Report on LSRD-SIS’ “OpenRefine: Managing Faculty Publication Profiles with Wikidata” Webinar

Samantha Thorne, North Caroline Central University

On November 6, 2023, Joe Cera, Legal Research Librarian for Information Technology and Scholarly Communications at UC Berkeley, presented the LSRD-sponsored webinar, “OpenRefine: Managing Faculty Publication Profiles with Wikidata.” In this practical session, Joe gave a live demonstration of how to use OpenRefine with Wikidata to improve faculty profile data for institutional repositories. He led attendees through the process of uploading data in OpenRefine then reconciling it against data in Wikidata. This allows the user to correct or enrich their current data by comparing it to Wikidata as well as add new data by extracting it from Wikidata. Along the way, Joe provided insightful commentary based on his experience, such as the pros and cons of using certain functions, steps that make the process easier, and resources for further training and additional reconciliation vocabularies.

By using these tools, the user can efficiently improve their metadata by taking advantage of information already in Wikidata and editing in batch rather than record by record. This process also has the benefit of connecting faculty profiles in institutional repositories to their corresponding Wikidata profiles.

LSRD-SIS thanks Joe for sharing his expertise! The next installment in our Wiki Wiki Webinar Series will be coming up Spring 2024, so please stay tuned for an announcement with all the details.
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Greetings TS-SIS members,

Fall has made way for the winter months (cooler weather here in Wisconsin and even snow!). The TS-SIS committees have been busy working on programs for our members as well as conducting meetings to support our members and their professional needs.

The Resource Management Standing Committee held a webinar on eBooks in conjunction with NELLCO, discussing how to manage eBook collections. Our Working Parents Roundtable held meetings as well, providing an informal place to discuss working/parenting demands and finding a balance. The Metadata Management Standing Committee has an Application Profile Task Force group that is starting the work to create a legal resource-based application profile for the new Official RDA. Our Professional Development Committee held a fall webinar on archives and institutional repositories.

TS-SIS members proposed many program ideas for the Annual Conference to be held in Chicago next July. The Professional Development Committee assisted in generating program proposals, and they will be monitoring what gets approved by AALL’s programming committee. Some proposals may turn into virtual webinars if not selected. We are always looking for member input for new topics.

Be on the lookout for our Biennial Membership Survey where you will get a chance to let us know how we are doing and make suggestions. There has also been an email looking for candidates for our elected positions for the next year. Later in the year, we will have a Volunteer Survey where you can sign up for a committee. All of these are great opportunities for members to contribute to our community. Also, TSLL is looking for more contributors for various columns. You don’t have to wait for a survey to sign up; just contact Sara Campbell, editor-in-chief.

Hope to hear from you soon!
FROM THE CHAIR

In November, LSRD-SIS hosted the Wiki Wiki Series hands-on workshop, “OpenRefine: Managing Faculty Publication Profiles with Wikidata,” instructed by Joe Cera. In December, four separate LSRD-SIS webinars were hosted as follow up to the “Batch Please!” program at the AALL 2023 Meeting in Boston, covering demonstrations on batch loading in various library systems and institutional repositories.

Keiko Okuhara has continued to deliver quality record information for the Legal Website of the Month, which are available via My Communities messages as well as on our website. These resources can be incredibly valuable to all types of library patrons.

Christopher Thomas has continued to deliver timely news and communications, as well as trainings related to OCLC, as chair of the OCLC Committee. They also planned and coordinated the Google Scholar with WorldShare Discovery webinar in August 2023.

The Membership Committee has been exploring new ways to track new membership, to provide appropriate welcome information and resources, and keep the rest of the board more informed on our membership statistics.

The Nominating Committee has begun the processes to fill our anticipated Executive Board openings for this coming summer: vice chair/chair elect and one member at large. Stay tuned for election information in the upcoming months.

The Web Advisory Committee has been diligently discussing, reviewing, and updating web content, web forms, and simplifying our various methods of communication and web presence. I am very excited to see all the upcoming changes and enhancements.

Lastly, our ad hoc Strategic Planning Committee has begun conversations around our SIS’s mission, purpose, identity, strengths, etc. We have also been reviewing last year’s biennial membership survey data to help guide the future path of the SIS.

These reports are just a sampling of all the hard work and dedication our volunteers have demonstrated over the past few months. Again, thank you to all of you! I look forward to what 2024 has in store for our SIS. Stay warm, and I wish a Happy Holidays and wonderful New Year to everyone.

- Becky

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

Apricot Bar Code Architecture: Watching out for AI-generated content

by Adrienne DeWitt, Georgia Southern University

Earlier this year, independent author Caitlyn Lynch took to Twitter (now X) to point out that AI-generated content had successfully spammed Amazon's Kindle Unlimited. According to Lynch, only 19 of the top 100 chart of Best Sellers in Teen & Young Adult Contemporary Romance eBooks were “actual legitimate books.” The rest, she claimed, were AI-generated books. Author Westley Chu confirmed this in a tweet that included a screenshot of the list. Some of the bestselling titles included: Apricot Bar Code Architecture, Department of Vinh Du Stands in Front of His Parent's Tombstone, Bad Handling Will Destroy the Race, and Jessica’s Attention, among others.

Amazon reportedly pulled the titles from the list after it was notified about the content issues. While Amazon has not eliminated AI-generated content from its site, it has begun to create new limitations on its use. This September, Amazon announced an AI-generated content guide that required that authors inform Amazon of all AI-generated content. In the same month, Amazon announced a new three-books-per-day publishing limit on its platform. Notably, the number is not articulated in the announcement, but an Amazon spokesperson told The Guardian about the three book limit. According to Amazon, this was implemented to curb abuse of its publication system.

For those of us in law library collection development, this may appear to be a nonissue. After all, we have our standing orders, Westlaw/Lexis contracts, Gobi slips, and Hein Greenslips to help us select titles, and it is unlikely that an AI-generated resource would make it past those gatekeepers. At the same time, most libraries accept patron requests for purchase. As AI-generated content becomes more sophisticated, there is a possibility that our patrons will have difficulty distinguishing between traditionally authored books and AI-generated books. Thus, it will be our responsibility to make sure that the books we purchase are the appropriate quality of content we require for our collections.

Currently, there are ways to tell if a book might be AI-generated, outside from purchasing it and reading its content. For example:

Page Count: In the top 100 Teen and Young Adult bestseller list mentioned above, most of the AI-generated books were less than 100 pages.
Authorship: This was originally one way to spot AI-generated content. Authors of AI-generated content had no author platform, no news of a book launch, and no mention of their work in author’s forums. Now this no longer appears to be the case. Author Jane Friedman discovered that AI-generated books were being sold under her name on Amazon and listed on Goodreads. She has since had the false content removed; however, book scams like this are not inconceivable. It is not inconceivable that the same scam could happen to other authors.

Generative AI has changed independent publishing; it is only a matter of time before traditional publishing could be impacted. Given the number of books we purchase for our libraries, both in print and digital, AI-generated content could find its way into our selection tools. Keeping up on the trends could potentially save our libraries time and money. For more information about the controversy of AI-generated content on Amazon, see the links below.

AI-generated books are sneaking into online bookstores: Here’s how to spot them, ZDNET, https://www.zdnet.com/article/ai-generated-books-are-sneaking-into-online-bookstores-heres-how-to-spot-them/


Publishing House: They are all self-published in 2023.

Cover Art: Repetitive cover art. Books published under different author names have the same cover art.

Reviews: Reviewers have called out AI-generated content.

### Digital FDLP

**by Wilhelmina Randtke, Georgia Southern University**

**Introduction**

In December 2022, the Federal Depository Library Program’s Task Force on a Digital Federal Depository Library Program released its report recommending a move to a digital Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP). Rather than being a change in direction for the FDLP, the report’s recommendation to move to a digital FDLP solidifies existing trends and provides recommendations and strategy on details of implementation.

**A Gradual Shift to Digital**

A digital FDLP is not a change in direction. The Task Force’s report states in the Executive Summary, "The move to a digital FDLP is not revolutionary, but rather evolutionary, and will result in the formalization of a process long underway as increasing amounts of U.S. Government information are born-digital." (1) The FDLP has a published timeline at https://www.fdlp.gov/evolution-of-digital-fdlp-timeline with key dates and statistics on shifts which have already happened. (2) The number of print titles sent to FDLP members has dropped over time. In 1995, the FDLP send 17,466 print titles to member libraries. In 2022, the FDLP sent only 4,371 print titles to member libraries. (3) In 2007, the cost of printing through the Government Printing Office was almost $10.5 million. In 2022, the cost of printing through the Government Publishing Office (GPO) was around $5.2 million. (4) In 2014, the name changed from "printing" office to "publishing" office. (5) Meanwhile, the number of FDLP libraries has shrunk but not dramatically. In 2008, there were almost 1,250 Federal Depository Libraries (FDLs). (6) Today, there are more than 1,100 FDLs. (7) With basically stable levels of participation, a shift from print to digital has already occurred gradually over the past 25 years.

Over the past decade, a shift to all-digital participation and a shift from print to digital for long term preservation occurred. The first all-digital FDL entered the program in 2014. (8) Since then, many...

---

3 Id.
4 Id.
8 GPO, supra note 2.

(Cont. on p. 6)
more all-digital FDLs have joined or converted. In 2021, 25% of FDLs were mostly digital or all-digital, and 17% planned to transition to all-digital. (9) In 2016, the GPO issued a policy statement that member libraries could discard print "if permanent public access to an authenticated digital version of the discarded material is available on the U.S. Government Publishing Office’s (GPO) online system of record." (10)

One dramatic and recent shift in access to collections was closures during the COVID 19 pandemic. An FDL "must provide access to FDLP content, including: Publications selected, distributed, and received through the Federal Depository Library Program." (11) Physical access to the building in order to examine FDLP materials in print has historically been one of the hallmarks of the FDLP program. During COVID, with quarantines and restricted access to indoor spaces, access to print materials was interrupted. The Task Force acknowledge this in its introduction. (12)

Summary of the Task Force Recommendations

The Task Force had the charge of reviewing feasibility of an all-digital FDLP, summarizing a rationale for change, and developing recommendations. (13) The Task Force defined a digital FDLP as, "A digital Federal Depository Library Program delivers permanent no-fee public access to digital content and essential support services to people seeking U.S. Government information." (14) The conclusion of the Task Force's report is that "The FDLP can and should go digital. Its infrastructure and legislative mandate should support the rest of the Federal Government in its transition to all-digital publishing." (15)

Beyond the key recommendation of going digital, the Task Force presented 19 recommendations related to specific aspects of digital publishing, access, and preservation, grouped around 6 themes. A good way to quickly skim these, and to get an idea of where the GPO might be at implementing them, is by looking at the GPO Director's Response to Task Force Recommendations. (16) In some cases, Task Force recommendations are acknowledged but can't be followed. For example, the Task Force's recommendation no. 1 was ensuring that all members of the public have no-fee access to Federal Government information regardless of telecommunications infrastructure. The GPO addressed this, stating, "national telecommunications policy is outside of the GPO's mission and authority." (17) Recommendation no. 13 was for the FDLP to collaborate with agencies, libraries, and others to work towards ubiquitous federal broadband. GPO's response to this includes, "improving access to broadband is not within GPO's statutory mandate." (18) In some cases, the GPO has already made progress in an area and is very specific. For example, recommendation no. 7 is for the FDLP to address issues related to preservation, and the GPO's response includes stating that the GPO has been certified as a Trustworthy Digital Repository.

As shown by some of the GPO responses indicating recommendations that are out of GPO's scope, the Task Force report looks at U.S. society as a whole in order to make recommendations. Truly implementing changes would likely require additional legislation. Interestingly, Section E of the report includes recommended changes to federal law in order to fully implement the Task Force’s recommendations, which are focused on routing Federal agency materials to the GPO and which, for example, don’t touch on broadband access. (21) The Task Force was composed of government documents librarians, rather than lawyers, and even broader legislative changes than are addressed within the report would have to be made to the federal government structure in order to fully implement Task Force recommendations in other sections of the report. The Task Force report gives a good factual and strategic overview of public access to information and of Federal agency actions related to archiving and preservation of significant government documents. The report is relevant to understanding the current state of public access to the law and attorney access to agency materials in the United States.
OCLC

by Christopher Thomas, UCLA

Machine Learning and WorldCat: improving records for cataloging and discovery

From 2022-2023, the OCLC Data Science Team explored integrating machine learning into the duplicate detection process. A data labeling project was conducted, in which catalogers from OCLC member libraries were asked to review pairs of potential duplicate records, decide whether the records should be merged, and specify which fields figured into the decision. Results of the data labeling project will be used to train deduplication algorithms. A full article on this project can be found in Hanging together: the OCLC research blog. https://hangingtogether.org/machine-learning-and-worldcat-improving-records-for-cataloging-and-discovery/

Transforming metadata webinar

On September 27, OCLC Research hosted researchers from Ithaka S+R and MoreBrains Cooperative to discuss the challenges and opportunities of communicating the value of metadata throughout complex research lifecycles. Learn about the forces inside and outside the library shaping scholarly communications and metadata ecologies.


Virtual AskQC Office Hours

Recorded office hours can be found at: https://help.oclc.org/WorldCat/Metadata_Quality/AskQC

September: Genre/Form terms

Kate James presented Get Informed about Genre/Form Terms at our September OCLC AskQC Office Hours. She discussed using field 655 to record genre/form terms and covered the difference between subject and genre/form, how to specify the source of the term, and the benefits of recording genre/form information in field 655.

October: Meeting librarians where they are today: incorporating Linked Data into existing library workflows

The presentation covered OCLC’s Linked Data vision as well as practical ways to apply Linked Data to library work today. There was a brief demo of our WorldCat Entities data and data editor, explaining how this Linked Data authority work can be immediately applied to current bibliographic cataloging workflows.

November: MARC Fields for Manuscripts and Archival Collections

Kate James provided information on topics related to MARC bibliographic records for manuscripts and archival collections. Fields covered included 340, 351, 524, 535, 545, 561, and 856.

OCLC Cataloging Community meeting June 9, 2023

In addition to updates on OCLC cataloging services and OCLC data quality, the June meeting featured several presentations on DEI:

- The U.S. Board on Geographic Names – An Overview of the Processes for Approving Geographic Names for Federal Use / Betsy Kanalley, Geospatial Products and Services Program Manager, USDA Forest Service
- Reparative Geographic Name Changes: Case Studies in Cataloging / Kate James, Program Coordinator, Metadata Engagement, OCLC
- Queering the Catalog: SACO Gender and Sexuality Funnel / Margaret Breidenbaugh, Library Specialist, Cincinnati State Technical and Community College, Maya Espersen, Cataloging Coordinator, Aurora Public Library (Colorado) / Adam Schiff, Principal Cataloger, University of Washington
- Rapid Harm Reduction Through Locally Defined Subjects in WorldCat Discovery / Grace McGann, Associate Product Manager, Delivery Services, OCLC


Connexion Browser to be discontinued

OCLC has announced that access to Connexion Browser will be discontinued effective April 30, 2024. This does not affect Connexion Client, which has no sunset date yet. Connexion Browser users who wish to continue using a web interface are encouraged to switch to the newer WorldShare Record Manager. Advantages of Record Manager over Connexion Client include better support of non-Roman scripts, more language options for the user interface, access to more authority files, more available label formats, and the ability to manage staff users and permissions locally. For more information, see the OCLC website: https://www.oclc.org/go/en/connexion-migration-ws-record-manager.html

OCLC Classify is being discontinued on 31 January 2024

The Classify API and web-based user interface are being discontinued on 31 January 2024.
As an OCLC Cataloging and Metadata subscriber, you can use the WorldCat Metadata API or WorldShare Record Manager, available as part of your subscription, to perform similar searches to find classification numbers. The WorldCat Metadata API features a new endpoint which allows you to identify the most popular Library of Congress and Dewey classification numbers for a given OCLC Number.

WorldCat Metadata API 2.0

OCLC’s new WorldCat Metadata API 2.0 offers the ability to read and write Local Holdings Records (LHRs), including registering shared print commitments, searching WorldCat and receiving single best-match WorldCat bibliographic record from multiple matches, and searching Local Bibliographic Data (LBD) records on a variety of indexes, as well as by OCLC Number or control number. Existing API keys for WorldCat Metadata API 1.x may be used with the new version as well. API 1.x will be discontinued on April 30, 2024, so users are encouraged to upgrade to API 2.0: https://www.oclc.org/developer/api/oclc-apis/worldcat-metadata-api.en.html

WorldCat Validation Release Notes, September 2023

On September 28, 2023, OCLC expects to install changes to WorldCat Validation, including the following new features and enhancements:

- OCLC-MARC Validations of New MARC Codes Announced April 25-August 29, 2023
- MARC 21 Bibliographic Update No. 36 (Announced June 2023)
- MARC 21 Authority Update No. 36 (Announced June 2023) to the Validation Rule Set that Includes All Valid Elements of MARC 21 Authority Format. These changes apply only to the OCLC-MARC Authority validation rule set that includes all valid elements of MARC 21 Authority Format. Name Authority Cooperative (NACO) participants cannot use these authority format changes in the LC/NACO Authority File at this time. The Library of Congress and OCLC will announce the implementation of these elements for use in name and subject authority records in the LC/NACO Authority File at a future date.
- MARC 21 Holdings Update No. 36 (Announced June 2023)

The following bug fix will also be included: Normalization No Longer Ignores Certain Retain Characters.

These features and enhancements are the result of announcements of new MARC elements and codes by the Library of Congress as well as feedback and requests from members of the OCLC cooperative.

Print serials are dead! Not so fast, my friend.

by Paula Seeger, Fox Rothschild LLP

As much as it’s been said that electronic resources are the new dominant format of serials, and this is likely true, there’s still a print presence in law libraries, perhaps more than expected. A recent poll of the Technical Services Special Interest Section and Private Law Librarians and Information Professionals Special Interest Section Technical Services listservs aimed to find out about basic print retention and serials use currently in place.

Posted in October 2023, the poll had 37 responses from the following library types:
- Academic: 86.5%
- Law Firm: 10.8%
- Government Law Library: 2.7%

Question 1: Do you have print serials/journals in your library?

- Yes, active subscriptions: 89.2%
- Yes, but no active subscriptions: 2.7%
- Yes, but only a few active journals: 2.7%
- Yes, but very few active subscriptions: 2.7%
- Other: Georgia Law Journals only: 2.7%

Is it surprising that so many libraries still have active print serials? Considering that some vendors haven’t transitioned to electronic format, probably not. Perhaps because academic libraries have more interest and participation in law serials (especially law reviews), there is more focus on their use and retention in law school education than in the practice of law firms where the focus is more on trade journals and practice-based resources.

Question 2: If you have print serials/journals, do you have and use transfer binders?

- Yes, actively: 40.5%
- Yes, but no active use: 24.3%
- No print serials/journals or transfer binders: 24.3%
- Other: When the vendor provides a transfer binder: 2.7%
- Other: We still do regular binding for a limited number of titles: 2.7%
- Other: I believe we have cancelled the titles that include transfer binders, we may still have a couple active titles: 2.7%
I thought that asking a question about transfer binder may offer some insight into overall retention as well as current practice of using transfer binders versus binding or declining use.

Question 3: If you have a retention policy/guideline for print issues, please choose which applies.

- No retention policy or no print journals/serials: 2.7%
- Yes, retention of current issues only: 2.7%
- Yes, retention of 1-2 years/volumes only: 8.1%
- Yes, but it depends on the title: 91.9%
- Yes, but it depends on space constraints: 13.5%
- Other: Retain all: 2.7%
- Other: We still bind most current print serials: 2.7%
- Other: We keep what is not on Heinonline, all print journals that we have active subscriptions, regional journals and 4 top law schools: 2.7%

Regarding retention: I would love to ask a follow up question to those who indicated that space may be an issue and whether that will impact retention in the future. I would try to see what the budget trend is for archives, storage, or offsite locations as well, and whether this funding is a factor.

Question 4: Do you have any titles that you keep a complete run of print issues/volumes of? If so, please list the title.

- No complete print sets of serials/journals: 13.5%
- Yes: 73%, among the examples:
  - Many are still on the shelf in complete runs, but this may be changing in the future: 5.4%
  - Many examples and no mention of upcoming changes: 11%
  - Law review or journals related to our local area/district/institution only: 29.7%
  - All print serials: 5.4%
  - Selected titles, especially if they are not electronically available: 21.6%

This exercise also made me curious about whether current work patterns are driving budgets or demand for print. If law firms have hybrid work arrangements (perhaps more than the academic environment?), the browsing and use of print materials may decline, and routing print copies becomes a logistical challenge when attorneys give up offices or work from home. Law firms seem to be trending toward print collection reductions and more investments into electronic resources, though I haven’t found recent statistics on the trend. Perhaps the next evaluation on this topic could break down retention by type of serial: academic/law journals, trade journals, bar association publications, and other types of serials or print formats, or seek out the trend and tie it to other factors such as work patterns.

---

**Resources to Note**

The American Library Association (ALA), Association for Library Collections and Technical Services (ALCTS) is now part of the Core infrastructure realignment. On their site, they include the United States Serials Price Indexes (up to 2020) at https://www.ala.org/alcts/resources/collect/serials/spi and several guides and syllabi on serials-related course and topics, though they were last updated in 2013, at https://www.ala.org/alcts/resources/collect/serials and seems like a resource that would welcome more current content.

---

**SERIALS TITLES**

**by Cindy Tian, Notre Dame**

The following is a list of serials title changes:

(OCoLC)28038194

**Changed to:**
Proceedings of the ... Annual Natural Resources and Energy Law Institute
68th (July 21-23, 2022)-
(OCoLC)1371260572

Seton Hall Legislative Journal
v. 1- v. 47
(OCoLC)2397767

**Changed to:**
Seton Hall Journal of Legislation & Public Policy
v. 48-

The following is a list of serials cessations:

BYU Journal of Public Law
**Ceased with:**
v. 37 no. 2
(OCoLC)16759621

Columbia Business Law Review
**Ceased in print with:**
v. 2021, no. 1
(OCoLC)15081194
Continued online (free of charge) at https://journals.library.columbia.edu/index.php/CBLR/issue/archive
(OCoLC)49361815

North Carolina Journal of Law and Technology
**Ceased in print with:**
v. 24
(OCoLC)49550726
Continued online (free of charge) at https://ncjolt.org/
(OCoLC)45552359

(Cont. on p. 10)
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(Cont. from p. 9)

Southern California Interdisciplinary Law Journal
**Ceased in print with:**
v. 32, no. 3
(OCoLC)26702630
Continued online (free of charge) at
https://gould.usc.edu/students/journals/iji/issues/
(OCoLC)48214900

Southern California Review of Law and Social Justice
**Ceased in print with:**
v. 32:2 Spring 2023
(OCoLC)70252219
Continued online (free of charge) at
https://gould.usc.edu/students/journals/rlsj/issues/
(OCoLC)84900062

Indiana Law Review
**Ceased in print with:**
v. 56, no. 4
(OCoLC)1774980
Continued online (free of charge) at
https://mckinneylaw.iu.edu/ilr/contents.html
(OCoLC)56050778

The National Interest
**Ceased in print with:**
v. 2022
(OCoLC)12532731
In order to obtain details on future publications, the publisher should be contacted directly at editor@nationalinterest.org

McGill Law Journal
**Ceased in print with:**
v. 68
(OCoLC)1756910
Continued online (free of charge) at https://lawjournal.mcgill.ca/
(OCoLC)47954543

International Tax Journal
**Ceased in print with:**
v. 49, no. 6
(OCoLC)1799512
The publication has transitioned to an online-only publication, directly, via the CCH Answer Connect Platform.

Journal of Tax Practice and Procedure
**Ceased in print with:**
v. 25, no. 3
(OCoLC)41658031
The publication has transitioned to an online-only publication, directly, via the CCH Answer Connect Platform.

Journal of Taxation of Financial Products
**Ceased in print with:**
v. 20, no. 3
(OCoLC)43652734
The publication has transitioned to an online-only publication, directly, via the CCH Answer Connect Platform.

Taxes: The Tax Magazine
**Ceased in print with:**
v. 101, no. 12
(OCoLC)271826208
The publication has transitioned to an online-only publication, directly, via the CCH Answer Connect Platform.

SUBJECT HEADINGS

by Patrick Lavey, UCLA

Subject Headings December 2023

With efforts underway to revise “Indians of North America” and many other headings, fewer lists of new Library of Congress Subject headings appeared lately. Have we law librarians have been resting on our laurels? In any case, we have several new legal headings to consider and use. “Judicial police” exist in some place, and the term has useful notes. “Telephone voting” occurs in some places, and “Bioprinting” will have legal aspects as it becomes more widespread. The term “Textualism (Law)” has been added and is popular with some on the United States Supreme Court. “Safecracking,” popular on television police dramas, was added. As of this writing, it does not take the topical subdivision “Law and legislation,” even though the term “Safecrackers” was also created. “Faith-based dispute resolution” is a new term, as is “Low-wage workers.” We may now use “Rent parties,” that time-honored method of avoiding eviction. “Unclaimed dead” is a problem facing governments. “Aerial networks (Computer networks)” have appeared and will cause legal controversies. “Discrimination against people with disabilities in popular culture” was added, as was “Government employees’ insurance.” “Computer software--Licenses” is, surprisingly, a new subject heading. “Electronic cigarettes--Law and legislation” was added not a moment too soon. “Haiti--Emigration and immigration” has already been used frequently by LC and is now formally established, despite the free-floating status of “Emigration and immigration.”

(Cont. on p. 11)
Some new headings for classes of people appeared. “Sexual minority criminals” is one, as is “Jewish feminists.” “Women, Black-Identity” and “Women spiritualists” have been added, and “Young human rights workers” and “Japanese American young women” may now be used. The heading “Muslim sexual minorities” was created, as were the headings “Gender-nonconforming people in library science” and “Transgender people in library science.”

Many new topical headings appeared. Some deal with historical trials or massacres. “Fort Seybert Massacre, West Virginia, 1758” and “Atlanta Race Massacre, Atlanta, Ga., 1906” are examples of this, as is the “Lincheng Outrage, China, 1923.” The “Ravensbrück Trials, Hamburg, Germany, 1946-1948” is another and is related to the Nazi camp and its staff. “Allyship,” a term describing the act of being supportive of those suffering discrimination, is available. We may use “Border security–Environmental aspects.” To avoid mincing words, the term “Feminine hygiene products” has been changed to “Menstrual products,” and the “Feminine hygiene products industry” is now the “Menstrual products industry.” “Giants in the Bible” is now “Tall people in the Bible,” and the heading “Giants” has been broken into “Giants (Foklore)” and “Tall people.”

Our withdrawal from Afghanistan has resulted in “Afghanistan–Politics and government–2001-2021” (a changed heading, with the end date added) and the new term “Afghanistan–Politics and government–2021-.” To describe the subject of machine politics, we use the existing term “Political corruption.” The “Kennedy Compound (Hyannis Port, Mass.)” was at one time frequently in the news. We may now use the term “Digital footprints.” The notes in this term help define it. “Large scale combat operations (Military science)” and “Geographic information science” joined the list, as did “Levelized cost of energy.” We may also use the heading “Seriousness” now. I am going to go back and reread that one.

Superheroes are all the rage in film, so our last subject headings pertain to one such superhero. “Daily planet (Imaginary newspaper)” has arrived, as has the broader “Imaginary newspapers.”

Genre-form terms continue to proliferate. “Farewell speeches” was approved. “Gay comics,” “Lesbian comics,” and others pertaining to the LGBTQ community were established. “Special issues (Serial publications)” was created and many other genre-form terms modified.

**TECH SCANS**

Thinking about the Future of Integrated Library Systems by Travis Spence

**by Travis Spence, University of Arizona**

Two significant pieces regarding the current state and possible future of integrated library systems (ILS) were released this year. Taken together, these pieces show somewhat of a shift in the trajectory of ILS development. On one hand, the long trend of consolidation and shrinkage in the number of available systems continues, although at a slower rate since the major players have already consolidated. On the other hand, there are signs of cracks at the base as some libraries explore whether one integrated system can ever meet all their business and service needs and whether they want to be constrained by the development schedules of the major system vendors.

The first piece to discuss these trends is from Marshall Breeding. His 2023 Library Systems Report (https://americanlibrariesmagazine.org/2023/05/01/2023-library-systems-report/) was published on May 1. This long-running, always useful report is a thorough documentation of the current library system marketplace and well-informed discussion about potential future developments. There are no real surprises in this year’s report. As Breeding states, proprietary systems from large vendors continue to dominate the market. But the report demonstrates that a growing number of libraries are choosing open-source systems when they migrate from older systems. Currently in the U.S., approximately 10% of academic libraries and 17% of public libraries use an open-source system, but that number is expected to grow as the historic barriers to these systems are dismantled. Long periods of development for these systems have finally got them to a place where functionality and customization options rival those of proprietary systems. The big development in this area, as detailed in the report, is how EBSCO’s support of the development of the open-source system FOLIO is finally bearing fruit as a growing number of large libraries and consortia are migrating to FOLIO hosted by EBSCO. This gives them the flexibility of an open-source system without the still-costly overhead of maintaining one.

The same month, a two-part post by Andreas Mace at Scholarly Kitchen, Do Libraries Still Dream Unified Dreams (https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2023/05/16/guest-post-do-libraries-still-dream-unified-dreams-part-1/), approaches the questions of ILS flexibility and customization from a different angle. It begins by posing the question, can any one system ever...
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perfectly meet a library’s needs? For decades, the idea of one system running all functions has been the ideal that librarians and ILS vendors have tried to achieve. Lately, as demonstrated in the 2023 Library Systems Report, the focus has been on developing open-source systems with flexibility and interoperability to meet that goal. What Mace describes in the second part of his post (https://scholarlykitchen.sspnet.org/2023/05/17/guest-post-do-libraries-still-dream-unified-dreams-part-2/) is a modular approach using a suite of integrated platforms; one for interlibrary loan, one for circulation, one for acquisitions, etc., all united seamlessly by open APIs and exchange-ready data standards. This modular approach would potentially allow libraries to more fully develop and customize the modules that are most crucial to their unique business practices without being tied to a development schedule for a larger integrated system.

A takeaway from reading both these pieces in conjunction is that, after years of seeing ILS development dictated by the contracting number of vendors in the marketplace, change and a different approach may be on the horizon. Going forward, ILS development may depend more on the growth of open-source solutions, especially smaller scale platforms that can be tied together as modules, creating the “perfect” ILS for each individual library.

GIS and Land Grant Research: The Evolving Role of Technology in Law Librarianship

by Samantha Ginsburg, University of Arizona

Samantha Ginsburg, Law Library Fellow at the University of Arizona’s Cracchiolo Law Library, has been participating in a large project to gather data about the University’s land-grant status and its impacts on Indigenous communities. She has authored this guest post to share her experience using GIS systems to present this data in a clear, visual way. Applying GIS in this innovative way is a first for the library and can serve as a model for others.

In the last year, the Daniel F. Cracchiolo Law Library undertook a significant task: researching and realizing the University of Arizona’s land-grant history and its impact on the state’s Indigenous peoples. The goal was to convey this information in an informative, transparent, and interactive manner. Recognizing that the essence of the land-grant concept revolves around land itself, we team made a deliberate decision to harness the power of maps and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) as the most effective means of presenting our research. Previously, I had limited experience using GIS from undergraduate coursework and infrequently encountered geospatial applications in my professional role as a criminal paralegal. This endeavor demanded a level of skill beyond what I was capable of. Fortunately, my supervisor, Cas Laskowski, is a mapping expert in addition to serving as our Technology & Empirical Librarian. We were able to navigate this ambitious project together, and as a result, I was able to continue learning and gain a deeper understanding of GIS technology. Ultimately, it became the perfect opportunity to see the practical application of how geospatial data could be used in an academic law library environment.

To provide some additional context, this project was in response to the compelling article by High Country News (HCN) titled “Land-Grab Universities” (https://www.hcn.org/issues/52.4/indigenous-affairs-education-land-grab-universities) and their subsequent investigation (https://www.landgrabu.org/) into land-grant universities across the United States. Using the HCN data as a starting point, we realized the uniqueness of Arizona’s land-grant history and that the quantity of land transferred to the state for purposes of higher education surpassed our original assumptions. While some tracts have been sold or swapped over time, most of the land remains managed in trust by the AZ State Land Department (https://land.az.gov/our-agency-mission/beneficiaries). I used the Bureau of Land Management’s General Land Office (BLM GLO) Records Automation web site (https://glorecords.blm.gov/) to locate and verify the parcels that were periodically selected in the years following Arizona’s statehood. I was able to identify most of the land parcels throughout the state and the authority under which they were granted. Next, I created a data set from the BLM Control Document Index records drawn from the state selection list. Once I completed “data scraping,” reformatting, and cleaning the BLM land data into our dataset, Cas turned the data into a shapefile (a geospatial vector data file format).

We used ArcGIS, a powerful GIS software developed by Esri, to capture and manage our geospatial data. Additionally, creating the maps based on the BLM data required advanced skills and techniques that went beyond the functionalities of the software. For instance, converting raw tabular data into a shapefile that would display geospatial information demanded the use of a computer programming language. To achieve this, Cas crafted a Python script enabling ArcGIS to read and interpret the data accurately and present a geospatial representation on-screen. Throughout the process, we collaborated closely, addressing any errors or challenges that arose. Cas generously shared her expertise, teaching me invaluable troubleshooting techniques applicable to both coding and data engineering. Once the maps were created, we seamlessly integrated them into ArcGIS StoryMaps, another product offered by Esri. StoryMaps is a web-based program that allows its users to create and feature maps alongside engaging narratives and other multimedia content. Our StoryMap, titled University of Arizona Land-Grant Project: Tracking the History of Land-Grant Enrichment at the University of Arizona (https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/913da256f3c3d46658690c3800b4ef48e), is now available to view through the Daniel F. Cracchiolo Law Library’s Special Projects’ page (https://lawlibrary.arizona.edu/special-projects/ua-land-grant-history).

(Cont. on p. 13)
The impact of leveraging geospatial data goes far beyond historical projects like this one. Such technology within an academic law library setting can have profound benefits for law students and faculty. In subject areas such as real and property law, water and environmental issues, and particularly Indigenous law, where border matters and sovereignty are pressing topics, geospatial data can play a pivotal role. The use of geospatial technologies revolutionizes a traditionally paper-heavy profession, ushering in a new era of interdisciplinary work. As a Law Library Fellow, essentially a novice librarian in training, I had the incredible opportunity to use our library resources and now understand the implications of what data-driven librarianship can do. Law libraries, by teaching and supporting law students in technologies like GIS, can foster significant advancements within the legal profession and shape a more dynamic and progressive future.
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