The Education of Law Librarians in the United States from the Library School Perspective

Paul T. Jaeger
University of Maryland. Email: pjaeger@umd.edu

Ursula Gorham
University of Maryland. Email: ugorham@umd.edu

In the United States, the occupation of law librarianship has existed longer than the American Library Association, and law librarians have their own professional organization that is now more than 100 years old. Throughout this history, however, the related issues of degree requirements and education standards for law librarians have been repeatedly discussed, but never resolved. While some of this inertia may arise from each organization hoping that the other would settle the issue, the largest challenges appear to stem from a lack of communication between law librarians and other parts of the field and a near-complete neglect of the education of law librarians—along with law libraries as an entity—in overall library pedagogical and research discourse. This article explores the roots of the long-running concerns about the educational preparation of and the professional standards for law librarians in the United States and offers ways in which library and information science educators can contribute to addressing these concerns.

Introduction: The Parallel Histories of Legal Education and Library Education

Prior to the formalization of the education of lawyers and librarians, preparation for both professions occurred through apprenticeship and guild-type arrangements. To wit, the Supreme Court of the United States did not have a Chief Justice with a law school degree until the appointment of William Howard Taft in 1921 (Price, 1948). Both formal law and library education were initially technical in nature but started to mature early on (Morse, 1977). The education of lawyers and of librarians in the United States both began to take on their recognizable current form in the late nineteenth century, with legal education coalescing around the Socratic and casebook methods (both of which were developed at Harvard Law School) and library education being formalized through the practical approaches advocated by Melville Dewey.

Given that the preparation for both lawyers and librarians is professional education and both fields have existed in their modern sense for roughly the same amount of time, it is not unreasonable to presume the existence of a strong connection at the nexus of the two fields—law librarianship. Unfortunately, the preparation of law librarians—for essentially as long as there have been law library positions—has been defined by a lack of coordination between or conclusions by legal education and library education. In spite of spending many decades exploring the issue of the best preparation for law librarians, the American Library Association (ALA) and the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) have never agreed to or individually adopted specific criteria required

in the education of law librarians (Belniak, 2009; Caufield, 2014). The lack of clear requirements for law librarian education is particularly surprising in light of the level of detail given to the required quantitative standards established for types of materials, numbers of volumes, and physical features of law libraries over the past century (Ahlers, 2002; 2011).

By and large, the ALA has deferred to the AALL on the issue of educational competencies for law librarians. In 1988, the AALL created "Guidelines for Graduate Programs in Law Librarianship" which emphasized competencies in the legal system, the legal profession and its terminology, the literature of the law, and legal ethics (Lester, 1989). The guidelines, however, expressly state that "[i]n-depth knowledge of the law is outside the realm of library education." Overall, when reading the guidelines, "one notes their general nature and lack of advice on how to acquire the subject competencies if the librarian does not learn them in a library school and is not a law graduate" (Caufield, 2014, p. 316). As such, ALA and AALL have left those wishing to pursue a career in law librarianship with less guidance than current and future professionals likely prefer.

Law librarians are instrumental in the functioning of academic law libraries, as well as of courthouse, public law, and law firm libraries. The lack of consideration and discussion within our field about the education of law librarians—who in many contexts work on information issues that are literally matters of life and death— thus is quite troubling. In 2014, Elizabeth Caufield wrote an extremely thorough paper detailing the many attempts to establish educational criteria and programs for law librarians, beginning in 1906 with the formation of the AALL. While quite informative about the historical evolution of the inertia that impeded the establishment of standards for law library positions, the most memorable aspect of the paper may be the paradox it encapsulates at the be-

ginning: "some law librarians must earn the often costly degree that belongs to another field without the corresponding salary and status that often accompanies that credential, while other find employment in the same libraries without the additional education, but their jobs lack comparable salary or status" (Caufield, 2014, p. 288). The end result, Caufield explains, is a lack of clarity about job roles, status, and compensation that impacts current law librarians, students and information professionals considering law librarianship as a career, and individuals who work with law librarians.

To help bring more focus to this area of librarianship in the library and information science (LIS) discourse, this paper explores the parallel developments of modern legal education and library education in the United States, the limited communication between the two areas of education and the resulting effects on the education of law librarians, and the current methods of preparing law librarians. Then, based on these considerations, the paper discusses the roles that library research, LIS pedagogy, and library organizations can play in the formalization of clearer standards for the preparation of law librarians, whether they are new to the library field or current librarians seeking to become law librarians.

Relationships between Law Schools and Library Schools Over Time

The year 1876 is a very useful starting point for thinking about this issue and the continuing inaction on it. It was then that the ALA was founded and the first formalized library education curricula were offered. At that time, law libraries existed at nine law schools, a number which would soon expand greatly (Frantz, 1951). Law libraries were not an entirely new idea at that point, as the Library of Congress had created its law library in 1832 (Whiteman, 2014). But, with the founding of

the AALL in 1906, law librarianship as a profession and the educational preparation of law librarians began to take shape. And, "it was not until the 1940's that the AALS [American Association of Law Schools]—a 'progressive' group that had much distinction and influence-got around to recommending that law schools have librarians whose principal activities were devoted to the libraries." (Brock, 1974, 325). By 1950, 137 law schools had libraries and the AALL had experienced a large increase in membership since the time of its founding (Frantz, 1951). At that time, both fields were also considering the best ways to standardize educational credentials in the field, ultimately settling on the Juris Doctor (JD) as the degree for lawyers and a Master of Library Science (MLS) or Master of Library and Information Science (MLIS) for librarians.

Also at that time, a tension (which would prove to be recurring) began to emerge between the two fields, as it became evident that law school libraries often saw themselves as distinct from other libraries. In a 1957 study, 40 of the 41 responding law libraries indicated that they did not want to be considered part of the university library system or be a part of its administrative structure, even if they currently were (Massey, 1957). The academic law libraries, in short, perceived themselves as part of the law school, not the campus library system. For decades, legal research and writing courses have been the only direct connection for law students between the classroom and the library (Mills, 1977). Nevertheless, in recent years, academic law libraries find themselves facing the same problems that many other kinds of libraries are facing, namely, the struggling to redefine their roles as technology has changed how people use information from libraries (Gorham & Jaeger, in press; Dalgash, Cordova & Estes, 2016).

This lingering tension continues to have a significant impact on the status of law libraries and the preparation of law librarians to this day. In some sense it is part of the greater exclusivity of the legal profession as compared to the library profession (Brock, 1974); lawyers self-regulate and license, but librarians do not (Chiorazzi, 2014). This very difference has affected the status of the two professions over time, and it is worth noting that law librarianship traditionally has not been viewed as having higher status than other types of librarianship. In 1948, for example, public librarians in New York City area were much better paid than law librarians on average (Price, 1948).

Perhaps more significantly, the tension inherent in the two nouns that make up the title of law librarian is also tied to a perceived neglect by library schools to the needs of law librarians. Law librarianship as a career began to receive attention from library schools not long after the AALL was launched, and the first lectures about law libraries were given by the New York State Library School in Albany in 1910. In 1937, the first regular law school course on law librarianship was offered (Morse, 1977) and it was around that time that the AALL and ALA were each complaining about the other being uncooperative in addressing issues of law librarian education (Caufield, 2014). By 1973, 15 of the 45 ALA-accredited library schools had a legal bibliography course (Morse, 1977). Beyond providing such courses, though, library schools have not generally prioritized law librarianship. They might offer one or several classes dealing partly with the law or public policies that are relevant to libraries (and sometimes none at all), but not that many library schools have active programs designed to prepare future law librarians (Brooks, 2005; Caufield, 2014; Hambleton, 1991).

A review of the AALL's website during the summer of 2016 revealed a list of 13 universities said to offer a joint Juris Doctor/Master of Library Science (JD/MLS) or Juris Doctor/Master of Library & Information Science (JD/MLIS) degree option. Even among the joint degree programs, there is a substantial amount of variation

in terms of the number and content of required courses, the amount of credits required, and so forth. For example:

- The joint degree program offered by Indiana University-Bloomington requires a minimum of 109 credit hours, 30 of which are within the MLS program. Courses in law librarianship and government information are required and, per the program's website, courses in online searching and intellectual freedom are considered "particularly appropriate" electives.
- The joint degree program offered by North Carolina Central University requires 112 credit hours, 24 of which are within the MLS program. The required MLS courses are not specific to law librarianship or legal information resources, although a course focused on special libraries is required.

It should be noted that a number of programs also offer a specialization or concentration in this area. Significant variation exists here as well, with some schools offering a well-defined curriculum (e.g., University of Washington requires 43 credits, with four law librarianship courses) and others recommending, but not requiring, certain courses for the specialization.

A 1962 paper noted the lack of effort by library schools to recruit or train potential law librarians as a key reason for the insufficient number of professionals prepared to work in law libraries, but it also noted an overall lack of a sense of what law librarianship meant as a field in either law schools or library schools (Borgeson, 1962). This latter point—which may be the greatest challenge in the preparation of future law librarians—is further reflected in AALL's somewhat lackluster and unfocused efforts to take the lead in standardizing the education of law librarians. In the past twenty years, they convened and disbanded in the same year two initiatives—the Task Force to Enhance Law Li-

brarian Education in 1999 and the Graduate Education for Law Librarians Special Committee in 2004—with neither leaving much evidence of its existence. The Conference of Law Library Educators has existed for many years, but only meets once a year at the AALL annual meeting. Its website (lib.law.washington.edu/colle/) has little content other than a few external links, with the homepage noting that there were no minutes from the last two meetings in 2014 and 2015.

This problem does not permeate the entire field of librarianship as, overall, the preparation of future librarians has standardized greatly from its early years. Formalized education programs for librarianship now date back 130 years in the United States. The standardized MLS/MLIS degree is over 50 years old and two-year library degrees have been the norm for more than 30 years (Murray, 1978; Swigger, 2012). The ALA provides clear accreditation standards for library schools and specific expectations of how future librarians will be prepared. Yet, the best ways to educate a law librarian—even with both the ALA and AALL being well over 100 years old—remain a bit of a pedagogical mystery.

Educational Requirements of Law Librarianship

As a result, the preparation of law librarians remains mostly informal and on-the-job, paralleling the exact kind of preparation that law schools and library schools were originally created to replace. Other than earning a joint JD/MLS or JD/MLIS or earning both degrees separately, law librarian preparation in formal education settings is primarily limited to law-related courses in library schools, continuing education, and paralegal certifications (McAdam, 1995). Over time, proposals have been made for the creation of a special law librarian certification process as part of the MLS/MLIS program (akin to the certification of school library media

specialists); the institution of a requirement of two Master's degrees—an MLS/MLIS and a Master of the Arts in Legal Studies (law for non-lawyers); and the creation of a new Master's degree of Studies in the Law (law specifically for law librarians). Others have argued either for requiring both the MLS/MLIS and the JD, while others believe that only an MLS/MLIS is necessary to be a law librarian (e.g., Balija, 2011; Carter, 2011; Young, 2012).

The education question has left law librarianship without specific means of judging readiness for the profession, creating the impression that "law librarianship is theoretically open to anyone" (McNeill, 2001, p. 6). As a practical matter then, mentoring opportunities are of particular importance to aspiring law librarians (Rastorfer & Rosenof, 2016). That type of mentoring, of course, requires already having a position in a law library. For those seeking to find a law library job, the resources are more of the self-help variety. Many online resources and books exist to help law librarians, as well as those who wish to become law librarians, teach themselves the job (Aycock, 2015).

It has been argued that you need both degrees to simultaneously understand the law and serve as a librarian, as "the law librarian is primarily a member of the library profession" (Bitner, 1947, pp. 56–57). Many articles—academic and professional—about law librarianship, however, are quick to point out that most law librarians do not have a law degree. According to the "Career Center" section of the AALL website, "about one third" of law librarians have both a JD and a library school degree and about 20% of position announcements for law librarian jobs require both degrees (www.aallnet.org/mm/Careers/lawlibrary-careers/Education-Requirements). However, there are several reasons that having a JD is important to a career as a law librarian. The JD helps a law librarian in several ways, providing them with knowledge about the law, how it works, and how to read the language and terms; familiariz-

ing them with legal culture; and grounding the librarian in his/her relationships with the rest of the law school (Whisner, 2009). A legal education also helps the law librarian understand the way in which lawyers' minds are trained to work (Bitner, 1947). Arguably, it also provides law librarians with a distinct advantage when it comes to contract negotiations with legal publishers for access to subscription databases, journals, and other resources. Most practically, no matter what the ABA guidelines or the employment ads might say, many believe that advancement in an academic law library is unlikely without a JD (Aycock, 2015).

Part of the confusion about the best degree or degree combination for law librarianship is rooted in a lack of consensus about the function of a law librarian. Some argue that a law librarian is primarily a management position, focusing on proficiencies in collection planning, budgets, space, e-resources, student and faculty training in technology literacy, and technology supervision in rest of law school (Kane, 2003). Others have argued—over many years—that law librarians are both administrators and educators or are entirely educators: "bibliographer, administrator, and teacher" (Price, 1948, p. 268) or "by definition a teacher and a mentor" (Chiorazzi, 2014, p. 82). To an extent, these efforts to define what a law librarian is fail to acknowledge that different positions within a law library will require different skills and areas of experience. The AALL "Core Competencies" (www.aallnet.org/mm/Leadership-Governance/policies/PublicPolicies/competencies.html) (last revised in April 2010), however, acknowledge a wide variety of roles, listing 60 competencies in 7 main categories: core, management, services, technology, collections, cataloguing, and teaching. Of particular interest is the statement that the competencies can be acquired through continuing education and/or experience, in addition to LIS graduate education.

Separate but Uncommunicative

Given the long-standing uncertainties in the education of law librarians and the nature of the position as bridging two fields, one might expect to find active discourse in both general LIS literature and in more specialized literature for law librarians. One, however, would be wrong. Attention to the education of law librarians—and to a large extent, the basic acknowledgement of the existence of law libraries—is fairly lacking in LIS literature.

A search through the online archives of the *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science* for the terms "law" and "legal" reveals almost no discourse about law librarians or their education. Several articles have been published on courses or parts of courses on law or specific legal issues impacting libraries and library careers generally (Dryden, 2011; Gathegi & Burke, 2008; Jaeger, 2008; Jaeger, Gorham, Taylor, & Bertot, 2015). Additionally, there are a few old announcements about law library courses being offered at certain library schools, but that is all in terms of discussions about law libraries or law librarianship in the most prominent journal for discourse about library education. A search though the archives of the other main library education journal, *Education for Information*, reveals a very small number of articles related to—or at least mentioning—law library(ies) (9 total) and law librarian(s) (5 total). None address the education of law librarians.

In other journals of library science (i.e., those not focused on education specifically), the results are not much different. Two of two most prominent outlets for research about librarianship offer similar results. *Library Quarterly*, across its 86-year history, gives the most attention to law librarians in its book review section. Only 13 research articles even mention law librarian(s), and only 46 mention law library(ies) in any way. None were dedicated to these topics, much less law librar-

ian education. As two examples, one paper discusses the education of law librarians as one of many topics in an overview of different approaches to library education (Asheim, 1955), while another focuses on cataloguing issues in law libraries (Stern, 1945). Issues of law are discussed in many other research papers in the journal, but the focus is on issues that impact all libraries or as a concern for all librarianship as a profession. In *Library & Information Research*—another major journal of library research—far fewer mentions are made of law library(ies) (17 articles) and law librarian(s) (5 articles) and none focus on education.

Accordingly, discussions related to the preparation of law librarians have been left to journals read not by library professionals generally or by library school educators, but by people already in the profession of law librarianship—primarily *Law Library Journal* and *AALL Spectrum*, as well as the occasional paper in a law review. While the reasons underlying the limited audience for these discussions are not entirely clear, the end results are that non-law librarians are paying insufficient attention to the education of law librarians in the general LIS discourse and law librarians are failing to bring broader attention to these issues by continuing the dialogue only within these more specialized venues.

Such a situation is not likely to promote a better understanding of the issues in either library schools or law schools. It has been noted that cooperation and investment from both library and law schools are required for a joint degree in law librarianship to succeed (Milles, 2004). Similarly, such cooperation is also necessary for solving larger concerns about establishing the best means to educate law librarians. As there are still important debates as to the degree or degrees needed to be a law librarian or the best educational preparation for them in library school (e.g., Balija, 2011; Carter, 2011; Young, 2012), thoughtful conversation between the two

groups seems to be a most necessary starting point. Moreover, empirical research into these issues would be helpful.

Library Education and Law Librarian Education

With questions about the education of law librarians still largely unresolved, the current challenges facing academic law libraries offer an opportunity to shape the future of this education in a way that addresses at least some of these questions. As law schools have faced significant declines in enrollment and funding, many have heavily reduced support for their libraries. Law school libraries have proven to be easy targets for budget cuts, with library budgets coming under increasing scrutiny in most law schools (Ax-Fultz, 2015; Fariss, 2013). The budgetary and space requirements of law school libraries are substantial (Gershon, 2013), leading to increasing questions as to the wisdom of devoting scarce resources to them. As noted by Fitchett *et al.* (2011), "[w]hen a dean looks at a law school budget, the biggest expenditure after faculty salaries is the library, and many must now wonder 'what are all those people doing with all that money?'" (p. 95).

Waning support is driven, at least in part, by a significant reduction in academic law library usage due to the migration of many legal materials online. Since the turn of the century, the necessity of the law school library in the face of the growing power and scope of WestLaw and LexisNexis electronic legal databases, as well as other electronic resources, has been challenged (Danner, 2002; Jarvis, 2004). As explained by Tice (2011), "[t]he digital environment has empowered information-seekers to make such connections on their own, essentially whenever and from wherever they choose. Surely—it is argued—this represents a positive development in legal information management that should be supported, encouraging legal researchers to work independently of intermedia-

tion, regardless of what that might mean to the status of the library" (p. 171). Between these twin pressures of reduced support and reduced usage, many academic law libraries have struggled to adapt to the new information, technological, and financial environment (Gorham & Jaeger, in press; Tice, 2011).

They can, however, learn from the experiences of other law libraries. Public law libraries, for example, have also found themselves redefining their role in serving members of the public in light of the growth of online legal materials. In recent years, there has also been an increase in self-representation, particularly in domestic relations, landlord-tenant, and small claims cases (Johnstone, 2011; Snukals & Sturtevant, 2007). Many self-represented litigants find themselves in this position because they cannot afford to hire an attorney (Legal Services Corporation, 2012). Public law libraries, building upon their "long history of serving all users, from court and bar to non-attorney users," have played a pivotal role in helping this group of litigants through the development of self-help centers (AALL, 2014, p. 24; see also Zorza, 2012). Resources and services typically available through self-help centers include "legal research help, referrals to other legal programs, computers, court forms, email reference, telephone reference, and professional collections for the person without a lawyer" (AALL, 2014, p. 25).

In addition to self-help centers, public law libraries across the country provide assistance to individuals with legal issues by connecting them with attorneys through "Ask a Lawyer" programs (generally involving brief one-on-one advice sessions) as well as clinics and workshops focused on specific issues (e.g., bankruptcy and debt collection). These initiatives often involve collaboration with courts, as well as with providers of legal services and bar associations (Jaeger, Taylor & Gorham, 2015). And through these collaborations public law libraries have been able to

build upon their traditional strengths and position themselves as valuable partners in ongoing efforts to address pressing community needs. For example, the Travis County Law Library and Self-Help Center in Texas has adopted a particularly innovative approach, relying on reference attorneys to assist self-represented litigants in uncontested family law cases. The reference attorneys review forms prepared by litigants and then complete a checklist to be presented to the judge, indicating that all necessary steps have been taken in the case. As noted on the website, this arrangement benefits both the litigant and the court, by making the process "faster and easier."

If we want public law libraries—as well as other types of law libraries—to continue to evolve so that they can better meet community needs, we cannot afford to be complacent about the lack of attention paid to the educational preparation of law librarians. As LIS programs consider ways in which they could better contribute to the preparation of law librarians, the current environment in which law libraries exist demands that they think beyond offering a course or three related to the law or to legal materials. Knowing the nature of the law and legal materials is clearly necessary, as reflected in the AALL core competencies, but so is an understanding of the educational roles of law librarians and the impacts of their work on the lives of their patrons. Regardless of whether they are employed in a public law library, an academic law library, or a private law firm, the work of law librarians can have important consequences for major life issues. The preparation of public librarians, academic librarians, archivists, and school media specialists is evolving to better account for the educational, community service, and social justice roles of their work (Gorham, Taylor, & Jaeger, 2016; Jaeger, Shilton, & Koepfler, 2016; Jaeger, Taylor, & Gorham, 2015; Jaeger, Taylor, Gorham, Kettnich, Sarin, & Peterson, 2014). It is vital now, more than ever, that the prepa-

ration of law librarians evolves in similar ways.

Ideally, the core of this preparation should be a curriculum that combines the traditional approach to law librarianship (i.e., courses focused on legal resources, government information, legal research, and law library administration) with courses that address the emerging roles of law librarians in the realms of education, public service, and advocacy. Additionally, the changing role of libraries in general should be considered so that curriculum for law librarianship fits within the broader needs of library education. The findings from the multi-year *Re-Envisioning the MLS* project (conducted by University of Maryland's iSchool) suggest that library education should emphasize: focusing on people and communities; knowing, leveraging, and leading in communities; holding true to the core ethics and values of the field; and stressing skills and competencies of leadership, education, advocacy, engagement, and relationship-building (Bertot & Sarin, 2015; Bertot, Sarin, & Jaeger, 2016; Bertot, Sarin, & Percell, 2015).

Among the competencies for future information professionals identified through this project were the "ability to facilitate learning and education either through direct instruction or other interactions" and the "ability to work with, and train others to use" a variety of technologies (Bertot, Sarin, & Percell, 2015, p. v). An important component of this education role is the ability to help others develop literacy skills. By way of example, law librarians are often tasked with doing more than physically locating a case, statute, or regulation. As more and more people search for legal information exclusively online, law librarians are increasingly functioning as navigators who ensure that their users are finding credible and relevant information (Zorza, 2012). They find themselves not only helping their users become more familiar with legal resources but are often also helping them become more comfortable in a digital environment. This teaching

role—increasingly important for librarians of all types—is all the more important within the context of legal information, which is unfamiliar (if not outright intimidating) to many people. The education role of law librarians thus encompasses "organizing information so it can be found as easily as possible, helping people find information, helping people use information, and acting as 'translators' between different systems" (Zorza, 2012, p. 6).

Preparing students to take on advocacy roles is equally important. Much has been written about the increasing irrelevance of law librarians in a world where legal information is readily available online (*see*, e.g., Jarvis (2004)). This argument, however, is flawed to the extent that it ignores the vital role of law librarians in connecting people with legal information and services they need. Initiatives such as the self-help centers discussed above can help law librarians demonstrate the value of the institutions in which they work but only if we equip them with the skill set to do so. In preparing future law librarians to take on advocacy roles, more emphasis should be placed on cultivating their understanding of the surrounding political environment to ensure that they can better identify and justify their unique contributions to communities that they serve (Jaeger & Sarin, 2016). These community engagement roles also need to be taught through the lens of building community partnerships with other organizations and institutions to achieve goals that libraries often cannot achieve on their own (Bertot, Jaeger, Gorham, Taylor, & Lincoln, 2013).

Many law libraries—at least academic and public law libraries—already engage in activities that can serve as a basis for expanded roles of advocacy, education, and public service by law librarians:

• Many law libraries also host legal clinics and pro bono hours for law students and lawyers to assist members of the surrounding community with issues like taxes. Through such programs, the law libraries are creating a link to the surrounding community and creating a perception of the law library as a helping institution.

• In many academic law libraries, the law librarians also teach courses on legal research to law students. In these law libraries, such education of law students could serve as the basis of expanded educational roles for promoting legal literacy in their surrounding communities.

• A number of law libraries are members of the Federal Library Depository Program (FDLP), which makes them open to all members of the public for access to government publications. For these law libraries, status as an FDLP institution is a direct connection to their regional community (Jaeger, Bertot, & Shuler, 2010; Shuler, Jaeger, & Bertot, 2010).

The space of the law library itself is another place where initial steps are occurring to increase a sense of a broader advocacy, education, and public service mission. Reconfiguring the space of law libraries—using principles that have already been embraced by many other libraries—can promote increased interaction, learning, and collaboration among users of the library (Peoples, 2014). These kinds of ideas and activities provide important linkages between the aspirations of the profession of librarianship and the goals of the law library.

Conclusion

Law librarianship is simultaneously about both law and libraries, and greater focus on both areas—with productive attention from both ALA and AALL—will help to rationalize the preparation of law librarians. In thinking about expanding the law librarianship curriculum in any of these ways, LIS educators will need to evaluate their current course offerings to see if these elements can be incorporated into

existing classes or whether classes should be completely redesigned. They will also need to determine the desired qualifications for those who will be teaching these classes. Ultimately, the ability to improve law librarianship education within any LIS program is dependent upon a variety of factors, including the level of resources, the expertise of faculty, and the support of the administration. A systematic review by the AALL of existing law librarianship programs and courses of study, however, would go a long way towards helping LIS educators better understand the current state of affairs in law librarian education. This deeper understanding, in turn, could pave the way for more informed decisions regarding the education of future law librarians. Ideally, it could also lead to the development of clearer standards for law librarian education that will better prepare law librarians to meet the continually evolving needs of the individuals and communities they serve.

References

Ahlers, G.-P., Sr. (2002). *The history of law school libraries in the United States: From laboratory to cyberspace*. New York: William S. Hein.

Ahlers, G.-P., Sr. (2011). *The history of law school libraries in the United States: Defining moments*. New York: William S. Hein.

American Association of Law Libraries. (2014, July). Law libraries and access to justice: A report of the American Association of Law Libraries Special Committee on Access to Justice. Retrieved from http://www.aallnet.org/mm/Publications/products/atjwhitepaper.pdf

Asheim, L. (1955). Education for librarianship. *Library Quarterly, 25*(1), 76–90. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4304385.

Ax-Fultz, L. J. (2015). Igniting the conversation: Embracing legal literacy as the heart of the profession. *Law Library Journal, 107*, 421–467. Retrieved from http://www.aallnet.org/mm/Publications/llj/LLJ-Archives/Vol-107/no-3/2015-20.pdf.

Aycock, A. (2015). How to become a law librarian in four easy lessons. *Information Today, 32*(5), 1–29. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Balija, S. V. (2011, July 6). Why a law degree matters to law librarians. *The Philadelphia Story*, p. 6.

Belniak, T. (2009). The law librarian of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. *Law Library Journal, 101*, 427–449. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/llj101&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=409.

Bertot, J. C., Jaeger, P. T., Gorham, U., Taylor, N. G., & Lincoln, R. (2013). Delivering e-government services and transforming communities through innovative partnerships: Public libraries, government agencies, and community organizations. *Information Polity, 18*(2), 127–138. doi:10.3233/IP-130304.

Bertot, J. C., & Sarin, L. (2015). The future of MLS: Rethinking library education. *American Libraries, 46*(3/4), 40–42. Retrieved from https://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/2015/02/26/the-future-of-mls/.

Bertot, J. C., Sarin, L. C., & Jaeger, P. T. (2016). Re-envisioning the MLS: The future of librarian education. *Public Libraries*. Retrieved from http://publiclibrariesonline.org

Bertot, J. C., Sarin, L., & Percell, J. (2015). Re-Envisioning the MLS: Findings, issues, and consideration. College Park, MD: College of Information Studies. Retrieved from http://go.umd.edu/ReEnvisionFinalReport

Bitner, H. (1947). The educational background of the university's law librarian. *Law Library Journal, 40*, 49–61. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/llj40&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=57.

Borgeson, E. C. (1962). Education and the image of the law librarian. *Law Library Journal, 55*, 200–203. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/llj55&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=224.

Brock, C. A. (1974). Law libraries and librarians: A revisionist history; or more than you ever wanted to know. *Law Library Journal, 67*, 325–361. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/llj67&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=343.

Brooks, S. (2005). Educating aspiring law librarians: A student's perspective. *Law Library Journal, 97*, 517–536. Retrieved from EBSCO*host*.

Carter, G. P. (2011). Questioning the paper chase: Why should law librarians obtain a law degree? *SCALL News, 39*, 15. Retrieved from http://scall-net.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/NewsletterSepOct2011.pdf.

Caufield, E. (2014). Is this a profession? Establishing educational criteria for law librarians. *Law Library Journal, 106*, 287–328. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/llj106&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=287.

Chiorazzi, M. G. (2014). Mentoring, teaching, and training the next generation of law librarians:

Past and present as prologue to the future. *Law Library Journal, 106*, 69–83. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/llj106&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=69.

Dalgash, J., Cordova D., & Estes, M.E. (2016). Managing Government Law Libraries Today: Challenges and Opportunities, *AALL Spectrum, 21*(2), 24–27. Retrieved from http://www.aallnet.org/mm/Publications/spectrum/archives/Vol-21/No-2/Managing-Government-Law-Libraries-Today-Challenges-and-Opportunities.pdf.

Danner, R. A. (2002). Electronic publishing of legal scholarship: New issues and new models. *Journal of Legal Education, 52*(3), 347–364. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/42893763.

Dryden, J. (2011). Learning about law in library school: A snapshot. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 52*, 184–197. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/41308895.

Fariss, L. K. (2012). Issues facing academic law libraries-New challenges, new opportunities. *Indiana Libraries, 31*(1), 37–40. Retrieved from http://journals.iupui.edu/index.php/IndianaLibraries/article/viewFile/2064/1943.

Fitchett, T., Hambleton, J., Hazelton, P., & Klinefelter, A. (2011). Law library budgets in hard times. *Law Library Journal, 103*, 91–112. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/llj103&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=91.

Frantz, L. B. (1951). The education of the law librarian. *Law Library Journal, 44*, 329–337. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/llj44&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=102.

Gathegi, J. N., & Burke, D. E. (2008). Convergence of information and law: A comparative study between I-schools and other ALISE schools. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 49*, 1–22. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40323784.

Gershon, I. R. (2013). In ten years, all new law schools! *University of Toledo Law Review, 44*, 335–344. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/utol44&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=351.

Gorham, U. & Jaeger, P.T. (in press). The law school library or the library at the law school? How lessons from other types of libraries can inform the evolution of the academic law library in the digital age. *Law Library Journal*.

Gorham, U., Taylor, N. G., & Jaeger, P. T. (2016). *Perspectives on libraries as institutions of human rights and social justice*. London: Emerald.

Hambleton, J. (1991). Does a law librarian need a law degree? In R. M. Mersky & R. A. Leiter (Eds.), *The spirit of librarianship: A reader* (pp. 37–43). Littleton, CO: Rothman & Co.

Jaeger, P. T. (2008). Building e-government into the Library & Information Science curriculum: The future of government information and services. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 49*, 167–179. Retrieved from Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40323771.

Jaeger, P. T., Bertot, J. C., & Shuler, J. A. (2010). The Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP), academic libraries, and access to government information. *Journal of Academic Librarianship, 36*, 469–478. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2010.08.002.

Jaeger, P. T., Gorham, U., Taylor, N. G., & Bertot, J. C. (2015). Teaching information policy in the digital age: Issues, strategies, and innovation. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 56*(3), 175–189. Retrieved from Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/docview/1717522503?accountid=14696.

Jaeger, P. T., & Sarin, L. C. (2016). All librarianship is political: Educate accordingly. *Political Librarian, 2*(1). Retrieved from http://openscholarship.wustl.edu/pllib/vol2/iss1/8

Jaeger, P. T., Shilton, K., & Koepfler, J. A. (2016). The rise of social justice as a guiding principle in library and information science research. *Library Quarterly, 86*(1), 1–9. doi:10.1086/684142

Jaeger, P. T., Taylor, N. G., & Gorham, U. (2015). *Libraries, human rights, and social justice: Enabling access and promoting inclusion*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Jaeger, P. T., Taylor, N. G., Gorham, U., Kettnich, K., Sarin, L. C., & Peterson, K. (2014). Library research and what libraries actually do now: Education, inclusion, social services, public spaces, digital literacy, social justice, human rights, and other community needs. *Library Quarterly, 84*(4), 491–493. doi:10.1086/677785.

Jarvis, R. M. (2004). What law professors will want from law librarians in the twenty-first century. *Law Library Journal, 96*, 503–506. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/llj96&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=506.

Johnstone, Q. (2011). Law and policy issues concerning the provision of adequate legal services for the poor. *Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy, 20*(3), 571–639. Retrieved from http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1336&context=cjlpp.

Kane, M. K. (2003). Technology and the law school librarian of the twenty-first century. *Law Library Journal, 95*, 427–430. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/llj95&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=429.

Legal Services Corporation. (2012, Oct.). *Report of*

the Pro Bono Task Force. Retrieved from http://www.lsc.gov/sites/default/files/LSC/lscgov4/PBTF_%20Report_FINAL.pdf.

Lester, J. (1989). The ALA accreditation process: Implications for educational preparation for law librarianship. *Law Library Journal, 81*, 511–522. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/llj81&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=545.

Massey, M. M. (1957). Law school administration and the law librarian. *Journal of Legal Education, 1*, 268–272. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/42891116.

McAdam, J. E. (1995). The place of legal education in law librarianship. *Canadian Law Libraries, 21*, 251–254. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/callb21&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=29.

McNeill, J. (2001). Of rants and money. *AALL Spectrum, 3*, 6–8. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.pace.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1482&context=lawfaculty.

Milles, J. (2004). Law librarians as educators and role models. *AALL Spectrum, 7*, 20–22. Retrieved from http://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~jgmilles/LibrarianEducators.pdf.

Mills, R. K. (1977). Legal research instruction in law schools, the state of the art or why law school graduates do not know how to find the law. *Law Library Journal, 70*, 343–348. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/llj70&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=365.

Morse, A. L. (1977). New directions in education for law librarianship. *Law Library Journal, 70*, 329–337. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/llj70&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=351.

Murray, K. (1978). The structure of M.L.S. programs in American library schools. *Journal of Education for Librarianship, 18*, 278–284. doi:10.2307/40322561.

Peoples, L. F. (2014). Designing a law library to encourage learning. *Journal of Legal Education, 63*, 612–639. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/jled63&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=630.

Price, M. O. (1948). The law school librarian. *Journal of Legal Education, 1*, 268–272. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/42890184.

Rastorfer, R., & Rosenof, L. (2016). Mentoring across generations: the training of a millennial librarian. *Law Library Journal, 108*, 101–118. Retrieved from http://www.aallnet.org/mm/Publications/llj/LLJ-Archives/vol-108/no-1/2016-5.pdf.

Shuler, J. A., Jaeger, P. T., & Bertot, J. C. (2010). Implications of harmonizing e-government principles and the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP). *Government Information Quarterly, 27*(1), 9–16. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2009.09.001.

Snukals, B. W., & Sturtevant Jr, G. H. (2007). Pro se litigation: Best practices from a judge's perspective. *University of Richmond Law Review, 42*, 93–105. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/urich42&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=103.

Stern, W. B. (1945). The new cataloguing rules and their importance for law libraries. *Library Quarterly, 15*(2), 143–147. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4303323.

Swigger, B. K. (2012). *The MLS project: An assessment after sixty years*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Tice, B. A. (2011). Academic law library in the 21st century: Still the heart of the law school. *University of California Irvine Law Review, 1*, 157–172. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/ucirvlre1&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=165.

Whisner, M. (2008). Law librarian, J.D. or not J.D.? *Law Library Journal, 100*, 185–190. Retrieved from http://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/llj100&g_sent=1&collection=journals&id=185.

Whiteman, M. (2014). Book burning in the twenty-first century: ABA Standard 60 and the future of academic law libraries as the smoke clears. *Law Library Journal, 106*, 11–46. Retrieved from http://www.aallnet.org/mm/Publications/llj/LLJ-Archives/Vol-106/no-1/2014-2.pdf.

Young, S. (2012). The dual degree: A requirement in search of a justification. *AALL Spectrum, 12*, 7–10. Retrieved from http://scholarship.law.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1785&context=scholar.

Zorza, R. (2012, April). The sustainable 21st century law library: Vision, deployment and assessment for access to justice. Retrieved from http://www.zorza.net/LawLibrary.pdf.