

March 30, 2007

To: Jean Pajerek, Chair of AALL TS SIS Cataloging and Classification Committee

From: Marie Whited, Law Library of Congress Catalog Liaison

Subject: revision of form table KF1

I am attaching a draft of changes that the Law Library of Congress would like to make to Library of Congress Classification KF, form table KF1. I will be submitting it to the Library of Congress Cataloging Policy and Support Office for their editorial and approval process for classification changes. I would like to include the comments from your committee in the package I send to CPSO. I will send my draft and comments to the Library of Congress Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate, Social Sciences Cataloging Division, Law Team. Would it be possible to send me the recommendations by July 31 after the July Cataloging and Classification meeting?

When I returned to the Law Library of Congress, I had to teach 1 lawyer and 7 catalogers how to classify for our classification project. None were law catalogers. It was hard enough to teach them just the very basics of classification. Forms divisions added another level of complexity to their work

The KF form tables mirrored the readings rooms of the 1960's and legal research books. Is that level of detail still needed today? In June of 2006, I met with 3 Law Library of Congress reference librarians. I went through one of the KF form tables with each of them separately in order to determine what they thought was necessary and what was not needed. After compiling their comments, I talked to 2 academic law catalogers and 1 law library director and asked what they thought about the KF form tables. I was surprised and pleased that there was almost complete agreement on what was not necessary in the KF form tables.

I showed the draft to my liaison in CPSO who agreed in principle with the changes proposed. He did have some editorial concerns which will be worked out when the draft is submitted for editorial review. After talking to CPSO, I met with the law catalogers from the New York City area who felt that this was a worthwhile project.

I would like the Cataloging and Classification Committee to comment on these changes. KF1 will be the model for changes that I will make to the other KF form tables. If you can agree in principle, I will change the other KF forms after the final version of KF1 is approved by CPSO. I will not submit the other KF form table changes to AALL although they will be subject to the CPSO editorial review.

Attached are the draft KF1 table and notes on particular changes. Please note that draft is rough and I was not able to get proper alignment with all of the captions and notes. I copied and pasted from *Classification Web*. It would be good to have a copy of Piper and Kwan *Manual on KF* to review the meanings of the current forms.

#### Comments:

- Catalogers like having the old forms left in the schedule with a note saying when the form was discontinued and a reference. See (KF1 19.A3-.A49) and its note from 1994. CPSO editorial will probably have guidelines for the notes.
- We need clear see references from the closed forms to the form where this material will now class.
- Notes that appear under the closed forms need to be moved to the new forms if appropriate or somehow incorporated in the new or revised form
- We need to eliminate many or most of the successive cutter numbers.
- Hopefully culling could be made easier and more date subarrangements could be used.
- I tried to use new form numbers so as not to make too much of a mess in the shelved collection. I did combine a couple of forms.

#### Comments on individual forms:

- 1 Bibliography. It is helpful that this form stays in the K form tables since in other classes bibliography is sent to Z.
- 1.5 Surveys. Very seldom used. No need to keep
- 2 Periodicals. Expand to include some of the closed forms
- 2.5 Yearbooks. Send to Periodicals. Yearbooks was eliminated years ago.
- 3 Society publications. This form is for works by a society about itself. It is seldom used and everyone agreed to get rid of it.
- 4 Congresses. This is supposed to be for congresses that result in legislative proposals and includes meetings intended to result in concerted action, e.g., recommendations for law revision, new legislation. See Piper and Kwan. We just never use it and everyone thought it should be done away with.
- 5.2-5.55 Other legislative. These forms can be consolidated into 1 number at the request of the reference librarians.
- 5.8 Compilations. Okay as is
- 5.99-6 Statutes. Collections. Expand to include state statutes and serial editions of individual laws. See notes further on.
- 6.5-599 Particular acts. The original instructions for using this form are in Piper and Kwan. You base the decimal number of the relative age of the subject. Is this the first law on the subject, etc.? It is subjective and based on some research. The law shelflisters usually picked a number in the middle. This is often not used correctly and some are using numbers like .52006 or .552006. They are attaching the date to one of the numbers in the span. This span is supposed to arrange the acts chronologically and this is not happening.
- 6.5-599 Particular acts continued. This is what I have proposed: 6.6  
*<date> Arrange chronologically by appending date of original enactment or revision of the law to this number and deleting any trailing zeros. If more than 1 law enacted in a year, append 2,3, 4 etc. to the <date> to indicate that a law is the second, third, fourth, etc. act on that subject enacted in that year.*

- Particular acts continued. The Under each table can be consolidated into Legislative history with one number and Texts with one number. *Numbers for particular acts. All the reference librarians and director felt it was most important to provide unique number for each act. If you have 2 acts on income tax passed in 2006, each should its own number. We need to come up with some kind of arrangement that would give each act its own number and that would not interfere with the numbers for individual acts already assigned.* Particular acts – legislative history. They all liked having a separate form for the legislative histories but saw no need to have a number for documents and one for treatises. They would use just one .A15 by date of publication. .A16-169 would need to have a note giving its ceased date and these materials need to be referred to .A16. Particular acts – annotated and unannotated. They saw no need to separate out the annotated, etc. and unannotated. They would prefer that they were all in one arrangement. They did not see any need to look in more than 1 arrangement for the versions of a particular act. *I would suggest using .A2 by date of publication for all of them or just further subdivide by date of publication without using the .A2. Again the no longer used numbers would need ceased notes and references to .A2 or the form used. I did tell them that the serial number under unannotated editions was worrisome in that the number was not changed when a new law completely replaced the existing law. They saw no reason why a serial of an individual law could not be considered a collection and be moved to .A29.* NYC catalogers had some concerns about putting commentaries and general works in with the other versions of the texts of law.
- 6.99-7. Regulations. Collections. Okay as is
- 7.5-529 Particular regulations. Originally I thought that these should be done the same as Particular acts. While I was working on KD classification, I changed my mind. Would it be possible to really simplify and not worry about keeping individual regulations separate? We don't get a lot of individual regulations and it is hard to determine adoption or revision dates. Should we just say by date of publication?
- 8-8.7 Digests ... Collections. The people I talked to in June felt that these could all be consolidated into 1 form called finding aids.
- 9-9.6 Comparative. This is an area needing work. Here are the comments from June: **Please read this section in Piper and Kwan. The 3 reference librarians thought that putting collections of comparative state legislation with the collections of federal legislation was more intuitive. They did suggest that there be an including note in the federal statute collection area saying "Including collections of state statutes" or some such note. In short the comparative state statutes collections should be separated from the uniform state laws. If you leave the particular uniform state laws section, it should be simpler to use. How many people know how to find the date for the particular uniform state law? (Again see Piper and Kwan) I tried to separate into particular interstate compacts and particular uniform laws. I just further subdivided by date of adoption and did not provide a cutter. This section may**

- need further work. KF879+ is the number for uniform commercial code and has a fairly big section.
- 10-12.7 Decisions. Basically remained the same at the request of the reference staff at LCC.
  - 14 Collections. **This is what the reference staff said about the single number version of this form: This is confusing. These are for random summaries not the digests like published by West. The reference librarians thought they should be moved to digests. There should be a reference like: For summaries of court cases see .A53; for summaries of regulatory decisions see .A57 and for summaries of both see .A53 or some such note. This section should have ceased note. The 2 digest numbers would need to have Summaries added to the caption or an including note.**
  - 14.5,17 Encyclopedias – Dictionaries. NYC catalogers suggested combining these.
  - 15 Loose-leaf services leave as is and I added note about date.
  - 18 Casebooks. Move to general works. They felt that this form is not needed. When the law library director agreed, that was enough for me to say get rid of it.
  - 19.A1 Collections. This can be moved to serials or general works
  - 19.A2 Collected. This can be expanded to include form 4.
  - 19.A7-Z Okay.
  - 19.3-9.8 Compendis-Works. I collapsed these into 19.85. In the 20 number table, it is worth having some kind of number for these materials. It does serve a purpose to separate them into a special category. I would not do this in the other tables with smaller collections. It is worthwhile keeping for the large number tables.
  - 19.9 Foreign. There is no need to keep this form.
  - 20 Works. I sent these to 19.A7-Z, especially since the collections of texts of federal and statute statutes are in 1 place. However, I am worried about the “Prefer ...” note.
  -

Cc: CPSO  
Cc: Law Team