the Open Courts Act of 2020, and Elizabeth Outer highlights some of the recent updates to HeinOnline. With a new administration coming in on January 20th, Ashley Ahlbrand discusses resources on learning more about and tracking presidential transitions, and Matt Timko updates us on recent FDLP/GovInfo enhancements. We also have the latest from our semiannual phone calls with vendors.

If you have an issue with a vendor that you would like assistance with, contact CRIV through our [Request for Assistance form](#). If you want to contribute an article to *The CRIV Sheet*, please contact [Ashley](#) and [Matt](#).

CRIV Blog

crivblog.com

Cynthia Condit
BLOG COORDINATOR
Deborah L. Heller
Matt Timko

Vendor Roundtable

Margaret Barlett
Deborah L. Heller
Tom Hemstock
Saadia Iqbal
Elizabeth Outer
Matt Timko

Listserv Liaisons

Elizabeth Outer & Matt Timko
ALL-SIS
Margaret Bartlett
PLLIP-SIS
Elizabeth Outer
Law-lib

Vendor Liaisons

Tom Hemstock
Bloomberg Law
Ashley Ames Ahlbrand
LexisNexis
Deborah L. Heller
Thomas Reuters
Cynthia Condit
Wolters Kluwer

VENDOR-PROVIDED ACCESSIBILITY DOCUMENTATION

TODD VENIE

ASSISTANT DEAN AND DIRECTOR FOR THE LIBRARY AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

LSU PAUL M. HEBERT LAW CENTER

This article describes the Louisiana State University (LSU) Law Library's experience documenting the extent to which our digital resources comply with the university's accessibility policy. This process involved familiarizing ourselves with the legal authority that led to this policy, learning a list of acronyms and other jargon, and working with vendors to obtain proper documentation. The article summarizes the legal background and technical standards of digital accessibility and advises law librarians who must comply with similar policies on what to look for when reviewing digital accessibility documents from vendors.

Like hundreds of colleges and universities in the United States, LSU entered into a resolution agreement with the U.S. Department of Education, requiring that our digital resources comply with a set of standards called the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0 AA (WCAG 2.0 AA). This agreement went into effect in August 2019, and applies to all digital resources provided or linked to by LSU, including university websites, course materials, learning management systems, and library databases. These accessibility standards ensure digital resources can be used by those with visual, hearing, or other disabilities.

As part of the workflow adopted by the LSU Law Library to comply with these requirements, we now request Accessibility Conformance Reports (ACRs) from all digital resource vendors, whether we are adding a new resource or continuing an existing subscription. Because of this modified workflow, and the excellent work of our Acquisitions Librarian, Ajaye Bloomstone, we have maintained all of our critical digital resources while complying with the university's policy.

While some details of our experience in this article are specific to academic institutions, law libraries of all types might find themselves obligated to follow similar procedures under multiple federal statutes and regulations. The technical standards described below are commonly used in a variety of environments, and they

form the basis of standards adopted by state and federal agencies.

Role of the OCR

The Office of Civil Rights (OCR) of the U.S. Department of Education is charged with investigating potential noncompliance with digital accessibility standards under the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, along with the regulations promulgated pursuant to those acts. These **regulations require** state and local government entities to, "ensure that communications with applicants, participants, members of the public, and companions with disabilities are as effective as communications with others." OCR investigations can result from a complaint alleging violations of these regulations, which can be filed by any member of the public, or from a directed investigation, which is initiated by the OCR itself.

If the OCR finds that the institution's digital resources are not accessible to those with disabilities, the institution can ask to resolve the allegations through a voluntary resolution agreement. While the person who filed the original complaint may still have a private cause of action resulting from any noncompliance, institutions frequently resolve OCR investigations through resolution agreements. At least 250 colleges and universities have reached a resolution agreement with the OCR since 2013.

The statutes and regulations requiring colleges and universities to meet accessibility standards do not actually define the technical criteria by which compliance is measured. Absent legally mandated technical criteria, the OCR applies the WCAG 2.0 AA criteria as the standard for determining whether the institution complies. Resolution agreements also establish a timeline for complying for both new content created after the agreement, and for legacy content created before the agreement. Resolution agreements are written broadly and apply to all of an institution's digital resources, and they also require institutions to create internal compliance, reporting, and auditing procedures.

The WCAG 2.0 AA Criteria

The World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) has developed standards for accessible digital content as part of its Web Accessibility Initiative. Originally developed and published as the **Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (WCAG) 1.0** in 1999, the standards have since been revised and updated. The most current version, the **WCAG 2.1**, was adopted by the W3C in 2018. Although version 2.1 is more current, most colleges and universities apply the **WCAG 2.0 standards**, because those institutions reached their agreement with the OCR before the development of version 2.1.

The WCAG 2.0 standards consist of 12 accessibility guidelines; conformance with each guideline is measured by multiple “success criteria” that are used to determine whether digital content meets the guidelines and principles of accessibility. The success criteria can be conformed at three levels, with “A” the lowest conformance level and “AAA” the highest. The vast majority of colleges and universities must conform with the success criteria at the intermediate, or “AA” level, as stipulated in the resolution agreements.

While the W3C is a nongovernmental organization and its recommendations do not have the force of law, its web accessibility guidelines have been used as standards by both courts and administrative agencies. The Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Education has invariably used the WCAG 2.0 as the applicable standard in its agreements with colleges and universities, at least since 2013. As a result, the WCAG 2.0 is the de facto requirement for higher education in the U.S.

Institutional Processes

The internal processes created by LSU to comply with the terms of its resolution agreement include a review of every purchase of, or subscription to, a digital resource. The review includes multiple steps, but each resource ultimately needs to be approved by a newly established Digital Resources & Content Exceptions Committee. The committee asks that we send documentation from the vendor indicating whether the resource complies with accessibility standards. That documentation usually is an Accessibility Conformance Report, which is based on the Voluntary Product Accessibility Template.

Role of the Vendor

VPAT and ACR

The Voluntary Product Accessibility Template (VPAT) is a standardized document format used by vendors to provide information about the accessibility features of their products. The standard blank template is called a VPAT before it is filled out by the vendor; once the document has been completed by the vendor, it is called an Accessibility Conformance Report (ACR), though some vendors still call the completed document a VPAT even after they have entered their conformance information.

The VPAT was developed and maintained by the Information Technology Industry Council (ITI) in collaboration with the U.S. General Services Administration. Initially, the VPAT was intended to document accessibility compliance under Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, which applies to federal government agencies. The ITI has since developed multiple versions of the VPAT, to document compliance with different technical standards and in multiple contexts.

The essential content of an ACR (a VPAT after the vendor has filled in the information) is a table listing each of the success criteria under the WCAG 2.0 AA standards. For example, criterion 1.4.4 specifies that, “Except for captions and images of text, text can be resized without assistive technology up to 200 percent without loss of content or functionality.” For each success criterion, the vendor can indicate in the table one of the following conformance levels: “supports,” “partially supports,” “does not support,” “not applicable,” or “not evaluated.” Once a vendor has entered a conformance level for the success criteria, the VPAT becomes an ACR for that vendor’s product.

What to Look for in an ACR

The ICI provides **four different editions of the VPAT**, with each edition applying a different combination of standards in different contexts. For example, the “Revised Section 508 Edition” applies to digital resources procured by U.S. federal agencies and includes success criteria under both the WCAG 2.0 and Section 508 standards.

Each of the four VPAT editions includes the WCAG 2.0 standards; assuming your school is using the WCAG 2.0 AA standards as the measure of accessibility, any of the editions should be acceptable. More critical than the edition is the version being used. The ICI continu-

ously updates the four VPAT editions to reflect changes in the WCAG 2.0 standards and the applicable statutes and regulations. Version 2.4 is the current version for all four editions of the VPAT, published in February 2020.

It is very common for vendors to provide ACRs based on outdated versions of the VPAT. In the last year, we have received VPATs dated as far back as 2010. We have contacted vendors for more current documentation, and they have provided it to us promptly. Librarians should also check to make sure an ACR provided by a vendor includes the success criteria specified under WCAG 2.0 AA. ACRs based on older VPATs might include only the WCAG 1.0 success criteria, and colleges and universities are almost invariably required to comply with the 2.0 AA success criteria.

Even when the vendor's ACR is based on the current version of a VPAT, vendors sometimes only indicate conformance levels for criteria other than the 2.0 AA success criteria. We have received ACRs from vendors that include the 2.0 A success criteria and not the 2.0 AA success criteria. We responded to the vendor asking for a new ACR with the 2.0 AA success criteria and they provided it, but the university probably would have rejected our subscription had we submitted the original ACR with the 2.0 A success criteria alone.

ACRs provided by vendors rarely indicate that their product supports all criteria, and resolution agreements do not require 100 percent compliance with the WCAG

2.0 AA standards. Instead, resolution agreements require institutions to develop strategies and processes to "ensure that individuals with disabilities have an equal opportunity to participate in the University's programs and activities offered through [the] University's website or equally effective alternate access." Institutions can consider several factors in deciding whether to subscribe to third-party digital resources, including the availability of alternatives and the programming impact that would result if the institution canceled the subscription.

A few vendors have told us they could not provide an ACR and had no intention of creating one. These vendors have all been small entities selling niche products, and we canceled our subscriptions to those products without affecting the research needs of our faculty and students. Other than those few cancellations, we have been allowed to add and renew all subscriptions to digital resources using the ACRs provided to us by vendors.

Conclusion

Vendor-provided documentation in ACRs is an essential part of an institution's processes for complying with accessibility laws. By modifying acquisitions workflows to include collecting this documentation from vendors and reviewing the content to make sure the document is up to date and uses the correct criteria, law librarians can continue to provide the digital resources needed by their students and faculty.

REPLACING PACER: THE OPEN COURTS ACT OF 2020

DEBORAH L. HELLER

ACTING DIRECTOR OF THE LAW LIBRARY
PACE UNIVERSITY ELISABETH HAUB SCHOOL OF LAW

Although Congress is in its lame duck period after the election but before the new session begins, there is a piece of pending legislation that could change the way users access docketing information of the federal courts. The Open Courts Act, [H.R. 8235](#), would be a huge step forward for access to federal court dockets. The bill itself was introduced by Henry C. Johnson Jr. (D-Ga) in September 2020. It was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary, which did hold a mark-up session. Although passed by the House in December 2020, it is unclear whether it will pass the Senate and be signed

by the President. On December 9th, the Senate read the bill and referred it to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

The current federal system used to find docket items is called PACER (an acronym derived from its true name, Public Access to Court Electronic Records). The system itself is not user-friendly and requires you to log in to each individual circuit and district in order to search for files. Once you do access the system, you then need to pay \$0.10 per page for any items you retrieve. If you stay below a threshold amount for a quarter,

you are not actually charged. However, many scholars researching court records can quickly accrue charges. The fees charged by PACER have been the subject of recent lawsuits. This summer the Federal Circuit issued a decision in *National Veterans Legal Services Program v. United States*, holding that PACER fees may only be used for expenses incurred in providing services that are part of providing the public with access to electronic information the federal courts maintain on its CM/ECF docketing system.

The **Open Courts Act** proposes a complete modernization of the electronic court records system to allow for search functions developed in coordination with the Administrator of General Services for use by both parties appearing before the courts and members of the public. The proposed new system must also make information available from other websites in accordance with section 205 of the **E-Government Act of 2002**, and allow external websites to link to documents on the system. The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts must coordinate with the Administrator of General Services and the Archivist of the United States to establish the data standards for the new system within a period of nine months of the date of enactment. The data standards should include full text searching with information provided in an independent readable format and allow for continual updating. Further, the Act requires that the system use the latest technology to provide for improved security, accessibility, affordability, performance, and decreased burden on pro se litigants. The date target for development of the system is January 1, 2025 but could be extended by one year.

Section 2 outlines some of the fees that may be charged. Until the system is fully established, either in 2025 or 2026, the Judicial Conference shall prescribe a progressive, reasonable, fee schedule for anyone who accrues fees for electronic access to court information in the amount of \$6,000 or more in any quarter. Such schedule must be based on a determination of specific and substantial need and cannot inhibit access to justice and the public right of access to court records or nonprofit research of the business of Federal courts. The Judicial Conference may prescribe schedules of fees to cover the costs of carrying out the Act but must base such fees on the extent of use of the system, feasibility,

fairness to other users of the system, efficacy, and to prevent the foreclosure of access to justice and the public right to access court records. However, the Judicial Conference will not be allowed to prescribe filing fees to cover the cost of the system unless the Conference determines that all other fee sources will not cover the costs of building the new system; furthermore, the fees must be graduated and equitable, as well as take into consideration the type of action, claim for relief, status of filer, amount of damages demanded, complexity of the action, and interests of justice. Any of the fees collected under § 2 shall be deposited in the Judiciary Information Technology Fund to reimburse expenses incurred in meeting the requirements of the Act.

Of greatest interest to researchers and litigants, Section 3 of the Act establishes that all materials in the system be publicly accessible, free of charge, and without registration. To cover the marginal costs of ensuring free public accessibility, the Judicial Conference shall collect an annual fee from Federal agencies equal to what those agencies paid in PACER fees in 2018 and adjusted for inflation. The Judicial Conference must review any fees established under this Act three years after the scheduled effective date and at three-year intervals thereafter. Any new fee schedules or adjustments must be published in the Federal Register as well as on the U.S. Courts website and provide a minimum comment period of 60 days.

Congressman Jerry Nadler (D-NY), chair of the House Judiciary Committee, issued a **press release** on September 15th urging his Congressional colleagues to support the legislation since it “takes a significant step forward in making the federal judiciary more modern, more open, and more accessible to the public it serves.” Congressman Nadler noted that “it is indefensible that the public must pay fees—and unjustifiably high fees, at that—to know what is happening in their own courts.” On the floor of Congress, Mr. Johnson noted that “[c]ourt records should be as easy to access as legislation is on **Congress.gov**.”

As part of the **floor debate** on the bill, a letter from the Judicial Conference was read into the record. The Judicial Conference expressed concerns that the legislation did not include “appropriate and necessary assurances and provisions regarding the budget” and that the requirements of the bill would have a “devas-

tating” impact on the Federal judiciary, resulting in expenditures of \$2 billion more than Congress presumed. Technological feasibility, security, and governance were provided as sources of additional concern.

Mr. Barr (R-Ky) conveyed his own reservations about the costs involved with developing such a system. Barr also argued that low-income Americans could access many of the records without cost and that the “vast majority” of those organizations and individuals that pay for records through PACER have the means to do so. In response, Johnson noted that the Judicial Conference only provided their letter at the last minute and that the alleged \$2 billion price differential was in fact not a realistic cost estimate. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimate was then read into the record. The CBO estimated that the new fees imposed on high-volume for-profit users, would generate an additional \$47 million in revenue during 2021-2030 and that even with a loss in revenue from the usual PACER fees, the net revenue stemming from the legislation would be increased by \$37 million over that same period. Furthermore, the estimation was that most of

the additional \$46 million in increased spending would occur during 2021-2025, leading to an increase of the deficit by \$9 million from 2021-2030.

The Open Courts Act would be a welcome update to an outdated existing system. Although the Judicial Conference may believe that those who engage in research that involves the use of PACER can afford to pay the fees charged, this is not always the case. Documents are quite lengthy, and the fees can build quicker than you might think. Even setting the concern over fees aside, the system is not user friendly and inhibits true empirical legal research since there are separate systems for each court. The ability to search through multiple courts in one system, a service that can now only really be done through paid services, is one that many cannot afford to subscribe to. The technological landscape has changed greatly since PACER was first introduced and it is time for a change. If the Open Courts Act of 2020 does not pass during the final days of the 116th Congress, hopefully similar legislation might be passed in the new 117th session.

UNDERSTANDING & TRACKING PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITIONS

ASHLEY AMES AHLBRAND

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR PUBLIC SERVICES
INDIANA UNIVERSITY MAURER SCHOOL OF LAW

With this issue of *The CRIV Sheet* publishing shortly after the inauguration of President Joe Biden, it felt timely to write an article on resources related to presidential transitions. Even when the President is elected for a second term, significant transitions often take place. For instance, the Partnership for Public Service’s Center for Presidential Transitions found that 43 percent of Cabinet secretaries, deputy secretaries, and undersecretaries left their jobs between Election Day and six months into the second term for Presidents Clinton, Bush, and Obama (for a helpful chart on this data, see [Presidential Transition Guide: A Comprehensive Guide to the Activities Required During the Transition](#) (2020), p. 207). The transition is greater when we switch presidential administrations, and even more so when the transition involves a change in political party as well.

The Center for Presidential Transitions identifies three phases of the transition. The Pre-Election “Planning” Phase, as its name suggests, begins in the spring of the election year. In this phase, the transition team is assembled, goals are set, and relationships are established with key governmental entities. Work in this phase of the transition is aided by the Pre-Election Presidential Transition Act of 2010 (Pub. L. 111-283), through which the General Services Administration provides both space and equipment to the transition teams following the political conventions. Phase two is the Post-Election “Transition” Phase, comprising the roughly two-and-a-half months between Election Day and Inauguration Day. During this phase, the focus is on staffing the White House and the agencies, conducting agency review, and making concrete plans for

executing the President's goals. Finally, phase three is the Post-Inauguration "Handover" Phase, the President's first 200 days in office, in which the primary focus is on careful identification of the best candidates to appoint to strategic offices in order to help fulfill the President's agenda. A new President will typically fill several thousand political appointments, many of which require Senate confirmation, so this vetting process is critical to kick off a successful presidential transition (more on these phases in Presidential Transition Guide, pp. 10-12).

Presidential transitions are rife with complexity (and often **controversy**); but there is a wealth of resources out there for anyone interested in learning more about this process. What follows is a selective annotated bibliography of the resources I have found most helpful in my own research.

Pertinent Laws

- Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (**Pub. L. 88-277**)
- Pre-Election Presidential Transition Act of 2010 (**Pub. L. 111-283**)
- **Executive Order 13176**, Facilitation of a Presidential Transition (Nov. 27, 2000): created a Presidential Transition Council; charged GSA with creating a Presidential Transition Directory (see below); see also **E.O. 13476**, establishing another Presidential Transition Coordinating Council for the transition from the Bush to the Obama administrations, and **E.O. 13727**, for the transition from the Obama to the Trump administrations.
- For more details on these laws and more, refer to the White House Transition Project's report, "**Rules Governing Presidential Transitions: Laws, Executive Orders, and Funding Provisions.**"

Research Centers & Organizations

Center for Presidential Transition: a branch of the Partnership for Public Service, this nonpartisan organization offers an array of resources both to assist transition teams and to help the public understand and follow the presidential transition. Of particular note:

- **Political Appointee Tracker:** a tool created and

maintained in conjunction with the *Washington Post*, this tool follows the appointment process, allowing you to see what positions have been announced, and where they are in the confirmation process.

- **Presidential Transition Guide: A Comprehensive Guide to the Activities Required During the Transition:** referenced a few times at the beginning of this article, this 200+ page guide provides advice to administrations on best practices for a successful transition, while also serving as a detailed resource for anyone interested in learning more about the transition process. They also have a separate transition guide for **agencies**.
- The entire site is a wealth of riches on presidential transitions, past and present. If you prefer to absorb knowledge by listening rather than reading, you might find their podcast, **Transition Lab**, more to your liking.

White House Transition Project: a nonpartisan group that provides information to new White House staff to help streamline the transition process. Their site has several resources of interest to anyone wanting to learn more about the presidential transition, including a transition pace monitor that compares the pace of Biden's transition team to that of previous administrations. Other resources of interest include:

- **CRS Reports:** a collection of Congressional Research Service reports related to presidential transitions, appointments, nominations, and more.
- **Office Briefs:** based on interviews with individuals who previously held these positions, these briefs provide guidance to key personnel

Brookings Institution: this nonprofit has several **policy suggestions** for the next administration, as well as several articles and events analyzing presidential transitions, past and present.

- "**Presidential Transition Process: Understanding the Obligations, Obstacles, and Urgency,**" (event held Dec. 14, 2020).
- Stephen Hess, "**First Impressions: A Look Back at Five Presidential Transitions,**" (March 3, 2001). An older article at this point, but still an interesting examination of transitions from Nixon to Clinton.

- Paul C. Light, “[Implementation of the 1963 Presidential Transition Act](#),” (testimony before the House Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, Dec. 4, 2000). [Access](#) the full hearing.

Ballotpedia: best known as a resource on elections, Ballotpedia also includes an encyclopedia of American politics and helpful coverage of the presidential transition.

- **Joe Biden Presidential Transition:** a page that monitors the latest on the transition, including news, appointments, senior staff, and victory speeches.
- **Transition Tracker:** in addition to the presidential transition, page, you can sign up for this newsletter from Ballotpedia to receive weekday updates on Biden’s transition team and political appointees.

University of Notre Dame, Keough School of Global Affairs

- **2020 Presidential Transition Index:** this resource seeks to assess the progress and potential weak areas of the presidential transition in real-time; overseen by Denis McDonough, Professor of the Practice of Public Policy, and former White House Chief of Staff to Barack Obama.

News Coverage

- **New York Times: The Presidential Transition:** including the latest news and information on Biden’s cabinet, and more.
- **Washington Post: Transfer of Power:** including information on Biden’s cabinet, agenda, and inauguration, with additional information about election integrity and the electoral college vote.
- **Wall Street Journal:** their [Election 2020 coverage](#) continues to post up-to-the-minute news on election results, lawsuits, and more. One unique piece by Gabriel T. Rubin and Dave Cole provides a photo essay on [Presidents in Post-Election Transition](#) (Nov. 16, 2020).

Government Resources

General Services Administration (GSA): The GSA plays a key role in presidential transitions, providing resources to both transition teams, pre-election, to ensure a smooth transition.

- **Presidential Transition Directory:** provides details on the GSA’s role, the transition process, and more.

National Archives & Records Administration:

NARA includes a wealth of resources on presidential transitions and research into current and past presidencies, including resources on presidential libraries.

- **Presidential Transitions:** including FAQs, laws on presidential transitions, and more
- **Past administration’s White House websites:** whitehouse.gov undergoes radical transformations with every administration. But White House websites are presidential records, so you can view the previous administrations’ websites from Clinton through Obama on NARA’s website.
 - For more archived government websites, visit [CyberCemetery](#), a project of UNT Libraries and the U.S. GPO to archive government websites.

- **Social media preservation:** social media has played an increasing role in politics since the Obama administration. The administration therefore announced a [social media preservation plan](#) in 2016, with [resulting projects](#) announced in 2017. Most notable is the [Obama White House Social Media Archive](#), hosted by ArchiveSocial.

- Where to find preserved Trump administration tweets? The Trump administration has not yet announced plans for archiving their social media, but you can read about several grass roots initiatives to do just that: Rachel Treisman, “[As President Trump Tweets and Deletes, the Historical Record Takes Shape](#),” NPR (Oct. 25, 2019).

These are just a sampling of the resources available to satisfy your curiosity about presidential transitions. As we enter Phase Three of the presidential process, we are sure to see many other changes in the federal government, particularly within the executive branch. Luckily, these resources above will help you keep track of what’s in, what’s out, and what’s coming.

LAW SCHOOL IMMIGRATION CLINICS HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO MAKE MAGIC WITH AI

JENNIFER ROCHELLE

LIBRARY FELLOW

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA COLLEGE OF LAW

The use of artificial intelligence (AI) in the legal field is growing at an exponential rate. In 2017, investment in legal technology was approximately 233 million dollars. By 2018, that number was over 1 billion dollars (*Ambrogi, 2020, Chapter 12). It has been estimated the global legal market for AI will grow 36 percent, each year, from 2019 to 2026 (*Laut, 2020, Chapter 4). Companies and start-up ventures are continuously developing and marketing new AI that uses machine learning, natural language processing, analytics, and visualization for the legal field.

At the same time, **the U.S. has doubled down on its efforts to deport as many immigrants and people without proper documentation as possible**, including Dreamers. **The U.S. maintains the largest immigration detention system in the entire world**, with over 215 detention centers spread across the U.S., that incarcerate people awaiting immigration decisions. In 2019, the U.S. detained over 500,000 people awaiting immigration decisions alone.

While people wait weeks, months, and sometimes even years in detention centers in order to have a decision as to their immigration status, they do not have the right to an attorney. In 2018, Wisconsin Watch found that about **two-thirds of the immigrants held in detention centers did not have lawyers**. A 2016 study by the **American Immigration Counsel (AIC)**, found that only 14 percent of detained immigrants go to court with a lawyer by their side. Needless to say, numerous studies have found that not having a lawyer for immigration hearings makes people more likely to remain in detention, not receive a just immigration decision, and be removed from the U.S. The longer immigrants remain in detention, the bigger the cost burden is to the U.S.

What if there was a way for the hundreds of thousands of immigrants who are detained in the U.S. every year, without representation, to have access to legal advice or some form of legal counsel through AI? It could

be a revolutionary method of decreasing judicial bias against unrepresented parties and increasing the ability for an unrepresented party to attain a fair immigration decision. AI could also serve to decrease the time a person is detained awaiting an immigration decision. Finally, AI could decrease the cost of the world's largest immigration detention system and save taxpayer money.

Currently, there are many law school clinics, nonprofits, and attorneys that volunteer their time, in order to give free legal advice, or representation, to immigrants who do not have the ability to retain legal counsel. However, the need is too great for nonprofits and law school clinics alone. The 2016 AIC study found that only 2 percent of immigrants obtained pro bono representation from nonprofit organizations, law school clinics, or firm volunteer programs.

Enter the beginnings of a solution: vendor provided AI, boosting the amount of work and clients law school immigration clinics can reach. Most, if not all, vendors now have multiple types of groundbreaking AI technology on their platforms. Law school students and clinics have access to these vendor AI technologies. It is the perfect match to increase access to justice in a system that is anything but.

Below are some very basic ideas for AI tools on vendor platforms that could be utilized by immigration law school clinics in order to provide access to justice:

AI-Driven Legal Research Tools

One type of AI is a legal research tool that allows its user to verify if the legal document being cited is still good law and helps to find the most relevant primary and secondary sources on the issue (*Heller, 2020, Chapter 3). Because immigration law changes so quickly and can vary greatly from circuit to circuit, this could be an invaluable time-saving tool for law school clinics. Westlaw's enhanced citator and Lexis's Ravel View are two examples of this type of AI in action. Another type of AI research tool is one that enables the user to

provide an entire document as a search, which would allow for similar time-saving techniques as previously explained above. Casetext's CARA is a good example of this newer type of research-focused AI. There are also answer tools that assist in finding answers to more straightforward questions, such as the elements of a particular crime, for example, or statutes of limitations. Most modern legal research platforms, such as LexisNexis and Westlaw, have implemented such quick answer features already.

In another vein are analytics tools. LexisNexis, Bloomberg Law, and Westlaw all have judicial analytic features. These tools can help predict how a judge will rule on a certain issue, given their past body of work and recommend suggestions as to phrasing and keywords to utilize in motions and briefs in order to persuade a judge. This AI tool could be essential for law school clinics to understand how to frame an argument to a judge or which judges might be worse or better on certain immigration issues. It would increase the odds of being successful on any sort of immigration claim or case.

Document Review and E-discovery

Document review tools, such as legal research tools, could operate to cut the time necessary to review a case and prepare for litigation. These could work to possibly free up additional time for law school clinics to assist a greater number of immigration clients.

E-discovery is a large section of legal AI development. These types of programs sort and organize discovery and can even do visualization and sentiment analysis, as well as threading emails together in the correct order, revealing code words or linked relationships. AI e-discovery could again be a large time saver for law school clinics, allowing students to assist more clients.

Drafting Pleadings

There are some AI tools that can assist in drafting

pleadings as well. Within this category, there are many that specialize in the creation of smart contracts. Because most immigration forms, like contracts, are very specific in what they require, this could be a type of AI that could be replicated for immigration forms. This could also be a powerful tool for law students to use, in order to assist clients in filing out a form correctly, with all the necessary elements, and decrease the amount of time needed on supervisory oversight.

Chatbots

Chatbots are a form of AI that has been around for a very long time and that more or less everyone who uses a computer has encountered at some point. From making a return on Amazon to being informed about your pizza delivery, chatbots are now commonplace. However, chatbots could also be crucial in assisting individuals with immigration questions, who could receive an answer by simply going to a law school clinic website (*Plumb, 2020, Chapter 9). Even just the direction as to what form to use, or a question as to the definition of a term, could mean the difference between a successful immigration case, spending life savings on an attorney, or in some cases even possible deportation.

In conclusion, the possibilities for creating a partnership between immigration clinics and cutting-edge vendor AI technologies are endless. In most of the categories described above, legal vendors have already begun developing these technologies for use by their clients. AI in the legal field is here and is advancing the ability for law school clinics to be better advocates, reach more clients, achieve better outcomes and further the interests of justice. All we have to do is harness it.

* E. Kroski (Ed.), *Law Librarianship in the Age of AI*, Chicago, IL: ALA Editions.

THE IMPORTANCE OF IMAGES

ALEX CLAY HUTCHINGS

LAW LIBRARY FELLOW

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA COLLEGE OF LAW

If you have children, then you already know how important images are to human understanding. Imagine a world where *The Cat in the Hat* was devoid of illustration: just black letters typed across a white page. No cat. No hat. Just words. How boring! All parents have probably chuckled at their kids flipping through a “grown-up” book lying on the coffee table and asking, “Where are all the pictures!?” Well, maybe that is valid question us grown-ups should be asking. Somewhere along the way, our books become less colorful, less illustrative, and less dynamic, and most definitely more boring.

This is nowhere more apparent than in the realm of law. **The U.S. Code** contains over 22 million words, and somewhere in all that text we have the instructional building blocks of everything we know about our country. In a way, it is the genome of the United States: 26 symbols repeated and rearranged millions of times, laying out the rules of our society from which plots of land are designated National Parks to what day we should pay our taxes. Yet, like all “grown-up” books, not a picture in sight.

So, to repeat the refrain just one more time: a picture is worth a thousand words. I offer an example from the U.S. Code. Title 31 U.S.C. § 5112 sets out the specifications for silver bullion coins minted under the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury:

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall mint and issue, in qualities and quantities that the Secretary determines are sufficient to meet public demand, coins which:

- (1) are 40.6 millimeters in diameter and weigh 31.103 grams;
- (2) contain .999 fine silver;
- (3) have a design;
- (A) symbolic of Liberty on the obverse side; and
- (B) of an eagle on the reverse side;
- (4) have inscriptions of the year of minting or issuance, and the words “Liberty”, “In God We Trust”, “United States of America”, “1 oz. Fine Silver”, “E Pluribus Unum”, and “One Dollar”; and
- (5) have **reeded edges**.

Within that description is the genetic information or making that coin. It is known to numismatists as a Silver Eagle, which features the iconic image “Walk-

ing Liberty.” Designed in 1916 by U.S. Mint sculptor Adolph A. Weinman for use on the half dollar, “Walking Liberty” features Lady Liberty, arms outstretched and draped in the Star-Spangled Banner as she steps confidently toward the rising sun. The design is considered one of the most beautiful to grace the face of U.S. coinage. As with all coins, mintage numbers and condition tend to determine value. The **rarest Silver Eagle** was minted in 1999, and examples in perfect condition is valued at \$23,000. **Wouldn’t it be nice to see a picture of it?**

There are countless examples within the law where the researcher could benefit from images associated with the text. For example, Woodsy Owl, Smokey the Bear’s beaked buddy, is a trademarked character owned by the federal government. He is defined at 16 U.S.C. § 580p:

- “**‘Woodsy Owl’** means the name and representation of a fanciful owl, who wears slacks (forest green when colored), a belt (brown when colored), and a Robin Hood style hat (forest green when colored) with a feather (red when colored), and who furthers the slogan, ‘Give a Hoot, Don’t Pollute,’ originated by the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture.”

That really paints a picture but give “Woodsy” a Google search to double-check that yes, he is an owl wearing green slacks and no shirt, and yes, that is kind of weird if you think about it.

Even the simplest of images can help explain the text of a law. **The FDA has recently revamped the requirements of nutrition labels** found on prepackaged foods. According to the FDA website, the “iconic” look of the label is retained, but the type size of “Calories,” “servings per container” declaration, and “Serving size” were increased, and the number of calories and “Serving size” declaration were bolded. The FDA insists they “made important updates to ensure consumers have access to the information they need to make informed decisions about the foods they eat.” Clearly the **FDA believes this visual change** was important, but an image of the old and new designs side-by-side is the only way to truly comprehend it.

Images are proven to increase reading comprehension, and in this era of information overload, images can serve as a visual shortcut to reading paragraphs of

text. Why read a newspaper when you can sum up the day's events in 10 memes or less? And if there is still any question about the importance of images in our understanding of the world, just think that 95 million photos are uploaded to Instagram every day, and everyday Instagram users leave 4.2 billion likes.

Vendors of digital legal information tend to lead with the pitch that their annotations provide “added value” to their materials, but currently no vendor supports any type of “illustrated annotation.” Nor, as far as I

know, is anything of this sort in the works. But perhaps it should be. My point is that images can add a level of understanding (that is, add value) to these materials over merely reading the black letters of blackletter law. Law librarians should take an extra moment while conducting legal research or assisting faculty and students and do an image search of their topic. They might find a picture makes it all click, or at least makes it a little more interesting. We grown-ups can learn a thing or two from *The Cat in the Hat*.

HEINONLINE UPDATES

ELIZABETH OUTLER

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES
OLIVER B. SPELLMAN LAW LIBRARY

As many commentators have noted, 2020 was quite eventful. It was also challenging in many ways, to many segments of our industry, and several information vendors offered products and services and innovated to help customers meet those challenges. Never least among legal publishers is HeinOnline, which put together quite an array of new products and features over the past 10-12 months. Given the eventfulness of this past year, one might be forgiven for having missed a number of these developments, so I offer this overview of recently added features in HeinOnline to help us all catch up. This is meant to be only an overview; extensive details can be found on the [HeinOnline blog](#) and [LibGuides](#).

New Databases

Early in 2020, Hein announced that it had acquired the *Current Index to Legal Periodicals (CILP)*. This was a major acquisition, and it removed some redundancies and created more convenience for users and for libraries. Anything that reduces confusion and effort for users is a good thing, so having SmartCILP profiles available in HeinOnline along with the other personalization features of MyHein is a real benefit. In fact, this transition could be an opportunity for getting users to embrace MyHein as a current awareness tool if they have not used it much in the past. For libraries, billing becomes considerably simpler, as does providing access to authorized users. Unlike the other databases described below, CILP is not available free of charge or as part of another subscription, but its move to HeinOnline is so

noteworthy it seems wrong to leave it out of a discussion of the year's developments.

Many publishers offered free or significantly discounted collections during the beginning of the stay-home period (approximately March to June 2020). HeinOnline, however, has long maintained the practice of offering new collections without additional cost, and it continued to do so with the new *COVID-19: Pandemics Past and Present* library (released as COVID-19 in America: Response, Issues, and Law in August 2020 with a major enhancement and name change in November), and the new *Civil Rights and Social Justice* library in October. These collections were clearly in response to the trending needs and interests of legal researchers in the United States and have been offered at no charge to any interested organization, whether they already subscribe to HeinOnline's Core collection or not. Both libraries are largely comprised of public domain material, but the value to researchers of having these items gathered together into a topical collection and indexed for searching is self-evident.

As mentioned above, HeinOnline often provides new collections in response to events and trends, and this fall it added an Executive Privilege library as well as an Electoral College collection within the U.S. Presidential Library. These are included without additional charge to subscribers and are quite a boon to researchers of these topics.

New Author Profile Features

In April 2020, HeinOnline finally enabled users to edit their own author profile pages (or authorize other users, such as librarians, to do so). There is now a tab in the MyHein page for Author Profile Admin, where users can update information such as email address, title, and institutional affiliation, add links to social media accounts, and add or edit biographical information. This author profile editing function was released not long after HeinOnline's integration with ORCID was announced. ORCID is a registry of unique identifiers that helps keep authors separated from one another in search results and ensures proper attribution of published works. With this integration, coupled with the author profile edit feature, HeinOnline author profiles can incorporate the ORCID ID number and link to an author's profile in ORCID. In August 2020, the second phase of the ORCID integration was completed, and the entire ORCID record was incorporated into the HeinOnline author profile, including articles that are not available within HeinOnline. Other author profiles from Google Scholar and SSRN are also available to be added as links within the HeinOnline author profile, further encouraging authors to manage their online identities and making that online presence easier to access.

New Search Features

A couple of convenient features were added to make searching easier and more efficient. The availability facet allows researchers to filter out results that have been indexed but are not yet available in full text from HeinOnline. The second new feature is database selection; this adds considerable convenience, and it is hard to believe it did not exist before. In the past a user could select one database to search, or they could search across the entire catalog to which they had access. After results were returned, they could be filtered by content type and collection, but it was not possible to select mul-

iple collections to search from the start. Now, from the search box on the home screen, the user can click the All Databases drop-down and see all available choices, and check as many boxes as they would like.

New Customization Features

Author Alerts, Favorite Databases, Search History

There were a number of added or improved features in MyHein over the past year. First, author alerts have significantly improved. They have existed for a while, but now these alerts can be managed centrally in the MyHein account. Whenever users view an author profile page, there is the option to set up email alerts. Now those alerts are gathered together and can be managed on the MyHein account that has the same email address that matches what was provided for the alert.

Researchers can now mark favorite databases in HeinOnline using their MyHein account. Once logged in and viewing the MyHein page, the user can click on the Favorite Databases tab and select (or unselect) databases they want to access quickly. Once these favorites are submitted, they will appear at the top of the list on the home screen, and users will no longer have to scroll or hunt for a frequently used collection.

Lastly, MyHein now includes a tab to view and organize search history. From this screen, researchers can email search results, and save searches for future use. If users do not want their searches tracked and accessible from the MyHein screen, they can turn this feature off.

In conclusion, the past year of challenge and frustration (and let us not forget, very real pain and loss) was also a year of innovation and achievement for HeinOnline. Subscribers are encouraged to explore the rich variety of features available to librarians and users, and to continue to express their needs and suggestions to vendors who show themselves ready and able to engage in continuous improvements.

UPDATES FROM THE GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE ONLINE

MATT TIMKO

ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGIES AND OUTREACH SERVICES

The Government Publishing Office, often overlooked in favor of the commercial databases, has been a reliable and cost-effective alternative for decades. They have recently made changes and (dare I say) advances to their various platforms to make the usability and searchability far easier and efficient, adding to the already considerable value of the resources available. This summary will highlight some of the major additions to the various GPO databases and how best to use (and improve) them. For more information on the different databases, please visit the news and updates pages for GovInfo, the eCFR, and the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP).

Beta eCFR

The biggest news to come out of the GPO is the beta version of the new electronic Code of Federal Regulations (eCFR). This means the current electronic CFR, published by the Office of the Federal Register, is getting a makeover of sorts. The Office introduced a [new beta version of the eCFR](#) in June and continues to seek feedback to improve the layout. The goal for the new version is for it to become the official version of the *Federal Register and Code of Federal Regulations*. While this would not replace the print version, it would mitigate the need to reference the PDF versions of the print resources through [govinfo](#), and would instead be treated as an additional official version of the Register and Code.

To get started with the new interface, the Office recommends beginning with the [Readers Aids](#), specifically the [Getting Started](#) page which provides an overview of the new page and features, a comparison with the [old eCFR](#), and the search functionality. As you go through the new platform, there will be a “Feedback?” button in the bottom right-hand corner of the screen which will allow for instant and direct feedback. As of right now there is no timeline for the expiration of the beta platform, so feedback is still encouraged.

Featured Content in GovInfo

GovInfo has curated their materials to provide “featured content” with contemporary relevance. These pages provide a thorough collection of the materials relevant to the particular issue. For instance, on November 24th the materials presented for [Thanksgiving](#) included a summary of the legal history of American Thanks-

giving, the statutes codifying the holiday, and some of the historical legislative debates on the day. Similarly, upon the passing of [Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg](#) the historical record of her confirmation and tributes on the floor of Congress are included, as well as the legal mechanism that provided for her remains to be on display in the Congressional Rotunda.

This featured content, which is described as “highlight content available in GovInfo related to various national observances, commemorations, anniversaries, and more,” truly does provide a comprehensive overview of the myriad materials available in GovInfo. It further reveals the important (and often overlooked) relevance of some of the government documents they have in their collection and provides readers with greater appreciation and legal context for specific American holidays and celebrations. You can [view](#) the most recent featured content highlights, as well as past features.

GovInfo Search Box Widget

GovInfo received so many requests for a search box feature to add to library homepages that they developed one. The [Search Box widget](#) still in the beta phase is now available for use on any website where it can be helpful. Currently, the search box has a neutral design so it will fit in with any style website design. Since it is still in the beta phase, GovInfo is looking for feedback to improve the functionality.

FDLP Training

Any questions of the GPO, including specifically in regard to the FDLP, can now be submitted in the new [AskGPO website](#). This database provides information on all aspects of the FDLP through a [FAQ](#) site, but also allows users to [ask their unique questions](#) to get a specific response, as well as adds to the FAQ section for future users. This service is not limited to the FDLP and can also be used for questions regarding GovInfo or any other GPO product.

FDLP holds [training webinars](#) through the [FDLP Academy](#), which focuses on enhancing government information literacy through communication and education of federal depository libraries. Each webinar is between 30-60 minutes and offers how-to guidance for handling government documents and understanding of the materials in the collection.

CRIV LIAISONS TO VENDORS

CRIV holds semiannual calls with four legal vendors: Bloomberg BNA, LexisNexis, Thomson Reuters, and Wolters Kluwer. CRIV publishes notes from the calls as they become available both in *The CRIV Sheet* and on the *CRIV Blog*. For this issue, we have notes from the most recent calls with Bloomberg BNA, and Thomson Reuters.

BLOOMBERG BNA SEMIANNUAL CALL

Date: December 17, 2020

Participants: Joe Breda (President, Bloomberg Law); Lauren Kaplan (BLAW Strategy and Customer Experience); Vani Ungapen (AALL Executive Director); Karen Selden (AALL CRIV Board Liaison); Tom Hemstock (AALL Bloomberg Law Liaison)

Note: To do extenuating circumstances, Mike Bernier (Bloomberg Law Director of Library Relations) was not able to make the call but he did provide follow up information.

New Bloomberg Law Developments and News

Analyzers

2020 was the “Year of the Analyzers” for Bloomberg Law as several new analyzer products launched:

- Brief Analyzer. Users upload a brief and see integrated points of law, suggested content, connections to the material, and links to practical guidance.
- Draft Analyzer. Enhanced version launching in January 2021. Features include the ability to break contracts into clauses, link into defined terms, determine if those terms are standard market terms, and compare with 1000s of other clauses on file.

Practical Guidance

Bloomberg Law added more than a thousand new practical guidance documents in 2020. These attorney-focused documents provide short practical guidance on new areas of the law with features such as annotated forms, explanations and overviews. In 2020 these items saw 100% increase in use.

Hot Topics

New hot topics on developing legal issues such as COVID-19 are available from the go bar menu. These hot topics highlight and combine available resources on a specific timely legal topic.

Legal News

Bloomberg Law is increasing coverage and usability

Other Items of Interest:

of legal news. [Note: Following this call, on January 5, 2021, Bloomberg Law announced that ALM material is now available on Bloomberg Law.] Additional features on legal news is also available as newsletters now have table of contents, increased number of subjects for news topics and personalized news is in beta testing.

Questions

Although there was not a specific request for advocacy regarding the change in policy regarding docket usage for law schools. I asked for clarification. Up to \$1500 of individual account docket usage is free of charge.

Bloomberg’s representatives estimated that 99%+ of academic users will not be affected by the new change in docket pricing.

Bloomberg Law clarified that approximately 50 to 60 individual academic account users were responsible for driving a huge amount of the cost.

Law school accounts can monitor their usage via a portal on Bloomberg Law and should contact their representative for details on accessing this information.

Requests for Advocacy:

- None at this time; all issues currently resolved.

AALL Programs, Activities, or Business of Interest to Bloomberg Law

- None at this time

- None at this time.

Bloomberg Law followed up with additional clarification on the docket question.

THOMSON REUTERS SEMIANNUAL CALL

DEBORAH L. HELLER

ACTING DIRECTOR OF THE LAW LIBRARY
PACE UNIVERSITY ELISABETH HAUB SCHOOL OF LAW

Wednesday, December 2, 2020 at 11:00 AM EST

Participants: Deborah Heller (CRIV Thomson Reuters Liaison); Vani Ungapen (AALL Executive Director); Karen Selden (AALL CRIV Board Liaison); Kim Hurley (Information Management Advisor at Thomson Reuters); Rachel Torgerson (Customer Success Strategist at Thomson Reuters); Rachel Beithon (Product Developer, Litigation Analytics); Rebecca Ditsch (Manager, Product Development, Westlaw Today) & Craig Vaughn (Senior Product Manager, Practical Law)

Agenda

- Practical Law's new Health Care Service
 - Developed and maintained by a team with decades of experience in the health law field.
 - Includes six topics at launch:
 - Clinical Trials and Research
 - Fraud, Abuse, and Compliance
 - Health Care Entity Formation and Governance
 - Patient Privacy and Security
 - Payment and Reimbursement
 - General Healthcare
 - Includes State Q&A resources, although not all states are available at launch. Information includes:
 - Data Breach Notification Laws
 - Fraud and Abuse Laws
 - Non-Physician Practitioners
 - Includes Multi-State Charts:
 - Physician Licensing Requirements
 - Consent to be Treated
 - Telehealth Requirements for Private Payers
 - Westlaw Edge Litigation Analytics Enhancement
 - Data coming from dockets with monetary awards and/or attorney fees or litigation costs. Only dockets
- Several updates throughout 2020:
 - Interface
 - Active judges pages
 - Additions to Case Type such as public health emergency cases and police conduct
 - Filter to remove MDL cases by default
 - Attorney Finder
 - Search by name and expertise
 - Allows filtering by case type, court, judge, etc.
 - Defaults to motions for summary judgment but can be adjusted.
 - Allows for comparison
 - Updated Case Type Taxonomy to make materials easier to find and more cohesive
 - Added Damages for Federal District Courts
 - Data coming from dockets with monetary awards and/or attorney fees or litigation costs. Only dockets where all damages could be determined with sufficient confidence are included
 - Includes civil dockets
 - Available from the Courts page
 - Includes civil dockets

- where all damages could be determined with sufficient confidence are included
 - Coverage begins from January 1, 2000
 - Coverage varies by jurisdiction
 - Includes a distribution chart with ranges of award in terms of percentage of dockets included
 - Provides a median award amount
 - Monetary awards and attorney fees and costs are separated
- Westlaw Today, new TR legal news platform, powered by Reuters
 - Accessible in two ways:
 - Via Westlaw Edge or Westlaw Classic using the product picker
 - Directly at today.westlaw.com
 - Includes 30 different practice areas
 - Content comes from several different providers
 - Reuters hired 14 new legal journalists who will contribute to the platform, two of which were recently hired for the service
 - Allows users to submit an article idea via a widget on the homepage
 - Everything is vetted, but this allows for dialogue between the publication and potential authors
 - Provides list of trending companies and law firms derived from recent legal news stories
 - Provides RSS feed delivery
 - For readers with Westlaw Edge, you can click through to the analytics page for attorneys and judges. For users without Westlaw Edge, you will see the person's profile page
 - Daily Email alerts go out at 8:00 AM EST
 - You can customize alerts to get any or all of the practice areas
 - Alerts can be combined into a single email
 - You can also follow a company in the news
 - The Daily Docket is a Reuters and Westlaw newsletter, which is free and does not require purchase of a TR product
- Provides a round-up of what is happening (latest news on the courts, lawyers, and legal profession)
- There are periodic breaking news alerts
- Updates to Billing
 - Improved communication of billing
 - Also providing electronic invoicing
 - PDF is included in the notice sent out rather than requiring users to follow a link
 - New sale invoice and debit invoice redesign released in May
 - New subscription invoice, monthly account summary, credit note, and pro forma invoices released in September
 - Easier to find the amount due and due dates
 - Clearly displays any payments received
 - Credit notes highlight the amount of a credit and that payment is not required
 - Hyperlinks throughout the document
 - The Monthly Account Statement displays the cleared charges for the previous month as well as any open balance as of the date of the invoice
 - Box at the top displays information about amounts due and due dates
 - Redesign of online invoices coming in Q2 of 2021



www.aallnet.org