

ACADEMIC LAW LIBRARIES—SPECIAL INTEREST SECTION
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAW LIBRARIES

The ALL-SIS Newsletter

Message From the Chair

Kumar Percy Jayasuriya
2011–2012 ALL-SIS Chair

What can ALL-SIS do for you? Let that be the theme of this ALL-SIS year. Last Spring the Board made a call for your energy and ideas. The simple request reaped a wealth of originality, a collection of innovative projects, and an outpouring of enthusiasm. Most of all the section is working to harness the talents of our members.

Continue the Conversation in Sound and Text

Members can listen to all of the 2011 ALL-SIS sponsored programs. At AALL's invitation each section may independently sponsor educational programs to be held during the AALL annual meeting. However AALL doesn't record them. This year, for the first time, ALL-SIS recorded its independently-sponsored programs and posted the audio recordings online. To listen to any of them, simply point your browser to

the ALL-SIS website. (<http://community.aallnet.org/resources/libraryfolders/?LibraryKey=cea48338-a50d-41c1-9bdb-42ab6af46ad4>) [Ed. Note: you must be logged into AALLnet to access these files.]

Some of the ALL-SIS programs were thought-provoking or controversial. We invite you to continue the discussion by posting a comment on the ALL-SIS e-group. If you couldn't express yourself during the meeting, now is your chance to participate.

Planning for the Future Strategically

Every five years the Section crafts a strategic plan to define the agenda for the coming years. As the

(Continued on page 2)

Inside this issue:

AALL Program Reviews	3 - 20
Legal Inf. & Tech. eJournal Update	20
Call for Papers	21
Law Librarian in the Dark	22
ALL-SIS Reception, Awards & Business	23
AALL Announcements	24
Member News	26

From the Editor

Welcome to Volume 31 of the *ALL-SIS Newsletter!* This issue is focused on reviews of many wonderful programs at the 2011 AALL Annual Meeting in Philadelphia. For those of you who were unable to attend it will hopefully provide some new information. With so many programs in such a short period of time, even those of us who were there may not have been able to attend all the programs of interest to us. It is unfortunate that all

the programs and events could not be memorialized!

Also in this issue the "Law Librarian in the Dark" column by Yasmin Sokkar Harker returns for its third year. Many thanks to Yasmin for continually bringing stimulating law-related films to our attention.

I encourage all readers to write for the *Newsletter*. The members of the News-

(Continued on page 15)

Message from the Chair, Cont'd

(Continued from page 1)

last plan expires, Merle Slyhoff is chairing the Strategic Planning 2012-17 Committee. The committee is drafting a prediction of the future of legal education. With that information the group will write objectives and design goals to guide the section and ultimately advance the interests of academic law libraries.

Curricular Reform

One strategic goal that is easily identified is the need for academic law librarians to participate in the national discussion of curricular reform in legal education. Spurred on by a struggling job market and the publication of the Carnegie Report on legal education, law school administrations across the nation and throughout the tiers are investigating real curricular reform to prepare students to succeed in the upcoming legal profession. ALL-SIS has created two task forces designed to help law libraries participate in the curricular reform and better train young lawyers.

First, Susan Nevelow Mart is leading a two year Task Force on Identifying Skills & Knowledge for Legal Practice. Suggested by the membership, this group is working with law firm librarians around the country and plans to submit a report on how academics can better educate law students.

As a second step, Amanda Runyon is leading the Task Force on Library Marketing and Outreach which has a two-year mission to identify the best ways to market library services within each library's home institution. In order for librarians to participate in the work of their law schools, they must relay their own expertise.

Preparing for Technological Changes

Technology continues to evolve at a speed too fast for any single person to digest. The executive board has organized two groups to lead the discussion of how law libraries can best utilize new electronic innovations. Creighton Miller is chair of the Task Force to Review and Update the ALL-SIS Web Presence. The group will develop ways for the section to utilize social media, audio visual and other new information systems. At the same time, Tom Boone is leading The Task Force on the Use of Mobile Computing. Together the two groups will collect the insights and tools to help all academic law libraries anticipate new and effective uses of emerging technologies.

Que Mas ???

This is just a sample of what ALL-SIS is doing. I haven't even mentioned all of the projects ALL-SIS' standing committees are completing. Also, the executive board will soon announce a few more committees, one on Bluebook issues and another on scholarly communication. There may even be a few more in the works.

Stay tuned for more announcements in the coming weeks.

Most of all please continue to ask what the section can do for you. Let's build upon the energy of the section to advance legal education.

AALL Program Reviews

Supporting Librarian Scholarship

Karin Johnsrud, Fordham University Law School Library

Librarians as authors was the focus of the ALL-SIS sponsored program, "Supporting Librarian Scholarship." Moderator Sara Sampson [Georgetown Law Library] began by urging all librarians to participate in scholarship and explained that the program would highlight three programs that help librarians create publishable works: the Boulder Conference, Georgetown Law Library's Scholarly Writing Program and the AALL Research Grant.

Barbara Bintliff [University of Texas Tarlton Law Library] briefly mentioned how important it is for librarians as professionals to share their expertise with other librarians in order to maintain a strong and engaged profession. She then discussed how the Boulder Conference originated. Every year, the University of Boulder has a summer scholarship conference and she proposed a librarian scholarship conference which was accepted by the university. Barbara stressed the importance of setting and sticking to a budget, adding that a conference does not need to be expensive as her budgets for the first two years were \$2,300 and \$1,800 respectively. In order to plan a conference, there are many details that need to be dealt with, such as setting the date, arranging food and reserving meeting rooms. However, it is very possible to work through all these details by being organized and planning. She also mentioned that it is a great idea to piggyback a new conference onto another existing conference, as the Boulder Conference did with CALI the first year and AALL in the subsequent two years. It is more likely that people will be able to attend if they have two programs to come out for rather than just one. Since this was a scholarship conference, they worked carefully on the timeline for paper submissions, as well as the structure of the conference itself to guarantee that the authors would have time to write before the conference and would receive helpful feedback at the conference.

Next Sara Sampson talked about the Georgetown Scholarly Writing Group which started as an informal

writing group that met once a month for lunch. One of the main discussion points was concern over having actual time to write. After a year, the group proposed a mini writing sabbatical for librarians. The library created a Scholarly Writing Committee to oversee the sabbatical program and to support the publication efforts of all librarians. The leave policy allows a librarian to take up to two weeks per year if approved by the Committee, their supervisor and the Library Director. After the leave, the librarian has to present the project to the group. While originally envisioned as two weeks straight, there has been flexibility in how the leave is organized with many librarians taking a week at a time. The leave program has generated a culture of publication among the librarians and is considered a valuable aspect of the Georgetown Law Library. Adeen Postar [American University Pence Law Library] recently served as the Chair of the AALL Research and Publication Committee which administers the AALL Research Grants. There are two research grants: Wolters Kluwer Law and Business Grant and the AALL Research Fund Grant (LexisNexis). The Law and Business Grant is for research of a practical impact and the AALL Research Grant promotes the AALL research agenda. The committee advertises the grant opportunities through the AALL website and on SIS listservs. It reviews all the proposals and chooses grant recipients. The grants are for one year and all recipients are required to provide a six-month progress report and a final report at the end of the year.

Participants from each of the three programs then discussed how the programs had assisted them in getting their articles completed and published. While at Georgetown, Leslie Street [University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

(Continued on page 6)

AALL Program Reviews

Can the F.C.C. Regulate the Internet?

Judy K. Davis, University of Southern California Call Law Library

This session, F-2, provided an advanced update to follow AALL's 2009 panel on network neutrality. The presenters were Ryan Harrington, coordinator and moderator, Yale Law School, Lillian Goldman Library; Dan Brenner, Hogan Lovells US LLP; Markham Erickson, Holch & Erickson LLP. They analyzed the three rules the F.C.C. issued in December 2010, along with changes that have occurred in this realm during the past two years. In addition, the panel discussed the Commission's authority to regulate the Internet and the consequences of its involvement in Internet policy. Finally, attendees learned about various levels of Internet service and pricing, as well as the manner in which current and theoretical approaches to both will affect the future of Internet users, libraries and even the economy.

A Brief Background

A few years ago, Comcast was accused of discriminating against its customers who use BitTorrent, a file sharing protocol that requires an enormous amount of bandwidth. The F.C.C. quickly stepped in and attempted to require that Internet service providers (ISPs) give Web users equal access to all content, including BitTorrent. When a lawsuit ensued over whether the F.C.C. had the authority to become involved in Comcast's network management, the Commission tried to justify the regulation, contending that it was charged to perform "any acts necessary in the execution of its functions." The D.C. Circuit Court disagreed, ruling in April 2010 that the F.C.C. did not have the authority to regulate an ISP's network management practices, thus hampering the Commission's attempts to enforce Net neutrality.

The December Rules

Despite the Circuit Court's April 2010 ruling, the F.C.C. continued to use the "any acts necessary"

justification of its authority in December 2010 when it issued three rules about Internet service. Those rules 1) require transparency; 2) prohibit blocking; and 3) prohibit discrimination. The panel discussed each rule in detail.

The transparency rule requires that fixed and mobile broadband providers disclose the network management practices, performance characteristics and terms and conditions of their services. Practices must be "appropriate and tailored" to achieving a legitimate network management purpose. Disclosure should serve several functions. End users can make informed choices about ISPs, and application developers will be able to design products that account for network management practices. Moreover, transparency serves to discipline the marketplace and will help the Commission collect the information necessary to enforce its rules.

The blocking prohibition states that fixed broadband providers may not block lawful content, applications, services, or non-harmful devices. Mobile broadband providers may not block lawful websites or block applications that compete with their voice or video telephony services.

Until recently, most people associated the term "blocking" with blocked *content*. Many forms of blocking exist, however. For example, Google, which created the Android mobile operating system, does not permit the sale of tethering applications to Verizon customers in the Android Market. Google states that Verizon's terms of service prohibit tethering, and that Google will honor those terms. Google does not block users from downloading tethering applications outside the Market, however. Even so, some argue that Google's activities deny, limit or restrict the applications' availability, in violation of the blocking rule.

(Continued on page 5)

AALL Program Reviews

(Continued from page 4)

The Google instance is one example of the manner in which practices concerning the Internet are becoming more complex. Accordingly, governmental efforts to regulate the Internet grow increasingly complicated and move progressively farther from the original purpose of net neutrality rules. Areas such as this might be better addressed by Internet task forces. The use of task forces or similarly qualified entities in lieu of regulations could have prevented the April decision that essentially upended the Commission's authority.

The F.C.C.'s third rule prohibits discrimination. Fixed broadband providers may not unreasonably discriminate in transmitting lawful network traffic, although they may conduct "reasonable" network management. The Commission has provided some guidance for this intentionally vague rule, stating that it should be viewed through the prism of end-user control. If end users control the quality of service and level of data availability, then unreasonable discrimination is less likely to have occurred.

"Unreasonably discriminate" does not prohibit usage-based pricing, however. Companies like Netflix, which require great bandwidth to provide their products, have already expressed concern about potential discrimination and anticompetitive application of usage-based pricing.

The F.C.C. also attempted to provide guidance as to which activities *do* constitute unreasonable discrimination. Generally, any activity deviating from standard practices would be troublesome. In addition, the Commission expressed concerns about applications that compete with network operations—tethering and VOIP services, for example—as well as any practice that impedes a user's ability to receive lawful content. An ISP's requiring a third party provider like YouTube to pay a premium to receive priority access to end-users would also present a significant problem. In fact, some coalitions

feel that this example is "the whole network neutrality argument in a bottle." To date, no ISPs engage in this practice, however.

Content-Delivery Networks

If ISPs do not give priority to some content providers at the expense of others, why then does some material seem to arrive so quickly, while other items—like an important email—linger in cyberlimbo for hours? The answer is Content Delivery Networks, or "CDNs." A CDN is a system of computers containing copies of data placed at various locations around a network. CDNs improve and speed data access by storing content near the end user, rather than across the country. For example, if a company in California wants to provide content to users in Philadelphia, it can pay a CDN located in Philadelphia to store the content in or near Philadelphia and send it only a short distance to the user. This process is not only faster but also less expensive than paying an ISP to send large quantities of data long-distance.

The Single-Payer Model—An Endangered Species?

One of the most important questions regarding Internet pricing is whether the current single-payer model for the Internet should continue to exist, or whether all participants should pay. For example, should an Internet subscriber pay \$40.00 per month to the ISP, plus an additional \$5.00 for each movie streamed, or should she pay \$30.00 and then pay \$6.00 for each movie? The film studio would then negotiate the necessary extra broadband capacity directly with the ISP. As the demand for bandwidth for video increases, a broader range of Internet pricing models may become necessary. Otherwise, subscribers who do not use video heavily will ultimately subsidize those who do.

Why Librarians Should Care

In the F.C.C.'s view, the crux of Internet neutrality comes down to the fact that the terminating access

(Continued on page 8)

AALL Program Reviews

(Continued from page 3)

Librarian Scholarship, Cont'd

Kathrine R. Everett [Law Library] was able to take advantage of the two-week research leave program to work on her article. Before taking the leave, she and her co-author had completed the literature review, outlined the article, created and administered their survey and tabulated preliminary results. During her first week of leave, they wrote a full draft of the article and in the second week of leave, they revised and edited the article so it would be ready to share for feedback. The initial feedback came as Leslie presented her paper to the Georgetown Scholarship Committee. In addition, she and her co-author were able to participate in the Boulder Conference where they received more useful feedback on the article. Leslie stated that both programs are extremely helpful for newer librarians who want to write because they provide great support and feedback during the writing process.

Jill Duffy [Supreme Court of the United States Library] and Elizabeth Lambert [Federal Judicial Center] applied for and received an AALL Research Fund Grant of \$1,800 in 2007 to work on their article about Supreme Court oral dissents. They stressed the need to spend time on the grant proposal, making sure to explain clearly why the project is worthwhile and how the project will proceed. It is also important when establishing the budget to be realistic about costs. Both Elizabeth and Jill stated that having the grant helped to set a timeline for their project, since they were required to provide a six-month report and final report with the final report acting as a deadline. Additionally, they advised being flexible in the planning because unforeseen events can arise and keeping in touch with the grant organization as the project proceeds.

In the question period, there was discussion about what types of expenses the AALL grants will cover. Adeen gave examples of covered expenses, such as Research Assistants and necessary software,

and expenses not covered, such a new laptop since its use would not be limited to the project. Jill and Elizabeth said that it was good to be creative in considering expenses when applying for the grant. The other main question related to whether faculty status should affect scholarship and the general consensus among the panelists was that all librarians, regardless of their status, should be involved in writing and scholarship as a way to strengthen the profession.

AALL Book Drive

Sarah Jaramillo, Fordham Law School Library

The SR-SIS would like to thank everyone for all the donations and support you gave to this year's book drive. As this Annual Meeting came to a close, many of those involved in coordinating the book drive converged in the Exhibit Hall during the chaos of the vendor booth deconstruction. At the last minute we had a pleasant surprise: even more books were added to the many boxes and bags that were collected during the Meeting because Oxford University Press donated the remainder of their world atlases and dictionaries.

Ann Hemmens, Sarah Jaramillo and Joseph Parsio hauled these books to a loading dock where Christina Chiolo of the Philadelphia Children's Foundation waited with a U-Haul. Shortly after we got to the loading dock and transferred the books that were donated at the meeting itself, John Cannan drove up with the many, many boxes of books that people donated through the mail. All present were thrilled to see so many boxes going into the Philadelphia Children's Foundation U-Haul truck which sped away from us. When all of the numbers were tabulated, the Philadelphia Children's Foundation was very heartened to receive over 400 books and over \$1300 from our members. A million thanks to all of you who donated to the Drive. You made it quite a success. Now that it is over, the only logical step is to start planning next year's Drive ...

AALL Program Reviews

Best Practices for Evaluating a New Electronic Resource

Jacquelyn McCloud, University of Iowa Law Library

This program (A-6) was the first of a three-part series sponsored by the Committee on Relations with Information Vendors (CRIV). This program focused on best practices in the evaluation of new electronic resources with particular emphasis on how to design and implement focus groups. We have Rob Myers (Case Western Reserve University) and Judith Kaul (Case Western Reserve University) to thank for preparing the presentation materials. We also have to thank Brandi Ledferd (K&L Gates LLP) for presenting and Shaun Esposito (University of Arizona) and Ed Edmonds (University of Notre Dame) for their engaging panel discussion.

The best practices highlights include:

1. Develop an e-resource Collection Development Policy.
2. Always get a trial from the vendor before agreeing to terms.
3. Have stakeholder involvement before deciding to purchase an e-resource.
4. Use an "Electronic Resource Evaluation Checklist" to objectively evaluate the e-resource.
5. Perform a cost-benefit analysis.
6. Benchmark (before, during, and after the purchase).
7. Regularly monitor usage statistics (and before renewing a subscription).
8. Develop and implement library workflows, policies, and procedures for selecting, evaluating, and accessing e-resources.

The session began with a brief discussion of the seven-phase life cycle of an e-resource: (1) discovery; (2) trial; (3) evaluation; (4) selection; (5) acquisition; (6) access; and (7) decision to renew or cancel. The presentation focused on the first four phases of the e-resource life cycle.

The life cycle begins with the discovery of new e-resources. The discovery tools mentioned include

vendor published e-resource directories and buyer's guides (*Gale Directory of Databases*, *Law and Legal Information Directory*, and Ken Svengalis' *Legal Information Buyer's Guide and Reference Manual*), publisher/aggregator or library/consortia websites, blogs (Nina Platt's *Strategic Librarian*, *LLRX.com*, *Three Geeks and a Law Blog*), library trade magazines (*Choice*, *Booklist*, *College and Research Libraries News*, *Library Journal*, and *Spectrum*), and e-newsletters and e-zines (*Scout Report*, and *D-Lib Magazine*).

The next step is of particular importance: the trial. Trying before buying allows you to have stakeholder involvement early in the selection process and an opportunity to benchmark or get feedback from the focus group. A useful sample questionnaire for focus group participants was provided on AALL2GO, available at <http://www.softconference.com/aall/sessionDetail.asp?SID=250750>. It was recommended that the focus group have at least one member from the stakeholder groups from your library community. Depending on the individual library, stakeholder groups may be librarians, end-users (attorneys, faculty members, students, or judges), and IT department staff. There also may be situations when limiting the focus group to a single stakeholder group makes sense. The presentation highlighted the efforts at the University of South Carolina Coleman Karesh Law Library and its efforts to involve their localized library community through a webpage and receive feedback through a link to an online survey.

After the trial, the library staff should evaluate the e-resource. This may include gathering and analyzing information from the trial focus group. It will also include reading the actual terms of the license agreement. An Electronic Resource Evaluation Checklist can also be used to objectively analyze the

(Continued on page 8)

AALL Program Reviews

(Continued from page 7)

Electronic Resources, Cont'd

e-resource and ensure that all of the necessary questions about an e-resource have been answered. This documents the information upon which you base your decision, collects all of the necessary information into one place, and reaffirms that the library staff involved are fulfilling their responsibilities. A great sample checklist is provided on AALL2GO, available at <http://www.softconference.com/aall/sessionDetail.asp?SID=250750>. This sample checklist includes five categories of information: (1) content and authority; (2) usability and design; (3) technical issues, training and support; (4) license agreement issues; and (5) cost and budgetary considerations.

The trial and checklist will aid in performing a cost-benefit analysis of the e-resource. Here, the concern is the actual cost of the e-resource balanced against factors such as competing products providing the same content, choice of format, subscription v. perpetual access v. digital ownership v. purchase + access, and terms of use under the license agreement.

Selection was the fourth and last phase of the e-resource life cycle that was discussed. This is the decision to subscribe, purchase, or pass on an e-resource. Selection should be informed by phases two and three, in other words by the trial, benchmarking, e-resource checklist, and cost-benefit analysis.

Finally, the selection and evaluation of new e-resources should always reflect the practices of the library's Collection Development Policy. If your library's Policy does not specifically address selection and acquisition of e-resources consider revising the policy to add these practices. Also consider developing workflows within you library to facilitate communication between library staff, create efficiencies, and help library staff create balance among their varied roles.

This program highlighted some of the challenges law libraries encounter is acquiring new electronic resources. Several useful strategies and tools were recommended to overcome these challenges. The focus group questionnaire and the e-resource checklist available on AALL2GO are great documents to help you get started or perhaps help you re-examine your current practices.

(Continued from page 5)

F.C.C. & the Internet, Cont'd

point—i.e. the point where the Internet reaches the subscriber—is a monopoly. The content provider must go through the ISP in order to reach the consumer.

If ISPs were to charge content providers a premium to reach the customers, serious problems could arise, in addition to the obvious free speech concerns. Although large companies like Disney or Netflix might afford such fees, many content providers—especially new companies—cannot. One reason the Internet has been such a successful arena is that start-up companies can reach customers without necessarily investing large capital. The next YouTube has the potential to be successful simply because Internet users like the content or service it provides.

Ultimately, no one knows exactly what constitutes a violation of the F.C.C.'s new rules, or even whether those rules have any authority. Almost everyone agrees, however, that challenges to the rules are imminent. As the legal issues slowly work themselves out, the markets continue to expand and grow more complex and are likely to outpace the law for some time to come. Will we be seeing yet another update to this issue at a future conference? The answer is almost certainly yes.

AALL Program Reviews

Empirical Research Support: Not When But How

Margaret A. Schilt, D'Angelo Law Library, University of Chicago

Empirical scholarship in law has increased exponentially in the past several years. Almost all academic law libraries are supporting faculty empirical research in some way. The Academic Law Libraries Special Interest Section showcased the efforts of three law libraries at an excellent and enlightening program at the AALL Annual Meeting in Philadelphia: "Empiricist or Empirical Reference Librarian?: Structuring an Empirical Legal Research Program".

First was Harvard Law Library: A Tale of Two Empiricists. Demand at Harvard Law for empirical research support began about 5 years ago. According to Suzanne Wones, Assistant Director of Research, Curriculum and Publication Services, their first attempt to meet the demand -- buying some time from a J.D./statistician from the Social Sciences-- validated the existence of the demand. The second, more substantial, attempt to meet that demand came as a part of the reorganization of the law library. At that time, between 10 and 15 full-time faculty were interested in empirical research support and the Law School had instituted a year-long seminar in empirical research topics. The Library established two positions: a teaching fellow for the seminar (in the fall of 2009) and a fellow to assist faculty (January of 2010).

The support offered to faculty was extensive. The research fellow did literature searches, provided study design assistance, chose study methods, worked with STATA to find the relevant equations and program the code, carried out statistical analyses and worked with faculty to write up the results. In some instances the fellow was credited with co-authorship on the resulting article.

Suzanne summed up the program as enormously successful from the point of view of services provided. The faculty can spend all their time on

analysis, while someone else actually does the study. The downside is the substantial cost of providing those services.

Jane Bahnson, Reference Librarian and Senior Lecturing Fellow at Duke Law, followed, describing an initially similar approach. In 2007, the Library hired a Ph.D. candidate in Political Science and Economics to provide empirical research support under the direction of a reference librarian program coordinator. The first task was needs assessment, then a determination of services to be provided, including direct assistance on faculty projects, expertise with statistical programs, identification of existing datasets, and maintenance of a webpage to support Duke empirical scholarship. The Library also funded and maintains an Empirical Reference Collection. The 2008-2009 academic year went well, but the program experienced an enormous increase in demand in 2010. The newly hired and immediately overwhelmed Empirical Associate quit and the librarians were in the unenviable position of struggling to provide the broad spectrum of skills required while searching for a new associate. They investigated consulting relationships, which were unsatisfactory, and eventually had to institute limits on the amount of service the Library would offer. Jane is now taking courses in statistics and attending webinars on accessing government datasets, but the service limitations occasioned by their difficult experiences will remain.

Karin Johnsrud, Head of Reference at Fordham Law Library, and Alissa Black-Dorward, Reference Librarian/Empirical Research Specialist, took another path. Karin initiated Fordham's program as a response to demand from law and economics scholars, deciding on a librarian/empirical research specialist model. The specialist, with a dual degree

(Continued on page 13)

AALL Program Reviews

Technology and Law Librarians 2011

David E. Lehmann, University of S. Carolina Coleman Karesh law Library

This year's AALL conference offered a wide selection of technology tools and suggested ways to integrate them into law librarianship. I am focusing on two programs that highlight the new advances and a review of collaboration for librarians with the help of technology tools.

First, the *Cool Tools Café 2011*; this presentation is always one my favorite at the AALL conference. The CS-SIS sponsored program is always fun and informational too. This year's program offered a smorgasbord of ideas and tools to add to your toolbox. The format of this presentation is a series of tables demonstrating different apps and downloadable technology for use in your library. There were 17 different tables this year. It required some effort to move around this many offerings in the time allowed. You couldn't really get a full understanding of the tools, merely an appreciation of what is available and if the apps or tools fit into your library. I will highlight several of the tools that I found most interesting. The complete list with handouts, discussions of the apps, and websites for the tools is available at: <http://aallcassis.pbworks.com/w/page/42056749/Cool%20Tools%20Cafe%202011>.

iPads and iPhones were highlighted in several presentations. These devices are becoming a staple of librarians. The following presentations were aimed at the iPad librarian:

- *Mobile Legal Research Applications for iPads (FastCase & Westlaw Next)*
- *Putting your iPad to Work: Tools for Document Management*
- *"Taking your office with you" Productivity Apps for the iPhone*
- *Just for fun: iPhone and iPad apps for fun and leisure*
- *ShowMe (and) More! iPad apps for teaching in and out of the classroom*

Android devices were included also:

- *Games, Gadgets and Gimmicks: Fun with the Android*

- *Productivity Apps for the Android Platform: Create, Share, Capture, Connect*

The use of these applications puts you into a mobile office. They allow the traveling librarian to connect and use the communication devices to be more effective. They showcased mobile research programs and the ability to teach from any location. Several are just plain fun to use; the Talk to Me translator program and the Android flashlight are perfect examples. The entire list of apps is on the individual program handout. There are many that you will definitely download.

Several of the tables focused on video and visual tutorials:

- *Display Your Data Easily in 5 Ways Using Simile Exhibit*
- *Create Easy Animated Video Shorts with GoAnimate*
- *Power Point Alternatives: Tools for Creating Non-Linear Presentations*
- *Upgrade Your Image! - How to use FireShot, Picnik and Snagit for improved image management*

I really enjoyed the *FireShot*, and *Picnik* applications. They were new to me and I have since used *Picnik* and found it to be a good quick tool. The PowerPoint alternatives were *Prezi* and *Ahead*. I have used *Prezi* (<http://prezi.com/>) but I am not sure that it is better than PowerPoint but it has several unique features. *Ahead* (<http://ahead.com/>) transforms content into zoom presentations. It allows you to format content regardless of resolution. It looks interesting, but I have not used it so I cannot comment on its effectiveness or usefulness. So much technology, so little time to try it all; however, I use *Snagit* (<http://www.techsmith.com/snagit/>) all the time and I love it, but it is not really a new tool. It is

(Continued on page 11)

AALL Program Reviews

(Continued from page 10)

Technology, Cont'd

certainly a cool tool and one that everyone will use once they try it. The screen capture and editing abilities work extremely well. The handout on the CS-SIS webpage describes the pros and cons of these all of these tools.

I would be remiss if I did not discuss the current awareness tools presentation by Ellen Qualey. I found these applications to be very useful and new to me. She highlighted three web tools, <http://readitlaterlist.com/>, <http://www.instapaper.com/> and <http://www.watchthatpage.com/>. These all have useful benefits, some are duplicative but all are worth looking at for future use. They are useful for saving information similar to *Evernote*, <http://www.evernote.com/>, only for saving web pages. I particular liked *Watch That Page*. It is an application that notifies you when a web page changes; the new information is presented to you in an email and/or a personal web page. This allows you to keep current with the page information.

Finally, Collaboration tools for librarians at different locations were highlighted in *Remote access tools for collaboration and instruction*. Susanna Lears showcased three apps, *Joinme*, *Logmein*, and *Dropbox*. These tools are very useful. I have and continue to use Dropbox for sharing information and shared documents for editing by group members. The others also provide the ability to share meetings or documents. Look them over and decide which works best for you.

This is a very short discussion on these tools. Go to the CS-SIS website and get a full description of these tools and start using technology to make your job easier.

Collaboration and collaboration tools were also the theme at the presentation, *The New Collaboration Tools: Let's work Together*. This program by two information technology entrepreneur librarians, Con-

nie Crosby, Crosby Group Consulting and Kathie J. Sullivan, Sullivan Information Management Services, focused on new technologies to enhance collaborative work. The presenters were very knowledgeable about the subject. They discussed the use of visual aids, anecdotal stories, and suggested several ways to use technology to aid collaboration. The presentation was very much a dialogue oriented program aimed at understanding the need for collaboration and understanding that new technology allows collaboration across traditional barriers such as location and time zones. Distance is no longer an obstacle to collaborative work. It can be done seamlessly, most of the time, from each individual's home base.

The presenters highlighted Cloud tools, project management tools, and gave guidelines for making collaboration on a distance-oriented project run smoothly. The presenters have established a wiki to support this program. This wiki allows you to participate, comment, and add information to it, if you join. See <http://lawlibrary.pbworks.com/w/page/15406810/Law-Library:-Collaboration-Tools>.

The wiki is a good resource for all of these ideas, includes readings and resources, and mind map tools. All of these resources are essential to planning and making a project work. The Wiki also has a list of tools for collaboration with their websites and contains additional discussions. This resource is one to bookmark for continued use. There were many more technology oriented presentations and you can see them on the *AALL2go* page (<http://www.softconference.com/aall/slist.asp?C=4040>) with a download of the handouts and information from most of the presentations.

AALL Program Reviews

30 Minutes to a More Efficient ILL

Judy K. Davis, University of Southern California Call Law Library

This session, E-5, provided a resource for OCLC users to improve their existing interlibrary loan programs. Most ILL librarians have mastered the basics of borrowing and lending and can navigate the main screens of OCLC's WorldCat Resource Sharing site. But how can we take advantage of the system's more advanced features to save time and avoid inefficient habits? Read on to share very useful tips presented by Merle J. Slyhoff, coordinator and speaker, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Biddle Law Library and Kate Irwin-Smiler, Wake Forest University Professional Center Library.

Tips for Borrowing

Policies Directory

The Policies Directory is one of the most crucial tools in the OCLC system. An essential function of the Directory is to allow the borrower to check whether a library which owns a needed item will loan it. Policies can indicate the types of items lent, length of loan time, types of borrowers to whom a library will lend, as well as pricing and any restrictions placed on items. Although clicking through the links that reveal the relevant policy information may take a few minutes, it can save days or weeks in the long run.

The Contacts section of the Directory is also valuable. Most librarians have received a request for a strange, rare or seemingly impossible-to-get item at some point. When that happens, the contact information in the Policies Directory can save the day. If the item exists at a lending library, borrowers frequently have great success simply by checking the contact information, picking up a phone, and calling the contact at the lending library. As we know, librarians are often extremely willing to help out a colleague in a pinch.

Library Holdings

Checking the lending library's holdings, especially when borrowing a serial, saves time. Just because a

lender owns a serial does not mean that it holds every issue. If the lender provides holdings data, take advantage of that. Even if the holdings are not available on OCLC, borrowers can search the lender's catalog and check the holdings by clicking the link for the library's name.

Another reason to check the lender's holdings is to make sure the item circulates and is in the library. A popular treatise or new item could be checked out or kept in closed reserve at all five lenders in a request string. Placing a request without checking the lenders' catalogs could waste a month of time obtaining the item.

Copies

Always choosing "copy" or "loan" in the request saves time and prevents rejections for items a borrower might otherwise obtain. One example is when requesting copies of pages from a looseleaf item. If the borrower marks the request as a loan, chances of success decrease significantly, since many libraries do not loan looseleaves but would be happy to copy a few pages. When requesting copies for patrons who need page images for citation purposes, always add that information to the request. The Pages field is a good place for that, and adding an extra note that an HTML version is not acceptable is helpful too.

Be a Good Borrower

In general, respect the lending library. Abide by any restrictions it places on loans, including due dates and shipping specifications. Communicate with lenders to let them know when an item has been received or when something may have been lost. This is not only good business but will help ensure that libraries remain willing to share their materials.

(Continued on page 13)

AALL Program Reviews

(Continued from page 12)

More Efficient ILL, Cont'd

Tips for Lending

Policies Directory and Deflections

All libraries should keep their Policies Directory listings current. This ensures information is available about items the library does and does not lend and who may borrow. Deflections are also useful. Using deflections, a lender does not even have to say “no” to requests that are not within its lending policy, saving time for both the borrower and lender.

Responding to Requests

Reply to ILL requests in a timely manner. It is important to respond quickly if the answer is “no,” but it is also important when saying “yes.” If the lender does not enter a response, the request will eventually move to the next lender, who may also say “yes,” and the borrower will receive two of the same item. Give a reason for “no.” For example, if the item is in use when the request arrives, stating that lets the borrower know that she may be able to try again later. This is especially important if a library is the only lender or one of few. On the other hand, if the lending library does not own the item and indicates that in the response, the borrower knows not to waste time trying there again.

Special Instructions, Requests and Responses

Check the notes field for special instructions. Just as the borrower should put special instructions or requests into the Notes field, the lender has the responsibility to check that field. In addition to special requests or helpful information, check to see if the borrower is a member of any groups or consortia that are relevant to the lending library.

Work to accommodate special requests. Even if an item does not circulate, at least consider the reason for that. This is especially important for consortia members, who often try to lend items that otherwise do not circulate. Even if the item must go out with

special conditions—“library use only,” or “return via UPS,” e.g.—lending is always preferable to saying no.

Send a conditional response only when necessary. A conditional response is not a substitute for “no.” If the item is in use, for example, just say “no” and provide the reason. Conditional responses delay the borrowing process because the request can take longer to move to the next lender. Proper uses of the conditional response include “not found as cited,” “library use only,” or “no copying.”

No one has an unlimited budget to purchase every item requested nowadays, so ILL affects us all at some point. By following the simple suggestions given in this informative session, we can become better ILL-ers, bring better, faster service to our patrons and maybe even develop some positive relationships with our fellow ILL librarians in the process.

(Continued from page 9)

Empirical Research, Cont'd

(either J.D. and M.L.I.S. or Ph.D. and M.L.I.S.) would know STATA and SPSS, understand the University’s resources for empirical scholars and how to locate existing datasets, and the IRB process. In the Library organizational structure, the specialist, now Alissa Black-Dorward, is the liaison for empirical scholars, maintains a research guide for empirical research, and is able to cross-train other librarians in the basics of empirical research support.

These three models provide food for thought for other law libraries struggling with demand for empirical research support. The presentation illuminated both the possibilities and the difficulties of providing that support through the frank assessment by these speakers of their experiences. Thanks to ALL-SIS and the AALL Annual Meeting for providing the forum for this educational and enlightening program.

AALL Program Reviews

Legal Research Skills in the Classroom and Firm

Steven R. Miller, Ruth Lilly Law Library, Indiana University School of Law

The assessment of legal research training by law librarians is a growing practice in both law schools and law firms. Law schools need better assessment tools in order to meet the potential demands of the Proposed ABA Standards on Student Learning Outcomes and continued talk of a legal research component on the bar exam. In law firms, librarians have begun to evaluate the training programs for associates in order to increase effectiveness.

The “Legal Research Skills in the Classroom & Firm” program (H-6) featured law librarians engaged in evaluating law school and legal research instruction. Participants were introduced to terminology, and the importance of evaluating legal research programs in the classroom and in the law firm. Participants became familiar with assessment models. This knowledge is vital to all law librarians because even if they have no formal teaching assignment, law librarians are teachers. Whether in the law firm or academic environment, they are helping lawyers and students build legal research skills while assisting them at a reference desk or in a classroom.

Producing law school graduates who can research and practice law from the outset is an important part of legal education today. Providing law students interactive legal research instruction is a necessary building block in accomplishing that goal. Shawn Nevers, from Brigham Young University’s Howard W. Hunter Law Library, discussed problem-based teaching, pre-class testing, and in-class testing models as the new form of teaching legal research to this generation of law students. There are two types of assessment, explained Shawn, formative assessment and summative assessment.

Formative assessment focuses on quantitative evaluation, such as letter grades and class rank. In contrast, summative assessment asks graduates to show what they have learned. It involves qualita-

tive feedback rather than scores for both student and teacher that focus on the details of content and performance. From the legal research environment in the law firm setting, formative assessment is commonly contrasted with summative assessment, which seeks to monitor educational outcomes, often for purposes of external accountability.

The summative assessment of legal research skills is more meaningful in a law firm setting. An associate needs to know how to perform legal research to write a memo or a brief, draft a contract or pleading, or prepare for trial. A fundamental building block of the practice of law is legal research. An attorney is expected to find the law and know how to apply it. The lawyer’s GPA in law school becomes less relevant to a client if the lawyer is unable to find good case law or other primary and secondary sources that support the position of the client. There are many ways we can assess legal research skills, and this sometimes can lead to problems. Law librarians who use summative forms of assessment focus on what students can do rather than what grades students have earned.

David Armond, Associate Director of Brigham Young University’s Howard W. Hunter Law Library, spoke about the use of pre-teaching feedback. David showed how he used the results of TWEN quizzes before lectures to design classroom instruction and used practicums as effective assessment tools in first-year legal research. David presented such course design and assessment ideas in a paper that won an AALL/LexisNexis Call for Papers Award along with Shawn Nevers. Although his focus was on the assessment of the first-year legal research course, the assessment tools he presented could also be used by all librarians who instruct patrons on how to do research.

Molly Brownfield, Manager of Services, Finnegan,

(Continued on page 15)

AALL Program Reviews

(Continued from page 14)

Legal Research Skills, Cont'd

Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner, LLP, was until recently the Head of Reference Services and Lecturing Fellow at Duke Law Library. In her presentation, Molly addressed assessment in the context of a legal research course focused on a substantive area of law. She gave specific examples of research assignments and corresponding grading sheets. Molly addressed course administrative issues, including grading under a curve, and demonstrated how tools in Excel can facilitate the process of grading.

Linda-Jean Schneider, the Director of Libraries & Research at Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP, examined assessment activities that she undertook in connection with her firm's associate training program. Linda-Jean devised a tool to assess the legal research skills of her law firm's associates and also evaluated the associate research training program itself.

Don MacLeod, Manager of Knowledge Management, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP, oversaw his law firm's mandatory legal research orientation session. All fall and summer associates are required to take the three-hour session. Don outlined the outcomes that all attorneys are expected to learn by the end of the orientation session. He also discussed his use of Research Monitor to evaluate the use of electronic subscriptions within his firm.

A new approach to teaching legal research in law firms and law schools is becoming the model throughout the nation. This approach is based more on analysis and practical application than theory and analysis. It raises the need for assessment tools that evaluate new lawyer and student learners in the context of resolving the needs of the client. Because no single legal research instructional model has been published that organically takes into consideration the needs and skills of today's law school students, law firms and law schools are developing assessment

tools to evaluate legal research instructional methods for a new generation of student learners.

1. [http://www.abajournal.com/files/
Learn-
ing_Outcomes_Clean_Copy_for_January_2010.pdf](http://www.abajournal.com/files/Learn-
ing_Outcomes_Clean_Copy_for_January_2010.pdf).
2. Ari Huhta, "Diagnostic and Formative Assessment," in *The Handbook of Educational Linguistics*, 469-482, (eds. Bernard Spolsky and Francis M. Hult) Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.
3. Carol Anne Dwyer, *The Future of Assessment: Shaping Teaching and Learning*, 192-193, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2008.
4. For more information on TWEN Quizzes, see Norman Otto Stockmeyer, "Using Multiple-Choice Quizzes to Assess, Academic Progress and Enhance Student Success," 14-15, available at [http://ssrn.com/
abstract=1501292](http://ssrn.com/abstract=1501292).
5. Information on the AALL/LexisNexis Call for Papers Award is available at [http://www.aallnet.org/main-menu/
Member-Resources/AALLawards/award-call-for-
papers.html](http://www.aallnet.org/main-menu/
Member-Resources/AALLawards/award-call-for-
papers.html).

(Continued from page 1)

From the Editor, Cont'd

letter Committee often contribute articles, but one does not have to be on the Committee to do so. It gives you a chance to share your professional interests, projects, and experiences with others and to opine on issue of importance to us all. Please contact me with your ideas!

Finally, I apologize for the tardiness of this issue. Some personal issues kept me from giving it the requisite attention during September and October. I plan to keep on schedule from now on – the deadline for Issue 2 is February 1 and I expect to post it by mid-February.

A Happy & Healthy Holiday Season to All!!

AALL Program Reviews

Legal Education for Law Practice: Teaching Legal Research in a Practice Environment

Lauren E. Schroeder, University of Houston Law Center, O'Quinn Law Library

This program, C-6, discussed the “embedded librarian” pilot project at the University of the District of Columbia’s Mason Law Library. The project placed law librarians into the law school’s clinical program (a requirement for all students) to address the problems that resulted from students not knowing how to conduct the necessary legal research to produce successful clinical projects. The clinics selected for the pilot were the Juvenile & Special Education Clinic and the Community Development Clinic. In addition, the pilot embedded a librarian into a criminal law seminar to help develop the students’ scholarly writing skills. The panel was composed of the law librarians who were embedded into the selected clinics and seminar, and the directors of those clinics. Panel members discussed the various aspects of their experiences, and provided their thoughts and perspectives about the project.

The clinical faculty on the panel said that their research skills are not as strong as those of the librarians, and that clinical projects also differ greatly from standard law school coursework, which can make the transition to clinical work harder. Because the librarians aren’t involved in the law school’s research and writing program, they viewed the collaboration as a great opportunity to work directly with the students, and to apply recommendations contained in *Educating Lawyers: Preparing for the Profession of Law* (the Carnegie report).

One major goal of the pilot was to help students see the “bigger, systemic picture” of the law. The participants also wanted to teach students about the available resources for conducting effective legal research, and how to think more creatively about the issues because there aren’t any easy answers in the real-world practice of law. The librarians attended clinical classes at the beginning of the semester to learn the substantive law alongside the students in

order to obtain necessary background information to aid them with their research. They also joined a weekly tutorial where clinical students discussed their projects and research efforts, and the librarians found that very helpful in guiding students to appropriate and useful resources. The criminal law seminar students were required to meet with their embedded librarian regarding their paper topics. In addition, all the librarians gave presentations: those for the clinical students were designed to make students more familiar with the District of Columbia’s legal system and its associated resources, and how to develop a research strategy and plan for their projects, while the presentation to the criminal law seminar students focused on how to effectively write a seminar paper.

Everyone on the panel viewed the first year as experimental, and saw it as an opportunity to analyze what worked and what could be improved or changed, because the goal is to expand the program to all of the law school’s clinics in the future. All of the participants realized that the students needed help with the fundamentals of legal research. The clinical instructors really welcomed and valued the involvement of the librarians, said they worked well together, and want to work towards further integration of the librarians as the program develops. They noticed a substantial difference in the project quality of the students who consulted with the librarians about questions that arose during the research process. In the future, they would like to have the librarians present at more than one tutorial session to address student issues and provide guidance and feedback about their projects. The instructors thought that projects need to have more focused topics, and students should be held increasingly accountable for meeting the project requirements and deadlines.

(Continued on page 17)

AALL Program Reviews

Cutting Beyond the Bone: Managing in an Age of Austerity

Susan M. Boland, University of Cincinnati,
Robert S. Marx Law Library

The title of the program says it all. Libraries have already been cutting to the bone but with the country's deepening economic woes, libraries need to cut beyond the bone. Unfortunately, this means the decisions about what to cut are becoming even harder. Librarians must become even more creative in finding ways to deliver necessary services. Program C-4, *Cutting Beyond the Bone: Managing in an Age of Austerity* attempted to give librarians some tools in order to deal with these issues.

In recent years, the AMPC has tried to encourage alternative methods of delivering programs. This program deviated from the usual panel discussion or PowerPoint presentation by using role playing. James S. Heller, College of William & Mary, Wolf Law Library, played the role of Director of Austerity Law Library at the Adversity State University. Jennifer E. Sekula, College of William & Mary, Wolf Law Library, played the role of Head of Public Services, and Jean M. Pajerek, Cornell University Law Library, played the role of the Head of Technical Services. The moderator, Alan Keely, from Wake Forest University Professional Center Library, began by identifying the players and briefly setting the stage. The discussion began with a summary of the institution's clientele, holdings, and budgetary situation.

The problems presented and the brainstorming of ideas to solve those problems contained useful information. Among the ideas presented included: cancelling print duplicates, reorganizing staff, using a snapshot of statistics to inform decisions about hours, cross-training staff, sharing collection development with other institutions, stop binding, turning to the cloud, sharing original cataloging with other institutions, leveraging RDA, and prioritiz-

ing. With each idea, the pros and cons were discussed.

Unfortunately, the format of the program made it difficult to follow. The conversation skipped around frequently. Also, although the target audience was listed as "library managers from all types of libraries involved with the budget or the budgeting process," the focus really was on an Academic institution and many of the ideas presented would not be appropriate for other types of libraries. That being said, the ideas and suggestions presented were valuable.

The best part of the program was the question and answer session. It was an honest conversation about painful choices in cuts.

(Continued from page 16)

Embedded Librarians, Cont'd

The librarians felt much more involved in the students' education and enjoyed being part of the program. They wanted to establish a stronger web presence for each clinic by creating separate web course areas with resources and materials for clinic students. When they give research presentations again, they said they will be sure to not schedule the presentations too far in advance of when the students will need to apply the concepts covered. It's also important for embedded librarians, whether in clinics or in seminars, to be responsive to how professors change or update their courses over time.

I found this panel discussion to be very useful and informative, with many helpful ideas that could be applied to all law school clinical programs, but particularly for those where law librarians don't participate in the school's research and writing curriculum. The advice regarding how to work with seminar students is also applicable to other types of courses desiring librarian involvement in the legal research process.

AALL Program Reviews

E-books and the Future of Legal Publishing

Jacquelyn McCloud, University of Iowa
Law Library

June Hsiao Liebert (John Marshall Law School) coordinated and moderated this program (I-3) as a follow-up to the 2010 annual meeting program: *Turning the Page: e-Book Readers in Law Libraries*.

While the 2010 program focused on e-readers and mobile apps, the focus this year was on e-book licensing models, pricing, digital rights management, and usability. June moderated a question and answer session with Scott Meiser (Director of Product Planning at LexisNexis), Dan Bennett (Senior Director of Technology at Thomson Reuters Professional), and Steve Sutton (Senior Digital Content Sales Manager at YBP Library Services, A Baker & Taylor Company).

The overall theme of the discussion was the future of e-books and how e-books will change law libraries. In recent years, e-books have become increasingly popular in consumer markets; however, legal publishers have cautiously approached publishing e-books. This panel discussion made it clear that times are changing and law libraries can look forward to more e-book options from LexisNexis, Thomson Reuters Professional, and YBP Library Services. Why the change? Scott Meiser of LexisNexis explained that people using e-books in their personal lives are now expecting to use e-books in their professional lives. He perceives a continued blurring of lines between personal and professional life, as well as online and paper content with the added expectation for the use of mobile applications. At the same time, Dan Bennett of Thomson Reuters Professional cautioned that the next couple of years “will be messy.”

What does this shift in legal publishing mean for law libraries?

LexisNexis will be blurring the lines between their

online and print content. They expect to have 75% of their content available by the end of 2011 and all content available by the end of the first quarter next year. As a result, law libraries will be able to get in an e-book format out-of-print books that were previously too expensive for LexisNexis to reprint. LexisNexis’ e-book rollout will be device agnostic, publishing in ePub and MOBI formats. This allows users to use their current e-book readers to access LexisNexis content.

The licensing models and digital rights management (DRM) restrictions are being explored, and Scott predicted that customer demand is going to drive the model. The options he discussed all mimicked software licensing agreements: single user/single copy, enterprise license, unlimited access across library community, and interlibrary loan. At the same time, nothing is as easy as it seems when it comes to DRM. He perceives that law libraries will have difficulty with the lending approach and consistency.

But for now Scott does not believe e-books will be even half of LexisNexis’ business in the near future. For LexisNexis, print will not disappear even as the company begins to explore e-books.

Thomson Reuters Professional is taking a strikingly different approach than its competition at LexisNexis. TR is selectively making its content available in an e-book format. They are focusing on making high-value print books available in an e-book format i.e. books that attorneys use every day such as court rules. TR is also focusing on publishing e-textbooks. As for everything else, there is no set timeline.

TR is also focusing on developing its own e-book platform. Earlier in the week, TR unveiled ProView, its new e-book platform, which can be used from any browser or from a free iPad app. The disadvantage to this approach is that users will not

(Continued on page 19)

AALL Program Reviews

(Continued from page 18)

E-Books, Cont'd

be able to use their current e-readers to access TR content. But Thomson Reuters perceives their new e-book platform as being a professional grade e-book platform with enhanced user functionality, including: footnotes, tabular material, full-text Boolean searching, linking to WestlawNext content, and automatic updating. The perceived challenge is going to be internal pagination as users transition to e-book use, while others still rely on print.

While TR is taking a different approach to its content and platform, it agrees with LexisNexis on the issue of licensing models and DRM. Like LexisNexis, TR is exploring different models for different content. Dan also emphasized the need for archiving e-books and mentioned a perpetual access and rights management model similar to Amazon, where rights are managed “in the cloud.”

While law libraries can anticipate the advent of ProView, Dan reminded the audience that it is going to be a long, long time before the print book disappears. Thomson Reuters Professional may be expanding into the e-platform and e-book markets, but it has no immediate or future plans to abandon the print book.

Finally, rounding out the discussion was Steve Sutton representing YBP Library Services and offering his perspective as an e-book distributor. According to Steve, current e-book sales figures indicate that e-books are here to stay. In the past year, YBP has partnered with ebrary, Ebook Library (EBL), and NetLibrary from EBSCOhost. To meet the increasing demand for e-books, YBP created a new division for e-books sales and is now offering demand-driven or patron-driven acquisitions as part of its collection development strategy. What does this mean? YBP will load all the e-books into the library's online catalog, users can access the e-books, and the library only purchases e-books that are ac-

tually used.

Because YBP is an e-book distributor, it does not create licensing agreements. All the same, it is affected by the license agreements between libraries and e-book aggregators, for example ebrary or NetLibrary. Steve explained that YBP works with its library clients to help them interpret and understand their license agreements. Ideally, he said there would be a single license agreement that would cover everything.

The biggest challenge is the various e-book formats. There is no single format and YBP re-sells the e-books in the original format. This means libraries may need different platforms to access the e-books in their digital collection. Another challenge is adequately describing e-books to differentiate between print and e-book content.

When asked about the future of print publishing, Steve answered with a question - how are libraries going to satisfy users who want print when the library has purchased e-books? He reasoned that print on demand might be a viable option. Under a print on demand model, libraries could buy digital first and then print as needed later. This also raised the question of whether there should be a discount on the print book if the library buys the e-book. While there are many unanswered questions about purchasing and licensing models, Steve enthusiastically encouraged publishers to publish e-books first or at least at the same time as print. He correctly noted that libraries want to have options and no embargoes. Why? Embargoes on digital content force law libraries to purchase content in print and digital formats to ensure access to the most recent content. He asked the audience if we wanted titles available in a timely fashion as e-books. By a show of hands, everyone is the audience agreed.

AALL Program Reviews

Developing and Using Patron Satisfaction Surveys

Karin Johnsrud, Fordham University
Law School Library

The ALL-SIS sponsored program J-1, “Developing and Using Patron Satisfaction Surveys”, was a 30-minute program focused on best practices for surveying patrons. The Moderator, Morgan Stoddard [Georgetown University Law Library] discussed the project by the Student Services Committee of ALL-SIS to gather patron satisfaction surveys from member libraries and make them available as examples for other libraries [See the Student Surveys Subcommittee website].

The primary program speaker, Francis Brillantine [Catholic University Law Library], has designed the biennial patron surveys at Catholic for the past seven years. For her, the benefits of surveys are to promote existing resources and to track trends. While survey software makes creating surveys deceptively easy, the hard part is still generating questions that will provide clear, useful and actionable data. Before administering a survey, it is necessary to formulate specific goals. Ms. Brillantine advised that one should not conduct a survey unless one is committed to making changes.

Much of the discussion focused on the type and structure of questions. [Powerpoint available] Ms. Brillantine provided examples of actual survey questions, some that worked and others that did not work. She also showed how to rewrite a question in order to make it more specific and produce helpful results. As an example, the question “Are you satisfied with the library hours?” requires a “yes or no” answer and is generally too vague to provide actionable results. However, adding specifics about the opening and closing times or asking about specific times of day when students use the library will frequently result in more helpful data.

Ms. Brillantine noted that surveys are designed to provide information, but the librarians still have to apply that information and use it to make a decision. She also stressed the importance of communicating the results with the patrons quickly and clearly connecting the changes made to the survey results. During the question period, she addressed the need to randomize the order of choices to avoid bias and to include benchmark questions that will show trends over time.

Legal Information & Technology

eJournal Update

Lee Peoples, Oklahoma City University
Law Library

The Legal Information and Technology eJournal (http://www.ssrn.com/update/lisn/lisn_legal-info-tech.html) was launched in 2009 with the generous support of ALL-SIS. In 2009, ALL-SIS committed to sponsor 2/3rds of the eJournal’s cost for the three years. MAALL agreed to sponsor the remaining 1/3rd of the cost for three years. These sponsorships began in January, 2010.

The idea behind the eJournal was to make the scholarship and professional literature of law librarianship accessible in one place. The eJournal has made significant strides toward this goal since its launch in 2010. The eJournal currently has over 300 subscribers. Nearly 900 papers are available for full text download from the eJournal. These papers have been downloaded 130,255 times. These figures demonstrate that the eJournal is an effective venue for law librarian scholars to disseminate their work. The entire contents of the eJournal may be viewed and searched here:

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/JELJOUR_Results.cfm?form_name=journalBrowse&journal_id=1334262

The journal still has room to grow thanks to the three year sponsorship commitment by ALL-SIS. The journal welcomes submissions from ALL-SIS

(Continued on page 21)

(Continued from page 20)

eJournal Update, Cont'd

members. If you already have an SSRN account just upload your paper and classify it under the Legal Scholarship Network > LSN Subject Matter eJournals > Legal Information & Technology eJournal. If you do not have an SSRN account it is very easy to set one up and upload your paper for free at: <http://www.ssrn.com/>

If your institution has an SSRN subscription I urge you to subscribe to the eJournal today. To subscribe simply log on to ssrn.com, click on subscriptions, Legal Scholarship Network, LSN Subject Matter eJournals, and select Legal Information & Technology. A video explaining how to subscribe may be viewed here:

http://ssrn.com/update/general/ssrn_faq.html#subscrDemo

The eJournal's co-founding editors are ALL-SIS members Randy Diamond, (diamondrj@missouri.edu) Director of Library and Technology Resources and Legal Research Professor of Law at the University of Missouri Columbia and Lee Peoples, (lpeoples@okcu.edu) Professor of Law Library Science and Law Library Director at Oklahoma City University.

Randy and I wish to express our thanks for the generous sponsorship provided by ALL-SIS. Please contact us if you have any questions about the eJournal or need help subscribing or uploading a paper.

The 2012 "CALL FOR PAPERS" HAS BEGUN!

Have you been thinking of writing an article of interest to law librarians? The AALL/LexisNexis Call for Papers Committee is soliciting articles in four divisions:

- **Open Division:** for active and retired AALL members and law librarians with five or more years of professional experience;
- **New Members Division:** for recent graduates and AALL members who have become law librarians since July 1, 2007;
- **Student Division:** Participants in this division need not be members of AALL. To be eligible in this category, you must have been enrolled in law school, or in a library school, information management, or an equivalent program, either in the Fall 2011 or Spring 2012 semester.

The winner in the Open, New Member, and Student Divisions will receive \$650 generously donated by LexisNexis, plus the opportunity to present the winning paper at a program during the 2012 AALL Annual Meeting in Boston! Winning papers are also considered for publication in the Association's prestigious Law Library Journal.

NEW FOR 2012!

Short Form Division: Articles in this category will be shorter than a traditional scholarly article, and appropriate for publication in AALL Spectrum, a bar journal, or a chapter or SIS newsletter. Participants must be AALL members. The winner will be awarded \$300 from LexisNexis.

Articles in the Open, New Members, and Short Form Divisions must be submitted by March 1, 2012. Articles in the Student Division must be received by May 15, 2012.

Application form and details, including word limits, can be found at the Call for Papers website <http://www.aallnet.org/main-menu/Leadership-Governance/committee/activecmtes/call-for-papers.html>. If you have any questions, please contact a member of the AALL/LexisNexis Call for Papers Committee:

- ◇ Jennifer Lentz, lentz@law.ucla.edu, Chair;
- ◇ Mark Podvia, mwp3@psu.edu, Vice Chair;
- ◇ Benjamin Keele, bjkeele@wm.edu;
- ◇ James P. Kelly, jim.kelly@vanderbilt.edu;
- ◇ Shawn Nevers, neverss@law.byu.edu

A Law Librarian in the Dark

Yasmin Sokkar Harker, CUNY Law School Library

Welcome to the new academic year! Now in its third year, this *A Law Librarian in the Dark* discusses movies for law libraries and law library feature film collections. Movies about lawyers, law schools, litigation, famous trials, crime and punishment, or movies that contain “legal themes” are all possible topics. If you have a DVD title that you would like me to review, e-mail me at yasmin.harker@mail.law.cuny.edu

In this issue, I will be looking back several decades to an oft overlooked Merchant Ivory Film, *A Passage to India*. Based on E.M. Forster's novel of the same name and set in 1920's colonial India, *A Passage to India* explores society under the paradigm of colonialism. Particularly interesting is its representation of a legal system that functions as an extension and tool of colonialism.

The movie focuses the friendship between Adele Quested, a young English woman, her soon to be mother-in-law Mrs. Moore and Dr. Aziz, a young doctor. Adele (played by Judy Davis) and Mrs. Moore have traveled to Chandrapore to visit Adele's fiancée Ronny who has just secured a colonial magistrate position.

Adele and Mrs. Moore both find themselves fascinated, yet disturbed by India. Bored by the parties and polo matches attended by elitist snobbish English women who live there, they long to know the “real” or “authentic” India. Despite the disapproval of Ronny and their English acquaintances, they meet and strike up a friendship with a young, local doctor named Dr. Aziz who invites them for an outing at the Marabar Caves. The outing at the Marabar Caves is disastrous and leads to an accusation of sexual assault against Dr. Aziz.

The latter half of the movie portrays the trial of Dr. Aziz and examines the idea of justice in a court system that is under colonial rule. The English officials, police officers, investigators, lawyers and

judges have decided that Dr. Aziz is guilty before the trial even begins. Adele's doubts about her own memory and her accusations against Dr. Aziz are dismissed by a society that is eager to see Dr. Aziz convicted. Mrs. Moore expresses her own doubts about the legitimacy of the accusations and is sent away by her son before the trial begins. The trial itself becomes a political spectacle in which the community gives ethnic and class loyalty more importance than justice. Indeed, an attorney in the trial states, “the darker races lust after the lighter races but not vice versa”, as part of his argument. The trial becomes about the legitimacy of English control over India, rather than the individuals who are affected by the trial.

Instead of giving away the ending, I urge you to add *A Passage to India* to your feature film collection and see it for yourself. It is an excellent examination of a legal system that serves colonialism instead of justice.

The DVD for *A Passage to India* was released in March 2001 by Sony Pictures Home Entertainment. A 2-Disc Collectors edition released in 2008 is also available from Sony Pictures Home Entertainment. The Collectors edition contains commentary from producer Richard Goodwin, a featurette about the director David Lean, a profile on the author of the book, E.M. Forster and more.

ALL-SIS Reception, Awards, and Business Meeting

The ALL-SIS Reception and Awards Ceremony was held at the 2011 AALL Annual Meeting on Sunday, July 24, 6:30 - 9:00 p.m., Marriott Liberty Ballroom Salon AB.

A wonderful buffet sponsored by Wolters Kluwer Law & Business greeted the crowd and served as the backdrop for socializing.



The award winners were then recognized. They are listed on the ALL-SIS webpage at <http://www.aallnet.org/sis/allsis/committees/reports/index.asp#awards>.



Margaret Leary, the 2011 recipient of the *Frederick Charles Hicks Award for Outstanding Contributions to Academic Law Librarianship*.

Earlier in the day at the ALL-SIS Breakfast and Business Meeting sponsored by LexisNexis, the ALL-SIS leadership officially changed hands for 2011-2012.



The gavel was passed from outgoing ALL-SIS Chair Jack McNeill to incoming Chair Kumar Percy Jayasuria.



Back Row (left to right): Incoming Chair Kumar Percy Jayasuria, Immediate Past President Beth Adelman, Outgoing Chair Jack McNeill, and continuing Secretary –Treasurer Ed Hart.
Front Row (left to right): Incoming Vice-Chair / Chair Elect Leah Sandwell-Weiss, Outgoing Executive Board Member-at-Large Margaret Schilt, and Incoming Executive Board Member-at Large Deborah Person.

AALL Announcements

Julia O'Donnell, Director of Membership Marketing and Communications



AALL2go Picks

[Editor's Note: Since the *Newsletter* is late, below are the AALL2go Picks for September, October and November.]

AALL's Continuing Professional Education Committee presents the AALL2go pick of the month for October: [Overcoming the Challenge of Change](#).

This one-hour, 43-minute audio file (mp3) was recorded at the 2011 Northern California Association of Law Libraries Spring Institute and features Sandra Yancey, founder and CEO of eWomenNetwork. Through frank discussion of real-life issues, this program will help librarians understand how to personally become an effective "change agent" and overcome obstacles associated with change.

Yancy begins by discussing her own personal journey into business ownership. She then walks audience members through a series of exercises and then discusses the results. She also discusses why little changes went unnoticed and why certain changes happened. Many of these tools and concepts that were incorporated into the session were created by Joel Barker, William Bridges, and Stephen Covey. Through this series of exercises followed by discussion, Yancy provides the audience with a framework whereby they can work with their own staffs to understand the challenges of change in any organization.

The AALL Continuing Professional Education Committee's AALL2go pick of the month for November: [Teaching and Using Legal Classics: Black Letter Law and the Google Generation](#).

This hour-long audio file recorded at the 2007 Northeast Regional Law Libraries Meeting in Toronto features two speakers who are actively involved in teaching legal research. Both speakers try to give the audience a sense of how law students may expect to obtain easy answers to legal issues because they are used to finding "the answer" using Google and other technology, yet the black letter law may be more difficult to find...if it even exists.

Shelley W. Obal, a research partner at Toronto law firm Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP, focuses on legal research using expert resources in a law firm setting and tells her law students and new attorneys to begin research with secondary sources before moving online for primary sources.

Next Alison Harvison Young, judge on the Superior Court of Justice of Ontario and former law dean at Queen's University, uses her experiences in academia and on the bench to provide examples of real world research skills in practice, both good and bad. She also briefly describes the civil law versus common law systems and how the research methods in each system may be a bit different.

The remainder of the program contains a question and answer session hosted by moderator John Sadler from the University of Western Ontario law library.

The AALL Continuing Professional Education Committee's AALL2go pick of the month for September: [Mary Ellen Bates Live: What Will the Information Profession Look Like in Ten Years?](#)

This program features Mary Ellen Bates, principal and founder of Bates Information Services, a research and consulting company, and a frequent author and speaker on library and information topics.

(Continued on page 25)

AALL Announcements, Cont'd

(Continued from page 24)

AALL2go Picks, Cont'd

Bates raises many thought-provoking insights for our profession - some positive and others more sobering. She opines that the insight that librarians bring to research and their abilities to facilitate the use of information will help our profession to endure. Her predictions for 2021 include more online learning; less face-to-face interaction but more collaboration in virtual spaces; expectations of engagement by librarians/information professionals in their clients' work; the emergence of cloud computing and less reliance on silos of information; increased outsourcing and telecommuting in the workplace; escalation of information availability but fewer traditional sources of published information; and the continued emergence of digital libraries.

The key is to think differently about the role of libraries and information professionals in their organizations and to maximize our value. As resources continue to emerge and expand in content, librarians will be more vital as information creators, interpreters, and distillers.

This program is presented in streaming video, with accompanying PowerPoint slides, and is available via AALL2go.

This program, generously supported by an AALL grant, was held on March 8, 2011, in Atlanta and was jointly sponsored by the Atlanta Law Libraries Association (ALLA), the Metropolitan Atlanta Libraries Association (MALA), the Special Libraries Association of Alabama (SLA-AL), and the Special Libraries Association of Georgia (SLA-GA).

Find these and more than 80 other free continuing education programs and webinars for AALL members on [AALL2go!](#)

2011 AALL Salary Survey Now Available

The AALL 2011 [Biennial Salary Survey and Organizational Characteristics](#) is now available online free for AALL members.

This new edition is the only source for up-to-date information about salaries for law librarians and other law library employees who work in academic libraries; private firms and corporate libraries; and state, court, and county law libraries. The survey was carried out this summer in complete confidentiality by Association Research, Inc., a professional research firm in Rockville, Maryland, that works exclusively with nonprofit organizations.

Printed copies of the survey will be available for purchase and shipment in mid-November; \$110 for AALL members and \$175 for nonmembers (contact orders@aall.org).

AALL/Wolters Kluwer Law & Business Grants Program Seeks Applications

The AALL Research & Publications Committee is accepting applications through Monday, December 12, 2011, for research grants from the AALL/Wolters Kluwer Law & Business Grants Program that may total up to \$5000.

The committee will award one or more grants to library professionals who wish to conduct research that supports the research/scholarly agenda of the profession of librarianship. The grants program funds small or large research projects that create, disseminate, or otherwise use legal and law-related

(Continued on page 26)

AALL Announcements, Cont'd

(Continued from page 25)

Grant Program, Cont'd

information as its focus. Projects may range from the historical (indexes, legislative histories, bibliographies, biographies, or directories) to the theoretical (trends in cataloging, publishing, or new service models in libraries) to the practical (implementation models for collection, personnel, or infrastructure management).

The AALL Research Agenda offers suggestions for possible research projects that cover a wide segment of professional interest, including the profession of law librarianship, law library patrons, law library services, legal research and bibliography, legal information resources, and law library facilities. However, projects are not limited to those described in the agenda, and the committee will consider all applications and research projects. To review AALL's Research Agenda, please visit <http://www.aallnet.org/main-menu/Member-Resources/grants/research-grants/research-agenda.html>.

The AALL/Wolters Kluwer Law & Business Grant Program was first established in 1996 with a generous contribution of \$50,000. Wolters Kluwer Law & Business considers its contribution as an investment in research that will provide a prospective look at the role of librarians, researchers, and legal information providers and will yield results to which publishers can respond. The goal is to sponsor research that will have a practical impact on the law library profession and inspire products and changes in the marketplace.

To apply for the grants, all applicants must provide resumes and statements of their qualifications for carrying out their projects. The applications must demonstrate experience with research projects and an understanding of the dissemination and use of legal and law-related information. Priority will be given to individual AALL members or AALL members working in partnership with other information

professionals. The grant application and complete guidelines are available at: <http://www.aallnet.org/main-menu/Member-Resources/grants/research-grants/Wolters-Kluwer-Law-Business-Grant.html>.

The submission deadline for applications is Monday, December 12, 2011. Grants will be announced and awarded in January 2012. Allocation of the research grants will be at the sole discretion of the AALL Research & Publications Committee.

Member News

AALL Leadership Academy Grant Winner

Congratulations to Jennifer Wondracek, Instructional Services Reference Librarian at Fredric G. Levin College of Law in Gainesville, Florida, on her selection as the recipient of the ALL-SIS grant for attending the 2011 AALL Leadership Academy. Look for Jennifer's article in an upcoming newsletter about her Academy experience. Thank you to the members of the ALL-SIS Awards Committee for their review and selection from a fine pool of candidates.

ACADEMIC LAW LIBRARIES—SPECIAL INTEREST SECTION

Barbara Gellis Traub, Editor
Head of Reference & Instructional Services
Rittenberg Law Library
St. John's University School of Law
8000 Utopia Parkway
Jamaica, N.Y. 11439
Phone: 718-990-1668
Fax: 718-990-6649
traubb@stjohns.edu

General Information

ALL-SIS was established in 1979 to promote interest in and to address issues of common concern to those employed in academic law libraries. The SIS serves as the umbrella organization for all interests--administration, collection development, consortia, directors, fees for service, interlibrary loan, public services, technical services, middle management, etc.

ALL-SIS Officers

Kumar Percy Jayasuriya, Chair	hrp6@law.georgetown.edu
Leah Sandwell-Weiss, Vice-Chair / Chair-Elect	leah.sandwell-weiss@law.arizona.edu
Jack McNeill, Immediate Past Chair	jmcneill@law.pace.edu
Edward T. Hart, Secretary/ Treasurer	hart@law.ufl.edu
Deborah Person, Executive Board Member	dperson@uwyo.edu

ALL-SIS provides opportunities for all librarians to contribute to the overall betterment of the entire academic law community. ALL-SIS has grown to more than 800 members and is the second largest SIS in AALL. Our members come from all aspects of academic law librarianship. Because of the SIS's broad coverage and subtopic focus, all those working in academic law libraries can benefit from membership and

The ALL-SIS Discussion Group

The ALL-SIS discussion group, aka mailing list, is used for official ALL-SIS announcements, news from AALL, and discussion of topics of interest to our members. If you're a member of ALL-SIS, you should be automatically subscribed! To send a message to the list, address the message to all-sis@aallnet.org. Please direct any questions to the forum moderator at owner-all-sis@aallnet.org. For more information, see ALL-SIS Discussion Group Instructions, 23 ALL-SIS Newsletter 18 (Summer 2004), available at

www.aallnet.org/sis/allsis/newsletter/23_3/Discussiongroup.htm.

ALL-SIS on the Web

Visit the ALL-SIS Home Page at www.aallnet.org/sis/allsis/. Electronic versions of The ALL-SIS Newsletter are available on our website, as well as other vital information.

Newsletter Information & Deadlines for 2011 - 2012 Academic Year

Please submit all articles and announcements to the ALL-SIS Newsletter Editor. Are you

working on any interesting special projects? Have you attended a meeting and learned something you want to share with colleagues? Do you just want to rant and rave about some problems related to academic law librarianship? If you answered "yes" to any of these questions, please send your thoughts. Any format, printed, faxed, or e-mailed will do, but it would be easiest for Newsletter production if the article is sent either as an attached text or word processing file or as the body of an e-mail. The **deadlines** for this year's remaining issues are **February 1 and May 21, 2012**. Thank you for your contributions and for your consideration.