

**Connecticut Judicial Branch
Law Library Advisory Committee
May 23, 2012**

The Connecticut Judicial Branch Law Library Advisory Committee met on May 23, 2012 at the Quinnipiac University School of Law, 275 Mount Carmel Avenue, Hamden, Connecticut, in the law library conference room LL241.

Present

Hon. Douglas C. Mintz, Chair
Hon. James W. Abrams
Hon. Jon C. Blue
Hon. William J. Lavery
Atty. Adam J. Cohen
Ms. Ann DeVeaux
Ms. Darcy Kirk

Absent

Hon. William H. Bright, Jr.
Hon. Theodore R. Tyma
Atty. William H. Clendenen, Jr.
Atty. Virginia C. Foreman
Mr. Blair Kauffman
Atty. William P. Yelenak

Other Attendees

Ms. Faith P. Arkin
Ms. Ann H. Doherty
Ms. Claudia Jalowka

Judge Mintz chaired and called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

I. Welcome

Judge Mintz introduced Ann Doherty, the recently appointed Deputy Director of Law Library Services.

II. Approval of Minutes.

Minutes from the January 18, 2012 Law Library Advisory Committee meeting were approved. Judge Lavery and Judge Blue abstained from the vote.

III. Law Library Operations

Ann Doherty reported that Law Library Services was given permission to advertise for a Law Librarian I position in the Stamford area. The application deadline was May 7. There were forty-one qualified applicants. Six candidates were interviewed on May 22, 2012. Ann also reported that there are at present two supervising law librarians and detailed their respective geographical areas of responsibility. Ann provided budget overview for fiscal year 2012-2013. She reported that Law Library Services is planning on a flat budget allocation. The budget for fiscal year 2012-2013 is projected to be one million dollars. This amount will be divided among all the staffed libraries and the administrative expenses for electronic services.

IV. Legal Publishing Industry

Claudia Jalowka, Supervising Law Librarian, presented an overview of the legal publishing industry – discussing topics on the evolution of the legal publishing industry from the existence of numerous legal publishers to today’s three principal publishers, the increasing costs, changing publishing practices, and print v. electronic format. The remarks regarding online vs. print highlighted certain facts: not everything is online; not all online resources are free; many secondary resources are for-fee only; online searching is not always easier or more productive; some publications are difficult to use online; historical data is not always available in electronic format. The report was well received. Judge Lavery suggested that the report contained information that was of value to the bench and should be disseminated to the judges. It was agreed that the material would be distributed to the judges in electronic format.

V. Future of Law Libraries

Judge Mintz stated that the Chief Justice requested that the Law Library Advisory Committee study the future of the law libraries. Judge Mintz noted that Claudia’s report provided an important foundation from which to work. Attorney Cohen inquired as to whether or not the committee was charged with issuing a report. Judge Mintz observed that a process should be undertaken in order for the committee to make findings and formulate recommendations to be forwarded to the Chief Justice. Judge Mintz thought the best approach would be to involve the law librarians since they are the experts. He suggested the librarians participate in focus groups. Questions should be formulated for the focus groups to address. Possible questions are “Who are the law librarians to serve?” “What services and resources do the users need?” “What should the libraries provide?” Ann stated that additional questions would be developed to present to the focus groups with the goal to provide a blueprint for structuring a law library system for the future. Following the report of the law librarians, the Law Library Advisory Committee will consider forming sub-committees to study the various components of the report. The Committee agreed that it would look at both the “ideal” law library (no fiscal limitations) and a “realistic” law library (recognizing current fiscal circumstances). Judge Mintz inquired as to how much time the librarians would need to meet and report; Ann stated at least three months.

VI. Future Meetings and Adjournment

The next meeting of the committee is planned for September after the law librarians’ report the findings of their focus group discussions to the committee members. The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ann H. Doherty
Secretary