

KF1 Form Table Comments

Discussion between members of Classification and Subject Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group:

Message 1: I very much like Marie's revision of the KF1 table. It's tighter and simpler (though by no means oversimplified).

I examined some material on our catalog and on LC, concentrating mainly on classification areas that use table KF1 and are known for their "heavy traffic" (e.g. KF6351-637---Income taxation). I must admit that I was surprised to see how unnecessarily detailed the current table really is. For example, most of the activity in 6355.2-6355.5 is in 6355.5, so eliminating the 5.2-5.5 range and grouping the material in 5.6 as Marie did makes a lot of sense.

I am particularly happy with replacing 6.5-.599 with the much more logical 6.6<date> for chronological arrangements of specific acts. The current range has been widely misapplied and most difficult to teach (I often find myself apologizing to new catalogers for the "fuzziness" of this range).

Some other highlights are: grouping together yearbooks and society publications with periodicals (2.5-3 merging with 2); creating one number for the various finding aids for statutes and regulations (8.8 replacing 8-8.7); and tightening up the 19.5-19.8 range into one number for examination aids and popular works (19.85).

The one change I'm still not sure about is the treatment of commentaries under "6.6<date>--Particular acts." In the proposed table ".A2 Monographs. By date of publication" makes sense for unannotated editions, but, since we won't be able to cutter for main entry, we'll lose the ability to

shelve together editions of commentaries by the same author/corporate body.

Message 2: Just a comment on the commentaries. The reference librarians liked one arrangement. They did not want to go to 2 places for the unannotated and the annotated. It seemed like they felt that keeping editions together was not so important in the sequences of individual acts and that it was good to have them together. We do not keep editions together when classing the compilations of statutes area. Should we start a list of pros and cons for this when it comes up for discussion? What was interesting was that the Japanese legal specialist felt the same way as the American reference librarians. The area of concern may just be the German commentaries.

Message 3: I have always felt that it is important to keep editions together but in this area maybe not. Sometimes it helps to make a visual. Maybe we should find a good example and arrange the books.

Message 4: There are a ton of excellent changes proposed that will truly help simplify this table. It's amazing how much time and energy Marie has spent talking to reference librarians and catalogers already.

As to the commentaries, I like doing away with the unannotated v. annotated distinction. I am wondering more about losing the serials v. monographs distinction here and throwing the serials into 5.99. Any others bothered by that?

I wonder how many editions of commentaries by the same author/corporate body situations exist? In other words, how many titles would be impacted if they were lumped together into A2 by date, with other titles possibly shelved in between? As has been noted, this most likely occurs only in the tax numbers. I confess I did not go to the shelves to look at those numbers.

Message 5: Regarding collections of laws serials including collections and serial of individual laws, reason: no one was changing the call number when the law was re-enacted. That was leading to instances where the 1954 internal revenue code and the 1986 code were shelved together (made up example). Also it made shelving considerations a little easier since the sets that would expand the most were together thus helping with space allocation.

Message 6: I'm convinced about the serials now.

Message 7: Serials: initially had a similar reaction, but after examining some specific material (especially in the area of the tax codes), I decided that shelving various versions of the code together makes much more sense than creating a new serial record for each version. The one thing we'll need to remember is to keep uniform titles for specific codes out of the serial records.

Editions of commentaries: I searched our database for the following patterns found under specific laws, regulations, rules, etc. in tables KF1 and KF6:

Table KF1

6.5-.599 .A5-Z

7.5-.529 .A5-Z

9.5-.529 .A5-Z

Table KF6

.A31-.A328 A5-Z

.A35-.A369 A5-Z

.A42-.A439 A5-Z

After analyzing the results I concluded that it is very rare to have editions of substantive commentaries in these areas of the tables; certainly not enough to justify separate cutting by main entry. The only place I thought keeping editions

together was still important is in KF879.5-.529 where we have works like Anderson on the Uniform Commercial Code (KF879.514.A53) and Quinn's Uniform Commercial Code (KF879.528.Q56). Our collection cannot be compared to LC, of course, but we do have good coverage of core US material.

Message 8: Excellent. Just the kind of helpful searches we need. I wonder if we should examine uniform laws for other solutions.

Other Comments

Comment 1: I'm so glad that simplification of the forms tables is being considered, and agree with many of Marie's proposals, especially grouping the unannotated and annotated versions of a law together by date. That's how I've shelved our tax legislative materials collection and the users find it very helpful.

However the proposal to eliminate the "Casebooks" number gave me pause. I have, illegally, been using that number for Nutshells and other introductory works, in order to present these materials at the beginning of the section on a topic. We found that new users, in particular, didn't persevere to the end of large groups (like corporations or tax) to find the Nutshells when they were relegated to "Compendis, Outlines."

I wonder if it would be useful to others to expand the casebooks number to "Introductory materials, casebooks, etc." For open stack collections with new users – law schools, law firms – this might make starting a legal research project a little friendlier.

Comment 2: I think this is a great project and agree with the changes proposed so far. I have been out of cataloging

for a while though and do not have any comments to make on the questions posed. I am all for making things simpler.

Comment 3: I like most of the changes suggested in the form table, but I wonder if the date could be put on a separate line in 6.6 rather than expanding the decimal number. This might be easier for people to understand. The main problem might be when there is more than one act in a year. Also regarding 6.6, if it remains with the date appended to the number and trailing zeros deleted, there should be an instruction to keep the zero for the second or later act in the year. Otherwise, 6.62012 could be either the first act in 2012 or the second in 2010.

In 15, I think the note for loose-leaf should be reworded to say not to add the date to the cutter. "Subdivided" implies a different kind of arrangement.

Comment 4: I LOVE this way of doing particular acts. A real time saver. Also the particular regulations – since I do dozens of them every year. This makes so much sense!

Comment 5: Something I wish we had: examples how to use the KF1 table. Just a thought ...

Comment 6: I wondered why we are keeping the Conference number, when other things were being collapsed into general. The higher level Congresses is gone, but the general congresses down in the general works area remains. It seems LC likes to emphasize congresses. To me they are less important and could be interfiled with the rest of the general books if we are trying to simplify the table.

I also am very much in favor of continuing to give individual laws an individual number. I have been horrified at the mess created when this was not done, and we had three laws going into the same number all interspersed.

Deadline for comment was June 1, 2007.

See also "Classification" column by Marie Whited in June 2007 issue of *TSL* (p. 13-14):

<http://www.aallnet.org/sis/tssis/tsll/32-04/32-04.pdf>