International Law and Human Rights: K or KZ?

George Prager
New York University

Works on international human rights law have traditionally been classified in K3236-K3240 (and nearby numbers). This range has also been used for works on comparative law of human rights in multiple jurisdictions not in the same region.

In October 2012, the Library of Congress added a new subject heading: International law and human rights. It added a corresponding class number, KZ1266, in April 2013. How and when should this newer subject heading and associated class number be applied? Unfortunately, there is no scope note on the subject authority record for the subject heading. KZ1266 has the caption “Relationship between human rights and public international law” and is indented under “International public law and municipal law.” “Relationship” is such a broad term. I would venture to say that the majority of works about or consisting of international human rights law fall under this umbrella. To understand better how and when KZ1266 and its associated subject heading should be used, I looked at a sample of national level records in OCLC. I found 83 that used KZ1266. I then compared these records to ones that used K3240 and had been published in 2013 or later (since the creation of KZ1266). There are a lot of works published with titles “International human rights law” or similar titles, both in English and other languages, for which one might think of using KZ1266 and the LCSH “International law and human rights” but which are classed under K3240. I could not figure out the basis upon which some records used KZ1266 and others used K3240. What is one to do in such a situation? Ask Jolande Goldberg and Aaron Kuperman, naturally (a conundrum indeed as to what to do once they retire). Aaron explained that KZ1266 and the subject heading “International law and human rights” is essentially for conflict situations, for the conflict or interface between human rights and the rights of nations (such as sovereignty). Works which focus on, or are collections of, international human rights laws should still be classified in K. Thanks, Aaron!
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I am writing this column a week before Black Friday and have Thanksgiving on the mind. This is a time to reflect on the good things in our lives and work and be thankful for them. I am particularly thankful for my technical services colleagues this year and their willingness to dig deep into questions and then make their knowledge available to the rest of us. I also thank our technical services predecessors for their attention to the minute details of description so we can determine what we have in our collection and what we need to get from someone else. The tools we use to describe our collections vary, but the goal is still the same. Those of us who are uncertain that the RDA Toolkit will ever make sense can be sure that we are not alone and that users of the previous cataloging codes had the same worries and concerns.

This is why it is so important that TS-SIS makes as many opportunities as possible to share our knowledge and understanding with each other. I remember taking AALL post-conference workshops on topics such as the new European classification schedules and the KZ/JZ schedules. These one- or two-day training sessions are probably a thing of the past, but the need to train new catalogers is still strong. We still have the annual conferences, and they are more full than ever with committee meetings, roundtables, and educational programs. Technical services librarians have produced some really awesome programs in the past few years, and it’s important that we keep creating them. Getting together in workshops to share our learning or being able to walk away from a program in deep discussion with colleagues is my favorite way to learn new things. But that’s not always possible. This year, I would like to encourage members to think about other ways to share knowledge.

We need more members of TS to help develop ideas for training videos and other online learning sessions. If you don’t feel you can do something like that, share your idea with other members, and maybe several of us can put something together. We can get technical support from AALL and from some of our TS members and their employers. If you don’t think you’re an expert in something, welcome to the club. But you know something, and others know something else, and soon the session is developed and ready for presentation.

We also have our reliable email and listservs as a resource. I’ve seen many questions over the years that helped me understand a concept even if I didn’t ask the question. Sometimes we are afraid to ask the “dumb question” (no such thing!), but then a brave person does ask, and we all benefit. I see questions about how to do things on particular ILS systems, what kind of printers or labels are best, and what to include in a disaster policy. Even if you aren’t dealing with this question now, you can take note of who answers the questions and keep them in mind for the future.

On a final note, I am very thankful to all our members who have generously donated to the ALA Cataloging Liaisons fund. We have received about $1,000 already from members, which will help us send our members to the important meetings to represent the needs of the legal community for rules and standards that meet our requirements to describe our materials as accurately as possible. At least one other SIS supports our liaisons’ work and has pledged an annual donation to assist us in continuing this work. I hope you all had a Happy Thanksgiving!

Pat Sayre-McCoy
University of Chicago
I don’t remember exactly when I learned the term “bibliography”—sometime in grade school, I imagine—but I also don’t think I ever bothered to look up the formal definition of it or the related terms of “bibliographic” or “bibliographer,” having made the assumption I knew what they meant based on my initial understanding of the first. Well, I just reviewed all these terms, and I will say that I am even more certain in my belief that the current name of our section does not fully reflect the work and interests of our members.

While the organization and description of books is part of many of our jobs, it is no longer all we do. Gone are the days where a librarian could spend all day every day only cataloging books. Most of us now also oversee library management systems, discovery layers, and library websites. This is often on top of e-resource management, creating content for research guides, and soliciting and uploading content to institutional repositories. The “bibliographic” part of our section name is now only a small part of most of our jobs. Moreover, while much of our work is done entirely online, so is most modern day information gathering—making the “online” part of our section name also superfluous.

Professionals in all fields regularly forget to remove the jargon from their vocabulary when talking to people outside their own circles. We as librarians should be especially mindful, not just of the words we use to describe things, but the words our patrons use. Most patrons now simply refer to bibliographic databases as “databases” and the register of all bibliographic items in our library as “a catalog.” Users often don’t distinguish between print or electronic as the medium of what they’re looking for because they expect it to be digital by default. Who knows if we or they will still be using these words in 20 years or more?

In this same column last year, Jackie Magagnosc shared someone’s survey comment that we should “discuss the future of Online Bibliographic Services in a way that doesn’t sound like it’s taking place in the ’80s.” I think what we should be doing is imagining what our jobs might look like in 20 years or more and start discussions from there.

There were some good ideas for a new section name that came out of the business meeting at this year’s conference, the most popular of which was “Library Systems & Resource Discovery.” While this is definitely a more modern description of our section, I’m not sure it will age better than our current name. I know we can’t predict which words will stick around and which will become obsolete, but I also know that buzzwords, by definition, are only fashionable for a short period of time.

Some other section names focus their special interest on who they are, like the Academic Law Libraries section. Others focus on specific topics, like the Government Documents section. If I could boil down the object of our section to one sentence, I think it might read, “To provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and information on the tools and methods used to improve and increase access to information.” I think this is also how we need to think about the naming of our section. But how do we communicate that through our section name, while still setting ourselves apart? We’re still trying to figure that out.

We’d love to hear your thoughts! Please let us know on the OBS-SIS Facebook page at https://www.facebook.com/OBS-SIS-Online-Bibliographic-Services-Special-Interest-Section-of-AALL-27391768304/ or email me or any member of the Executive Committee.

Jessica Pasquale
University of Michigan

Integrating Performance Management into Acquisitions

David Sanborne
Cook County Law Library, Chicago

As any given AALL annual meeting schedule indicates, metrics and data driven performance management are hot topics in law library management. At Cook County, there has been a countywide push to make sure that metrics and performance measures are closely connected to mission statements and provide actionable data that departments can use to improve performance. Traditional acquisitions and collection development data points, like volumes added or collection...
size, are not particularly useful for these purposes and are increasingly irrelevant as publishers discontinue print editions of their titles or convert loose-leaf or other publications into annuals.

One potential metric that can be both mission-based and provide valuable data for collection management decisions is to use reference statistics to identify gaps in the collection. Then, based on the number of total reference inquiries, the law library can produce a measurable statement about the comprehensiveness of the collection in answering patron needs. This process can help guide the library in what subject areas need more resources while also providing a general sense of the reliability of the collection. The steps outlined below are geared towards law libraries where most reference inquiries are in person, especially public law libraries where the majority of patrons are walk-ins who may or may not have any institutional connection to the library. In libraries with a large number of electronic reference requests or more restrictive access policies, developing these metrics is even easier.

The first step in developing this metric is to make sure that the reference staff are already keeping a running record of the number of reference inquiries. Next, reference staff need to keep a log of each time a reference inquiry cannot be resolved within the existing library collection. The level of detail in this log can fluctuate based on library needs and staff buy-in, but to be useful for collection development purposes, it should include at a minimum the subject area and whether the issue is a lack of resources in that subject area (e.g. no secondary sources on the law of commercial aviation) or the lack of a specific resource (i.e. a patron looking for a specific book that the library does not own but where the library collection includes other equivalent resources on that topic).

Once the raw data has been collected, the library can then divide the number of reference inquiries (N) that either could not be resolved with existing resources or that required sending the patron to another library by the total number of reference inquiries. This results in the percentage of “gap” inquiries (G) which can be used to calculate the inverse, the percentage of inquiries successfully resolved with existing library resources (S). The latter number can be calculated directly as follows: S = 1−(N/G).

As previously mentioned, calculating the percentage of reference desk inquiries resolved with in-house resources by itself provides a rough estimate of how effective the current collection is at addressing patron needs. This number is useful as a quantitative foundation for a departmental narrative about the effectiveness of the library. It is not helpful for identifying waste in the collection, areas with many redundant resources, or under-utilized resources, but it can be used alongside a report from reference desk staff specifying where the actual gaps are to help guide acquisitions decisions. As a bonus, it can be used to gauge how familiar reference staff are with the collection if subject areas well-represented in the library question show up on the report.

Using this data serves the twin demands of performance management and collection development while introducing quantitative data about what subject areas need more collection based on actual collection usage data. One advantage of this approach is that it provides numbers without overriding the professional experience of professional librarians, providing tools that acquisitions specialists can use to refine library purchasing to better meet patron needs.

---

**Collection Development**

A PDR by Any Other Name is Restricted to Medical Professionals Only

Adrienne DeWitt
Campbell University

In general, law librarians collect books or resources related to the law. There are times, however, we need to move beyond KF for our reference material. The Physicians’ Desk Reference (“PDR”) is an example of such a purchase.

The PDR’s importance to doctors and the practice of medicine cannot be overstated. Publisher J. Morgan Jones gave out the first edition of the *Physicians’ Desk Reference to Pharmaceutical Specialties and Biologicals* to U.S. physicians in 1947. The PDR gave doctors easily accessible prescribing information for currently available medicine, as well as a quick means of finding dosing recommendations, warnings and precautions, and approved indications for currently marketed medicine. Throughout the years, the PDR became even more user friendly. In the 1960s, the PDR added pictures to help aid in pill and capsule identification. By the late 1980s, the PDR was on CD-ROM. In 2004, the PDR reportedly had over 3,000 pages and was sent to over 400,000 doctors nationwide.

In 2017, the PDR announced it would no longer produce print editions of the PDR. Instead of a print resource, the PDR would now only be available as a mobile app and website (“PDR.net”). This transition made sense, both economically
and environmentally. Doctors were relying on Google more than ever, and the print volumes were not environmentally friendly. They were also becoming too expensive to continue to produce without a charge. The PDR.net solved all these problems, plus allowed for alerts and drug updates, recall information, and other tools such as pharmacy discount cards for doctors and patients.

With a change in format came a change in name. Instead of the Physician’s Desk Reference, the online version is now called the Prescribers’ Digital Reference. Like the print version, PDR.net is free to U.S. medical personnel. Herein lies the catch. It is only available to U.S. medical personnel.

The website succinctly states, “U.S. based MDs, Residents, DOs, NPs, and PAs in full-time patient practice are able to register on PDR.net for free through pharmaceutical company sponsorship” (see fig. 1). For non-medical practitioners, the site recommends purchasing “a book or CD–ROM version of the PDR” for “personal use.” This is when things get odd. When you click on the link, it leads you to a dead page (see fig. 2).

---

**Fig. 1**

**Fig. 2**
Should you persist and navigate back to the homepage, then click on the PDR Books link under Resources, a page will open that tells you the PDR is not publishing books (see fig. 3). Which leads to the question, why include a link to a non-existent bookstore with a recommendation to buy either a book or CD-ROM if these materials are no longer for sale in the first place? Could they not have simply linked it to Amazon? Personally, I felt a bit trolled.

After all, the PDR is not only a resource for doctors; it is also important for attorneys and courts, especially when litigating medical malpractice and patent lawsuits. A cite check on Westlaw retrieved over 1,600 citations in both state and federal courts. The most recent citation was from October 2019.

And yet, despite the fact the opinions were decided within the past year, many courts appeared to cite to the older print editions. For example, in a 2019 opinion by the West Virginia Supreme Court, the court relied on the 2017 edition of the PDR to describe the contents of three controlled substances. See footnotes, Lawyer Disciplinary Board v. Stidiopolis, 828 S.E.2d 777 (W.Va. 2019). I found it interesting that a 2019 opinion relied on a 2017 reference book, so I decided to see if this was specific to West Virginia or if it was a national phenomenon. So, I made a chart for comparison.

My chart consisted of court opinions between the years 2017 – 2019 that had older PDR editions in their footnotes (see fig. 4). I only included opinions where the court cited directly to the PDR in their footnotes, and then only those that used the PDR for definition purposes. I did not include opinions that indirectly cited it or that used undated or online versions. I also did not included opinions that were citing older editions because of the issue being litigated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PDR Editions Cited, 2017 - 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case name and Attorney Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 3**

**Fig. 4**
Between 2017 – 2019, Westlaw retrieved forty-eight opinions. Of the forty-eight, only fifteen met my criteria of footnote definitions. Seven cited to the 2017 edition, while the rest cited earlier editions. The oldest cited edition was the 55th (2001). On a side note, the Office of Federal Claims was the most consistent user of older PDR editions. Also, some courts are still referring to the online version of PDR.net not by Prescribers’ Digital Reference, but as Physicians’ Desk Reference Online (see fig. 5). That might explain why a citation search for Prescribers’ Digital Reference only retrieved eleven results (see fig. 6).

Because PDR.net is a commercial resource, getting its pharmaceutical sponsors to open up access will be an uphill battle. In the meantime, keeping old editions of the PDR might not be a bad idea, at least until the access situation is resolved. Even then, it might still be a good idea to keep them.

Welcome to the second installment of TSLL’s “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. This issue’s column features two reports from regional conferences and the keynote presentation at this fall’s Depository Library Conference. 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.

Workshop Report Digitization for Small Institutions
Rachel Evans
University of Georgia School of Law
Presenters: Angela Stanley, Director at Georgia HomePLACE with Georgia Public Library Service
Mary Willoughby, Digital Projects Manager at Digital Library of Georgia with University of Georgia & GALILEO

This Georgia Library Association (GLA) preconference workshop was a half day long with a short break in the middle of the session. The two presenters opened by talking about the Digital Library of Georgia (DLG). In this context, I quickly learned more about the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA) and the Digital Library Foundation (DLF). This introduction served as the backdrop for the rest of the session’s more detailed “how to” segments. Although I had heard of and visited each of the aforementioned DL sites before, it had been quite a while since I had taken a moment to just learn more about them and familiarize myself with their respective purposes. This seemed particularly relevant after I returned from the conference as we prepared for Open Access Week just a few weeks later. I did not realize how many wonderful resources DLF made available for free online. It was a treat diving deeper into their content.

Following this intro, the presenters shared links to highly useful resources. My favorite of those shared was the DLF toolkit for Project Managers: https://wiki.diglib.org/DLF_Project_Managers_Toolkit. For folks new to using a project management tool, this wiki has an excellent table of recommended software with summaries of each, links to them, and pros and cons side by side. Many of the tools you expect to find are there (Jira, Asana, Trello, Slack, Google Suite), though there were still a few I had not yet heard of or tested out. The project manager toolkit wiki is invaluable, and even if you are not working on projects that will eventually feed up into a DL site, the kit contains so many best practices and tips that it could be useful for many types of digitization projects. One such best practice was this 5-step process: (1) Selection & Planning; (2) Metadata Creation; (3) Prep & Scanning; (4) Post-Processing (crops & edits); and (5) Ingest & Preservation (into institutional repository).

Before an intermission midway through, attendees were divided into break-out groups of 3 to 4 people. This form, we discussed why we were there, what projects we were undertaking, and what our role was at our institution. It was very cool to experience the unique mix of staff and librarians in the workshop groups and to hear issues they experience or projects they are working on coming from such a wide variety of library types, including museums and public libraries.

I was able to share in my breakout group out loud the challenges of a certain project I have been collaborating on in our library for properly and efficiently archiving thousands of photographs. Lucky for me, our project is dealing with media that is already digital, and I already have a space that exists and is ready for hosting the images and metadata (Digital Commons). It was super neat to hear the stories and challenges of others, including what types of media they are digitizing, organizing, and archiving to make accessible to their patrons. This workshop also provided a hands-on station to practice digitization before you left the room. I love that the session enabled everyone, even those interested in the topic (lots of MLS students were there too) but not currently working in a place or role that allows them to get their hands dirty, to do just that!

For the rest of the workshop, we were shown workflow charts and given what might as well have been a micro-course on metadata terms, with a focus on descriptive data and specifics on Qualified Dublin Core. There was even a little Linked Data talk! What was most helpful about this section were the slides that included specific examples of Title fields. You know a session is worthwhile when you can take that nugget of info back and start using it immediately at work when you return. This was that particular nugget for me! I left the workshop feeling inspired and with an added confidence for the project waiting for me back in the office. Many of the tips I gained from the workshop I am currently utilizing this very week.
Ensuring Enduring Digital Access: Principles and Approaches to Digital Preservation
 Depository Library Conference keynote, October 21, 2019
 Jackie Magagnosc
 Cornell Law Library

The Federal Depository Library Conference is held annually each fall in Washington, D.C. Recently, the Government Publication Office has made “virtual” registration and attendance available, with approximately half the content presented at the conference available for live streaming or later viewing. All available recordings and slides are available at https://www.fdlp.gov/fall-2019-federal-depository-library-conference.

The keynote presentation, given by Trevor Owens, Head of Digital Content Management for Library Services, Library of Congress, was particularly interesting. He explicated many of the issues around ensuring continuing access to digitized/born digital materials. Non-specialists seem to think of digital preservation as, “Why don’t we just hoover it up and shoot it into space?” Owens contrasted the two current narratives around digital materials:

• What you put up will be there forever.
• Look out! It might all go away.

Owens started the program by describing his own background. He continued with a short definition of digital preservation, presented sixteen “axioms” for digital preservation, and concluded with “steps you can take.”

To define digital preservation, Owens reminded the audience that preservation is not a terrifying flow chart. Digital preservation is “working to ensure enduring access to digital content.” The “sixteen axioms” include:

1. A repository is not a piece of software. A repository is the sum of financial resources, hardware, staff time, and ongoing efforts to ensure long-term access to content.
2. Institutions make preservation possible.
3. Tools can get in the way as much as they can help.
4. Nothing has been preserved; there are only things being preserved. This axiom reflects the enduring commitment entities must make to ensure preservation.
5. Hoarding is not preservation.
6. Backing up data is not digital preservation.
7. Boundaries of digital objects are fuzzy.
8. One person’s digital collection is another’s digital object is another’s dataset.
9. Digital preservation is making the best use of resources to mitigate threats and risks.
10. The answer to nearly all digital preservation questions is “it depends.”
11. It’s well past time to start taking actions. There are practical things that can be done to “get the boxes off the floor.”
12. Highly technical definitions of digital preservation work are complicit in silencing the past.
13. The affordances of digital media prompt a need for digital preservation to be entangled in digital collection development.
14. Accept and embrace the archival sliver.
15. The scale and inherent structures of digital information suggest working more with a shovel than with tweezers.

The presentation concluded with description of the six things we can start doing today to facilitate preservation of digital materials:

1. Identify what digital stuff you have that you need to keep.
2. Get the digital boxes off the floor.
3. Schedule out a plan for improving things and checking in.
5. Join the communities of practice.

2019 Northwest Interlibrary Loan Conference review
 Jake Kubrin
 Stanford Law Library

The 2019 Northwest Interlibrary Loan (NWILL) Conference was a productive meeting and a chance to hear about the trends and best practices of ILL colleagues. The Conference was hosted at the Portland Community College, Sylvania Campus, an excellent venue for a regional conference. Not only were topics such as international mail and reciprocal
borrowing agreements discussed, I found a number of presentations that provided helpful information about how technical services may be able to better support ILL. Specifically, these presentations identified successes, opportunities, and challenges of collaboration between these departments.

The presentation from Stefanie Gorzelsky (Access Services Librarian, Saint Martin’s University) overiewed a successful collaboration between ILL and technical services staff and highlighted the benefits of integrating their ILL management system (Tipasa) and ILS (Alma). Also known as NCIP integration, the automated communication between Tipasa and Alma demonstrably improved the library’s ILL workflows. For instance, brief bibliographic records could be automatically created in Alma upon receipt of an item borrowed from a partner library in Tipasa. Alma can also be set up to send automated pick-up, overdue, and recall notices to patrons as well. The brief record is deleted once the material is checked back in, saving ILL staff a lot of effort since they only have to work within Tipasa. Technical services staff worked to ensure that sufficient bibliographic description was included in the brief record and also established new and more descriptive location codes for ILL materials during NCIP integration set-up. Technical services staff can then use the location codes as an additional way to handle identify and collocate these materials.

John Spracklen (Interlibrary Loan Supervisor, Gonzaga University) pointed out that an opportunity for technical services staff to support ILL is during ILL management systems migration. John spoke about his library’s transition from ILLiad to Tipasa. He suggested that there is a lot of opportunity to involve staff outside of the access services department, particularly with regard to the integration of new ILL functionality in a discovery layer. Tipasa allows patrons to submit ILL requests directly from the catalog, which technical services staff helped to configure. The bibliographic information submitted to ILL staff by the patron helps staff more easily identify partner libraries with holdings for that specific material, helping to increase fill rates at the same time.

Finally, there are some potential challenges for technical services staff looking to better support their ILL operations. Zack Lane (Head of Delivery Services, Columbia University) presented about the increasing trend for extended loan periods, reciprocal agreements, and reducing invoices sent to partner libraries for lost ILL materials. In other words, Zack was advocating for friendly and more efficient resource sharing policies that allow materials to circulate more regularly, for longer periods of time, and to a wider number of international patrons. It may go without saying that a small but guaranteed number of materials will likely be lost or destroyed while on loan. Acquiring new copies of lost and damaged materials may become a new and costly challenge to technical services staff not aware of today’s more patron-friendly resource sharing best practices.

NWILL was a great conference, and I would recommend it to any technical services staff from the Northwest with an interest in learning more about ILL. The programming, presenters, and other attendees made this a very worthwhile conference.

---

**DESCRIPTION & ENTRY**

**Headings Cleanup in Kuali OLE:**

A closer look at headings forms, $0s, and the UI of an ILS

Jesse A Lambertson

University of Chicago

Time moves on, 2019 is nearly over now, and systems themselves have to change from time to time (hopefully, not too often). A superb example of this is found in the eventual disappearance of the open-source Open Library Environment (OLE) library services platform (which some may not have heard of) Kuali OLE (starting circa 2009 I believe). The University of Chicago Library is using this system. Kuali OLE is disappearing, to be replaced by a scalable, open-source (FOSS) system, designed to work with APIs and in a current network environment, called FOLIO (see [https://www.folio.org/](https://www.folio.org/)).

In this edition of Description & Entry, I would like to point a little light on the Kuali OLE interaction, how it looks, how one edits records, and how this connects to the University of Chicago Library’s general work in Linked Data.

In University of Chicago’s planning for migration to FOLIO in the Summer of 2020 (expected), the library is doing all kinds of cleanup and changes to make MARC records ready for migration to FOLIO’s environment (technically, schema-agnostic). This article will focus on vendor records that have traditionally been catalogued quite well by an outside vendor—and even with names that were once in the Name Authority File (NAF) and the way in which we are cleaning up those names. Some of these names are still in the NAF but have changed form; some are no longer in the file currently.
A script run bi-weekly in the data management department generates a spreadsheet with headings that are not able to get $0 (URIs) and/or $1 (RWOs) enhancements. Sometimes, that script will return with the preferred heading if it is clear to the machine and the heading is switched and the $0 data is entered programmatically. If the heading is either no longer in the file or the heading has changed so that the script can’t determine the current heading, one must examine those to verify their status or to edit them so they contain the correct heading and get the URIs from id.loc.gov.

The spreadsheet looks like this:

```
500 SaMary., ScQueen of Scots., Sd1542-1587., SbTrials, litigation, etc.
100 SaMihailović, Draža., Sd1893-1946., SbSedendant.
600 SaMihailović, Draža., Sd1893-1946., SbTrials, litigation, etc.
610 SaYugoslavia, SbVojjska, SxOfficers, SbTrials, litigation, etc.
710 SaYugoslavia, SbDržavni sud.
700 SaPhillips Greene, ScMrs.
```

One can see that the headings come from anything 1xx, 7xx, and names used as subjects (6xx). This particular sheet in the workbook contains headings that DID NOT get $0s (let alone $1s).

But we are specifically doing the manual cleanup on the headings that need to be cleaned up (or deliberately skipped).

That sheet in the workbook looks like this:

```
194 11443535
195 Heading not found for: Rust, C. D.
196
199 11594569
199 Heading not found for: New York (State). Legislature. Senate. Special Committee to Investigate the Supply of Gas in New York City
201 11594583
201 Heading not found for: Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company Trials, litigation, etc.
202 Heading not found for: Virginia (Battleship: No. 13)
203
205 11595403
205 Heading not found for: Van der Veen, Walewyn
207 11598565
207 Heading not found for: National Society of Colonial Dames in the State of New York. Committee on History and Tradition
209 11598565
209 Heading not found for: Prunt, Bert S.
```

There is an array of possible workflows through this cleanup process—and this last step HAS to be manual—but we are using a script that uses the whole string in relevant fields, subjects, creators, etc. and queries id.loc.gov for $0s as well as VIAF for the $1s. Sometimes the form is in the heading but is incomplete, like if a death date has been added to the file but the record has never been touched since the records came from a vendor or if the heading is not in the file currently.

We have a lot of headings that are not in the file. Here are a few examples of names:
This one has a different status:

As one can see, the heading in the 1xx has been given the $0 by the script. We can see that the heading is in the NAF and is in id.loc.gov, but the same heading in the 6xx is not. Why? Because the subdivision for that heading does not have a URI and may never receive one.

One can see the tag itself is a ‘field’ in which the content of the MARC tag is contained. This includes the traditional MARC tag delimiters as well as the $0s and $1s (if they exist).

The next example exhibits one aspect of this validation issue (masquerading as two):

I search the name in https://authorities.loc.gov and get this result:

We know via the ‘References’ that this name’s actual heading goes off in some other direction.

Hmmm…

We now know the heading in OLE has become the 4xx in the current file—and, of course, id.loc.gov contains the current heading found in the NAF.

At this point, the next step is to copy the heading out of the NAF into OLE and add the $0 (we are not adding the $1 manually because it was decided to let the script add the $1 if they are found and to move on if not. That way, we get more preparation for Linked Data by keeping the bulk of our MARC headings enhanced for the future).
Any changes in the record must get saved (which is the final step for each record).

[side comment: OLE uses | as the delimiter as opposed to $, $$, or the ‡ of Connexion.]

At this point, the bulk of the headings from this vendor are getting $0s and $1s—and only a small fraction need this manual step (which is good)—and our data, even from vendors, is better prepared for a Linked Data future (especially as we migrate to a schema-agnostic FOLIO that can theoretically move to BIBFRAME in the future too).

So, herein I detail a nitty, gritty headings cleanup process [we are almost done, whew!] that involves a library-wide process and some manual steps that happen with records loaded for the law library. Also, I wanted to talk a little more about Kuali OLE since it gets almost nothing written about it and is about to go away. I hope to follow up with at least one more Description & Entry column exhibiting Kuali OLE before it is closed down.

Navigating GitHub for meaningful communication about software platforms (with no intention of learning git or coding) – Part 1

Wilhelmina Randtke
Florida Academic Library Services Cooperative

What is git?

Git is a programming language specifically for versioning code or any other text file. Rather than recording only incremental saves, like a version history on a document might do, git uses small changes (commits) and allows multiple people to work together by saving their own changes, sharing out changes for possible inclusion in a release, locating and incorporating other people's changes, and commenting on each change. Git is fairly complicated to learn and conceptually involves there being multiple realities for any piece of software, rather than a single version which changes over time.

Git also involves leaving a comment on each saved commit to a file or set of files to explain why the change was made. These comments can be retrieved later when looking at a specific piece of code.

Git is generally used for software development, communicating between software developers about software changes and versions of in-development software, and keeping notes on history, such as why a change was made.

Generally, releases of software are not put out to the public through git, but rather are done through sets of static text files (i.e. a zip or tarball to download and install). Git is for a deep dive into a single platform or the history of a piece of software. Most people working with a software platform just want to use it and not take a deep dive into the inner workings. Each deep dive takes time, and for end users and organizations running many software programs and platforms, there isn't time for a deep dive into everything. For this reason, most releases of software that you would download and run to power a website are released as .zip files without git.

Instead, git is for collaboration, new development, and deep dives into a single software platform.

Think of git as, at heart, being about communication. A culture and series of formalities for talking to other people. Not a language for talking to computers.

What is GitHub?

Various websites exist for hosting code versioned in git. The two most significant in the U.S. and Canada are GitHub (https://github.com) and Bit Bucket (https://bitbucket.org). (Bit Bucket is run by Atlassian Corporation, so may sometimes be referred to as Atlassian; Atlassian also runs several other software collaboration platforms, including Jira and Confluence.)

Each website for hosting files versioned in git has a graphic interface, as opposed to git which is all command line. The graphic interface is important because it allows communication with a wider group of people, specifically communication back and forth with people who don't know git and with people who are uncomfortable with a command line interface. The graphic interfaces aren't simple and, on some level, involve understanding and navigating multiple realities for any piece of software, but they are less intimidating and don't require memorizing and typing commands. So, the conceptual complexity of the communication is still a factor, but learning a new programming language is not.
Regarding GitHub and Bit Bucket, GitHub is geared toward public access, whereas Bit Bucket has mostly private activity. Both GitHub and Bit Bucket offer paid accounts as well as free-of-charge accounts, and both have a free-of-charge tier allowing private repositories which can be shared with a specific select group of other users. Both also allow public- ly available repositories through the free and paid accounts. See https://github.com/pricing and https://bitbucket.org/ product/pricing?tab=self-managed. The difference is not in what each platform allows, but rather in how each site tends to be used by people and companies. The major use of Bit Bucket is to allow collaboration on a software project without making the code public. For example, a large corporation might allow all employees access to the company Bit Bucket accounts. Code can be made public on Bit Bucket, but it is not the norm, and most activity on the site is private. Meanwhile, GitHub has a huge amount of public activity. GitHub is commonly used by people and companies to self-promote and raise the profile for their organization and projects by posting code and contributing code to other projects, as well as for projects to gather input and contributions from a wide community in a controlled way.

In short, GitHub is commonly used as a public site for sharing, self-promotion, and collaboration. The public aspect is why it’s well known, including awareness of the site in a wider community than just technical. Anyone can search GitHub and grab files and info from it, all without needing a login or account. And there's lots of content to search, navigate, and pull from.

Also key is that not everything that's open source is on GitHub. GitHub is just really popular, and many projects have a public face there in order to be visible. But absence of activity on GitHub doesn't mean an absence of activity.

**Basic background: A software platform can be spread across many repositories.**

In GitHub, each user account can own multiple repositories. The user account is something you are likely familiar with from all kinds of websites—a user account's public activity appears at https://github.com/useraccountnamehere. Within each user account, there can be multiple repositories. Each repository is a versioned file or set of files. Generally, that's source code for software, but the content of a repository can be any text file.

When you go to look at a software platform, you are not necessarily (almost never!) looking for one single git repository where code is maintained. Instead, components of a larger software platform might be maintained separately. Also, as discussed earlier, supporting libraries, which are necessary to run a platform but are used by many platforms in an out-of-the-box fashion, are typically bundled into a .zip or tarball release but are not published on GitHub as part of the GitHub public face of a software platform using that library. That would be clutter.

(An example of a supporting library might be software to automatically make and save thumbnails from bigger pictures. Another example of a supporting library might be code for allowing Chinese, Arabic, and Russian/Cyrillic characters to be stored and displayed. Another example of a supporting library might be code for displaying letters as an image for captchas. These can be used in an out-of-the-box way and do not need to be customized or written from scratch for projects across the web.)

Then, a single platform and the parts of it which are unique are frequently spread across multiple repositories. When you go to look at a software platform, you often are looking at one central user account in GitHub, then at several different repositories, each tracking pieces of the code. Once again, it's a deep dive to understand how those repositories interact with one another. If you are looking to connect to open source without learning git and without taking a deep dive, then the important thing is to understand that one software platform might live in multiple repositories; that's a common and normal thing to see, so be comfortable with it. Be comfortable with there being multiple small parts that come together to make a whole and those parts not necessarily being laid out together.

In trying to locate the public face of the code for a software platform on GitHub, you are usually looking for one authoritative user account; then, within that single user account, you are often looking at multiple repositories. And most of the actual information you need is found at the repository level.

---

**Library Metrics Trends:**

**What's On The Horizon?**

Rachel Decker
Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library
Chapman University Fowler School of Law

In the last *Library Metrics* column, I wrote about the U.S. News & World Report’s new Scholarly Impact Ranking. Impact metrics are not necessarily new, but perhaps signal a trend that is worth paying attention to. As we come to the end of 2019, I want to look ahead and provide a brief trend analysis in library metrics. An article that appeared last year in *The Serials Librarian* gave me a good starting point (Markovic and Oberg 2018), and I intend to build on some of
the trends expressed in that article here. There are four categories, with a concise description of trends in each, and I hope to explore these more deeply in the coming issues.

Collection Metrics

As far as standards for library collection statistics go, COUNTER continues to be the gold standard. In January of this year, COUNTER rolled out its new Code of Practice, Release 5 (COP5) (COUNTER 2019). The current “Register of Compliant Content Providers” on its website lists the content providers who have undergone the mandatory independent audit and comply with COP5. Notably, only a small handful of legal information vendors are on this list. The lack of compliance makes it difficult to compile standardized usage statistics uniformly across a law library collection. This area is ripe for advocacy for law librarians invested in seeing COUNTER expand.

Similarly, holding steady in collections metrics is the need for ROI reports to justify acquisitions. In other words, to integrate usage data with cost data across electronic and print formats to inform renewal/cancellation decisions. Evidence-based acquisitions is more critical now than ever and is made even more challenging by the sheer number of available metrics. COP5 is an excellent example of the ever-expanding specificity in usage statistics. This trend can be seen in other areas as well, such as ALLStAR data, discussed below. As granularity increases, so does the opportunity to gain valuable insights into the importance and value of a collection to its users. On the other hand, more granular data makes for a lengthier and more complicated process to analyze and compile a cohesive ROI report.

Finally, an interesting area of collection analysis is the desire to assess collection outcomes, not output. Output is a quantitative value: the total size of a collection, the currency of the material, the number of formats provided, or the breadth and coverage in a particular subject area. While these metrics are arguably easier to obtain, they don’t offer any insight into the usefulness of those resources. Measuring outcomes goes beyond whether the collection meets users’ needs and asks if it improves their work, increases their competitiveness, or tangibly furthers the mission of the organization. ACRL defines outcomes as “the ways in which library users are changed as a result of their contact with the library’s resources” (ACRL 1998). These types of qualitative measures are typically used in evaluating programs and services but can be extended to serve as collection metrics as well. This type of analysis can be useful in the never-ending pursuit to communicate the value of a library collection.

Impact & Engagement Metrics

As noted earlier, impact metrics aren’t new but are a category of metrics that is growing exponentially, both in usage and in sites that offer them. This year, research impact took center stage with U.S. News & World Report’s Scholarly Impact Ranking, which is, in large part, based on citation metrics. Recently, Cornell Law School’s Society for Empirical Legal Studies wrote to U.S. News & World Report, in a letter dated October 28, 2019, to express their concern over U.S. News’ Scholarly Impact Ranking (Cornell Law School 2019). Many of their concerns are ones that plague citation metrics generally and also highlight how flawed impact metrics can be. Other citation metrics projects have been expanded or improved this year: Google released its 2019 Scholar Metrics (Google 2019) in July, Wikidata is working on its citation project, Wikicite, and HeinOnline continues to improve its ScholarCheck system. The multitude of options to gauge research impact necessarily calls for standardization. David Lewis, Former University Library Dean at Indiana University and the 2018 recipient of the ACRL Librarian of the Year award, published a proposal for standard impact metrics this past July (Lewis 2019) and argues for more simplified metrics, including visuals to help quickly understand the different measures.

Altmetrics are one of the standard metrics Lewis argues should be used and are also one of the most talked-about metrics in recent years. Altmetrics are “metrics and qualitative data that are complementary to traditional, citation-based metrics” (Altmetric.com). Altmetrics encompass a multitude of different measures that gauge how many people have been exposed to or interacted with scholarly output (e.g., views or downloads). These are indicators of engagement with an audience that citation metrics cannot capture. Additionally, social media mentions or interactions (e.g., shares or likes on Facebook, retweets on Twitter, or likes on Instagram) are increasingly being used to measure engagement with users (Diaz-Faes, Bowman and Costas 2019). With as many impact and engagement metrics that exist, a new project called the Metrics Toolkit (https://www.metrics-toolkit.org/) serves as a new and comprehensive metrics dictionary to help users determine which impact metrics are appropriate for a given project.

Platforms & Systems

One of the challenges with tracking, compiling, and synthesizing data is finding a reliable place to house and share information efficiently and reliably. There are several platforms and systems to assist librarians with managing the ever-increasing data load, from automated collection methods to data repositories and dashboards. Academic Law Libraries: Statistics, Analytics and Report (ALLStAR) is a platform that is gaining acceptance and use by academic law libraries. Led by Yale Law Librarian Teresa Miguel-Stearns and supported by NELLCO, ALLStAR is in its third year after going live in 2016. ALLStAR states, “With the discontinuation of the Law Library Section on the ABA Survey, ALLStAR is committed to continuing to gather these statistics and providing summary data to all academic law libraries in the United States who wish to participate.” After attending the ALLStAR Users Group meeting at the 2019 AALL Annual Meeting, it is clear that many libraries are working on learning how to enter and generate reports from...
the data. ALLStAR is expanding the number of data points it accepts and provides benchmarking and best practices for data collection and reporting.

In the commercial sector, information vendors such as Elsevier, Gale, ProQuest, Innovative Interfaces, and TIND continue to build out their analytics and reporting systems. Many Library Services Platforms include, or are being engineered to include, a statistics module with the option of incorporating additional analytics capabilities in the future. These modules are meant to provide more efficient methods for collecting data to avoid the dreaded paper work forms and tally marks. As these systems become more sophisticated, it is not beyond reason to assume they will begin to include predictive analytics functions using artificial intelligence (AI). In fact, Ex Libris published a white paper this year that examines artificial intelligence in the library. They argue “implementing machine learning in the library's processes and digital resources can optimize collection analysis, visualization, and preservation” (Ex Libris 2019). To my knowledge, no commercial vendor is currently using AI capabilities in this capacity yet; however, this seems like an inevitability.

Lastly, visualization tools are a consistent trend that has staying power, not just as a component of existing library systems, but as an essential tool used to display and communicate library metrics. The appetite for creatively consuming statistics is likewise increasing. It is no longer the icing on the cake to transform tables and numbers into a chart; doing data visualization is now a necessary step. There are a multitude of user-friendly, free, or low-cost tools that allow users to create dynamic and eye-catching visuals that are a far cry from Excel pie charts and line graphs.

Ethics & Data Privacy

As our use of data grows and its granularity increases, we must be mindful of using metrics responsibly. Data privacy issues will be at the forefront, especially in libraries. Article III of the current Code of Ethics of the American Library Association states: “We protect each library user’s right to privacy and confidentiality with respect to information sought or received and resources consulted, borrowed, acquired, or transmitted” (ALA 2008).

A recent example illustrates this point. In June of this year, after an investigation into Santa Cruz Public Libraries’ (SCPL) use of third-party analytics, a Grand Jury published its report (County of Santa Cruz 2019). While the use of the third-party analytics did not break any state laws, the report concluded that SCPL “did not recognize the importance of informing patrons how SCPL uses their personal data; giving patrons the opportunity to consent to use of their personal data; explaining patron data use in proposed privacy policy and online documents; adopting best practices outlined by the American Library Association; carefully evaluating risks versus rewards when using data analytics; staying abreast of state laws concerning library use of patron data; and resolving the disagreements among staff regarding the use of data analytics and its implications for patron privacy.” SCPL Director Susan Nemitz summarized their dilemma in Library Journal saying, “SCPL is facing a challenge that is becoming increasingly common within the field—meeting the expectations of patrons who have become accustomed to the seamless conveniences enabled by big data, while adhering to policies that promise privacy” (Enis 2019). With lots of new and exciting metrics on the horizon and, as promising as many of the innovations are, we need to proceed thoughtfully and take our obligation of data privacy seriously.
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In his excellent book, *The Intelligence Trap: Why Smart People Make Dumb Mistakes*, science journalist David Robson persuasively argues that smart people may be more likely to fall prey to certain kinds of erroneous thinking patterns than people of average intelligence. These reasoning errors can include:

- when they have a false belief, their intelligence helps them construct elaborate arguments to justify their belief, so they become more dogmatic in their views over time (aka climate change/Holocaust deniers)
- they rely on their raw brain power and quick thinking to make a rapid decision, never taking the time to deliberate or reflect on this decision (a doctor who makes a snap diagnosis before you finish describing your symptoms)
- they may believe that their expertise in one subject area makes them an expert in all areas¹ (don’t we all have at least one relative like this???)

Don’t despair, Einstein—recent research shows that the character trait of curiosity can help smart people from falling down these cognitive rabbit holes. Some researchers report that curiosity even rivals general intelligence in its importance to our development in childhood, adolescence, and beyond.² Additionally, curiosity is strongly correlated with empathy—inquisitive people are, by nature, genuinely interested in others’ points-of-view and can thus more easily see problems and situations from multiple perspectives.³

Management researchers have also explored the importance of curiosity in the workplace. Recently, the *Harvard Business Review* ran a series of articles on the trait, noting that having a curious mindset boosts job performance because it:

- reduces our susceptibility to stereotypes and to confirmation bias
- fuels employee engagement and collaboration
- enhances organizational resilience by prompting creative problem solving in the face of uncertainty and pressure.⁴

As managers, how can we incorporate some of these research findings into our workplaces? A natural first step would be to screen job candidates for the trait. Questions that could provide a glimpse at someone’s level of curiosity include:

- Describe a challenging situation at work and how you grew from handling it.
- What is something new you learned to do in the last year? How did you learn this new skill?
- Describe a project you had to complete without being given detailed instructions.
- What was the last book you read for pleasure? Where do you like to go on vacation?

Also, pay attention to what questions the candidates ask you about your organization—do they only want to know about their own narrow part of the organization, or are they interested in broader organizational issues and goals as well?⁵ Finally, don’t immediately dismiss candidates who have seemingly “job hopped” a bit—perhaps these previous jobs were not intellectually stimulating and did not hold opportunities for growth (and, of course, your position would because you are such a great manager!).

---


Now that we are happily staffed with smart but intellectually humble people, how do we keep the curiosity flowing? First, as managers, we should model inquisitiveness—we shouldn’t fear losing status by admitting we don’t always have all the answers. By openly soliciting novel approaches to a challenging situation, we demonstrate that the organization is thoughtful, not reactionary, and is guided by curiosity. Encourage exploratory, open-ended dialogue at meetings by using “plussing,” a technique famously used at the movie studio Pixar. Plussing involves building on ideas without using harsh, judgmental language—so anytime someone comments on another person’s idea, the comment must contain a “plus” or a way to improve the idea, rather than a criticism to knock it down. Better brainstorming is more likely to occur at meetings because people will be willing to participate and “think out loud” if they know their ideas aren’t going to be mocked. Other ideas include: suggesting learning goals, as well as performance goals, on annual performance evaluations; cross-training among departments; and sending staff to continuing education events, even when budgets are tight.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, just back off! As Ian Leslie writes in Curious: The Desire to Know and Why Your Future Depends on It, “Curiosity is likely to lead to better work, but only if it is allowed time to breathe.” We shouldn’t chase efficiency by micromanaging employees and loading them down with tons of quantifiable performance goals—instead, show them respect by giving them the time and space to do good work. And with this time we’ve freed up from not micromanaging our staff, we can fix our curious minds onto our own good work!

Endnotes
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**OCLC survey on Local Genre/Form Access Points**

Christopher Thomas
University of California, Irvine

OCLC is considering removal of local genre/form access points (i.e., 655 with 2nd indicator 4) from bibliographic records for resources cataloged in English if a coded scheme is present in other 655 fields such as LCGFT. There are many cases where terms in 655 with 2nd indicator 4 are exact matches or close matches to terminology in other 655 fields coded as belonging to another scheme. One special case where we'd particularly like input is for eBooks. The access point "Electronic books" is coded as 655 with 2nd indicator 4 and came into use before other fields such as 337 and 338 were implemented to convey the same kind of information about the carrier. "Electronic books" is unlikely to be added to LCGFT; it would be one of the fields possibly dropped from bibliographic records.

**Action needed to access new OCLC file exchange servers**

To enable faster delivery, we are transitioning our file exchange service to new servers. If you log in via SFTP, SCP, or FTP to exchange files with OCLC, you need to take action to access the new servers. If you only use My Files in the WorldShare interface to exchange files with OCLC, you do not need to take action.

To make this simple transition to the new servers, you will need to use a new host name that will replace the location you currently use to upload and download your files, as well as a new username.

Please visit [https://help.oclc.org/Librarian_Toolbox/Exchange_files_with_OCLC](https://help.oclc.org/Librarian_Toolbox/Exchange_files_with_OCLC) to see the host name changes.

You may begin this transition immediately but will have until 31 December 2019 to make the change. Your existing account will continue to work until that time, but it should no longer be used once you have made the transition.

**WorldCat Validation Release Notes for November 2019**

- OCLC-MARC Validations of New MARC Codes Announced May 31, June 28, July 19, August 9, September 13, and October 4 and 11, 2019.
Preserving Tragedy

Heather Kushnerick
South Texas College of Law, Houston

When I volunteered to write this column, I thought that my first submission would be kind of fluffy as a way to introduce the membership to my slightly oddball way of writing and my delightful sense of humor (also, my humble nature). Shortly after Jason told me I had this gig, however, I attended the Society of American Archivists convention held in Austin, Texas, from August 1-6, 2019. On Saturday, August 4, there was a mass shooting in El Paso, Texas. We woke up Sunday, August 5, to the news of another mass shooting in Dayton, Ohio. That afternoon, I attended a session called, “Tragedy Response: Preparation and Support for Archives and Communities.” The panel was comprised of archivists and public historians who have experience preserving and archiving tragedy. It is my hope that you all indulge me as I share a little of what I learned, as it seems these sorts of events are all too common.

The official unofficial term given to what I’m talking about is Rapid Response Collecting. This is when items of cultural significance are collected at the moment they become significant. This is not limited to tragedy—it can (and does) include Lego sets, iPhones, drones, and 3-D printed items, just to name a few. For our purpose today, it refers to collecting items from memorial sites that communities set up in the wake of a tragedy, like a mass shooting, as well as photographs of the community interacting with those memorials, candlelight vigils, and any community event held to remember the victims and survivors of tragedies. This is collecting with a specific purpose and, for the most part, it must be completed within a specific timeframe. That timeframe is dependent on how long the memorial items will survive out in the elements.

Collecting the items and developing a timetable to remove and preserve them is challenging. You can’t just go in and start removing items willy-nilly; you will have to get some sort of permission: from local business owners where the memorials are set up, possibly from your local government, and, most importantly, you have to talk to the families of victims who may want some of the memorial items.

These memorials serve a purpose: they help the community grieve and heal, and people develop an ownership of the sites. However, to preserve some items, particularly posters, drawings, paintings, or photographs, they need to be removed as quickly as possible. Memorials should be photographed daily to not only show the evolution of the site, but to provide a record of those more fragile items and how they originally looked prior to fading. It is important to provide a visual inventory and to photograph everything in situ so you have a record of what you have and where it was left in context.

Unfortunately, it isn’t difficult to locate more information on rapid response collecting and creating condolence archives. NBC news (https://www.nbcnews.com/nightly-news/museums-across-nation-work-archive-mementos-grief-left-after-shootings-n859736) did a story on this very topic in April 2018. This 2017 post (https://academicarchivist.wordpress.com/2017/07/31/archiving-the-aftermath-of-a-tragedy-preserving-expressions-of-condolence-and-humanity/) on the Academic Archivist blog details how Charleston archivists volunteered to assist the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church preserve items they received from across the world after a 2015 shooting that took 9 lives. Tammi Kim, the Special Collections & Archives Technical Services Librarian at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, wrote a blog piece (https://archive-it.org/blog/post/archiving-and-describing-mass-tragedy) about their efforts to preserve all the web traffic surrounding the Las Vegas shooting that took place in October 2017. An entire chapter in the Handbook of Research on Disaster Management and Contingency Planning in Modern Libraries is entitled, “Response to the Unthinkable: Collecting and Archiving Condolence and Temporary Memorial Materials following Public Tragedies.”

Going further back, we find articles about the 2007 shooting at Virginia Tech (https://

Endnotes

1. I say it is unofficial because it is not in SAA’s *Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology*.
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**PRIVATE LAW LIBRARIES**

**Dana Deseck-Piazzon**  
Crowell & Moring LLP  

Quest is a reference tracking system designed for libraries to manage research and other requests. It is a complete and complex tool for managing, processing, and logging requests. It can be deployed in the cloud or on-premises. The system is web-based, and the library team interacts through the web interface; the attorneys communicate with the librarians via email. Installing the system requires email configuration and identifying people and matter data feeds. After Quest has been fully deployed and is in use, time and billing data can be integrated into the system. Quest is connected to a library email box and monitors the account for incoming emails.

**What is the Workflow?**

The settings configuration is based on the organizational needs and desired workflow. Workflow is determined by configured notification settings that you select when implementing the system. A high-level overview of a request workflow proceeds as follows: An attorney sends an email to a library email address, or they submit a research request form, which is forwarded to the same email address. Quest periodically checks for new emails, and when a new email is received: (1) it checks whether the sender is in the system, and if the sender is not, then it sends an administrative notification (email) of an unknown sender; (2) it checks for a request ID in the subject line. If it doesn’t find an existing request ID, then it creates a new request and auto-populates specific fields; or (3) if it finds a matching request based on request ID, then it adds a comment to an existing request. When a new request is created, it is first added to the “unassigned” cue in the system “dashboard” until a librarian reviews it and changes the assignee to him/herself. Quest auto-populates several fields and other information when a request is created, including request title based on email subject, requested date, requestor, adds a description of the request, cc’s on to the request; it also adds any associated attachments, recent requests, and workstream. Fields that are set up here and need to be completed by the librarian are: workstream, request type, reason, client matter number, and time worked.

When an assignee first assigns a request to her/himself, a comment is added, generating an email to the requestor stating that the request has been received and is being worked on. If the requestor responds via email, then the assignee receives a notification email that the request has been updated with new comments. Requests are pre-populated with due date, and when the request becomes overdue, an email is sent, reminding the assignee of the request (determined by settings). If we receive a phone call or walk-in, then we create a new request. Anytime a librarian responds to a request, a comment is added, which generates an email to the attorney. When the assignee completes the request, he or she finishes profiling the request, including entering time spent and client matter, then updates it as resolved.

---

Pre-implementation and Installation

Pre-implementation requires identifying an email account for Quest, data sources for employee feeds, preparing and reviewing sample data, and identifying a server to install a component called “Quest Sync.” It connects to firm systems and periodically retrieves people and matter information from HR/Active Directory. The Quest Sync utility connects to a specified internal database or retrieves data from a specific location, then transfers the data to the Quest cloud servers. Once the utility is configured and data is uploaded into the Quest Sync, a task must be scheduled to upload the data daily.

Before deploying Quest, allow time to consult with your team on the system configuration settings. It is this aspect that requires the most modification. Discuss with your team the following settings: due date/overdue settings, email notifications, email templates, workstreams, and request fields. When a request is generated, a due date is automatically set based on the system settings, but it can be adjusted based on the requestors’ needs. Selecting a standard due date is simple; however, there are two settings that can help you manage neglected requests and that you can use to adjust the system to your workflow, “minutes until unassigned requires assignment” and “minutes until assigned requires response.” Email notifications are triggered by specific event types determined by you. For instance, you can configure a notification that when a new internal comment is added to a request from the “Request Details” page, Quest sends an email with the comment to the assignee or assignees.

Quest in Action

Librarians profile every request using numerous fields that have been pre-configured. The main fields are: workstream, client matter number, requestor, due date, types, reason, assignee, and time. These fields are populated based on metadata you choose and the data upload. Although the system comes prepopulated with sample types and reasons, you will want to modify and add your own metadata. If you are interested, there is an option to set unique due date rules by request type. We solicited input on request types from everyone in our department, which we incorporated into the data fields; we then decided on three workstreams: research, competitive intelligence, and tech/training/support.

TRG regularly enhances the system and upgrades the software. In the future, we plan to integrate time entry into the system. We needed to address when requests unexpectedly have a status change. For instance, a librarian completes a request, resolves it, and then the attorney responds to the resolved request. But what if the librarian who worked on the request is out the next day? Who is notified of the reopened request? We needed to ensure that our requests were being effectively managed. We configured a notification called “Status Changed Reopened From Resolved,” which notifies selected people on the team when a requestor reopens a request after it was resolved. Since libraries customize the system to adjust to their workflow, Quest anticipates these types of needs and makes available options to address them.

Quest has various reporting options and a statistics page. The reports we use most frequently are “Request Count by Office” and “Most Frequent Requestors by Office.” There are pre-configured charts and trend reports that you can run as-is or customize by adding additional filters. Another option is to build a new report from a template.

Now that we have used the system for two years, we leverage the system’s knowledge management capabilities. Quest is the repository of our work for our patrons, and we can search it when needed to find pertinent requests, resource information, etc. Also, we have created several comment templates with ready responses to commonly requested information, such as our Wall Street Journal subscription information.

Quest is a multifaceted request tracking tool that has improved our team’s collaboration and efficiency. After you have it configured for your needs and workflow, the settings can be maintained indefinitely or regularly adjusted. If you are looking for a reference tracking system that is customizable and can be in production within a few months, then Quest is one product to check out.

RESEARCH & PUBLICATIONS

Going the Distance

Molly Brownfield
University of Texas Tarlton Law Library

I recently ran my first marathon—the 2019 Chicago Marathon. That may sound impressive (and I won’t lie—I’m both a little shocked and proud that I did it), but the actual running of the marathon paled in comparison to the months of training leading up to it. I began running over a year ago—starting out with just one mile at a time and not even being able to complete that distance without stopping to walk and catch my breath. It was disheartening. I’d see other runners glide past me on the trail with seemingly no effort and think those people must have a natural talent that I did not pos-
Writing, for me and perhaps for others, is a marathon. It is daunting to get started, it does not always come naturally, and I frequently want to stop. When I look at the various publications of my fellow law librarians, I am in awe of how they accomplished it. How did they come up with those ideas? How did they fill those pages with such great content? Successfully researching, writing, and publishing an article, chapter, book, blog post, or other writing often seems as insurmountable as running a marathon, and the two feats are very similar in that you have to start small with just one mile, with just one sentence, and build from there. Nobody wakes up one morning spontaneously able to run for miles on end (except for Forrest Gump), and nobody miraculously churns out publications without tremendous work and dedication. The key is not to obsess about the ultimate feat to the point of forgetting to take the first steps. The next time you feel intimidated by others’ publications, remember that they started exactly where you are now, and that you just need to write one sentence, one paragraph today, and tomorrow you’ll write a little bit more, and eventually you’ll get there. The end result may inspire awe, but it’s the courage to begin and the daily grind of the journey to get there that is truly impressive.

This column addresses some thoughts on an important serials issue (pun intended): CHANGE in the library profession and one RESPONSE to it.

CHANCE

In today’s world, we must grapple with the changing nature of both libraries and technical services librarians. In particular, serials librarians must deal with new situations and develop practices for new processes. What were once printed loose-leaf supplements that had to be checked in and filed are now available only online. Similarly, that same situation applies to what were once printed newsletters. Also included in this “brave new world” are “born digital” resources.

As information professionals in many types of libraries, significant change on an organizational level (i.e. shrinking or static budgets) can lead to decreasing or static numbers of staff members. This situation may then lead to expanded job duties.

HATS

In this changing environment, we frequently wear many hats. While Technical Services have usually encompassed many components, we are now often hybrid librarians with a mix of duties and responsibilities. Using different language, our job descriptions may reflect an amalgam of elements. Additionally, using language from the cuisine world, technical services librarians (including serials librarians) often provide a fusion of library services. Regardless of the language, you get the point. Often, this may include providing reference services. While technical service librarians (or serials librarians, for that matter) may not provide primary reference services, their responsibilities may include SOME reference services. For example, I am a hybrid. My official title is “Reference/Technical Services Librarian.”

RESPONSE

In this column, I propose professional development as an appropriate response (just one of many possibilities) to such an environmental change. Specifically, international conferences offer many benefits to technical service librarians (including serials librarians). I certainly understand that the cost of attending an international conference can become considerable. However, scholarships, grants, bursaries, and frequent flier miles can help to offset the cost of attending.

BENEFITS

Attending an international conference offers many benefits to your employer, your patrons, and you. Regular conference attendance fosters the development of networks between librarians from all over the world. As legal information professionals, we draw upon these networks when seeking answers to questions, information about best practices, help...
with research, and acquiring library resources. In addition, your attendance would further develop international exposure for your employer. Attending sessions on specific subjects could really help you to better support your organization.

International conferences are usually much smaller than AALL. Their smaller number of attendees make them conducive to more in-depth, one-on-one contact with vendors. For example, I recently attended the 2019 International Association of Law Libraries (IALL) annual course in Sydney, Australia. Conference vendors included our Integrated Library System company. Their representative sat down with me at a computer to show me specifically what I needed to do (about the question I had asked). Logistically, my employer gave me the time off to allow me to attend the conference. I used frequent flier miles for most of the airfare. I stayed with my husband who also attended the conference and whose room was paid for. That meant that I had to pay for conference registration (this year, I unfortunately didn’t meet the criteria for a scholarship application—next year!) and meals. For me, the experience was entirely worth the months of adding little by little to my personal travel fund.

What has been YOUR experience with changes in the library world, hats, and international conferences? What do YOU think? I’d love to hear from you. Email me at rengsberg@sgrlaw.com!

---

The following is a list of serials title changes:

**Harvard Journal on Racial and Ethnic Justice**

*v. 26 (spring 2010) – v. 34 (spring 2018)*

(OCoLC 501811588)

**Changed to:**

**Harvard BlackLetter Law Journal**

*v. 35 (spring 2019)*

(OCoLC 1120053263)

The following is a list of serials cessations:

**Buffalo Intellectual Property Law Journal**

*Ceased with:* v. 12 (2018)

(OCoLC 48429313)

**Holy Cross Journal of Law and Public Policy**

*Ceased with:* v. 22 (2018)

(OCoLC 36634020)

**Journal of Hate Studies**

*Ceased in print with:* v. 13 (2016)

(OCoLC 48970239)

Continued online at [https://www.gonzaga.edu/academics/centers-institutes/institute-for-hate-studies/journal-of-hate-studies](https://www.gonzaga.edu/academics/centers-institutes/institute-for-hate-studies/journal-of-hate-studies)

(OCoLC 60638784)

**Journal of International Law and International Relations**

*Ceased with:* v. 13 (2017)

(OCoLC 182747928)

**Journal of Passthrough Entities**

*Ceased with:* v. 22 (December 2019)

(OCoLC 39073231)

**Law Librarian’s Bulletin Board**

*Ceased with:* v. 30, no. 8 (2019)

(OCoLC 20141355)

**Marquette Sports Law Review**

*Ceased in print with:* v. 29, no. 2 (2019)

(OCoLC 44488544)

Continued online at [https://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/sportslaw/](https://scholarship.law.marquette.edu/sportslaw/)

(OCoLC 45832563)

**Pace Law Review**

*Ceased in print with:* v. 39, no. 1 (fall 2018)

(OCoLC 6796884)

Continued online at [https://digitalcommons.pace.edu/plr/](https://digitalcommons.pace.edu/plr/)

(OCoLC 57895586)

**South Carolina Journal of International Law and Business**

*Ceased in print with:* v. 14, no. 2 (2018)

(OCoLC 86111625)

Continued online at [https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/scjilb/](https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/scjilb/)

(OCoLC 53451864)

**Tilburg Law Review**

*Ceased with:* v. 22 (2017)

(OCoLC 212407449)

**UN Chronicle**

*Ceased in print with:* v. 55, no. 3/4 (2018)

(OCoLC 4268996)


(OCoLC 60625018)

---

Joy Humphrey
Pepperdine University
Many subject headings have been approved since our last column. Geographical headings are a good place to start. The headings for the recent history, and politics and government, of several nations and some U.S. states have changed. Cambodia and Italy are two such nations. For example, Cambodia--History--1979- is now Cambodia--History--1979-1993, and the heading Cambodia--History--1993- has been established. It will be helpful to watch for others of these. For the United States, the changes are on the other end of history, so to speak. Michigan--Politics and government--To 1837 is now Michigan Territory--Politics and government. Headings for the early history and politics of Wisconsin have also changed, with Wisconsin Territory being established. Interestingly, the same changes have been made for Illinois, Indiana, and Minnesota.

In other matters, we have the following headings. World War, 1914-1918--Campaigns--Saudi Arabia appeared, as did China--History--Great Leap Forward--1958-1960, as well as China--History--Famine, 1958-1962. The heading El Salvador--History--1979-1992 has changed to El Salvador--History--Civil War--1979-1992. For the Philippines, Marawi, Battle of, Marawi, Philippines, 2017 is available. Democracy and environmentalism appeared, as did Propaganda, Anti-Armenian. Yellow Vests movement is now a subject heading. Egypt--Administrative and political division is available, as is Egyptian governorates. The former heading Autonomous vehicles is now Automated vehicles.

A recent school shooting here in California raises this subject, once again. We can now use Christchurch Mosque Shootings, Christchurch, N.Z., 2019 as well as Las Vegas Shooting, Las Vegas, Nev., 2017. These cry out for broader terms, and they have arrived: Mass shootings--New Zealand and Mass shootings--Nevada. A heading for a similarly tragic event, the Tulsa Race Riot, Tulsa, Okla., 1921 has appeared.

A number of new headings concerning the LGBTQ community were created. Gender-nonconforming children and Rural sexual minorities have been established. We now have Homophobia in motion pictures and Lesbian detectives. The heading Gay-parent families now takes Law and legislation. Gay comedians and Overweight gays may now be used.

Other additions to classes of persons were added. Mexican American political activists, Health ministers, Arab American teenagers, and Event planners are available, as is Japanese American teenage girls. Families of military personnel--Legal status, laws, etc. is now Families of military personnel--Law and legislation. Other new headings include Blackface, Yellowface, and Antisemitic literature. The scope note for this last heading needs to be consulted, as does the expanded scope note in Holocaust denial literature.

As for more strictly legal headings, we now have Pilgrims and pilgrimages (Islamic law), Cryptocurrencies--Laws and legislation, and Design-build process (Construction industry). Suspects (Criminal investigation), Contracts for difference, and Deference (Law) have arrived for our use, and the headings for types of lawyers now includes Immigration lawyers. Thanks to technology, we now have Portfolio careers, which are entire careers characterized by a succession of short-term jobs. Pirate television broadcasting and Marijuana tourism were created recently. Love hotels may provide business for divorce lawyers.
Finally, some Genre/Form headings of interest. Web archives was added, as was Biostatistics and Medical statistics. Campaign speeches, Editorial cartoons, Graduation speeches, and Yom Kippur sermons round out this column.

**Contributing authors:** Rachel Evans, Jackie Magagnosc

**Cataloging**

**BIBFRAME Goes International**

A recording of the Library of Congress webcast BIBFRAME Goes International 2019 video, [https://www.loc.gov/item/webcast-8682/](https://www.loc.gov/item/webcast-8682/), presented April 2, 2019, has been made available. A number of speakers addressed experimentation and implementation of BIBFRAME and/or Linked Data concepts in Europe, the United States, Asia, and Australia/New Zealand.

Some highlights:

Kungliga biblioteket, The Swedish National Library of Sweden has a production BIBFRAME based union catalog ([https://libris-stg.kb.se/katalogisering/](https://libris-stg.kb.se/katalogisering/)) available for exploration. They are actively seeking a path out of the MARC environment.

Judith Cannon spoke at length about the PCC/LD4P grant funded group. Seventeen selected PCC libraries are working in a "sand box." Metadata will be created and saved using "Sinopia," a Linked Data platform developed by Stanford University. More information about the project and its goals is available at [https://wiki.duraspace.org/display/LD4P2/LD4P2+Project+Background+and+Goals](https://wiki.duraspace.org/display/LD4P2/LD4P2+Project+Background+and+Goals). The Library of Congress is developing initial training material based on LC's BIBFRAME editor. It is not clear when these tools might be available for non-participating libraries to play with.


Hong Kong University of Science and Technology has an experimental Bibliographic Linked Data Learning Platform ([http://catalog.ust.hk/bf/](http://catalog.ust.hk/bf/)). With this tool, you can view and compare bibliographic data presented in different serializations, plus information about the work contextualized using Wikidata knowledge cards. The site also has an experimental SPARQL query form that can be run against their bibliographic data.

The National Library of New Zealand has made their Ngā Upoko Tukutuku / Māori Subject Headings available as Linked Data as an aid to bibliographic description centered on a Māori world view.

**Technical Services Related Conferences**

**CALICON 19 Sessions**


Mary and Lisa were excellent presenters who didn't just share something cool (maybe their topic wasn't the flashiest on the schedule) but certainly brought one of the more relevant sessions throughout CALICON's two-day whirlwind. What institution isn't interested in saving money for their law students? What library doesn't grapple with ways to make things more cost-effective? This session not only discussed measures that would greatly benefit students but also ideas for faculty members who want to publish their own course content. This session covered lulu.com (CALI actually uses them to publish their books; very affordable, 600+ page books for around $25 shipped), Powernotes, H20 open casebook platform, and more. The presenters also shared strategies for liaising with your registrar office and faculty members to offer alternatives before or alongside booklists and how they reviewed their own booklists from past semesters to locate and suggest cost-saving measures for specific courses.

Most of us deal with our IR in some form or another. If you have ever manually entered items into your own IR one at a time, you smile at the prospect of batch loading. Large archiving projects often involve the tedious manual creation of spreadsheets or other data entry. However, this session shared coding and tips for automating that work. Although the presenter's project was with Law Journals and pulling content from PDF’s, these techniques can be scaled to other types of projects and instantly put to use.

**Georgia Library Association Digitization for Small Institutions Workshop**

The two presenters opened by talking about the Digital Library of Georgia (DLG) and right away shared links to resources including a toolkit for Project Managers from the Digital Library Federation (DLF): [https://wiki.diglib.org/DLF_Project_Managers_Toolkit](https://wiki.diglib.org/DLF_Project_Managers_Toolkit). For folks new to using a project management tool, this wiki has an excellent table of recommended software with summaries of each, links to them, and pros and cons side by side. Many of the tools you expect to find are here (Jira, Asana, Trello, Slack, Google Suite).

The first hour was devoted to DLF, DLG and DPLA (Digital Public Library of America). This was an extremely interesting portion of the workshop that served as the backdrop for the rest of the session's more detailed “how to” segments. The project manager toolkit wiki is invaluable, and even if you are not working on projects that will eventually feed up into a DL site, the kit contains so many best practices and tips that it could be useful for many types of digitization projects. One such best practice was this 5-step process: 1. Selection & Planning, 2. Metadata Creation, 3. Prep & Scanning, 4. Post-Processing (crops & edits), 5. Ingest & Preservation (into institutional repository).

For the rest of the workshop, sample workflow charts were shown, and attendees were given what might as well have been a micro-course on metadata terms, with a focus on descriptive data and specifics on Qualified Dublin Core. There was even a little Linked Data talk. What was most helpful about this section were the slides that included specific examples of Title fields. You know a session is worthwhile when you can take that nugget of info back and start using it immediately at work when you return.

Not everyone has a repository in place, and not everyone has the staff or tools to achieve their goals right away. This workshop also provided a hands-on station to practice digitization before you left the room. The session enabled everyone, even those interested in the topic (lots of MLS students were there too) but not currently working in a place or role that allows them to get their hands dirty, to do just that.

*Continued from page 1*

I re-examined the same sample of records in light of Aaron’s explanation (condensed above, and of course I am responsible for any inaccuracies). KZ1266 and the associated subject heading appeared to be assigned mostly to two categories of works: 1. Conflict/interlace of human rights with other international legal obligations or regimes: sometimes just public international law (such as international criminal law or international humanitarian law), but often also including international investment, trade, or environmental legal regimes (areas which class as primary topics in “K,” not “KZ”). Examples: the work cited in the subject heading proposal for International law and human rights: *Hierarchy in international law,* LCCN 2012931992 (“Do human rights obligations trump other duties?”); *Globalization and its impact on the future of human rights and international criminal justice,* LCCN 2015506155 (Human rights and conflict/interface with public international law); *Economic, social and cultural rights in international law,* LCCN 2013952014 (Human rights and international humanitarian law, international criminal law, but also world trade law, the last mentioned usually classed in “K,” not “KZ”). 2. Conflict of international and regional and/or national human rights. Example: *European Convention on Human Rights and general international law,* LCCN 2018942411.

But, as always, there are some works which defy easy analysis and could arguably be classified in either “K” or “KZ.” Also, if an earlier edition of a work was published prior to the introduction of KZ1266 or “International law and human rights,” the later edition (or editions) may not have been evaluated to see if it belongs more appropriately in KZ but just classified automatically under the same number as the earlier edition.

Cataloging as we know is not (always) an exact science, particularly for those of us without the knowledge of Jolande or Aaron. Jolande and I have discussed two options for making the use of KZ1266 clearer: 1. Adding only the following scope note under KZ1266: “Class here comparative works or works on conflict of human rights with one or more other obligations or legal regimes of international public law.” 2. Revising the hierarchy and captions, in addition to adding the same scope note. The current hierarchy in this section of KZ is (omitting several and showing only the relevant section):

*International public law and municipal law*

*KZ1265 Conflict between municipal and international public law*

*KZ1266 Relationship between human rights and public international law*
We are proposing:

*Comparisons of, or conflicts between, norms of municipal and international public law*

**KZ1265 General works**

**KZ1266 Human rights and public international law**

Class here comparative works or works on conflict of human rights with one or more other obligations or legal regimes of international public law

With both options, we would also propose a similar scope for the LCSH record for “International law and human rights,” as well as a see also reference in Class K under human rights, referring to KZ1266. At this time, we are leaning toward the second option. More information to follow!

**Future columns**

I am very pleased to be the new TSLL Classification columnist and hope that you will find my columns enlightening (or at least amusing). I am sure that many of you have burning questions about LC classification or ideas for good columns. Please send them to me at pragerg@mercury.law.nyu.edu. Thank you.