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Program Report: Innovation Tournament

Wendy Moore
University of Georgia School of Law Library, wemoore@uga.edu
Welcome to TSLL’s inaugural “Conference Round-up” column. The goal of this column is to facilitate sharing of conference experiences beyond AALL’s Annual Meeting. Whether at a national conference such as ALA, a regional conference, or a local workshop, there is a wealth of information being shared that can be reported back to our peer technical services law librarians. If you have the opportunity to attend a local, regional, or national conference or workshop with content of interest to technical services librarians, consider providing a brief write up for TSLL.

Demystifying Digital Preservation
NASIG 2019
Courtney McAllister
Yale Law Library

As a newcomer to academic law librarianship, I’ve discovered several knowledge gaps I need to fill. Digital preservation is one of those areas. In my former role at a liberal arts college, our work in technical services revolved around meeting immediate needs and responding to current users’ requests. Now that I am a part of a technical services team with a different philosophy, sustainability and long-term access are much more prominent in my daily life. Thankfully, during NASIG’s 2019 Conference, Shannon Keller (Helen Bernstein Librarian for Periodicals and Journals at New York Public Library) delivered an excellent presentation entitled Demystifying Digital Preservation: Recommendations for Organizations, Libraries, and Information Professionals.

During the session, Keller reported on the Digital Preservation Task Force’s recent activities. As the name suggests, this Task Force was organized by NASIG to examine the broad landscape of digital preservation issues, raise awareness about the threat of digital data or information loss, and advocate for partnerships and practices to address pressing questions such as:

- Who is responsible for ensuring perpetual access to born-digital and digitized materials?
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Third, most of the “data visualization” options presented were different types of Excel charts (e.g., table, bar chart, tree map, trend line chart, etc.), with the goal of choosing which type of chart best tells your story, such as a pie chart for subscription prices or a line graph for year over year increase. Although some more software options were identified on a slide, the presenters did not really discuss them more than mentioning Power BI. One thing to keep in mind is using the colors consistently throughout your charts—the same color for each vendor over all of your charts.

Finally, the presenters effectively made the seemingly dry process of looking at data more fun and turning it into a colorful chart with meaningful numbers made a fake law firm almost seem real. By the end of their presentation, I wondered if they made their CFO agree with their findings.

Program Report
Innovation Tournament
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The AALL Innovation Tournament is an initiative hosted by AALL and sponsored by LexisNexis to showcase creative legal information workplace solutions undertaken by AALL members.

Applications for contestants were solicited by AALL with a May 17 deadline. A subteam of the Annual Meeting Planning Committee (AMPC), consisting of members representing different library types, then reviewed the entries and selected the three finalists who participated in the tournament. The finalists were:

- Erik Y. Adams, Research Analyst at Sidley Austin LLP, and Martin J. Korn, Director of Research and Knowledge Services, at Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP – TEST
- Andre Davison, Research Technology Manager at Blank Rome LLP – Integrated Library System EOS
- Allison C. Reeve, Library Manager at Littler Mendelson, P.C. – California Tentative Rulings Database

The finalists had up to five minutes to make their pitches, and then the Panel of Judges were given up to five minutes to ask questions of the finalists. The panel of five judges were Owen Byrd (Lex Machina and sponsor representative), Catherine Monte (Fox Rothschild LLP), Scott Vanderlin (University of Chicago D’Angelo Law Library and one of the 2018 tournament winners), David P. Whelan (Law Society of Ontario), and Beth Williams (Stanford University). Judges used the following criteria to evaluate and score the finalists:

- Clear articulation of the problem
- Clear articulation of the innovation
- Detailed demonstration of who will be served
- Approach is novel/unique/creative
- Information provided suggests a likely successful outcome if the innovation is implemented

The first finalists to present were Adams and Korn, who proposed creating a suite of training materials geared toward legal information professionals to help them learn to develop Python-based machine learning or AI systems. While hands on training materials do already exist, none use real world data sets drawn from the legal environment, resulting in learning models that lack utility in law firm environments. They noted that their biggest challenge is putting together the data set itself, but they have identified ways of gathering those data points using several methods.

The second finalist to present was Davison, who is pursuing seamless digital access using SAML to individual secondary sources available in Westlaw and Lexis Advance through his firm’s Library OPAC. The goal is to get SAML to authenticate the user in Westlaw or Lexis Advance and then take you to the non-billable table of contents. This innovation would eliminate multiple clicks, password issues, client numbers, and searching platforms for specific titles. It will also direct firm use of these resources through their ILS/Intranet, allowing them to gather more information about which resources are being used and by whom. Davison finished up his presentation by swinging a baseball bat to knock the goal out of the park. Seamless user access - isn’t this the dream of all librarians?

The third and final presentation of the session was finalist Reeve, who proposed building an expanded California Superior Courts tentative rulings database in order to gain insight into recent judicial rulings. The database results would provide context, an historic archive of decision making, and analytics on judge and court behavior. This innovation would build off the existing Santa Clara Tentative Rulings Database used by her firm’s California-based offices. A product like this could even eventually expand to cover other states. Audience members working in or with firm offices in California were definitely excited about the possibilities a platform like this one could offer their users.
Following the presentations, a live online poll was held to determine the Audience Choice Award while the judges’ scores were tallied. The two awards of $2500 each were presented by judge and sponsor representative, Owen Byrd of LexisNexis’ Lex Machina.

The 2019 Innovation Tournament Winners were:

- The **Audience Choice Award**, which was selected by audience members using a live online poll, was awarded to Andre Davison.
- The **Judges’ Choice Award**, which was determined by the judges using their scoring rubric, was awarded to Allison C. Reeve.
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- Where does the funding for this infrastructure come from?
- How do we incorporate preservation considerations into our publishing and acquisition workflows?
- How can information professionals articulate the importance of digital preservation in a way that resonates with multiple stakeholders?

The Task Force, whose membership includes Keller, James Phillpotts (Oxford University Press), Wendy Robertson (University of Iowa), and Heather Staines (Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Knowledge Futures Group), has developed some key guides and documentation for NASIG and the larger community of technical services, scholarly communication, and publishing practitioners. One guide, “Digital Preservation 101,” provides a helpful overview of preservation activities and tools, such as LOCKSS (Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe) and Portico. Another guide, “Talking Points and Questions to ask Publishers about Digital Preservation,” is designed to facilitate meaningful discussions between publishers and librarians. When negotiating with publishers and vendors, it can be difficult to know what to ask for and how to frame questions and requests. This guide can be used to prompt important discussions about how publishers are preserving their content, whether they are contractually obligated to do so, and how they determine which kinds of content (i.e. errata and corrected versions) to preserve. These guides are available at [https://nasig.wordpress.com/2018/04/27/nasig-digital-preservation-task-force-guides/](https://nasig.wordpress.com/2018/04/27/nasig-digital-preservation-task-force-guides/).

The Task Force also distributed a survey to the library community and analyzed the results. One trend the survey revealed was that the majority of respondents do not have preservation policies. The Task Force hopes to work towards a template or model preservation policy that will help institutions incorporate preservation planning into their mainstream operations.

Additional survey findings are included in Keller’s presentation slides, which are available at [https://static.sched.com/hosted_files/nasig2019/5a/Demystifying%20Digital%20Preservation%20NASIG2019.pdf](https://static.sched.com/hosted_files/nasig2019/5a/Demystifying%20Digital%20Preservation%20NASIG2019.pdf) (no login required). The NASIG Board recently approved the recommendation that the Task Force become a Standing Committee, so there will be additional updates in the future as this timely and relevant work continues.

**RDA Toolkit Redesign Workshop**

**ALA Preconference Workshop, Washington, DC, June 21, 2019**

Jean Pajerek

Cornell Law Library

Those who signed up for the ALA pre-conference “RDA Toolkit Redesign Workshop” anticipating an 8-hour deep dive into the redesigned RDA Toolkit probably came away from it disappointed. Whether seeking elucidation of the theoretical underpinnings of the redesigned Toolkit, hoping for an overview of the practical impacts we can expect on our day-to-day cataloging once the new Toolkit is implemented, or simply wanting to learn how to navigate the new Toolkit, participants were likely to experience dissatisfaction from this workshop, which provided none of these.

The workshop entailed almost no direct interaction with the beta Toolkit. Instead, participants spent the beginning of the workshop getting a crash course in using RIMMF (RDA in Many Metadata Formats), which is software intended to help catalogers “think in RDA” without the constraints of the MARC 21 format. I had used RIMMF before, having attended two “Jane-a-thon” sessions at which RIMMF was used. Nonetheless, I felt a bit lost as Deborah Fritz, co-creator of RIMMF, rapidly demonstrated the beta version of RIMMF 4, which incorporates the changes made to the revised RDA Toolkit. As for the people who had never used any version of RIMMF before, I can only guess as to how confused they may or may not have been.

Upon entering the workshop, participants were asked to choose from among nine tables in the room, with each table focusing on a different kind of material or cataloging issue: static single works, appellations, aggregates, diachronic works, and representative expression elements. Each table had its own examples to catalog using RIMMF, under the guidance of an RDA expert.
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