Legal scholarship is unique amongst nearly all disciplines because it is edited and published through student-run law reviews and journals rather than through the traditional peer-review and editing processes. The student-edited law review system has been in place for over a century and serves two purposes: (1) to act as a vehicle for legal scholarship and (2) to serve as a learning opportunity for American law students. Law reviews are cited by practicing attorneys, judges, and legislators, and these publications have helped to shape the current state of American law. However, law students who serve as staff members on these journals often receive little training and support from legal institutions and faculty. This research paper explores the types of services that academic law libraries are providing for staff members of student-edited law reviews and journals and seeks to identify emerging best practices and areas for further expansion of services.
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Introduction

The majority of American legal scholarship is currently published and circulated through law journals, and these journals are typically managed and staffed by law students. Second-year law students serve as cite-checkers who confirm the accuracy of a contributing scholar’s legal citations, and they also proofread and fact-check the content of submitted articles. As third-years, law students serve on journal editorial boards and are responsible for selecting articles for publication, overseeing the junior staff members in the cite-checking process, negotiating printing contracts, making edits to submitted articles, and ensuring that the journals are published in a timely fashion. Student-run journals serve as the sounding boards for legal debate amongst scholars and attorneys, are cited by judges in legal opinions, and are an important tool in the development of American law at the local, state, and federal levels (Swygert, 1985).

Despite the important role that law journals play in the development of American law, the students who run the journals receive little training for their roles and responsibilities (Stracher, 2008). Any support services that are provided for law journal members typically come from law libraries, and the level of services varies by institution. This research examines the types of support currently provided by law libraries to law students serving on law reviews and journals with the goal of identifying best practice and possible areas for the future expansion of services to this student group. To accomplish this research purpose, this author interviewed both current student editors and
law librarians. Interview questions were geared to engage both sets of interviewees in reflecting on current law library services, areas for possible expansion, and also any areas in which services are ineffective or could be improved.

Despite over a century of operating as student-edited publications, the law review system has come under increasing pressure and criticism in recent years from legal scholars and practitioners who prefer a peer-reviewed journal system. Law libraries and the services that they provide are perhaps the only outlet within law schools that can provide support at all stages in the journal publication process - from training incoming editors in article selection skills, to assisting staff members with locating materials for cite-checking, and assisting editors with making final publication decisions. A law library’s robust service program for the members of student-edited journals can help bridge the gap between scholars who are concerned about the lack of training and knowledge of students and the student editors who value journal membership because of the unique skills and opportunities it affords.

Moreover, law libraries can only benefit from the provision of innovative services to the law school community. As print collections dwindle and the majority of legal research is conducted online, law libraries are actively looking for ways to continue to assist both students and faculty in legal education and scholarship. The student-edited law review system involves many second- and third-year law students, along with the majority of law faculty who are actively writing and publishing. Thus, any law library services provided to these populations will enhance the visibility of the law library and provide another avenue for law librarians to continue operating as a critical component in law school education. This research attempted to identify the types of services already
being provided by law libraries and hopes to begin the discussion about best practices for improving and expanding services in support of the student-edited law review system.

**Background & Literature Review**

**History & Influence of the Law Review**

The tradition of the student-edited law review began as an academic experiment in the late 19th century to meet a recognized need in the legal community for regular analysis and reporting on the development of American law. Practitioners in the mid-19th century wanted a resource the provided analysis of legal trends, reported on major developments in American jurisprudence, and also provided insight into recent legal developments at the state and local levels (Swygert, 1985). In short, practitioners wanted a regularly published legal periodical that provided both practical information on recent legal developments and a more theoretical analysis of legal trends.

Prior to the creation of the first student-edited law reviews in the late 19th century, attorneys had three main resources for updating their knowledge of the law: legal treatises, law reporters, and a handful of legal periodicals (Swygert, 1985). Each of these resources met identified needs for information within the legal community, but each also had its drawbacks. Legal treatises, for instance, provided detailed exposition on legal doctrine and were critical in bringing consistency and uniformity to American law (Swygert, 1985, p. 747). However, these treaties were often expensive, bulky, and quickly became outdated; publishers of the treatises simply could not keep up with the
month-to-month and year-to-year changes in American law at the state and local level (Swygert, 1985).

Law reporters, which printed case summaries and judicial decisions, were the main method for keeping abreast of the development of the common law. These books were essential to the practice of law in America, as “the principles and rules of the common law could only be learned by attending to the decisions of the courts” (Swygert, 1985, p. 749). However, during the 19th century, law reporters were not comprehensive in their coverage, and many attorneys did not have access to summaries and reports from their own jurisdictions. This, of course, changed with the creation of the national reporter system by West Publishing Company in the 1870s and 1880s, but the recognized gap between the extensive treatment of legal issues by the treatises and the simplistic case summaries in law reporters highlighted the need for some type of compromise between the two. Lawyers needed a publication that provided the right balance of scholarly insight and summaries of judicial decisions.

The advent of the legal periodical came in fits and starts in the early 19th century, as small-shop printers attempted to delve into the market for periodicals that reported on bar-related matters, provided updates on local or state law, analyzed recent cases, and provided a forum to practitioners to engage with one another on legal questions and reform (Swygert, 1985, p. 751). However, many of these early periodicals failed for lack of funding and were considered either too similar to the law reports or too local in their approach. In order to survive, legal periodicals needed to find that critical balance between reporting on cases and providing scholarly analysis on legal developments.
The first successful legal periodicals, the *American Law Register* and the *American Law Review*, were published in the mid-1800s and managed to successfully strike a balance between academic and professional writing. The publishing schedules of these two periodicals were unique because they were published only quarterly rather than monthly or weekly (Swygert, 1985). This publication schedule enabled the periodicals’ editors to more carefully select articles for publication, and this led to the structuring of the periodicals in a way that inspired future student-edited legal periodicals (Swygert, 1985). Each periodical was centered around a series of “lead articles”, which typically included critical and scholarly analyses of important legal issues or cases, followed up by book reviews, news of legal events of both regional and national interest, and contributing articles from practitioners on a variety of skills-based topics (Swygert, 1985, p. 758). However, the majority of practitioners at the time operated small legal practices in non-urban settings. These practitioners cared more for their own jurisdictions, and even these popular legal periodicals could not completely satisfy the demand for local and state level updates.

The first student-edited law reviews were modeled after the successful legal periodicals of the late 19th century, but the students behind these journals initially had different goals for their publications. The original editors of the *Columbia Jurist*, a short-lived publication of the law students at Columbia Law School in 1885, believed that their department needed some type of academic publication because all the other colleges at Columbia had something similar (Swygert, 1985, p. 766). The *Columbia Jurist* contained a combination of notes from class lectures, moot court decisions, and general legal news (Swygert, 1985). However, the journal came under fire early on from the editors of the
American Law Review, who dismissed the publication as “amateur legal journalism” and claimed that its only value came from the contributions made by Columbia law professors (Swygert, 1985, p.768). The Columbia Jurist would cease publication after a year, but the idea behind that student-created periodical served as the impetus for the creation of a similar publication at Harvard Law School in 1886 (Cramton, 1986).

The Harvard Law Review found particular success because it offered law faculty an avenue for publishing their legal scholarship (Swygert, 1985). Prior to the creation of the student-edited law review, legal scholars did not have many avenues for publication (Swygert, 1985). Law faculty who were interested in publishing did so either through contributions to legal treatises or in the short-lived periodicals of the time (Swygert, 1985). In addition, the student editors at Harvard Law School used the journal to discuss legal pedagogy, including the case method of instruction (Cramton, 1986). The first edition of the Harvard Law Review contained a series of lead articles authored by Harvard faculty, but it also published a student article amongst those lead articles (Swygert, 1985). The Harvard Law Review met with success chiefly because it served as a vehicle for delivering the legal scholarship of the Harvard Law faculty to the professional world.

In the twenty years following the publication of the first volume of the Harvard Law Review, five of the nation’s most prestigious law schools also created student-edited law reviews (Swygert, 1985). These new student-edited law reviews provided students with educational opportunities, communicated that law schools were committed to legal scholarship, and soon came to represent the mark of a mature educational institution (Swygert, 1985). By the 1930s, nearly every major law school in America had at least
one student-edited law review, and the number of specialty law journals grew rapidly after World War II in response to rising enrollment rates (Closen, 1997, p. 16). What started out as an academic experiment by proactive students soon found itself at the heart of the American legal education model. By the early 20th century, most of the legal community, including professors, practitioners, and judges, viewed the law review experience as an integral component in a comprehensive legal education.

In addition to its growing importance as an educational experience for law students, student-edited law reviews also gained almost immediate influence amongst practitioners, judges, and legislators. In 1897, Justice Edward White cited to a law review article in his dissenting opinion in United States v. Trans-Missouri Freight Administration (Swygert, 1985; 166 U.S. 290 (1897)). In 1900, Chief Justice Fuller cited to an article by Harvard Professor James Ames published in the Harvard Law Review in his majority opinion in Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railway Co. v. Clark (Swygert, 1985; 178 U.S. 353 (1900)). Citations to law review articles by Supreme Court justices clearly signaled that the student-edited law review carried weight in shaping the future of American jurisprudence. Law review articles were important tools for judges because they served as a medium for synthesizing legal development and debate. Justice Cardozo noted that law review articles were of “conspicuous utility in the performance of judicial duties” and found that “[i]n the engulfing flood of precedents the courts are turning more and more to the great scholars of the law schools to canalize the stream and redeem the inundated fields” (American Association of Law Schools, 1931, p. xi).

Law review articles also influenced the thinking of legislators and practicing attorneys. Swygert (1985) posits that law review articles have influenced the drafting of
various uniform statutory frameworks, and that attorneys came to rely on the publications to remain informed on legal ideas and developments in their practice areas (Swygert, p. 798). At all levels of American lawmaking, student-edited law reviews and the scholarly content contained in them were being read and cited by influential legal thinkers. The student-edited law review, it seemed, had answered finally answered the need for scholarly legal analysis, and the growth in law schools across the country guaranteed that the new law reviews and journals published a good number of pieces dedicated to local and state law issues. Moreover, the problems with funding that plagued so many of the smaller, private legal periodicals of the 19th century were not a problem for student-edited law reviews that often received funding and support for well-established law schools.

The Controversy Surrounding Student-Edited Law Reviews

Despite its seemingly illustrious history, the student-edited law review system is not without its detractors. Both critics and proponents of the system recognize that any student-edited enterprise will have its faults, but they typically part ways when weighing the perceived benefits of the current system in light of those costs. The following is a discussion of the varying viewpoints on the student-edited law review system, with particular emphasis on the main topics of critical discussion and also the perceived benefits.

Critics of the student-edited law review system generally focus on three areas of perceived inadequacy: (1) student editors lack the training and background knowledge to select articles, (2) students are not competent to edit scholarly articles, and (3) student editors lack the experience necessary to manage an academic publication (Day, 2007; Posner, 1995). Each of these critiques has merit and highlights potential (or actual)
weaknesses within the student-edited law review system. However, there are compelling arguments as to why these perceived deficiencies are often inappropriately blamed entirely on the student editors. Moreover, there are meaningful steps that can be taken by law schools and student editors to help bolster the prestige and reliability of student-edited law reviews while still leaving the majority of the decision-making and publication processes in the hands of the student editors.

**Article Selection**

Critics of student-edited law review argue that students lack the requisite legal training to “make sophisticated evaluations of intelligent arguments, and end up selecting pieces for publication based on other criteria such as an article’s length and number of footnotes, its topic, and the author’s school affiliation” (Stracher, 2008, p. 354-355). Judge Richard Posner (1995) argued in his critique of law reviews that students equated “conformity to rules found in grammar and style books” with style and the “length of a submitted article as a signal of its quality” (Posner, 1995, p. 158). Judge Posner warned that:

> The defensiveness, the intellectual insecurity, of student editors is reflected in their penchant . . . for insisting that authors maximize the number of footnotes and citations in order to create the impression that everything in the article is proven fact. Novelty and imagination, freshness and liveliness, and originality are all discouraged.

(Posner, 1995, p. 158). Critics argue that an academic publication with credibility and reliability must contain articles of doctrinal relevance that have been thoroughly vetted by other legal scholars, and student editors in their second and third years of law school cannot bring that level of critical, scholarly analysis to article selection.
Indeed, this argument is further strengthened by the criticisms of prominent judges who fault student-edited law reviews for their poorly chosen articles. These judges believe that law reviews have lost their focus and are of little use to practitioners in their current state. Chief Justice John Roberts noted at a judicial conference, “Pick up a copy of any law review that you see and the first article is likely to be, you know, the influence of Immanuel Kant on evidentiary approaches in 18th century Bulgaria, or something, which I’m sure was of great interest to the academic that wrote it, but isn’t of much help to the bar” (Roberts, 2011). Judge Dennis Jacobs of the Second Circuit Court of Appeals said something similar in 2007, quipping that he hadn’t “opened up a law review in years. No one speaks of them. No one relies on them” (Liptak, 2007). These judges are highlighting that practitioners increasingly find law reviews and the articles selected for publication to be too theoretical, with no usage in practice anymore. While judges many have once cited to these articles in making decisions and evaluating the state of American law, their influence has waned in recent years as student editors shift the focus of law reviews from the practical to the entirely theoretical (Stracher, 2008; Liptak, 2007; Liptak, 2013).

Proponents of student-edited law reviews acknowledge the truths of these arguments, but they also highlight that legal journals (and their editorial boards) diverge from other academic publications in important ways. Chiefly, legal journals are not as concerned with the absolute “truth” of an assertion, as compared with journals from other disciplines that require the support of data. For example, a medical journal must report truths based on data-driven research; the hard sciences must focus their publications on verifiable scientific research (Stracher, 2008). Conversely, legal debate and discussion
are often focused on analyzing the reasoning behind judicial decisions, tracking developments in the law, and advocating for particular positions on legal arguments or decisions. In addition, the large number of journals currently published makes the likelihood that a law review article of particular importance will not be published very unlikely (Stracher, 2008).

Similarly, proponents also raise the point that student editors are more likely to publish articles on new or controversial ideas than editors in other academic disciplines (Olsen, 2001). In academic fields where journals are peer-edited, “new areas of inquiry can be effectively blocked by those entrenched in editorial positions” (Olsen, 2001, p. 680). While creative and enterprising work may not find a ready home in the more prestigious law reviews, the sheer number of law reviews in America increases the likelihood that faculty authors will find a publication outlet (Olsen, 2001). Ultimately, proponents of the student-edited law review believe that the freshness of approach that students bring to the editorship of journals necessarily means that they will be less likely to select articles based on the traditional importance of the subject area or the prestige of the author. While articles are certainly selected for these reasons, proponents of the system believe that the frequency with which this occurs is significantly lower than in other academic disciplines.

Finally, and most convincingly, proponents of student-edited law reviews point to the changing nature of legal research to rebut claims that student editors are undermining the publication of important and critical legal analysis through their selection errors. The importance of the physical journal itself as a means for interacting with the legal community is quickly diminishing (Stracher, 2008, p. 356). Instead, once an article is
published in *any* law review, it becomes accessible and findable through a variety of electronic databases, including HeinOnline, Westlaw, LexisNexis, and Google Scholar. Researchers looking for articles on particular issues or topics will find them based upon keyword searches, rather than perusal through specific law reviews. In addition, law articles of particular importance gain traction and popularity through a wider variety of means, including the blogosphere, list servers, and SSRN. As Stracher (2008) highlighted:

> While a prestigious journal can still serve a ‘certification’ function, increasingly the ‘prestige’ of an article is measured by how many scholars link to it, visit it, and comment upon it. Put another way, it matters less which law review publishes any particular article because most articles will make their way into the (digital) marketplace where they will compete for supremacy on a more egalitarian basis. (p.356-357).

Stracher’s (2008) idea of the “digital marketplace” is important for the future of law review publishing, as authors and editors realize that the move to digital publications can provide legal scholars with even larger readership levels. HeinOnline’s Law Journal Database includes over 1,900 American law journals, which further supports the argument that it is highly unlikely that a quality piece of legal scholarship will want for a publication platform (Stracher, 2008). Indeed, this author’s interviews (discussed in Results and Discussion) with law librarians suggested that many law journals are actually struggling to find *enough* legal scholarship to print. Proponents of the student-edited law review system argue that the oversaturation of the market with publishing outlets, combined with the powerful electronic research tools that find these articles based more upon their content than place of publication, significantly cuts down on the fears
associated with student editors making improper choices in selecting articles for publication.

**Editing Scholarly Articles**

Similar arguments are often cited by critics of the student-edited law review system when discussing the editorial process necessary for preparing journal articles for publication. Chief among these criticisms is the concern with over-editing by law students. Dekanal (1989) characterized the balance between good editing and over-editing as follows:

> Good editing makes certain that sources are appropriately cited, and helps with organization and language in an effort to make the article crisper and clearer and, thus, more understandable. It does not rewrite the article. It does not make the editor’s choice of words dominate the author’s choice of equally good words . . . Over-editing amounts to a serious abuse of power, and publishing an over-edited article under the name of a single author is a misrepresentation.

(p.236). It is common practice on most law reviews to put accepted articles through a rigorous editing process that includes everything from basic citation checking to minor editing for syntax and structure to wholesale revisions of portions of an article. Legal scholars are perhaps right in expressing their frustration with student editorial boards that unilaterally decide to rewrite a submitted piece, especially if those rewrites alter the fundamental arguments of the article or change the voice of the original author. Critics highlight these editorial practices and argue that if students are not even qualified to select articles for publication, they are even more unqualified to edit those same articles (Dekanal, 1989, p. 235). Judge Posner (1995) believed that law students were “rarely competent to offer substantive improvements, or catch analytic errors, or notice
oversights in research” and thus should not be given the editorial rights to rewrite or edit the substantive material in a journal article (p. 1134).

This arguments gains additional weight when student-edited law reviews are compared with publications from other academic disciplines. In the majority of academic disciplines, the responsibility for editing and critiquing a scholar’s work typically rests with his or her peers – individuals with similar levels of education and experience (Stracher, 2008). Legal scholarship is again unique in this respect, as legal scholars place their writing and research into the hands of students for their editorial oversight. These criticisms are entirely valid; however, many individuals making these criticisms fail to offer viable alternatives to the present system.

Proponents of the law review system counter that legal publications are unique and do not necessarily require an advanced degree or years of experience to understand and edit (Cramton, 1986). In 1956, Northwestern University School of Law Dean Havighurst commented that:

> It is a striking fact that once a person of superior intelligence learns to read the cases, acquires the vocabulary and becomes acquainted with legal materials, he is in a position to deal effectively with legal theory in almost any field, provided that he will devote to it the requisite amount of time.

(Havighurst, 51 Nw L. Rev. 22 (1956)). Proponents argue that law review articles are meant to be read and understood by a variety of readers – other scholars, judges, legislators, practitioners, students, and even laypersons. Unlike academic journals, which are written by scholars for scholars, law reviews and journals are written and published for a wide readership. Thus, it stands to reason, any one of these reader groups should be able to offer criticisms of the published pieces.
The arguments mustered by proponents of the student-edited law review system also highlight that the occasional overreach by student editors during the editorial process is also a risk that law faculty accept by participating in the law review process. According to Strachan (2008), “faculty complaints about student-run law reviews miss the point: the law review is a teaching institution. In essence faculty have traded free research assistance and the cost of professional editors for additional teaching responsibilities” (p. 360). Law students commit to closely reviewing article submissions for proper footnote citations and sound legal arguments. They review the articles and check the sources to ensure that the arguments being made by the article author are sound. In return, law faculty commit to provide tutelage and training to these student editors. For many years, law faculty advisors exercised greater levels of oversight of the law reviews and functioned as important partners for student editors (Strachan, 2008). The cooperation between law faculty and student editors only recently started to erode late in the 20th century, as student editors increasingly operated as independent editors with minimal input from law faculty advisors.

Even student editors’ strict adherence to the Bluebook and its citation framework serves a purpose, proponents argue, because it reinforces in students the critical skill of documenting all asserted facts (Strachan, 2008). Lawyers making arguments in court must support any statement of the law with a citation to precedential authority, or they risk losing for want of basing their arguments in precedent. For better or worse, the laser focus on the Bluebook and citation support helps train law students to remember that a successful legal argument must be firmly supported by proper legal authority.
Finally, proponents of the student-edited law review also highlight that law reviews are different from typical academic publications because they are written for a larger audience. Law review articles are read by a wide variety of individuals inside the profession, including other scholars, practicing attorneys, judges, and legislators. The process of editing conducted by law students, chiefly the practice of ensuring that articles contain adequate citations to support the author’s recitation of facts and arguments, ensures that these articles remain accessible to the wider audience (Strachan, 2008).

Managerial and Publication Responsibilities

Managerial knowledge is something that is taught, and the law review experience provides students with a unique opportunity to gain managerial skills before entering the workforce. However, critics of the law review system note that the journals are plagued by “their failure of institutional memory and history, their lack of timely publication, and their inability to discipline and adequately mentor their members” (Strachan, 2008, p. 363-364). Moreover, critics argue that any educational benefits that might be gained from serving on a law review are overshadowed by the failures of the system as a whole (Cramton, 1986). As Cramton (1986) described it:

The perennial problems of student editorial boards – lack of continuity resulting from the annual turnover of editors, falloff in interest of third-year editors who are not elected to officer positions, limited scholarly perspective, and inexperience in legal research, writing and editing – have always affected the timeliness and quality of the resulting publication . . . This is one reason that an increasing number of top students at many law schools have declined to participate in law review work.

(p. 9). Perhaps the biggest concern is the lack of institutional memory at the nation’s law reviews. As will be discussed more fully in the results section of this paper, both law journal editors and law librarians interviewed for this research confirmed that the
“transfer of power” between editorial boards was a serious issue. Outgoing editorial boards are not doing properly transferring their skills and knowledge to the incoming editorial boards, with the result that overall journal quality and editorial efficiency suffers from year to year.

Proponents also recognize that efficiency and discipline are problems in the student-edited law review system. The counterarguments to these criticisms also highlight that this is a problem that is not likely to go away. Essentially, the defense to this criticism is finger-pointing and deflecting – academic journals are also notorious for inefficiency, and law faculty frequently miss their own deadlines and can be cantankerous when dealing with student editors (Strachan, 2008, p.364).

However, several scholars have highlighted that inadequate mentorship and involvement by law faculty in the law review publication process is the first place to look in attempting to remedy what is broken with the system (Dekanal, 1989). Harper (1998) outlines one possible method for bringing law faculty back into the editorial process: the “editorial seminar model” of student-run law reviews (p. 1289). Under this framework, a law faculty advisor commits to providing at least bi-weekly seminars for student editors of the law review (p. 1289). As a part of these meetings, the student editors discuss article manuscripts with their advisor, get assistance and advice on editing decisions, and solicit instruction from their advisor on any “gaps” in their understanding of legal scholarship. The editorial onus still rests with the student editors, but they have a more reliable and regular source of support in their law faculty advisor. Such a model would also help alleviate some of the problems associated with the loss of critical information during the yearly turnover in editorial boards. The ultimate goal, though, is to bring the faculty back
into the picture in a more obvious advisory role – one that requires active participation and engagement on the part of the faculty advisor.

The problems associated with the student-run law review system are numerous and many of them do highlight serious issues in the current model. However, as has been discussed previously, many of the same criticisms are found across academic publishing. Much of the criticism ultimately boils down to the inexperience of law students as editors, but this criticism forgets that law reviews serve two purposes: (1) the dissemination of legal scholarship and (2) the education of future lawyers in citation detail, legal editing, reviewing and understanding legal scholarship, and managing a group of peers. Any solutions that are proposed to deal with the system’s weaknesses must keep these dual objectives in mind. The law review, unlike so many other academic publications, is simultaneously both a teaching tool and a vehicle for scholarly debate and discussion.

**Roles of Law Libraries in Student-Edited Law Reviews**

Law libraries have worked cooperatively with law journal review editors for many years, with the majority of assistance being targeted towards helping staff members with cite-checking duties and writing responsibilities (Burdett, Clark, & Waters, 2001). Typically, law librarians assist in the cite-checking process by helping law review staff members locate the resources that are cited by the author in their articles. Maxwell and Holtz (2010) highlighted that perennial problems in cite-checking revolved around the editors’ willingness to accept PDFs in place of print copies and “unverified cites” (p. 30). During the transition years when the Internet was increasingly becoming an important tool in legal research, student editors resisted the use of PDF scans found on the Internet
in place of traditional print copies of materials. This made the process of cite-checking more complicated for staff members, and it required significantly more effort on the part of law librarians to both identify the resources and obtain them.

While some law review editorial boards still persist in relying on print-only cite-checking, many law reviews and journals now accept scanned PDFs of materials. “Unverified cites” as highlighted in Maxwell and Holtz (2010) referred to the problem that many law librarians experienced with students requesting materials via interlibrary loan that are actually held at their own libraries. Students lacked the basic knowledge required to search through the library’s catalog to identify those materials that were already held by the law library or a library connected with the university. This phrase can also refer to the problems associated with multiple students requesting the same items through interlibrary loan (p. 30). As discussed more in the Results and Discussion section of this paper, many law libraries now offer journals their own borrower cards that all staff members use when checking out materials. When multiple requests for the same item come in, interlibrary loan staff can quickly recognize when they are dealing with a cite-check request.

Law libraries have also traditionally assisted students with the article writing requirements at most journals. At the UNC School of Law, this provides law review and journal members with a way of fulfill one of the “writing” requirements for graduation. Burdett, Clark, and Waters (2001) note that librarians typically provide topic selection assistance and preemption checking (p. 598-599). Law librarians are particularly equipped to assist students with narrowing down their writing topics and also finding resources to use when researching their topics.
Future Service Areas

As legal research continues to evolve and adapt to fully-electronic methods and Internet databases, law librarians are identifying areas in which their unique skill sets might further assist law review and journal editors. Keele and Pearse (2012) posited on the possible roles of law librarians in the future when addressing the needs of student-edited law review members, and they highlighted that the greatest needs would likely arise in digital publishing and open access efforts. Law librarians with training in data curation will be particularly useful, as they will have the technical skills and knowledge of best practices for long-term care of the digital publications (Keele and Pearse, 2012). As the majority of legal research is now completed via search engines in Westlaw and LexisNexis, the inclusion of metadata in digital journal articles is critical to ensuring their findability in the databases.

In order for metadata to properly boost the findability of an article in a database, it must take advantage of the controlled vocabularies utilized by the database. Thus, metadata is critical to ensuring that law journal articles appear in search results. Law librarians serve as the mediators for both law faculty and students with many legal databases, so they also have an inherent understanding about the most effective search terms and strategies. As Keele and Pearse (2012) explain:

“Librarians . . . could also contribute more significantly to the development of underlying taxonomies and ontologies that could then be consistently applied to enrich the metadata and make them more valuable. Since librarians often review articles with students and generally know how researchers look for information, they are in a unique position to contribute substantively to the terms and language that ensure accessibility and discoverability for relevant user groups.”
As will be highlighted later in the Research and Discussion section of this paper, law libraries are already assuming this role in assisting law review and journal editors with managing their publications in digital formats that provide for greater open access and accessibility.

**Methodology**

The majority of scholarship focusing on the student-edited law review system generally provides either an overview of the system, a critique of the system, or highlights the strategies currently being used by individual institutions to assist student editors. This author could not find any systematic studies of the experiences of student editors at law reviews or any research measuring the types of services typically provided by law libraries to support these students. Thus, for the purposes of this initial study, an exploratory approach was chosen. Questions and a project description were submitted to the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Office of Human Research Ethics, which determined that this study did not involve human research subjects, and that Internal Review Board approval would not be required.

This author conducted two separate sets of interviews for this research – one set of interviews with current law students serving on law journal editorial boards and another set of interviews with law librarians at a sampling of universities across the country. Two separate sets of broadly worded interview questions were generated for use with these participants. The first set of interview questions were drafted for use with student editors on law reviews. (See Appendix A.) These questions sought to ascertain student editors’ overall responsibilities on their journals, their interactions with their law
school’s library, their personal thoughts on the effectiveness of law library services, and reflections on tasks or duties in the editorial process for which they believed more support was needed or would be helpful.

The second set of interview questions were drafted for use with law librarians. (See Appendix B.) These questions sought to generate a picture of the types of services that law libraries typically provide for law review student staff and editors, including any services that were uncommon or unique when compared with other law libraries. In addition, the interviews with law librarians included discussions about the current state of the law review system and its strengths and weaknesses, and the interviews closed by asking law librarians to provide insight into how services to this population of students might expand or change in the near future.

In order to explore student editor perspectives, voluntary and convenience sampling were used to solicit participants. Emails were sent out to the publicly available contact information for law journal editorial boards. The e-mail invitation for participation also encouraged those journal editors to forward the e-mail to law reviews at other institutions that might also have an interest in participating in the research. Ultimately, five interviews were conducted with students representing four law journals.

A similar sampling method was employed when soliciting participation from law librarians. For the purposes of this initial study, it was decided that law librarians working at law schools that were similarly-situated in terms of class size, rankings, and journal types would help to paint a clearer picture of the general trends in services provided by law libraries to law review staff. Thus, a list of 14 similarly situated schools was identified and law librarians in the reference or public services departments of each
institution were contacted via an e-mail invitation. Of the fourteen libraries contacted, law librarians from five different institutions were able to schedule time for interviews during the study period. These law librarians worked at institutions across the country, with four currently working in public universities and one serving at a private university.

Interviews were conducted over a four-week period, from January 30, 2017 – February 24, 2017, and lasted between eighteen and fifty-five minutes per interview, averaging approximately thirty-six minutes per interview. Interviews with student editors were recorded for analysis. Interviews with law librarians were not recorded, but the interviewer took detailed, typed notes during each discussion. All interview audio recordings and notes are on file with the author. Interviews were conducted on the guarantee that personal names, associated law journals, and institution names were to be kept confidential. Due to the smaller number of interview participants – five student editors and five law librarians – it was decided that qualitative analysis was inappropriate for this research. Instead, this research summarizes the responses provided by interviewees and highlights higher-level trends and patterns in the responses.

Results and Discussion

This author began her research with the goal of identifying the ways in which law libraries are currently assisting law review students in their responsibilities as both staff members and editors. The secondary aim of this research was to ascertain, via interviews with law review student members and law librarians, what types of the services might be provided in the future to further assist these students in their work. While helpful information on both of these research aims was collected and will be discussed in the
following sections, several other interesting themes emerged from the interviews that this author feels have important implications for future collaboration between student editors and law librarians. Thus, the closing section of this Discussion will identify these themes and reflect on how they might impact the future of the student-edited law review.

In addition, it must be noted that the law schools and the student-edited law reviews each have their own unique infrastructures and oversight systems. The infrastructure of the individual journals varies depending upon the level of support and oversight they receive from their associated law schools. Figure 1 highlights the most common differences in infrastructure and school support gleaned from interviews with law librarians and student editors.

The five law librarians that this author interviewed described levels of institutional cooperation and oversight that were unique to each institution. No single law school appeared to exercise each of the types of institutional oversight, with the result that most of them fell somewhere in between total oversight of their journals by the law school and a completely student-run and independent journal system.
A discussion of the various strengths and weaknesses of the journal models is outside the scope of this research. However, it is worth remembering that student editors at different legal institutions receive varying levels of support on the “business” tasks associated with running a journal. In this context, “business” tasks can include any (or all) of the following: negotiating with editors, contracting with printers, managing subscriptions, engaging in public relations and marketing, coordinating symposiums, and handling the journal’s financial affairs. At the schools where law reviews and journals are provided with the least amount of institutional oversight, student editors handle nearly all aspects of article selection and editing, along with all of the tasks associated with running the law review or journal as a business. This level of management is usually completed with little school funding, so that the journals really are functioning as small-scale business enterprises. On the other end of the spectrum, some student editors receive robust support from their institutions in terms of funding and the handling of their journals’ business concerns. The findings presented in this paper demonstrate that, while the level of institutional support varies greatly from journal-to-journal and school-to-school, law libraries across the board are providing roughly equivalent types of services to student-edited journals and their staff members.

Classic Law Library Services

All of the law librarians interviewed for this study identified the following four services as being offered by their institutions: (1) assistance with locating materials through interlibrary loan, (2) reference desk help with locating harder to find materials, (3) training sessions for junior staff members on available library services; (4) the
provision of space within the library for journal members to work and store their materials, and (5) the assignment of law library liaisons to each journal.

The first two services are typically provided to all students, but each interviewed law librarian stressed that journal students frequently need specialized help in these areas. For instance, one law librarian noted that students serving on subject specific journals frequently need access to specialized databases for their work. She noted that her law library considers the needs of the student-edited law reviews when they are making collection acquisition decisions. Any resources that journal students feel they will need on a regular basis are prioritized. Two law librarians noted that the process of finding materials for journal students could be unique teaching opportunities, as students are typically tasked with finding legal materials that they have never seen before. One law librarian recounted that she regularly walks students through basic legislative history research because so many journal students need to find materials from the Congressional Record. She observed:

“These are legal materials that are important. Students should learn about them as a part of any basic legal education, but the majority of classes deal almost entirely with cases, and a few incorporate statutes and regulations. When a journal student works with a law librarian to find sources for a cite-check, we can help them understand how other legal resources fit into the picture.”

Even the process of finding materials can serve as a learning opportunity for students. This assertion was supported by all of the student editor interviewees as well. Each one noted that the assistance they received as junior staff members on cite-checks was invaluable in terms of locating the needed materials and also understanding what they were looking at. One editor reflected:
“I remember having one article which had citations to cases in older, nominal reporters. At the time, I had no idea what a nominal reporter was, so I went to the law library completely clueless about how to track these things down. I met with a law librarian and walked away with a new understanding of the old reporter system. There was a good bit of teaching there.”

As proponents of the student-edited law review system have long argued, the experience of serving on a law review actually does provide opportunities for learning that would not otherwise be available to students through their regular coursework. Law librarians recognize the potential teachable moments that are woven into the cite-checking process.

Staff member training sessions were another common service in the law libraries included within this research. Each law librarian described a similar type of program – an initial training session or presentation to introduce students to the law library and its services. One law librarian described the purpose of the presentation as “letting students know that the library has a lot to offer – it is much more than just the space that they studied in during their first year of law school.” Indeed, four librarians noted that the current law school curriculum does not require a significant amount of actual legal research, so students typically do not utilize the materials in the law library during their first year. The demands of cite-checking and student writing that come with law review membership require students to use legal materials and research databases that they did not encounter during their first year, and so law librarians stress during these initial presentations what some of the major databases are and the types of assistance that the law libraries can provide.
The provision of physical space within the law library for journal work was another commonly provided service amongst the interviewed law librarians. Typically, this includes providing each individual journal with a set of study carrels for their personal use and storage. Three of the five law librarians noted that their libraries prefer students to store all their borrowed materials in these carrels, as it allows the librarians to renew the materials before their due dates and retrieve materials that have to be sent back to other lending institutions. One librarian noted that this basic “clean-up” service is a way to ensure that the journals are not exceeding due dates or losing materials amongst the many staff members. In addition, four law librarians noted that their libraries provide the journals with borrower cards. Three law librarians also noted that their institutions waive all late fees on these cards and also allow students to use longer check out periods. The borrower cards also provide a way for circulation staff to know when individual students check out an item for journal use rather than their own personal use. As one interviewee noted:

“Communication with the journals can be hard. They are busy, and they are managing a large group of students. You also usually find students needing the same resource to complete their portions of a cite-check. So, the borrowers card and the library study carrels for storage help alleviate some of that confusion and the backlog it can cause for library staff.”

All librarians noted that the provision of physical space and the use of journal borrower cards make life easier for both student law review and journal members and law librarians.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, all librarians interviewed highlighted that their libraries assigned individual liaisons to each journal. A library liaison typically serves as the main contact point for the journal on cite-checking issues and also student
comments or notes. In addition to cite-checking and editing accepted scholarly articles for publication, law review staff members are also asked to write an article (typically called a comment or a note) that analyzes a particular legal issue or case of interest.

Student editors noted that their library liaisons were very helpful during the staff member writing process. The library liaisons helped with topic selection, preemption checking, and also pointed students to different types of resources that would be helpful in their research.

All of the law librarians interviewed mentioned that library liaisons are assigned to journals based upon the librarian’s areas of expertise. For example, a specialty journal that focuses on foreign and international law issues would be assigned a law librarian who specializes in that type of legal research. Several law librarians noted that these library liaisons are underused by the student journals, but that generally those journals in specific or unusual areas of the law typically utilize the service the most.

**Trends in Developing New Programs and Expanding Services**

In addition to identifying the most common law library services that are offered to journal students, this author also questioned interviewees on the unique or different types of services that they were offering to law journal staff. The first major area where law libraries are working with student editors is in the movement towards digitization and electronic open access to law journals. Three institutions specifically mentioned the efforts of the law library to digitize materials on behalf of law reviews and journals. Two of those three noted that all journals located at their respective institutions are now entirely online and all historical collections are now accessible online along with the latest volumes. In addition, two law librarians discussed their libraries’ efforts to provide
digital platforms for the journals to use in preserving their digitized copies and making them accessible through digital repositories and journal websites. As more libraries cut print subscriptions of journals, the provision of these types of services by law libraries places them in the unique position of being able to assist student editors with adapting their journals to the demands of a 21st century market and also providing digital repositories for storing and preserving that data over long periods of time.

Three law libraries also offer intensive presentations/trainings – in both small and large group settings – to student editors and junior staff members. These sessions were provided at the beginning of the journal-publishing year and covered basic legal research skills. As one law librarian described it:

“We use these sessions at the beginning of the year to help the second year students who may not have much experience in legal research. We cover the nuts and bolts of how to do legal research. These sessions are used to cover the resources that law students may not have heard about. They know Bloomberg, Lexis, [and] Westlaw – but they don’t really know about the humanities and business databases, health, medical that might be related to their articles.”

These training sessions are distinguished from the typical introductory presentations because they provide a deeper dive into legal research and how to use specific databases. Two law librarians noted that their training sessions took place over lengthier time periods and that food was provided for students who attended.

One law librarian also described special presentations for journal editors on topics like journal rankings, impact factors, and other publication considerations. Student editors interviewed for this research noted that such tutorials would be particularly helpful, as their respective law schools exercised very little oversight of the journals and consequently did not provide much assistance in these areas. The student editors that this
author spoke with identified publication decisions as one of the harder aspects of the job to master. One editor noted:

“I was really surprised at how many factors go into selecting articles for publication. I think many other editors on my team do not understand the difficult calls that we have to make. We may want to publish something, but we can’t because we also have to focus on maintaining journal rankings. It’s a balancing act we are doing here between publishing pieces that are really different and exciting and also publishing those pieces that we are confident will bolster the reputation of the journal.”

Ultimately, the law librarian interviewees all reiterated that these sessions were aimed at getting the word out about the law library and the various ways in which it can support law review staff.

**Areas for Future Cooperation and Services Expansion**

Interviews with student editors also identified areas in which student editors would appreciate additional library services and areas in which law librarians believe future expansion might occur. The most common suggestions related to the problem inherent with all law review editorial boards – the loss of institutional knowledge with the yearly turnover. All five student editors commented on the inadequate training that they received from the editorial boards and said that they were simply left to learn the majority of their job duties once on the job. Another editor commented that:

“Our journal has a really great history – there are a lot of amazing stories behind the people who have worked on this journal. But we don’t really remember any of that because we don’t do a good job of holding on to our history and passing it down. This also stymies us in terms of improving. If editorial boards are constantly playing catch up, we are never going to have the time or energy to devote to making needed reforms.”

The idea that journals need a place to store their institutional knowledge is not a new one. Indeed, as discussed in the Background section of this paper, critics of the law review
system regularly fault student editorial boards for failing to properly train and prepare the students who will fill their shoes in the years to come. This author has experienced the reality of this criticism personally. I served as the publications editor for a law journal while in law school – a position that included managing both the formatting of the print journal and the maintenance of the journal’s web presence. I received little to no training for this position and found it extremely difficult to contact the former editor with questions after he had graduated. When you consider that I was quite literally the only person on the editorial board with the knowledge of how to properly format the print journal, you see the risks in the lapse of institutional knowledge and proper training.

Student editors interviewed for this research were not sure how libraries could assist with these gaps in institutional knowledge, but they all noted one thing: law libraries are permanent fixtures in the law school. They believe that the permanence of the law library makes it a perfect place to store their institutional knowledge. It may require quite a bit of time and effort to establish a law library program that provides a systematic method for storing journal knowledge, but it is an area in which students recognize an unmet need.

Another area that student editors identified as a possible area for greater cooperation between law libraries and law reviews related to the intensive training sessions already in place at several of the institutions represented by law librarians in this research. Students observed that some of the most difficult aspects of their jobs involved article selection. Two editors surmised that training in how to identify quality law review articles would greatly aid them in the decision-making process. While this appears to be an area in which the law faculty advisor should serve as the main contact, there is a role
for law librarians in supporting any background reading or research that should be done to equip students to properly evaluate submitted articles.

This is also an area in which interviewed law librarians recognized an opportunity. Those law librarians whose institutions already offered some form of intensive presentation training to new law journal staff noted that they “could be doing more” on top of the trainings that they were already doing. One librarian observed that the goal of these services is twofold: (1) to provide some of that important background knowledge that students will need to fulfill their journal duties and (2) to foster a connection early on with new journal editors that encourages them to use the library frequently. Trainings offered at the beginning of the school year allow law librarians to make that first connection with the new editorial board and help them get off to a good start in their new roles.

Another possible area for future expansion of services involves the increasing use of library liaisons by journal staff members. Several interviewed law librarians noted that they already provide general training for journal staff members on the note/comment writing process, including tutorials on how to select a topic and ensure that their chosen topics have not already been preempted. However, law librarians can expand the breadth of services offered in this area by providing one-on-one tutorial and advising sessions for staff members. In these focused research appointments, law librarians can meet with journal staff members on an individual basis and provide intensive instruction in preemption checking, topic selection, and initial research strategies.

Individual research appointments provide librarians with the opportunity to make personal connections with journal students during their first year of membership that will
ideally translate to future cooperation with those same students when they serve the following year on editorial boards. Moreover, students often approach their note/comment writing requirements with trepidation, as they are largely unfamiliar with the advanced legal research required for this type of writing and often do not have the skills to narrow down a general idea into a workable topic. By offering research meetings with law journal staff members, law librarians are strengthening the relationship between the library and journals while also providing staff members with much needed support in writing their notes and comments.

Finally, the last area identified by students as a possible area for greater cooperation is also the area that will likely receive the most pushback from librarians. Four of the student editors mentioned that they would appreciate having a resource for assistance with challenging Bluebook questions. Understandably, this suggestion receives quite a bit of pushback from law librarians, as they answer the question of providing “Bluebooking” assistance in two ways: (1) highlighting that one of the main points of journal membership is to teach students through experience how to handle such questions and (2) noting that librarians specialize in legal research strategy and resources, but they do not specialize in the Bluebook citation form. Thus, while this is an area that students struggle with, that struggle is an important part of the law journal experience. It is highly unlikely that librarians will attempt to take on the role of “experts” in the Bluebook.

Possible Problems/Issues with the Law Review System

Both the student editors and law librarians interviewed for this research freely volunteered criticisms of the student-edited law review system that were largely unsolicited by the questions asked. This author believes that the concerns identified by
interviewees were stressed because of the effect they have in stymieing efforts by both groups to make the law review a more effective and meaningful scholarly enterprise.

Naturally, in any discussion about how to make the law review a better place for everyone, criticisms of the faults in the current system would inevitably surface. The most common themes were: (1) a lack of communication from law students, (2) the decline in quality of the publications, and (3) the law review system’s continued insistence on relying on outdated modes of citation checking.

Three of the five librarians interviewed for this research highlighted that communication with student editors has grown increasingly difficult in recent years. One librarian noted that this can be a particular problem for library liaisons who want to make sure that the editorial boards are getting the assistance and support that they need, but they cannot do this if the editors will not even respond to e-mails. Another librarian noted that law faculty has become more alarmed in recent years with an apparent lack of attention to detail in many journal publications and find this doubly frustrating when the editors themselves do not reach out for help. Ultimately, serving on a law review editorial board is a job commitment, and students need to practice proper communication in this role. However, as one librarian noted, if the editors will not communicate with you, there is not much that you can do to increase law library services to them.

Dovetailing off the communication issues that were discussed during interviews, law librarians and student editors also complained of a decline in quality of law reviews, albeit from different perspectives. Both, however, agreed that the market is likely oversaturated with journals, and this may be contributing to the decline in quality. One law librarian commented that student editors on the lesser-known journals were
struggling to find scholarship to print. Another law librarian wondered whether the drop in law school admission numbers and the lowering of admission standards might be indirectly responsible for the lowering of standards in many law journals.

Finally, another law librarian mused that perhaps the drop in quality was a result of the drop in student interest in the law review. This librarian highlighted that there are multiple activities that law students can devote their time and attention to – and some of them appear to pay greater dividends for students. For instance, students can see the immediate benefit of serving on a trial advocacy team – experience in a mock trial setting helps to equip these students with practical skills that they will not get anywhere else in law school. Why would a student who aspires to a career as a trial attorney choose the “drudgery” of the law review over the exciting challenge of a trial team? The real reason for the decline in quality many see in law reviews is likely the result of all of these influences. As law schools continue to move towards a more practice-oriented approach to legal education, the more scholarly activities like law review are likely to drop even further to the wayside. As one student editor put it, “serving on a journal is an important line on your resume,” but even this mark of distinction appears to be dimming.

Finally, law librarians and student editors recognize that many of the current rules for cite-checking are outmoded and in need of updating. The largest complaint revolves around the insistence by many law review editorial boards that staff members find their sources in print, even when it is clear that the author of the article never saw the print version of a source. For example, many students are frustrated when they learn that they must track down a microfiche of a newspaper article published five years ago when that same article is still available in HTML format on the newspaper’s website. As one
student editor described it: “It does not make any sense that we have to look at the original in print when the author clearly used an Internet connection and his laptop to read an article.” The standards have begun to loosen – many law reviews and journals now accept PDF scans of original sources – but editorial boards still cling to a mode of legal research that no longer reflects reality.

One interviewed law librarian believes that a more realistic approach to citation checking would allow students to get more out of the substantive work of editing the article and reviewing the citations for accuracy. She noted that, “law review should teach students to be close readers. They should be looking at the content. Instead, students are spending time worrying about locating a print version of something that is accessible within seconds online.” Change in this area is slow in being realized, but librarians are in a unique position to serve as advocates for further change. As the main points of contact for finding these more difficult-to-locate resources, law librarians can stress to editors that a more realistic approach to cite-checking is a wise move.

**Where can we go from here?**

This author believes that the interviews conducted for this research highlight at least two areas in which law librarians might step into identified information gaps and provide needed services for student editors: (1) providing assistance with publication issues and (2) serving as a repository for journal institutional knowledge. Both of these additional service areas may require that law librarians acquire additional knowledge or skillsets, but this author believes that there is no better candidate at the law school to fill these new roles.
Two student editors noted during their interviews that additional assistance with navigating the publication process would be greatly valued by their editorial boards. These editors served on journals that do not receive much oversight from their respective institutions, so the responsibilities involved in publication fell squarely on their shoulders. Law librarians can potentially provide advice and instruction into impact factor numbers, the system and factors behind the journal ranking system, and the elements to consider when interacting with printers during the publication process. Law librarians are uniquely suited to providing this type of advice because they deal with many of these issues as a part of their basic job duties. Law librarians regularly consider impact factor ratings and journal rankings when making subscription decisions, and law librarians are perpetually engaged in the process of negotiating favorable contract terms with journal publishers. These are experiences that can be shared with student editors who are making their own decisions regarding how to best enhance the profile of their journals and ensure that they are getting the fairest terms in printing and publication agreements.

Finally, this author also believes that law libraries are uniquely suited for acting as repositories of law journal institutional knowledge and history. However, this is not to say that law librarians must take on the additional duties of proactively collecting this information. Rather, law librarians can work in cooperation with law review and journal editorial boards to store their materials and also assist in their journal trainings. Thus, law librarians serving as journal liaisons will gradually accumulate a detailed knowledge of journal procedures and history that can be used to advise and assist future editorial boards. One of the chief criticisms of student editors is that they fail to properly pass on
their knowledge from year-to-year, and this is an area where working in cooperation with law librarians can provide some continuity to the editorial board transition process.

**Conclusion**

The student-edited law review system continues to serve as the main publication medium for legal scholarship. Over the past century, the infrastructure model for law reviews and journals changed as the number of journals grew, and many law journals became more independent from their associated institutions and law faculty advisors. For better or worse, many student editors now operate independently of any major oversight from a legal institution in selecting articles, editing those articles, and publishing the nation’s legal journals. The mantle of responsibility carried by student editors is immense. Judges, attorneys, and legislators all cite to legal scholarship in issuing decisions, practicing law, and crafting new legislation. The student-edited law review system continues to shape the future of American law.

However, student editors recognize that they cannot fulfill their commitments to produce quality legal publications on their own. Editors and staff members regularly look to law librarians for assistance in verifying sources, locating resources, supporting research, and increasing access to their publications. Law librarians have provided student editors with assistance in all aspects of the publication process and are actively looking for additional avenues for increasing services to student editors.

Many law libraries are now offering intensive training sessions and increased reference and interlibrary loan services for journal members. As legal scholarship is increasingly provided in open access digital formats, the need for law librarians to assist
in formatting and preserving these materials will likely only increase. Another major service area into which law librarians need to be prepared to enter is the field of data curation, as student editors will look to the law library for guidance in best practices. While the arguments about the value and importance of student-edited law reviews might continue, there is little question that the system itself is here to stay, and thus law librarians need to be prepared to help these student editors meet the challenges of a new century in American law.
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Appendix A: Law Journal Editor Interview Questions

(1) Can you describe your duties as an Articles Editor for the NC Law Review?

(2) You're already one semester in to your service on the journal's executive board. What has been your overall experience so far?

- **Probing Questions:** What parts of the job have been easier than expected? What parts of this process have been challenging for you? Anything that surprised you? Any areas that you wish you were more prepared for?

(3) Have you had any interactions this year with the law library?

- **Probing Questions:** When? What was the purpose? Do you feel like the interaction was valuable for you as an editorial board member?

(4) Who is your library liaison? How often have you met with him/her? What types of support has he/she provided?

- **Probing Questions:** Did they train your staff members at the beginning of the year?

(5) Can you evaluate your experiences so far with the law library?

- **Probing Questions:** Have any services been particularly helpful or valuable? Why? Any services that haven't been useful? Why?

(6) Are there any tasks or duties that you think the law library might be able to provide additional support for? How might they help?

- **Probing Questions:** Think about trainings, tutorials in publication or journal rankings, assistance for staff members, etc.
Appendix B: Law Librarian Interview Questions

(1) Please describe the structure of your law journal system.
   • **Probing Questions**: Who owns the copyright? How involved is the law school? Are there faculty advisors? How much oversight do the students receive?

(2) What types of services does your law library currently provide for journal students?
   • **Probing Questions**: What types of services are there for cite-checkers? Do you offer any services for editorial boards?

(3) Do you have assigned library liaisons for individual journals? Can you describe what types of assistance liaisons provide?
   • **Probing Questions**: Do any librarians have special skills or experiences that make them strong liaisons? Do they meet with editorial board members? How often? What are the purposes of the meetings?

(4) Do you have any support systems in place to help journal students with handling vendors, publication issues, or impact factors/journal rankings?

(5) Do you have any digital initiatives that impact law journals? For instance, does the law library host a digital repository?

(6) How do you see your services to law review/journal students changing in the future? Will you enhance and increase the types of services that you provide?
   • **Probing Questions**: Do you anticipate this being an area for growth? Why/why not?

(7) Have you encountered any challenges in providing services for this population of students? What are they?
- **Probing Questions**: Any resistance from faculty or students?