

THE CRIV SHEET

THE NEWSLETTER OF THE COMMITTEE ON RELATIONS
WITH INFORMATION VENDORS

VOLUME 44, NO. 1 / NOVEMBER 2021





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

Ashley Ames Ahlbrand
CHAIR

Cynthia Condit
VICE CHAIR

Jane Bahnson
Andrew Christensen
Thomas E. Hemstock
Saadia Iqbal
Donna M. Lombardo
Lawrence R. Meyer
Carol Ottolenghi
Elizabeth Outler
Christy Smith

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

Editor's Corner	4
From the Chair	6
Meet SCALES-OKN: The New Open Platform for Federal Court Information and Analysis	7
Beyond CRIV: Monitoring Developments, Issues & Trends in Legal Information	14
CRIV Sheet Summaries: 2021 AALL Annual Meeting Education Programs	17
CRIV Liaisons to Vendors	26
CRIV / Bloomberg Law Semiannual Call	27
CRIV / LexisNexis Semiannual Call	27
CRIV / Thomson Reuters Semiannual Call	30
CRIV / Wolters Kluwer Semiannual Call	32



EDITOR'S CORNER

ANDREW CHRISTENSEN

HEAD OF DIGITAL INITIATIVES AND OUTREACH
WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

The CRIV Sheet

Andrew Christensen
EDITOR

Education

Ashley Ames Ahlbrand
Jane Bahnson
Donna Lombardo
Saadia Iqbal

Member Survey Taskforce

Ashley Ames Ahlbrand
Andrew Christensen
Thomas E. Hemstock
Donna Lombardo
Carol Ottolenghi
Elizabeth Outler
Christy Smith

Welcome to a new issue—and new volume—of *The CRIV Sheet*. I am privileged to be the editor for volume 44 and look forward to bringing you content that is as valuable and informative as the prior *CRIV Sheet* editions have been for me as a law librarian.

Aside from the change in leadership (shout out to Ashley Ahlbrand, our new CRIV chair and former *CRIV Sheet* editor, for the opportunity and guidance), much has transpired since our last issue in June. Another school year has started; fall is in full swing and for those of us in an academic setting, most things have returned to a semblance of normal following the COVID-19 pandemic. I hope everyone is happy and healthy.

Of course, one casualty was the in-person 2021 AALL Annual Meeting & Conference, originally slated for Cleveland but held instead in a virtual format from July 19-23. The planners and participants did not disappoint in the least, and a significant silver lining is that educational programs were all expertly recorded and archived for our future reference and continued enjoyment. Per tradition, this first post-Conference issue of *The CRIV Sheet* includes summaries of several programs identified as overlapping with our committee's broad purview of matters relating to the provision of information. I hope you will peruse these write-ups and, if you registered for the Conference, click through the links provided to view these outstanding presentations at your leisure.

This issue also contains minutes from the most recent semiannual conference calls that took place over the summer between AALL and the four largest vendors of our profession: Bloomberg BNA, LexisNexis, Thomson Reuters, and Wolters Kluwer. Please see these reports for an outline of the new products, policies, and practices that should improve our use of their platforms, publications, and services.

For substance this issue, I'm delighted to present the forthcoming open-web legal information and analytics platform SCALES-OKN, in the words of several of the project's leaders whom I peppered with questions about this impressive and helpful new product. Many thanks to Chris, Dave, Charlotte, Tom, Adam, Rachel, and the C3 Lab scholars for your time in corresponding and for your work on SCALES-OKN. Our *CRIV Sheet* readers are most appreciative!

CRIV chair Ashley Ahlbrand also gives us an extensive and conveniently hyperlinked roundup of resources from many other groups throughout AALL that touch on tracking legal information and vendor relations. I'm sure you will find it useful and will learn about activities that our SISs are up to that can make your job easier and world smaller when you are looking for legal information.



In closing, thanks to all who contribute their time, effort, and expertise to creating this and every issue of *The CRIV Sheet*: the authors, Committee members, and Heather Haemker from AALL's staff for her patience in pulling it all together into an attractive package. And thanks to you for reading! If you find yourself inspired or intrigued by anything along the way, **please let me know**—we have plenty of room for features and conversations in our future issues and welcome your contributions.

CRIV Blog
crivblog.com

Christy Smith
BLOG COORDINATOR

Listserv Liaisons

Jane Bahnsen & Saadia Iqbal
ALL-SIS

Andrew Christensen
BLL-SIS

Ashley Ames Ahlbrand
LIT-SIS

Christy Smith
LSRD-SIS

Donna Lombardo
PLLIP-SIS

Andrew Christensen
RIPS-SIS

Elizabeth Outler & Christy
Smith
TS-SIS

Elizabeth Outler
LAW-LIB

Vendor Liaisons

Thomas E. Hemstock
BLOOMBERG LAW

Ashley Ames Ahlbrand
LEXISNEXIS

Elizabeth Outler
THOMSON REUTERS

Cynthia Condit
WOLTERS KLUWER



FROM THE CHAIR

ASHLEY AMES AHLBRAND

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR PUBLIC SERVICES
INDIANA UNIVERSITY MAURER SCHOOL OF LAW

Hello dear readers! Welcome to another year and volume of *The CRIV Sheet*. I am honored to serve as chair of CRIV this year and I am grateful to work with a number of fabulous committee members comprising both public and technical services, at libraries ranging from academic to firm to government sectors. Although we come from a range of settings and engage with legal information from diverse perspectives, we share a mutual need for open and successful communication with information vendors. That is where CRIV comes in. CRIV is a resource for the entire AALL membership, serving you in many ways. First, if you are experiencing any frustration or confusion with an information vendor, CRIV is happy to serve as an advocate on your behalf. Our goal is to facilitate open and positive communication between AALL members and information vendors, seeking resolution of identified problems and clarification of vendor policies. To seek assistance from CRIV, simply fill out our [Request for Assistance](#) form. A second way that CRIV seeks to serve the AALL membership is through education. In our publications—both *The CRIV Sheet* and the *CRIV Blog*—we offer content on the latest developments and trends in legal information and other timely topics of interest to members. If you are interested in authoring a piece for *The CRIV Sheet*, email this year's *CRIV Sheet* editor, [Andrew Christensen](#). If you are interested in guest blogging for us, email this year's blog coordinator, [Christy Smith](#).

I have been thinking at length about my goals for CRIV this year. By both its composition and its mission, CRIV is a committee of and for the people—serving the needs of the entire AALL membership and soliciting content from

writers across the entire AALL membership. I want to continue this mission but expand upon it as well. You will see in this issue an article from me that highlights many resources related to legal information and information vendors created by other AALL entities and each AALL special interest section (SIS). As a committee that serves the entire AALL membership, I would like to see CRIV highlight and promote the excellent CRIV-related work of other channels of the Association and profession. If you have open resources and upcoming programming related to legal information and information vendors that you would like CRIV to highlight, either through *The CRIV Sheet* or the *CRIV blog*, [please email me](#). Librarianship is community driven. As a part of that community, CRIV strives to serve as advocate, educator, and cheerleader, providing our own resources and programming, but supporting yours as well. Here's to another great year!

MEET SCALES-OKN: THE NEW OPEN PLATFORM FOR FEDERAL COURT INFORMATION AND ANALYSIS

ANDREW CHRISTENSEN

HEAD OF DIGITAL INITIATIVES AND OUTREACH
WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

Contributors

- **Rachel Adler** (Associate Professor of Computer Science, Northeastern Illinois University & Affiliate Faculty, C3 Lab, Northwestern University)
- **Charlotte Alexander** (Connie & Ken McDaniel WomenLead Chair & Associate Professor of Law & Analytics, College of Law, Georgia State University)
- **Christopher Cotropia** (Dennis I. Belcher Professor of Law & Director, Intellectual Property Institute, School of Law, University of Richmond)
- **Tom Gaylord** (Faculty Services and Scholarly Communications Librarian, Pritzker School of Law, Northwestern University)
- **Adam Pah** (Clinical Assistant Professor of Management & Organizations, Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University)
- **David Schwartz** (Frederic P. Vose Professor of Law & Associate Dean of Research and Intellectual Life, Pritzker School of Law, Northwestern University)

In early September, I received an unexpected request to participate in “User Testing for Non-Profit Docket Search Software.” The brief email was from law professor Chris Cotropia at the University of Richmond, and mentioned that Roger Skalbeck, director of their law library and a former colleague of mine at Georgetown, had suggested me—in my capacity as a law librarian—as a good test-user of a new platform called SCALES-OKN.

I was unfamiliar with the name, but a visit to the [SCALES-OKN website](#) (and their [YouTube video](#)) quickly informed me of their worthy and ambitious cause, and the value that the project promises to bring to legal information seekers from professional fields and the public at large.

I agreed to try it out, and the next day spent nearly an hour on Zoom with Dr. Rachel Adler of the C3 Lab at Northwestern University kicking the proverbial tires of the SCALES-OKN platform, running searches of court records through various interface versions, and evaluating results for consistency and presentation. My input from a professional perspective was sought and noted and the experience was impressive. The potential for the system seemed enormous.

What system is this, and why is it so interesting and promising? In their own words, SCALES-OKN seeks to “build an AI-powered data platform that makes the details of the federal judiciary and insights into how it works available and accessible to every single person.” The elements of its acronym further state their mission: Systematic Content Analysis of Litigation EventS Open Knowledge Network.

Funded by a National Science Foundation (NSF) grant since August 2020, SCALES-OKN is led by a team of computer and data scientists, legal scholars, journalists, and policy experts, who strive to develop a suite of tools to enable access to court records and analytics. Six working groups are currently focused on exploring issues in criminal justice, complex litigation, environmental law and policy, intellectual property, journalism and public policy, and judicial administration. Considering the [team roster](#), there is little question that they will succeed on all fronts.

The positive experience I had testing the SCALES-OKN court records portal, and the clear utility of such a legal research tool on the open web, convinced me that more people, in particular law librarians, need to know about this nascent platform, track and poten-

tially contribute to its development, and promote it as a valuable resource to our communities.

To that end, I reached out to several members of the SCALES-OKN team to get an overview of the project—its history, aims, achievements, and future—to share with readers of *The CRIV Sheet*. Representing a diverse set of specialties and skills, six scholar-developers of SCALES-OKN kindly agreed to present their perspectives through answering a brief set of questions I prepared. I hope you enjoy their insights, and that their passion and vision for this unique project inspire you to check out SCALES-OKN and keep it on your radar.

1. Please describe your role in the conception, development, and operation of the SCALES-OKN project.

Chris Cotropia: I joined the project after its initial conception. I think I was brought on due to my empirical legal scholarship focus and previous work with federal litigation dockets, including my study of patent litigation. I am part of the community support and engagement team at SCALES-OKN, looking at the needs of various communities to access and analyze federal litigation, including the ways SCALES-OKN can be developed to meet those needs. I am also part of the data acquisition and ontology working groups.

Charlotte Alexander: I also joined the SCALES team after the project was already underway. I had done previous work using text analytics to identify important litigation events from the unstructured text of federal court docket sheets to understand how employment lawsuits make their way through the court and how they conclude. As part of the SCALES team, I run the Ontology Working Group, which is tasked with conceptualizing ontologies of civil and criminal litigation events and working with our data engineering and development teams to develop models that can classify docket sheet entries according to the ontology events to which they belong. I'm also a member of the team's Executive Committee and in that capacity, I work with my co-Principal Investigators to set the priorities for the research as a whole.

Tom Gaylord: I joined SCALES pretty early in the process, though not from the outset. David Schwartz, one of the SCALES founders, and I have had a long relationship: I was his first library liaison at Chicago-Kent

College of Law when he first became a law professor, and we both later ended up at Northwestern, where that relationship continued. As someone who works with court dockets on a regular basis, including on prior empirical projects with Dave, I was brought in to lend a user's perspective, especially that of a librarian. A lot of the early work was looking at the scope, what to include, what could we include, and how we would get it.

Adam Pah: The initial formation of SCALES was started through an interdisciplinary research luncheon group that the Northwestern Institute on Complex Systems (NICO) sponsored. Both Dave and I were a part of a group focused on bringing people together from Computational Social Science, Economics, Criminology, and Law. As a part of the research luncheon, Dave presented on his research interests (empirical study of patent litigation) and for the most part astounded everyone that was a part of the group when we found out how poor data availability was. I remember asking him basic questions that I thought the answers were at least definitely known for, like how many cases settle in a year, and was flummoxed to find out that there was little that was definitively known at a systematic level.

From that meeting, we brought in a few more people around Northwestern and received a seed grant from NICO to acquire a small dataset to begin assessing what we could systematically do with the court records as a pilot project. Serendipitously, right as we were starting to put the group together and outline our pilot research program the NSF Convergence Accelerator made a public call for projects that “build upon basic research and discovery to accelerate solutions toward societal impact.” We felt that our focus on making systematic analysis of court records available to the public was a great fit, so we quickly moved to add to the team from Northwestern and put a proposal together as Northwestern Open Access to Court Records Initiative (NOACRI).

Luckily our proposal was selected, and we were able to spend the first year in the Convergence Accelerator refining what it is exactly that would best enable legal scholars, journalists, and legal aid organizations to do systematic research on court records. It also gave us the time to make new connections and expand our team to include more experts and collaborators from across



the country as we charted our plan toward what we now call the Systematic Content Analysis of Litigation EventS or SCALES-OKN, reflecting our broader purpose and participation. Fortunately, the NSF was also excited about our plan and the team that we put together, so after that pilot year our project was selected to continue and actually build the SCALES-OKN.

David Schwartz: As an academic, I long have been aware of deficiencies in the system of records maintained by the federal judiciary. That system, known as PACER (Public Access to Court Electronic Records), is difficult to use as a researcher. First, even to review the docket report of records, it costs \$0.10 per PDF page. Second, PACER lacks effective search features that are required to systematically locate and analyze cases. Instead, the search features are built to find a single case that the user is interested in. For many years, I have conducted empirical research into federal litigation, with an emphasis on patent litigation. In these studies, I relied upon commercial databases for the federal court data.

A few years ago, I had an opportunity to join an interdisciplinary group at Northwestern that brought faculty together from Computational Social Science, Economics, Criminology, and Law. Each faculty presented their research and a problem that computer and data science could aid in solving. When I presented my research into patent litigation, I emphasized that access to federal court data was quite limited, and that empirical legal research was being held back by the limitations of PACER. Other members of the interdisciplinary group were disturbed that court data was not easily and freely available from the federal judiciary. We formed a working subgroup to consider overcoming these issues. Adam Pah, Luis Amaral, and Kristian Hammond were part of the original group. From there, we added more depth in terms of research interests and skills, and the project grew more concrete. I recruited more faculty and our star librarian from the law school.

Rachel Adler/C3 Lab: We are the core design and development team on the SCALES-OKN project. The work we do is on a platform called Satyrn, a research project within the scope of the C3 lab here at Northwestern, which is our attempt to automate many of the aspects of data science in pursuit of democratizing

access to the information locked up in data. In other words, we want to give non-technical users—those who couldn't write code or SQL—the toolset necessary to drive data search and analysis without a data scientist in the loop. The SCALES-OKN project is one instance of this Satyrn platform that is populated by court data pulled from PACER as its primary data source, supporting search across case dockets and system-level analysis of the federal courts. This means users are able to not only request, in effect, “give me all the case dockets in the Northern District of Illinois with nature of suit Trademark,” but also “how long have those cases taken on average over the past 10 years?” or “how often are fee waivers granted in those cases?”

Our involvement with the project stems in part from our advisor's—Kristian Hammond, professor of computer science here at Northwestern—collaborations with members of the law faculty at Northwestern's Pritzker School of Law, including an ongoing innovation lab class run by Kris and Dan Linna. Our work on the project dates back to 2018, when we saw the big-picture goal of SCALES as a great opportunity to explore not just the democratization of access to court data through search, but also to leverage the lab's research to support democratization of access to information about the dynamics and processes of the U.S. court system.

The C3 team members involved with the Satyrn/SCALES project beyond Kris, include:

- **Andrew Paley** – PhD candidate in CS at NU, with research interests in human-information interfaces, human-centered AI and NLP, and a background in the design/development of applied AI products at startups as well as journalism. Paley leads the design of Satyrn, co-develops the core system, and manages platform development.
- **Andong Luis Li Zhao** – PhD candidate in CS at NU, with a research interest in modernizing our political systems through AI. Zhao co-develops Satyrn's core and collaborates on design as well as focuses on bringing political data into the platform.
- **Rachel Adler** – Associate professor of computer science at Northeastern Illinois University and an affiliate faculty of the C3 lab at Northwestern University. With a research focus on Human-Computer Interaction, Adler leads the effort to discover user needs and user testing components of the project.

- **Sergio Servantez** – PhD candidate in CS at NU and an attorney, with a primary research focus on the intersection of neuro-symbolic AI and law exploring novel approaches to reasoning over legal documents. Servantez co-develops components of the platform code and brings legal expertise to the project.
- **Harper Pack** – Research associate at NU, with a focus on exploring how AI technologies can best partner with human beings across disparate academic and professional domains. For SCALES, Pack is the platform database admin and develops the data loading components, liaising with the data engineering team to ingest the outputs of their data extraction and transformation pipelines.

2. What needs is SCALES-OKN meant to address, and who are the anticipated users or beneficiaries?

CC: SCALES-OKN, at its most basic, is meant to provide society meaningful access to the workings of the federal judiciary. Currently, mainly due to PACER and the fee-for-access model of federal courts, it is very difficult if not impossible to easily determine the activities in a given case, but more importantly, what is happening systematically throughout the federal courts. SCALES-OKN meets these needs by providing docket information for free and providing meaningful access through user-friendly search, a robust ontology to better identify important legal events, and built-in data analytics. We anticipate that our primary users will be legal scholars, law librarians, and legal aid organizations, but will ultimately include everyone who wants information on the judiciary, including academics, journalists, lawyers, policy makers, and concerned citizens.

CA: Unlike other branches of the federal government, the federal courts release very little data about the cases that are filed, what happens in court, and the way(s) that cases end. What data exists can be unreliable on the trial level, as the 94 different U.S. district courts use different coding practices to identify different litigation events and outcomes. The situation is even more complicated—and the data even less accessible—when it comes to state courts, where data often resides in separate silos and systems, county by county.

To find reliable answers to questions about how justice is done, then, researchers need access to the underlying court records themselves. And those court records sit behind paywalls in a bewildering variety of different electronic records systems. This is the central challenge that SCALES is tackling: to bring court data into public view in a consolidated, accurate, useful form, to serve policymakers, journalists, researchers, and even the courts themselves.

TG: From a librarian’s perspective, and this is something many librarians have been discussing for decades, is how much we are forced to rely on commercial publishers for access to “the law.” Most case law is commercially published. At the federal level, only the Supreme Court has an official case reporter, and while “opinions,” at the least, are supposed to be freely available in PACER, this is not always so, because the data tagging standards differ not just from court to court, but even from judge to judge, so an interim order that one chambers might tag as an opinion might not be one office door down.

RA/C3 Lab: The big picture goal of SCALES is to bring transparency to the systems and processes of the U.S. courts, ensuring that they are fair, efficient, and accurate—and we see this same spirit extending to open data in general in the broader context of Satyrn as a platform. In the end, Satyrn is designed to close the gap between open data and open information, bridging that last mile and providing meaningful information access for end users. Various open government and data transparency initiatives have focused on data access, which is of course an important and necessary step. However, data access alone is insufficient for the vast majority of the population that lack a specific set of technical skills (or the significant resources necessary to employ people with them), and—with Satyrn—we seek to close that gap.

To make that concrete, in the context of the SCALES-OKN instance, our target users include U.S.-based legal scholars, lawyers, and journalists—people who know what questions they want to ask and are tech-savvy enough to use a host of consumer applications, but can’t necessarily write code or SQL to generate answers from data.

3. What challenges (expected and unexpected)

has the project overcome, and what challenges do you see lying ahead?

CC: My perspective on challenges is shaped by my role in the project—I am not as exposed to the technical-side and more on the coding and interpretation of the docket information and how this information can be identified and transformed to better serve potential users. While not unexpected given my previous work with litigation dockets, the wide range of variation in litigation dockets—from the various docket entry formats used by different districts and different judges to the multitude of ways lawyers and judges articulate the same legal event or outcome—is a challenge. Taking this wide variety of docket information and situating it in an ontology that is useful to the multitude of various users of SCALES-OKN has also proved challenging. We want to create a truly robust and transparent tool for those interested in legal information, including those who are not experts in federal litigation.

Another major challenge is data acquisition. PACER is expensive, and our project is meant to provide access to users with a wide variety of interests, not only in litigation subject matter but geography and time period. We have gone a long way in acquiring multiple years' worth of docket information from all the federal courts, but we would certainly like to obtain more. I knew this would be a challenge, but never fully appreciated how expensive obtaining the data would be (particularly expensive in contrast to the costs of developing the underlying technology). In a sense, this challenge makes the case for the SCALES-OKN—federal litigation remains hidden because of PACER and its fees. are missing your colleagues from across the country, pre-arrange drop-in Zoom rooms to catch up.

CA: In addition to what Chris said, a challenge is how to create a system that is as universally useful as possible. Our SCALES research team must make judgment calls about how to invest our resources—for example, how granular should our classification of litigation events be? Should we identify five more general types of motions on the docket sheets or 10 more specific ones? Or should we all vote about which motion types are most important in the progress of a case? In making these decisions, we are constantly checking ourselves to ensure that users will be able to perform independent searches and otherwise manipulate the data to serve their own ends—and won't be hemmed in by our research team's prior decisions.

TG: After my first meeting with Dave about the project, I went back to my boss and told him I didn't think this would take up much of my time. The scope of the project then was much smaller than it is now, and I was already pessimistic about its chance of success. So, personally, that was its own obstacle. If you tell an outside layperson who probably is never going to use PACER what the costs are, and how they can be waived, they might go so far as to think we are trying to solve a problem that doesn't need solving, but those costs quickly aggregate and, again, this is government information, something our taxes should already be funding, not a profit-based endeavor from a commercial publisher.

AP: The first major technical challenge was simply getting a handle on just how difficult PACER records can be to work with. There is a huge amount of variation in how the system is used across all 94 districts given the variety of proceedings that can occur in federal court. At this point I think we have become more expert in PACER nuances than I ever expected as a non-lawyer, but it's been essential to get to the point where we are ready to release the data for consumption and research use by others.

Going forward, data acquisition costs for a nonprofit, public good will always be an issue until the Open Courts Act is passed. We believe and hope that the SCALES-OKN can provide another good reason why this bill is necessary and an example of how making these records available for systematic analysis will improve the function of the courts for everyone involved.

RA/C3 Lab: There is a dual track to SCALES development. First, there's the data work necessary to extract, transform, and load the unstructured and semi-structured data sources (e.g., court dockets) into a well-defined relational database, which also includes some language modeling for the sake of tagging docket entries. Second, there's the work on the Satyrn platform itself that supports new features in the SCALES instance as well as any other instances of the platform (e.g., another area we are now doing active work involves political data).

Against that backdrop, on the former, there are ongoing challenges with bringing standardization to court data, especially as it pertains to disambiguation of entities (e.g., parties, lawyers) and ontologizing all the relevant aspects of a case. Further, there is the challenge of designing a schema capable of addressing a wide



array of possible situations in each case (e.g., change of representation, the splitting or joining of cases, change of venue, additional complexities introduced by the processes associated with criminal cases, and so on). Luckily for our lab of computer scientists and AI researchers, we work with a data engineering team focused on many aspects of ETL and tagging, and the broader SCALES team includes a host of legal scholars, lawyers, and other domain experts who we collaborate with to fully understand and model the space.

On the second part—the Satyrn platform—our pursuit of automating data science in a cross-dataset and cross-domain way introduces a host of meaningful challenges, from how best to help a non-technical user through the process of data search and analysis to how to provide them with results that are understandable while also surfacing potential issues with the underlying data. Further, the Satyrn model opens the door to the possibility of non-technical users bringing new datasets to the platform for blending with other novel forms of analysis, and one near-term tract of work is set to focus on supporting that workflow. At this point, we have many of the building blocks in place and user testing to date has validated our core approach, so we are excited about continuing down this path.

4. What is the timeline for completion and full deployment of the SCALES-OKN products and/or services?

CC: We just finished our first year under an NSF Convergence Accelerator grant. After these 12 months, SCALES-OKN has moved from alpha to beta release, with major improvements in the user interface, PACER docket information parsing and processing, downstream analytics, and core ontology.

Going forward over the next year, we plan to crosswalk our data with other datasets, such as USSC sentencing data and the Federal Judicial Center’s Integrated Database. We are also focused on further improving our litigation events and phases modeling efforts.

Our goal is to keep pushing and enriching the SCALES-OKN user interface and data ecosystem throughout the year and, with continued user testing, reach our milestones for a stable and feature-filled public release in summer 2022. As the

year progresses, we plan to make more incremental public releases (ontologies, models, raw data, and more).

RA/C3 Lab: We plan to have a semi-open beta release around the end of the year for the SCALES-OKN instance, during which users will be able to sign up and—with account approval—get access to the platform stocked with court data (and supplemental datasets). Beyond that, we will be looking to go into open beta with the full, cross-domain Satyrn platform sometime next year.

5. How could the project benefit from increased partnerships, funding, promotion, personnel, etc.?

CC: We love to hear from (and work with) those who have questions that need access to federal litigation information to get fully answered. For example, SCALES-OKN held an Open Justice Research Workshop in May 2021, where four research collaborations were born that will use SCALES-OKN to answer a variety of research questions. We have started generating “living reports” where SCALES-OKN can help actively answer questions of community interest (e.g., the sealing activity of federal courts in patent cases—with the living report [available here](#)).

We would also benefit from greater funding (not a shocker there). Such funding not only helps answer specific project-related questions, but also aids in the development of SCALES-OKN overall and addressing future project needs.

RA/C3 Lab: This is an ongoing research project. We are curious to continue learning about what research professionals in this space want to know and their process for engaging with these data. We would benefit from learning about additional data we could include, other attributes to analyze, and further research questions to explore. We would like to know what legal scholars and journalists want to know, but currently do not have the ability to answer to help ensure our system will be complete and able to answer all types of questions.

We are further interested in exploring other domains and extending the platform beyond its current legal purview. Therefore, at present, we are investigating how we might systematically answer questions for political



scientists and would benefit by talking to researchers in that space—or others such as economics, medicine, operations, and education.

6. Is there anything else you would like law librarians and legal research professionals to know about SCALES-OKN? (E.g., how could the platform help us, and how could we help you?)

CC: We certainly think that SCALES-OKN will prove beneficial to anyone doing legal research, including law librarians and legal research professionals. We have also benefited greatly from the legal research community—so please, reach out if you have any interest, comments, or suggestions. You can watch our [website](#) for the latest updates on SCALES-OKN. At its core, SCALES-OKN is about the community—providing federal judiciary access and insights to every single person.

CA: We are interested in locating additional troves of federal district court docket sheets and/or court documents to add to our records repository and feed into our text analytics models for training and testing. We are also eager to learn from professionals about possible uses, e.g., what questions would you answer if you had unlimited access to data about the characteristics, pathways, and outcomes of federal civil and criminal cases?

TG: One thing I think legal research professionals, and law librarians in particular, agree on is getting legal information that is generated by the government to the end user at the lowest possible cost, if not altogether for free. The project's aim to get us to that point should be an extremely appealing aspect of it to legal research professionals. And to piggyback on Charlotte's response: Absolutely let us know if any attorney, professor, or student has asked a question that might be answerable (either now or in the future) by SCALES, because we have a ton of bright people working on this, but we haven't thought of everything.

DS: We are interested in linking the court data with other publicly available data. In my field, that includes linking patent infringement lawsuits to information about the underlying patents and R&D expenses of the parties. We welcome suggestions from researchers in other fields for information to link to.

RA/C3 Lab: Ultimately, we are really looking forward to getting this new platform out into the hands of more users, and we're very open to feedback and

collaborations towards improving the platform as we roll forward. If you're interested in being a beta tester or getting early access, please reach out!

BEYOND CRIV: MONITORING DEVELOPMENTS, ISSUES & TRENDS IN LEGAL INFORMATION

ASHLEY AMES AHLBRAND

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR PUBLIC SERVICES
INDIANA UNIVERSITY MAURER SCHOOL OF LAW

Just as law and technology change on a dime, so too, it seems, does the legal information landscape. Whether we are assisting faculty and students, judges and law clerks, or paralegals and attorneys with legal research; whether we use the legal resources ourselves or provide and instruct others on how to use them; whether the resources we use are in print, electronic, audio, or visual; legal information bombards us at every turn—an ever-present factor in our day-to-day work as legal information professionals.

Through our own publications, the *CRIV Blog* and *The CRIV Sheet*, the members of the Committee on Relations with Information Vendors (CRIV) endeavor to keep our readership informed on the latest developments, trends, and issues facing law libraries and information vendors. But we are not the sole voice in this effort.

This article highlights some of the other AALL and special interest section (SIS) publications and resources that can help expand your knowledge of trends, trials, and techniques in the legal information landscape. While none of the resources listed here have a sole focus on legal information and information vendors, all regularly share content touching on these subjects and may be beneficial to anyone wishing to learn more about the legal information issues facing law librarians. (Please note that this is not an exhaustive list.) What system is this, and why is it so interesting and promising?

Academic Law Libraries SIS

- **ALL-SIS Newsletter** – The content of SIS newsletters generally includes updates about individual SIS members, and other SIS business, such as reports of committees. However, most member newsletters also include more substantive articles, many of which pertain to legal information-related topics. SIS newsletter archives are accessible to all, regardless of whether you are a member of that particular section and are well worth exploring.

- **Collection Development Committee Resources** – The ALL-SIS Collection Development Committee has compiled several resources related to collection development in law libraries. While many are focused specifically on academic law libraries, others, such as the **Collection Development Resources on the Web**, have a broader scope.
- **Legal Research and Sourcebook Committee** – While the materials collected by the Legal Research and Sourcebook Committee have an academic focus, there may be helpful crossover for those in non-academic law libraries as well, such as ideas for attorney or public patron training sessions, CLEs on legal research, and more.

Black Law Librarians SIS

- **BLISS Blog** – Similar to SIS newsletters, SIS blogs include posts on SIS business, member updates, and more substantive topics.
- **Diversity in the Legal Information Profession Resources** – This page includes a substantial list of articles, several of which deal with diversity-related issues in legal information resources.

Foreign, Comparative & International Law SIS

- **FCIL Newsletter** – Recent issues have included, for example, a series of “Resource Reviews” from members of the Electronic Research Interest Group.
- **DipLawMatic Dialogues** – Blog that includes posts on business, member updates, and more substantive topics.
- **Jumpstart** – This resource, also prepared by members of the Electronic Research Interest Group, contains, among other things, a helpful list of FCIL-SIS specialists you can contact if you have a research question pertaining to a particular country, region, or aspect of FCIL work.

- **Online Discussion Forums** – This page helpfully compiles a list of FCIL-related listservs beyond AALL. Some are member-exclusive, but many are open to all. Listserv focus ranges from country specific to broader FCIL topics. (Am I thinking of joining the German law listserv to refresh my German language skills and learn some German legal research along the way? Ja wohl!)

Government Documents SIS

- **JURISDOCS** – Newsletters includes updates about individual SIS members, and other SIS business, such as reports of committees.
- **State Bibliographies** – Often, it seems, state legal and governmental information can be challenging to track down. The GD-SIS Publication Committee’s production of State Bibliographies can really help. (Note: The link is to the page describing the project; the bibliographies are available through HeinOnline.)

Government Law Libraries SIS

- **GLL News – A recent issue** of this newsletter demonstrates yet another reason to check out the newsletters of different SISs: to look for news and reviews of programming at other conferences that might inspire your continuing education.
- **Self-Representation Resources** – For those who work with members of the public, or even those simply looking to showcase free or low-cost legal research options to their patrons, this page highlights various county and government law library guides (and, in some cases, programming) to legal resources for the self-represented.
- **GLL Mentorship Program** – If you are looking for insight into various areas of government law library expertise, this page is a helpful resource. With categories ranging from collection management to education to technology, they list an array of GLL members ready to offer their consult and advice.

Legal History & Rare Books SIS

- **LH&RB Newsletter** – Includes updates about individual SIS members, and other SIS business, such as reports of committees.

- **Unbound** – In addition to the content of their regular SIS newsletter, Unbound offers reviews of recent articles and books related to legal history and rare books.

Legal Information Services to the Public SIS

- **Law Librarians & Access to Justice** – This is a joint blog of LISP-SIS and SR-SIS.
- **Public Library Toolkit** – Compiled by LISP-SIS members Marsha Thomas and Betsy Sandison, this toolkit offers state-specific and general resources for public law libraries, from guides on how to help public patrons with their legal research to collection development guides.

Legal Innovation & Technology SIS

- **LIT-SIS Blog** – For news on upcoming SIS programming, conferences, and helpful technology tips, the LIT-SIS blog is a great resource to follow.

Library Systems & Resource Discovery Special Interest Section

- **Website of the Month** – As an ALL-SIS member, I see a message about this resource every month through My Communities, and although I am not a cataloger, I am always interested to see what website they are highlighting this month. This resource provides members with a MARC record for the featured website, as well as a description of the site’s contents. An **archive** of past featured websites is available as well.

Private Law Librarians & Information Professionals SIS

- **On Firmer Ground (blog)** – Along with more substantive posts, I am loving their “PLLIP Picks” series, highlighting the books members are reading right now.
- **Member News** – The member news often includes recent publications of SIS members, as well as highlighting upcoming programming that might be of interest.
- **PLL Resource Guides** – This resource includes guides to everything from hiring law librarians to collection development to internet research options.

- **Dewey B Strategic** – Though not an official SIS resource, this popular blog is authored by SIS member Jean O’Grady and covers news, trends, and innovation in the legal market.

Professional Engagement, Growth & Advancement SIS

- **Member Newsletter** – The PEGA-SIS newsletter often includes articles on productivity tools and other professional advancement resources that might benefit your library or patrons.
- **PEGA-SIS Blog: Take Flight** – Includes posts on SIS business, member updates, and more substantive topics.
- “So You Wanna...” – This webinar series covers an array of topics related to professional growth and advancement, and the committee is always looking for suggestions. (Oh, I feel a PEGA-CRIV collaboration coming on!) Summaries and links to recordings are available from the blog.

Research, Instruction & Patron Services SIS

- **RIPS Law Librarian Blog** – Includes posts on SIS business, member updates, and more substantive topics.
- **Legal Research Article Summaries** – This page provides summaries of recent articles related to legal research.
- **Legal Research Text Summaries** – This page serves as a companion to the first, offering summaries of recent books related to teaching and legal research.
- **Teach-In Kit** – A mainstay since the mid-1990s, the Teach-In Kit includes resources created by academic, government, and firm librarians for the training of students, new attorneys, members of the public, and more. If you haven’t checked it out lately, take a peek at its redesign, now organized by subject

Social Responsibilities SIS

- **Member Newsletter** (see the joint LISP-SR blog, referenced above)
- **Resource Pages** – SR-SIS has created a series of pages with tools, guides, and articles on a variety of

subjects, including **immigration law**, **disability**, **prisoners**, **environmental sustainability**, and **sexual orientation and gender identity**.

Technical Services SIS

- **Technical Services Law Librarian** – This SIS newsletter is a rich resource for tech services and non-tech services librarians alike, with program reviews and columns on everything from research and writing to technology.
- **TSSL TechScans** – The companion blog covers the latest trends and technology in technical services.

AALL

Finally, I would be remiss not to highlight other AALL resources that often cover topics related to legal information and information vendors, including the weekly **KnowItAALL** and **eNewsletters**, **AALL Spectrum**, **Law Library Journal**, and the **AALL Knowledge Center**. Make sure to keep an eye on the Association’s **calendar** as well, for upcoming programming such as coffee chats and webinars.

One final note: Although I have highlighted the work and resources borne out of SISs in this article, these are not the only interest groups we have in AALL. You might also check out the work of the many caucuses and member-created communities, the full list is available through My Communities on AALLNET. Many of these groups discuss, evaluate, and offer programming and resources on issues related to legal information and information vendors (for example, see the member-created Legal Research Database Evaluation Community).

As I sat down to work on this article, I looked forward to learning about the resources published by SISs where I am not a member and was pleasantly surprised to learn how much SIS material is available to everyone. I was even more amazed to discover resources within my own SISs that I had previously known little about. I am now subscribed to far more blogs and newsletters than I had been previously. I have always appreciated the community-driven ethos of librarianship, our openness to resource-sharing and learning from and with each other. Through our own publications, CRIV is proud to be a champion of this sharing and learning culture, and as I said in my column, we would like to



push that further this year by helping to spread the word about your CRIV-related resources and programming. If your SIS, caucus, or chapter has an upcoming event or new publication or resource related to legal in-

formation and information vendors that you would like us to highlight, or if you have a committee or member who would like to write for us, please reach out. We look forward to learning and growing alongside you.

CRIV SHEET SUMMARIES / 2021 AALL ANNUAL MEETING EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The 114th Annual Meeting & Conference of the American Association of Law Libraries was held virtually July 19-23, 2021. The theme was “Leading with Wisdom & Insight.” In volume 43 no. 3 of *The CRIV Sheet* (June 2021), CRIV was happy to recommend several programs for this Conference. In this issue, we follow up with program reviews of seven of those recommended programs as part of our CRIV Sheet Summaries. All the reviewed programs were recorded, and their titles below link to video of the session (accessible to registered Conference attendees).

DIY ANALYTICS: BEYOND EXCEL (SPONSORED BY FASTCASE)

ELIZABETH OUTLER

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER

Coordinator: Erik Y. Adams (Manager of Library Digital Initiatives, Sidley Austin LLP)

Speakers: Martin Korn (Director of Research & Knowledge Services, Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP) & Casandra Laskowski (Technology & Empirical Services Librarian, Head of Research, Data & Instruction, University of Arizona College of Law Library)

This deep dive on-demand program consists of 60 minutes of video plus a set of exercises and sample data in GitHub.

Each speaker shared a portion of a beginner-to-intermediate level introduction to working with data and starting data projects to provide value to your organization. The program began with Cas Laskowski giving an overview and explanation of some basic math concepts that are important fundamentals in working with data. As she exhorted her audience, don't skip this part. Unless you are a statistics wizard, this short refresher is worth the time, especially for those who fear/hate math. Laskowski did a great job of making the ideas approachable and straightforward, and no one has to think about formulas or anything like that. Additionally, this introduction grounds one's thinking. It is a reminder of what working with data really is for, and that there are limits to what can be reasonably concluded from any given dataset.

The second speaker, Martin Korn, focused on sour-

ces of data. This can be internal to the organization, from statistics collection that is already performed, or that can be created from records that are already kept. This is important, especially in the law firm environment, because the often-labor intensive exercise of creating data-collecting instruments (like surveys or new software tools) can result in many unbillable hours of work (which, it goes without saying, should be avoided). Other sources of data that may not be known are external, such as data provided by software and database vendors that you already have contracts with. There are also high-quality government sources of data, and vast amounts of it. An important site to consult is Data.gov to see not only sources that are available, but examples of projects that have used that data. A thread that continued from Laskowski's presentation into Korn's was the importance of knowing what questions you want to answer with data and understanding what questions can be answered using the data you have available.

The final speaker was Erik Adams, who discussed



tools for data analysis and visualization, including OpenRefine, R and R Studio, Jupyter Notebooks, Python, Power BI, and Tableau. It is OK not to know what any of those things are, as he gives a brief description of each, and points out that several are programming languages and tools used heavily by actual data scientists. However, for librarians who are interested in expanding their skill sets into coding, R and Python are accessible and learnable, and these tools can pay dividends far beyond just data manipulation. Everything listed above is free and open source, except for Power BI (a Microsoft product) and Tableau (recently acquired by Salesforce). The exercises provided to go along with the deep dive program show you how to use a free, trial version of Tableau (if your organization does not already have this software).

An important concluding note about this useful and empowering program is to draw attention to its subtitle: Beyond Excel. Adams points out in his portion of the program that while Excel is a powerful and ubiquitous tool, it has limits when it comes to true data analytics. The other tools that he describes allow for much larger data sets than Excel can accommodate, they make complex statistical formulas much easier to apply and use, and tools like Power BI and Tableau offer much more user-friendly and powerful data visualization possibilities.

In summary, if you want or need to do some data analysis projects and don't know where to start, this program can be a good introduction to some of the concepts and tools that will help you take the plunge.

THE FUTURE OF LIBRARY COLLECTIONS

CHRISTY SMITH

HEAD OF COLLECTION SERVICES
SETON HALL UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

Coordinator/Moderator: Michele Knapp (Head of Collection Services, University of San Diego School of Law)

Speakers: Andre Davison (Research & Information Operations Implementation Manager, Orrick LLP); Michael McArthur (FCIL Librarian & Head of Collection Development, Duke University School of Law); Kirstin Nelson (Senior Law Librarian, USDA National Agricultural Library) & Dawn Smith (Head of Acquisitions, Yale Law School Lillian Goldman Library)

Librarians from different types of law libraries discussed aspects of collection development operations. The session started out with an overview of collections operations. Panelists then discussed usage evaluation, development of digital collections, and budget management strategies.

Smith kicked off the session reminding us to consider our stakeholders' needs throughout the collection development process. Keep in mind the who and why. Collection requests may be initiated from anyone and needs vary.

All purchase requests land in Technical Services, where all the magic happens: acquiring and paying for the resource, cataloging or activating the resource, physically processing the resource, and linking it on the website or intranet. It's important to let the requestor know of any unanticipated costs, delays, or access issues. Technical Services should notify the requestor once the

item is accessible. Smith recommended LibAnswers to create more efficient communication workflows rather than using group email.

The discussion then moved to usage evaluation. McArthur talked about negotiating IP access and using Google Analytics to gather click-throughs on the catalog and website, using circulation statistics from the integrated library system, and relying on vendor statistics. McArthur evaluates all data prior to each renewal. McArthur also found the usage data provided for their Evidence-Based Acquisition (EBA) plan to be helpful when determining which titles to purchase.

Davison discussed tools used in a firm library: Onelog, SpendConnect, and Research Monitor. His firm is also able to use statistics gathered from their SharePoint site and then use data visualization systems such as Tableau.



Nelson's USDA National Agricultural Library is part of the Agricultural Law Information Partnership. They are archiving born-digital COVID-19-related resources pertaining to agricultural legal issues. The group is trying to capture as much as they can since states are already starting to remove information from their websites. Content includes major laws addressing flexibility with USDA-backed loans, grant programs, and COVID-19 food assistance programs. They are archiving gray literature, Twitter posts, blogs, social media, podcasts, and legal literature. They will likely need to purchase back-files from the Internet Archive.

McArthur discussed using the Internet Archive and HathiTrust during the pandemic. Many vendors offered free digital access temporarily. Maintaining an open dialog with vendors is imperative, he stressed, especially this year when increased enrollment at many law schools has resulted in budget challenges as prices go up based on a higher student count.

Discoverability and accessibility are key, Davison advised. His firm started shifting print content to digital format and linking the digital formats into their intranet practice-area portals. During the pandemic, they have increased training by teaching attorneys how to navigate the resources on their practice pages. A "tripod of systems" (integrated library system + request management system such as LibAnswers + usage and metric system monitors such as Research Monitor and OneLog) can all be used to make resources discoverable and evaluate usage.

The panelists then discussed budget management strategies. Smith talked about setting up the budget

structure to make sure it captures your library's needs. The structure should help answer *what* and *why* regarding your spending.

Smith reminded us that it's good to consider, and collaborate with, other libraries when canceling print resources. Make sure you are not relying on a handful of libraries to supply print materials when needed.

Davison's firm used consultants to help renegotiate contracts. The consultants provided market insight and reports. The firm deduplicated formats and content and converted some print resources to digital formats. They created policies surrounding the new collection development practices. Questions still arise about purchasing copies for one office, every office, or selected offices.

Nelson's situation is unique. Her library's print budget was eliminated in 2010, but they have been able to continue acquiring print. Almost all USDA directives are provided to the library and some other agencies send print resources. They also use the Library of Congress Surplus Books Program and participate in the Library of Congress' Cataloging-In-Publication Program for scientific-related works. Their catalogers create the records for the publications and by doing this, they receive a copy of each book from the publisher.

Nelson also has a large special collections department. When scientists retire, they often donate their papers. The USDA library catalogs the materials and makes them available. In addition to papers, they also receive fibers, bug samples, art, seeds, fungi samples, and other unique items. In 1998, they created a tribal college partnership and ship extra or unneeded books to those colleges.

ETHICS OF USING ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY IN LEGAL RESEARCH

ANDREW CHRISTENSEN

HEAD OF DIGITAL INITIATIVES AND OUTREACH
WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

Moderator/Coordinator: Mindy Rattan (Litigation Team Lead, Analysis, Bloomberg Law)

Coordinator: Michael Bernier (Director of Library Relations, Bloomberg Law)

Speakers: Darla W. Jackson (Research Librarian, University of Oklahoma Law Library); Daniel W. Linna, Jr. (Senior Lecturer & Director of Law and Technology Initiatives, Northwestern Pritzker School of Law & McCormick School of Engineering) & Catherine Sanders Reach (Director, Center for Practice Management at North Carolina Bar Association)



This program presented the complex, controversial, and ever-evolving topic of ethics in the use of advanced technology in legal research. The target audience was all law librarians who use, or whose patrons use, information resources built on artificial intelligence (AI)—which, due to recent enhancements in the major commercial databases, makes the session relevant to most of us. The panelists drew on their experience in legal practice, academia, law firm librarianship, and work for information vendors to expertly present an overview of AI's beneficial applications and problematic implications for legal information. Attendees are left with a global understanding that is well worth 60 minutes and likely to spawn thoughts, conversations, and projects well beyond the session.

Dan Linna, a scholar with dual appointments at Northwestern University's law and engineering schools, began by framing the discussion with a widely accepted definition of AI: intelligence demonstrated by machines. Using helpful graphics and examples, he explained that AI encompasses a variety of methods, purposes, and tools, only a few of which have gained relevance and traction in the law and legal research. Natural-language processing and machine learning, for instance, are the adaptive and predictive models at the core of today's enhanced legal search engines, driven by data supplied by users over time to provide better answers and results. Linna also highlighted the utility of AI expert systems, rules-driven programs that operate on fixed input from expert humans, as increasingly valuable to legal practitioners and researchers in decision-making and task automation. All these AI systems fundamentally function on algorithms, or step-by-step procedures for arriving at a logical outcome. Linna advised that, as the professionals often charged with evaluating and managing systems based in AI for our institutions, law librarians need to know generally how these systems work, and to learn from vendors in simple terms how any given AI tool for research was developed in order to explain it on a functional level to others.

Catherine Sanders Reach, a former law firm librarian and current director of the North Carolina Bar Association's Center for Practice Management, walked through some examples of AI-enhanced legal research products. Starting from the premise that AI can make legal professionals' jobs easier in helping to process and

analyze the large amounts of data involved with the modern practice of law, she focused on how librarians can effectively assess the utility of AI research products for their institutional needs. Analytics, visualization, e-discovery, issue and citation tracking, legal writing, and prediction are among the applications that tools from leading and emerging vendors have in firm and academic settings. Working closely with the vendors and asking as many questions as needed is the key to understanding these tools, Reach recommended. She also voiced a concern on how AI-enhanced tools, for example, those that instantly retrieve and insert authorities into a brief simply uploaded into the system, may blur ethics lines as a form of unauthorized practice of law—they are arguably doing the research for you. For those in private practice, Reach also mentioned the growing presence of AI in knowledge management (KM) products, streamlining the organization of firms' large data sets while requiring special consideration within acceptable use policies.

Next, Darla Jackson presented an overview of how current legal ethics rules may be construed to cover the use of AI in legal research, especially as converging with the practice of law. Existing limitations and guidelines, such as those regulating the unauthorized practice of law by non-licensed persons (such as librarians in many instances), can be interpreted or even specifically modified to include the "practice" of law by automated computing systems. With reference to the ABA's Model Rules of Professional Conduct, Jackson spoke to five areas in which the use of AI in legal research and practice may require special consideration: 1) competency in understanding the advantages and risks of using the technology; 2) a lawyer's supervision of non-lawyer conduct; 3) duty to communicate with a client as to the use of AI tools; 4) duty of confidentiality in processing work product with tools like brief analyzers; and 5) discrimination that may arise from biases inherent to an AI system.

The panelists then traded views and anecdotes on best practices in advising attorneys and students in using legal AI, including gleaning insight or inspiration from state bar ethics opinions and hypotheticals. Linna then moved on to examine biases in AI, such as those that systems manifest through operating on



data that reflects unfair historical conditions, technical biases that impact users who access an AI tool in different ways, and biases that arise when a system learns and reflects biased input from its users. He mentioned the growing development of AI principles by scholars and business leaders, seeking to codify the ethical use of such technologies by ensuring responsibility, accuracy, auditability, and fairness in AI systems.

Rounding out the hour, Reach gave an overview

of AI in e-discovery and ways for evaluating whether a tool is suitable for a firm's needs. The panelists also outlined several interesting big-picture questions for the audience to consider, such as whether librarians using AI tools need to know how the information processed will be used by both the system and the end user. In addition to the [program recording](#) for registered meeting attendees, the session's [slides and reference materials](#) are also available.

THE INS AND OUTS OF INDIA LEGAL RESEARCH: LEARNING HOW TO FIND INDIA PRIMARY AND SECONDARY LAW

CINDY DABNEY

ASSOCIATE LIBRARIAN FOR OUTREACH SERVICES AND LECTURER IN LAW
INDIANA UNIVERSITY MAURER SCHOOL OF LAW

Coordinator: Mandy Lee (Research & Instructional Services Librarian, Chicago-Kent College of Law)

Speakers: Sunil Rao (Foreign Law Librarian, University of Wisconsin-Madison) & Pushyamitra Veeramachaneni (Outreach and Library Services Law Librarian, Florida International University)

This program is an excellent introduction to India's legal system and strategies for finding Indian legal documents.

Veeramachaneni introduced the history of the Indian legal system and its evolution. India blends religious law and customary law with the system inherited from the British colonization. She covered the different eras of Indian history: how laws were made and handed down, the court system, and primary and secondary sources. This provides background on why the legal system of India functions the way it does. Additionally, she offered resources for locating older Indian legal materials.

Rao covered the period since India's independence from Britain in 1947, and spoke to modern law and legal research. The Constitution of India is the longest in the world and describes a central government, state governments, and various types of local government.

India's central government is modeled after the British law common law system. The Constitution is the highest law of the land, and there are the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial branches. State governments mirror the central government. One interesting feature, though, is a single integrated court system.

The three types of primary law are legislation, case

law, and customary law. For legislation, the Constitution of India designates a Union List of subjects for the central government, a State List for state governments, and a concurrent list that either entity can legislate upon. The central government usually legislates about matters of national importance, while state governments deal with items of local and social importance.

The official source of law for the central government is the *Gazette of India*. Legislation is in force on the date it appears in the Gazette, unless the legislation itself says otherwise. The best source for state legislation is the *India Code*, a digital repository that covers both state and central government acts. States also publish weekly gazettes, but they are not easy to get.

Many databases for Indian law are structured to facilitate finding cases, as the Supreme Court is so influential. The Supreme Court has appellate jurisdiction but also uncommonly extensive original jurisdiction, for example, over any alleged violation of the fundamental rights listed in the Constitution. The second tier of the court system are the High Courts, which oversee civil and criminal matters at the state level. District courts are divided into civil and criminal courts. There are also specialized tribunals, established by statute, which run parallel to the court system.

The last primary source is customary law. Customary law tends to be more local, and may deal with topics such as indigenous tribes, natural resources, and family and inheritance law. Customary law is often decided by Lok Adalats, local alternative dispute resolution bodies. In 1987, an act made the decisions of Lok Adalats binding—equivalent to decisions of civil courts.

When it comes to locating cases, Supreme Court and High Court decisions are the most available. The official reporter for Supreme Court decisions is the Supreme Court Reporter, which should always be cited where available. There are also two commercial reporters, All India Reports (which includes High Court cases) and Supreme Court Cases. Reporters for the High Courts include the India Law Reports and reports specific to particular states.

There are some excellent free options for legal research in India. Possibly the best is [Indian Kanoon](#), which features an intuitive, Google-like search and a wealth of materials including case law, legislation, law

journals, and primary sources from the time under British rule. It even has a citator of sorts. There is also the [Legal Information Institute of India](#), which has an excellent selection of content, but is much more difficult to search, and can be a little out of date.

Secondary sources include digests, legislative commentaries, journals, dictionaries, and encyclopedias. They also have Reform Reports, written by groups charged with studying the current law and making recommendations for how to change and improve it.

[Veeramachaneni](#) and [Rao](#) have each created LibGuides on India that cover the materials in the presentation and more. There were more questions than the speakers had time for, so there is also a follow-up question and answer post in the FCIL-SIS [DipLawMatic Dialogues](#) blog. Anyone who is interested in improving their legal research skills for Indian law could benefit from this session.

BRIEF ANALYZERS: THE NEXT LEVEL OF BOTS DOING LEGAL RESEARCH

ALEXANDER R. MOLDAUER

LAW LIBRARY FELLOW

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF LAW

Coordinator: Benjamin J. Keele (Associate Director, Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law Library)

Speakers: Katie Labonte (Research Specialist, Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law) & Susan Nevelow Mart (Professor and Director of the Law Library, University of Colorado Law School)

In this session, three presenters discussed their research on brief analyzers—artificial intelligence (AI) tools that analyze legal briefs and search for related authority. The presenters discussed the strengths and limitations of brief analyzers, their research comparing brief analyzers from four different vendors, and considerations for law librarians teaching law students and attorneys how to use brief analyzers.

Susan Nevelow Mart began the session by reflecting broadly on the role of AI, or machine learning, in online legal research. She noted that human ingenuity and differences in worldviews influence machine learning, often with positive results. We cannot rely entirely on AI to do legal research, she pointed out, because machines cannot replicate the human capacity for “creative problem-solving under conditions of complexity and uncertainty.” After all, “machine learning bypasses

analogic reasoning in favor of statistical probability.”

Next, Katie Labonte described the presenters’ study evaluating four brief analyzers: Westlaw Quick Check, Lexis+ Brief Analysis, Bloomberg Law Brief Analyzer, and Casetext CARA AI. Initially, the presenters asked attorneys to identify research questions they typically face in practice. The researchers selected 10 of these questions for the study. Labonte highlighted the following example: “Under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), what factors are considered when determining if an employee is able to perform the essential functions of their job?” For each of the 10 questions, the researchers ran a keyword search and chose a brief relevant to the issue from the results. They ran each brief through each of the four brief analyzers, which took varying approaches to brief analysis. Westlaw and Bloomberg provided separate recommendations for



each section of the brief. Westlaw identified five suggested cases per section as well as several “additional cases.” Lexis identified key passages and provided separate recommendations for each passage. Casetext identified legal concepts but did not break down its recommendations by section or passage. All four brief analyzers use filters, keywords, and legal concepts. The researchers analyzed 298 cases across the four brief analyzers, of which 267 were unique (recommended by only one of the brief analyzers). Casetext had the highest average unique case rate across the 10 briefs with 83 percent, while Lexis had the lowest with 70.1 percent. Apart from two outliers, the average uniqueness rate for each research question was between 80 and 90 percent.

Finally, Benjamin Keele discussed the implications of the study’s results. He noted that, as indicated by the high uniqueness rates, the results varied significantly across the four brief analyzers. Given the specificity of the brief analyzers’ algorithms, he observed, these tools should be used only on polished, well-structured briefs with well-formatted citations. Accordingly, legal research professors should not

teach students how to use brief analyzers until they have mastered basic legal research skills. Keele suggested practicing attorneys use brief analyzers in two ways. First, he recommended attorneys run their own briefs through the software to ensure they have not missed critical authority. Second, he recommended they run opponents’ briefs through the software to help identify authorities and arguments for responsive briefs.

During the question-and-answer portion of the session, the presenters addressed privacy concerns by noting that none of the four brief analyzers save search results. They also acknowledged that the research questions they used in their study may have been broader than those attorneys typically face in practice. As a result, their search results were likely overinclusive. The presenters plan to do more research to gain a more detailed understanding of result relevance. At present, they do not have enough information to recommend any of the brief analyzers over the others.

SOVEREIGNTY, NATIVE AMERICA, AND LEGAL CULTURE: WHY ACCESSING AND UNDERSTANDING TRIBAL LAW JUST BECAME MORE IMPORTANT

CYNTHIA CONDIT

HEAD OF FACULTY AND ACCESS SERVICES & PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA COLLEGE OF LAW LIBRARY

Moderator/Coordinator: Darla W. Jackson (Research Librarian, University of Oklahoma Law Library)

Speakers: Bonnie Schucha (Associate Dean for Library & Information Services, University of Wisconsin Law School); David Greisen (CEO & Founding Director, Open Law Library) & Christina Steinbrecker Jack (CPO, Fastcase)

It is not easy to locate a complete, up-to-date, and easily accessible collection of tribal law. This program presented a call for urgent and renewed efforts to develop accessible and complete resources of tribal law post the U.S. Supreme Court’s decision in *McGirt v. Oklahoma*, and highlighted three ongoing initiatives to meet the call.

Darla Jackson began the session with an introduction to the *McGirt* case, which focused on whether a Native American who committed a crime on tribal land could be tried under Oklahoma state law. Heralded by many

as a landmark decision by the U.S. Supreme Court, *McGirt* affirmed that the Muscogee Creek Nation reservation was never disestablished and that treaties established with Native Americans still stand. The court determined that crimes committed by any Indian in Indian Country do not fall under state law. Instead, these crimes fall within tribal and federal jurisdiction. For more about the case, Jackson recommended a July 2020 [webinar](#) presented by Arizona State University.

Post *McGirt*, Jackson noted, there has been a surge in cases in tribal courts to address issues arising from



the ruling. The **Cherokee Nation and Chickasaw Nation Criminal Jurisdiction Compacting Act** has been introduced to Congress to give tribes authority to stipulate compacts with states. However, only these two tribes currently support compacting. Without options to negotiate with state courts to assist with the bulging case load and an increased need for access to relevant tribal law, there is a greater sense of urgency to work toward developing complete and accessible repositories of tribal law.

Jackson introduced attendees to the Oklahoma Indian Legal Services (OILS) **Tribal Code Resource Guide**. Links there lead to over 35 tribal websites where codes can be accessed. There are some drawbacks to the guide; for example, it lacks site-wide search capability, the color scheme can make viewing difficult, currency of information varies, and some resources do not get updated.

One of the challenges in further developing the Guide is funding. Although OILS fundraises as a nonprofit, these monies are primarily for providing representation to tribes and tribal members. Another challenge is developing technology skills among personnel. The Legal Services Corporation provides some technology assistance and grants, but skills within OILS and tribal governments remain low.

Next, Bonnie Shucha and David Gereisen discussed the digital publication of the Tribal Laws Pilot Project they are collaborating on.

In 2020, the University of Wisconsin Law Library received a three-year grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services. The goal of the project is to develop tools for Native nations and libraries to provide tribal law content freely online. Partners in the project include the **Stockbridge-Munsee Community Band of Mohican Indians**, the University of Wisconsin Law School **Great Lakes Indigenous Law Center**, the **National Indian Law Library**, and the **Open Law Library**. The project will have direct input from members of the Native nations, and tribes will retain full control over their laws. The tool will allow publication of information in a standardized digital format, with unified access and search functionality across the laws of all participating tribes.

Information will be housed on the Open Law Library platform, the mission of which, Greisen said,

is to make all laws accessible to the public. Entities can publish their laws directly to the platform rather than going through for-profit publishers. In the first phase of the project, the collaborators worked with their tribal partners to address the unique needs they face in publishing legal materials, including ensuring tribal control, currentness, authentication, preservation, and accuracy. Now in the second phase, the library platform and open law collections are being developed.

Not unexpectedly, obstacles have arisen. For libraries, there is a disparity of in-house technical capability. It is difficult to find solutions to meet the needs of incredibly small specialty libraries that must outsource technical capabilities. There are issues of maintenance of legal materials for nascent Native nations including little to no support for maintaining legal materials over time.

Another issue is how the political desire for open access waxes and wanes. Nonprofits leading programs for open government and laws often fail when the political support disappears. One way this is being addressed is by interfacing with government partners at the procurement level rather than at the political level. Having a contact with each of the partners ensures they have the support and tools to maintain their laws over time and to keep them open.

Two pilot libraries and tribes are now using the platform and the National Indian Law Library is entering data from both tribes into its system. The next step will be integrating the University of Wisconsin Law School information into the collection management system. Greisen concluded with examples of the work that has been accomplished and details behind the workings of the platform.

Christina Steinbrecker Jack discussed the preliminary work that goes into adding a new library to the Fastcase platform and the unique challenges that adding a library of tribal law opinions presents.

Her team, like others working to increase access to tribal law, must meet distinct concerns in creating this new library. For instance, she highlighted the importance of ensuring that the overall hierarchy of tribal opinions is correct, something that requires respectful and conscious conversations with tribes. Similar issues arise when determining how to configure browse-views and filtering. She addressed the need for Fastcase to



obtain permission from the tribes to put the content online and to incorporate the voice of the user. Her team must also address the challenges of content presentation, updating and expanding the collection, ensuring authentication, and making sure that they are considering the user's needs at each step. The project was still in

the planning stage at the time of the presentation, and no content was yet available on Fastcase.

A follow-up Q&A took place later, where participants assisted the panel in evaluating possible solutions to the challenges experienced in developing each of the resources.

UNDERSTANDING BIAS IN ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE: HOW ALGORITHMS IMPACT OUR PATRONS AND WORK

ASHLEY AMES AHLBRAND

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR PUBLIC SERVICES
INDIANA UNIVERSITY MAURER SCHOOL OF LAW

Coordinator: Rebecca Sherman (Librarian, U.S. Courts Library, Ninth Circuit, Oregon)

Moderator: Nicole Dyszlewski (Head of Reference, Roger Williams University School of Law Library)

Speakers: Darla W. Jackson (Research Librarian, University of Oklahoma Law Library); Michael Katell (Postdoctoral Research Associate, Alan Turing Institute) & Ishita Rustagi (Analyst, Center for Equity, Gender, and Leadership, UC Berkeley Haas School of Business)

When it comes to studying and understanding the challenges of bias in artificial intelligence (AI), I am most definitely a novice, so when I saw this program on the schedule for the Virtual Conference, I was excited to attend. In the end, I was regrettably unable to attend live, but was able to catch the recording on AALLNET (the beauty of the recording being my ability to watch and re-watch segments to catch everything the speakers said). In this LISP-SIS-sponsored session, experts from several different industries, including an academic law librarian, a post-doc researcher in criminal justice, and a business analyst at UC Berkeley, discussed the pervasiveness of AI in our day-to-day lives and the challenges of identifying, confronting, and overcoming biases in these systems.

The speakers first discussed the ways that bias infiltrates AI systems, end to end: first, in the collection of the data itself, then through all the decision points in the design of the search algorithm, and finally in the way the algorithm is used. At each stage, you are likely to have different actors making decisions, bringing different biases into the mix. Often each of these actors makes choices with the best of intentions, but humans are fallible, and bias is most often (we would hope always) unintended.

So how do we overcome bias in AI? Katell and Rustagi discussed methods for evaluating the fairness

of AI systems. Katell highlighted the **work of David Leslie** of the Alan Turing Institute and his four categories of fairness in AI:

- Data Fairness – What data is being collected and how?
- Design Fairness – What problem is the algorithm designed to solve?
- Outcome Fairness – Examining results, is data that the algorithm draws from being distorted?
- Implementation Fairness – Who is the algorithm is designed for and how it is being used?

Katell suggested a fifth category: Stakeholder Fairness, in which we should look at who was at the table at each point in the creation and implementation of an AI algorithm, from data collection to technology design. Rustagi agreed that these fairness considerations should be made from start to finish, but added that fairness should continue to be evaluated long after implementation, saying “users and stakeholders should be able to see, understand, and appeal choices made by algorithms to truly create the realm of fairness within AI.”

Katell suggested a fifth category: Stakeholder Fairness, in which we should look at who was at the table at each point in the creation and implementation of an AI algorithm, from data collection to technology design.



Rustagi agreed that these fairness considerations should be made from start to finish, but added that fairness should continue to be evaluated long after implementation, saying “users and stakeholders should be able to see, understand, and appeal choices made by algorithms to truly create the realm of fairness within AI.”

This alludes to another significant challenge with many AI systems: transparency. These systems involve proprietary technology that most companies are unwilling to share openly. The speakers suggested several solutions to this problem. Katrell discussed third-party audits of AI systems, noting that these are employed with greater frequency in some areas than others. For example, AI used in pre-trial assessment programs are audited by third parties more regularly, whereas AI used in hiring decisions is still largely not audited at all or in limited ways, where the company itself employs the auditors or refuses to provide completely open access to its algorithms and data. Rustagi advocated for changes at the company level, creating a culture of ethics and social responsibility within the company and establishing policies and practices for responsible data collection and algorithm development. From the user standpoint, she further recommended implementing a system of checks and balances, such as requiring companies to produce datasheets that accompany their datasets and algorithms, which she likened to nutrition labels for datasets; this documentation should be made available to users in the interests of transparency, helping assure that data is used only for its intended purpose.

As the academic law librarian on the panel, Jackson discussed ways to inform library patrons, whether students, attorneys, pro se litigants, or others, about the potential for bias in AI-based legal research platforms.

Because our providers, too, are tight-lipped about how their algorithms actually work, Jackson noted that most studies on the topic in law involve examination of search results as our best attempt at reverse-engineering a platform’s search algorithm, highlighting in particular the [work of Susan Nevelow Mart](#) in this area. Jackson noted that this might be easier to demonstrate to academic patrons, who have access to multiple research platforms and can more easily conduct their own comparative analysis, whereas attorneys are likely to have only one or two research platforms at their disposal. Jackson agreed that, in terms of fairness and bias mitigation, transparency and accountability are the name of the game, suggesting that regulation might be our best resort. Noting that Europe has gone farther in the arena of regulating AI, Jackson highlighted recent efforts at AI regulation in the U.S., including the proposed [Algorithmic Accountability Act of 2019](#) and calling for greater efforts at U.S. regulation in the future.

For a self-proclaimed novice in AI in legal information, I found this program to be a wealth of information and a great place to begin my education on the subject. I love a program that provides suggestions for further reading, and this session did not disappoint. Not only did they provide a [handout](#) of readings and tools, but several links were also offered in the chat during the livestream, collected, and made available in [one spot](#) for easy reference. (I should also note that the chat was preserved and made available alongside the recording, for those who missed the live session.) Thank you to LISP-SIS for sponsoring this session and to all the speakers who offered their expertise. This novice has a lot of reading to do.

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, Law LexisNexis, Thomson Reuters, and Wolters Kluwer.

CRIV / BLOOMBERG LAW SEMIANNUAL CALL

THOMAS E. HEMSTOCK

RESEARCH, INSTRUCTION AND ACQUISITIONS LIBRARIAN
ALBANY LAW SCHOOL

Date: Thursday, July 29 / 11:00 a.m. via Zoom

Participants: Mike Bernier (Director of Library Relations, Bloomberg Law); Joe Breda (President, Bloomberg Law); Michelle Hook Dewey (AALL Board Liaison to CRIV, Mercer School of Law) & Tom Hemstock (CRIV Liaison to Bloomberg Law, Albany Law School)

Outstanding Issues: None

New Items

Expanding News Channels

Fourteen new news channels were added in 2020, and that number is increasing. Bloomberg Law is adding timely channels such as Social Justice & Diversity, Cannabis, and more.

Improved Email Alerts

In response to customer feedback and to increase engagement, Bloomberg modified email subject lines in alerts to be more descriptive. For example, the sender for the Banking Report will be a variation on “Banking” instead of the umbrella “Bloomberg Law” line that is unclear.

ALM News Content

Although introduced in 2020, and mentioned in the previous vendor call, Bloomberg Law emphasizes that they have ALM content (such as National Law Journal) added shortly after the content is published on ALM’s site.

In-Focus Content

Bloomberg Law continues to add new in-focus pages that bring resources together in one place. Resources on these pages are crafted by experts in the field. Recent In-Focus pages include Contract Drafting, Biometrics, and a Core Litigation Skills Toolkit.

Draft Analyzer Improvements

Significant new features are now included such as improved comments, the ability to create a table of contents of clauses, hyperlinks to defined terms within the uploaded draft, and details/comments on the clauses used in the document.

Case Law Enhancements

Opinions can be now filtered by published and unpublished opinions.

Law Librarian Update

A newsletter for librarians launched and is available at <https://pro.bloomberglaw.com/law-librarian-newsletter>. Emails are sent to librarians when new editions are posted. Contact [Mike Bernier](#) to be added to the distribution list.

CRIV / LEXISNEXIS SEMIANNUAL CALL

ASHLEY AMES AHLBRAND

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR PUBLIC SERVICES
INDIANA UNIVERSITY MAURER SCHOOL OF LAW

June 11, 2021

Participants: Carolyn Bach (Senior Manager, Librarian Relations and Faculty Programs) & Simon Weierman (Sr. Director Segment Management)

This update includes product enhancements released between January and June of 2021.

Lexis+™

- **Lexis+™ Litigation Analytics** released in late January as part of the Lexis+ ecosystem. Lexis+ users now have access to a powerful toolset for

litigation analytics in a single, integrated workflow providing precise, relevant, data-driven insights from Lex Machina® and Lexis® CourtLink® to quickly evaluate or compare judges, courts, and counsel.

- **Shepard's® At Risk** helps ensure users are citing the best authority for a point of law. It was extended beyond the full-text case opinion to display in other context across Lexis+, including Brief Analysis and *Shepard's®* reports.
- **Brief Analysis** was included at Lexis+ launch and offers powerful insights by analyzing legal briefs (users or their opponent's) and providing recommendations to craft stronger legal strategies and drive winning outcomes. This year to date, multiple updates have been rolled out to further improve Brief Analysis, including embedding *Shepard's* analysis in the "Cited in your Document" tab, enabling users to filter recommendations for specific legal concepts and jurisdictions, and launching enhanced PDF processing capabilities.
- A recent case study was published about Brief Analysis by AWS, **LexisNexis® Builds AI-Powered Legal Brief Analysis Tool Using AWS**, which highlights the collaboration between Lexis Labs and AWS through a "Working Backwards" innovation approach to develop a capability which improves productivity and decision-making for our customers.
- Other recent Lexis+ updates:
 - The experience dock choice a user makes (Research, Practical Guidance, Brief Analysis or Litigation Analytics) now remains as the default across sessions, so users can pick up where they left off.
 - In a similar manner, the Explore Content area of Lexis+ that enables users to browse our collections of content and resources, was enhanced to persist the last tab utilized so users can pick up where they left off across research sessions.
 - Annotations and highlights are now made visible when a user returns to a document without requiring the document be saved to a Lexis+ work folder.
 - The Lexis Answers® tool is now made available

when searching Practical Guidance materials on Lexis+.

- The full-text document display across our content collection was updated to improve the presentation, focusing on readability and navigation.

Lexis® and Lexis+

- Law360® Pulse, which launched in January and provides unparalleled business of law coverage, was integrated for access to archived articles through Lexis and Lexis+.
- Our International Primary Law collection, already leading in coverage from beyond the U.S., was expanded to include laws and regulations through machine translations and original-language source documents. The initial wave began with Latin American countries (January), with later additions of Germany and Indonesia (April) and then Spain (May). Sixteen new countries have been added within 2021, increasing our total collection to 25 plus the European Union.
- The LexisNexis® Public Records user interface was refreshed to align with Lexis and Lexis+.
- The Trial Court Orders content collection was expanded by over 100K documents through March.
- Search Relevance enhancements were launched for Statutes & Legislation and case law searching, which will improve the relevance of results for Lexis and Lexis+ users.

Practical Guidance

- The approach to search was updated by combining results across previously separate content categories, leading to more relevant results when searching Practical Guidance.
- An updated presentation of the Practical Guidance home page and starting practice area pages was launched to all users to improve discovery of important resources and simplify product navigation.

Context

- A new module of Context, **Context Attorney Analytics** was released in March, which applies the powerful language analytics capabilities of Con-

text to attorney data. Our solution provides unique insights into the records and experience of attorneys and uncovers the precise arguments they have made in prior motions and briefs, helping attorneys neutralize their arguments and strategy.

- Context Judges and Courts for Canada was released, expanding our powerful language analytics capabilities to international use.

Law360® and Law360 Pulse

- **Navigational support was added between Law360.com, Law360 Pulse, and the Law360 Authority products** through the left-hand navigation panel on each website.
- **Law360.com search was extended across products.** Users on Law360.com can now search across all content and filter results, helping reduce research time. Content exclusive to Law360 Pulse, Law360 Tax Authority, and Law360 Employment Authority is labeled as exclusive.
- **Our mobile applications for iPhone® and Android® devices now include all Law360 brands for on-the-go coverage.** Law360 Enterprise and Platform customers have access to the Law360, Law360 Tax Authority, Law360 Employment Authority, and Law360 UK products in the app. The Law360 app can be downloaded at the [Google Play™ store](#) or [Apple® App Store](#).

InterAction®

- The recently released [2021 Law Firm Marketing and Business Development Report](#) provides insights on the impact of COVID-19 and business development trends.

Lexis® for Microsoft® Office

- Texas Greenbook citation formatting rules on Lexis for Microsoft Office have been updated to the 14th edition, along with enhanced Lexis for Microsoft Office Canada McGill's formatting rules for legislative citations.

Nexis Newsdesk™

- Multiple enhancements have been made to Nexis Newsdesk newsletter management and analytics capabilities.

- The [Nexis Newsdesk Insights](#) view helps surface key events and trends in a graphical display without running a full analysis.
- Read the top stories for each search
- Identify the most active sources and their sentiment
- See which people and companies are dominating the conversation
- View topics word cloud and sentiment charts now in the Insights view
- Dashboards are now customizable to resize or reorder the widgets
- Sources cards reveal key information about the publication
- Journalist articles panel quickly displays more articles from a selected author
- One tab is used for newsletter management options
- Playable clips are included for TV/radio (for accounts with the TV/Radio Broadcast add-on)
- For accounts with the Premium Social Media Package:
 - Volume column and pause control for Twitter streams
 - Full-length tweets now visible in the search results
- The new [Nexis Newsdesk Certification Program](#) is a three-part series helping Nexis Newsdesk administrators improve their skills, search techniques and content-sharing strategies.

Summer Associates

- The new [Summer Associate page](#) includes a wealth of resources for training and guidance, including career advice from legal professionals, practice area resources, essential legal research skills, and more.

AALL

- LexisNexis is proud to be a Platinum sponsor of the 2021 AALL Virtual Conference. Please join us in the Virtual Exhibit Hall on July 19, plus additional sessions on July 20–22, to learn about the most recent product updates and announcements. [View offerings here.](#) In addition, LexisNexis

is sponsoring the following conference-related events. We are looking forward to connecting with you at the conference.

- July 21 at 2:00 p.m. (CDT) Program Session: “What’s in a Name? Expanding the Concept of Libraries and Librarians in the 21st Century,” panel discussion
- July 21 at 6:00 p.m. (CDT): Happy Hour & Magic Show
- Diversity & Inclusion Symposium
- Innovation Program
- AALL-SIS Reception and Business Meeting
- AALL Awards Program
- Leadership Training
- PLLIP Summit

CRIV / THOMSON REUTERS SEMIANNUAL CALL

ELIZABETH OUTLER

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES
SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY LAW CENTER

Conference call took place on Tuesday June 22, 2021, at 11:00 AM ET

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); Zane Wright (Sr. Product Developer); Zena Applebaum (Director Professional & Corporate Segments) & Gia Norris (Director, Product Portfolio Management)

Agenda

- Westlaw Edge Litigation Analytics Enhancements – Damages
 - Added in November 2020
 - As of March 2021, Damages has been added as an option on litigation analytics
 - Can view monetary damages and attorney fees and costs
 - Monetary Damages include Compensatory Damages, Interest, Liquidated Damages, Punitive Damages, Settlement & Statutory Damages
 - Attorney Fees & Costs include Litigation Costs & Expenses
 - Analytics added in a new delivery method around the end of February that allows you to get all the tabs together in a customized report
- Quick Check Enhancements
 - Improved option to analyze opponent’s work
 - Contrary authority identification
 - Helps researchers quickly find weaknesses in an opponent’s arguments by clearly identifying new cases that are contrary to their arguments.
 - Locates cases that may be helpful in arguing against the opponent’s filing and prioritizes them in the results. Within Quick Check, researchers can easily compare procedural information about the analyzed document with details of the recommended cases, and quickly review tags indicating when a recommended case originated from the same type of motion or contains contrary authority.
 - Provides cases that are contrary to what the other party has cited.
 - New citation tags that highlight negative aspects of the opposition case
 - New depth of discussion indicators on what the opponent has focused on in the document
- Submit to Quick Check
 - When you find a relevant case, you can access the filings of the case
 - Includes case recommendations for each seg-

- ment of the motion
 - Can filter by headings in a document
 - Added to appellate briefs in December 2020 and now added to trial motions.
- *Reuters News*
 - Debuted Reuters Legal News beta.
 - Previously, Legal news was nested within Business on reuters.com
 - Includes the top legal news stories that are editorially curated at the top of the screen
 - Showcases three Reuters' legal columnists: Alison Frankel, Jenna Greene, and Hassan Kanu
 - Legal Video includes both video and audio materials
 - Latest stories by reference to section pages
 - Legal Industry is the business of law news page
 - Industry Insight is legal analysis from TR legal focusing on the business of news
 - Includes a section on the Supreme Court
 - Will have special reports
 - All stories are tagged with practice areas and industry
 - The Daily Docket newsletter is the Industry Buzz
 - The attorney analysis module focuses on reaching out to the broader legal community
 - Will include links to related documents mentioned in news stories
 - Links to Westlaw will not route you back through OnePass, you will stay on the platform
 - Will allow users to choose the types of materials they see through My View
- Customer to Cash updates
- Continuing the redesign of invoices
 - New West Information Charges Invoice will debut in July 2021
- Hyperlinks throughout the document
- Customers with two+ locations will receive two additional summary level reports and a single location report for each location.
- Details in-plan and out-of-plan charges
- Clearly shows the total due at the top of the invoice and in other places
- Any account suspension would be clearly displayed
- New payer reports
- Product summaries for all locations
- Account totals by location
- Add in subscription service periods above each product
- Usage reports have new client level reports with two sorting options
- Client/reference by user by day
- User by client/reference by day
- CSV reporting now available
- Invoice information report
- Usage report
- These are optional and the customer must sign-up for these (also only though electronic billing so a customer must be signed-up for that)
- Past due invoices coming in July
- Simpler format
- Easier pay now button
- Enhanced hyperlinks
- Inform TR that a payment has been sent
- Set-up autopay
- Installment plans
- Attached to notices via PDF
- When you mail checks, there can be a 10-day delay in updating your account information

CRIV / WOLTERS KLUWER SEMIANNUAL CALL

CYNTHIA CONDIT

HEAD OF FACULTY AND ACCESS SERVICES & PROFESSOR OF PRACTICE
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA COLLEGE OF LAW LIBRARY

The call took place on June 21, 2021 / 10:00 a.m. (PDT)

Participants: Jenna Ellis (Wolters Kluwer Liaison); Vani Ungapen (AALL Executive Director); Karen Selden, (AALL CRIV Board Liaison) & Cynthia Condit (AALL, CRIV Wolters Kluwer Liaison)

Wolters Kluwers Programs, Activities, or Business of Interest to CRIV and/or AALL

Jenna Ellis provided several updates on items of interest.

- **Treatise Search Solution:** This solution provides access to Wolters Kluwer Treatise content through a REST-based API framework that allows firms to embed Cheetah's native research experience within their intranet site resulting in seamless access to expert information from within their own environment and includes an "out of the box" search interface to serve as a reference for implementation by the firm's IT team.
- **(Federated SSO) Expansion and Simplification of Single Sign-On with Seamless Authentication:** This capability makes it possible for law firm users to access Wolters Kluwer content tools and research sites securely without being prompted to enter their credentials via custom links designed to automatically authenticate users based on the firm's internal directory.
- **Establishment of Permanent Links:** Permanent links to Reporters, primary source content, Treatise titles (including targeted chapters or sub-chapters) plus Practical Content all can be obtained from multiple sources (including directly from the Cheetah platform) and stay consistent even when the underlying content is updated, making them an ideal low-maintenance solution for posting on SharePoint practice and other firm intranet pages.
- **Expansion of Widgets:** Wolters Kluwer now offers more than 850 customizable Title and Practice Tool Widgets that provide seamless access to

specific content via a simple turn-key integration solution, including Treatises, Reporters, or Practice Tools (such as multi-jurisdiction Smart Charts) that can easily be embedded on a firm's SharePoint practice or other intranet site ([learn more](#)).

- **Fast-Access-by-Citation Feature:** This solution provides users with a simple tool to efficiently find and print or download targeted primary source content and forms directly from their SharePoint practice or other intranet site without being prompted for any credentials.

Requests for Advocacy

There were no requests for advocacy.

AALL Programs of Activities, or Business of Interest to Wolters Kluwer

- Vani Ungapen thanked Wolters Kluwer for its vendor participation at this year's Virtual Conference.
- Additionally, CRIV thanked Wolters Kluwer for participating in CRIV's Vendor Roundtable, which focused on accessibility this year. Participating vendors will highlight features and/or services vendors currently provide or might be providing in the future to allow people of different abilities to use their products.

Adjournment

- The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:40 a.m.



www.aallnet.org