CORD

Congressional Oversight Records Database (CORD) Codebook

Congressional Oversight Records Database Codebook

Congressional Key

Congress	President	House	Senate
103 (93-94)	Clinton (D)	Democrat	Democrat
104 (95-96)	Clinton (D)	Republican	Republican
105 (97-98)	Clinton (D)	Republican	Republican
106 (99-00)	Clinton (D)	Republican	Republican
107 (01-02)	Bush (R)	Republican	01/03/2001 - 01/19/2001 (D); 01/20/2001 - 06/05/2001 (R); 06/06/2001 - 01/02/2003 (D)
108 (03-04)	Bush (R)	Republican	Republican
109 (05-06)	Bush (R)	Republican	Republican
110 (07-08)	Bush (R)	Democrat	Democrat
111 (09-10)	Obama (D)	Democrat	Democrat
112 (11-12)	Obama (D)	Republican	Democrat
113 (13-14)	Obama (D)	Republican	Democrat
114 (15-16)	Obama (D)	Republican	Republican
115 (17-18)	Trump (R)	Republican	Republican
116 (19-20)	Trump (R)	Democrat	Republican
117 (21-22)	Biden (D)	Democrat	50/50 (D Majority)
118 (23-24)	Biden (D)	Republican	Democrat

- **Methodology note**
  - Began the data collection processes with the two congressional oversight committees, the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs (HSGAC) and the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability (COA). Those committees were suspected to have a high volume of reports, which would provide a basis for the dataset. This proved an effective strategy, providing a solid foundation of reports for the dataset.
  - Initially, the Library of Congress Website Archive was solely used to locate archived reports. Later, the Internet Archive's WayBack Machine was added to supplement the archived websites and material.
  - Occasionally, mentions of reports were discovered, but the actual document could not be found. These reports are labeled "Missing Reports" and assigned to a separate spreadsheet of the same name for further investigation. There are currently fewer than 15 Missing Reports and less than five are from the two oversight committees comprising the first phase of data collection. These were not added to the database without files because the lack of naming conventions and consistent citations means that some of the Missing Reports could be press releases or hearings. The actual document is needed to verify the report.

  - While expanding the dataset, it became apparent the current methodology was incomplete. As such, a final "step" was added to the methodology wherein the researcher creates a list of each chairman and ranking member for the committee, then visits each member's website during their tenure on the committee to search for any missing reports.

- **What is an Oversight Report?**
  - **For the purpose of its database, the Levin Center defines an "oversight report" as any document that:**
    - was produced by a congressional committee, subcommittee, or member of Congress;
    - is labeled or formatted like a report;
    - involved fact-finding*; and
    - is distinct from a House or Senate filing in connection with specific legislation.
  - In this instance, "fact-finding" is defined as the investigatory process that results in collecting and analyzing information. See the definition of "Oversight Records" for a detailed discussion of documents that are exceptions to this rule.
  - This approach is intended to sweep in a wide variety of congressional committees and subcommittees, including standing, select, joint, temporary, or special committees or subcommittees, and focus attention on reports developed under the leadership of one or more members of Congress. It excludes reports authored by other agencies or officials within the legislative branch such as the Government Accountability Office, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, Congressional Budget Office, Architect of the Capitol, House Inspector General, House or Senate Sergeant of Arms, or Capitol Police. The fourth criteria excludes reports written by a committee to accompany a specific bill to be reported to the full House or Senate for further action and reports created by a conference committee to present legislation for final enactment by both chambers.
    - **NOTE:** the first criteria *includes* reports written by individual members of congress outside of committees, reports written by congressional staff members, and reports written by a congressional committee.
    - **NOTE:** the second criteria *includes* all documents that *call themselves reports within the document* in addition to documents that *share the same format as reports.* (See: *What is an Oversight Record?* below for a more detailed discussion of what qualifies as an oversight record.)

- **NOTE:** the fourth criteria is meant to *exclude* only those committee approved reports (as defined below) produced in connection with a specific piece of legislation. Reports that mention or discuss legislation may be otherwise included.

- **Reports by Members of Congress:** Occasionally, a report will be authored by one or more members of Congress but also indicate that it was created for a separate initiative run by the member(s). In this case, as long as the member(s) are current and not former member(s) of Congress and are leading that initiative, the report can be included in the dataset. (*see:* https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14300/203 *for an example of a report that falls under this rule*).

- **Reports by Staff Members of Committees:** Reports may be explicitly authored by staff members of committees, such as Staff Directors, and the report may even include a note along the lines of "the views expressed in this report do not reflect that of the committee as a whole or its individual members." In such cases, as long as the document meets all other criteria, it falls under this definition.

- **Congressional Task Forces and Ad Hoc Committees:** Included in the Levin Center's definition of oversight reports and records are both Congressional Task Forces and Congressional Ad Hoc Committees. They will only be included if they produce a report or oversight record.

- **Congressional Caucuses:** Caucuses are NOT included in the Levin Center's definition of an oversight report or record. There are simply too many to search given current resources.

- **Novel Types of Reports:** Another category of reports that raised questions about their inclusion in the database involved novel committee reports that utilized an online video format rather than written text to describe a specific oversight effort. To date, several such reports have been identified, all from the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, but it is possible that more committees have chosen or may choose video or other novel presentation options in the future. The Levin Center decided NOT to include video reports within its dataset, regardless of whether they fulfill all points of the definition. This decision was primarily made due to the limited amount of video reports found and the difficulty in obtaining a copy of the video and subsequently indexing it. It is possible that these video reports will eventually become part of another dataset elsewhere in the Levin Center's collections.

- **Impeachment Reports:** Using similar reasoning, the Levin Center for Oversight and Democracy also determined to include all reports issued by the House or Senate related to the impeachment process. These reports will be subject to the four criteria of our definition. Reports recommending impeachment of an executive branch official, judge, or the president necessarily involve Congress' oversight authority under the Constitution as well as the presentation and analysis of facts. Impeachment-related reports can be issued by the House Judiciary committee, a special committee, or another committee. All are expected to be included in the database.

- **Contempt Reports:** These are reports calling for contempt proceedings to be initiated against a specific individual or entity. While used sparingly, Congress has long had the authority to hold a person "in contempt of Congress" for refusing to cooperate with an oversight investigation, such as by refusing to comply with a congressional subpoena for documents or testimony. Prior to seeking a House or Senate vote to hold a person in contempt, the relevant committee has typically issued a report explaining the facts, including what information it requested, why it was important, what information was provided or withheld by the persons at issue, and why legal proceedings would be appropriate. The reports often present and analyze disputed facts. In addition, they inherently address Congress' contempt authority which is key to Congress' ability to enforce its information requests. Due to the importance of contempt proceedings in the oversight process, the Levin Center for Oversight and Democracy decided to include in the database all congressional reports related to the actual exercise of Congress' contempt powers. These reports are subject to the four criteria of our definition.

- **Executive Reports:** Another category of reports which raised questions about their inclusion in the database are so-called "Executive Reports" related to the Senate's constitutional responsibility to provide advice and consent on presidential nominations and treaties with other countries. A collection of these reports is made available to the public by the Library of Congress in an online section providing not only copies of each committee report since 1995, but also the presidential messages that transmitted the pertinent nominations and treaties. The following are Executive Reports:

    - **Nominations <u>ARE</u> Reports:** The first subset of those Executive Reports examines whether a presidential nominee should be confirmed. In most cases, nominees proceed through the Senate confirmation process answering questions on a variety of issues but without triggering a committee report. On occasion, however, a committee asked to consider a nomination will conduct a full-blown investigation of the nominee and issue an official Executive Report with factual analysis and findings. Because Executive Reports on nominations typically involve an investigation into an individual nominee and include factual analysis related to making a decision on confirmation, the Levin Center for Oversight and Democracy decided that nomination reports should be included in the database. These reports are subject to the four criteria of our definition.

    - **Treaties & Foreign Agreements ARE <u>NOT</u> Reports:** The second subset of Executive Reports addresses agreements between the United States and one or more foreign countries. All of those reports are issued by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and describe specific documents submitted by the president to the Senate for its advice on ratification. **The Levin Center for**

Oversight and Democracy determined that those reports were equivalent to committee reports on legislation, were NOT the product of a congressional investigation, and should not be included in the oversight report database.

- **Committee Oversight Plans** are NOT considered reports under this definition.
- **Format:** Reports not included in this definition generally contain some variation of “Background and Need for Legislation” and/or “Summary and Purpose of Legislation.” If these are included in the contents of the report, it is almost certain the report is not included within the definition. A key indicator of reports issued in connection with legislation is the phrase “[To accompany…]” followed by the name of a bill. This is usually found on the title page.

- **What is an Oversight Record:**
  - **For the purpose of its database, the Levin Center defines an “oversight record” as any document that:**
    - was produced by a congressional committee, subcommittee, or member of Congress;
    - involved fact-finding; and
    - is distinct from a House or Senate filing in connection with specific legislation.
  - This definition differs from Oversight Reports because it lacks the “is labeled or formatted as a report” clause. The key element separating Oversight Records from Oversight Reports is their consistent brevity and tendency to list facts rather than present the results of fact finding derived from an investigation.
  - Specific documents always included in the Oversight Records category are “fact sheets,” “white papers,” “issue briefs, “policy briefs,” and “issue papers.” This list is not exclusive and other documents with the same format but a different label (if any) may be included.
  - **Recurring Records:** occasionally, a member of Congress, committee, or subcommittee will issue a series of reports on a single substantive issue. Examples include Rand Paul’s series of “waste reports” and the House Homeland Security’s Republican members’ “Border Crisis Startling Stats” and “Terror Threat Snapshots.” While these documents are sometimes called “reports,” they tend to have a “fill in the blank,” repetitive nature, only listing facts without evidence of an investigation. They tend to be released monthly and are generally 1-2 pages in length. This type of document is always labeled an Oversight Record, whether or not the document calls itself a report.

- **Serial Number *(dc.identifier)***
  - For the "Serial Number" category, list the number as: Congress-serial # during that congress. Serial numbers are generally found in the top right-hand corner of GPO published documents. Otherwise, search elsewhere on the title page. For example, the 167 report in the 113 Congress would look like: 113-167, followed by the appropriate modifier as described below.
    - When a report has both a senate and house serial number, *list the senate number first,* followed by a semicolon and the house serial number. (Ex: 107-351.S; 107-792.H)
    - There are different types of serial numbers: Senate reports, House reports, and Senate/House Committee prints. To differentiate between the types, the Levin Center is currently coding them as:
      - Senate Reports: EX: 114-211.S
      - House Reports: EX: 114-211.H
      - House Comm. Prints: EX: 114-211.Hprt
      - Senate Comm. Prints: EX: 114-211.Sprt
- **Report Date *(dc.date.issued)***
  - For this column, list the creation/publication date of the report in a YYYY-MM-DD format. This can be found in multiple different places, including but not limited to: the report itself (cover page or in the text), in a press release or news article, in a hearing transcript, in a corresponding committee activity report, or in the report's metadata.
    - Only check the report's metadata (found by going to the "properties" of the PDF document) if all other options have been exhausted. This is the least reliable method because the date in the metadata can often change (if the publisher/creator of the report is not careful) every time they open the document to edit it. However, if absolutely no other date information is available, this will be a good alternative source of information. In this case, make a note in the internal metadata that you took the date from the metadata.
  - When a date for the report's creation does not specify the day of the month, use the first of the month in order to remain consistent in format and to make data analysis easier. Make a note that this decision was made for a specific report in the "notes" section.
    - **Example:** a report that's only dated October 2002 would look like 2002-10-01.

- IF a report has **multiple versions or multiple dates** and the reports are **identical or different versions of the same report**, use the **newest (most recent)** date available and note in the internal metadata that there is an earlier version and any major changes between the two (or more). Also, be sure to either list the original document(s) along with the newer documents in the appropriate spreadsheet or upload both documents to CORD for reference purposes. If possible, list the press release associated with the earlier version in the "Press Release" section as well.
    - If the most recent report is a declassified version, use that date. Declassified versions of reports count under this rule.
    - If a report has a "legislative date" and a normal date listed, use the normal date. This is most commonly found in committee approved reports.

- **Policy Agendas Project Codes *(dc.subject.major & dc.subject.minor)***
    - In the "Major Code" column, enter in the number value of the Major code assigned to the report.
        - Code according to the substantive policy area examined in the report. See the Policy Agendas Project Codebook to learn more.
    - In the "Minor Code" column, enter in the number value of the Minor code assigned to the report.
        - Code according to the substantive policy area examined in the report. See the Policy Agendas Project Codebook to learn more.
- **Committee(s) *(dc.contributor.committee)***
    - List the committee(s) that worked on the report in the order that they appear on the report, each receiving their own value entry.
        - Always begin the name of the committee with either "House Committee on/of" or "Senate Committee on/of."
            - Exclude the word "the" in cases like "Committee on Judiciary" and "Committee on Budget".
        - **Current and Former Committee Names:** When entering this value in CORD, always enter the committee name used on the report. For instance, if the report states that it was written by the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (a previous name of the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability), it would be uploaded to CORD under the House Committee on Oversight and Accountability, but the metadata value entered for

"committee" when creating the item would be the name written on the report (House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform).

- **Punctuation in Committee Names:** for committees like the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, the oxford comma is not always included when the committee is listed on the reports. As a rule, always include the oxford comma if the committee previously used it, even if they didn't on a specific document.

- **Subcommittee(s)** ***(dc.contributor.subcommittee)***
    - List the subcommittee(s) that worked on the report in the same order that the committees were listed, each receiving their own value entry.
    - Omit the chamber of the subcommittee. Do not list "House/Senate" before subcommittee name
- **Independent Author(s)** ***(dc.contributor.other)***
    - List reports done by individual congresspeople here. This can include more than one person—the point is that they were not part of a committee, they used their own staff.
        - This usually looks like: "report prepared by the staff of Blank Congressperson" and they generally deal with state-specific issues, though not always. If the committee is listed in association with that person, file it with the committee as author.
        - Use the naming convention as follows: Lastname, Firstname M.I. (Ex: Waxman, Henry A.). Exempt titles like "chairman" or "senator"
- **Report Title** ***(dc.title)***
    - List the report title here. Format the title by capitalizing important words, even if the title on the title page of the report is in all capitals or no capitals.
        - **Ex:** A TITLE IN ALL CAPS = A Title in All Caps
        - **Ex:** a title in all lowercase = A Title in All Lowercase
- **Brief Executive Summary** ***(dc.description.abstract)***
    - A few sentences to describe the contents of the report at a glance. To compile this, reading the executive summary and looking at the table of contents is generally enough. See the official *Rules for Summaries* document for more information.

- **Minority/Add./Diss. Views? *(dc.description.additional)***
    - This field is meant to indicate that the report may have had dissenters or critiques against it. The database is not attempting to make judgment calls on partisanship, and so this entry will help the researcher/scholar decide this for themselves.
        - Input the values in the order they appear on the report, each receiving their own value entry.
        - Only apply the relevant "views" in this column. Not all reports will have this. Most of the time they will be noted on the title page, but they are sometimes only noted in the table of contents. Occasionally these views will be in a completely separate document, often only found through associated press releases.
    - **Minority views:**
        - Reports can be committee approved with the addition of minority views so that it is more likely to be voted upon favorably by the committee.
            - There have been cases where minority views are present in a report and noted in the table of contents, but not noted on the cover page.
            - Minority views are most often found in Committee Approved Reports, but can be found in Staff Reports as well. Occasionally, the minority views will take the form of an additional document.
                - If the additional document calls itself "Minority Views/Response" (or any variation thereof), then it should be listed as the minority views for the main report (see section: *Type of Report: Anomalies: Minority Views as Separate Documents*) for information on how to add them to the main report).
    - **All other views:**
        - **See:** *Minority views* for rules.
        - **All types of views:** Additional views; Minority views; Dissenting views; Additional Minority views; Additional Dissenting views; Minority Dissenting views; Supplemental views; Clarifying comments; Separate views.
        - If you come across another type of "views" apart from the above list, please email gmoore@wayne.edu to add it to the database submission form.

- **Type of Report *(dc.type)***
  - **House/Senate Committee Approved Report**
    - A report that has been voted on by the entire committee and is thus committee approved. All committee approved reports must be sent to the Government Publishing Office and receive their particular format.
    - This can be determined in a couple ways:
      - Does the report contain a “Report” number assigned by the Government Publishing Office? (See section: *Serial Number*) Keep in mind, print numbers are different from report numbers.
      - If you see “To Accompany S./H.”, (indicating the report was created to accompany legislation), the report is NOT included in our definition regardless of whether or not it’s a committee approved report.
    - **SPECIAL NOTE**: Committees are not always consistent at labeling reports as committee approved, so there may be inconsistencies between our classification system and what the committee would classify the reports as. However, this is the best definition we have been able to identify.
  - **House/Senate Joint Committee Approved Report**
    - A report issued by two or more committees from the same chamber of Congress.
    - Apply the rules for determining a “House/Senate Committee Approved Report” here as well.
  - **Bicameral Joint Committee Approved Reports**
    - When two or more committees, with at least one being from a different chamber of Congress, issue a single report.
    - Apply the rules for determining a “House/Senate Committee Approved Report” here as well. However, because the title indicates both chambers of Congress already, adding “House” or “Senate” would be redundant.
  - **Staff Reports Note:**
    - All committee prints (S.prt or H.prt) are staff reports. The document will say “Committee Print” at the top of the report. These often appear very similar to committee approved reports.

- **Coding Partisanship in Staff Reports:** If the document does not indicate partisanship, check for context clues in the text and in the press release. Occasionally the report's investigation began partisan/bipartisan and ended the opposite. Always code the partisanship based on the status upon the report's release.

- **House/Senate Staff Report**
  - Staff Reports issued by a committee, but lacking any information indicating partisanship. For instance, the report may only call itself a "staff report" and list the committee as the creator, rather than the chairman or ranking member.
- **House/Senate Bipartisan Staff Report**
  - Staff reports issued through the cooperation of both the majority and minority parties on the committee but not voted on by the whole committee.
    - **Note:** to receive this code, reports *must* explicitly mention the majority and minority in some way as creators or contributors to the report. For instance, both the chairman and ranking member may be listed on the cover page or bipartisanship could be mentioned in the text.
- **House/Senate Majority Staff Report**
  - Staff report by the majority staff of a committee but not voted on by the whole committee.
  - If the report only lists the chairman and has no other indication of partisanship, it is coded as a House/Senate Majority Staff Report.
- **House/Senate Minority Staff Report**
  - Staff report by the minority staff of a committee but not voted on by the whole committee.
  - If the report only lists the ranking member and has no other indication of partisanship, it is coded as a House/Senate Minority Staff Report.
- **House/Senate Joint Majority/Minority/Bipartisan Staff Report**
  - When two or more committees from the same branch of congress issue a single report.
    - **EX:** a report issued by the Republican staffs of the House Judiciary and House Homeland Security Committees in August 2013 would be coded as a **"House Joint Majority Staff Report."**

- **Note:** A report issued by one committee and multiple of its subcommittees is not a joint committee report.
- **Note:** If the report does not designate minority/majority, democrat/republican, or a specific member of congress, it will be coded as a **"House/Senate Joint Staff Report."**

- **EXCEPTION: Bicameral Joint Staff Reports**
  - When two or more committees, with at least one being from a different branch of congress, work on a single report/investigation. In such cases, determine who issued the report and code as some variation of the following:
    - House M/M/B Staff Report||Senate M/M/B Staff Report
    - House Joint M/M/B Staff Report||Senate Joint M/M/B Staff Report
  - **EX:** Report issued in June 2016 by Chairman of House Oversight Committee and Ranking Member of Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. Code as: "House Majority Staff Report||Senate Minority Staff Report."
  - **EX:** Report issued in February 2020 by the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Chairman of the House Oversight Committee, and Ranking Member of Senate Judiciary Committee. Code as: "House Joint Majority Staff Report||Senate Minority Staff Report."
- **Activity Reports:**
  - Activity reports are always classified as House/Senate Committee Approved Reports.
  - See the CRS Guide to Committee Activity Reports: Purpose, Rules, and Contents for a list of reports since the 110th Congress and an explanation of rules and requirements for Committee Activity Reports.
  - While every attempt has been made to locate all possible Committee Activity Reports, it is possible that more still exist. Further, gaps may be present in our dataset due to inconsistent records management practices.
- **Anomalies**
  - **Note:** ***For any difficult decisions, make a note in the internal metadata that the document/report is an anomaly and why. This way, it can be revisited later if there is a dispute.

- **Coding Staff Reports:**
  - IF a report simply calls itself a "staff report," check to see if it was issued by anyone specific, such as the Chairman and/or Ranking Member of the committee.
  - IF both the Chairman and Ranking Member's names are present on the report, the report will be coded as "House/Senate Bipartisan Staff Report."
  - IF only the Ranking Member is listed, code it as a "House/Senate Minority Staff Report."
  - IF only the Chairman is listed, code it as a "House/Senate Majority Staff Report"
  - IF the report is listed as issued by a specific congress-person who is not the Chairman or Ranking Member, look up that person's party affiliation and code according to if it is in the majority or minority.
    - If two or more members are listed, and at least one author is from the opposite party within the same chamber, then the report would be a "House/Senate Bipartisan Staff Report." If all authors are from the same party, follow the above rule as if only one author was listed.
      - **Note:** do NOT code a report as "joint" unless two or more committees/individual members from the same chamber of Congress are listed as authors.
    - This rule stands even if the report also lists the committee name in addition to the individual members of Congress. For instance, a report that lists HSGAC and then one or more committee members that are from the minority but who are not the Ranking Member, then the report would be a Committee Minority Staff Report.
  - **Report Self Identification:** IF the report is listed as being by either the Majority or Minority Staff of a committee, but it also lists both the committee Chairman and the Ranking Member's names on the cover page, simply code the report as it calls itself–as either a House/Senate Majority or Minority Staff Report, disregarding the information on the Chairman and the Ranking Member.
  - **In-Text Identification:** Some reports indicate majority or minority authorship in the text. In such cases, it is permissible to use that in-text

information to code the report. This usually appears within the first few pages of the report. Look for phrases like "Committee Chairman and Ranking Member initiated an investigation."

- **Reports by Staffers:** IF the report indicates in the document that it was issued by a member of the staff and does not reflect the views of the committee or its members, but still refers to itself as a "report," "staff report," or some variation thereof, it does qualify as a staff report under this definition. Code the report as the appropriate variation of House/Senate Staff Report.

- **Joint Economic Committee (and other Joint Committees):** When coding this committee, code according to what is mentioned in or on the report, as usual.
  - If it lists a senator or representative, look who is in the majority for that chamber and code accordingly.
  - If it only says "republican staff" or "democratic staff" then code in one of the following ways:
    - If the party mentioned is in the majority or minority in *both* chambers, call it a "Majority Staff Report" or "Minority Staff Report" and add the "Bicameral" filter.
    - If the party mentioned is in the majority in one chamber but the minority in the other, code the report with two different codes like other bicameral staff reports (ex: senate majority staff report; house minority staff report). Add the "Bicameral" filter.

- **House/Senate Majority and Minority Staff Reports Disguised as "Committee Reports":** IF a report calls itself a "committee report" but does not have a GPO number and/or the appearance of a committee approved report, check the document to see if there is any indication of a whole-committee vote to approve the report. If no vote information can be found, it is safe to say that the report should be coded as a staff report. As noted above, there has been a noted lack of a consistent naming scheme among staff reports.

- **Majority/Minority Staff Report Notes:** IF a report specifies a specific party before the words "staff report," such as "Democratic Staff Report" or "A Report by the Democratic Staff of BLANK Committee," check to see if that party is in the majority or minority that congress and code the report accordingly.
  - See: *Congressional Key*

- **Reports by Individual Congress Members:** IF a report is listed as being prepared for or authored by an individual congressperson AND it was found using our data collection process, then it will be coded as a staff/committee report normally would be. This is because, if the report was found during the standard data collection process, then it was likely on a committee website or associated with a committee somehow, meaning the committee likely made use of the individual's report. Thus, it was decided to treat these individual's reports as committee reports.
    - However, IF the individual's report was discovered through any method other than our methodology, then the report will receive a "no" value for the "Found Using Methodology?" metadata field. This field indicates whether the report was discovered using our defensible and replicable methodology.
- **Reports by Both a Committee & an Individual Congress Member:** If a report was issued by a committee and a member of Congress not affiliated with a committee (at least, it's not listed on the document), treat the member(s) without an affiliated committee listed as if they represent another committee, making the report a "joint" report. Code according to the individual congress member's party affiliation (to determine if it is a majority or minority report) along with the committee's designation.
    - **Ex:** If a democratic representative who is not the ranking member or chairman on the House Oversight Committee issued a report in the 108th Congress and listed their committee affiliation, it would be coded according to the partisanship of the person listed. In this case, the democrats were in the minority in the 108th Congress so it would be a House Minority Staff Report.
- **Video Reports:** Committees occasionally issue video reports. The Levin Center decided NOT to include video reports within its dataset, regardless of whether they fulfill the definition. This decision was made due to the limited amount of video reports found and the difficulty in obtaining a copy of the video and subsequently indexing it.
- **Updates/Supplements:** In some cases, a report may have one or more preliminary reports, updates, and/or supplements. This list is not exclusive. In order to qualify as a separate report, it must contain a separate and related investigation and call itself a supplemental report in the text of the document.
    - Due to the lack of consistency in naming conventions for types of reports by congressional committees, a situation may arise wherein the coder could find a report that satisfies the first condition (separate and related investigation) but not the second (calls itself a supplement). In

that case, the coder may use their judgment, in addition to consulting with another coder, to determine if that report will qualify. New terms may be added to the list of accepted terms for supplemental reports when discovered in such a way.

- In other words, the update/supplement cannot just be a continuation of the first report, including all of the first report's content.

- **See section:** *Type of Report: Anomalies: Minority Views as Separate Documents* for instructions on how to add the supplement to the main report.

- Occasionally, reports will not just have updates, but will have newer versions of the same report created to update the original content. In such cases, because the main content of the report has not changed, only been slightly updated, do not create separate entries for each version. Use the newest/most recent date available. Upload copies of all previous versions of the report and note the phenomenon in the Executive Summary as well as in the internal notes.

▪ **Separate but Related Investigations:** There may be reports with the same or a very similar title, date, and/or author to another report. Unlike the rule for updates and supplemental reports, as long as these reports have a separate but related investigation, they can be considered as independent reports.

- These reports do not need to call themselves "updates" or "part of a series," though it may be worthwhile to note any related reports in the "notes" section.

- Additionally, it is acceptable if the report contains some information from another report, as long as it also contains a separate investigation.

▪ **Reports in a Series:** IF a report that falls under our definition of an oversight report states that it is part of a series of reports, note that in the item's summary.

▪ **Reports in a Series with the Same Name:** IF a report has the same title but there is more than one iteration of it, then each should have their own row/entry in the database, *as long as they are separate reports, not just different versions of the same report.*

- For example, the report "Making the Federal Government Accountable: Enforcing the Mandate for Effective Financial Management" was created on 7/31/1998 and has the house report number 105-664. However, there are two other reports by the same name by the same committee with the house report numbers 106-170 and 106-802. Each report contains *different information* on the same issue as they are all part of a series of reports/multi-year effort on the part of the committee. Therefore, each report should get its own line as each contains unique and important information which indicates that three separate investigations were conducted.

- **Contempt Reports:** Code contempt reports as usual and they should remain distinct from House/Senate filings in connection with specific legislation.

  - **Minority Views as Separate Documents:** In some cases, a report may call itself "minority/additional views/response" to another report. In Committee Approved Reports, these views are included in the main document, but with staff reports, it appears as if they are often separate. In such cases, if the document designates itself as any variation of "minority views," then code it as such by adding it to the main report it is referring to. If the document only refers to another report but does not designate itself as any variation of "minority views," then code the document as a normal staff report.

    - In the case that the document does designate itself as some variation of "minority views," add it to the main report by saving the document and adding the file name to the associated spreadsheet column and also (if possible) adding the press release link for the document to the "press releases" column. As always, make a note in the "notes" column about the changes made.

  - **Minority Views Indicating Partisanship?**

    - In most cases, minority (or otherwise) views only appear on Committee Approved Reports. If a staff report containing additional views of any kind appears, do not count the views towards the report's partisanship. This is because additional views of all kinds are mentioned elsewhere in the metadata.

  - **Draft Reports:** Committees will release a draft report sometimes, but not always, before putting it up for committee vote. While waiting for the committee vote, draft additional, minority, and/or dissenting views (or any variation thereof) can be submitted as well.

    - If the committee approves the report, it becomes a Committee Approved Report and the draft(s) become a finalized version. In this case, attach any draft reports to the main report if found (see section: *Type of Report: Anomalies: Minority Views as Separate Documents* for instructions on adding the draft report).

        - If the report is NOT approved, it remains a draft report with possible draft views. Treat such draft reports as staff reports and code accordingly.

- **Found Using Methodology? *(dc.identifier.method)***
    - This indicator assigns a yes/no value to the item. When reports are located outside of the stated methodology, they are assigned the "no" indicator. This piece of metadata is intended to show that, if the methodology was replicated, those reports marked "no" may not be found. For example, if in the process of searching for missing reports another report is found, that latter report would be marked incidental. Furthermore, if a report is otherwise received by the processor through any means other than those stated in the methodology, then it would be marked "no."
- **Report Length *(dc.format.extent)***
    - For "Report Length," record the number of pages in the PDF document, not the official page count.
        - **Multiple Volumes:** If there is more than one section or volume to the report, list the full number of pages as one total.
            - **Ex:** a report with two volumes of 100 pages each would be listed as having 200 pages.
        - **Reports with Exhibits and/or Appendices:** a report containing exhibits/appendices *within the same document* will have those included in the pages count. *However,* if the exhibits/appendices are *not* included in the same document as the report, they will not be included in the page count.
        - *Please* note the *lowercase* format of "pages" and the lack of punctuation. Follow the guidelines exactly. This is essential for indexing purposes.
            - **Ex:** 126 pages
- **Congress *(dc.indentifier.congress)* - Under Construction**
    - This number indicates the congress that the report was created during and also the folder that the report's file is located in. Therefore, when someone is looking for this specific report, they know to go to the right folder first. In the spreadsheet, only list the three-digit number. (Ex: 106)
        - This metadata field is not yet fully implemented.

- **File Name *(dc.identifier.file)***
    - List all file names of the reports and their related documents here so that users can easily locate the exact file they are looking for.
        - Remember: when creating file names for reports, do not include spaces. Format as follows. Begin with the date separated by hyphens, then an underscore and the letter "R" to indicate that the format is a report, then a hyphen and the report title (often shortened) separated by underscores, then a hyphen and the report number (103-42 or 103C, depending on if the report has an official number). Finally, make sure to include the ".pdf" at the end of the file name in the database.
            - YYYY-MM-DD_**R**-Report_Title_Here-XXX-XX.pdf
            - YYYY-MM-DD_**R**-Report_Title_Here-XXXC.pdf
                - **R**=Report
                - **M**=Memorandum
                - **OR**=Oversight Record
                - **PR**=Press Release
                - **A**=Archival Material
            - IF the report was jointly authored by a house and senate committee and was committee approved, it will have two different report numbers. In cases such as these, name the file like so, with the senate number first.
                - YYYY-MM-DD_**R**-Report_Title_Here-XXX-XX+XXX-XX.pdf
    - **How to Save a Document According to Archival Standards**
        - Begin by saving the document to your local drive (computer/laptop) using the file naming conventions above. It is best to also save a copy of every report on the cloud for the purpose of redundancy. It is recommended that the files on your computer's local storage be backed up to the cloud either daily or weekly. It is ideal to have three copies of the document, with at least one local and one on the cloud.
- **Related Hearings *(dc.description.hearings)***
    - As for the "related hearings" section, use congress.gov and govinfo.gov to find the related hearings.

    - Simply open the report, press “Ctrl+F,” and search for the word “hearing.” This will generally (esp. for the more recent reports) return any notes about related hearings. If none are found this way, there may still be hearings associated with the report, but looking for them would take undue time, so only add them if you stumble across them. Ensure that the search function is working properly, as it can occasionally malfunction and return zero results when in fact there are many instances in the document. *Especially pay attention to those hearings mentioned in the footnotes or endnotes.* Cite any hearings found according to the following naming conventions.

- **Naming conventions for hearings:**
    - Senate/House Committee on Blank, hearing on “Title of Hearing Here,” XXXth Cong., S/H.Hrg. XXX-XX, (YYYY, Month Day)
        - EX: Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, hearing on “Investing in an Effective Federal Workforce,” 112th Cong., S.Hrg. 112-682, (2012, September 19)
            - If no hearing serial number is present (S/H.Hrg. XXX-XX), exclude that section
            - If multiple hearing serial numbers (S/H.Hrg. XXX-XX) are assigned to the same hearing (as is often the case when multiple committees work on the same hearing), list the serial numbers in the same order that the committees were listed. If it is not clear which serial number belongs to which committee, list them in the same order that they appear on the hearing transcript.
        - If the hearing was authored by a subcommittee, include the name of that subcommittee after the committee name with a comma.
            - EX: House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Subcommittee on Human Resources, hearing on "Public Health 2000: Hepatitis C—The Silent Epidemic," 105th Cong., H.Hrg. 105-131, (1998, March 5)
        - If the hearing is held before multiple committees/subcommittees, list them all separated by commas, with the final one in the list separated by “and”
            - if it is a “joint” hearing, list it as a “joint hearing on” after the list of committees/subcommittees instead of simply “hearing on”

    - Ensure "and" is added between committees.
    - EX: Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, and Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, joint hearing on "Energy Pricing and Profits,"...
    - EX: Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, and House Committee on Oversight and Accountability, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Information Technology, and Government Innovation, joint hearing on "Hearing Title Here," XXXth Cong., (YYYY, Month DD)
        - In the case where there is both a house and senate serial/hearing number assigned to the same hearing, simply do not list either and skip that part of the citation.
- If a hearing refers to itself as a "field hearing" or "Classified/Full Committee Classified," cite is as a "field hearing on" or "classified hearing on"
    - EX: House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, field/classified hearing on "Title of Hearing Here," XXXth Cong., H.Hrg. XXX-XX, (YYYY, Month DD)
    - If the hearing also happens to be classified as "joint," just list all identifiers in a row, beginning with "joint"
        - EX: "joint field hearing on" or "joint classified hearing on"
- Occasionally, multiple hearings will be included within the same transcript/document. In such cases, cite the hearing as a plural: "hearing*s* on"
- Where the official title of the hearing includes the words "Hearing on," "Hearing with," "Hybrid hearing on, "Full Committee Hearing on," or any variation thereof, omit that part as it would be redundant.
    - Wrong EX: hearing on "Hearing on the Title Here,"
    - Correct EX: hearing on "The Title Here,"

- In such cases where a title ends in punctuation (exclamation points, question marks, etc.), do not add a comma to the end of the hearing title before the quotation mark
  - EX: House Committee on Blank, hearing on "Title of Hearing Here?" XXXth Cong., H.Hrg. XXX, (YYYY, Month DD)
- Italics and bold font are not to be used in these citations.
- When entering the citation into the database, use Alt + 7 to add a bullet point and space at the very beginning.
  - • Senate Committee on Banking, hearing on "Identity Theft: Recent Developments Involving the Security of Sensitive Consumer Information," 109th Cong., (2005, March 10)

- **Press Releases & Contextual Information *(dc.identifier.publication)* - CONDITIONAL**
  - This metadata field will only be present IF it is found in the process of locating the report or in the course of following the methodology. Press releases and contextual information are not the priority and will not be specifically sought out if not found immediately.
  - These are most often found on committee websites, accessed normally, through the WayBack Archive, or through the Library of Congress government website archive.
  - The gold standard for a press release is one that is issued by the committee that created the report, was issued on or around the same date as the report, and contains contextual information beyond an announcement of the report's existence. However, it is more important for press releases or news articles to contain historically significant contextual knowledge than it is to make sure the source is from the committee. Therefore, it is also acceptable to include news articles from reputable sources such as good governance organizations and large news organizations like the New York Times, the Washington Post, The Hill, etc.
  - **How to Save a Press Release:**
    - If the press release takes the form of a link, go to the WayBack Archive and click the top left tab for "Web" and enter the link for the press release into the "Save Page Now" bar that should appear at the top right of the page. This process requires the creation of an account. The archived link will then be entered into CORD under dc.identifier.publication
  - In most cases, the press release will take the form of a link. In some cases, however, it will take the form of a file name, usually in the case of documents sent to the press.

Links and files will be uploaded/entered as normal to the dc.identifier.publication metadata point on CORD.

  - Label the press release file with the same date as the report and “PR” for Press Release instead of “R” for Report, then the name of the article. (EX: “YYYY-MM-DD_PR-Title_of_Artile_Here-XXXC.pdf”)

- **Language *(dc.language.iso)***
  - Select the language used in the document.
- **Taxonomy *(dc.subject)***
  - The taxonomy metadata field is incomplete. As of now, it serves to unite disjointed types of reports under more unified types due to limitations in the database software. For instance, if a researcher wants to see all staff reports, they would need to do a search for House/Senate Majority Staff Reports, then House/Senate Minority Staff Reports, and so on. By creating a tag/keyword for all staff reports of “Staff Reports” researchers can now see every staff report at once.
  - **Current tags/keywords:** Staff Reports, Committee Approved Reports, Memoranda, Oversight Records, Bipartisan, Fact Sheet, Bicameral
- **Internal Notes *(dc.description.note)***
  - For now, we are recording all additional (non-public) information here. This includes...
    - Who uploaded the report, questions about the report, notes about additional documents included, notes about missing information, connections between reports, interesting details about the report, notes about if the report’s document has been modified or has a broken link.
- **Committees in CORD:** CORD will only include committees that contain reports.
- **Questions, Suggestions, or Comments?**
  - Contact Grace Moore at GMoore@wayne.edu