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Repository Mission

- Provide access to and preserve the intellectual output of William & Mary Law School

- Two-pronged initial attack
  - Faculty Scholarship
  - Law Journals

- Other content to follow
  - Conferences and presentations (video ...)
  - Publications (newspapers, annual reports ...)
  - Other law school history (photos ...)
Starting Point

Wolf Law Library » Home

News and Events

Winter Interim Hours

The Law Library will open on a reduced schedule during the winter interim. See our complete hours for Saturday, December 18th through Sunday, January 9th. As always, Law School community members may access the library 24 hours a day with their ID cards.

Check This Out!

feature stories from the Wolf Law Library

W&M Law’s Scholarship Repository Takes Off!

Thousands of articles from our professors and journals are just the beginning.
Repository Timeline

- April 29: 1st bepress conference call
- May: Site design at W&M and bepress
- June 10: Site goes live
- June 25: Begin work on PDFs for William and Mary Law Review
- June 30: Submit WMLR journal setup form
- July 20: First content (faculty pubs) loaded
Toolkit

- Content
  - PDFs from HeinOnline

- Workforce
  - Librarians
  - Student assistants

- Equipment & Software
  - 3 computers / 1 port
  - Lacie NAS, “Big Blue”
  - Adobe Pro
  - OCR Software
  - Scanner
Journal Timeline

- Aug. 9: WMLR journal site live
- Aug. 10: First content added (LIFO)
- Aug. 23: Student assistants begin loading
- Sept. 1: BORJ live
- Sept. 2: ELPR, JOWL and BLR live
- Sept. 7: William & Mary Review of Virginia Law live
- Oct. 12: Colonial Lawyer series created
- Nov. 11: All back issues for journals completed
Adding the Journals

- Natural progression from print archive to digital
- Should include all Law School publications
- We own digital copies (HeinOnline)
- Broader access for W&M scholarly output
Excluding the Editorial Boards

- Primarily an archival decision
  - Not a publishing tool
- Consistent look and feel
- Ease of administration
  - 5 journals = 5 editorial boards
The Final Product

About this Journal

Since 1957, the William and Mary Law Review has published important scholarly work to become one of the top general interest law journals in the country. Published six times per year—October, November, December, March, April, and May—the Review has featured the work of experts in all areas of the law.

Current Issue:


Prefatory Matter

Table of Contents (v. 52, no. 2)

Articles

Standardization of Standard-Form Contracts: Competition and Contract Implications
Mark R. Patterson

Local Rules and the Limits of Trans-Territorial Procedure
Samuel P. Jordan
6 Journals / 5 Designs
Reflecting the Print

William & Mary Bill of Rights Journal

About this Journal

Since 1992, the William & Mary Bill of Rights Journal has published important scholarly works on constitutional law. Published four times per year - in October, December, March, and May - BORJ is the third most-cited student-edited constitutional law journal by Washington and Lee's Law Journal Rankings Survey.

Current Issue:


Prefatory Matter

Table of Contents (Vol. 19, no. 1)

Articles

Government Identity Speech and Religion: Establishment Clause Limits After Summum
Mary Jean Dolan

Oral Dissecting on the Supreme Court
Christopher W. Schmidt and Carolyn Shapiro
Colonial Lawyer

Colonial Lawyer

Issues from 1991
Colonial Lawyer, Vol. 20, No. 1 (Spring 1991), Editors of Colonial Lawyer

Issues from 1990
Colonial Lawyer, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Spring 1990), Editors of Colonial Lawyer
Colonial Lawyer, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Fall 1990), Editors of Colonial Lawyer

Issues from 1989
Colonial Lawyer, Vol. 18, No. 1 (Spring 1989), Editors of Colonial Lawyer
Colonial Lawyer, Vol. 18, No. 2 (Fall 1989), Editors of Colonial Lawyer

Issues from 1988
Colonial Lawyer, Vol. 17, No. 1 (Spring 1988), Editors of Colonial Lawyer
Colonial Lawyer, Vol. 17, No. 2 (Fall 1988), Editors of Colonial Lawyer
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Law Review Buy-In

- Library purchases back content
  - Broke the PDFs
  - Loaded all articles

- Administrative Assistants
  - Provided missing issues this summer

- Journal Editors
  - Provide missing issues
  - Looking for ways to improve their websites
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal staff</th>
<th>Library staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides future content to the library to be loaded in the repository</td>
<td>Provides complete archive of all journal issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ Issues are broken down by article.</td>
<td>◦ Open access to the articles so a journal does not have to maintain content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>◦ Available before the issue is available in print.</td>
<td>on their own site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What we offer each other**
Loading Journal Articles

- Batch Load vs. Item by Item
- Librarian vs. Student
- Training
- Metadata
Tax TARP Needed for Year One and Year Two Returns of Executive Bonus to TARP Recipient: A Case Study of Year One Rescission/Exclusion From Income and Year Two Deduction Under Section 1341

Abstract
This Article addresses the tax consequences to AIG Financial employees who repay their controversial retention bonuses in the year of receipt (Year 1) or in a subsequent year (Year 2). At the time the executives received their bonuses, the media and members of Congress raised challenges that might induce such repayment, thus justifying favorable tax treatment for repaying executives. Accordingly, bonuses repaid in year 1 should be excluded from gross income under the doctrine of Year 1 rescission. Bonuses repaid in Year 2 should result in an adjustment under Section 1341, which reduces the income taxes for Year 2 by the amount that the income taxes for Year 1 would have been reduced if the repaid bonus hypothetically had been excluded from income in Year 1.

This analysis is based upon a "balancing-entry approach" which backs out a Year 1 transaction when an assumption at the time of Year 1 receipt (that the employee would get to keep the bonus) later turns out to have been in error. This balancing-entry approach is traced across a number of case law and statutory doctrines including the claim of right doctrine, the Crane-Tafts doctrine, and rescission and cancellation in Year 1. Contrary interpretations exist, however, manifesting the need for Congressional or administrative clarification and to encourage repaying of such controversial bonuses.

Repository Citation
John W. Lee, Tax TARP Needed for Year One and Year Two Returns of Executive Bonus to TARP Recipient: A Case Study of Year One Rescission/Exclusion From Income and Year Two Deduction Under Section 1341, 1 Wm. & Mary Bus. L. Rev. 323, 390 (2010), http://scholarship.law.wm.edu/wmblr/vol1/iss2/3

Publication Information
Additional Student Tasks

- Keywords
  - LegalTrac
  - Index to Legal Periodicals

- Adding additional journals

- OCR and editing PDFs

- Abstracts
Staying Organized

- 9 Repository Students
- 32 Reference Students
- 8 Collections (7 journals)
- 6 Keyword lists
## Downloads

### W&M Law Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Downloads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>2,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>7,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>3,843</td>
<td>26,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>3,855</td>
<td>20,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: August - December</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,855</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,094</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we’ve learned in the past 6 months.

PROS AND CONS
Pros

- Entire journal archive loaded in 3 months
- Continuity in procedure
- Introduced the repository to future law review staff members
Cons

- Missing pages in purchased content
- Too many simultaneous projects
- Students created as much work as they produced
What would we change?

- Fewer students
- Fewer collections at once
- Purchase all additional hardware and software first
These slides are available at: http://scholarship.law.wm.edu/library/21/
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