Do What You Can

Beth Farrell
Cleveland State University

The motto of my employer, The Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, is “Learn Law, Live Justice.” This summer, the “live justice” aspect of our motto rose to the forefront of our consciousness. As Dean Lee Fisher wrote in our school’s Call to Action: “A global pandemic revealed a fragile economy and brutal racial, health, and economic disparities. A pandemic of racism revealed a fragile democracy and a broken criminal justice system that has shaken our sense of fairness and justice.” The school created a Racial Justice Task Force, and I was asked to co-chair the Public Action Work Group of the task force. In addition to working on the big initiatives of the task force, I have also tried to examine my own conscious and unconscious biases to ensure my everyday workplace behavior matches my antiracist values.

In her important, deeply moving book, “So You Want To Talk About Race,” Ijeoma Oluo poignantly describes the oppression she feels from encountering microaggressions and racism day after day. She says “…if I stopped to feel, really feel, the pain of the racism I encountered, I would start screaming and I would never stop…every day is a new little hurt, a new little dehumanization.” Educating oneself about these commonplace microaggressions and vowing to call them out (and apologizing when committing one!) is essential behavior for those who aspire to be antiracist allies.

A concrete place to start could be our daily communication. In their recent article, “What Inclusive Leaders Sound Like,” Noah Zandan and Lisa Shalett
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Dear TS-SIS Members,

Soon we will be saying goodbye to 2020. What a year! We have seen challenges and disruptions like no other time. As the COVID-19 pandemic grips the world, bush and wild-fires destroy millions of acres and displace hundreds of thousands of people. Countless citizens are holding peaceful demonstrations and sometimes violent riots to protest police-involved killings of black individuals. Sadly, we lost Ruth Bader Ginsburg, a pioneer for gender equality.

So, what good things happened in 2020? We discovered more time with our families, spent more time outdoors, acknowledged the importance of teachers, moved museums and other collections online, and began appreciating toilet paper conservation. We also adapted to online meetings, workshops, and events, allowing more colleagues the opportunity to attend. Through this time, the TS-SIS (Technical Services Special Interest Section) Executive Board and Committee Chairs continue to support and advance TS-SIS members' readiness to communicate ideas, interests, and research.

What is readiness, and what are the TS Board and Committee Chairs doing to promote it? Readiness is being fully prepared for something and planning for change when the benefits outweigh the costs. The TS Executive Board referred to answers on the 2020 TS Membership Survey for guidance from members calling for more educational opportunities and better communication.

Here are some of the Board's actions to meet the needs. As the need to erase core racist realities manifested in each of society's major parts arose, the Board created a task force to propose long-term TS initiatives to overcome racism and discrimination. Second, the Professional Development Committee is spearheading programs and training opportunities that meet current needs. Thirdly, updates to the TS-SIS web pages are underway to keep members informed on current best practices and committee work. Also, there is a plan to review and revise the TS-SIS Strategic Plan.

The newly created TS-SIS Anti-Discrimination and Anti-Racism Task Force, chaired by Alexis Zirpoli and Karen Scoville, is surveying the landscape and proposing a long-range plan advocating impactful changes in access to legal information within the law library technical services profession and purview.

The TS Professional Development Committee (PDC), chaired by Jennifer Mart-Rice and Lauren Seney, offers webinars on assorted topics. In September and December, the PDC held a roundtable for all, but especially of interest to TS Working Parents. This roundtable discusses surviving while working from home and supplying homeschooling/daycare for children. Look for upcoming announcements of 2021 roundtable meetings soon. For more information, contact Lauren Seney at lauren.seney@colorado.edu.

On December 2, Alan Keely, Jackie Magagnosc, and Jennifer Mart-Rice, members of the PDC Webinar Planning Group, organized and held a TS-SIS Fall Webinar, From Task Management Apps to Accessible Training and Procedures: Tools & ADA Compliant Tech for Teleworking Librarians.

In 2021, the TS-SIS Management Issues Round Table plans to meet in January, April, and July. On January 13, 2021, we hope your schedule allows you to join Alan Keely in his popular Management Issues Roundtable discussions. For more information about the January 13 meeting, click this link [https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSd2R7h1sS/SdaJ58L2gyo58ZJZDJBLcGQ1NctxAzmjvID2w/viewform] or contact Lauren Seney at lauren.seney@colorado.edu.
Library Systems & Resource Discovery Special Interest Section

Season’s greetings, friends and colleagues, at the close of this most challenging of years. 2020 has been strange and different in so many ways, up-ending our personal lives and routines, our children’s school schedules, and our work situations. But I know well that LSRD and TS librarians are creative and resourceful, and I hope that this year provided you some opportunity to demonstrate your unique talents, for the benefit not only of your institutions and patrons, but also your own professional development.

I have long felt that the LSRD librarian is perfectly situated in between public and technical services units, so during that late-spring period where many of us transitioned to fully-remote work arrangements with very limited access to print collections (without ever having planned to do so), we were best prepared to fully leverage our “library systems” to maximize “resource discovery” in this changed environment. Sometimes I was amazed at just how normal our work seemed this year—even when I was cataloging e-books from home after putting the kids to bed—and that is a testament to the adaptive nature of LSRD/TS work.

The TS-SIS web pages and brochure require updating. The first web section to receive attention is the Collection Development pages. The Resource Management Committee is beginning to revise the policies and guidance once found on these pages. The TS Executive Board is reviewing other sections for needed changes. The Membership Committee and Chair Gilda Chiu-Ousland are updating the TS brochure. After approval, TS will post the newly revised information on the web and print a few copies for limited distribution.

For 2021, the TS-SIS Executive Board expanded the availability of educational funding to include online venues. In addition to the on-site meetings, the TS Awards Committee may offer up to five $100 grants in each New Member, Experienced Member, and Active Member categories. Find more information about grant opportunities at [https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/awards-grants/], or contact the Awards Committee Chair, Jackie Magagnosc, at jkm95@cornell.edu.

Amid 2020 circumstances, the TS-SIS Executive Board and Committee Chairs have tried to meet members’ needs, advance readiness, and offer essential programs as reflected in the 2020 Membership Survey. If you have suggestions, comments, or complaints, please email me at ecollin1@utk.edu or communicate with any TS-SIS Executive Board member. If you are interested in or have questions about committees or subcommittees, please contact the Committee Chair or Co-Chair. You can find Board and Chair information at [https://www.aallnet.org/tssis/about-us/leadership/]. Please reach out with recommendations for improvements and questions.

The year 2020 will go down in history as a test of humanity. Congratulations to each one for adapting, meeting the challenges, and pursuing unique solutions and opportunities. As we say goodbye to the year, I am grateful for TS-SIS colleagues and wish each one health, happiness, and well-being in 2021.

Warm Regards,
Carol Morgan Collins
University of Tennessee
Here on the LSRD board, however, our attention is already well into the 2021 calendar year, as the nature of SIS work is to be looking ahead. The AALL conference program proposal submission period which was extended through November has recently ended, and the Education Committee is looking forward to finding out which proposals have been accepted by the AMPC and which others might be re-worked into LSRD-specific training sessions or discussion sessions. Then comes the SIS Meeting Matrix, an arduous task best suited to the puzzle experts among SIS leadership.

Also coming in early 2021 will be the LSRD biennial membership survey, so keep your eyes open for that to be distributed by vice chair Larissa Sullivant. This is how the board collects our basic SIS demographics to examine them for any shifts or trends in our membership, but more importantly, it is a chance for our membership to let us know what you want from LSRD, to share your professional interests and any thoughts or concerns about the future of the section. So please take the time to respond to the survey as it very much does inform the board’s decision-making.

The other really important component of the survey is the opportunity to volunteer for SIS service: this is the only way we can keep doing the good work of LSRD, by continually involving enthusiastic new members for committee and representative assignments. Those reps and committee members may go on to become committee chairs, then board members, and then on to other AALL service and leadership roles where they can continue to advocate for LSRD. I can remember being so nervous as a newer member invited to my first board meeting, in a hotel lobby in Seattle, but then-OBS chair Katrina Piechnik and the rest of the board were so welcoming and supportive and have been ever since.

So, to our newer members today, please consider volunteering for LSRD in 2021, and you will be rewarded with interesting work assignments and a fun peer-group that will help you along the way to your professional goals.

Kevin Carey
Ohio State University

When selecting legal research plans for public law libraries, one important consideration is what are commonly called “patron access” plans versus the standard one user, one login model. Patron access has the advantage of requiring, in general, significantly less labor for library staff, but vendors may restrict access to some content, preventing patron access plans from using some popular resources. In many cases, the library’s own policies will drive the decision making process as much as vendors and price considerations. Hybrid options, where staff, or a select group of patrons, have logins while other users are limited to public terminals, is a third option. Avoiding unauthorized practice of law is also a factor that might come into play.

Law libraries with more expansive public access rules that do not require memberships and whose policies discriminate between self represented litigants (SRLs), attorneys, and others are generally better served by relying primarily on a patron access model. With a patron base that likely changes from day to day, the paperwork required to set up login information for every single user would quickly become overwhelming. For libraries with a large number of short-term users, the per-user cost of individual logins quickly becomes unsustainable.

Patron access plans may require more up front effort to set up, involving more detailed conversations between IT staff and vendor representatives. Once everything is in place, ongoing interaction is minimal, barring server updates and other routine IT bugs that come up in every networked system. With individual user logins, vendor intervention is required.
with every new patron. Cost per user is potentially lower with a patron access plan, but because vendors price those plans based on expected use, the difference is likely to be less significant.

One option, for libraries that don’t want or can’t afford to allow the general public to run wild on Westlaw or Lexis, is staff-mediated access, where the library acquires staff logins who then e-mail or print materials upon patron request. This is the option that requires the fewest user licenses and is thus likely to be the least expensive. When serving SRLs, however, there is the risk of entangling library staff in potential UPL issues, when patrons have vague requests that staff must interpret, or patrons making huge, far reaching requests, forcing librarians to choose between allowing a small number of patrons to monopolize their time or cutting off patrons and potentially compromising their access to justice.

Libraries that operate on membership models or offer different services to patrons based on their status have more options. Legal database access can be a selling point for library membership. Some law libraries might offer some services to SRLs but restrict database access to cardholders. For these types of libraries, patron access plans are largely unnecessary. This may partially be driven by legal limitations on what is or is not considered unauthorized practice of law in a given jurisdiction, but generally speaking, setting SRLs loose unsupervised in a database effectively removes the librarian from the litigants’ work.

The Cook County Law Library (CCLL) relies on a hybrid model, where the library only subscribes to products for which a patron access plan is offered, but for databases where there are significant resources only available via individual user logins, the library then also acquires a small number of user logins for staff use, allowing patrons who are looking for specific titles to still obtain access. In pre-COVID times, the Cook County Law Library hosted weekly in person legal research database classes, allowing SRLs to learn how to use the tools without telling them what they needed to look for. This is the option that allowed CCLL to maximize access to resources while still maintaining the library’s obligation to provide the same level of service and access to resources to all patrons regardless of status or education.

Using ClassWeb, Part II
Boolean Searching in ClassWeb

In my prior TSLL column, I discussed some of the basics of browsing and searching for classification numbers in ClassWeb, except for Boolean searching, which I will discuss in this column. I will also discuss some tips and tricks suggested by some of our colleagues.

To perform a Boolean search, first select the type of search you want to do (i.e., LC classification) from the main menu. Click on “search” under “search options,” select “ALL” or “ANY” search options. “Find ALL matching terms (AND search) or ANY matching term (OR search).”

The second set of options are to Run a browse, Basic query, or Boolean query. Select Boolean query. Use quotation marks around the search terms. If you are using more than one search term in any input box, you need to use one of the Boolean operators (“and,” “or,” “>,” “<,” or any of the others listed at ClassWeb Search Help (https://classweb.org/Help/Common/search.html). Additionally, you can use any of the proximity operators for keyword search boxes included in a Boolean query. Use parentheses if necessary to insure the proper meaning of your search. If you do not add parentheses, ClassWeb will interpret Boolean expressions from left to right but give low precedence to “OR” searches. On the search results page, you will have an option to “refine search” or “search a subset.”
Some examples:

To find all the class numbers for torts and delicts in the Asian/African regional tables KL-KWX, use:

Class number: \( \geq \text{"KL"} \)

Caption or index term: “Torts” or “delicts”

Under “Search options,” make sure you have selected “Boolean query” and “Find all matching terms (“And” search) Also select “Tables” or “Both” since you will be searching tables.

I retrieved 27 results from all the Kl-KLW regional tables. Of course, there are other ways you could perform the search to get similar results.

To find all the class numbers in the European law tables KJ-KKZ relating to mines and mineral resources:

Class number: \( (\geq \text{"KJ"} \ and \ \leq \text{"KJT"}) \)

Caption or index term: “Mines” or “mineral?”

In the above search, you could alternatively use Class number: \( (\geq \text{"KJ"} \ and \ <\text{"KL"}) \). I like selecting the “Caption and Index Term” search. It’s a broader search than just searching captions or index terms, but not as broad as keyword searching, which is likely to give a lot of false hits.

As far as I know, there is no way to find all the class numbers for all the civil law European jurisdictions in KJ-KKZ including France, Germany, the European Union, the countries covered by the KJ-KKZ regional tables, and European comparative law—at least not through one search. That is because you can search either tables or schedules, but not both at the same time (Clicking on “both” only searches tables). You would need to do the above search and then a second Boolean query, making sure that you select “Schedules” in the search options.

Here is one way to do the second search to find the class numbers for mines and mineral resources in the civil law European schedules:

Class number: \( (\text{"KJ"} \ or \ \text{"KK"}) \)

Caption or index term: “mine?” or “mineral?”

Truncating the search by using the wildcard character “?” does retrieve a few unwanted entries in this case: KJV974-KJV975.2 “Unemancipated minors. Mineurs emancipes”. To avoid the false hits, you could simply include all the variants in the search “Mine” or “mines” (and other variants) or use a “!=” “not equal to” search.

If you wanted to comprehensively search all European law, you could search class number “KD” or “KJ” or “KK” in your second search.

Boolean searching in ClassWeb is exceptionally powerful. It’s definitely worth spending time trying different searches on your own. I have only touched the surface.

Tips and tricks to using ClassWeb, courtesy of our TS-SIS colleagues:

I would like to extend my thanks to Aaron and John for their helpful suggestions below.

Aaron Kuperman, Acting Section Head, Library of Congress Law Cataloging Section:

“I’ve always taught that one should determine the subject heading first and use that as a guide to classification. That way, if a topic was used in some jurisdiction other than the one of the resource being cataloged, you have a guide about where to look for a number and what to use as a pattern, if a proposal is required. If that fails (meaning the subject has never been encountered before), trying keywords (including tables and schedules; always include tables and schedules) helps. If all these fail, pretend to be a user looking for something on the subject and see if there has ever been a work on the subject before. If not, time to make proposals for LCSH and LCC, preferably together.”
John Hostage, Senior Continuing Resources Cataloger, Harvard Library--Information and Technical Services:
“I find the bibliographic correlations useful for finding a class number. I always use the hierarchy browser. I can't think of any reasons to use the other browsers. There is one annoying part of the interface that people should be aware of. If you use the search box in the classification browser or the subject heading browse or anything similar, and you click on the X on the right side of the box to clear the box for another search, you lose the focus of the search box and have to click on the box for another search. It shouldn't be like that. It's also annoying that it doesn't remember previous searches. This is probably obvious to anyone who has worked with it: if you're in a classification browse, you can click on a caption with blue linked text. If you click on the lowest level of the hierarchy that is shown, it opens another level for more detail. If you click on a higher level (not indented as far), you can close up the display to that level for easier browsing forward and backward. You can achieve similar effects by clicking in the hierarchy captions at the top of the screen.”

The Cost of Free Docket Research
Adrienne DeWitt
Campbell University

Bloomberg Law (B-Law) has now implemented a $1500 a-calendar-year docket charge for academic users. This is a change from B-Law’s previous policy of offering “unlimited/unmetered docket to every single law school seat.” https://crivblog.com/tag/aba-bna-lawyers-manual-on-professional-conduct/ The current charge is $.10 a page with a maximum of $3.00 to request documents, update a document, or track a document. There are certain conditions, however, that can change the cost. Northwestern Pritzker Legal Research Center’s Case Dockets and Filings provides an excellent explanation of the charges: https://library.law.northwestern.edu/c.php?g=477783&p=3267027.

For those who might be worried about the B-Law cap, there are other docket platforms that might work just as well. Two of note are CourtListener (RECAP archive) and Lexis Courtlink. Granted, not all documents found on CourtListener or Courtlink are available for free, but then neither are all documents found on B-Law Dockets. B-Law has always restricted access to documents that were sealed or that required a courier, so it stands to reason other docket platforms might do the same thing.

In terms of fees, both CourtListener and Courtlink are significantly more transparent. If CourtListener does not have a document, it will direct you back to PACER. Likewise, Courtlink hyperlinks the word “Free” under a document’s accessibility if it is in the Courtlink database, so there is no question of cost.

As for ease of use, both CourtListener and Courtlink mirror B-Law’s Docket format. All three present docket information in a chart format that is numbered and easy to read. On a side note, I find CourtListener and Courtlink to be even easier to use than B-Law. On CourtListener, you download the document. Courtlink has an additional step that asks you to confirm your selection and shows you the price before downloading the document. Both are straightforward and easy.

In my opinion, B-Law makes document retrieval unnecessarily convoluted. First, there is the View/Request confusion. Unless a document has been previously viewed, you will have to request it. A pop-up will then ask you to accept the charges or fee waiver before the document is retrieved in the Download Center. For those of us who’ve used B-Law for years, this is second nature. Unfortunately, it is my experience that students find these steps confusing.

As for those wondering whether CourtListener or Courtlink have the same number of documents, CourtListener states that it has 8,777,639 documents from PACER. https://www.courtlistener.com/faq/ Courtlink states that it has access to more than 226 million federal and state court dockets and documents. https://www.lexisnexis.com/en-us/support/courtlink/faq.page Compare these to Bloomberg Law’s Docket Key, which, as of January 2020, had classified over 210 million docket entries. https://pm.to/35XGRJg CourtListener is still growing, but Courtlink appears comparable.
Welcome to the November 2020 installment of TSLL Conference Round-up. The goal of this column is to facilitate sharing of conference experiences beyond AALL’s Annual Meeting. This issue’s column features reports from ELUNA, the Depository Library Conference, and the Connecticut Library Association’s Technical Services fall program. 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. If you have the opportunity to attend a local, regional, or national conference or workshop with content of interest to technical services librarians and would like to provide a short summary, please contact me at jkm95@cornell.edu.

2020 ELUNA Law Libraries Special Interest Group Virtual Meeting
Rebecca Bearden
Boston University Fineman and Pappas Law Libraries

Speakers: Rebecca Bearden, Boston University Fineman and Pappas Law Libraries (Law SIG co-chair), Angela Jones, Southern Methodist University Underwood Law Library (Law SIG co-chair), Katie Dunn, University of Wisconsin Law Library (Content Working Group Law liaison), and Christopher Thomas, University of California, Irvine Law Library

The Ex Libris Users of North America (ELUNA) Law Libraries Special Interest Group (Law SIG) held their 2020 meeting virtually on October 22, 2020. This meeting is normally held in person during the annual conference in May but was cancelled this year due to the COVID-19 pandemic. There were 53 people in attendance.

A PowerPoint was presented which included all agenda items and general topics. Angela Jones began by leading the meeting overview. She started with virtual meeting housekeeping, then shared some membership statistics. As of October 19, 2020, there were 140 subscribers to the Law SIG listserv, from 61 different institutions in the United States, as well as 7 international institutions: 3 from Europe, 2 from Australia, and 2 from Asia. There were 56 registrants for the meeting from 35 different institutions.

Rebecca Bearden spoke about upcoming vacancies for the three leadership positions of the Law SIG; two co-chair roles and one Content Working Group (CWG) law liaison. Rebecca and Angela have been in the co-chair roles since May 2018, and Katie Dunn has been in the CWG law liaison position since its creation in January 2019. Rebecca described the responsibilities for the co-chair roles and called for volunteers to express their interest by mid-November 2020. Note: Jennifer Friedman, from UCLA Hugh & Hazel Darling Law Library, Trina Holloway, from Georgia State University Law Library, and Stephanie Schmidt, from University of California, Hastings Law Library, have accepted these roles as of November 16, 2020 and will begin their term in January 2021.

Katie Dunn, CWG law liaison, presented the Content Working Group update. She included an overview of the role’s duties and requirements as well as the findings of a survey that had been conducted last year on law content in the Alma Community Zone (CZ). There were some discussions relating to Alma’s Provider Zone and Central Discovery Index (CDI) after the presentation. Following that, Christopher Thomas presented on how to link local electronic collections.

But the bottom line is cost. For those who do minimal research on dockets, B-Law remains the go-to. But if you plan to do some heavy docket research, remember you have alternatives. B-Law has competition. The market will win out in the end.
to the Community Zone in Alma and what the benefits of doing so were, including better metadata and article level indexing.

Rebecca and Angela also spoke briefly about serials workflows in Alma. Rebecca shared her experiences working with print serials, especially law specific materials, at two different Alma law libraries, and how each of these institutions has handled things similarly or differently. Angela spoke about SMU’s different approaches to these areas. Angela and Rebecca agreed that it can be nice, as well as challenging, to have so much flexibility.

After a short break, the second half of the meeting was an open discussion. Several topics were brought up, such as making certain fields searchable in Primo VE, collection duplications in the CZ, title level CDI information, using Alma Analytics for ALLStAR reports, and advocacy for improving collections in the CZ.

Meeting materials will be made available in the ELUNA repository as well as on the Law SIG’s wiki. More information can be found at https://el-una.org/special-interest-groups/descriptions/law-sig/.

Fugitive Documents 101: Or a Guide to Lost Federal Documents
Federal Depository Library Conference
Jake Kubrin
Robert Crown Law Library, Stanford Law School

Cynthia Etkin, Stephen Kharfen, and Vicki Tate gave a great introduction to fugitive federal documents in their presentation, titled “Fugitive Documents 101: Or a Guide to Lost Federal Documents,” at the 2020 Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) Conference. (See slides here: https://www.fdlp.gov/file-repository/outreach/events/depository-library-council-dlc-meetings/2020-meeting-proceedings/2020-fall-federal-depository-library-conference/handouts-slides?limit=100.) Etkin’s part of the presentation gave a history of the federal government’s definitions of fugitive, or lost, documents. Though recognized as a challenge earlier, the first use of fugitive documents appeared in a report from 1896, describing these fringe and hard to collect materials like “circulars, bulletins, orders.” The Government Publishing Office (GPO) has since used different terminology as its approach to and scope of materials cataloged in the Catalog of Government Publications (CGP) and distribution of resources to participating libraries in the Federal Depository Program (FDLP) has changed. For instance, an additional category of online documents was included in 2003. In 2004, the definition was updated to any document of public interest or educational value not considered classified information. In an effort to be as inclusive as possible, the official definition of fugitive publications today is “public information products that are not discoverable through [CGP].”

Kharfen then discussed GPO’s policies and procedures for cataloging and making fugitive documents discoverable. In 2019, there were a total of 651 online submissions to the Lost Docs Reporting Form to request for inclusion in the CGP. Today, users can submit fugitive documents to askGPO.gov, which offers a much more user friendly and efficient interface. GPO staff review all submissions and follow up with any clarifying questions. The growing number of submissions indicates a rising interest in fugitive document hunting as well as the success of GPO’s efforts to make fugitive document reporting as easy as possible.

Finally, Tate gave a very useful guide to hunting lost federal documents. Essentially, fugitive document hunting is a type of collection development activity since it involves identifying gaps in local collections and making new resources discoverable. At first glance, it may seem difficult to pinpoint fugitive documents given the nature of these materials, but they can appear more readily than you may think. In my own case, fugitive documents came to my library’s attention after helping a faculty member with a research project tracking online reports made available by a federal agency but not yet in the CGP. It may be possible to also locate fugitive documents after hearing about a controversial government report in the news. This underlines why fugitive document hunting remains an important part of technical services departments’ work in disseminating useful public information.

FDLP has created a pilot project to determine best practices for fugitive document hunting, especially when given very limited bibliographic information, as is usually the case. As a participant in this pilot project, I’ve been happy to share
some of my more successful and less fruitful search strategies with FDLP staff. I’ve also learned some really helpful tips that have made fugitive hunting a rewarding and fun challenge. For instance, limiting to “.gov” or “.mil” sites helps to give more precise results, but further digging is usually required once you enter the site. In addition to broadening the scope of the definition of fugitive documents and updating reporting tools, FDLP’s desire to share best practices shows their attempt to encourage technical services to participate in collection development in a unique and rewarding way.

2020 Connecticut Library Association Fall Program: Casting a Critical Eye on Cataloging and Classification
Jackie Magagnosc
Cornell Law Library

Speaker: Violet Fox

As is the case with so many other programs this year, the Connecticut Library Association’s Technical Services fall program was offered online. The speaker, Violet Fox, is a cataloging and metadata expert with an interest in the ethical implications of classification. Most recently, she was a Dewey editor for OCLC. In 2019, she was recognized as a Library Journal “Mover and Shaker.”

Fox began her presentation by describing her professional background. She argues that it is vitally important that our controlled vocabularies and classification systems reflect more points of view, especially LGBTQ+ and BIPOC. She participates in the Critical Cataloging (#critcat) movement, related to radical and ethical cataloging and centered in critical librarianship’s emphasis on social justice principles.

The presentation continued with the following statements:

- Cataloging is not neutral
- Cataloging cannot be neutral
- Cataloging should not be neutral

Our training as catalogers is fundamentally at odds with these statements; our instructions tell us to be “neutral” and “objective.” We need to recognize the bias built into cataloging, where the default is a heterosexual, white Christian male viewpoint. Pointing out these issues is not new. Many of us are familiar with the work of Sandy Berman, but during the 1940s, Frances Yokum at Fisk University and Dorothy Porter at Howard University were bringing attention to these issues. Fox argues that the current modes of description are colonial products defaulting to hierarchical means of organization. All systems are inherently biased; to regain trust and authority, designers and editors must embrace transparency.

The presentation continued with a description of the concept of “literary warrant.” Our controlled vocabularies and classification schemes are based on the totality of works that have been processed. If we do not like the way these systems work, we must develop a new system of warrant. Fox then reviewed the acronyms and entities associated with cataloging, including LCSH, LCC, SACO, PCC, and PTPC, reminding the audience that the Library of Congress and these entities function as gatekeepers. She then reviewed the LCSH submission process, starting with identification of a need via literary warrant, research to identify terms and definitions providing authoritative references, and formulation of a record following the rules. Fox emphasized that anyone can do this, but if an individual is not associated with a SACO library or SACO funnel, it is less obvious how to submit a proposal. The review process, from receipt through evaluation and publication of decisions, takes approximately six to ten weeks. To submit a proposal you need:

- Subject matter expertise
- Access to the SACO participant’s manual
- Access to the Subject Headings manual
- MARC
Fox then described the Cataloging Lab project (cataloginglab.org), a website designed to crowd source revisions to LCSH. An example of a successful subject-heading proposal developed through this venue is Cultural appropriation (https://cataloginglab.org/kb/cultural-appropriation/), which was developed by library school students.

Local options are a possible way to address bias in a catalog. Libraries can choose to use alternative vocabularies, but some systems make this difficult. For example, in WMS, you can add local headings, but you cannot remove problematic ones. Fox emphasized that it is better to go through the process to change a problematic vocabulary term before deploying a local option. It is up to all of us to improve LSCH and reclaim the process from LC and larger institutions. The options for collocating on other vocabularies that meet our user needs should be explored. This conversation needs to happen across populations. Fox referenced Critical Cataloging (http://critlib.org/about/critcat/) as one venue for this conversation.

Issues discussed in Q & A included the status of the proposal to change “Illegal aliens,” respecting privacy when constructing authority records, developing advocacy for #critcat efforts, strategies for sharing local options, and brainstorming data and tools to share. A final discussion centered on how to point up concepts not well managed by LCSH, such as LGBTQ+ affirming content.

**Funding Research Opportunities Grant (FROG) Announcement**

**Hop to it!!**

Please see the following research opportunity, and don’t forget the FROG! It’s quick, it’s easy, and your research will benefit your Technical Services colleagues.

The AALL LSRD-SIS and TS-SIS FROG (Funding Research Opportunities Grant) Committee is always accepting applications from any AALL member. The FROG provides support for law librarians to perform research or assessment projects which will enhance our profession. FROG is open to all AALL members and must show evidence that their research will benefit technical services law librarianship. The LSRD/TS FROG Committee will award up to $1,000 in grants in a single year.

“AALL’s Strategic Plan envisions that AALL and its members will be the recognized authority in all aspects of legal information. AALL’s Research Agenda [https://www.aallnet.org/education-training/grants/research-grants/research-agenda/] seeks to make that vision a reality by stimulating a diverse range of scholarship related to and supportive of the profession of law librarianship.” – AALL Research Agenda 2013-2016.

For other research topic ideas, visit the FROG website (https://www.aallnet.org/lsrdsis/awards-grants/#past) and AALL’s Research Agenda page (https://www.aallnet.org/education-training/grants/research-grants/research-agenda/). For more information on the grant and the application process, visit the Grant Guidelines (https://www.aallnet.org/lsrdsis/awards-grants/).

If you have any further questions, please email the FROG Committee Chair, Jessie Tam, at jessie.tam@mdcourts.gov.
Metadata Mapping in the Institutional Repository (IR)  

Jesse A Lambertson  
University of Chicago

For quite a while now, there has been a joint effort between the law school and the law library to publish materials produced by faculty in the IR, which is named Chicago Unbound (https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/).

When one clicks through the IR, links that go to journal articles, working paper series, and book sections (if not metadata for whole books) are found. There are a myriad of publications and publication types represented. There is also a myriad of metadata structures represented in this system – even if that structure is not immediately obvious from the UI. I want to set up the context for this column first.

The other element of the faculty publication universe managed by the law school and supported by the library is the citation database that populates faculty webpages; we call it Law Cites (which I just always refer to as ‘law_cites’).

This landing page is a staff-only interface for keying metadata and URLs, and it is considered to be the database of record as it populates, as mentioned above, the public facing profile for each faculty member on their websites.

It has been decided that we want to add all metadata and a PDF copy of relevant materials (if available) to Chicago Unbound for anything added to law_cites. Not a bad idea to use the public facing BePress-based IR as a way to promote faculty scholarship. But, unless we find a pseudo-batch or programmatic way of moving metadata, at least, from law_cites to Chicago Unbound, then absolute duplicate entry will be required. But our Working Group connected with Chicago Unbound workflows and procedures is working on just such an effort, to minimize duplicate entry as we ‘migrate’ metadata from one system to the other. Herein is the high-level topic of this edition of the Description & Entry Column: How do we map the metadata required for law_cites to the appropriate required data points in Chicago Unbound?

The first efforts were focused on clearly understanding the way the data was reported from law_cites and how the batch upload and batch revise spreadsheets organized metadata for Chicago Unbound.

One can see here that I pulled spreadsheets from both platforms with criteria around what our main publication types are: journal articles, book sections, and books (new or revised).
That top document, not a spreadsheet, is the document I used to explicitly detail the headings and form of the metadata in each platform. I did a type-by-type general analysis of the ways each platform either structured or reported the data it had.

For new book-data uploads:

1. CU organizes the 'Book' itself at the level of the very template of the spreadsheet
2. CU organizes the name of the author into two data points:
   - author1_name
   - author1_name
   - author1_institution
   (this is repeated for the number of the author added
3. CU organizes the resource's abstract content under 'abstract'
4. CU organizes the resource's title under 'title'
5. CU organizes something like a citation (custom, other than the standard citation INSIDE CU) as 'custom_citation' (in this, I mean that it looks like CU produces a citation for the resource from the data points loaded in the spreadsheet)
6. CU organizes years and dates for books under 'publication_date'
7. CU has a section for keywords under 'keywords'
8. CU has a section for subjects under 'disciplines'
9. MORE?

:::

1. Law_cites organizes the 'Book' under 'Source Type' where in the 'Book' is a data entry under the header.
2. Law_cites organizes the name of the author under 'Author(s)' wherein the author's information is keyed as a single set of characters in a string
3. Law-cites organizes the resource's abstract content under 'Abstract'
4. Law-cites organizes the resource's title under 'Book Title' (as opposed to 'Article Title')
5. Law-cites organizes the resource's citation under a heading with the specific entire citation under 'Generic Citation'
6. Law-cites organizes the resource's years and dates under 'Citation Month', 'Citation Day', 'Citation Year'
7. Law_cites has NO such data header for 'keywords' as such
8. Law_cites has NO such data header for subjects or disciplines

There is an array of differences between how each platform structures its metadata.
For instance, Chicago Unbound splits author first name from author last name, while law_cites populates one ‘field’ with the unstructured name. Also, in the same vein, Chicago Unbound allows for the populating of a spreadsheet for batch uploading of data (technically) while, as we understand it, law_cites only allows for batch reporting based on very general criteria. The match between reporting and the metadata entry is not very tight. One can see that there is some real difference between the two platforms: one platform has subject metadata built in while one does not; one splits ‘fname’ and ‘lname’ while one does not; one is built specifically for the publication type while the other is not; one has ‘disciplines’ while the other does not; both have ‘abstract’ sections even though one calls that section ‘Abstract’ while the other calls it ‘abstract.’ There are a number of differences between the two platforms – the biggest of which is that, in Chicago Unbound, the material types determine what metadata is associated with each upload or revised spreadsheet, while law_cites uses the same exact spreadsheet but only includes the available data in its report.

So, the next stage of this project will take place in two steps (ideally). The first is to be absolutely explicit about what from law_cites is needed for Chicago Unbound (pieces of information such as author, title, abstract, and perhaps discipline). The second part of this project will be to determine if we can programmatically copy text strings from the law_cites report to the Chicago Unbound spreadsheets that get updated with at least the metadata – this step would limit the duplicate keying of information in Chicago Unbound.

First, let me show what the reporting looks like for law_cites (you will see the options are not super granular – but will be helpful).

There are not that many options to choose from – the only thing missing from this image is the option to only draw materials with authors affiliated with University of Chicago (which I did choose). In the screenshot below of the output from the above criteria, one can see the type information drawn.
Below is an example of the metadata that has been entered for a Book Section in Chicago Unbound.

**Book Sections**

**Scalia as Procrustes for the Majority, Scalia as Cassandra in Dissent**

Mary Anne Case

**Publication Date**
2019

**Publication Title**
Justice Scalia: Rhetoric and the Rule of Law

**Book Editors**
Brian Sloom & Francis Mootz

**Publisher**
University of Chicago Press

**Section Title**
Scalia as Procrustes for the Majority, Scalia as Cassandra in Dissent

**Recommended Citation**

And a spreadsheet from Chicago Unbound looks like this…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where the Dark</td>
<td>2007-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Running and Philosophy</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Brief History</td>
<td>1996-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Advocacy in the Classroom: Problems and Possibilities</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Brief Primer on</td>
<td>2009-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Tax Strategies for Corporate Acquisitions, Dispositions,</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Century of Slap</td>
<td>2002-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Christian Perspectives on Legal Thought</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Law Professor</td>
<td>1998-03-06</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Cooperation, Efficiency, and Antitrust: Compatabilities and</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Note on French</td>
<td>2009-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Novel in Which</td>
<td>2007-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Whittaker's the Moral Life: Essays in Honor of Coral</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Place for Mercy</td>
<td>2007-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Doing Justice to Mercy: Religion, Law, and Criminal Justice</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Return to Caution</td>
<td>1988-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Clones and Clones: Facts and Fantasies About Human Grafting</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Tale of Duplicates</td>
<td>1999-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Program of the 4th Annual Conference for Law School Article</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A U.S. Perspective</td>
<td>2003-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>The Role of the Judge in International Trade Regulation</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion in the U.S</td>
<td>2009-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Road to Abortion?</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abortion, Dignity</td>
<td>2012-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Feminist Constitutionalism: Global Perspectives</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts of Terror</td>
<td>2003-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>The Bias against Guns</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Possessions</td>
<td>1985-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>A Property Anthology</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice to a School</td>
<td>2006-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Common Man and Uncommon Man: Remembering</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterword: The Case</td>
<td>2010-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>What Caused the Financial Crisis?</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against Capitalism</td>
<td>2008-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Mental Psychology</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Costs, Ev</td>
<td>1989-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Principals and Agents: The Structure of Business</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberto Gentil</td>
<td>2010-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>Alberto Gentil: All dei convelli al quarto cento dolor</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akrism and Value</td>
<td>2006-01-01</td>
<td>00:00:00</td>
<td>When Akrism Isn't Enough: The Case for Compensating Article</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The metadata is simple, which is fine. Not at all the thing we associate with the granularity of MARC, but I just look at it to point out where one does not quite match up with the metadata.

All this is really to bring up the status of where we are in our efforts. We are meeting shortly to work out the details or compromise between, as mentioned above, the absolute programmatic effort vs. the absolute duplicate re-keying the data two whole times. We won’t want to do that. So, that’s where we are. I may not touch on this again in another Description & Entry Column. In fact, I plan on writing more on Sinopia BIBFRAME efforts in the next columns, but this is happening currently and seems to be a relevant column topic.
Adobe Flash End of Life: Flash Will be Phased Out of Major Internet Browsers in January 2021

Wilhelmina Randtke
Florida Academic Library Services Cooperative

Adobe Flash discontinuation
Three years ago, in Fall 2017, Adobe announced it would discontinue Flash completely after December 2020. The discontinuation date is now upon us.

What is Flash
Flash was an early and dominant software for creating interactive web content. It used static files (.swf files). These were created using Flash Studio software, which was licensed software that someone who wanted to create Flash websites could purchase and use to make the .swf files. The learning curve for Flash was not so steep as for many programming languages. Because Flash used .swf files that ran in browser or on the browser side computer rather than on the web server, the files could be uploaded to cheaper hosting plans and didn't require special server prep or functionality. For people looking at the web and visiting websites, they could download a Flash player for their web browser; Flash sites would then run in the browser. With Flash, things like sound effects, interactive content, and games were relatively easy for people making websites to create and post and for users browsing the web to use.

Historic significance of Flash: A dominant technology for designing and running a website from 2000 to beyond 2010
Flash was introduced in 1996 by Macromedia Corporation. At the time, HTML was fairly simple and didn't include interactive features. Essentially, using plain old HTML, it was possible to position and color text on a page, to position images, and to link out from text or images to other web pages. Within HTML, it wasn't possible to add sound effects; mouse over animations, accordion out descriptions or text, or provide just about any interactive feature beyond linking to a separate page or file. Flash provided a user friendly way to produce more interactive and visual web pages and was heavily used for web development of interactive pages. Gradually, HTML and CSS added functionality to do more visual and interactive features, and Flash was no longer the only way for a person to easily make interactive web content. Some of the functionality now included in HTML 5 and current open web standards was likely inspired by Flash. In 2010, Steve Jobs, head of Apple released an open letter, "Thoughts on Flash," which announced that Flash would not be allowed on iPhones or iPads and would be discouraged within the Macintosh operating system. This went beyond not supporting the software, which might include extra steps for a user to install software or extra work to find instructions on it. In the closed environment of the Apple App Store, software had to be specifically approved and allowed by Apple in order for someone to run it on an iPhone. This cut off a large chunk of internet users from Flash content and led to Adobe moving resources from Flash toward software packages for app development. Desire to reach iPhone users led to websites choosing other technologies instead of Flash, and web development in Flash dropped off sharply after the Thoughts on Flash open letter. Nevertheless, for a period of more than 10 years from the late 1990s through and beyond 2010, and during a time when regular people first got widespread access to the internet in the U.S., Flash was a dominant software for entire websites to run on. For early web video and simple online games, Flash was almost universally used up until the Thoughts on Flash open letter.

Discontinuation of Flash
In July 2017, Adobe announced it would discontinue support and distribution for Flash at the end of 2020. Adobe Inc., Flash & the Future of Interactive Content (July 25, 2017), available at https://blog.adobe.com/en/publish/2017/07/25/adobe-flash-update.html. So, beginning January 2021, Flash player would no longer be available for download from Adobe, and no security or other updates would be made. Something unusual about this discontinuation is that there was coordination between leading web browsers, leading search engines, and the software manufacturer, such that Flash content has been suppressed leading up to the discontinuation date. Adobe's information page about Flash end of
life notes that the Flash end of life announcement was collaboratively written between Adobe and several other
technology companies including Apple, Facebook, Google, Microsoft, and Mozilla. Adobe Inc., Adobe Flash Player EOL
23, 2020). Essentially, the major web browsers and tech companies will phase out Flash simultaneously. Simultaneous
to Adobe's announcement about end of life for Flash, Microsoft posted an announcement regarding its phase out plan
for Flash, stating, "By the end of 2020, we will remove the ability to run Adobe Flash in Microsoft Edge and Internet
Explorer across all supported versions of Microsoft Windows. Users will no longer have any ability to enable or run

Microsoft announced a plan to remove the ability to play Flash files as part of routine updates that install automatically from time to time on people's computers. Microsoft recently reaffirmed this; in September 2020, they released a statement that: "In keeping with this plan, Microsoft is ending support for Adobe Flash Player on Microsoft Edge (both the new Microsoft Edge and Microsoft Edge Legacy) and Internet Explorer 11 at the end of 2020," and "In Summer of 2021, all the APFs, group policies, and user interfaces that specifically govern the behavior of Adobe Flash Player will be removed from Microsoft Edge (legacy) and Internet Explorer 11 via the latest ‘Cumulative Update’ on Windows 10 platforms and via ‘Cumulative Update for Internet Explorer 11’ or ‘Monthly Rollup’ on Windows 8.1, Windows Server 2012 and Windows Embedded 8 Standard. Also, the ‘Update for Removal of Adobe Flash Player’ will be included as part of the ‘Cumulative Update’ and ‘Monthly Rollup’ from this point forward." Microsoft, Update on Adobe Flash Player End of Support (Sept. 4, 2020), available at https://blogs.windows.com/msedgedev/2020/09/04/update-adobe-flash-end-support/.


The discontinuation is more abrupt than usual for software end of life. Usually, software remains in use for a few years after end of life, and it eventually becomes untenable when security issues require that the computer the software is running on be updated in a way that is incompatible with the software. Usually, the date in the end of life announcement is the beginning of the end. With Adobe Flash, it's the end of the end. Software generally either runs fully within a desktop environment (for example older versions of Microsoft Word), and a person can run it until an operating system update interferes with it working, or runs on a web server (for example, older versions of Wordpress), and a person can run it until an update to the server technologies, usually necessitated by internet-wide security concerns, interferes with the software working. Because of files playing in browser and running on the end of the person browsing the web, Flash is in a unique position where browser security updates will end access to the player promptly after security updates are removed. The nature of Flash Player as a browser add-on means that the player runs in an environment with ongoing security risks. For example, browser saved passwords must be kept secure, and cookies must be kept secure so that they can't be reverse engineered, so browsers tend to be continuously and quickly updated, and it's risky for an individual to put off these updates on a browser that they use to login to online accounts. In this case, all major browsers will remove Flash Player promptly after end of life, and because of the connected nature of internet browsing, people have to install browser updates relatively promptly.

Since individual .swf Flash files are available from a wide variety of websites, following December 2020, Flash content likely will still be available, but it will become much more difficult to play or run that content. And because software updates tend to install automatically on an ongoing basis, the change will likely happen in the background soon after the close of December 2020 without people consciously choosing to uninstall Flash players.

This affects a huge amount of back content designed for the web and older websites. To give a sense of the scale and penetration of Flash, I will use Florida's Orange Grove learning objects repository as an example. The Florida Orange Grove was a repository of learning objects for K-20 Florida public education which launched sometime around 2003.
and which accepted new content up until 2020. Learning objects were given peer review before being added to the repository and included textbooks, quizzes, and interactive tutorials. In July 2020, Florida's governor vetoed the budget for Florida's state established consortium for distance learning and library technology, which housed the Orange Grove. Shortly after that, several services, including the Orange Grove, were discontinued on 30 days notice. I had worked at the consortium for the previous 5 years but was no longer employed there, and so, from the outside, I did web scraping on discontinued repositories owned collectively and not owned by any single institution. Because of this, I have a comprehensive copy of all content uploaded to the Orange Grove. Out of items uploaded to the learning repository at the time of decommissioning, about 10% were in the .swf Flash format. To give some context, about one third of items uploaded were in the PDF format. So, Flash materials in this long running repository were about 1/3 as prevalent as PDF, and no one doubts the centrality of PDF as a file format. Flash also dominated interactive objects in the repository, as opposed to static content like textbooks and self help tutorials with limited interactivity. That's the scale of existing web materials that will become inaccessible without ability to run Flash.

In a sense, the Flash material skews older. And, in a sense, websites have had a longish window of time to go through Flash content and redo material in a different format if the content was worth the effort. Adobe made the end of life announcement in July 2017 for a December 2020 end of life. That's a big window. But also, interactive content requires a deep dive to understand what it's doing. It's a more difficult conversion than would be text to Microsoft Word to Adobe PDF. And the effort to get interactive content into a modern format is further complicated because a less steep learning curve led to widespread adoption, so effort to redo interactive material in something other than Flash might require more technical skill and a steeper learning curve than did creating the original content. It might take more effort to recreate a Flash website or game in modern dominant technologies than it did to build the original in Flash. Likely, there is significant content that hasn't been moved to new formats and won't be due to limited resources.

**Possible impact of lost content: Videos likely will persist in other formats; interactive content likely will disappear**

Historical or legacy systems sometimes really can be left in the past, but sometimes get set up and used for years. The nature of what will disappear can be understood by understanding that Flash was designed for interactive content and was easier to learn than, for example, a programming language. For a website with video animations in Flash and other similar video oriented content, it's possible to record that to a video format and keep access. The effort to record a Flash video to a video format, for example, an mp4, is relatively modest and can be done with screencasting software in a pinch. For interactive content like an online quiz module, a graphing calculator simulator, a legal forms prep package, or something where clicking on different parts of a picture makes sound effects, it's much more labor intensive to fully recreate that in a format other than Flash, and recreating it requires looking closely at the Flash file then rebuilding in a different format. Beyond public facing websites, there probably will be some impact from internal workflows based on Flash. For example, something built internally within a business that takes a spreadsheet of input and makes load packages for a billing system at a government agency. Another example would be something that takes input and makes a batch file to feed into another system. These are the kinds of things that get set up and left in place until they break. Because Flash was once nearly ubiquitous, and easy to use compared to computer programming alternatives, it's likely that various workflows within businesses and organizations will be affected and have to be redone once operating system updates cut Flash off entirely.

**Flash emulation and access to older content**

Meanwhile, for entertainment content and Flash materials that were created for public use rather than to support internal workflows, Internet Archive recently launched the Flash Software Library at [https://archive.org/details/softwarelibrary_flash](https://archive.org/details/softwarelibrary_flash). The Internet Archive maintains similar software libraries that allow the public to emulate and run games for now-obsolete computer operating systems.

Endnote

1. Many of the items uploaded to the Orange Grove were entire web pages. For this analysis, I've treated an entire web page as a single item. When the web page appeared to have significant content included in the swf Flash format, I treated that as a Flash file. For example, a set of HTML wrappers which call and display Flash files to a browser would be one item, even though it might be many individual files, and here would be counted as a single Flash item, because the "meat" of the website was a series of Flash files with interactive content.
In November, OCLC launched the new OCLC Community Center, a searchable platform which facilitates collaboration, includes message boards and OCLC announcements. The service is now live at: https://www.oclc.org/community/home.en.html.

OCLC will be hosting a Cataloging Community Meeting on 15 January 2021. During this online event, you will hear updates from several members of the cataloging community as well as from OCLC staff. There will be time to take questions you have at the end of the presentations, and OCLC will answer as many as time allows.

Planned topics include:
- WorldCat cataloging partner collections
- Subject headings for indigenous peoples/First Nations
- Connexion
- Linked Data
- OCLC cataloging news and metadata quality updates

Additional details about the OCLC Cataloging Community Meeting – including speaker information and other details – will be shared on the new Cataloging and Metadata community in coming weeks.

OCLC Cataloging Community Meeting
Date: 15 January 2021
Time: 2:00 pm - 4:30 pm EST (UTC -5)
Register at: https://oclcwebinar.webex.com/oclcwebinar/onstage/g.php?MTID=ee5c069bf8b516f4314e46c6ce4c32d

There are no serials title changes for this issue.

The following is a list of serials cessations:

DePaul Journal of Art, Technology and Intellectual Property Law
**Ceased in print with:** v. 29, no. 1 (fall 2018)
(OCoLC 226301839)
Continued online at https://via.library.depaul.edu/jatip/
Also available on HeinOnline
(OCoLC 1004551916)

Journal of the National Association of Administrative Law Judiciary
**Ceased in print with:** v. 39, no. 1 (spring 2019)
(OCoLC 10592404)
Also available on HeinOnline
(OCoLC 269406610)
A number of new headings of interest to law catalogers appeared in this latest period. How to organize them? A simple alphabetical arrangement might result in readers “Doxing” (recently approved) me, so some of our usual areas, such as law and crimes, classes of persons, and historical or political events of interest, will have to do.

In the area of law, we now have “Electoral security,” “Voter suppression,” and “Felon disenfranchisement.” The heading “Voter suppression” is distinct from “Voter intimidation,” and the scope notes of both should be consulted. A related term is “Prisoners--Suffrage.” The interesting heading “Moral injuries” appeared with several Source Data Found notes that merit reading as there are several situations covered by this. Will this become a tort? We shall see. “Discrimination in school discipline” is available, as is “Sundown towns” (read the scope note; this is not about retirement communities but rather race relations and an ugly practice used in many largely white communities). “Social distancing (Public health)” was added and is used instead of “Physical distancing,” which is officially preferred here in California. “Child sexual abuse by clergy in literature” is available, as is “Mass media and transnationalism.” We now have “Disasters (Islamic law)” and “Intelligence tests--Law and legislation.” “Urban ecological design” will be useful for works on sustainability. It is now official: “Sheep stealing” is both a crime and is available for use by catalogers. We now have “MeToo movement” for works on this subject. The former heading “Tulsa Race Riot, Tulsa, Okla., 1921” is now “Tulsa Race Massacre, Tulsa, Okla., 1921.”

In the area of classes of persons, the Library of Congress has been busy. “Women slaveholders” appeared, as did “African American polo players” and “African American video gamers.” “Children of medical personnel” are both in the news and may be used in cataloging. The headings “Minority couples” and “Minority transgender women” appeared, as did “Sexual minority military personnel.” Both “Singaporean Americans” and “Singaporeans--United States” have been added. We may now use “Women popular music fans.” “Racially mixed people--Southwest, New” has appeared, as has “Hispanic Americans--Mixed descent.” “Chinese American civic leaders” and “Chinese American politicians” have been established.

The new heading for one class of persons, “Armenian Genocide survivors,” deserves comment. The former heading “Armenian massacres, 1915-1923” has been changed to “Armenian Genocide, 1915-1923.” There were earlier massacres of Armenians by or at the behest of the Turkish government. These are covered by the headings “Armenian massacres, 1894-1896” and “Armenian massacres, 1909.” Survivors of these horrors are entered under the heading “Armenian massacres survivors.” These headings have useful scope notes which will help catalogers avoid confusion.

The heading “Race in video games” appeared, as have several others related to various forms of media. “Labor in motion pictures,” “Incest in mass media,” and “Jews in mass media” were approved. “National security in motion pict-
“Homicide on television” and “K-pop (Subculture)” were established. The heading “Cancel culture” appeared and merits reading, as it has been applied to ordinary persons as well as celebrities and companies.

“Church work with transgender people,” “Trump family,” and “United States--Civilization--Hindu influences” round out the subject headings in this column. Among the new Genre Form terms are “Community newspapers,” “Public opinion polls,” “Publishers’ catalogs,” “Sample books,” and “Christian fiction.”

Continued from page 1

note that while organizational leaders around the world are pledging to be more inclusive, if their actions and behaviors don’t demonstratively support these values, the pledge is meaningless. An inclusive communication style, they further argue, is essential for leaders to demonstrate their commitment to inclusiveness.

Research shows that using more audience-centered language is one of the top communication behaviors of inclusive leaders. While this obviously means using unbiased language (language that the Linguistic Society of America describes as: acknowledging diversity, conveying respect to all people, demonstrating sensitivity to differences, and promoting equal opportunities), it also means adapting messages to the values, needs, interests, and demographic makeup of listeners. Zandan and Shalett share an incredible example of tone-deaf communication: a corporate leader, speaking about resilience and productivity during the pandemic, describes travelling to his vacation home for a rejuvenating respite—clearly not considering that his employees mostly lived in New York City apartments, where they were likely supervising their children’s virtual schooling as they worked from home, everyone trapped inside during shelter-in-place orders. While I would like to think I would never be that tone-deaf, I’m ashamed to admit that early on in the pandemic, I was sharing with my staff how my family and I were driving each other crazy and how we all just wanted some time alone—not remembering until the end of my rant that every single one of my staff members lived alone and could well be struggling with isolation and loneliness.

Other communication practices that demonstrate a commitment to inclusiveness include:

- interrupting racist statements or behaviors during meetings or presentations, whether or not a person of color is present or objects. You can ask, “Could you say a little more about what you meant by that? I’m not sure I understand.” or “May I give you feedback right now about what you just said?”

- thoughtfully referring to feedback you have been given in the past and making a point to solicit feedback with every communication

- scheduling meetings at different times, recording meetings, and/or offering to send notes/transcripts in order to include people who work various shifts

- allowing work-from-home employees to attend meetings with video off, recognizing they might be multi-tasking at home

- examining written policies and procedures to ensure they use inclusive language.

While systemic racism, by definition, is not something that can be easily or quickly dismantled, we can all try to do something every day to try to demonstrate inclusivity. As activist and tennis superstar Arthur Ashe said, “Start where you are. Use what you have. Do what you can.”

Endnotes

1. https://www.law.csuohio.edu/meetcmlaw/noroomforsilence
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