Introduction

Policies regarding subject access to materials about specific legislative enactments have evolved over the years. Prior to 1995, the Library of Congress restricted the use of uniform titles of laws for subject access to legislative histories and textual criticisms of laws (usually as a 610 author-title heading, with the author being the jurisdiction and the title being the uniform title for the law). Material about a specific law could not be retrieved by the name of the law unless the presence of the text of the statute resulted in a 110/710 author-title heading for the statute. In a card catalog, author and subject headings were usually interfiled, so a card for a 110/710 heading was for the most part just as good as a 610 heading. This is often not the case in a modern OPAC that makes a clearer distinction between author and subject headings without consulting the user. As discussed below, Anglo-American statutes tend to change limited aspects of preexisting law, so that except for a legislative history a topical heading is probably more relevant than a heading for a single statute.

Following lobbying by AALL, LC changed this policy in 1995 to allow assignment of an author-title subject heading for a work on a specific law if it is “judged to be a useful access point.” The current policy is stated in Subject Cataloging Manual H1715. The heading for a statute (usually a jurisdiction as author combined with a uniform title) may be assigned as a subject heading to works about the individual act. As before, headings for individual laws, with the subdivision for legislative histories, are mandated for legislative histories. Due to the rule that the first subject heading needs to “support” the classification number in LCC, one can conclude that first subject heading should be the 610 for the law if the book is classified in a specific number-cutter for the statute, though H1715 also says not to make a 610 heading if the book consists exclusively of the unannotated statute (perhaps because of redundancy since in that case the author-title heading for the statute will be the main entry.)
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Thank You For The Opportunity To Serve

I am pleased to take my turn at bat to chair OBS during the 2002/2003 term and hope I prove worthy of being in the same league as the exceptionally effective and dedicated colleagues who have chaired OBS before me. I look forward to working with OBS’s splendid Board and committee chairs. As I wear the OBS ball cap this year (yes, there really is a ball cap, not a crown) I resolve to do as much as I can to make OBS relevant to your professional lives.

Education Committee News

I’m particularly interested in OBS’s most important mission of “facilitating the exchange of information, providing educational programs and materials.” So, I’m delighted to report that the new timeline change for the Education Committee has gone a long way toward improving the process of developing programs. As Vice Chair during the 2001/2002 term I also chaired the Education Committee. This was the first term under the timeline change proposed by Ellen McGrath (TSLL v.26, no.3/4) that allows for convening the Education Committee much earlier in the year. You may remember that prior to this reform, the Education Committee was formed in May after the election of the Vice Chair. That meant a frantic 2 ½ month period to develop ideas and write proposals. The most intense part of the work took place immediately after the annual meeting and before the proposal deadline in August. An amazing amount of work was packed into a really short period during the height of vacation season. The biggest drawback of the process was not having enough time to get the full sense of members’ programming needs and desires. Our past Education Committees are to be commended for coming up with such great programs over the years while enduring the crunch.

When I posted the annual survey in January 2002 I asked OBS members to rank a number of possible ideas for development into programs and as usual solicited volunteers for committees. The result? This year for the first time the Education Committee convened “virtually” in February to discuss the survey results and to brainstorm about turning the popular choices into programs. By late spring we had four fully developed programs—one 30 minute, one 60 minute and two 90 minute programs—and one program idea to discuss at the AALL Committee meeting. When we met in Orlando, the Committee put the finishing touches on the proposals and firmed up the speakers. We had time to turn the embryonic idea into proposals for three half hour programs united by a common theme. The Committee’s work was accomplished with much less stress than usual. (Bless you, Ellen!) The outcome of all that work? AMPC accepted for the Seattle meeting the following programs:

- **Connected to the Future: OCLC’s Connexion** — Michael Maben, Coordinator—30 min (Prog. K4, Wed. July 16, 1:45-2:15)
- **Envisioning Tomorrow’s Catalog: A View From Outside the Library** - Kevin Butterfield, Coordinator—60 min (Prog. C2, Sun. July 13, 4:15-5:15)
- **Open Linking and E-Journal Management: Strategies for Maximizing Your Investment in Electronic Resources Today**—Mary Jane Kelsey, Coordinator—90 min (Prog. G5, Tues. July 15, 10:15-11:45)
- **Two Stepping With Technology** — Janet Hedin, Coordinator—30 min (Prog. L3, Wed. July 16, 2:30-3:00)

*MARBI Report — Susan Goldner, 30 min (TS-SIS, co-sponsor) [All program times and dates are subject to change]*

And Now For The Pitch

OBS functions with just enough bureaucracy to give members the framework needed to communicate and connect with each other and to actively participate in the formal AALL program planning process. As our professional lives are very busy, our relationships with OBS are usually rather passive. We grow professionally from articles, programs, the OBS website and listserv postings prepared by our colleagues—generally this is as it should be. However, the benefits we draw from our association with OBS don’t come from an infinitely self-generating resource. I ask you to be aware of opportunities in your career—maybe between projects—when you can take time to be active in OBS, write articles, propose or present programs. I encourage you to be alert to those opportunities and turn them into activism. As it states right up front on our Website, “The Online Bibliographic Services Special Interest Section (OBS-SIS) of the American Association of Law Libraries focuses on all aspects of the various national and local bibliographic utilities. These include public access to bibliographic data online, acquisitions sub-systems, mail message systems, and integration of circulation systems with the online bibliographic data.” OBS members have a wealth of knowledge on these topics and a generous spirit of sharing that knowledge. Together we can create and facilitate teaching moments for each other. So, be thinking of what you want to learn, what you’re able to teach. And don’t be shy!
You Can Really Help By Completing the Annual Survey

All of us have do have an opportunity to be involved in a significant way—and without a big time commitment. You can help OBS tremendously by completing the annual survey when it is posted this winter. It doesn’t sound like a big deal, but this is the best way the Board has of knowing what the membership wants for educational programming and who is available for committee work or office. The larger the response, the more reliable the analysis. When Kevin Butterfield posts the membership survey this winter ask yourself if this is your time to step up to the plate. He will also ask for feedback on ideas for proposals for the Boston meeting. It’s not too soon to be sending him program topics for polling. Email to <butterfi@law.uiuc.edu>.

Nominations Committee

Ellen McGrath is Chair of the Nominations Committee. She and committee members, Susan Chinoransky and Anna Belle Leiserson are compiling the slate for three offices: Vice-Chair/Chair-Elect, Secretary/Treasurer, Member-at-Large. Please let Ellen know of anyone who would make a good candidate and be sure to consider putting your own name forward.

Blessings in the New Year

On behalf of the OBS Board, I wish you all health and happiness in the coming year.

“Blessed are they who give without remembering and take without forgetting.” (Anonymous)

Mary Jane Kelsey
mary.jane.Kelsey@yale.edu

Technical Services Special Interest Section

Notes from TS-SIS

Well, I’m writing this a little more than a month after the annual meeting in Orlando, but already it seems that it was a year ago. I will try, though, to recap some of the highlights for you. It was hot, and there seemed to be no shopping, so luckily there were programs and meetings. Unfortunately, some of the meetings overlapped, but more about that later. At the TS business meeting, we approved some minor changes to the bylaws. Thanks to past-chair JoAnn Hounshell for proposing, explaining, and shepherding them through. The Rene Chapman award went to the richly deserving Janis Johnston, eloquently introduced by Joe Thomas. I first met Janis when she graciously and capably hosted the amazing Basic Cataloging Institute at Notre Dame.

In the spirit of “creating connections,” TS agreed to exchange liaisons with the Academic Law Libraries SIS. Our liaison will be, ex officio, the chair of our Education Committee, since it seemed that most of our cooperation will lie in program proposals. In other liaison activity, our Preservation Committee has a liaison from the Legal History and Rare Books SIS. Although next year we will be “maximizing today, envisioning tomorrow,” we may wish to envision a more connected tomorrow. In all seriousness, it does seem that it may not be a bad idea to cultivate closer ties with other SISs, or at least be aware of their concerns. If these relationships prove fruitful, we may wish to consider pursuing more liaisons with other SISs.

A web committee met as well, and proposed to add some subject content to our website, something several of you mentioned as desirable in your survey responses. Content editors for Preservation (Pat Turpening) and Cataloging and Classification (David Bratman) were appointed. If anyone is interested in editing an Acquisitions or a Serials page on the TS site, please contact either Martin Wisneski or myself.

Probably the most important news from Orlando, however, had to do with programming. First of all, AALL President Carol Avery Nicholson proposed something new for next year. She is introducing a thirty minute program slot. These slots appear promising for quick product reviews or for reports from AALL liaisons to other associations, like the BASIC and ALA reps, and we’ve submitted a number of proposals for these slots. Please plan to stay on Wednesday in Seattle, which is when these slots will appear! Secondly, and more fundamentally, an AALL committee (the Annual Meeting Educational Programming Special Committee) was convened to look at the annual meeting. Our own Melody Lembke was a member. The AMEPSC issued a report (available on our website at: <http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/other/ampc/summary.htm>) recommending a number of things, the most important to us being recommendation 1, which states that SISs and committees be allowed to schedule small meetings, roundtables, discussion groups, and educational opportunities against educational programs. At the very least, this would alleviate the problem we experienced in Orlando of having three TS meetings scheduled against each other. Even better, it would allow for TS to schedule more “hot topic” programming like the highly successful Cataloging and
Approval Plans have been an acquisitions/collection development tool in academic libraries for decades. I first learned about approval plans in library school and a few months later found myself working with a long established plan at a small undergraduate school. A few years later I was working with a more complex plan at a larger University, but when I migrated to law libraries (even in the academic environment) approval plans, as I knew them, were not as common.

The term “approval plan” can mean different things, to different librarians and different vendors. I define an approval plan as: a documented profile, created by a library and a jobber, that dictates which books will be delivered to a library immediately upon publication; once received, the library then decides if they want to purchase the book or return it to the vendor.

Like almost all acquisitions tools I’ve used, I can list benefits and disadvantages to using approval plans. On the positive side, consider the following:

- Approval plans bring the book to your library before you have to make a purchase decision.
- In most cases, books arrive within a few weeks of publication.
- Approval plan profiles can specify which material you will receive based on subject, publishers, prices, audience, format, country of publication, language, LC numbers, and more.

Approval plans bring the book to your library before you have to make a purchase decision.
- In most cases, books arrive within a few weeks of publication.
- Approval plan profiles can specify which material you will receive based on subject, publishers, prices, audience, format, country of publication, language, LC numbers, and more.

Most approval vendors can produce retrospective profiles, so you can acquire materials that you may have missed prior to your participation.

Once a profile is active, you can usually predict expenditure patterns and thus make budget decisions accordingly.

Because of the consistency of expenditures, most approval vendors offer exceptional discounts.

Of course, there are also disadvantages:

- Establishing an approval plan is time and work intensive.
- Approval plans require constant monitoring to insure that a library is receiving the type of material it wants to receive.
- The vast majority of books received on an approval plan will not yet have been reviewed.
The automatic shipment aspects of a plan can overwhelm a library if proper procedures are not developed and followed.

Key publishers (this is especially true in the legal market) may not allow a vendor to sell their materials.

It is easy to become too dependent on an approval plan, and thereby start ignoring other methods of acquiring materials.

The idea of instituting an approval plan at the academic law library I now work at has been ricocheting around my head ever since I arrived, more than ten years ago. Being a research facility, we have always purchased a fair amount of monographs from university and commercial scholarly presses, both foreign and domestic. While our collection development librarians strived to keep abreast of what was being published, we often found that we were learning about needed materials months, or even years after they were published. Typically, we were asked by a faculty member, “why don’t you have Title X? - it is quickly becoming a classic and I need it immediately.” Having worked with approval plans in the past, I knew that a well designed plan could not only reduce this type of request, but could also insure that our collection was developing in a consistent and economical manner.

Once we made the decision to start investigating approval plans it took us quite a while to decide if we then were ready to activate the plan. This was partly due to our tendency to proceed with any new project slowly, but mostly by the need to carefully develop the initial plan. Once in place an approval plan can be tweaked and modified in a matter of moments, via online profiles, but establishing the initial plan must be done extremely cautiously with input from a variety of sources. We had a representative from our major monographic jobber come to the library to help us develop the profile. Our collection development people provided the rep with an outline of the types of books we wanted to acquire via the plan. Without going into great detail, we basically designed a profile that selected books based on subject parameters (from a vendor thesaurus), specific publishers, audience level, and price. For materials falling outside our profile, but that we still might be interested in purchasing, we arranged to receive forms that contain basic bibliographic data about a particular title.

Once a basic profile had been developed, we asked the vendor to run the profile against their data from the previous year to show us how many books would have arrived if we had used the plan last year. This was done primarily to quell my concerns that we not create a plan that would result in our library receiving more titles than we could afford to purchase. Once the comparison was made, we did indeed find we needed to place some more limitations on the profile, in order to reduce the number/cost of the materials that would arrive. Obviously, there is no way to predict exactly the quantity of books that will arrive, but a solid estimate based on recent publishing trends is essential in the development of an initial plan. Once we were satisfied with the numbers, we activated the plan.

Despite the fact that the books arrive in boxes marked “approvals,” with a corresponding invoice also marked “approvals,” we found we needed to institute new internal procedures to insure that the books don’t automatically get added. Upon arrival, we place the books on shelves in the Technical Services Department where selectors may view them. The invoices are placed in a folder for processing once a decision has been made. So far we have been receiving approximately 5-7 titles a week. We keep each title for 2-3 weeks while we decide if we want to keep them; so far we have been keeping approximately 80%. Books we decide we do not want, we return to the vendor and adjust the invoice appropriately. Although the plan has been operational for less than two months, we feel positive about it. If we have any complaints, it is that we may be receiving too many titles published outside of the U.S., but we will wait a few more weeks to see if this continues. If it does, an adjustment in the profile can be made online.

No library should view an approval plan as an automated collection development system; rather it is one more tool to be used in the acquisitions/collection development process. And, while approval plans have traditionally been used by large academic institutions, I know of no reasons why they can’t be used by smaller, more specialized libraries. Now that most approval vendors offer online profiles, it has become increasingly easy for libraries to experiment and limit their approval acquisitions to very specific criteria. If your library is considering an approval plan, or has one already in operation, let me know the results.
Beth Geesey Holmes is joining me as co-editor of the column. You will start to see her name on the columns soon.

By now, you should all have subscribed to LC’s Classification Web. If you have not, please check <http://www.loc.gov/cds/classweb.html> for information about subscribing. It is pretty easy to use but do read the tutorial and the user group information. Do subscribe to the listserv.

It is so nice to type in KF9219 and go to the class number with the forms that correspond to that number. An outline of the schedules has been added to the product and the subject heading/classification correlation section can be helpful. Also the product contains the draft (emphasize draft) schedules for KB, KBM and KBP.

Last spring I had a question about using K4602-K4603 Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (The GATT Parties). World Trade Organization. The arrangement is:

K4602 Serials
K4602.2 Monographs. By date
K4603 First and subsequent conferences (sessions). By date of conference

Under each:
.A27A-Z Other documents (announcements, preliminary papers, reports of delegates, etc.). By country or agency
.A3 Final acts, conclusions, resolutions. By date
.A35A-Z Works on the conference
.A4-.Z Treaties and other international agreements
.A4-.A44 Texts
.A4 Unannotated editions. By date Including official editions, with or without annotations
.A44A-Z Annotated editions. Commentaries
.A46A-Z Related agreements (accessions, amendments, protocols, etc.)
.A6-.Z Works on the agreement

K4602 and K4602.2 are for works — serials and monographs — about 2 or more of the sessions. Looking at the Library of Congress catalog you will see most of these are general works about the GATT and they should be works about 2 or more of the individual conferences.

K4603 is subdivided by date of conference. However, it is not so easy to find the dates of the conferences or rounds. Originally I used dates that I found in one of the encyclopedias. Later I found a website with the dates: <http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/sites/0200/ijee/chronology.htm>. Some of the authority records have dates in them, i.e. Tokyo Round[d(1973-1979); Uruguay Round[d(1987-1994); Kennedy Round[d1964-1967]; Geneva, Switzerland). We are probably all familiar with the Uruguay Round (K4603 1987). These various sources — encyclopedias, web sites and authority records — do not always agree on the beginning date of the rounds. Dillon Round is listed as starting in 1960 or 1961 depending on the source. The first round was probably 1947, 2nd Ammecy 1949, 3rd Geneva 1956, 4th Dillon 1960 or 1961, etc. I did find that LC catalog has used 1960 for the Dillon Round works. You will find various dates and practices regarding K4603 in LC and other catalogs. You must remember that K4603 has to be divided by date first and later by the form table listed in the schedule. During the 1970’s and 1980’s the LC practice was to use the date that corresponded to the beginning date of the round after the number K4603. Thus a typical K4603 number would look like this: K4603 1987.A35|bU78 1995.

Will this hold true for the future? I am not sure. Will the World Trade Organization hold rounds or will we change the forms? Looking at some of the records with dates after 1987, I can see titles that would have been better with 1987 Uruguay Round.

On another note, sometimes we forget that certain numbers exist. This is just a reminder that the KF American state tables have specific numbers for court reports. Search KFN5045 and you will find a list of call numbers for New York court report titles.

Stay tuned and send me some questions to answer in the column.
Weeding, Anyone?

When was the last time you systematically weeded your collection? Many of us have the best of intentions, but somehow we never seem to find time for it. Weeding should be an integral component of your collection development activity. Here are some tips to get you started.

The Guide to Review of Library Collections defines weeding as “[s]electing for discard, for donation to another institution, or for transfer to a storage area excess copies, rarely used materials, and materials no longer of use.” Deselection is defined as the “decision to withdraw an item from the library collection.”

The extent to which a library articulates its weeding policy will be determined by the scope of its collection development policy. Libraries that have extensive descriptions of the subject matter and formats collected as well as the criteria for selection tend to have a good explanation of weeding and retention practices. If your collection development policy doesn’t have a section on weeding, consider adding one. Here are two sample excerpts from law library collection development policies:

Boston University Pappas Law Library: Factors that may be relevant in deciding which items should be weeded or relegated include level of use: accession date; publication date; qualitative value; using criteria similar to those for book selection; continuing need for duplication; physical condition; and availability in other libraries. (See http://www.bu.edu/lawlibrary/tech/procedures/colldev.htm.)

Washoe County Law Library, Nevada: Weeding is the process through which materials are removed and withdrawn from the Law Library’s collection. Generally, the Law Library will remove from its collection obsolete or outdated materials (that have no historical or research value), worn out or extensively damaged materials (that will also be considered for repurchase), and surplus copies of materials no longer in high demand. Weeding determinations are based on the following factors: potential use by the bench, bar and community; significance of the subject matter; availability of other materials on the subject; relevance to the collection; current and permanent value; physical quality; duplication; available space; circulation record. (See http://207.228.25.168/lawlib/colldev.htm.)

While articulating your deselection policy is important, it’s not enough to keep weeding near the top of your priority list. The University of Colorado Law Library has an impressive procedure for keeping this task at the forefront of library business: Removal from the Law Library collection, or cancellation, of obsolete materials or titles of marginal subject interest is needed to maintain the quality and usefulness of the collection. Each summer, each librarian is assigned a range of call numbers in the Law Library collection, and will be given two weeks to weed, or recommend cancellation of materials in, the assigned call number range. (See http://www.colorado.edu/Law/lawlib/ts/cdpolicy/.) The policy goes on to describe the criteria to be considered in selecting materials for possible weeding or cancellation.

Of course, you will want to develop your own policy and criteria for weeding so that you can tailor it to the specific needs of your library, but it is useful to consider the factors that are described in other law library collection policies.

Tools

The Guide to Review of Library Collections: Preservation, Storage, and Withdrawal describes several elements of a deselection review program and includes an extensive bibliography.

The Guide for Training Collection Development Librarians presents suggested competencies in the area of deselection and weeding, as well as sample activities to use for training selectors with various levels of experience.

Weeding Library Collections: Library Weeding Methods is generally considered the bible on weeding standards and methods. Though not focused on law libraries, it includes a helpful discussion of the relationship between in-library use and circulation use.

The law library literature has little to offer on the topic of weeding, but there was a full-day workshop on weeding and deselection of law library collections at the AALL Annual Meeting in 1989. It covered implementing a weeding program, disposing of weeded materials, and the impact of electronic resources on weeding. Breakout sessions were organized by type of library to address related issues, including developing a policy, who to involve in deselection, and evaluating historical and superseded materials. The audiotapes and the 60-page booklet produced for the workshop are held in several law libraries. Though dated, these materials still provide a solid foundation for addressing weeding and deselection in the law library environment.
In the past two years I’ve had the opportunity to negotiate with a variety of information vendors for the products and services needed to build a law library collection. Although I had prior experience with such negotiations, I found that doing more of it helped me to enjoy it more. Far from being something that librarians approach with fear and loathing, negotiation can be fun and rewarding if we are well prepared.

Five things I love about negotiating with vendors

1. Every company, product and contract or license are different. This means that each negotiation is a tremendous learning experience, albeit a challenging one. And it adds variety to the job. But I know that each negotiation I enter into gives me a better understanding of the legal information industry and ultimately makes me a better librarian.

2. Some things really are negotiable. I recently concluded a license agreement for a product widely marketed to the financial services industry. It was an amiable negotiation, but the high price was a sticking point for us and I was worried about future price increases. I expressed this concern to the sales representative, and the company responded with the offer of a lower price and a guaranteed ceiling on the annual price increase for the next two years.

3. I often don’t have to pay for what the library doesn’t need. Sometimes an electronic resource will include extraneous material that will never be used. If the less essential parts can be “unbundled” from the primary product, the pricing structure usually can be adjusted accordingly.

4. The process requires a complete understanding of the library and its users, and at least an intellectual understanding of the vendor’s business. First, we have to know our own libraries – how they work, who our users are, what content the users need, how they want information delivered, and how the library is organized to help with that delivery. Second, we have to be able to articulate this understanding, so that vendors have a framework in which to negotiate. Ideally the vendors will be explaining their world to us too, but in the absence of that, it is imperative to learn everything we can about the information industry. I know that going through this process is a terrific opportunity to increase my understanding of the many facets of libraries and publishing.

5. When both parties leave a negotiation satisfied, it strengthens the business relationship. I never sign on the dotted line if I’m unhappy with the agreement, because I know I will be bitter about the process and unwilling to do business with that company again. It’s much more satisfying to keep working for better terms or a compromise that is more palatable. I also know that if I work at the process openly and honestly, the other party will remember that the next time and will be willing to work just as hard to get my business and to keep it. When both parties are responsible and responsive, it improves the negotiation process and enhances the long-term business relationship.

5 tips to help you love negotiation

1. Know everything you can know about the company and the product. If your initial conversation with a vendor demonstrates that you are familiar with the company’s history, product lines, competitors and customer base, you will be in a much stronger position to ask the right questions and to negotiate more effectively. Do your homework.

2. Know what you want from the product and the negotiation. Be able to identify what it is about the product that interests you. Maybe it’s a package of resources, and one of your goals is to unbundle that package and purchase only what you need. Or maybe you want everything in the package, but you can’t afford it unless the vendor can offer a lower price. Or you need a deferred payment plan, or you don’t need some of the services the vendor provides. The important thing is to have a list of goals that you want to reach with each negotiation.

3. Stick to your guns on the essentials, but be willing to compromise. You have to know what is non-negotiable for your library. I recently agreed to the general terms of a product license through a series of e-mail and phone conversations. When the
This summer passed in a blur of professional meetings, brief vacations, and frenzied but decidedly unsuccessful efforts to catch up on the day-to-day work in the intervals between these more scintillating activities. So for this issue of TSLL, I’ll confine myself to a discussion of a somewhat problematic treaty heading which ended up occupying far more of my time than I should care to disclose publicly.

Our library recently received a 1996 treatise by Jose Roberto Dromi entitled: *Acuerdo Mercosur-Union Europea*. This book contained a discussion and full text of an agreement between the two entities given in the title and their member countries. As an authority record had not yet been created for this agreement, I decided to give it a try. Throughout the work, the ostensibly bilateral nature of the treaty was stressed. At the beginning of the text of the treaty, the full Spanish name was given as: *Acuerdo marco interregional de cooperacion entre la Comunidad Europea y sus estados miembros y el Mercado Comun del Sur y sus estados partes*. To the uninitiated, this certainly sounds like an agreement between the member governments of two international intergovernmental bodies acting collectively, which would be covered by AACR 21.35B: Agreements contracted by international intergovernmental bodies. But what then are the two entities in question?

4. Have a list of licensing principles that guide your institution. Be familiar with your parent institution’s requirements for contracts and licenses. Know the procurement rules that provide the framework for the print acquisitions process as well as the information policies that guide the licensing of electronic resources. If your institution doesn’t have written guidelines, work with your library administration and central purchasing departments to create such a document.

5. Read every word of your contract or license agreement. If you are the individual in your library who has the authority to recommend or sign contractual agreements, you must be familiar with the language and meaning of every clause. You are obligating your institution to both rights and restrictions on the use of a product or service; you need to be completely familiar with those rights and restrictions, and you must take steps to ensure that staff and users also understand them.

It’s important to be prepared, communicate clearly, and know when to compromise. Negotiation is a great learning experience. Approach it with a positive attitude and have fun!

**Resources**


My next two columns will be devoted to the ABA Standards for Approval of Law Schools and the ABA Annual Questionnaire, in particular those issues relating to electronic resources. This has been a hot topic for several years, and I welcome your comments and questions. Contact me at 651-962-4868 or mmaxtmann@stthomas.edu. Thanks - MMA
I recently received my copy of AACR2 Revision 2002, now issued in a handsome if somewhat ungainly loose-leaf binder. On December 1, 2002, the Library of Congress, OCLC, and RLIN are scheduled to implement these new revisions, the corresponding revised Library of Congress Rule Interpretations (LCRIs), and most but not all of the related changes to the MARC 21 format.

I would like to discuss some of the major changes in AACR2 and the LCRIs, especially as they pertain to loose-leaves and serials. I will leave it to the estimable Ms. Goldner, our MARBI representative, to fill us in on the MARC 21 changes. I will then conclude with a brief discussion of where I think the new rules fall short.

New Taxonomy for Bibliographic Resources

AACR2 has introduced a new taxonomy for bibliographic resources into the Code: All materials are divided into the categories of “finite” and “continuing resources”. The latter category is defined in the glossary (Appendix D) as “A bibliographic resource that is issued over time with no predetermined...

“MERCOSUR (Organization)” would be one of the two (n 92046250). What would be the other one? Here things get a bit messy. Looking in the national authority file (NAF), we find 4 seemingly related headings none of which are bibliographically linked to the others: European Community (n 80066947), European Communities (n 80066946), European Economic Community (n 79054869), and European Union (n 94097877). The first two have notes that “Publications by and about the common institutions of the three European communities (Euratom, European Coal and Steel Community, European Economic Community) are entered directly under the names of the institutions and services.” Thanks. What about using “European Economic Community”? This is the only one of the 4 authority records which is coded to allow use of its 1XX field as a main or added entry (fixed field 008/14 “a”). At first I thought I was on the right track, as the NAF contains several apropos examples, such as: (n 85072417: European Economic Community. St Treaties, etc. $g Grupo Andino, $d 1983 Dec. 17). This seems quite similar to the agreement given in the book. However, leaping to field 83 of the brobdingnagian authority record for the European Economic Community, there’s the following note from the Yearbook of international organization:

…provisions adopted in the Maastricht Treaty, 1992, with reference to treaties establishing the EEC replaced the term “European Economic Community” by “European Community” throughout, and the “EEC” officially became the “EC”; although no formal merger of the 3 communities has taken place, there are good reasons for regarding them as one unit: European Communities; cf. editor’s note on confusion of terms referring to European Community, European Union, etc.

I confess I read this note a few times without fully grasping its meaning, even though it contained information I more or less already knew (at least subconsciously). What’s relevant here is that for works dealing with the period after the Treaty on European Union in 1992, we need to think in terms of the European Union and European Union countries, rather than the European Economic Community and European Economic Community countries. But when we refer to the authority record for the “European Union”, we are reminded that “European Union” can be used only as a subject heading, not as a corporate body.

So, we have an agreement between MERCOSUR and its member countries and the European Union (not a corporate body) and its member countries. Therefore, we must apply AACR 21.35A2: Treaties between four or more governments, which instructs us to enter under title or uniform title (25.16B2):

“Use as the uniform title for a treaty, etc., between four or more parties the name by which the treaty is known. Use an English name if there is one. Add, in parentheses, the year, earlier year, or earliest year of signing.”

I did a quick Google search and found the English text of the agreement on the SICE WWW site, so I was able to establish the heading (no2002060469) as:


It wasn’t a problem to give cross references to the various forms of the Spanish name of the agreement which appeared in our book; I wanted to give some kind of name title cross reference from MERCOSUR, but that would require a corresponding subfield “g” with “European Union”, and, given the strictures on the authority record for the European Union, it was clearly not possible, at least not legally.

In retrospect, the phrase “Union Europea” in the book’s title should have led me right away to AACR 25.16B2 “Four or more parties”, but I let myself get led astray by the actual name of the treaty as given in the Spanish and English texts which practically shouted “Bilateral”.

But as we all know, there’s an austere, if sometimes unfathomable, beauty in descriptive cataloging.

**Description & Entry**
conclusion. Continuing resources include serials and ongoing integrating resources." "Integrating resource" is another category new to AACR, and is defined as "A bibliographic resource" that is added to or changed by means of updates that do not remain discrete and are integrated into the whole." This category includes updating loose-leafs, updating web sites, and updating databases. [Note: The latter is a somewhat problematic term, defined in (008/21 Serials “d” Updating databases) in update no. 2 (Oct. 2001) in the MARC format for bibliographic data as: “A collection of logically interrelated data stored together in one or more computerized files, usually created and managed by a database management system.” (008/21 Serials “d” Updating databases)].

Each instance of an integrating resource, either as first published or after it has been updated, is now defined as an “iteration”.

More Types of Bibliographic Resources Now Covered in AACR2

Up until the new revision, AACR2 had pretty much ignored unnumbered monographic series, as well as the entire group of resources represented by the new category “Integrating resources”. For loose-leafs, the cataloger needed to refer to Adele Hallam’s Cataloging rules for the Description of Loose-leaf Publications, 2nd ed. 1989 (Henceforth cited as “Hallam”). For remotely accessed Internet resources, some guidance was provided by Nancy B. Olson’s Cataloging Internet Resources: A Manual and Practical Guide, 2nd ed., c1997. For unnumbered monographic series, the LCRI provided some answers. Now all the above resources are treated in AACR2 Revision 2002, most notably in its Chapter 12 (formerly named “Serials”, now renamed “Continuing resources”). Chapter 12 also covers resources which exhibit the characteristics of serials, such as successive issues, numbering, and frequency, but whose duration is limited (e.g. newsletters of events); reprints of serials; and finite integrating resources.

How can one distinguish between serials, monographs, and integrating resources?

At times it might be difficult to determine whether a bibliographic resource should be cataloged as a monograph, an integrating resource, or a serial. While AACR Revision 2002 does not provide much help in this regard, LCRI 1.0 (labeled as “LC practice”) offers valuable guidelines.

Title Changes (Excluding Integrating Resources)

The new AACR2 rev. 2002 has introduced the concept of major versus minor title changes. Only major serial title changes require a new record. (21.2A). The corresponding RI (June 2002) adds that in determining whether or not the change is major or minor, the title on the later issue must be compared against the title proper recorded on the bibliographic record. Multiple minor changes do not equal a major change. The list of title changes not requiring a new record has been expanded considerably (21.2A2). I’ll only mention a few of the most felicitous additions here.

1. Previously, the addition or deletion of the name of the issuing body anywhere except at the end of the title was considered grounds for a making a new record. Now “the addition, deletion, or rearrangement of the name of the same corporate body or the substitution of a variant form” is considered a minor change (21.2A2c). This is an excellent and long overdue addition to the list of conditions for not making a new record. Had this modification been added to the cataloging rules in a more timely manner, hundreds, or should I say thousands of hours of work by serials and cataloging staff could have been saved—to say nothing of the frustrations of bemused reference librarians and library patrons. Just think of such cases as: the Federal supplement changing its name to West’s federal supplement. Everyone knew that this wasn’t meant by the publisher as a meaningful title change, yet that’s exactly how it needed to be treated, in order to have our records conform to the national standards. Of course, we can’t lay the blame entirely on the rather “unfast” pace of change in our cataloging rules, as publishers have been putting, and will no doubt continue to put, vague, inconsistent, and contradictory information on the chief sources of their works, probably well into the next millennium.

2. A new serial record is no longer justified by: “The addition or deletion anywhere in the title of words that indicate the type of resource such as “magazine”, “journal”, or “newsletter”, or their equivalent in other languages (21.2A2i). However, the change from one word to another is considered a major change, such as from “magazine” to “journal”. (RI 21.2A June 2002).

The list is still relatively conservative. For example, words indicating a frequency of publication are not included in minor changes; so a hypothetical change such as “Chicago daily news” to “Chicago news” would be considered a major change. (see the above RI). Maybe this will change too with a future revision.

Grounds for optimism: The “in case of doubt provision” for title changes has changed from “Consider the title proper to have changed” to “Consider the change to be a minor change.”

Title Changes and Other Descriptive Changes For Integrating Resources (21.2C1b, 21.3B1, etc.).

AACR2 Revision 2002 follows Hallam in its treatment of title changes and other changes for updating loose-leafs. In nearly all cases, a new record is not made, but the title proper is replaced with the new title proper, and the description is changed to reflect the latest information.
CHANGES IN RULES FOR THE DESCRIPTION OF UPDATING LOOSE-LEAF RESOURCES:

Dates of Publication

For all published bibliographic resources, AACR2 previously instructed us to supply a date of publication; if the exact dates were unknown, approximate dates of publication had to be supplied (AACR2 1998 rev. 1.4F7).

In the 2002 revision, if the earliest iteration is in hand, the beginning date should be put in the 260 field; if the resource has ceased and the latest iteration is available, then the closing date should be given in the publication field.

When the earliest iteration is not in hand, but the beginning date is known, it may be put in a note field. If the resource has ceased and the last iteration is not available, information about the ending date may also be given in a note (1.4F8 and 12.7B1.1). Unformatted MARC 21 “362” fields (first indicator “1”) should be used for this type of note.

Examples:

362 1  Began in 1984.
362 1  Ceased in 1998.

Dates of Publication: AACR2 Revision 2002 and LC/PCC Option

In addition to the new provision to use a note when the earliest and/or latest iterations are not available, there is also an option to supply bracketed beginning/ending dates if they can be “readily ascertained” (1.4F8). LC/PCC practice stipulates not to investigate beyond the resource to find such a date (see information on the rule at CPSO Web at http://lcweb.loc.gov/catdir/cpsdo/de2002_2.html), to be included in the last 2002 update to the LCRIs.

Physical Description Area: Extent of Resource

Previously, for loose-leafs, we were instructed to give 1 v. (loose-leaf), 2 v. (loose-leaf), etc., as appropriate. For updating loose-leafs, we are now to use “v. (loose-leaf)”, until the resource is completed, after which we are to add the number of volumes (12.5B1).

Notes on Frequency of Updating

Statements indicating frequency of revision or frequent updating are not to be considered edition statements, but may now be given in the note area (MARC field “310”), as well as notes on changes in frequency or updating (MARC field “321”). (12.2B2 and 12.7B1). The word “updated” or “updates” should be included with the frequency word to make clear that the resource itself doesn’t have that frequency. Examples: “Updated quarterly”; “Monthly updates.” (RI 12.7B1 June 2002)

Standard Number and Terms of Availability Area

a. For updating loose-leafs, add the qualification (loose-leaf) to the ISBN (12.8E2).

b. Both ISSN and ISBNs may now be used on records for updating loose-leafs (RI 12.8B1 June 2002)

What’s Missing from AACR2 Revision 2002

The cataloging rules have made several steps forward, and the planned introduction of annual updates will help considerably. I’d like to mention what I find most lacking in the new rules:

1. Instructions on how to deal with monographic publications with pocket parts or regular cumulative supplements.

2. Multipart monographic publications which include replacement volumes and often pocket parts, cumulative supplements, and advance sheets. You all know whereof I speak.

For now, they are to be treated as finite resources. One could add MARC 21 “006” fields added to represent the seriality of the pocket parts, supplements, etc. A conscious decision was made not to deal with these publications in the 2002 revision of the rules; perhaps they will be “dealt with” in some future update.

3. When to Make a New Entry for Integrating Resources

I’m intentionally limiting the discussion to updating loose-leafs here. We are referred from the chapter on continuing resources (specifically 12.0A1c) to Chapter 21 for guidelines on when subsequent iterations of an integrating loose-leaf require a new description. However, in Chapter 21, we are told chiefly of a few cases when not to make a new entry (basically when there is a title change or a new main entry).

Similarly helpful is 12.2F1b: Change in edition information: integrating resources. Here we are instructed to change the edition area on the record to reflect the current iteration, if the change doesn’t require a new description [no further information given], and to make a note if the change is significant.

The most specific guidance is given not in AACR2 rev. 2002, but in RI 21.3B: “Integrating resources: Updating loose-leafs”:

Make a new entry only if there is a new base volume (i.e., an in toto replacement edition). Do not make a new entry for a gradual replacement edition (i.e., the author or publisher considers the publication to be a new edition and issues a replacement title page with a new edition statement but does not issue a new base volume)…

This RI helps, but does it really cover such creatures as recompiled editions issued in new binders, often by a new publisher, with each page bearing a date subsequent to the date of the last iteration before the recompilation. What if the release numbers revert to “1”? West Group as we know does this sort of thing frequently.

Some guidance is provided indirectly by the new RI on Conflict resolution (specifically RI 25.5B p.3
Just as we follow the Library of Congress, MARBI and other library centered organizations through their standards making processes, it is wise to follow those few bodies setting online systems and web related standards. Two organizations to watch are the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) and the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C).

**NISO**

The National Information Standards Organization (NISO) is a non-profit association accredited by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). NISO identifies, develops, maintains, and publishes technical standards used to manage information including retrieval, re-purposing, storage, metadata, and preservation.

NISO draws its support from the communities it serves. The leaders of over 70 organizations, including AALL, in the fields of publishing, libraries, IT and media serve as its voting members, serve on NISO committees and as officers of the association.

NISO sponsors pre-standardization workshops that bring together expert industry representatives to talk standards for a day. The result is a report with recommendations. The recommendation may suggest that a standards committee be formed. If formed, the committee then meets to draft the standard.

NISO believes that standards are a product of consensus which requires significant base-building that must go on to move a group to a common solution. Therefore, drafts of proposed standards are submitted to voting members of NISO for comments and approval and available to any involved party for comment.

When a standard is published, NISO announces this as widely as possible through a variety of electronic lists, to many industry news outlets, and on their web site.

Some NISO standards require a Maintenance Agency to register users, to assist in implementation of the standard and to provide information on any changes to the standard and advise on how to implement the standard. And all standards are reviewed on a regular basis at least five years after approval and revised as the information environment changes.

**W3C**

The World Wide Web Consortium was created in October 1994 to develop common protocols that promote evolution and ensure interoperability. W3C has more than 500 Member organizations from around the world.

The World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) has developed more than 35 technical specifications for the Web’s infrastructure. To understand how W3C pursues this mission, it is useful to understand the Consortium’s goals and driving principles.
W3C does most of its work with an explicit mandate from the Membership. Members review proposals for work called “Activity proposals”. These proposals define the initial scope and structure of an Activity. These proposals include a summary, a description of why this activity is being proposed now and its scope, a description of its initial deployment including timelines, duration, a summary of resources to be dedicated to the activity, intellectual property information, and a list of communities that would benefit from the activity. When there is consensus among the Members to pursue this work, W3C initiates a new Activity.

An Activity organizes the work necessary for the development or evolution of a web technology. Each Activity has its own structure that generally includes Working Groups, Interest Groups, and Coordination Groups. These groups may produce technical reports, review the work of other groups, develop sample code, etc. The progress of each Activity is documented in an Activity Statement. These statements describe the goals of the Activity, completed and unfinished deliverables, changing perspectives based upon experience, future plans, etc.

W3C Activities are generally organized into groups: Working Groups (for technical developments), Interest Groups (for more general work), and Coordination Groups (for communication among related groups). These groups produce technical reports, open source software, and services. These groups also ensure coordination with other standards bodies and technical communities. There are currently over thirty W3C Working Groups.

To facilitate management, the Team organizes W3C Activities and other work into five domains:

1. **Architecture Domain:** The Architecture Domain develops the underlying technologies of the Web.

2. **Document Formats Domain:** The Document Formats Domain works on formats and languages that will present information to users with accuracy, beauty, and a higher level of control.

3. **Interaction Domain:** The Interaction Domain seeks to improve user interaction with the Web, and to facilitate single Web authoring to benefit users and content providers alike.

4. **Technology and Society Domain:** The W3C Technology and Society Domain seeks to develop Web infrastructure to address social, legal, and public policy concerns.

5. **Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI):** W3C’s commitment to lead the Web to its full potential includes promoting a high degree of usability for people with disabilities. The Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI) is pursuing accessibility of the Web through five primary areas of work: technology, guidelines, tools, education and outreach, and research and development.

A duration is specified in the Activity Proposal that defines when work must be completed. Criteria for participation in these groups require three things: technical competence in one’s role, social competence in one’s role and the ability to act fairly.

The standards created and maintained by NISO and the W3C have had and will continue to have a strong impact on the library community. Exchanging, encoding and preserving digital information falls under an increasingly broad spectrum of groups and organizations. While it is often said that the nice thing about standards is that there are so many to choose from, it is still important to understand the processes by which they are made and the ways we, as acquirers, organizers and preservers of information influence the result.

For More Information:
- NISO: <http://www.niso.org>
- W3C: <http://www.w3c.org>

---

**MARC Remarks**

The More Things Change, the More They Stay the Same

Another major change is about to take place in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format, a new bibliographic level for integrating resources. Because loose-leaves are the print integrating resource, law catalogers have a real advantage. We understand their characteristics and should have no difficulty applying principles we know to the new types of integrating resources: updating Web sites and updating databases.

There is an extremely helpful PowerPoint presentation on the Internet...

Schedule of Changes

As with most major changes in the MARC format, these accompany changes in descriptive cataloging. The revised documentation schedule for integrating resources is:

October, 2001
MARC 21 revisions published

September, 2002
AACR2 revisions due

Fall, 2002
Library of Congress Rule Interpretations due

But, implementation of the changes will take place in two phases. On December 1, 2002, the Library of Congress will begin following the new rules. But the utilities, OCLC and RLIN, will not be ready to add the new bibliographic level “i”. That will not happen before the summer of 2003. As far as I know, the repeatable 260’s will be implemented at the same time.

I do have a little more information about OCLC and RLIN than I reported to the room full of people who came to the Cataloging and Classification Roundtable in Orlando. Although the new 008 coding for integrating resources will be available in December, the new codes for integrating resources will be available for use in the serials 006. The one exception to this is that RLIN will not be ready for entry convention code “2” (006/17).

Fixed Field Codes

Beginning in December, the practice will be to code integrating resources as monographs, with bibliographic level “m” (as we do now). In addition, we are to add a serials 006, using the integrating resources codes. Many of the elements of this 006 will remain the same as we are used to in the fixed fields. The new codes for integrating resources in the 006 (and eventually in the 008) will be:

Frequency (006/01 and 008/18):
  k Continuously updated

Type of continuing resource (006/04 and 008/21):
  d Updating database
  i Updating looseleaf
  w Updating Web site

Entry convention (006/17 and 008/34):
  2 Integrated entry
  [Note: This will not be available in RLIN in December 2002]

Variable Field Codes

There are some changes to variable field coding, as well. Some fields that were just used for serials in the past will now be used for integrating resources too. Here is a very brief overview of variable fields that will be used to describe integrating resources.

Standard Numbers: If an integrating resource has both, give both in the catalog record.
  020 - ISBN
  022 - ISSN

Change in Title Proper: Change 245 $a/n/p to reflect the current iteration. Give the earlier title in a note.
  247 - Former title or title variations: Use to generate title added entry and note
  547 - Former title complexity note: Give a separate 547 “Title history” note in addition to the 247 field only if the situation requires more explanation than can be given in the 247 field. (LCRI)

Frequency of Updates: Always give a note for known frequency of updates, even if already apparent from the rest of the description.
  310 - Current publication frequency
  Examples:
  310 - Continuously updated
  310 - Updated irregularly, $b 2001-
  321 - Former publication frequency

Dates of Publication: Make notes on beginning/ending dates of publication not recorded in 260 $c. (i.e. When not cataloging from first/last iteration.)
  362 1# - Unformatted date of publication
  Example: 362 1# Began in 1987

Change in Main Entry: Make note for earlier responsible person in 500 or body in 550 note, if considered important. Required to justify 7XX if present. Includes dates to identify iteration.
  550 - Issuing body note

Again, I strongly recommend visiting Mr. Miller’s website that I mentioned earlier. It contains both the changed descriptive cataloging rules and the new MARC tagging. Use the site to train yourself and your staff. While you do, enjoy the fact that these changes will be a little easier for you because you have been cataloging integrating resources all along.
I hope that all of you who attended the annual meeting in Orlando had an enjoyable time. For me, it was a time of learning and socializing with my colleagues from around the country, and in fact from around the world: I met librarians from Australia, Canada, and the UK.

**OCLC Committee Open Discussion – Orlando**

The OCLC Committee met for its open discussion on Monday, July 22nd at the Orange County Convention Center in Orlando, Florida. Twenty people got up early that morning to join the discussion. Our speaker was Mr. William Caine with the Solinet network out of Atlanta. The discussion centered on the release of Connexion (more on that later). Mr. Caine’s talk was titled “Planning for Life after OCLC Passport for Cataloging & CatME, CJK, OCLC Arabic Software…” He discussed why OCLC was changing, the planning that has gone into this change, what future changes and enhancements will take place, and how libraries should plan for making the transition. The discussion was very relevant, since Connexion had just been released three weeks before the meeting. If you are interested in seeing the printout of Mr. Caine’s presentation, contact me and I will be glad to send you a copy.

One item that I raised at the meeting was the name of the committee. We have referred to it for the past several years as the OCLC/WLN Committee (due to OCLC’s purchase of WLN in 1998). However, according to the OBS bylaws, our official name is the OCLC Committee. WLN does not exist anymore—if you go to the old WLN website, it is now the OCLC Western Service Center website. I asked the committee if anyone objected to going back to OCLC Committee, which was acceptable to the attendees.

Thanks again for all those who attended the meeting. I will look forward to seeing you again next year in Seattle.

**Connexion**

The hot topic with OCLC this summer has been the introduction of the new web interface with its new name—Connexion. It was released on June 30, 2002. The CORC name was retired; and the CORC list was replaced by the OCLC-CAT list. Almost immediately, the messages filled both OCLC-CAT and AUTOCAT about Connexion. If you have not seen it, I would suggest that you have a look: connexion.oclc.org. Your current user identification and password will work with Connexion.

What has been of particular interest to me has been the reaction by the cataloging community to Connexion. I examined Connexion that first week, but did not really try to do any work in it. Judging from the comments posted to AUTOCAT and OCLC-CAT, the reaction by the library community has been largely negative. The system is clearly a work in progress and is not capable of handling many functions that we now take for granted with Passport and CatME. Some posters felt that OCLC rushed it into production before it was ready. OCLC stated that they are working on a web client version of Connexion, which some people viewed as evidence that OCLC rushed it. Other people took OCLC to task for its “arrogance” in forcing us to change from proven products that work and work well (Passport and CatME), to one that forces libraries to use a web-based interface with all its mouse work, clicks, etc. As I write this (in mid-August), most of the negative comments have died down. I suspect that most libraries continue to use Passport and/or CatME, and are waiting for further developments and enhancements to Connexion before making the switch.

Speaking for my library, we will probably not make the switch until sometime next year (probably in the summer or fall of 2003). Libraries have until December 31, 2003 to make the transition. I am serving on the university-wide committee for the Indiana University Libraries that is examining this and other OCLC issues to make recommendations to the administration. My library has a separate account and symbol with OCLC from the university’s Main Library, but our telecommunications with OCLC go through the Main Library. Thus, whatever they decide to do with this transition, we must go along. That is the reason I wanted to be on this committee. One critical issue for the Indiana University Libraries is Connexion’s current extreme difficulty in handling diacritics and other special characters. That is an issue for us because we do collect some items in German, French, and other languages. However, for our Main Library, it is absolutely essential to handle this because they collect heavily in many different languages from around the world (they have catalogers who exclusive catalog items in Russian and the Slavic languages).

Much of what has developed and continues to come out concerning Connexion is not a surprise to me. Jay Jordan’s presentation to ALA in June 2001, what I heard at the OCLC Users (now Members) Council meeting in Dublin, Ohio in May 2001, and what Don Muccino of OCLC said to me in October, 2001 clearly laid out the
direction OCLC has gone and will continue to go with Connexion. Connexion is a just a part of OCLC’s broader shift in direction and development for WorldCat. OCLC is listening to people like Sarah Thomas of Cornell who advocates that library catalogs should act as a portal to the Internet, knowledge, and information in general. Sarah Thomas spoke at the Users Council meeting I attended, and I could tell that Jay Jordan and OCLC were promoting her views to the group. Her article advocating this is on the Library of Congress website at <www.loc.gov/catdir/bibcontrol/thomas_paper.html>. Jay Jordan’s address to ALA is available on video via ILL from OCLC, and it shows what he and OCLC feel will be the future of WorldCat with its links and enhancements.

Final Thoughts

My column in the June issue of the Technical Services Law Librarian was supposed to have been the final one—my two-year term as the chair of the OCLC Committee ended with the Orlando meeting. However, I was asked and agreed to serve another term as the chair of the committee. I appreciate the confidence that Ellen, Ismael, and Mary Jane have in me, and for their continued support. So I look forward to another two years of these columns and planning the open discussions at Seattle in 2003 and Boston in 2004.

Finally, as this column was in the works, we received the sad news of the passing of Susan Roach. Susan was a member of this committee, and a former chair of the Online Bibliographic Services SIS. She will be greatly missed.

Recently, an optometrist responded to my frustration over reduced night vision by saying “Light is our friend.” That is certainly true in most circumstances, but it is not true for library and archival materials. Light is not a friend to paper and book bindings.

As a matter of fact, light causes a chemical reaction in paper and bindings that is not only destructive, but irreversible as well. Over time, light causes cloth covers to fade and pages to change color. Fading, in itself, may seem to be only an aesthetic change, but is actually the visible result of a process that will weaken and embrittle a book.

Are all light sources equally damaging?

In general, there are three main sources of light in libraries: sunlight or natural light, fluorescent light, and incandescent light. If presented in order of their potential to destroy library materials, the list would read the same. Sunlight is the most destructive, as it is brighter and contains more ultraviolet (UV) light. UV light, although invisible, strikes papers and bindings with greater force and more rapidly than visible light, therefore accelerating deterioration. Sunlight, in all forms, is damaging, but direct sunlight is extremely bad and should be avoided entirely.

Flourescent lighting, because it emits some UV light, falls in second place. Incandescent lighting, although more slow to destroy, will also discolor and embrittle papers and bindings that are regularly exposed.

How do you know whether your collections are overexposed?

If you have ever seen what appears to be the imprint of a bookend on a book’s cover, you have seen evidence of light damage. What you actually witnessed was a book cover that had faded around the bookend. Even if you have not seen something like this, chances are very good that your collections are being damaged by light. To avoid damage, preservation sources generally suggest that visible light levels not exceed 55 lux for sensitive materials (art work, exposed pages, etc.) and 165 lux for less-sensitive materials.1 In contrast to this, the recommended light level for a reading area is at least 300 lux and for a study area at least 700 lux. Clearly, this is an issue where preservation concerns must be balanced against user needs. This balancing act is not a consideration where UV light is concerned. UV light is not visible light, so it can be reduced without affecting vision. Preservationists recommend keeping UV radiation at less than 75 microwatts per lumen.2 Determining whether the lighting in your library exceeds these limits can be fairly simple but potentially costly. Light meters for visible light range between $100-$200, but UV light meters are much more expensive, usually costing over $1000. Whether or not a library wishes to purchase light monitoring equipment to precisely measure exposure levels, there are many things that can be done to reduce light damage.

What can be done to lessen the damage?

First, and foremost, never allow collections to be exposed to direct sunlight. Even indirect sunlight contains some UV radiation, but is preferable to direct sunlight. If it is impossible to move books away from windows or skylights, consider installing blinds or window film with UV
There are several things that can be done to protect books from artificial light sources. One simple and inexpensive way to increase protection is to choose bulbs with a lower wattage when fixtures are relamped. If the light source is fluorescent, consider shielding the bulbs with a UV filter. There are two types of filters readily available. One type wraps around the fluorescent tube, the other consists of sheets placed inside the fixture cover. Whichever type is used, make sure the relampers are aware of their presence so the filters are not inadvertently discarded. Fluorescent bulbs are available that are pre-coated with UV protective materials, but are rather expensive for general collections, costing as much as $35 each.

If shelving books on top stacks exposes them to nearby lights, try to avoid using the top shelves, or install canopies or covers that will provide a protective barrier. Books that are in closer proximity to the light source are also affected by any heat produced, placing them at greater risk. Libraries should consider installing timers on stack lighting so that lights automatically shut off when not in use. Timers may also be combined with motion detectors that switch on lights when a person approaches. Timers and motion detectors may be especially useful for areas where sensitive and/or valuable materials are kept.

**Light Exposure & Displays**

Be mindful of light exposure to library materials placed in display cases or exhibit areas. These spaces are usually well lighted to highlight displays, are often enclosed, and materials may sit closer to light sources than normally. In addition to filtering UV light and taking other precautions already mentioned, care should be taken not to keep items on display for lengthy periods of time. If books are displayed with open pages, it is advisable to turn the pages occasionally so that the same two pages are not constantly exposed. Light damage slide rules can be used to measure how light intensity and length of exposure in a particular display area will affect exhibited materials. The slide rules, created by the Canadian Conservation Institute, are inexpensive and available from many preservation supply companies.

**Remember:**

Any exposure to light is harmful to library collections and should be controlled as much as possible. The effects are gradual, but permanent.

**Endnotes**

1 1 lux is the amount of light intensity needed to illuminate one square meter of spherical space.
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**Private Law Libraries**

Betty Roeske  
Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman  
betty.roeske@kmz.com

I am interested in having future columns relate stories from other libraries on how they maintain records for the licensing of electronic products. Back in the days when floppies and CDs were the access avenues, your Automation Department could control who was set up with access. Now with web access, it is harder to retain control. We have had success with some companies by requiring them to accept registrations from either certain IP addresses or certain e-mails. Other companies accept all registrations and then we get a surprise bill. My question is, what have you done, or attempted to do, to keep track of the users of the web products? They can be either positive or negative on the attempts. I will compile answers for the next column. This is something that all libraries are encountering, so this does not necessarily need to be restricted to comments from the private law libraries.

The following are some examples of what some libraries have encountered to date:

**We have one vendor that will only send invoices to the attorneys and not to the Library address.** The attorneys do not forward the invoices to the Library. They ignore them. We have tried phone calls, faxing, snail mail and e-mail to try and communicate with the company. We have not found a reliable form of communication in order to receive the invoices from them. If we are able to request a duplicate invoice, it is again sent to the attorney and not to us. It is then ignored by the attorneys again. That is frustrating for the staff and for the attorneys. So much for automation making life simpler for me! As a result, the attorneys inform us that they have been cut off. We use our Serials system to keep a record of who are the valid subscribers.

***************

**We have found a wonderful contact person for our web accessible product. We are limited by a number of members. The Customer Service Representative is able to copy the Library Contact person with a notice of the**
Are you one of those people whose mind is always percolating with research dreams? Whose cranium is overflowing with innovative, ground breaking ideas you cannot wait to share? Whose words flow effortlessly from brain to keyboard, displaying a vocabulary that is both extensive and captivating? Who can always find the time to write, no matter how many projects are piling up on your desk? If you are … you make me sick!

Okay, not sick exactly. Actually, I am extremely jealous. Because, as a writer, I am nothing like that. I have a hard time generating research ideas that I think are worth my time and effort to write, and other people’s time and effort to read. If I do come up with a good idea, I often procrastinate and never begin. Nor do words pour out of my brain like a flood; each word is more like a drip that I have to get just right. (Hmm, is that the cataloger in me?) And do not even get me started on being able to find the time.

So what do I have to offer as a columnist then? (I have asked myself that question more than once!) Well, I suspect many of you can relate to my shortcomings—lack of ideas, lack of motivation, lack of persistence. So you and I will be fellow sojourners on this path. A research project is often like a journey. You do not always know what the ultimate destination will be. There may be pitfalls and heartache along the way. But despite the pain, there is an immense feeling of satisfaction when the trip is done. So as one who needs encouragement, I will try to encourage you. As one who needs a kick in the pants from time to time, I will try to motivate you. I am mindful that I am standing on the sturdy shoulders of those who have gone before me. Brian Striman, Ellen McGrath, LeGrande Fletcher, and a host of guest columnists have always made this a place where ideas can be shared and accomplishments lauded. I hope I can tend this garden as well as they have.

Now for a little substance. I think one thing that makes some of us reluctant writers is a narrow view of what research is. Sometimes we get locked into the mindset that for something to be truly worthy of the designation “research,” there must be a great deal of mind-numbing statistical analysis accompanied by 200 footnotes. I recently read a book titled Scholarship Reconsidered by Ernest L. Boyer, however, that made me think of research in a different light. Boyer contends that “scholarship” has come to be associated exclusively with research, when in fact there are several different types. He identifies four kinds:

- the scholarship of discovery, or the advancement of knowledge through investigation, which comes closest to what academics typically think of as “research”
- the scholarship of integration, or putting our ever-advancing knowledge into perspective and context and finding relationships among different disciplines
- the scholarship of application, or putting our knowledge into practice
- the scholarship of teaching, or making our cache of knowledge understandable to others

He encourages academic institutions, therefore, to abandon the one-dimensional view of scholarship and recognize and affirm the diverse talents and interests of their individual faculty members as they pursue scholarship in one or more of these forms.

Although this book was primarily addressed to teaching faculty, are there lessons in here for librarians? I definitely believe there are, because I think we can use these models to broaden our own concepts of what research is. We oftentimes, I feel, never get past associating research only with discovery. Consequently, if we do not see ourselves as bold explorers of the library frontier, if we despair of ever creating a new classification system or
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inventing the next MARC, we might be inclined to excuse ourselves from participating in the research arena at all.

But in truth we have much more to offer. Whereas the discoverer might ask, “What remains to be known?,” the integrator asks, “What does this information mean?” In your law school or firm, does any group have a broader base of knowledge than the librarians? We have one foot in the realm of information technology, and another foot in the world of information retrieval, and another (wait, how many feet do we have?) in information evaluation, and other feet who knows where. I guess we are information centipedes. We stand in the gap between information sources and information users. Are we not uniquely positioned to make connections among the ever-blurring boundaries of disciplines?

Application is certainly an area where there are abundant research opportunities. While library literature is often criticized for having too many “how-we-did-it-good” articles, our profession is at its heart a practical one, and also one that values cooperation. Sharing lessons learned and mistakes to be avoided is just another way that librarians assist one another. The mistakes, in fact, are often more valuable to hear about than the successes, although we are usually loath to admit them.

Do you think of yourself as a teacher? Sometimes we believe we must be an expert in order to publish an article on a certain subject. But teaching is the highest form of learning, and if you shed the misconception that you must be an expert before you even begin a project, you might open yourself up to a whole new realm of possibilities. What are topics you would like to learn about that are not currently being covered in the literature? Why not study those topics yourself and teach the rest of us?

I do not much like articles that ask a lot of questions and fail to give many answers, but with smoke rising from my keyboard, I realize I have written one. But that will not stop me from asking one more. What might some of these discovering, integrating, applying, or teaching research projects look like? Well, see, I told you I was not very good at generating those kinds of ideas. So you tell me—email me some ideas and I will share them with everyone. And I will continue to think about it too. And if you have published something, email me that as well and I will include it the next column. We may never gain riches from our research, but we can at least bask in the adulation of our peers!

Endnotes
1 Ernest L. Boyer, Scholarship Reconsidered (1990)

---

It’s time for a change!

In fact it’s time for many changes.

This is my final column. Chris Long, Indiana University at Indianapolis, will take over the column. Many thanks to Chris! He has been interested in research and publishing for many years. Ellen McGrath and I have said we are available to help him with any questions he has or to bounce ideas back and forth to him. I bet he’d love to hear from any of his professional colleagues too. That’d be YOU! Please, please be sure to contact Chris if you have a guest opinion for the column, or to report on some research and/or publication opportunity or writing workshop you attended that you’d like to share.

Other announcements: in case you haven’t read about it on the TS and OBS electronic lists: Eloise Vondruska, Northwestern University, will be taking over the reigns as Chair of the OBS-TS Joint Research Grant Committee. Many thanks to Eloise for getting involved in this important joint committee. Also thanks to the members of the JRGC who volunteered to stay another year to help Eloise fine-tune the guidelines of the Committee and to help with increased promotion efforts (hint: watch for improved promotion and grant info on the OBS and TS web sites). Chris Long has also volunteered to be the OBS & TS Research Roundtable coordinator/moderator for the annual AALL roundtable meetings. It seemed like a great “fit” to have Chris be both roundtable coordinator, and TSLL Research and Publications column editor.

Since this TSLL issue is filled with a lot from the July AALL annual meeting, I’m going to just stop at this point and say good bye to you as column editor. Please read the Research Roundtable report in this TSLL issue. Ruth Balkin took the minutes of the meeting and after a bit of editing by yours truly, it’s ready for you to enjoy all the stuff we learned at the roundtable meeting. These annual Research Roundtable meetings are fun and valuable to attend. If you haven’t attended one, please, instead of shopping or partying, or attending some other AALL scheduled event, come to the Research Roundtable. Next year is Seattle! And you **know** what rhymes with Seattle!

Now let’s see… where was I…. Oh yeah… the Good bye. Good Bye dear reader. Keep writing! Keep wanting to strive for extending yourself beyond your busy office walls. We learn when we share.

Brian Striman
University of Nebraska
bstriman@unl.edu
The following serial title changes were recently identified by the University of San Diego Legal Research Center serials staff and the University of California, Berkeley Law Library cataloging staff:

Amnesty international news
Vol. 25, no. 1 (Jan. 1995)-v. 31, no. 02 (Mar. 2001)
(OCoLC 32003359)
Changed to:
Wire (Amnesty International)
Vol. 31, no. 03 (May 2001)-
(OCoLC 46992502)

Australasian gay & lesbian law journal
Vol. 3 (Oct. 1993)-v. 9 (Feb. 2000)
(OCoLC 29613762)
Changed to:
Gay & lesbian law journal
Vol. 10 (May 2001)-
(OCoLC 50059590)

Cardozo studies in law and literature
Vol. 1, no. 1 (spring 1989)-v. 13, no. 2 (fall 2001)
(OCoLC 19329285)
Changed to:
Law and literature
Vol. 14, no. 1 (spring 2002)-
(OCoLC 47172552)

Columbia-VLA journal of law & the arts
Vol. 10, no. 1 (autumn 1985)-v. 24, no. 4 (summer 2001)
(OCoLC 13162259)
Changed to:
The Columbia journal of law & the arts
Vol. 25, no. 1 (fall 2001)-
(OCoLC 50137673)

Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe.
Official gazette of the Council of Europe

(OCoLC 42030668)
Changed to:
Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe.
Texts adopted by the Congress of Local and Regional Authorities of Europe 8th session (29-31 May 2001)-
(OCoLC 48852345)

La Raza law journal
(OCoLC 9982196)
Changed to:
Berkeley La Raza law journal
Vol. 12, no. 2 (fall 2001)-
(OCoLC 49231318)

Macarthur law review
(OCoLC 37797875)
Changed to:
University of Western Sydney law review
Vol. 5 (2001)-
(OCoLC 49571806)

Marketing for lawyers
Vol. 1, no. 1 (May 1987)-v. 15, no. 10 (Feb. 2002)
(OCoLC 15641607)
Changed to:
Marketing the law firm
Vol. 15, no. 11 (Mar. 2002)-
(OCoLC 49398471)

Natural gas industry analysis 2000-2001
(OCoLC 44085757)
Changed to:
Natural gas and electric power industries analysis 2002-
(OCoLC 48846397)

NJC alumni
-v. 16, no. 1 (spring 2001)
(OCoLC 44782464)
changed to:
Case in point
Vol. 1, no. 1 (winter/spring 2002)-
(OCoLC 50335661)

Tax guide for college teachers and other college personnel 1998-
(OCoLC 2878347)

United States. Office of Management and Budget.
Preparation and submission of budget estimates
Ceased with 2001 issue
(OCoLC 23106538)

Virginia journal of sports and the law
Vol. 1, issue 1 (spring 1999)-v. 3, issue 1 (spring 2001)
(OCoLC 39456333)
Changed to:
Virginia sports and entertainment law journal
Vol. 1, issue 1 (winter 2001)-
(OCoLC 48962722)

The following serial cessations were identified by the University of San Diego Legal Research Center serials staff and the University of California, Berkeley Law Library acquisitions staff:

Administrative Review Council (Australia).
Annual Report (OCoLC 6782525)
Ceased with: 24th (1999-2000)
Subject Headings
(continued from page 1)

Descriptive issues affecting statutes as subject headings

An important caveat to remember is that headings for laws are governed by AACR2 rather than LCSH, with the appropriate authority records residing in the Names Authority File, and that non-LC proposed headings arrive via NACO rather than SACO. Unlike topical subject headings, which are formulated based on LCSH and the Subject Cataloging Manual (which look to reference sources as authorities to determine usage), name authorities are formulated according to AACR2, and AACR2’s rules are less than user friendly, particularly when used for a constructing a name authority heading for a statute.

The first element in the heading consists of the issuing jurisdiction. Sometimes a statute may be issued by one jurisdiction to be applied to another, such as the British North America Act which is an act of the British parliament that has served as Canada’s de facto constitution. Until recently, all modern Scottish statutes were entered under Great Britain (though Scotland was used in the subfield Z of the 650 topical heading) and European Union legislation is never entered under jurisdiction since CPSO doesn’t recognize the EU as a jurisdiction (it’s a little more complicated than that, but de facto, that’s the situation). There are deep philosophical meanings behind these decisions (e.g. did Scotland merge with England in 1707, or did it continue as a separate country whose legislative functions were outsourced to the merged parliament) which catalogers should avoid getting involved in.

Many significant Pakistani laws are still pre-independence Indian laws with anachronistic headings such as “Pakistan. Oath Act, 1873” (hint: there was no such thing as Pakistan 130 years ago). Indian cases before the breakup of imperial India are still “good law” in Pakistan, and books cite the law’s treatment in the other country’s court (since it is the same statute). Anyone desiring to preserve their sanity should avoid dealing with LC’s treatment of “Palestinian” law over the course of the last 100 years (great subject for law review articles, bad subject for catalogers).

While these types of issues almost never arise with United States materials, they can confuse anyone working with “foreign” law. The form established for the name of the law can also create problems for access. LCSH establishes headings based on usage in English reference sources. AACR2 establishes its headings based on the actual publications in the country of origin. The names of administrative agencies (issuing bodies for regulations) and the headings for statutes are therefore in the “vernacular” (in the original language, rather than English), though the jurisdiction is established based on the English form of name. English language reference sources routinely speak of Israel’s “Law of Return”, AACR2 dictates a heading of “Israel. Hok ha-Shevut” (which of course is no problem if there are proper 4XX headings integrated into the OPAC, which of course all OPACs have and are fully understood by users, right?) Another complication is that, unlike American laws with “short titles” that usually reflect the nature of the law, many civil law countries use mechanical formulas such as “Italy. Decreto del presidente della Repubblica 18 luglio 1986. n. 545 “ (i.e. Presidential decree of July 18, 1986, no. 545). Such headings are easy to construct for catalogers but worthless unless you already know which law you are looking for.

When is a heading for a law not needed or not useful?

Regardless of whether Memo H1715 allows you to use a heading for a statute, there are times when it isn’t needed at all, and making one misleads the users. In some areas of law, the statute and the subject are coextensive. This occurs when the legislature (which can mean the Congress, the Queen in Council, or the chief warlord who unilaterally enacts laws since he is the
boss—we don’t make value judgments) decides to consolidate all the law on the subject, repeal all other laws (that which wasn’t reenacted is repealed), and amends the consolidated law rather than passing supplemental new statutes. “New York. Penal Law” is frequently discussed in titles, but never has warranted a 610 heading at LC (though if it were more recent, a legislative history or a book on its enactment would warrant a 610). The 650 heading “Criminal law—New York (State)” covers the same material. All books on criminal law in New York are on the Penal code, and any book on the Penal code covers almost the entirety of New York criminal law. Common law crimes or pre-codification criminal statutes haven’t had legal status in New York in living memory. In other states, such as Maryland, where common law crimes co-exist with statutory crimes, “Criminal law—Maryland” is by definition broader than any heading for a statute, and any book on a statute is a focused book on an aspect of Maryland criminal law, but never the totality. Unlike New York where new statutes typically amend the codified law (meaning after a year, one usually cites only the codified law), new statutes in Maryland frequently supplement existing statutes (and need to be cited).

The Federal Bankruptcy Law (NAF: United States. Bankruptcy) is another example. It is a section of United States Code, which includes all Federal legislation on the subject, and has been enacted into positive law (as opposed to other sections of USC which are quasi-official editorial arrangements of existing statutes). Therefore, there is never a need for a subject heading for the law, (except for a legislative history of its passage), since the heading “Bankruptcy—United States” covers the same territory. Of course, an individual act that amends the Bankruptcy law would warrant a heading, but after a year no one cares much about those laws, only the total law which assimilated them.

Most major codes in Roman law systems are similar to New York’s Penal law or the Federal Bankruptcy law. All of “Civil law—[place]” is in the “[Place]. Civil code.” and vice versa. Even though the 1995 changes to SCM allow a 610 heading for code, a 610 isn’t too useful for those jurisdictions since every book about civil law is about the code. Indeed the term “Civil law” is defined by whatever Justinian included in Corpus juris civilis (the original and enduring paradigm for codification). While legislative history or a detailed textual analysis would still need a heading, even under the pre-1995 rule, unless it is a legislative history or a book on a new code, a 610 heading tells the user nothing they don’t know from the 650. One should remember that the enactment of a new code in Roman law systems is a major event, e.g. the last country using Justinian’s code didn’t adopt a new one until the 20th century. The major codes are expected to last for generations. Of course many publishers create their own “code” out of collected statutes, but these codes are mere compilations and do not require any special consideration in subject headings.

Landmark legislation in the United States is often meaningless as a subject heading. Everyone who deals with Labor law knows about the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act, which LC of course refers to by their official names: “National Labor Relations Act” and “Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947”. Official documents of the National Labor Relations Board routinely invoke them, but they are almost never used as subject headings. If you look at the text in United States Code, the reason is apparent. The unofficial codification weaves the two together (not enacted in positive law) so that one can not really be considered without the other, along with subsequent legislation that amends, replaces or affects both. Similarly, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is rarely the subject of a book aimed at non-historical researchers since the law has been reworked so many times that a book on “United States. Civil rights act of 1964” is of little value to a user who wants to know the current status of “Civil rights—United States.” In these situations, anything other than a legislative history of the original law does not need a subject heading for the statute, and in fact such a heading would mislead the users. No one writes books on the statute for legal practitioners, even if they include the statute in the title, rather they write on the area of law.

Constitutions and treaties.

Even though constitutions and treaties are considered part of the law in the United States, AACR2 treats them very differently, and LCSH treats them somewhat differently.

A constitution (discussed in SCM H1465) raises the same issues as statutes. For the United States, “[Place]. Constitution” is coextensive with “Constitutional law—[Place].” The United States has had only one constitution and the United States adopted its own constitution (entering “Articles of confederation” under United States is slightly anachronistic since at the time it was a multilateral treaty that we now see as a de facto constitution). Only for a partial heading (a single amendment or group of amendments) would an author-title heading be of use for anyone researching American constitutional law. However the 610 headings would definitely help users in a country with a history of multiple constitutions (which includes most jurisdictions other than the United States, as well as most American states) or whose constitution incorporates multiple documents such as Israel and Great Britain.

Treaties (discussed in SCM H2227) have several different problems. The rules for assigning headings for treaties and works on treaties are slightly different, and the AACR2 treatment of some treaties is obtuse, to say the least (i.e. “Canada. Treaties, etc. 1992 Oct. 7” rather than NAFTA or North American Free Trade Agreement). However for most multilateral treaties,
AACR2 enters them under user-friendly names, and the heading can be especially useful since international agreements are often on subjects that don’t correspond nicely to the country-specific subject headings of LCSH.

It is also interesting to note that the rule governing assignment for the fixed field (in the 008) for contents limits the use of the “l” for legislation to statutes (adopted by legislatures) and regulations (adopted by agencies, though in some countries there is little substance to the distinction), but excluding constitutions and treaties. This ignores the fact the constitutions and treaties are types of legislation and have the same force (at least) as acts of the legislature or decrees of the chief executive. Of course, the fixed fields in MARC21 are from different sources than either LCSH or AACR2, so one wouldn’t expect them to be neatly coordinated—but that belongs in another column.
information by type. Keep in mind that access does not have to be an either/or proposition – e-resources can be linked to in more than one place. Do not be afraid of technology; collaborate with colleagues to find creative solutions. Continually improve.

The speakers were engaging and well informed. I highly recommend the program bibliography for further reading on this topical subject.

Increasingly, librarians are finding themselves swimming in license agreements. As print resources migrate online and proliferate, law librarians are faced with understanding, negotiating and tracking multiple licenses. Organized by moderator, Lorna Tang, this resourceful program gave voice to our collective concerns.

“Every online subscription has an agreement related to its use,” began Julie Bozzell, Research Applications Specialist in the firm Greenberg Traurig, LLP. License agreements vary in form and content, and are not substituted by order forms or invoices. The license may be online, come included in the content of the CD, or sent inadvertently to technical support shrink wrapped with the CD. Even if it means asking the vendor to send an email, this too can be used as a contract. Did a vendor mention what was included in the product? Be sure to get them to write that down.

Some licenses are negotiable and others, like the click-through licenses online are not. Stop the chances of your being taken advantage of by preparing a licensing checklist. A checklist will ensure complete and consistent coverage of your concerns in the negotiation process. Julie organized her concerns into five main areas: who is it for; what is the format; what is the content coverage; what kind of support is available; and what is the cost. Her sample checklist is available at <www.gtlaw.com/host/aall2002/> or in the Educational Program Handout Materials booklet.

Is the product worth the price and worth it for your patrons needs? Explore less expensive sources for the information. Will someone back up the decision to license an expensive product that has the authority to approve it? Is there one user who is interested in the product or will there be multiple simultaneous users?

What is the format? If the product is online, that’s a lot less work for your staff. If you are responsible for product support, then you’re going to be installing, networking, fixing technological incompatibilities, and providing training. Make sure the format is compatible with your existing equipment, browser, and operating system, and that a toll free number is provided for technical and search support.

What’s the date coverage? Is it comprehensive, in full-text or abstracts? Often you’re only being leased the information, allowed access to archived data for as long as you pay the bills. If you’re thinking about tossing the print and archiving the electronic, ask if you can continue to have access to what you paid for after the subscription expires. Is the data updated consistently and timely? Although vendors will say their online subscriptions are updated, this may be difficult to detect.

“We are drowning in passwords.” Keeping track of multiple licenses and passwords that all work differently is important. Consolidate and organize critical paperwork including user guides and manuals because you’ll need to refer to them later. Suggestions for storage include scanning and entering passwords with instructions into a database that can be accessed remotely.

How much is it going to cost? Are there options in the pricing structure such as FTE, or an annual or per transaction fee? Are there consortia discounts or discounts with more than one subscription? There could be hidden costs, such as password fees, product support, or customer service. Review products carefully because vendors may repackage information you already have, add information you don’t need but will be paying for, or putting a spin on free or low cost information.

Lisa Smith-Butler, Associate Law Library Director at Nova Southeastern University Law Library and Technology Center, and the second speaker, created a bibliography of resources available in the Educational Program Handout Materials booklet. Lisa touched upon several pivotal issues, such as looking for guidance in the mission statement of your organization to determine whether providing electronic resources supports your institutional goals.

Stay aware of legal issues, such as privacy concerns. If the publisher wants user information, they should keep it confidential. Rights and obligations of both parties should be clearly spelled out. After you’ve posted the appropriate copyright information on your web site, and told your library users what their rights and responsibilities are, make sure that the publisher absolves you of any liability for copyright infringement committed by third parties. Is there mandatory arbitration? If you end up suing a
vendor, whose law will govern? Frequently the vendor says you have to sue them in their home state.

Cover the basics such as downloads, email, print, and ILL. Read over warranties. If the vendor has to bring a website down for a scheduled maintenance, ask them to notify you ahead of time. Do you have to return older CD’s to the publisher once you’ve received the update? Consult with IT to confirm whether you’re going to need to buy additional hardware to support the subscription.

The third speaker Kermit F. Lowery, Assistant General Counsel, Senior Director and Manager of the Customer Legal Services Group at Lexis Nexus discussed licenses from the vendor’s point of view. When customers don’t agree with the standard licensing form, Kermit does all of the customer legal contracts. He knows from experience that Lexis Nexus is willing to negotiate license agreements.

Kermit explained that the reason for having license agreements is primarily to protect intellectual property and proprietary data. Not only Lexis Nexus but also third party suppliers, and federal and state government regulators insist that the information be protected. Lexis Nexus needs to protect themselves against the misappropriation of data, from a clients’ wrongful use, or the use of erroneous information provided by third party suppliers. They are required to keep track of who uses their data and to what purpose because Lexis Nexus must able to report back to government regulators. Licenses are also used because the information they provide is on loan rather then sold to the consumer. “We’re not transferring property. We are merely licensing the opportunity to have access to and the ability to use the data in the database.”

In conclusion, what are our hopes for the future? How about renewals at a lower rate; user statistics; less bundling of additional content, and less content overlap and duplication? Consider taking technology into your own hands by looking into your own remedies for tracking statistics, or purchasing software to track usage. If problems occur, talk to CRIV who may have suggestions and lobbying capabilities. Stick together and share concerns on listservs where vendors listen.

The best preparation for dealing with licensing agreements is learning from experience. Be flexible, willing to give on some points to get a better deal. Taking part in more negotiations will help you become more comfortable with the whole process.

---

**Electronic Surveillance: Recent Legal Developments**

David Sobel, General Counsel of the Electronic Privacy Information Center, presented a provocative and timely report on new means of electronic surveillance. Mr. Sobel argues that it is difficult for law to keep up with the lightning speed of new technology developments, and sometimes the complexity of modern technology can escape the drafters of legislation. In 1975, just after Watergate, the Church Committee urged Congress to guard against the “awesome technology” within the National Security Agency. Compare today’s technology to that of 1975, and the problem becomes apparent. A case in point is the USA Patriot Act.

The Patriot Act (1) expands government surveillance power, (2) limits judicial review, (3) blurs the distinction between law enforcement and intelligence surveillance, and (4) extends transactional surveillance to the Internet.

Transactional surveillance devices (also referred to as pen registers) resemble Caller ID rather than wiretaps, and consequently there is no requirement of probable cause. Instead, the desired information must be merely “relevant” to an ongoing investigation. Moreover, a judge is required to sign the order for the installation of a pen register without the ability to use his/ her discretion. Proper transactional surveillance on the Web is difficult because messages are split up into packets. As a result, if the Internet service provider can’t separate out the name of the recipient, agents end up receiving entire messages instead. Mr. Sobel concludes that this overcollecting interferes with legitimate investigation and invades the privacy of citizens. The FBI’s pen register is known as Carnivore.

Government agents can also decode passwords in order to access email through “key logger” technology. In U.S. v. Scarfo, the defense contended that key logger is equivalent to a wiretap. The government invoked the Classified Information Procedures Act to prevent access to specific details of the technique. Because the decision in Scarfo would have been written after September 11, Scarfo chose to plea bargain, and thus lost the opportunity to appeal. Magic Lantern technology allows remote installation of Internet surveillance. It works through a virus, so there is no need for physical access to the computer itself. For more information on Scarfo, see <http://www.epic.org/crypto/scarfo.html>.

---
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The best step to hiring successfully is to attract the best candidates. Accomplish this by careful and thoughtful writing of the job description.

**Developing the job description**

The best step to hiring successfully is to attract the best candidates from the start. Accomplish this by careful and thoughtful writing of the job description.

What is your library’s mission and that of your organization? What composition of staff does this require? Everyone in your organization needs to agree on what you are looking for. List responsibilities in descending order of how much time they take in the workday. Don’t let qualified candidates get away by making the “skills/responsibilities” section of the job announcement too narrow. For example, asking for “experience cataloging legal A/V materials” may turn away a very qualified cataloger who has been cataloging nonlegal A/V materials for years and could quickly adapt to cataloging legal materials.

The choice of publications in which the job advertisement appears affects the type and quality of applicants for your position. For example, many libraries advertise in ALA’s *American Libraries*, but this often has too broad a geographical scope. Be creative when choosing where to place your ad.

To attract the best candidates you must offer an attractive package. We have all seen those job announcements that look like three jobs rolled into one, and to add insult to injury the salary range is too low. Asking the world and offering low pay is a red flag that you may have unrealistic expectations of, or are unclear about, what you are looking for.

Since your HR department will be involved in the hiring process it is best to work with them when writing the job description. Most HR people are not familiar with the operations of the library, so talk to your HR representative not only about the library but specifically about technical services. They can scan resumes more effectively if they understand the environment in which the candidate will be working. Ask your HR rep to brief your screening committee on legal issues they need to be aware of to avoid legal action resulting from a negative hiring process.

**Screening candidates**

If you receive many weak or inappropriate applications, this may reflect that applicants don’t understand the nature of the job or your work environment. This might be due to a poorly written job description. It also may be a red flag that the candidate is applying for a job for which they are not qualified. If the cover letter and resume are overly slick or don’t mesh with the job description, this can be a sign that the candidate has manipulated their resume so as to make it through the first phase of the selection process.

Another red flag to watch out for is the candidate who applies for a TS position but whose application materials show a lack of interest or experience in technical services. This candidate may be applying for your TS position mainly out of a motivation to escape public service.

**Interviewing**

Establish rapport with the candidate and draw them out by asking open-ended questions. Ask all candidates the same questions. When explaining the position to the candidate, let them know that adding value to their position is expected of them above and beyond their core job requirements. Explain the culture and hierarchy of your organization, and show the candidate the environment in which they would be working.

Because a candidate’s past actions are one of the most effective indicators of their future success, asking behavioral interview questions such as “Tell me about a time when you…” will give you...
a more insightful look into a candidate’s potential than hypothetical questions such as “What would you do if…?” Avoid making judgments of the candidate based on personal or cultural biases, as this is a major red flag which can not only cause an interview to fail but it can also be illegal.

Checking references

Get a release from the candidate to check references. Check references over the phone rather than in writing, and make sure it is a good time for the reference to talk. Describe the position, and then ask questions which are related to the desired skills and attributes of the job and to the questions you asked the candidate in the interview. Ask the same questions of all references. It may be necessary to also conduct a criminal background check on a prospective employee.

Hiring

Once you have hired the candidate who seems best for the job, finish up your good hiring practices by providing them with an effective orientation. Have a probation period to protect yourself in case the candidate doesn’t work out. But hopefully, if you watched out for the red flags and followed the advice given in this program, you will have “Hired the Right Technical Services Candidate the First Time!”

---
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Creating Connections in the Serials World

Jean M. Pajerek
Cornell Law Library
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Many libraries have implemented, or are in the process of implementing, integrated library systems that feature predictive check-in of continuations and require the establishment of publication patterns for each title the library intends to check in. There is tremendous duplication of effort as individual libraries all across the country find themselves establishing predictive publication patterns for many of the same titles. If holdings data could be created and distributed in a standardized way, libraries could share the work of establishing publication patterns, much as we already share the work of creating bibliographic and authority records. Libraries could realize significant time savings by using publication patterns already established by other libraries instead of “re-inventing the wheel” with each check-in pattern. This is the idea behind the CONSER Publication Pattern Initiative [http://lcweb.loc.gov/acq/conser/patthold.html], overseen by the CONSER Task Force on Publication Patterns and Holdings.

The first portion of program C-2 at the AALL meeting in Orlando (“Publication Patterns: Creating Connections in the Serials World”) was prepared by Ellen Rappaport of Albany Law School and presented by Linda Miller, Senior Automation Planning Specialist at the Library of Congress. Ms. Rappaport’s presentation provided an outline of the CONSER Publication Pattern Initiative and its accomplishments. The Publication Pattern Initiative has as its mission the “cooperative creation, sharing, and distribution of pattern and holdings data via the CONSER database and among local systems, and [the promotion of] full use of the MARC 21 Format for Holdings Data (MFHD) by library systems.”

A successful two-year pilot program to add serials pattern data to the CONSER database was recently completed, resulting in pattern data being added to over 43,000 bibliographic records in OCLC. The pattern data are expressed in linked pairs of 85x and 86x fields. The 85x fields contain caption and frequency information and the 86x fields contain enumeration and chronology data. These data are intended to be manipulated by OPAC software to create a meaningful holdings display. During the pilot project, participating libraries added basic-level caption and pattern data (field 853) and enumeration and chronology data (field 863) to CONSER records in OCLC; the data are embedded in 891 fields within the bibliographic records (see example below).
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The 853/863 pairs are linked by the values encoded in subfield 8. Fields with the same value in subfield 8 are linked to each other. In the above example, the number 1 in subfield 8 in the 853 field and the first number 1 in subfield 8 in the 863 field indicate that the two fields are a linked pair. In the 863 field, the second element (following the period) in subfield 8 is the “sequence number,” which determines the order of display of the linked fields (lower sequence numbers display before higher ones). If there are multiple 863 fields associated with a single 853 field, each 863 has its own sequence number encoded in subfield 8.

While the pilot program has been deemed a success, further work remains to be done, including the integration of pattern creation and maintenance as a formal part of the CONSER program. More libraries must be recruited as contributors, and more needs to be done to encourage ILS vendors to develop systems that support MARC holdings.

One of the goals of the CONSER Publication Pattern Initiative is to work with integrated library system (ILS) vendors on the development of software that will be able to interpret the data in the 891 fields and convert them into a local serial control record.
without human intervention. Ted Fons of Innovative Interfaces was the second speaker, presenting an ILS vendor’s perspective on MARC holdings implementation and the CONSER Publication Pattern Initiative. Referring to a survey of ILS vendors conducted in the summer of 2000 by the CONSER Task Force on Publication Patterns and Holdings <http://www.loc.gov/acq/conser/vendorsurvey.html>, Mr. Fons asserted that vendors are doing a “fairly good job” of designing their systems to accommodate the good job” of designing their systems. However, vendors have not done such a good job in allowing publication patterns to be shared among their customers. Although this situation is being ameliorated by the CONSER Publication Pattern Initiative, vendors still face the challenge of developing new products and features that comply with standards such as the MARC 21 Holdings Format, while still supporting system features that work well, but are not based on standards because they were developed before the standards came into widespread use. Innovative Interfaces has developed a “loader” program that automatically creates serials check-in records in the local system based on pattern data embedded in 891 fields, but most integrated library systems do not yet support the automatic creation of check-in records.

In the third portion of the program, Linda Miller described specific steps a library can take to ensure that the ILS it purchases supports the emerging national publication patterns database. Ms. Miller takes the position that it is impossible for me to pass up, though the primary target audience was listed as public services librarians. This program took place on July 21, 2002 during the AALL Annual Meeting in Orlando, Florida and was sponsored by the OBS-SIS. Mary Strouse (Catholic University of America) was the coordinator and moderator. Michelle Wu (University of Houston O’Quinn Law Library) and Richard Ameling (St. Louis University Law Library) were the speakers.

Mary Strouse began with an introduction to the topic. Taking a show of hands, she noted the presence of a number of non-catalogers in attendance. She laid the groundwork by emphasizing the importance of having a user-centered catalog. The optimal situation of having the highest quality catalog record, with numerous access points and completely adapted to the needs of the library’s users, is not always possible. Ms. Strouse noted the practical issues of workflow efficiencies that come into play. Creating the perfect catalog record every time significantly slows down the volume of cataloging work that can be achieved. The need to make the material available quickly is at odds with the need to do that in the most economical manner possible.

Ms. Strouse described a typical situation: A reference librarian comes to the cataloger and says that a record is wrong and asks that s/he fix it, as well as all other similar records in the catalog too. The cataloger responds that changing the record would violate a national standard. The reference librarian understands this to mean that the cataloger is not interested in the needs of the user. The purpose of this program was to restructure that

**Rule Maker or Rule Breaker?**

How could any self-respecting cataloger resist a program called “Rule Maker or Rule Breaker?” It was impossible for me to pass up, though
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conversation in such a way that the national standard comment is the beginning of the conversation, not the end.

Violating standards is very different than adapting standards, or what Ms. Strouse calls “disciplined rule breaking.” The goal of national standards is consistency. If the decision is made to consistently catalog differently than the national standards, then there is a higher cost outcome associated with that decision since every shared catalog record will need to be changed to meet the local standard. This cumulates over time and slows the cataloging process considerably, thus affecting how much cataloging can be accomplished. It also introduces the possibility of more human error if records must be edited extensively every time. If you do choose to differ from standards, be sure you know why you are doing it and document it. The goal of cooperative cataloging is to get more records into the bibliographic utilities quickly, so that catalogers can spend saved time adding extra value to records that will benefit their catalog users. When such value is added (e.g., adding table of contents), it is essential that this value be added in such a way that all libraries may benefit from it.

Public services librarians and administrators need to know the conflicting needs facing catalogers. Ms. Strouse cautioned that the cataloging manager is balancing many different needs. S/he is constantly juggling competing concerns and reprioritizing on the fly. It is best to recognize the fact that there will always be records in the catalog that do not meet all users’ needs. Knowing the specific needs of users helps cataloging managers to better meet them. As an advocate for the user, the reference librarian is well-situated to advise the cataloger of those needs.

Michelle Wu began by stating that technical and public services librarians are reaching for the same goal, though perhaps in a slightly different way. It is therefore imperative that they work together. The common goal is simply to serve the patron and this goal is accomplished by providing:

- Easy access
- Predictability/consistency
- Portability (users should be able to take knowledge to other situations/libraries)

Ms. Wu outlined, from a reference librarian’s perspective, what should be done if a catalog record is not meeting a need. Catalogers try to anticipate users’ needs but this is not always possible. So the need for a change should be analyzed. Can the situation be addressed by user education? Is the problem recurring often? The end objective should be pinpointed before the reference librarian approaches the cataloger. But once that is done, the reference librarian must talk to the expert (cataloger), without telling the cataloger what to do. Reference librarians know how users use the catalog and they should convey that knowledge, while leaving judgments about the rules to the cataloger.

Practical examples of enhancements and alterations that can be made to catalog records by collaboration between reference librarians and catalogers were presented next.

- Location determination (e.g. move item to Reserve if often used or goes missing)
- Added titles or subjects (popular names, e.g. commonly know as “Green book”)
- Scope notes (reference librarians should ask catalogers how certain subject headings are assigned; cataloger may point to authority record)
- Related links (guides that go along with related works)
- Form/genre (format) information

Other examples of innovations were then given:

- Local changes (only for your patrons)
- Call numbers and subject headings (SACO)
- Names, uniform titles (NACO)
- Changes to MARC standards (MARBI)

Ms. Wu summed up by saying that catalogers and reference librarians can work together to create a better catalog and to address the differences between actual use of the catalog and anticipated use of the catalog. This dialog is essential!

“Standards and Real Life: Reasonable Accommodation in the Law Library” was the title Richard Amelung gave to his portion of the program. He advised steering clear of the “just say no” approach to catalog change requests. Standards are guidelines that work to our benefit by providing:

- Predictability (it always displays right here on the screen because it is stored in the same place in the record; if not there, it is lacking or not appropriate)
- Possibility (if x is like this, then y should be like that; allows user to make analogies)
- Portability (different definition: data transferability from one system to another)

It is best to be able to recognize what is a reasonable accommodation (or not) and why. Mr. Amelung then proceeded to sketch out seven request situations. Except for one, these situations were all real. He read the request, listed all the cataloging tools the cataloger must consult, asked for a judgment from Mary and Michelle as to whether the request was reasonable or not, and then described how the situation could be handled. During this process, Mr. Amelung raised pertinent questions that must be asked, as well as both the short and long-term ramifications that must be considered.

As an example, request #1 read: “Our professor just wrote a book with three friends, but can’t find it in the catalog under his name. Please add his name to the record.”

Mr. Amelung responded by saying that they now encourage their professors not to write with so many people, but if they must, that they should be sure their name is listed first. Moving on to a...
more serious response, he listed the relevant standards involved. In this particular case, they are: AACR2, the LCRIIs (Library of Congress Rule Interpretations), and the Descriptive Cataloging Manual. He quoted the shared responsibility rule, or as he referred to it, the rule of four, which says that in such a situation, access to only the first named author should be given. However, the rules do advise that if a heading will provide important access, the cataloger should add it. Mr. Amelung said that this should be done locally. Ms. Strouse and Ms. Wu agreed that this was a reasonable request.

The remaining six request situations illustrated very nicely the profusion of standards that catalogers are faced with on a daily basis: AACR2, LCRIIs, LCSH (Library of Congress Subject Headings), SCM (Subject Cataloging Manual: Subject Headings), LCC (Library of Congress classification schedules), MARC 21, bibliographic utility standards (OCLC and RLIN), and local and consortium systems standards. There are numerous forces driving technical services, not just AACR2. It is all the standards, all the time, coming at catalogers, who must consider and apply them as appropriate.

In seeking solutions, Mr. Amelung suggested that certain questions must be asked:

- Who is being served? (Think of primary patrons first.)
- What is the desired outcome? What, not how?
- While x is being done, y is not being done. Is that acceptable?
- Can you achieve the same thing another way?
- Can you have it all? (Answer: probably not! Tradeoffs are necessary.)

Ms. Strouse closed with the comment that continuous education is essential for catalogers. If they take the opportunity to participate in the national discussion that changes those rules and standards, they can influence the changes and thereby better meet the needs of their users.

This was a terrific program! It reinforced the importance of establishing an ongoing dialog between catalogers and public services staff in a clear and clever way and it achieved its goal of attracting non-catalogers to the presentation. The title was deliberately provocative. If it were up to me, I might have renamed it “Rule Maker or Rule Bender.” I never think of myself as “breaking” the cataloging rules, though I have at times seen myself as “bending” them a bit to better meet the needs of our users. After all, since the overall philosophy underlying the cataloging rules and standards is to provide the best possible service to library users, how can we really be “breaking” those rules when we do all we can to achieve that goal? The trick, as pointed out so well in this program, is to weigh all the ramifications of your decisions carefully and to do your best to achieve a balance that provides the consistency so essential to our users.

What I Learned About Preservation From Visits to 30 Libraries and How It Applies To You

Between facing questions about licensing electronic resources and cataloging the internet, have you wondered recently what could be done about those volumes full of acidic paper that are crumbling in your stacks? Preservation is all about the physical state of our collections. Exercising care for our current collections and planning for their future preservation is the only way to extend the life of the physical materials in our libraries. This program reminded us of our responsibility for preservation and offered many simple solutions to that end.

Pat Turpening, Head of Preservation and Archives at the University of Cincinnati Law Library, opened the program with two startling statistics: libraries currently spend approximately $1.2 billion on legal information and 85% of today’s acquisitions budget is spent on hard cover books. This investment deserves our utmost attention to the storage and maintenance of our physical resources.

Ms. Turpening took sabbatical leave in 2000-2001 to visit 30 law libraries in Ohio, Kentucky, Illinois, and Michigan. The purpose of her visits was to survey the current state of preservation in those libraries, to conduct preservation workshops, and to recommend actions that could be taken. She selected a good cross-section of academic, private and court libraries, and found positives (e.g. food and drink policies displayed prominently, HVAC controls in place) and negatives (e.g mold damage, uncovered windows) in every library. Very few formal in-house preservation programs exist in the surveyed libraries.

Among Ms. Turpening’s findings and recommendations, she emphasized that many preservation problems can be prevented by planning. The greatest need is for awareness and teaching of staff and users about good care of books. Most librarians are aware of the need for preservation but avoid incorporating preservation activities into collection management because “they are too expensive” or “there isn’t enough staff” or “we don’t have any training”. Support from the director of the library is essential for success in budgeting and planning. One person on the staff should have ultimate responsibility for the library’s preservation program.
AALL should bear some responsibility for educating its members about preservation. A basic course on preservation and book repair is highly desirable. Among the surveyed libraries, Ms. Turpening found a lot of interest but not a lot of action to preserve materials, which will eventually result in no usable books left on our library shelves.

Mary Rider, Head of Technical Services at Moritz Law Library of the Ohio State University, spoke from the perspective of one of the surveyed libraries. OSU was able to follow up on Ms. Turpening’s visit with some immediate fixes in the shelving of oversize books, pamphlet binding options, and their backlog of volumes in poor condition. They have also implemented training in simple book repairs for staff and teaching shelving-friendly practices to student workers. At Ms. Turpening’s suggestion, Ms. Rider has sought out local experts for identifying what can be repaired in-house and for training in minor repairs. What OSU learned from Pat’s visit should be instructive to all libraries:

- Look for simple solutions
- Take advantage of existing services, such as a commercial bindery
- Plan preservation projects to build enthusiasm and momentum for getting the job done
- Involve student workers and incorporate preservation training in regular staff and student training

Although this program was scheduled in the conference’s final time slot, interest was high and the speakers used slides effectively to capture attention. Ms. Turpening provided photos of the types of damage being inflicted on books through poor shelving and environmental practices. Ms. Rider gave many specific examples of simple solutions that have been achieved at OSU.


Brian Striman announced he is stepping down as Coordinator/Moderator of the Research Roundtable (or RRT). Chris Long volunteered several months ago to take over. Paul Healey, Editorial Director of AALL Spectrum was the guest speaker. There were twenty-two librarians in attendance.

Copies of the OBS/TS Joint Research Grant applications were made available, with a brief discussion that this grant is awarded to qualifying applicants who can be awarded a total of $1,000, funds permitting. This is a shared grant with $500 from TS and OBS. More information about the grant is available at the OBS or TS web sites. Copies of a “Publishing kit” compiled by Brian Striman were made available and distributed to those attending the Roundtable.

Brian talked about the July 2002 issue of AALL Spectrum, noting that there are several articles devoted to writing. Kevin Butterfield, Chair of AALL’s Research Committee, and Ellen McGrath (who will be coming on board to that committee) also attended the RRT. They reminded us that there is money for research projects and that they encourage technical services law librarians to consider their Committee as a source for funding when doing research and writing.

Most of the rest of the Roundtable time was devoted to Mr. Healey who discussed some of the writing he did and why he did it and the advantages of writing for publication at large, as well as for AALL. He talked about a writer’s expectations and a publisher/editor’s expectations, and focused much of his discussions around Spectrum. He said he started writing professionally as a result of a paper he wrote in library school where his assignment was to answer a question on liability of librarians (Paul was one of the few lawyers in class). It was later published and he won an award in a papers competition. Paul said that in the library business, if it is about the profession and in English, it will be published. He continued his talk about how he would do his writing on his own time. It may not sound too good to the inexperienced librarian, but spending that time, even if it’s your own time, gets your name out there for exposure, especially if you are new in the profession. It paid off for him when he went to University of Illinois where publishing requirements for librarians are the same as for other “teaching” faculty. Paul said it’s hard to get the time to do it, but it’s essential and may shorten your tenure track approval time because of all the writing you do. Part of the success he enjoys now, from all that writing work is that it led him to be chosen as the successful candidate for editorial director of Spectrum, and one
of his new priorities now is to rustle the bushes to get people to write.

He said he hears from people that feel the work they do and the issues, challenges, solutions and ideas that they wrestle with are so specialized that no one else would be interested in reading about it. They feel that they are dealing daily with pieces of minutiae and details not worth writing about. Paul’s encouragement for the group was: “You DO, in fact, know things that your colleagues don’t know that would be of interest to them… You can’t assume that others know what you know.” He cited an example with Jolande Goldberg’s work on the K schedules, and she recently won the Joseph L. Andrews award for her work. If you notice, many of the awards in our association are for the recognition of excellence in skilled, in-depth work that was published.

Paul continued by stating that librarians already possess, or should possess, the language skills to write, that we need to think about something we would like to see researched and written that hasn’t been done yet, and that we should include responding to things about the way our profession works about which we disagree. For Paul, the writing process is not easy. He said that if you are willing to work on the writing and idea, you will find someone to publish it. It’s a good idea to have in your mind some potential places in mind as your “target audience.” He volunteered to look at our ideas first as possible submissions to Spectrum. It’s okay to talk to him before you start writing (rough outline stage), but he prefers to share with any editor your idea plus a rough outline you have drafted up. In most cases, if it is an idea they are interested in, they will guide you as to length, and most appropriate style. Editors are most comfortable working with successive drafts. Articles need to fit in with the purpose and mission of the publication. It’s a good idea to start your publishing opportunities by opening a dialog with the people who might want to publish your article.

Another thing Paul is looking into is the need to profile the various SIS’s for different issues, such as the work they do and their organization, including substantive areas of each SIS. These series of articles would let others in the organization know what it does for people, why they enjoy it, how it’s a voice, how it functions and why they should be a part of it. The goal is to get every SIS profiled, each with a 750 – 1000 words limit.

Diana C. Jaque spoke about her work editing review columns in LLJ. She would like to see more diversity in the contributors. They work far in advance, for the quarterly issues. They have guidelines for the reviews, and if you volunteer, you can be put on a list to pick the book and you get a review copy of the book directly from the publisher. They profile what the best library setting appropriate for what set of topics, and you look for authority of authors, and doing comparisons of different resources. It’s best that this column represent all sections of AALL.

Debbie Wynot had an idea for an article about using a free form database instead of a turnkey system. Brian Striman wondered about a TSLL “technology review” column, but an editor would be needed and so forth, to get the column going.

Ruth Balkin spoke about some special database or software for sharing data, and someone recommended the Technoids discussion list, or even the TS discussion list, to pose her question. The last topic for discussion, which we didn’t have much time to explore, was getting paid for article submissions in professional journals or other publishing sources. Apparently, there are some Special Library Association publications that do pay authors for their published works.

Minutes taken by Ruth Balkin, Balkin Library & Information Services; edited by Brian Striman, University of Nebraska
I. The meeting was called to order, and a count of the members confirmed there were over 30 members present, which enabled the Section to conduct business.

II. Joe Thomas presented the Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award to Janis Johnston

III. Executive Officers’ Reports

A. Secretary/Treasurer Report:
1. Members approved last year’s business Meeting minutes as published in TSSL.
2. 251 ballots out of 614 mailed were returned resulting in 41% of the membership participating in the election of Gary Vander Meer as Vice-Chair/Chair Elect, Patricia Sayre-McCoy as Secretary/Treasurer, and Lorraine Lorne as Member-at-Large. A motion to destroy the ballots was passed.
3. Copies of the year’s budget summary were distributed. The year’s budget, as of 5/31/2002 [$1,764.60], does not include expenses for the Annual Meeting or the fourth issue of TSSL.

B. Member-at-Large Angelina Joseph:
1. The Joint Reception took place at the Conference Center on July 20, 2002 from 6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. 209 people attended. Angelina thanked Innovative Interfaces for handling the entire cost and mentioned that TS SIS contributed money for corsages and boutonnieres for Innovative Interface’s staff.
2. Because Kathleen Pecarovich could not attend the Annual Meeting, Angelina took charge of our Activities Area table. She asked for more volunteers.

IV. Standing Committees’ Reports

Acquisitions Committee - Chair Karen Douglas reported on the successful new developments in acquisitions workshop given at American University and thanked those involved. She also announced that the Acquisitions Committee would be meeting Monday, July 22, 2002, at 7:00 a.m. in the Peabody Hotel and that the Acquisitions Roundtable would take place Tuesday, July 23 from 5:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m., also in the Peabody Hotel.

Cataloging and Classification Committee - Chair Nancy Poehlmann reported on the Administrative Subcommittee and that the survey on how paraprofessionals were used would be in LLJ. She announced that the Cataloging and Classification Roundtable would feature Susan Goldner and Richard Amelung speaking on revised AACR2 Chapter 12. The Beginning and Intermediate Cataloging for Law Librarians workshops were successful. To end her report, she reminded the membership that the Committee would meet at 7:00 a.m. Tuesday morning, July 23, 2002 in the Convention Center.

Preservation Committee - Chair Will Meredith said the preservation plan was still being studied and that he was resigning as Chair. A new Chair is needed. He mentioned there was a preservation related program at 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, July 24, 2002. Chair JoAnn Hounshell asked that people interested in volunteering for Chair of the Preservation Committee contact her.

Serials Committee - Chair Andrea Rabbia reported 18 members attended last year’s committee meeting. They:
- Distributed Marla Schwatz’s Report as the BASIC Representative
- Discussed establishing an AALL representative to NASIG
- Discussed program ideas
- Selected a volunteer to coordinate the newly merged Exchange Committee with the Serials Committee. Andrea recognized the work of Paddy Satzer, who administered the Exchange and Duplicates program, which netted $1,074.
- One program proposal was accepted for this year, “Publication Patterns: Creating Connections in the Serials World.”

V. Special Committee Reports

Awards Committee - Chair Lorna Tang reported that this year the Committee was responsible for the Chapman Award and the new educational grants, which are intended to cover registration to AALL workshops only. Grants were given to one new technical services librarian, Wendy Medvetz, for the acquisitions workshop, one non-academic technical services librarian, Cindy Buhi, for the basic cataloging workshop, and another to a not so new technical services librarian, Christy Ryan, who due to sudden illness, could not use it for the intermediate cataloging workshop. Lorna also thanked her committee for their hard work.

Education Committee - Chair, Patricia Sayre-McCoy, thanked the committee members (the TS SIS Committee Chairs and volunteers). Five TS programs were approved for this annual meeting plus one workshop. A proposed SECO workshop had to be withdrawn but will be submitted again. She also called for topics for next year and reminded that the Committee would meet on Wednesday, July 24, 2002, from 12:15 p.m. to 1:30 p.m. Next year’s Chair will be Kathy Winzer.

Nominations Committee - Chair, Betty Roeske, recognized the members of her Committee and stated the charge to find a diversification of candidates. Candidates should come from the private law libraries, court libraries, etc. and represent as many areas of the country as possible. She asked that everyone think of candidates when the call for nominations goes out.

VI. Other Reports

A. Christina Tarr, who was in charge of the membership survey, related 102 members or 16% of the membership, responded to the survey. Membership
placed highest value on TSLL and expressed enthusiasm for the columns. Paper copy is still desired by some. The educational programs placed second and members wanted a broader mission, more local programs, more management programs, and better, more flexible program scheduling. Members also felt the strategic plan needed to be more concrete. Chris thanked Martin Wisneski for putting the survey on the TS SIS web site. She informed the membership that there would be a web site meeting on Tuesday, July 23, 2002, at 10:00 a.m.

B. Susan Goldner, the MARBI Representative, told us that during the January and June meetings MARBI had 17 proposals and 8 discussion papers. Topics included the changes to Formats for Holdings Data, adding URIs to various fields, additions to the character set, and changes to accommodate Faceted Application of Subject Terminology (FAST), an OCLC project. The most interesting topic was FRBR (Fundamental Requirements for Bibliographic Records). It is supposed to apply more of a user perspective and connecting links. Due to the AACR2 Chapters 9 and 12 revisions, MARC21 has under gone more changes, such as the repeatable 260s. These changes were published last October, but Library of Congress will not implement the AACR2 revision and the LCRIs until December. OCLC and RLN may redo their systems in the summer of 2003. We will be able to add serials fields to looseleafs and electronic resources when Library of Congress implements the changes in December. A summary and full report is on the TS SIS website.

C. Brian Striman, the Chair of the OBS/TS Joint Research Grant Committee, reported that Larry Dershem, recipient of a year 2000 grant has finished his report and Susan Goldner and Lorraine Lorne have a draft of the index to TSLL. Brian feels more public relations is needed. He also wants to step down. There is a possible replacement for 2003/4. Chris Long will write Brian’s column. He announced that research grant applications were available at this meeting.

D. Joe Thomas, the TSLL editor, told the members that four issues of volume 27 of TSLL were printed and distributed. 800 copies of each cost $1.70 each for a total of $5,462. All columns will continue as replacement columnists have been found for all those leaving. There will be reporters at all the TS SIS programs at the AALL Annual Meeting. Cindy May, Martin Wisneski, and Linda Tesar were thanked.

E. Betty Roeske, who is in charge of the TS SIS list, reported that there are 569 people on the TS SIS list. She reminded the members that the list would auto-populate in August/September. If they do not wish to be on the list, they will have to unsubscribe themselves. She also requested that they check their e-mail addresses on AALLNET to be sure the correct ones are there.

F. Melody Lembke, the Annual Meeting Educational Programming Special Committee Representative informed us that a final report and recommendations, based on a survey of members on what they liked and disliked, had been sent to the AALL Board but had been tabled. The Educational Policy Committee and the SIS Counsel are to see it. The Committee made four recommendations:

1. The Professional Development Committee should look at the professional competencies criteria for evaluation of the programs.
2. Programs should proportionally represent the population of the membership of the SISs.
3. Job function should be added to the appointment guidelines for the AMPC to enhance the charge in the selection of members on the AMPC.
4. Committee meetings should be allowed during the programs but not during the plenary sessions. The thirty minute programs could possibly be used for reports, like that from the MARBI Representative, but would still need approval from the AALL Program Committee.

VII. New Business

A. All amendments to the TS SIS by-law quickly passed. No one wished to discuss them.

B. Gary Vander Meer noted that the TS SIS Handbook was not included in the overall handbook for the SISs given to all the SIS chairs. He was assured our handbook had been sent in time but somehow AALL Headquarters had dropped the ball.

C. Alva Stone sought confirmation that the SAC and CCDA reports would be given at the Cataloging and Classification Committee meeting. JoAnn reassured that this was so. She also confirmed the BASIC report would be in the next issue of TSLL.

D. JoAnn thanked Alva Stone for her work on the TS SIS Handbook, Martin Wisneski for his web work, Lorna Tang and the Awards Committee, Betty Roeske for answering calls for help, and Northwestern University.

VIII. Installation of new TS SIS Chair

A. JoAnn introduced the new Chair (Christina Tarr) and presented her with the book, Standard Parliamentary Procedure.

B. Chris thanked JoAnn and stated, as the Chair of the TS SIS, she would be looking into the TS SIS strategic plan and pushing educational opportunities. She also asked people to come up with ideas for programs and to attend the TS SIS Educational Programming Committee.

IX. Motion was made to adjourn and passed.

Respectfully submitted,

Pam Deemer
Secretary/Treasurer,
2001-2002
This year, the Technical Services SIS Awards Committee has been quite busy. In addition to selecting a recipient for the Renee D. Chapman Award, we have also awarded three educational grants to three very deserving technical services law librarians. However, the Committee members all enjoy working on the committee because it is fun to give away monies for a very good cause.

Members of this year’s TS-SIS Awards Committee are Linda Kawaguchi McLane (University of California Berkeley School of Law Library), Chris Long (Indiana University School of Law Library at Indianapolis), Ellen McGrath (The University At Buffalo, State University of New York, Charles B. Sears Law Library), Eugenia Minor (University of Mississippi Law Library) and myself as the Chair.

As soon as the Annual Meeting was over last year, we began to solicit applications for the acquisitions workshop held in Washington D.C. from November 2nd to 3rd 2001. We had five applicants but the Committee decided to award one grant for each workshop. This way our modest grant of $1,500 this year can be used to support more librarians to attend technical services workshops and this will also help publicize the availability of this educational grant. Wendy Medvetz from the Capital University Law Library was chosen as the first recipient of the Educational Grant. Her report of the acquisitions workshop has been published in the Technical Services Law Librarian.

At last year’s conference, we all thought it was too late to solicit applications for the Basic Law Cataloging Workshop scheduled to take place in September 2001. Unfortunately, the tragedy of September 11 happened and the Workshop was postponed to March 2002. This gave the Committee the opportunity to solicit and award the 2nd educational grant. We had four applicants and the grant was awarded to Cindy Buhi at the Washington State Attorney General’s Law Library. We were very pleased that we could help a law librarian working in a non-academic setting to attend the Basic Law Cataloging workshop held in Chicago.

In May we awarded our third and final education grant to Christy Ryan from the University of Tulsa School of Law Library for her attendance at the pre-conference workshop, Advanced Law Cataloging, to be held in Orlando, Florida, on July 20, 2002. Unfortunately, Christy became seriously ill before the conference and was not able to attend the workshop.

As for the Renee D. Chapman Award, it was a difficult decision for the Committee to make. We had three excellent nominees and each of them deserved this award. The committee looked at the timing and the progress of each nominee’s career path and decided to give this year’s Award to Janis Johnston, Director of the Law Library at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Janis is moving on in her career, but we know that technical services will always be close at her heart.

The committee has had a busy year, but we all cherished the opportunity to help and to recognize the wonderful work done by our colleagues.

Submitted by Lorna Tang, Chair

---

The Administration Subcommittee, charged with investigating libraries’ use of paraprofessionals in copy cataloging, developed a brief survey on copy cataloging practices, which was distributed in February 2002 via the TS SIS and AUTOCAT lists. We received 70 responses to the survey, reflecting a broad cross-section of the library community: 23 responses were from academic law libraries, 1 represented a public law library, 2 were submitted by government libraries, and 1 by a law firm library. Representing the non-law libraries, 12 from public libraries, and 1 from an independent research institute library.

The survey data reflects a fair range of practice in the choice of library materials for copy cataloging, the extent to which paraprofessionals are employed in copy cataloging, the extent to which they edit copy, and the extent to which paraprofessionals’ supervisors revise their work. Though a surprisingly large number of libraries responding have no written procedures which they use for training, the survey did yield quite a few references to published training materials, and numerous libraries offered to share URLs for their own web-mounted training materials. Several other libraries also have offered to share with us procedures that they have available in print form only.

**Summary of Survey Responses**

1. **What is your job title?**

While exact job duties cannot always be extrapolated from the title of a position, especially when institutions’ relative sizes are unknown, the 70 respondents characterized themselves as follows:
13 indicated that they were Heads of Technical Services, or had job titles suggestive of that function; 18 were Head of Cataloging, or Senior Catalogers; 23 described themselves as Catalogors or Catalog Librarians; a few job titles also suggested systems, acquisitions, serials, or government documents responsibilities; 12 are in positions called “Technical Services Librarian”; 1 was a Library Manager; 1 was a Database Management Librarian; 2 were paraprofessionals.

The only generalization that can be made is that, depending on institution, supervision of cataloging paraprofessionals is done by staff at varying levels, some of whom may have additional responsibilities unrelated to cataloging, and in some cases may involve paraprofessionals’ supervising other paraprofessionals.

2. What type of copy is used for copy-cataloging in your library?

Most libraries indicated that they use both LC and shared copy, edited when necessary:
- LC and shared copy, both edited if necessary: 53 libraries;
- LC copy accepted as is, shared edited as needed: 10 libraries;
- LC accepted as is, shared accepted as is: 2 libraries;
- LC copy only: 3 libraries;
- No copy cataloging done at all: 2 libraries.

Several libraries also indicated that, although they do edit LC and shared records, the editing done is typically quite minimal.

3. What types of materials are designated as copy-cataloging in your library?

In response to this question, most libraries indicated a willingness to use available copy for most formats they collect:
- Monographs, serials, and nonprint: 50 libraries, most specifying a wide range of nonprint formats cataloged as copy;
- Monographs and serials: 4 libraries;
- Monographs only: 11 libraries;
- Monographs and selected nonprint formats only: 3 libraries;
- No response: 2 libraries.

4. Do paraprofessionals copy-catalog materials in your library?

Most libraries indicated they do employ paraprofessionals as copy-catalogers, qualified by materials’ format in some cases:
- Yes: 54 libraries; one library indicated that 75% of all copy-cataloging is done by student assistants;
- Yes, depending on type material and quality of copy available: 8 libraries;
- No: 8 libraries.

5. Do you revise copy-cataloging done by paraprofessionals?

Although a few libraries responded that copy-cataloging done by paraprofessionals is always revised, most indicated that revision ceased, or was done on demand only, after an initial training period:
- Yes, on an ongoing basis: 8 libraries;
- Yes, during training: 33 libraries; most of these indicated that they continued to revise copy-cataloging after this period on request;
- No (presumably this means after training has been completed): 20 libraries;
- No answer or N/A: 9 libraries.

6. Does your library obtain any of its catalog records from an outside source? If yes, do paraprofessionals load and/or do any checking of these records?

Many respondents believed that this question referred to the use of OCLC as an outside source of copy. Those responses have been broken out separately where possible. Bear in mind that the lack of definition in the question renders the results somewhat unreliable:
- No records from outside vendors: 28 libraries;
- Yes, from OCLC: 8 libraries; in all cases loaded/edited by paraprofessionals;
- PromptCat or TechPro: 3 libraries; loaded and checked by paraprofessionals in 2 libraries;
- Yes (vendor unspecified): 31 libraries;
- Paraprofessionals load and check: 17 libraries;
- Paraprofessionals load only: 0 libraries;
- Paraprofessionals check records after loading by librarian: 4 libraries;
- Paraprofessionals neither load nor check records: 10 libraries.

7. Have you discovered any published training materials that you find useful in training brand-new copy-catalogers? If so, please list briefly.

47 libraries either gave no answer to this question or indicated that they had found no helpful published materials. Among the titles listed by remaining libraries were:

AACR2R and the Library of Congress Rule Interpretations


CatSkill [Computer file] (1994)


Fritz, Deborah A. *Cataloging with AACR2R and USMARC* (1999)


Kao, Mary Liu. *Cataloging and Classification for Library Technicians.* (2001)

Lembke, Melody Busse. *Cataloging Legal Literature.* (3rd ed.)

Library of Congress. *Cataloging Policy and Support Office. Subject Cataloging Manual* (dates vary for Subject headings, Classification, and Shelflisting volumes)

Taylor, Arlene G. *Wynar’s Introduction to Cataloging and Classification* (2000)

Numerous libraries also identified OCLC documentation and local workshops presented by their regional OCLC providers as being more helpful than any printed materials.

9. If you have web-format procedures available on your library’s site, would you be willing to share the URL with the members of the Administration Subcommittee? Would you be willing to share the URL with other interested members of the law library community, on a web site or in our newsletter?

Numerous libraries offered to share the URLs for their web-mounted training materials, and all but one (which is not listed below) would be willing to have the URL published outside this committee:

- Middlebury College Library <http://www.middlebury.edu/~catalog/>
- University of Colorado Law Library <http://www.colorado.edu/law/lawlib/ts/man/index.html>
- UCSD Libraries <http://hpot.ucsd.edu/>
- University of North Dakota’s Chester Fritz Library <http://www.und.nodak.edu/dept/library/Departments/abc/techhome.htm>
- University of South Carolina Libraries <http://www.sc.edu/library/techserv/catalog/catman.html>
- University of Washington Law Library <http://www.washington.edu/lawlibrary/techmanual>
- UC Berkeley Law Library <http://www.law.berkeley.edu/library/techmanual>
- University of Virginia Law Library <http://www.law.virginia.edu/library/techmanual>
- UC Berkeley Law Library <http://www.law.berkeley.edu/library/techmanual>

Many libraries have no in-house training materials at all. Of those that do, the majority have them in print versions only, though quite a few do declare their eventual intent to put them on the Web. Some libraries have placed, or plan to place, procedures on their intranets only:

- Print training materials only: 30 libraries;
- Print and mounted on intranet: 3 libraries;
- Print and web versions: 8 libraries;
- Web versions only: 4 libraries;
- No written training materials: 25 libraries;

8. Have you any in-house written procedures to train new copy-catalogers?

To this list should be added an annotated bibliography of training sources compiled by Beth Holmes for the Intermediate Law Cataloging Workshop this past summer in Orlando. It may be found at <http://wwwarchives.uga.edu/~eholmes/ Trainingbib.html>

This report fulfills the charge of the Administration Subcommittee. We would be happy to discuss the survey results at our meeting in Seattle.

Respectfully submitted,

Judith A. Vaughan-Sterling
Chair, Administration Subcommittee
The Renee D. Chapman Memorial Award for Outstanding Contributions in Technical Services Law Librarianship is presented at AALL’s Annual Meeting to an individual or a group in recognition of achievement in an area of technical services, for service to the Association, or for outstanding contributions to the professional literature. The TS-SIS Awards Committee is seeking nominations for the award that will be presented in Seattle in 2003.

Factors considered in selecting the recipients of the Award include such things as the publishing, presenting, or sharing of innovative techniques or research, analysis or commentary; the development of software, hardware, or other mechanisms that significantly enhance access to collections; and the contribution of service to the Technical Services SIS as a whole. Achievements may be in the areas of acquisitions, cataloging, and classification, materials processing, preservation, automation, or technical services administration.

All members of AALL are invited to submit names for consideration. Nominations should include the candidate’s full name, title and current firm, company or institution name and address. If the candidate is retired, the name and last place of work and the home address should be submitted. The letter of nomination should be signed by someone other than the individual being nominated, and should accompany a list of projects, programs, or publications of the candidate. The letter should describe the candidate’s work with respect to his or her qualifications for the Award.

Nominations should be submitted by March 1, 2003 to Elizabeth Geesey Holmes, Catalog Librarian, Alexander Campbell King Law Library, University of Georgia School of Law, Athens, GA 30605 (eholmes@arches.uga.edu).