NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARIES

VOL. XXXIII, NO. 1 FOUNDED 1942 SPRING 1975

CONTENTS

DIRECTORY OF 1974-1975 NCLA OFFICERS AND CHAIRMEN

EXECUTIVE BOARD

President
GENE LANIER
Chairman
Department of Library Science
East Carolina University
Greenville, North Carolina 27834

First Vice-President and President-Elect
ANNETTE PHINAZEE
Dean
School of Library Science
North Carolina Central University
Durham, North Carolina 27707

Second Vice-President
NANCY CLARK FOGARTY
Reference Librarian
University of North Carolina
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412

Secretary
WILLIAM ROBERTS
Director
Forsyth County Public Library
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101

Treasurer
RICHARD BARKER
University Librarian
Appalachian State University
Boone, North Carolina 28607

Director
OPHELIA M. IRVING
Assistant Director of Information Service
Division of State Library
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Director
NORMA ROYAL
Media Specialist
North Durham Elementary School
Durham, North Carolina

ALA Representative
FLORENCE BLAKELY
Head Reference Librarian
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina 27706

Past President
ELIZABETH H. COPELAND
Librarian
Sheppard Memorial Library
Greenville, North Carolina 27834

EX OFFICIO

SELA Representative
I. T. LITTLETON
Director, Library
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Editor, NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARIES
HERBERT POOLE
Library Director
Guilford College
Greensboro, North Carolina 27410

SECTIONS

Chairman, Junior Members Roundtable
THERESA COLLETA
Children's Librarian
AMY Regional Library
Burnsville, North Carolina 28714

Chairman, Trustees
PATSY GINNS
111 N. Front St.
Elkin, North Carolina 28621

Chairman, North Carolina Association of School Librarians
MYRTLE J. McNEILL
Director of Libraries
Durham City Schools
Durham, North Carolina

Chairman, Public Libraries
WILLIAM O'SHEA
Director
Wake County Libraries
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601

Chairman, Resources and Technical Services
NANCY IDOL WHITE
Cataloger — Serials
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Chairman, College and University
MARY CANADA
Assistant Reference Librarian
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina 27706

Chairman, Junior College
DAVID HUNSUCKER
Director of Learning Resources
Gaston College
Dallas, North Carolina 28034

Chairman, Children's Services Section
BETTY POHL
Appalachian Regional Library
North wilkesboro, North Carolina 28659

STANDING COMMITTEES

Chairman, Archives
CHARLESANNA FOX
Randolph Public Library
Asheboro, North Carolina 27203

Chairman, Audiovisual
ELLEN DAY
2021 Bluemont Drive
Greensboro, North Carolina 27408

Chairman, Constitution & Codes
EDWIN B. McDILL
1705 Efland Drive
Greensboro, North Carolina 27408

Chairman, Development
LEONARD L. JOHNSON
Greensboro City Schools
Drawer 2
Greensboro, North Carolina 27402

Chairman, Education for Librarianship
FRED W. ROPER
School of Library Science, UNC
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Chairman, Governmental Relations
JUDITH G. LETSINGER
2719 Kittrell Drive
Raleigh, North Carolina 27608

Chairman, Grievance
GENE D. LANIER
Department of Library Science, ECU
Greenville, N. C. 27834

Chairman, Honorary Membership
JOCELYN E. STEVENS
Library, NCCU
Durham, North Carolina 27702

Chairman, Intellectual Freedom
RAY N. MOORE
Durham City-County Library
Durham, North Carolina 27702

Chairman, Library Resources
SCOTTIE W. COX
Wayne Community College
P. O. Drawer 1878
Goldsboro, North Carolina 27530

Chairman, Membership
NANCY C. FOGARTY
Library, UNC-G
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412

Chairman, NCLA Reorganization (Ad Hoc)
G. JOHN HEYER
Wilson Library, UNC
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514

Chairman, Nominating
BERNIE M. SHEFFIELD
900 English Road
High Point, North Carolina 27260

Chairman, Public Relations
SHEARIN P. ANTONOWICZ
Blanche S. Benjamin Branch Library
1510 Benjamin Parkway
Greensboro, North Carolina 27408

Chairman, Scholarship
MABEL S. HOWELL
3012 Englewood Drive
Kinston, North Carolina 28501

Chairman, Federal Relations Coordinator
DENNIS L. BRUCE
Wake County Public Libraries
Raleigh, North Carolina 27601

Chairman, Annual Sessions (Ad Hoc)
ROBERT H. MAY
Forsyth Co. Public Library
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101

Chairman, "N. C. Index" (Ad Hoc)
OPHELIA M. IRVING
Division of the State Library
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Chairman, State Documents Depository (Ad Hoc)
M. SANGSTER PARROTT
School of Education, UNC-G
Greensboro, North Carolina 27412

Report from the President

Most of the sections continue to sponsor activities of interest for all types of library and media personnel. I sincerely hope that you are taking advantage of these workshops and tutorials. The ones I have participated in have been well attended and quite worthwhile. Again let me say how delighted I am to see all sections represented at these meetings. This indicates to me that cooperation among different types of librarians and media personnel is becoming more evident. If you recall, this was one of my major priorities for this biennium.

The Spring Workshop is scheduled to be held on the campus of Greensboro College in the Cowan Humanities Building on Saturday, April 5, beginning at 9:30 A.M. Committees will meet from 9:30-11:30 and there will be a joint meeting beginning at 1:00 P.M. for committee reports. The Executive Board will meet the previous afternoon in the Library at 1:00 P.M. David Jensen has again graciously agreed to be our host.

It is at the Spring Workshop that standing and *ad hoc* committees meet to review their progress to date based on their plans made at the Spring Workshop held one year before and at any subsequent meetings. This is also the time that committees make plans for the next year. Although the president of NCLA will change in the fall, committees remain the same until the next spring when new committees are appointed by the in-coming president. This gives the new president an opportunity to become oriented to the office prior to appointing new committees.

As is true of most organizations, some committees are more active than others.

Gene D. Lanier

Although rather elaborate goals may be set for the committee, many of the plans never occur due to weak leadership or simply because of apathy among the committee members. I am certainly not casting any stones because I have been very pleased with the support and participation exhibited by most of the NCLA committees. There have been a few committees, however, who have not reached a single goal they identified back in the spring of 1974. To me this is distressing. These will be the committees that I will recommend to the President-Elect for reorganization or to be dissolved.

Agreeing to serve on a committee obligates the person to participate and often forego personal activities in order to be a good committee member. Naturally, there are emergencies that occur which make it necessary for you to resign committee membership. These cannot be anticipated. I think it is unfortunate that some people accept committee assignments knowing that they will not be able to participate because of professional or family obligations. Usually acceptance does not just mean a contribution of time but usually there are financial obligations involved when you truly participate. Everyone knows this when they accept. There are some people, however, who come up later with rather lame excuses for not being an active member. Fortunately for me and the organization, there have not been too many of this type with committee assignments this biennium. It will be interesting as we meet this spring and measure each committee's progress.

Due to the strong leadership at the committee and section level, rarely has a month passed this biennium that there has not been some activity available to the membership. These have been located in different areas of the state making it unnecessary to travel great distances to participate. When these workshops and other activities are planned, one of the big considerations is the location and the cost to the participant. This accounts, sometimes, for their being held in something other than first rate hotels. The lower the cost, the higher the attendance.

Some of you may wonder why the biennial conference is being held in Winston-Salem again. This is simply because attendance at previous meetings has been higher there than at any other location in the state. Another very evident reason is the fact that there are few sites in North Carolina that can handle large group meetings, large banquets, and exhibit space. Many places can furnish one or the other of these items, but not all three. Winston-Salem is the most central and this accounts for the larger attendance. What is most important? An exotic location or a large attendance? I vote for reaching the most members possible.

Many of you asked me what could NCLA give you if you joined, when I solicited new members. I hope you have seen now what is provided. Many participants at other state and regional meetings have commented to me that they would put NCLA and their meetings and conferences up against these other organizations any time. I hope you feel this way. Other than the activities provided, you have been receiving a top rate journal as far as I am concerned. Herb Poole, David Jensen and their editorial board have done an outstanding job. All you have to do is look at some of the other state journals and compare and you will see what I mean.

Make your plans now for attending and participating in the Forty-First NCLA Biennial Conference to be held at the Benton Convention Center in Winston-Salem, October 29 - November 1. Annette Phinazee, your President-Elect and program chairman has exciting plans for this event. Bob May is handling local arrangements, Leland Park and Bill Tydeman are responsible for the exhibits, and Arial Stephens is overall conference manager again. The Winston-Salem Hyatt House is serving as headquarters hotel with a passageway to the Benton Convention Center making it unnecessary to go outside. There are several other motels conven-

iently located near the convention center. You will receive information prior to the conference on reservations and program.

This gives you an opportunity to hear experts in the field in section and general sessions as well as talk and socialize with other librarians in the state. This conference will end up as a learning experience regardless of the number of meetings you attend or the number of exhibits you observe. Simply associating with other people in the state who have ambition, exciting programs, genuine interest in the profession, and a positive attitude will rub off whether you intend it to or not. I will look for you there.

Letter to the Editor

Will you include the following information in your next issue of *NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARIES*:

We have read with interest the article, "The Classification of Fiction into the Library of Congress Literature Schedule," by Nelsie P. Rothschild and John A. Moorman in *NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARIES* (Winter 1974, p. 23-26). We were reminded of the problems we encountered during reclassification in establishing the correct national literature classification number for those authors whose works were classified in PZ3 or 4. We prepared a list (52 p.) of the authors and numbers established. We would be interested to know if any other library has a similar list and would be interested in exchanging lists. We shall also be glad to provide any library in the throes of reclassification with a Xerographic copy of our list at the cost of ten cents per page. You may contact Miss Susie N. McKeown, Head, Cataloging Dept., Dacus Library, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S.C. 29733, (803) 323-2131.

Sincerely yours,

Susie N. McKeown, Head
Cataloging Dept.

From the Editor's Desk

RAY NICHOLS MOORE
1914-1975

Dear Reader:

Ray Moore is dead. She passed away during the evening of March 23rd following an illness of several weeks. Our sense of loss is profound, and the sadness of knowing we will not see her again in this life evokes long moments of silence.

Ray was a native of Georgia, the youngest of twelve children. She attended high school in Chattanooga and graduated from Spelman College in Atlanta in 1930. Fifteen years later she graduated from North Carolina College (where her husband served as Dean of the School of Library Science) with a library degree.

Ray's career as a librarian spanned forty-two years. She served as a teacher-librarian in the public schools of Chattanooga County, Georgia, as well as in the city schools of Concord and Durham, North Carolina. In 1945, she became the librarian of the Stanford L. Warren Public Library in Durham, a position which she held until 1966 and her appointment to the assistant directorship of the Durham County Library System.

Ray was active within her profession not only as an administrator, but also as a diligent and able committee person, as a contributor to the professional literature, and as a dedicated and loyal member of the editorial board of *NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARIES*. Unfortunately for all of us, fate would require her loved and loving spirit elsewhere, just at the zenith of her career. Perhaps it is best, as Robert Ingersoll observed, just at the height of one's morning when the flower of success is in fullest bloom to crash upon the unseen rocks and sink beneath the waves of the farther shore.

As a proper and lasting tribute to Ray, the North Carolina Library Association has authorized *NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARIES* to solicit the general membership for contributions which will be used to establish an annual writing competition known as the Ray Moore Award for the best article on public libraries submitted to your journal for publication. Each gift to such a fund is tax-deductible. NCLA will appoint a panel to judge the contest. Within a few days each of you will receive an invitation to help *NCLA, NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARIES,* and yourself by assisting with a lasting memorial to a North Carolina librarian whom history should record as a great lady.

Those of us who knew Ray loved her. Please help preserve her memory.

College Libraries: Are 100,000 Volumes Enough?

by James D. Lee
Assistant Librarian
D. Hiden Ramsey Library
University of North Carolina at Asheville

A current interest of academic librarians in North Carolina is the assertion that no undergraduate library should exceed 100,000 volumes, or that this number is adequate to serve the needs of all undergraduate campuses.[1] There are many existing factors which refute this contention and should be considered before accepting it.

The most obvious would be the diversity of institutional goals. A glance into college catalogs will show a wide variety of things the particular institutions strive to achieve. Some of the goals will require little support from the campus library; others will require considerable.

Closely allied to institutional goals are the curricula, vehicles through which the goals are attained. Some curricula require extensive literature support, while others, especially those oriented toward science and technology, do not. Teaching methods vary. Some require heavy use of library resources, while others rely primarily on textbooks and lectures. In an institution whose goals require considerable library support, whose curricula are of a nature demanding extensive library resources, and whose faculty for the most part require much library use in support of teaching methods, formidable powers of persuasion would be required to convince the campus community that an arbitrary number of 100,000 volumes is sufficient for its library needs.

Davidson College currently holds 191,000 volumes, while North Carolina Central University (formerly the North Carolina College at Durham) holds 246,000, with over 170,000 in the campus library. In 1970, Colby and Bowdoin in Maine held 260,000 and 400,000 respectively. While it

is probable that the shelves of these libraries harbor a certain amount of deadwood, it is doubtful if even the most ruthless of weeding programs would reduce their holdings to 100,000 volumes. Admittedly, the four colleges named are institutions with established qualities of excellence, no doubt due in part to their libraries. However, if a universal standard of this nature is to be applied, it would affect all colleges, superior or mediocre, by asserting that each is the exact counterpart of all the others, at least in terms of library holdings. Any factors which affect holdings such as institutional goals, curricula, teaching methods, and number of enrollments would be disregarded, including the question of having the same number of volumes in a college library serving 600 as in another serving 6,000.

Another factor refuting this proposed standard is the lack of standards in this particular area. Despite several attempts, no yardstick has as yet been developed which is universally accepted. Several projects have been carried out whereby librarians anticipated a set of standards would result. For various reasons they failed to materialize. At the root of these failures is one overriding cause. In the words of K. W. Humphreys: "Almost all the standards . . . have little or no validity outside the environment [that is, the particular institution] for which they were invented."[2] Although the 100,000 volume assertion would, if accepted, settle any dispute about what size a college library collection should be, its weakness lies in what is disregarded, almost like shoes made in only one size for every one to wear.

Disagreement among librarians regarding standards is divided generally between those favoring a quantitative approach and those stressing quality. The former hold the view that library holdings can be determined only by the quantity and range of materials being published which are relevant to the academic programs they are supporting. The latter group feels that the content or quality of a collection is of primary importance. Both views indirectly refute the 100,000 volume assertion. The quantity view is limited only by the quantity and range of publication, not an arbitrary figure of 100,000, while the qualitative approach would impose no limits on collection size as long as each volume is deemed meritorious. Thus, even the two sides of the standards argument leave no provision for a cut-off in acquisitions at 100,000 volumes.

Yet another factor denying the assertion is the information explosion. Although 200 years ago technology doubled every 150 years, it now doubles every several years. If it is accepted as true that man's knowledge is increasing at a tremendous pace, and that much of this knowledge is deposited in the form of books, it should also be reasonable to assume that libraries to house this wealth of information would of necessity increase their collections.

A last factor, and perhaps the most telling, is traditional evaluation procedures. An experienced evaluator will attempt to base his work on both qualitative and quantitative considerations, that is whether the collection is adequate in number of volumes and the books merit the shelf space they occupy. Two formulas have been developed which are often used for a quantitative evaluation. In 1959 the American Library Association produced a formula based on student enrollments and a minimum collection of 50,000 volumes.[3] Stressing that the basic collection was a minimal figure, the ALA included the statement that steady growth of the collection is essential but may slacken at 300,000 volumes — a clear refutation of the 100,000 volume contention. In 1965, Clapp and Jordan[4] produced a formula based on a core collection of 50,000 volumes, plus other quantitative factors such as enrollment and number of faculty. Yet the Clapp-Jordan report recommended qualitative evaluation procedures as "the best yardsticks of adequacy," defining them as "those to which we have become accustomed — the book-selection list and the specialized bibliography, frequently reviewed and brought up to date by experts

and in the light of use." No limits were set except minimal ones "for providing threshold adequacy." Hendricks, who used this formula in recommending quantitative standards for academic libraries in Texas, says that "strong arguments can be marshalled for the correlation of collection size and academic quality."[5] Although the statement was in reference to university libraries, this also refutes the 100,000 volume argument, for a library confining its collection to a certain number could not aspire to any richer academic quality than is commensurate with that number.

The qualitative evaluation procedures deny the 100,000 volume argument in a way more convincing than all the other factors mentioned, that of history. Beginning in 1931 with the Shaw[6] list, all the successive book lists compiled for college libraries have shown a steady increase in number of titles included. A special case in point is Harvard's *Catalog of the Lamont Library*,[7] a list of holdings in the undergraduate library. The 39,000 titles comprising the original list were selected by the criterion of probable use by undergraduates, with book selection to continue on the same basis. The history of this particular library, and its programs especially, destroys the contention of the 100,000 volume argument. The planning for the Lamont Library envisioned a library of constant size — a maximum of 100,000 volumes — but always changing. Daily criticism from faculty and librarians would ensure a dynamic collection of constant size. The collection was considered impermanent and so were any existing deficiencies. Despite an intensive and continuous weeding program, by 1972 the library had grown to 172,000 volumes. Philip J. McNiff, librarian of the Lamont Library in 1953, provided a fitting summary of all the above factors refuting the 100,000 volume collection. In the introduction to the *Catalogue of the Lamont Library* he stated that

> . . . the *Catalogue* is not intended as a list of the best books which should be in every college library. No two persons or institutions will agree on the choice of titles best suited for undergraduates. If a college library should reflect the aims and educational policy of its institution, the diversity of aims among our colleges militates against identical book collections.[8]

In order to convince librarians, professors, and administrators that no undergraduate library need exceed 100,000 volumes, it will be necessary to produce in detail proof of the contention, which would include a demolition of the factors just mentioned. When institutional goals are identical, curricula and teaching methods are uniform, enrollments equal, acceptable standards are developed, and man's acquisition of knowledge is at a standstill, then it will be far more feasible to attempt a plan wherein each college library contains only 100,000 volumes.

NOTES

[1]Jerrold Orne, "A Time for Reflection, And a Program for Action," *SOUTHEASTERN LIBRARIAN*, XXI, no. 1 (Spring, 1971), 40.

[2]K. W. Humphreys, as quoted in Donald D. Hendricks, "Standards For College Libraries," *TEXAS LIBRARY JOURNAL*, XLVIII (May, 1972), 76.

[3]American Library Association. Association of Colleges and Research Libraries, "Standards For College Libraries," *COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES*, XX, no. 4 (July, 1959), 274-280.

[4]Verner W. Clapp and Robert F. Jordan, "Quantitative Criteria for Adequacy of Academic Library Collections," *COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES*, XXVI, no. 5 (September, 1965), 371-380.

[5]Hendricks, *Op. cit.*, 74.

[6]Charles Bunsen Shaw, *A List of Books for College Libraries* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1931).

[7]Harvard University. Library. Lamont Library. *Catalogue of the Lamont Library* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953).

[8]*Ibid.*, vii.

Microform Retrieval: A Practical (i.e. cheap) Approach

by Jayne Castle Krentz
Perkins Library
Duke University

If you are into microforms to any extent, questions relating to their storage and retrieval have undoubtedly flitted through your mind on more than one occasion; most likely on those occasions when you could not locate one of the elusive rascals for an impatient patron.

One does not need to delve far into the literature on the subject before encountering the attractively simple idea of numbering each piece of microform consecutively and shelving it in numerical order (microform 1, 2, 3, . . .). If you are considering treating your microforms in this manner, heed the voice of experience. All is not as elementary as it sounds.

Having made the decision to retreat from the near chaos of an alphabetical arrangement, the staff at Duke University set to work with determination. Each of us felt a vested interest in changing the system because each had experienced once too often the problem of trying to shelve or retrieve a roll of microfilm in an alphabetical arrangement with five or six titles filmed on it, a problem augmented by the fact that the public catalog seldom if ever specified which title had been chosen for the honor of being alphabetized. A further complication was that of locating a title which was part of a larger set. Had it been filed with the set or separately? A little imagination will provide further examples of the complications of an alphabetized system.

It did not require lengthy investigation to arrive at the conclusion that anything expensive in the way of reorganizing the department was undesirable. Due to fiscal limitations, classifying the several thousand pieces of microforms could not be considered. In this day of the tight budget one need not ask why. The consecutive numbering system was chosen to replace the old arrangement and the department's staff began what seemed

a monumental project by assigning the first dozen pieces of microform the numbers one through twelve. The main entry card (the only one in the department's catalog) was located, matched carefully to its piece of microform and given the number of the material which it represented. The number was written in pencil in the card in the upper, left-hand corner. Pencil was used in case we ever changed our minds about an individual item or the whole system. The number on the microform was printed in large, legible figures on an adhesive tag and affixed to the box of microfilm, carton of microprint, case of microfiche, or whatever. Everything was returned to the shelf in numerical order.

The problem of multiple titles on a single microform was solved easily since each main entry card carried the number of the item and that is all the searcher needs to find the material.

Sounds too good to be true, does it not? Alas, problems arose almost immediately. Problem Number One was posed by serial or continuation items. Only one main entry card exists for an expanding series such as a newspaper or magazine. Thus each new addition cannot be given a different number without cluttering up the main entry card rapidly. Also, room must be provided for growth of these items and this would quickly negate the advantages of economies of shelf space which consecutive numbering provides. The department's staff, alert always for the simplest method, chose to store continuation materials in a separate area under an alphabetical arrangement. Such a system is practical for serials and newspapers since they do not contain multiple titles on individual reels, cards, and the like. If and when a serial item ceases such as *LIFE* magazine did, it can be shifted as a set to the consecutively numbered section.

Problem Number Two which developed related to handling sets of materials. Most sets have their own system of organization. For example, *LIFE* magazine's reels are dated. Other types of collections are numbered. Our department chose to give the entire set one number and let the collection's own system retain its integrity. The patron asks for the location number and the date or perhaps simply for the reel number of the particular piece of material desired. For example, the number 1300 brings the searcher to *LIFE* magazine's location. The date brings him to the individual reel.

Problem Number Three was what happens when a mistake is made and a set receives a number which everyone assumes is complete and then twenty more boxes of microfilm arrive. Since items have been shelved closely in order to save space there is no way to squeeze twenty more cartons into the right numerical space. The only workable solution we found was to pull the whole set from the shelf, remove the numbered tags, erase the pencilled number on the main entry card and cry. In order to avoid a gap on the shelf and in the numbering, the next step is to put some newly received or as yet unnumbered material in the vacant spot, giving it the old number.

What happened with the set that was pulled? Since the vast majority of our material is stored on shelves, the consecutive numbering system was well-suited to our department's needs. All types of microforms are interfiled. There are probably several ways of adapting the system to libraries whose collections of microforms are housed in cabinets. Since various types of cabinets are designed for specific types of microforms, interfiling is not too practical. Possibly each cabinet could be given a number and the materials placed in it in sub-numbered order. Catalog cards would read, for example: Cabinet 5, Item 235.

On the whole our department is pleased with the new system. The procedure went rapidly. Shelf space is being used more economically, and shelving and retrieving have been simplified greatly, thereby reducing the frustration level of staff member and patron alike.

The Development of Centralized Processing For School Libraries During The 1960's: A Literature Survey

by Carolyn Lucille Shelhorse
Danville, Virginia

General Characteristics of Central Processing Units and Recent Trends in Their Development

Centralized processing is generally defined as the use of one physical facility to accomplish the ordering, cataloging, and physical preparation of materials for a number of individual libraries. During the 1960's, centralized processing became a national library trend for all types of systems. Many school library administrators introduced it to their districts with the same hopeful expectation as did public and academic librarians. It was assumed that this new organizational pattern would provide the solutions to several plaguing problems.

First and perhaps most important was the problem of the rising cost of processing. It was reasoned that centralized processing would eliminate the duplication of effort then being made by highly paid professional librarians to catalog and process the same titles. At a processing center original cataloging could be done once and the routine work of copying could be performed by clerical help.[1] It was also argued that expensive reference tools and equipment would have to be purchased only once if processing centers were established. Finally, it was believed that better discounts could be secured from book jobbers if orders were pooled.[2]

A second problem facing library administrators during the 1960's was the shortage of qualified librarians. In many states, persons with only limited training were stationed in school libraries. Often teachers were used, while in other cases unqualified persons were employed because the certification requirements were low. Centralized processing was advocated in these systems since it would relieve the librarians who were weak in cataloging from this responsibility.[3] Also, numerous schools had no librarians at all, and it was maintained that centralized processing would provide their collections with accur-

ately and consistently cataloged materials without depending on volunteer parent or teacher aid.[4]

A third problem was the increase in materials to be processed. During the 1960's, federal funds were widely distributed for the purchase of library resources. Central processing was advocated as a way to prevent backlogs of these newly acquired, unprocessed materials.

Several positive advantages of centralized processing were emphasized. Individual school librarians would have more time to help both students and faculty use the library if the processing responsibility were removed from them.[5] Secondly, whole collections could be made ready for use by opening day in the numerous schools being established in urban areas.[6]

Actually however, centralized processing was not a new idea in the 1960's. Indeed, the Mahar and Holladay study for the United States Office of Education entitled *Statistics of Public School Libraries* reported that in 1961 at least 467 school systems were providing centralized processing for their elementary schools, while 239 secondary libraries were receiving the service. The largest percentage of these systems were located in either the far west or the Great Lakes regions.[7]

Despite the obvious awareness and use of centralized processing by schools prior to 1960, the emergence of a major trend occurred after that date. No doubt, many school systems were prompted to initiate processing centers by the encouragement given in several studies published early in the decade and by the following statement in the 1960 *Standards for School Library Programs:* "Centralized technical processing constitutes a form of cooperative planning for school libraries that takes place before the establishment of a materials center. When school systems have three or more schools, centralized processing should be introduced."[8] This early enthusiasm unfortunately was not always accompanied by careful reasoning and planning. Later authorities in the field argued that the 1960 *Standards* were wrong to encourage a system with only three schools to centralize its processing. By 1966, Richard Darling was suggesting that school systems should consider instituting processing centers only if they purchased as many as 45,000 to 50,000 volumes a year and if they were expanding and adding entire new schools and library collections.[9] Nevertheless hundreds of processing centers were established during the 1960's.

During the early stages, most school processing centers were organized within and administered by a single school district. While it is true that in some states school libraries received processing services from public libraries and area processing centers, this was far from the predominant pattern.[10] The single district centers generally initiated their services on a limited basis. A problem was identified, the center was established to solve it, and after the resolution of the problem, the processing center's program was expanded to meet less pressing needs. In most cases, processing was offered to elementary schools first. Their need was greatest because many new elementary schools were being built requiring complete new collections and elementary school libraries were generally staffed by fewer professional librarians than were secondary schools. A third reason for beginning processing with elementary schools was the fact that duplication of titles is greater among their collections.[11]

The services offered by school processing centers varied widely from district to district. The ranges from partial to full services were great. Some centers performed only the ordering and cataloging functions, thus leaving the final physical processing to the individual librarian, while other systems supplied processed materials only to new schools or to special collections.[12] Many centers provided processing for book materials only, while others included the handling of all types of audiovisual materials. Most centers purchased commercially printed cards, but varying uses were made of them. Some systems bought printed cards only for small special collections, while other centers purchased all the cards which were available. Some centers used printed cards entirely, purchasing a set for each volume processed, while other systems bought only one set and reproduced copies at the processing center.[13]

Staff size and duties were generally comparable from district to district. The United States Office of Education's study previously cited reported that in 1961, 370 professional and 707 clerical workers were employed in the nation's school processing center.[14] Two primary professional positions were identified. First was the administrator of centralized processing who was responsible for the management of processing as well as the supervision of the catalogers and clerical workers. This position was generally subordinate to the head supervisor or director of library services. The second professional position was that of cataloger which carried the usual responsibilities. The average school processing center employed from 2 to 5 professional persons and from 3 to 10 clerical workers.[15]

The physical quarters provided for central processing units were often barely adequate during the 1960's. Many centers were set up in leftover storage buildings, in basements or annexes to the system-wide administration building, and in old school buildings no longer used for instruction. Even when remodeling was attempted, many of these structures could not be altered to allow for a smooth workflow arrangement of the furnishings.

The processing centers of the 1960's depended on various types of equipment to facilitate their production. Administrators reasoned that the cost of such machines was more than offset by the speed they introduced into the process and by the professional appearance they gave to the end product. Therefore, many centers

invested in an assortment of pasting machines, call-number lettering machines, and duplicating equipment.[16] In Viola James' 1963 study of nineteen major school processing units, a wide variety of different duplicating machines were found to be in use. Three systems were utilizing the small hand-operated Cardmaster roller-applicators. The most commonly used duplicating methods, however, were mimeograph or stencil duplication and offset duplication. It was noted by the author that several of the systems which were employing offset processes for duplication were producing less than the 85,000 cards a year which the American Library Association's Library Technology Report has indicated is the least number possible for such equipment to function economically.[17] In the latter half of the decade, many centers switched to direct copy Xerox equipment. At least two school systems invested in data processing equipment and fully computerized their processing.

Because central processing was introduced in many school systems at least partially for the purpose of reducing the cost of preparing materials for use, administrators have been very interested in determining whether their processing units have, in fact, performed economically. Admittedly, few centers were able to show a savings in the first years of operation, because the initial cost of establishing processing units was so high.[18] However, even after several years of production, cost figures varied widely from center to center. In James' survey, the estimates of the cost of production per book ranged from a low of $0.55 to a high of $2.50 to $3.00. Most of the processing centers reported figures corresponding to neither of these extremes, however, with the cost averaging between $1.00 and $1.50 per item. The James study surprisingly did not indicate any pattern to the cost variations. Contrary to the predictions, costs did not necessarily go down as the number of items processed increased. Such inconsistencies may have been caused by poor record keeping, poor management policies, or simply the fact that costs are drastically changed by such disparate and uncontrollable factors as raises in clerical salaries, the purchase of new equipment, and the amount of duplication present within any particular year's production.[19] Unfortunately, no adequate cost comparisons have been made recently between school processing center production and com-

parable commercial or individual school production.

During the latter half of the 1960's, two new trends in the organization and operation of school processing centers began to emerge. First was the trend toward regional processing centers. Many small school systems had found their processing centers to be uneconomical; therefore, administrators began to test the practicability of processing units which were to serve increasingly larger areas. Several organizational patterns were suggested for these new regional centers. Some favored the establishment of regional district centers which were to be administered either cooperatively by the participating schools or by the state in which the region was located. Others recommended a system in which one single center within the state was responsible for all cataloging while regional centers completed the rest of the physical processing. A third possibility considered was the establishment of a single center within each state to perform the entire processing function for all the schools under that state's jurisdiction.[20]

The second major trend identifiable at the end of the 1960's was toward the use of data processing equipment and computers for processing materials. Such equipment is capable of processing greater amounts of material in much less time than the conventional equipment employed largely because many of the routine procedures formerly done manually can be handled by the machine in a computer operation using punched cards with coded data.[21]

Individual Types Of Centers

Early Unmechanized Systems

During the early 1960's, many small processing centers were established. These were largely unmechanized and their greatest advantage was that clerical workers rather than professional librarians performed the routine ordering, filing, typing, and pasting functions. The reports published on these centers often lacked detail; therefore, the researcher must compose the studies made of several such centers in order to produce an adequate picture of their operations.

The processing center for the Madison, Wisconsin, Public Schools was a typical one of this type. It served thirty-five schools. Book orders were submitted by individual school librarians to the center. These orders were coordinated at the center, and a set of Wilson cards was procured for each individual book. If Wilson cards were unavailable, original cataloging was done and sets were typed by the center's clerical staff. When both the books and the printed cards had been received, the remainder of the physical processing was completed. The Madison center also maintained a union file. One card was prepared for each title in the system. This card contained the basic bibliographic information for the title and coded symbols for all the schools in the system. Markings, which had been specially designed to indicate first, second, and third copies, were placed beside each school's symbol when the title was acquired.[22]

A 1961 study by Vincent Aceto of school processing centers in New York state indicated that procedures for those systems were quite similar to the ones used in the Madison unit. Of the twenty centers surveyed, eighteen purchased books with printed cards. Several centers indicated the additional purchase and processing of such items as periodicals, pamphlets, and audiovisual materials. Some centers provided the following non-processing services: the provision of bulletin board materials; the planning of book fairs; the preparation of book reviews, classified new book lists, and bibliographies; the supervision of interlibrary loans; and the coordination of school and public library services.[23] The New York study also included information about the staffing and housing of the processing centers. Of the twenty centers studied, only one had a full-time professional librarian. Most of the others employed one of their regular librarians as the director of the processing

center, thus, that person's time had to be split between service to an individual school and service to the processing center. All of the centers used clerical help. Over half employed at least two full-time clerks, while several systems used student volunteer assistants. The New York processing centers were generally located either in or adjacent to one of the school libraries or in the system's administration building. The physical facilities were usually considered inadequate. Need was expressed for additional work space, shelving, storage, and plumbing.[24]

In general, the early unmechanized processing centers seem to have been initiated without forethought and long-range planning. The physical facilities were makeshift, while the staffs were overburdened with too many responsibilities. By the end of the decade, many of these units had merged into district centers for greater efficiency.

Early Mechanized Systems

Not all of the processing centers of the early 1960's were as ill-planned as some of the small New York efforts. Many of the large urban city systems made detailed studies before initiating their processing centers and planned carefully for their eventual growth and expansion.

One such system was the Baltimore City Schools which began planning for its processing center as early as 1955. A study was first made of the system's existing curriculum topics, processing procedures and cataloging needs. Then centralized processing itself was studied through a thorough reading of articles on the subject, visiting of cataloging departments in the public and government libraries nearby, and compiling the results of a questionnaire. Finally, studies were read and tests made of the various techniques and equipment available.[25]

In the interest of orderly and smooth development, it was decided that Baltimore's processing center would be made operational in four stages. In 1956, actual card preparation began for the collections of eleven of the system's existing libraries as well as for one new junior-high school's basic collection. Six months later cataloging and processing services were extended to include all of Baltimore's secondary schools and seventeen additional junior-high schools. Five years after its opening, the Baltimore center was serving 132 out of the 188 schools in the city's system.[26]

The processing procedures adopted at the Baltimore center involved the mechanical duplication of cataloging done by the center's professional personnel rather than the purchase of printed cards. This method was chosen because the 1955 study had indicated that it was the most economical one available. Offset duplication equipment (Multilith #80) was selected; however, mechanical problems were experienced with it. Because offset duplication is done from typed stencils, it was found necessary to purchase an electric typewriter along with a standard one for each staff member. Stencils were produced for popular titles and extra cards duplicated and stored until requested. For less popular titles, cards were typed individually. Using these procedures and equipment, the processing center was able to produce 198,902 sets of cards within the first five years of operation. In addition, total processing was given to 166,373 books. During the month of September, 1960, a peak production of 10,000 books was reached.[27]

In 1961, when the Baltimore processing center had reached full operation, its staff included one cataloger, one assistant cataloger who served as a liaison between the center and the individual schools, one typist, and two clerks. However, a definite need had been experienced for another cataloger, two more assistant catalogers, and two more clerks, one of which would work solely with the Multilith machine. It was noted that additional staff was particularly necessary during the summer months when processing reached its peak.[28]

The Baltimore processing center was housed on the second floor of the central

warehouse in a space containing 1,300 square feet. The structural remodeling given the building included the installation of flourescent lights, air conditioning, an asphalt tile floor, running water with sinks, and electrical outlets. Shelf space for 3,000 books was provided, and access to outside delivery areas was made easy.[29]

The administrators in Baltimore made careful cost studies during their first five years of operation. A comparison of these costs was made with the recorded production of the center, and it was estimated that in 1961 each book required an average of 52¢ to process.[30] By 1963, when Viola James' study was made, this figure had risen to 75¢. Despite the rise, the Baltimore center's cost were still considerably lower than the average.[31]

The success of this center and the many others like it confirmed the hypothesis that centralized processing could be an economically practical pattern of organization. The glowing reports issued were meant to assure the library world that centralized processing was not a passing fad, but a possible solution to some very plaguing problems. By the middle of the 1960's, librarians were no longer debating whether centralization of processing was a good idea; they were more interested in discussing how technological advances and organizational improvements could make the advantages even greater.

Updated Mechanized Systems

Although many single-district centers similar to the ones discussed above were established during the early and mid-1960's, in most cases reports of their activities and processes have not been undated since the initial introductory ones. It has been impossible, therefore, to document the changes and improvements which were made in these processing centers during the latter half of the decade. The Greensboro, North Carolina, City School processing center is one notable exception. In 1969, a study of its recent procedures and production was published. In order to supplement the information in the report with a final updating, the writer personally visited the facility in March, 1972.

By 1969, the Greensboro center was serving a total of forty-nine school libraries. Complete ordering, cataloging, and processing were being performed for both book and audiovisual materials. Throughout most of the decade, processing procedures remained unchanged. Commercially prepared catalog cards were ordered for each book being processed when available. All other cards were typed with the exception of cards for motion pictures which were mechanically reproduced. Stencils, made photographically from Library of Congress film cataloging, were used to reproduce these cards with offset duplicating equipment. Under this processing method, a total of 317,305 items were made ready for use from 1961 to 1968.[32] The cost of processing each item was estimated at $1.29 in 1963.[33] In 1969, however, processing procedures and equipment were completely revised and changed. The purchase of commercially prepared cards and the typing of original cataloging were reduced to one set per title. These sets were then stored in a master file and copies duplicated upon request by individual school libraries. New duplicating equipment was procured. Following the example of many processing centers, a Xerox 914 direct-copy duplicating machine was rented.[34]

The number of staff members at the Greensboro processing center remained stable throughout the 1960's; however, duties were readjusted to correspond with the procedural changes instituted. In 1969, the center employed thirteen people, three of whom were professional librarians. The head cataloger served as the director of the processing center. Two actual catalogers were employed, one for book materials and one for audiovisual materials. Four duplicate cataloger-typists were used along with one filing clerk and one clerk for making Xerox copies. There were four processing assistants responsible for opening boxes, stamping, accessioning,

pasting, jacketing, packing, and delivering materials.[35]

The Greensboro processing unit was located on the ground floor of the city school system's administrative building annex. The 4,900 square-foot room was divided into several work areas by strategically placed shelving which also served as book storage space.[36]

This processing unit was one of the most productive school centers in the state during the 1960's. Methods for improving its service were studied, and finally new procedures and equipment were installed in an attempt to meet the increased demand for processed materials.

Regional And State Systems

As mentioned earlier, a major trend during the second half of the decade was toward the establishment of regional and state processing centers. It was hoped that the added volume of work accomplished at these larger units would reduce the cost of processing for each individual item.

One such center was established by the Rhode Island Department of State Library Services. This center began its operations by offering processing services to eighteen school and public libraries. The output was later increased to include materials for 112 additional libraries.[37]

The processing procedures of the Rhode Island center were partially computerized. When orders were received from individual libraries, they were key-punched onto computer cards. The center's equipment was then used to sort the orders by book dealer and print out order sheets as well as bills. After the arrival of the books at the center, catalog cards were retrieved from the master process file or typed if the title were new to the center. Copies of these cards were reproduced photographically and sent with the processed items to the requesting library. Each library using the center's service was assigned a coded number which specified its distinct library type. School libraries were numbered in the 9000's. This assigned number accompanied the book orders and was used by the processing center to determine the specific alterations which would be made in the master catalog cards. For school libraries, shorter classification numbers and simplified, shortened subject headings were superimposed on the master cards during the photographic process.[38]

Unfortunately, the operation of the Rhode Island center did not prove to be an economical one. Although the center charged its customers a reasonable $1.00 per volume for the service, the actual cost of processing was estimated to average $2.22 per volume.[39]

It remains to be seen whether the new regional and state processing centers will be able to operate more economically and with greater speed in the 1970's than did their counterparts, the single-district centers, in the 1960's.

Data Processing Systems

Observers of centralized processing in the late 1960's increasingly began to predict the use of data processing equipment and computers in the processing units of the Seventies. In fact, two fully computerized operations had already been established in the country by 1967. One of these was the Library Processing Center of the Albuquerque City Schools. The unit began operation as early as September, 1963, on an experimental basis. In the first year, procedures were established to process the materials of one small new elementary school using an assortment of IBM equipment. In March, 1964, processing was initiated on the collections of five additional new elementary schools. By the spring of 1966, the center was functioning efficiently enough to add processing for secondary schools. In March, 1968, the original IBM equipment was changed, and thereafter a Honeywell 1200 unit housed in the school system's Data Processing Department was used. By 1969, the processing center was serving a total of 108 libraries.[40]

In 1969, the processing procedures of the Albuquerque center were based on the use of two automated files. The first of these, the card order file, contained ordering information which had been coded and key-punched onto computer cards. Recent books, whether they had been requested by librarians or not, were constantly added to the file. The computer record included a control number, the vendor, author, title, publisher, unit cost, reading level, and a purchase or recommendation level. Three purchase levels were used, and any individual title's rating was based on personal inspection of the volume by the center's personnel and the recommendation of published reviews. Twice a year this file was sorted by purchase level and printed out, thus producing buying lists which were distributed to the individual school librarians.[41]

The card order file's primary purpose, however, was to facilitate the ordering of books. When book orders were received from individual librarians at the center, the basic ordering information for each title was retrieved from this file and printed on both the jobber's order forms and on work sheets which were held for later use by the center. When the requested books were received at the center, these work sheets accompanied each individual title through the remainder of the physical processing.[42]

The second major automated file contained complete cataloging data for all titles processed at the center. This file was stored on tape and was used to produce the catalog cards which accompanied each volume processed. When a new title entered the system, original cataloging was done at the center, and after thorough checking for accuracy, the data was added to the tape file for future use.[43]

As the services and complexity of the Albuquerque operation increased during the 1960's, so also did the size of the staff. When the experimental processing began in 1963, there were five employees consisting of one head cataloger, one clerk, one key-punch operator, one machine operator, and one library consultant. By March, 1969, the staff had increased to nineteen; two catalogers, ten clerks, and three key-punch operators having been added in the interim.[44]

Estimates of production costs were not available for the Albuquerque center; however, figures have been released for the similar operation in the Port Huron, Michigan, School District. This center, in a year of admittedly high production, reported that books were processed at a cost of 75¢ to 80¢ per volume.[45]

The computerization of processing procedures seemed a logical development in the 1960's. Much of the processing work involved time-consuming, repetitive, clerical tasks which could be automated with ease. Experimental projects seemed to indicate that the relatively high cost of data processing equipment would not prove prohibitive. Thus, the increasing appearance of regional centers using computer based procedures offered hope that centralized processing would become an even more efficient and effective organizational pattern in the years ahead.

Conclusion

When central processing units were first established, it was hoped that they would help to cut the rising cost of processing, relieve school personnel who were weak in cataloging from that responsibility, provide for the speedy processing of increased numbers of materials, and free school librarians for service to their patrons. By the end of the decade, many of these hoped-for advantages had been realized.

Although some centers were plagued by continued rising processing costs, many of the better managed centers were able to show substantial savings or at least stable costs in a time of rapid inflation. As predicted, decreases in expenditures occurred because of the reduced need for expensive employees and reference books as well as because of jobber's discounts.

Virtually all schools, including those whose librarians were adequate catalogers, reported that central processing provided better quality cataloging than had previously been possible. The information was generally more accurate and more complete.[46]

There were mixed feelings about the speed with which central processing units produced the requested materials. Some librarians claimed that books reached their shelves faster with individual school processing, while others praised the central unit's promptness. Nonetheless, all librarians were in agreement that central processing freed them from time-consuming clerical work for the professional service they were trained to give.

In several school districts, the processing centers were able to provide additional services beyond those initially expected. Many centers found that with a little extra effort their master files could also serve as union catalogs. Such records were quite valuable, especially when the center was a regional or state one and, therefore, had holdings data on numerous individual libraries. Computerized systems were able to provide such added benefits as the publication of suggested buying lists.

Despite the many advantages produced, there were unavoidable problems with central processing. In the early days, some centers were established which were too small to produce effective and economical processing. Also, backlogs and delays occurred in many units. These delays often necessitated the unsatisfactory practice of setting fixed order dates or required selection lists.[47] A third problem was the resistance of school personnel. In some school systems, school administrators were unwilling to recognize the need for centralized processing even when backlogs of uncataloged materials at the individual schools were high.[48] In other systems, it was the individual school librarians who felt threatened and who resisted. These librarians' usual complaints were that they did not get to examine the books thoroughly and that subject headings and classification numbers were not sufficiently adapted to the needs of each individual library.[49]

Generally, however, the use of centralized processing in school systems was a success. The predominant attitude held in 1969, after ten years of experience with centralized processing, was well summarized in the 1969 *Standards for School Media Programs:*

> It is advisable to have materials cataloged and processed through some agency outside the school building. This insures skilled service, avoids duplication of effort, and provides maximum time for the professional staff of the school media center to work directly with students and teachers. Moreover, it makes materials immediately accessible upon their delivery to the media center.
>
> Arrangements for centralized processing are practical and recommended for any school system or cluster of cooperative schools.[50]

NOTES

[1]Richard L. Darling, "School Library Processing Centers," *LIBRARY TRENDS*, XVI (July, 1967), 58.

[2]Greensboro, North Carolina, Public Schools, *Centralized Ordering, Cataloging, and Processing of Library Materials: An Outline* (Greensboro, North Carolina, 1969), p. 1.

[3]Darling, "School Library Processing Centers," p. 59.

[4]M. Bernice Wiese and Catherine Whitehorn, *Centralized Cataloging and Processing in the Baltimore Public Schools: Five Year Report, 1956-61* (Chicago: American Association of School Librarians, 1962), p. 1.

[5]Darling, "School Library Processing Centers," p. 58.

[6]Wiese, *Centralized Cataloging and Processing in the Baltimore Public Schools*, p. 2.

[7]Mary Helen Mahar and Doris C. Holladay, *Statistics of Public School Libraries, 1960-61*, Part I, quoted in Darling, "School Library Processing Centers," p. 62.

[8]American Association of School Librarians, *Standards for School Library Programs* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1960), p. 112.

[9]Richard L. Darling, "Is Centralized Processing for You?" *SCHOOL LIBRARY JOURNAL*, XIII (December, 1966), 16.

[10]Richard L. Darling, "Streamlining for Service," Appendix K in *The School Library: A Force for Educational Excellence*, by Ruth Ann Davies (New York: Bowker, 1969), p. 223.

[11]Viola James, "Patterns of Administering in Processing of Resources for the School Library Materials Center," in *The School Library Materials Center*, ed. by Alice Lohrer (Champaign, Illinois: Distributed by the Illini Union Bookstore, 1964), p. 36.

[12]Darling, "Streamlining for Service," p. 224.

[13]James, "Patterns of Administering the Processing of Resources," p. 42.

[14]Mary Helen Mahar and Doris C. Holladay, *Statistics of Public School Libraries, 1960-61*, Part I, quoted in Darling, "School Library Processing Centers," p. 62.

[15]Richard L. Darling, "Professional Positions in School Librarianship," *LIBRARY TRENDS*, XVI (April, 1968), 436, 444.

[16]Darling, "Streamlining for Service," p. 224.

[17]James, "Patterns of Administering the Processing of Resources," pp. 43-44.

[18]Gladys M. Lively, "The Creative Elementary School Library and Centralized Processing," *WILSON LIBRARY BULLETIN*, XXXVI (May, 1962), 753.

[19]James, "Patterns of Administering the Processing of Resources," p. 42.

[20]Frances Henne, "Standards for School Library Services at the District Level," *LIBRARY TRENDS*, XVI (April, 1968), 508.

[21]Darling, "Streamlining for Service," p. 225.

[22]Lively, "The Creative Elementary School Library," p. 756.

[23]Vincent J. Aceto, "Panacea or Pandora's Box? A Look at Central Processing in New York State," *SCHOOL LIBRARY JOURNAL*, XI (January, 1964), 27.

[24]*Ibid.*, pp. 26-27.

[25]Wiese, *Centralized Cataloging and Processing in the Baltimore Public Schools*, p. 3.

[26]*Ibid.*, pp. 3-5.

[27]*Ibid.*, pp. 6-8.

[28]*Ibid.*, pp. 5-6.

[29]*Ibid.*, p. 6.

[30]*Ibid.*, p. 15.

[31]James, "Patterns of Administering the Processing of Resources," p. 41.

[32]Greensboro, North Carolina, *Centralized Ordering*, pp. 6, 8, 10, 13.

[33]James, "Patterns of Administering for Processing of Resources," p. 41.

[34]Interview with Mrs. Stella Townsend, Head Cataloger, Library Department Processing Center, Greensboro Public Schools, March 16, 1972.

[35]*Ibid.*

[36]Greensboro, North Carolina, *Centralized Ordering*, p. 4.

[37]H. G. Kurtz, "Centralized Processing, Diversified," *LIBRARY JOURNAL*, XCV (May 15, 1970), 1807.

[38]*Ibid.*, pp. 1808-10.

[39]*Ibid.*, p. 1807.

[40]Mildred Breiland, "Centralized Data Processing for Libraries in the Albuquerque Public Schools, *DREXEL LIBRARY QUARTERLY*, V (April, 1969), 92-94.

[41]*Ibid.*, p. 94.

[42]*Ibid.*, p. 95.

[43]*Ibid.*, pp. 96-98.

[44]*Ibid.*, pp. 92-93.

[45]Darling, "Is Centralized Processing for You?" p. 16.

[46]Wiese, *Centralized Cataloging and Processing in the Baltimore Public Schools*, p. 10.

[47]Darling, "School Library Processing Centers," p. 61.

[48]Brooke B. Anson, "Central Processing in Illinois School Libraries," *ILLINOIS LIBRARIES*, LII (November, 1970), 962.

[49]Wiese, *Centralized Cataloging and Processing in the Baltimore Public Schools*, p. 11.

[50]American Association of School Librarians, *Standards for School Media Programs* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1969), p. 26.

Organizing and Collecting Non-Print Materials In Academic Libraries

by Anne LeClercq
Non-Print Librarian
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

During the summer of 1974, I visited some twenty-five different non-print departments, instructional resource centers, or learning resource centers located on college and university campuses. The research was funded by a grant from the Council on Library Resources, and purported to survey the purposes, facilities, collections, and uses of non-print departments in university libraries to determine the current state of development and to develop a model for the future. My reading, interviewing and on-site visits indicated three dominant areas of concern around which my investigation centered. These focal points are: (1) Administrative Organization of Non-Print Resource Centers; (2) Collection Development; (3) Instructional Modes, Media Formats, and Delivery Systems. I have used selected examples from my survey to amplify and highlight trends and developments which are occuring in the organization, collection and use of non-print resources.

The Administrative Organization Of Non-Print Resource Centers

Universities and colleges exhibit many differing approaches to the administrative organization of the various components of the information — communication service complex. Libraries and audiovisual centers have been identified as two major components of a university's information-communication resource network. In the institutions surveyed, the administrative and physical relationship of the library and the audiovisual center ranged from separate, with separate directors to joint with a single director, or joint with both a library director and an a-v director.

In the past a-v centers have considered their primary function to be the production

of materials, the provision of equipment and materials for classroom support, and instructional development and research. Libraries have traditionally been the retail outlet, housing the collections and delivery systems for the distribution of nonprint resources.

The administrative relationship of the library and a-v center is crucial to the type of collections and service provided, and involves such things as physical facilities, budgets, personnel, acquisitions, integrated cataloging, and overall management. Where there is no administrative integration, the relationship of the two separate service departments requires considerable cooperation if a complete range of services is to be provided for both faculty and students, and if duplication is to be avoided. Administrative integration of the library and a-v center in a learning resources center is the preferred model of high schools, junior colleges, and community colleges. The learning resources model has become the preferred administrative pattern for those universities reorganizing their services and for new universities. The integrated model lends itself well to the demands for total availability of instructional resources and information for faculty and students.

Some of the advantages which accrue as a result of the integration of these two units are: (1) a single and ample materials budget based on a standardized formula for library funding; (2) a diversified, professional staff with faculty rank including a-v specialists, instructional development specialists, and librarians; (3) a process for the bibliographic control of material through classification and cataloging; (4) access to both commercial and locally produced material on an individual and group basis.

The institutions surveyed which typify the learning resources model of an integrated administration of the library and a-v center are: Oral Roberts University, Oklahoma Christian College, Tarrant County College, Georgetown University, the University of Maryland, Syracuse University, the University of New Hampshire at Durham, Brookdale Community College, Bergen Community College, Eastern Michigan University, Purdue University, Wright State University, Governors State University, the College of DuPage, William Rainey Harper College, Oak Park and River Forest High School, Gross Mont College, Chabot Community College, Lane Community College, Evergreen State College, and the University of Washington at Seattle.

The institutions surveyed which maintain a totally separate administrative relationship between the library and a-v center are: the University of South Florida at Tampa, Florida Atlantic at Boca Raton, the University of Tennessee at Nashville, and the University of California at Berkeley, Los Angeles and Santa Barbara.

A more acute insight into the pervasive effects of administrative organization on the functioning of libraries and a-v centers can be gained by focusing on some specific examples of each pattern of organization. Oral Roberts typifies the learning resources model, while the University of South Florida at Tampa reflects a traditional a-v center pattern of organization.

The Learning Center at Oral Roberts brings under a single director, Dr. William Jernigan, both the traditional library staff and the production, or audio-visual staff. This organizational format provides for a unity of purpose in acquistion, retrieval, distribution, and production. Linda Baxter, the Learning Resources Librarian, stated that the combination of the two units allowed the resources control and organization of librarianship to be harnessed in unison with the instructional development knowledge of the production staff. Mike Mitchell, the Assistant Director for Educational Media, reflects the "missionary zeal" of a man who is committed to the "happy customer" ideal. As a media production specialist he does everything to convince faculty that media is a part of the total package of learning resources. He helps faculty set behavioral objectives, assemble visuals, and write scripts which result in effective mediated learning packages. All

new faculty at Oral Roberts are required to produce a media project with the help of the Learning Center staff.

The non-print collections, whether commercially purchased or locally produced, are developed through close cooperation between Learning Center staff and faculty. The collection is organized by the Library of Congress classification scheme, and is accessible to both faculty and students in individual learning carrels or fully equipped classrooms, all located in the Learning Center.

The successful integration of all communication and information resources at Oral Roberts in their Learning Center is borne out in conversation with faculty. Dr. Franklin Sexton who is the faculty member responsible for coordinating the production of a 40-unit humanities course, described the procedure. He stated that most faculty felt that mediated instruction was great for every course but their own. Sexton felt that the mounds of work required to produce a sophisticated media program would be impossible if it weren't for the Learning Center staff. He said that the Learning Resources Librarian was crucial in identifying commercially produced audio and visual components for a program, while the production specialists helped clarify behavioral objectives and assembled the technical specialists (graphic artists, video technicians, photographer) necessary to produce the end product.

At the University of South Florida at Tampa the Library and the Educational Resources Division are physically and administratively separate. The library is a traditional book emporium, while the Educational Resources Division is responsible for all purchase, production, and distribution of non-print resources. The problems apparent in the Educational Resources Division bear detailing as they have been noted in other a-v units which exist as separate entities.

It is a well established pattern on university campuses for personnel in a-v centers not to have faculty rank. The Educational Resources Division at the University of South Florida is no exception. When a new chancellor was appointed at the University in 1972 he promptly fired the Director of the Educational Resources Division and a substantial portion of his staff. The library staff, protected by faculty rank with its concomitant tenure, were spared. The staff of the Educational Resources Division were obviously uneasy and bitter about the experience.

The problem of assuring an adequate budget for operations, materials, and equipment permeates the whole structure of the Educational Resources Division at USF. There is no standardized formula for generating university funds. This single fact compels the Educational Resources Division to look elsewhere for funding. Thus, their primary energies and interest are directed outside the university community, and as a result service to University faculty and students suffers.

Some examples: (1) The film library generates money for acquisitions from rental fees. While USF faculty are not charged a rental fee, the primary input for selection of new titles comes from requests on a rental basis. Thus, if high schools in the area are the main film rental patrons, the collection will, and in fact does, reflect their needs and demands, not those of the University. (2) Auxiliary accounts and contracts have become a substantial source for funding on-going television production. This means that the energy and creativity of the production staff are drained off into private contract production. (3) The Educational Resources Division has recently devised an innovative, community-oriented program entitled "Your Open University" (YOU). In cooperation with the Office of Academic Affairs, they are offering continuing education courses on TV for USF credit. The idea of extending the services of the University outside its sanctum are laudable. However, in this case, the Educational Resources Division is being forced to look outside the University as a means of burnishing its image and gaining dollars from the "outside" community. (4) The Educational Resources

Division has an expensive ($250,000) dial-access system with 47 four-track sound decks (188 program sources) plus 9 video sources. According to Gray Bower who is in charge of the Learning Lab, the system has had only marginal use for the past two years. Several factors are responsible for this parlous situation. The dropping of the language requirement, the lack of stereo sound, and most importantly, a materials budget of only $600 per year. The heart of any delivery system must be its collection. An analogy can be drawn to a beautiful library building with a $600 a year book budget.

The need for a standardized procedure for generating funds is essential to the viability of any organization. The trend toward an integrated library, a-v center complex is based, in large part, on the fact that libraries have been successful in establishing formula funding.

The topic of the organizational relationship of the a-v center and the library has been acrimoniously debated on many of the campuses I have visited. Librarians tend to feel that all collections should be library located and administered. They feel that librarians are well trained to handle the acquisition, cataloging, circulation, and promotion of all materials for use in both research and instruction. However, most librarians interviewed would prefer that a separate a-v center or instructional media division handle all production, and administer equipment. Audio-visual specialists, on the other hand, are leary of being absorbed into library operations, and espouse the belief that two distinctly different kinds of knowledge and concern are required to oversee the two types of operations. Insight into this thorny problem can be gained by a brief scrutiny of combined a-v, library operations at Purdue University and Eastern Michigan University at Ypsilanti.

At Purdue University the a-v center has long been a part of the Library. David Moses, Director of the A-V Center, is responsible to the Director of the Library, and sits on the Library's Administrative Council. Moses is fairly happy with the A-V Center's library "home," as he views the library as the only campus-wide service facility. "If media services are located in extension, education or other departments, the tendency is to serve those units exclusively, rather than the whole university community." Some of the observed advantages of the combined operation at Purdue would be: faculty rank for professional trained A-V Center staff; and access to a healthy materials budget and to individual departments' library allocations.

At Eastern Michigan University at Ypsilanti a new organizational pattern combines the University Library and Media Services into the Center for Educational

Resources. The Director of the Center for Educational Resources, Fred Blum, is a print-oriented librarian. LaVerne Weber, Head of the Division of Media Services, a large and diverse a-v production and distribution unit, seemed well pleased with the integration of the two units. Again, faculty status and access to a substantial materials budget were apparent advantages of combined operations. An attempt to have uniform LC cataloging for both print and non-print materials has been initiated, with the goal being a totally integrated catalog. As Weber stated, for the first time, they (library) were willing to put our media into their catalog. Weber felt that the combination of services was a happy marriage — while his division had lost some of its autonomy, it had gained recognition, status and funds.

Collection Development

The idea that print and non-print materials should be combined as instructional resources for use in the teaching-learning process is widely accepted by the institutions surveyed. However, procedures for developing well-rounded, diverse collections of media in all formats are still in their incipient stages.

The procedures which librarians have used to select and acquire print collections should have some applicability to non-print collection building. In developing print collections librarians have relied heavily on four sources: (1) evaluative reviews in library and subject literature, (2) book subscription plans; (3) subject bibliographies; (4) faculty requests. In developing non-print collections a-v specialists in universities have relied to a great extent on two sources — their own expertise or faculty requests. The reasons for this are multifareous. (1) Review sources tend not to be evaluative, comprehensive or reliable. (2) Subscription plans such as Baker and Taylor's Media Quick Lists provide adequate coverage for elementary and secondary schools, but only about 20% of their listings are in the adult or higher education range.

As a result of the limited range of sources and individuals involved in building non-print collections, these collections tend to be over-weighted with expensive 16mm films designed to support classroom instruction. A factor which further reinforces the sterility of non-print collections is that a-v specialists tend to be only slightly involved in planning for curricula changes and teaching-learning innovation. A few examples from my survey can both highlight the problems, and perhaps point the way toward organized procedures for collection building.

Governor State University in Illinois is a brand new senior college (3rd and 4th year and graduate studies) with 150 faculty and approximately 3,000 students. Their stated goal for the teaching-learning process is the total individualization of instruction with high emphasis on mediated learning packages or modules. Administratively both the library and the a-v center fall under the Dean of Instructional Services. The charge to build a media collection was delegated to the Media Librarian. In the course of ten months, the Media Librarian developed the 16mm film collection from 150 titles to 650 titles. Several comments can be made about this collection. First, 16mm films are a notoriously poor format for individualization of instruction. The learning center was totally unequipped to make this large, expensive collection accessible to students. Second, the collection had been selected on the basis of the personal predilections of the Media Librarian. There was no organized procedure for relating collection to curricula or faculty interests. It is no wonder then that the collection resembled a public library film collection, heavy in film as art titles, general social documentaries, and series on the environment. Needless to say, the media formats most suitable for individualized learning — filmstrips, audio cassettes, slide/sound sets — had been underdeveloped as a result of the emphasis on 16mm films. However, some attempt had been made at developing an audio collection: a blanket purchase of the Big Sur Audio Tape Catalog. While this misexpenditure

of funds seems especially egregious, it is not atypical. The procedures and tools for developing an opening day media collection have not been finely honed.

Media collection development can be seen as a double faced coin, with producers, distributors and bibliographic tools on one face, and faculty, students and the instructional system on the other face. The collection building specialist is the mediator between these two forces. An obvious imbalance is created where one side is given more weighted consideration than the other. The producer-distributor side is a finely organized lobbying force that has been extremely skillful in persuading media specialists of the value of their wares. The faculty, student, user side of the coin is unusually inept, often unconcerned or unaware that they have a responsibility and a right to participate in the media selection process. How can the a-v center organize its collection building procedures to bring these two forces into equilibrium?

Bergen Community College in Paramus, New Jersey, is one institution which has refined its collection building procedures for both print and non-print into a truly workable model. The Library and Learning Resources Center provide print and non-print resources for approximately 250 faculty and 2,500 students. Peter Heulf, Head of Educational Media, is responsible for the total range of audio-visual services including production, distribution of software and equipment, and collection development.

Collection building and utilization at Bergen are the responsibility of seven reference librarians who have the title of Media Utilization Advisors. Each of these individuals has a masters in librarianship and in instructional media. Each Media Utilization Advisor is assigned to two academic departments, and is expected to spend at least 15 hours a week in contact with their designated faculty. Mr. Heulf stresses face to face contact, feeling that a reliance on telephone or mail reinforces the faculty member's image of the faceless librarian. The librarian is charged with the responsibility of bringing about a relationship between faculty and potential resources. The Media Utilization Advisor is the chief negotiator or liaison between library selection tools such as *CHOICE, BOOKLIST, LIBRARY JOURNAL, PREVIEWS, MEDIA AND METHODS,* and faculty. Advisors send reviews of books and media to faculty, faculty initiate a request, and in this fashion the library asures itself of maximum faculty involvement in the selection process.

The intimate relationship between collection building and utilization which exists at Bergen is enhanced by the Library's information dissemination techniques. All print and non-print material is cataloged by the LC system. The computer based catalog makes material accessible in several different ways. Media are retrieved by LC classification in print-outs, and by media format print-outs. Media Utilization Advisors regularly provide faculty with LC printouts in their area of subject interest. A computer based faculty profile enhances dissemination of acquisition information. The Library collects non-print materials suitable for use in large group instruction (16mm films, transparencies, slides) and individualized instruction (8mm loops, filmstrips, videocassettes, audiocassettes). Thus print-outs by media format allow faculty who wish to pursue a particular instructional mode to select materials suitable to that mode.

The Bergen Library does not rely solely on its Media Utilization Advisors and its bibliographic system for communication with faculty. The Library also offers an a-v course and a bibliographic course for faculty. Broad faculty participation in these courses has apparently stimulated a fuller utilization of library resources.

The only aspect of the Bergen collection development model which is unique to that institution is its enthusiastic staff. Basic features, such as assigning staff collection building responsibilities in coordination with academic department liaison work, are adaptable in any college library.

Instructional Modes, Media Formats And Delivery Systems

Experimentation with a variety of instructional modes has been rife as college and university faculty seek patterns of instructional programming which will meet different educational goals, learning styles, and capabilities of individuals. The swelling enrollments of the sixties gave impetus to instructional patterns (TV, dial access) which promised economies of scale. Faculty who had long relied on the lecture method as their sole method of communication, began to utilize mediated instruction for both classroom and individualized learning.

The diversity of instructional modes and a-v support systems has been born out during the course of my survey. Florida Atlantic University at Boca Raton, and Tarrant County College at Fort Worth, are two institutions with widely differing missions, instructional patterns and a-v support systems. Their successes and failures with the use of media can provide insight into future trends.

Florida Atlantic University, a senior college founded in 1964, has been committed to innovation in mediated instruction since its inception. The Division of Learning Resources has four departments; Production, Graphics, Engineering, and Instructional Services. The Production Department, housing three sophisticated TV studios with complete back-up services, functioned initially as the producer of numerous, entire TV courses. The idea that a "canned TV course" could substitute for professional interaction with students in a teaching/learning context failed as miserably at Florida Atlantic as elsewhere. Students resisted, faculty became disenchanted, and finally the Vice-President for Academic Affairs issued an edict that no more than 50% of any course could be taught on TV. The resilient, imaginative leadership in the Learning Resources Division realized that TV technology was a viable method of instructional communication if applied to the truly visual segments of a course. They have consequently switched from the mass media, whole course approach, to producing individual modules of various segments of courses, and distributing the product in videocassette format. The videocassette, which is perfectly suited to individualized learning situations, has become the preferred format for making television productions accessible, both at Florida Atlantic and at other universities.

While experimenting with various methods of producing and packaging televised instruction, the FAU Division of Learning Resources has also supported classroom instruction with non-book media and equipment (principally slides and 16mm films) and operated an Independent Study Laboratory. The Laboratory is equipped with individual audio, slide, video, and film stations and carrels. All software, includ-

ing the 16mm film collection, is available for student use. The Learning Resources Division has not invested in an expensive dial access audio and video system. They feel that their individually operated stations are far less expensive, and are more flexible and adaptable to various learning styles and capabilities. Disenchantment with dial access systems is evident throughout the country, and is comparable to the earlier disappointment with mass applications of television. The preferred instructional modes place emphasis on the individual controlling his learning environment. Large automated dial access systems, except those with random capability, simply do not provide this kind of control. This trend toward modular packaging of media which is accessible through hands on use equipment is evident at FAU and at other universities in the country.

Tarrant County College has an instructional mission, student body and faculty which are quite different from Florida Atlantic University. Tarrant County College is a junior college with three campuses serving the Fort Worth area. Over half of the college's offerings are technical programs such as drafting, nursing, and dental hygiene. The College is dedicated to a program and type of instruction which will provide the less academically motivated student with skills and knowledge to be a self-sufficient member of the Fort Worth community. The Learning Resources Division, which includes the Library and Media Department, is a central force in the College's attempt to achieve this mission. Paul Vagt, Dean of Learning Resources, articulated the philosophy of his Division in accepting responsibility for providing instructional resources which would meet the needs of students and faculty.

The teaching/learning process at Tarrant County College is pursued through a combination of classroom instruction and individualized learning laboratories. Equipment and furniture in the labs is highly flexible. Individual carrels and group stations contain the whole range of moveable a-v equipment. The preferred media formats are audiocassettes, slide/sound sets, and videocassettes. Whenever the Media Department produces a mediated learning module for a faculty member's classroom use, they also provide three copies for student use. The Media Department de-emphasized television production unless motion is required. The dial access audio, video system which was installed in 1969 in the new Learning Resources Center is being dismantled. The inflexible design of the system is incompatible with the instructional modes used by faculty.

When one compares the use of media at Tarrant County College (TCC) with Florida Atlantic University (FAU) an important distinction is apparent. Faculty at TCC are evaluated on the basis of the success of their instruction. The promotion, tenure, salary process is based solely on the quality of instruction. Media utilization has become an inseparable part of quality instruction at TCC. Evaluation of faculty at Florida Atlantic University is based on a combination of research and instruction. Faculty at FAU are much less likely to be rewarded for producing an effective mediated learning module. This distinction between instruction and research, and the reward system tied to it, is crucial to the effective use of media on college and university campuses. Partially for this reason, the junior and community colleges are far ahead of universities in the equal utilization of print and non-print resources.

Library Boards – An Endangered Species?

by Kenneth D. Shearer
School of Library Science
North Carolina Central University

I was saddened recently to learn that some of my favorite species — the orangutan, the blue whale, the mountain gorilla, and the slender horned gazelle — are on the endangered species list of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. As human domination of the other animals grows absolute, we grow nostalgic, depressed, or even fearful about the endangerment of one after another of our fellow species whose survival until recently seemed so secure. Today our sympathies, for many sound reasons, are easily aroused for the fate of endangered species.

Even in this current climate of opinion which generally looks with favor on the fate of all species, basic feelings about a particular species enter into an assessment of its merits. If mosquitoes, tarantulas, or water mocassins are ever endangered, it would be a pure act of mercy on my part to protest their diminishing numbers or their ultimate extinction. The only way to arouse my ambivalence toward a dying mosquito would be a convincing demonstration that human fate was inextricably bound to the pest.

But we are here to consider the face of the public library trustee, a species which we all find singularly likeable. I wonder, therefore, that so prevalent and admirable an American animal should find itself classified as an "endangered species."

Let me hasten to remark that a recent census of the species shows neither clear nor present danger. Mildred Batchelder wrote in 1969 that there were 61,000 American public library trustees extant.[1] This number, incidentally, is much larger than the number of public librarians distributed over the same land mass at this time. The picture of seeming good health of public library trustees also merged in a standard text on public library administration. In 1962, Joseph Wheeler and Herbert Goldhor stated that "more than nine-tenths of these [public] libraries, i.e., approximately seven thousand, are governed by boards of lay trustees."[2] Another

---

Amended version of an address given at the annual Library Trustee-Librarian Conference at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Institute of Government, March 25-26, 1974.

writer placed the figure at an even higher 95% based on a large survey of cities by the International City Managers Association.[3]

History

Not only are library trustees prevalent throughout the continent today, but they also have been with us longer than the public library as we know it. An antecedent of the public library, the social library of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, often had subscribers who elected a governing board to oversee the library. Ann Prentice writes that:

> The shareholders or association members elected some of their members to supervise the activities of the library for the group. These elected members responsible for the care and operation of the social library were forerunners of today's library trustees.[4]

Another nineteenth century experiment in providing library service to the general public came in the form of school district libraries which had trustees who reported to boards of education.[5] Finally, in the middle of the last century the municipal public library emerged and fairly quickly established a board form which remained relatively independent of city politics although it was appoined by the mayor and city council.

Furthermore, during the latter half of the nineteenth century the board-of-trustee form of governance became popular in many other municipal services including police and fire prevention services. General use of boards for municipal services has been abandoned in the twentieth century. Thus, the board has been in decline as a "species" in that fewer city departments are commonly governed or guided by boards than formerly. Some authors speculate that services which must deal with crisis situations — extinguishing fires in burning buildings or halting robberies — cannot afford to deal with citizens' boards; instead, their directors must be free to go directly to the local chief executive.

Studies Of Public Library Trustees

Serious analysis and research publications concerning the desirability of governing libraries by trustee boards are themselves a rather well established, if underpopulated, species. Nearly forty years ago there was an important investigation of the government of the public library which found that library boards, like nearly everything else in this life, had strong as well as weak points. Carlton Joeckel noted that boards had had success in protecting struggling new libraries from excessive political corruption, hastened library growth, and often provided enlightened leadership when the librarian could not or would not.[6] But he detected a misplaced provincialism on the part of trustees when larger and larger library systems were proposed in order to develop collections and expertise which could not be developed locally. Joeckel also scored library boards on the count of undemocratic representation in that the young and the poor, for example, did not serve on them. The observation that boards do not truly represent community composition is a theme that runs through the literature ever since Joeckel's work.

In a 1941 study entitled *Public Administration and the Library,* Miles and Martin set forth conditions under which, theoretically at least, cautious abandonment of strong library boards would be advisable.[7] The essential point which they made was that the manager-council form of government renders the use of public library boards less viable than they were under earlier governmental forms. Miles and Martin reasoned that if local government grows less corrupt and more skillful, all the while attempting to conduct affairs in accordance with a code of ethics, then the library board might no longer serve a useful purpose. Its role as a buffer, a buffer between the library and the dirty politics in town, would become obsolete. Professional managers would understand better than their predecessors the need for good public library service as a consequence of their professional education.

Similarly, as librarians grow more competent by virtue of improved education, library associations, certification programs, salaries and library science literature, public library executives, needing far less guidance and support in policy-making and administration than before, would emerge in increasing numbers. These public library executives would have the technical knowledge which would increasingly enable them to make better decisions on resource allocation and library system design.

The notion, incidentally, that the library board should act as a buffer between the library director and the harsh realities of city or county politics may have been less a result of a conscious analysis of how best to govern a library than an unconscious result of sex roles in a situation where the trustees were so very often men and the librarians so very often women. The use of boards for libraries and schools, but not for fire and police departments, does not undermine this hypothesis; certainly the buffer metaphor calls to mind the honorable gentleman stepping in to protect the frail lady from harsh circumstance.

After World War II as a part of a massive assessment of the public library in the United States, Oliver Garceau took a look at governance and reinforced Joeckel's work.[8] On balance, Garceau concluded that the library board was a reasonably strong governmental form which did, however, need to represent its community's social, economic and other groupings more closely and to recognize that very often good library service required resources far greater than could be assembled locally. More recent research by Morton Kroll, Raymond Carpenter and Ann Prentice, however, questions more and more insistantly whether the public library board is still necessary.

Since 1960 this research progressively has brought into question whether the board as a maker of policy, a source of library control and a holder of power is not like the human appendix, very much present but generally useless and sometimes a cause of pain. I have stated this last point in excessively strong terms to invite your attention to the fact that the threat to the library board species is a real threat. Some experts believe that the board more frequently obstructs rather than encourages good library service where both the librarian and the city or county manager are competent professionals. Morton Kroll urges a shift in the policy-making function from trustees to the legislative body of local political units, fully understanding that such a move would effectively leave most decisions in the hands of the librarian and the manager.[9] He further proposes that states make such a shift easily possible for local governmental units by altering state laws in this connection. This sort of reasoning conforms exactly with recent changes in North Carolina's public library legislation, as we will see.

But first let us reflect a bit more on the results of research into the role of the public library trustee. Donald Koepp recently studied how certain classes of major decisions are made concerning local public library service.[10] Seven California libraries which were in areas with the council-manager form of government and which served populations within the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas ranging from 50,000 to 100,000 people were included in his study. Six of these libraries had boards. One had none.

There is enormous variety in the manner of making decisions and the allocation of responsibility of making them. Some of the variety was a consequence of differences in regulations governing how decisions were expected to be made, but some seem to have just grown up. Koepp could not, as a result of his research, offer us a prescription on how best to govern public libraries. But he does thoughtfully dwell on the absence of real criteria on which to base such a decision. It is not known whether libraries should or should not have boards. If libraries do have boards, the question of the degree of autonomy which they should have is also

out with the jury. It may be a hung jury. If not, the case may go to a higher court.

Perhaps the answers to such questions can never be known. But it seems clear that systematic study could shed more light than we have now. On the other hand, a California councilman's observation about the irrationality inherent in resource allocation within communities may be generalizable to the question of who can best decide how to allocate resources within the community. This councilman said:

> There is not any rational way of deciding whether it is better to plant more trees in the downtown area or to buy more books for the library. And there isn't any rational way of deciding whether what Joe Blow does in the recreation department contributes more of benefit to citizens of this community than what Mary Smith does in the library.[11]

I don't know about you, but I am of two minds about such sentiments. While there is some truth in them, they also invite an inattention not conducive to honest government. Rational decision-making at some level may indeed be impossible, but the attempt at rational decision-making still is worth the price.

Recent Change In North Carolina Law

The case has already been made that as manager-council systems and librarianship come into increasing maturity, boards of trustees may do well to modify their functions and reduce their autonomy, or cease altogether. Attention to these general trends seems especially relevant to North Carolina trustees today in view of the previously alluded to changes in recent North Carolina public library legislation.[12] Fundamentally, this change now merely permits, where once it insisted upon, appointment of a board. Then if a board is appointed, the law states that the library board will be delegated all further powers by the city or county with the exception of the requirement to prepare two annual reports, one to the governing board for the local government and the other for the state library. This means that such other library board functions as were once customary and required in law such as appointment of the librarian, establishment of library policies and programs, supervision and care of library property, and budget preparation, for instance, belong to the board only if the local city or county governing body delegates these powers to their board.[13]

Thus the new legislation solidly places power over the government of the library in the hands of the governing body, if it chooses to exercise that power. The general national trends we have briefly surveyed most certainly could have influenced the current formulation of legislation concerning library trustees. It is not fully ascertained whether it did to any degree. From comments of a person close to state affairs, it appears that a major concern was to bring the general law into conformance with current practice. Special acts locally had already established less powerful boards than those established under the old law.

This new legislation can, over several years, invite great variation within North Carolina. There will be localities both with and without public library boards. Governments which do appoint or retain a board have increased flexibility not only in what functions they assign its members but also in the size the board will be (it can now be as many as twelve members whereas earlier it had to be exactly six).[14] Under these conditions a particular board may continue much as it did before this law was enacted; it may reexamine its own role and suggest change in its size or the purposes, or it may be assigned a new role by the local government.

From the point of view of an observer, public library trustees in North Carolina seem less likely to be threatened by extinction as a species than to be undergoing a profound mutation with the likely appearance, in the short term at least, of even more subspecies and varieties than before. It may be that one or more of

these new forms will be stronger than the others and that further down the road the situation will become more standard once again. Many boards will have less responsibility for the library's workings, but the case for the professional librarian together with a city or county manager handling these workings better than a lay board seems entirely credible, assuming, of course, checks and balances are included to prevent the obvious potential for abuse in this structure from being realized.

I would be less than candid if I did not remark that under the new law the library board may, like the old soldier, not die but slowly fade away. That is possible. But aside from the observation that probably many boards will indefinitely go on as before under the new legislation, there needs to be made visible here the outlines of a new subspecies of library boards I would like to see flower. It would be advisory and unconcerned with details of operation. Instead, it would concentrate its energies (in addition to the writing of the two annual reports required in the new law) to a two-lane road of advocacy.

The board would advocate: (1) creative use of the library by its public, and (2) a creative response to its public by the library. In the first role of advocacy it would provide spokesmen who would argue for the power of accurate information, clear thought, ancient wisdom and works of art to enhance the quality of life and community affairs. Moving in the other direction, important, but unrecognized, community needs for collections and programs would be identified; then the board would inform library management about these needs and would advocate that methods be adopted to answer them.

In the latter role, note that there is often a chance for lay people to point out a missed opportunity for public libraries to form special collections to attract new businesses or permit citizens to learn new skills, for example. I often wonder that those who know of child care centers do not explore with children's librarians ways to change these centers from merely necessary babysitting services into enriching educational services with social benefits to all concerned. Boards could also be helpful in the effort to make the library into a source not only of information related to the people's studies but also a source of direct practical information on where in the government and private bureaucracies help is to be found in coping with everyday problems.[15] This trustee role which we merely hint at above would involve an active, talented group of lay people working to insure that, insofar as possible, the public would get the best return on their library taxes. They would prevent the institution from growing apart from its only justifiable purpose.

More and more often neither the librarian nor the city or county manager are natives of the area they serve. At the same time the populations of political units, at least in most of the piedmont and western regions of the state, grow larger each year. Professionalism alone cannot remove the danger, and often increases the danger that public services will grow away from public needs. Or, almost as bad, will be perceived by the public as having done so. Centralization of government can invite a situation in which only the relatively sophisticated and esoteric work gets consistent attention. Responsible boards should be able to help prevent such developments.

But to be responsive as well as responsible, these boards would have to reach into many sectors of the community. A recent study of the public library trustee and his relationship ot library budgetting stated:

> The library trustee of 1970 had much in common with the trustee of 1935. Today's trustee . . . is white, male, with an average age of 53 years. . . . He holds a graduate degree and is employed in a professional occupation.[16]

Ann Prentice, who performed this research, also characterized those who are not on library boards:

> Almost totally unrepresented among the trustees are Blacks, those with a high

> school diploma or less, students at any academic level, craft and trade unions, and the unskilled or semi-skilled workers. In effect, the trustees represent a highly educated minority and do not reflect either the community or a large percentage of the library's patrons.[17]

I hope some of the experimentation in the near future in reforming North Carolina library boards will include more diverse community representation.

Conclusion

Consistent with the main thrusts of informed opinion on how to govern public libraries, the North Carolina legislature has permitted a considerable shift of power from local boards to other interested parties. It has also permitted latitude in electing to change from the former mandatory form.

This situation will invite many new hybirds. Some of them, as I have tried to hint, may be of even greater public service than their useful predecessors.

NOTES

[1]Mildred L. Batchelder, *Public Library Trustees in the Nineteen-Sixties*, ALTA Publication Number 4 (Chicago: American Library Trustee Association, 1969), p. 81.

[2]Joseph Wheeler and Herbert Goldhor, *Practical Administration of Public Libraries* (New York: Harper, 1962), p. 54.

[3]Mildred L. Batchelder, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

[4]Ann Prentice, *The Public Library Trustee: Image and Performance on Funding* (Metuchen: Scarecrow, 1973), p. 2.

[5]*Ibid.*, 2-3.

[6]Carleton B. Joeckel, *Government of the American Public Library* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935).

[7]Arnold Miles and Lowell Martin, *Public Administration and the Library* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941). Chapter VII, pp. 217-245, is entitled "The Board Form of Library Organization."

[8]Oliver Garceau, *The Public Library in the Political Process: A Report of the Public Library Inquiry* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1949).

[9]Morton Kroll, ed., *Public Libraries of the Pacific Northwest* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1960).

[10]Donald W. Koepp, *Public Library Government; Seven Case Studies*, University of California Publications: Librarianship, 6 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968).

[11]*Ibid.*, 179.

[12]The reader should see the *North Carolina General Statutes* (G.S. 153A, Article 14, 1973).

[13]The section of the law dealing with the board's powers and duties is quoted here:

> If a board of trustees is appointed, it shall elect a chairman and may elect other officers. The governing body may delegate to the board of trustees any of the following powers:
>
> (1) To formulate and adopt programs, policies, and regulations for the government of the library;
> (2) To make recommendations to the governing body concerning the construction and improvement of buildings and other structures for the library system;
> (3) To supervise and care for the facilities of the library system;
> (4) To appoint a chief librarian or director of library services and, with his advice, to appoint other employees of the library system. If some other body or official is to appoint the chief librarian or director of library services, to advise that body or official concerning that appointment;
> (5) To establish, a schedule of fines and charges for late return of, failure to return, damage to, and loss of library materials, and to take other measures to protect and regulate the use of such materials;
> (6) To participate in preparing the annual budget of the library system;
> (7) To extend the privileges and use of the library system to nonresidents of the county or city establishing or supporting the system, on any terms or conditions the board may prescribe;
> (8) To otherwise advise the board of commissioners on library matters.
>
> The board of trustees shall make an annual report on the operations of the library to the governing body of the county or city and shall make an annual report to the North Carolina State Library as required by G.S. 125-5. If no board of trustees is established, the governing body shall make the annual report to the State Library. G.S. 153A-266.

[14]The new laws reads:

> The governing body of a county or city may appoint a library board of trustees. The governing body shall determine the number of members of the board of trustees (which may not be more than 12), the length of their terms, the manner of filling vacancies, and the amount, if any, of their compensation and allowances. The governing body may remove a trustee at any time for incapacity, unfitness, misconduct, or neglect of duty.

[15]The reader interested in exploring this rich new concept of public library service is urged to start by reading Alfred Kahn, *et al.*, *Neighborhood Information Centers; A Study and Some Proposals* (New York: Columbia University School of Social Work, 1966).

[16]Ann Prentice, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

[17]*Ibid.*

New North Carolina Books

by William C. Burris
Professor of Political Science
Guilford College

ANN DEAGON. *Poetics South.* (Winston-Salem: John F. Blair, Publisher, 1974). Available in most book stores, $4.95.

Poets, like all creative artists, are not ordinary mortals. They see things in the mundane experiences of life that, for the most of us, remain unseen. The artist who publishes, be it music, fiction, poetry or whatever, must suffer the silences and blind stares of those who gaze but do not see, who read but do not comprehend. I am certain that many who turn the pages of this first collection of poems will not see what Ann Deagon sees. But, no matter. Poetry, once written, exists for its own sake. Who reads it or, for that matter, who likes it, is a secondary matter, perhaps another thing entirely.

Poetics South contains twenty-nine poems, some of which have appeared earlier in other publications. The poems speak of many things: Alabama railroad towns, a black man fleeing from the chain gang, a lover's touch, hospital rooms, old maids in Southern towns, cavorting goats, and, best of all, the celebration of life in the heartbeat of a living child. Some critics have slapped the "eroticism" label on Deagon's poetry. This is an exaggeration, if not a misreading, of what the poet is saying. Her effort is to capture the human condition, all of it, in words; she doesn't censor her muse (and Deagon listens to all nine of them) in response to any form of propriety. These poems spring from the full life of a many-talented woman; Southerner, mate, wife, mother, teacher, scholar, linguist, social critic, earth mother to lost souls, builder of fences. And last, a remarkably successful new poet from whom we shall hear again, "if nothin' don't happen."

WALLACE R. DRAUGHON. *History of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints in North Carolina.* (Durham: Durham Ward of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, 1974). Pictures, statistics, geneological tables. Order from the publisher.

This book represents the first effort of the Morman Church outside of the state of Utah to record its activities in book form. It is a historical account of the founding and growth of the church in North Carolina, particularly the Durham Ward. It is primarily a geneological work, valuable for those who need information about Morman missionaries who lived and worked in North Carolina. It would be of some historical value to anyone interested in the activities of one of the less well known religious sects in the state.

F. ROY JOHNSON. *Supernaturals Among Carolina Folk and Their Neighbors.* (Murfreesboro: Johnson Publishing Company, 1974). Illustrations by Judy Godwin Mizelle.

In the introductory essay of this volume the author explains why early settlers in North Carolina were so fond of storytelling . . . especially "idle tales of fairies and witches." Our folk tradition is rich with these yarns, and it seems to get richer as the years go by. Even in this day of electronics, instant communications, and rational thought, people persist in their appetites for stories of banshees, devils, and monster children. This book is a collection of such stories, many of which appear here in print for the first time. Most of them have come down by word-of-month and the author includes a bibliography which provides the names of the people from which the stories were obtained. North Carolinians who have a fancy for ghost stories will enjoy this book.

HELEN HILL MILLER. *Historic Places Around The Outer Banks.* (Charlotte: McNally and Loftin, Publishers, 1974). Photographs and Commentaries.

JOHN FOSTER WEST and BRUCE ROBERTS. *This Proud Land.* (Charlotte: McNally and Loftin, Publishers, 1974). Photographs and Poetry.

We owe a debt of gratitude to McNally and Loftin for publishing these two priceless volumes. Before too many years, if the industrial and commercial development of North Carolina continues apace, the beauty of the Outer Banks and the Western Mountains will remain only in books such as these. For those of us who live in the clutter and neon ugliness of the Piedmont, a trip to the Outer Banks or the Blue Ridge still provides a renewal of faith in the land and the sea. But each year the primeval beauty of our heritage slips away bit by bit . . . lost to the obscene quest for profit and progress.

Helen Hill Miller's photographs of the Outer Banks and her commentary on the life of the region will delight those who retain a fascination for this unique place. The photograhps of Bruce Roberts and the poetry of John Foster West capture the majesty of the mountains and the pride, simplicity, and toil of mountain people. The heritage of the mountains, too often forgotten now, can be perceived in the faces of Samuel Davidson, John Williams, Big Tom, Aunt Orlena, Sam Green, Pink Washborn, and the nameless mountain children standing in the doorways of crude log cabins. Every reader will share the poet's lament, "Why must we mountain folk go . . . vanish." These two slender volumes belong in every North Carolina library.

EDWIN ARTHUR WEST. *Elise High School and Upper Moore County.* (New Bern: Owen G. Dunn Co., 1974). Pictures, statistics, index. $10.00. Order from the author, 112 Spruce Street, Washington, N.C. 27889.

This book was commissioned by The North Carolina Presbyterian Historical Society and the Alumni Association of The Elise High School. It is a thoroughly researched and carefully documented account of one of the many private academies that flourished in North Carolina before the coming of state supported public schools. Private and church schools played an important role in education in North Carolina during the early days. Unfortunately, too little is written about them and they are remembered only by those who had some direct contact either with the institutions or with the courageous and dedicated people who operated and supported these schools. The book is also a county history; it gives an interesting account of the people who settled Moore County and the social, political, and industrial growth of this area of the state. Like many county histories, the organization and continuity of the book suffers from the inclusion of so many facts and details. But West handles this problem about as well as it could be handled, and his story is interesting and relatively easy to follow. The book is a valuable contribution to the history of education in North Carolina and to local history. The index has been carefully prepared, and will be useful to those interested in geneology.

North Carolina Library Education News

East Carolina University

Department of Library Science

The Department will be offering a series of two, three, and four week workshops this summer. This will allow library personnel on twelve month contracts to update and renew their training in short periods of time.

Available June 16-July 3 are courses in reference and bibliography of the social sciences. Two courses in the organization of media are available June 16-July 11. A seminar on public relations in libraries and an introductory course in educational television will be held June 30-July 11. Courses in field work and independent study are also available all summer with times to be arranged.

Later in the summer, July 14-August 1, courses in research techniques and selection of media will be available. Media for Children and Storytelling will run from July 14 through August 4. A course in multimedia production of materials will be conducted July 14-August 8.

Individuals who are not seeking a degree may enroll in these workshops by showing proof of an undergraduate degree and requesting application forms from the Admission Office, ECU, Greenville, N.C. 27834 or Dr. Gene D. Lanier, Chairman, Department of Library Science, ECU, Greenville, N.C. 27834. Persons seeking graduate degree credit should request application forms from the Graduate School at the same address.

Tuition for each workshop is $42 for North Carolina residents. On campus housing is available. Most workshops will meet two hours each day Monday-Friday. No Saturday sessions will be held.

FIRST SUMMER SESSION, 1975

001	*Research Skills*	June 16 - June 30	3:00 - 4:00	1
304G	*Introduction to Reference*	June 16 - July 3	8:00 - 10:00	3
306G	*Organization of Media: Class*	June 16 - July 11	10:20 - 11:50	3
307G	*Oragnization of Media: Desc*	June 16 - July 11	12:40 - 2:10	3
311G	*Field Work*	TBA	TBA	3
407	*Biblio Soc Science*	June 16 - July 3	12:40 - 2:40	3
470D	*Sem Lib Adm: Pub Rel*	June 30 - July 11	8:00 - 11:00	3
490A	*Independent Study*	TBA	TBA	3

SECOND SUMMER SESSION, 1975

001	*Research Skills*	July 21 - August 4	1:50 - 2:50	1
208	*Storytelling*	July 14 - August 4	10:20 - 12:20	3
217	*Media for Children*	July 14 - August 4	8:00 - 10:00	3
309G	*Selection of Media*	July 14 - August 1	10:20 - 12:20	3
311G	*Field Work*	TBA	TBA	3
488	*Research Technique*	July 14 - August 1	8:00 - 10:00	3
490B	*Independent Study*	TBA	TBA	3

Media Courses: First Summer Sessions, 1975

Educ 272	*Intr AV Instr*	June 2 - July 11	8:00 - 9:00	3
Educ 272	*Intr AV Instr*	June 2 - July 11	9:10 - 10:10	3
Educ 272	*Intr AV Instr*	June 2 - July 11	11:20 - 11:30	3
Educ 425	*Elem Sch Curr*	June 16 - July 11	8:00 - 9:30	3
Educ 480	*Intro to Research*	June 16 - July 11	8:00 - 9:30	3
Educ 480	*Intro to Research*	June 16 - July 11	10:30 - 12:00	3
Educ 492	*Intro to Educ TV*	June 30 - July 11	1:00 - 4:00	3
Educ 425	*Elem Sch Curr*	June 16 - July 27	3:00 - 6:00	3

Media Courses: Second Summer Session, 1975

Educ 272	*Intr AV Instr*	July 14 - August 21	8:00 - 9:00	3
Educ 321G	*Ed Comm Meth and Mat*	July 14 - August 21	9:10 - 10:20	3
Educ 374G	*Des Multi Med*	July 14 - August 8	11:30 - 1:00	3
Educ 423	*Hist Phil Educ*	July 21 - August 1	2:00 - 5:00	3
Educ 424	*High School Curr*	August 1 - August 5	1:00 - 4:00	3
Educ 425	*Elem Sch Curr*	July 14 - July 25	3:00 - 6:00	3

North Carolina Central University

School of Library Science

The School of Library Science is offering a course on Libraries and Legislation this semester. It is the first time a course on this subject has been offered here. Dr. Kenneth Shearer, an Associate Professor, who joined the faculty of the School this year is in charge of the course.

Several lectures have been offered to which the attention of the general public is drawn. All are welcome to attend and the talks will take place in room 205 at 2:25 p.m. on Tuesdays. There is limted parking for visitors in front of the Law School and more extensive space on Lincoln Street.

Mr. Michael Richmond, an Associate Professor of Law at NCCU, who holds degrees in both law and library science, spoke on "What Every Librarian Should Know About Law" February 4.

Ms. Rebecca Ballentine, the Director of the Institute of Government at UNC-Chapel Hill, delivered a lecture on "Library Laws in North Carolina" on February 25. In her talk, as in her research, the emphasis was on public libraries.

Dr. Alex Lodenson, Compiler of *American Library Laws* and Special Executive Assistant to the Board of Directors of the Chicago Public Library, spoke on "Library Laws in the United States" on March 4. Dr. Lodenson is an internationally recognized authority on this subject.

Mr. William Roberts, Director of Forsyth County Public Library, and Mr. William O'Shea, Director of Wake County Public Library were the speakers on "Helping to Shape Library Laws and Work with Legislators" on March 18.

Guest seminar speakers for the spring semester have been Joshua I. Smith, Executive Director, American Society for Information Science; Mrs. Sharon Bell Mathis, Author of the 1974 Coretta Scott King Award; Mrs. Barbara Bates, Editor, Children's Books, Westminster Press. Mrs. Amanda Rudd, Educational Consultant, Field Enterprises, will speak April 23, at 10 a.m. in Room 205, James E. Shepard Memorial Library.

Miss Eileen Cooke, Director of the Washington Office of the American Library Association lectured at the School of Library Science at North Carolina Central University on February 18.

Miss Cooke is responsible for relaying news of federal government activities to the ALA membership and supplying information and assistance to government agencies and Congress. She has gained the respect of her colleagues and members of Congress for the efficient manner in which she assists librarians in their contacts with Washington officials and works closely with state library associations.

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

School of Library Science

Mrs. Marian Orgain, Curator of Special Collections, University of Houston, delivered a lecture on "Adventures in Rare Book Collecting," January 29th. Mr. Joseph W. Lippincott, Jr., President of the J. B. Lippincott Company, delivered a lecture February 19th on "New Perspectives on Publishing."

Dr. Robert B. Downs, William Rand Kenan, Jr. Visiting Professor of Library Science, spoke about the "Impact of Books on History" at a public lecture in the school on March 26, 1975.

Dr. Downs, Dean Emeritus of Library Administration, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, is the author of numerous books on the influence of significant works on the modern mind. Representative of his publications are *Books that Changed the World, Famous Books, Ancient and Medieval, Books that Changed America,* and *Famous American Books.*

NCLA Section Activities

College and University Section

From Cullowhee, Asheville, and points west to Wilmington and points east some 125 North Carolina librarians came to Durham on March 6-7 for the Academic Library Collections Development Tutorial sponsored by the College and University Section of NCLA. Dr. Ralph Russell, East Carolina University, was chairman with Dr. Leland Park, Davidson College, as his co-chairman. Jayne Krentz, Duke University, was chairman of local arrangements.

Speakers for the sessions were: David Estes, Assistant University Librarian, Emory University, talking on "Development of Special Collections"; Dr. Ellis Tucker, Chairman, Department of Library Science, University of Mississippi, and Eugene Huguelet, Associate Librarian, East Carolina University, on "Approval/Gathering Plans for Collection Development"; Dr. H. Joanne Harrar, Associate University Librarian, University of Georgia, on "Staffing for Collection Development"; Mrs. Lucille Edwards, Materials Reference Consultant, College of DuPage on "Collection Development in the Community College." Dr. James Govan, University Librarian, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, on "Long Range Planning for Collection Development: The Swarthmore Experience." The banquet speaker was Dr. Robert B. Downs, Dean-Emeritus of Library Administration, University of Illinois and Visiting Professor, School of Library Science, University of North Carolina.

The excellent sessions and stimulating discussions met with favorable response from the participants. There was general agreement with the enthusiastic non-junior member who said, "This tutorial was like a spring tonic for my professional middle-agedness."

As this issue of *NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARIES* goes to press, the chairman of the section is in the process of appointing a nominating committee to present a slate at the Winston-Salem meeting in the fall. Officers to be elected include a vice-chairman and chairman-elect, a secretary, and two directors. Any suggestions sent to Mary Canada, Chairman, College and University Section, N.C.L.A., Reference Department, Perkins Library, Duke University, Durham, will be forwarded to the committee.

Junior College Libraries Section

The friends and associates of Mary Ann Kincaid, a librarian at Wingate College, are sadden by her death caused by an automobile accident several weeks ago. Mary Ann was a member of JCLS's Conference Committee. She will be missed by all who knew her.

The Section is tentatively planning a program on "Computers as Library Tools" for its regularly scheduled meeting at the NCLA Conference. It is hoped that a panel of people involved in making use of computers in library operations in junior colleges in this state can be secured.

Library Roundup

One of the nation's best reference collections on the events of the past 25 years has been acquired by WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY.

The acquisition comprises the news morgue and reference library of *THE REPORTER,* a magazine on world affairs published fortnightly from 1948 to 1968. (In newspaper vernacular a morgue is a file of clippings and photographs.)

Dr. Max Ascoli of New York, who founded the magazine and was its editor and publisher gave the collection to Wake Forest in memory of the late Dr. Camillo Artom, internationally known biochemist who was a member of the Bowman Gray School of Medicine faculty from 1939 until his death in 1970.

During the 20 years of The Reporter's existence, as many as six employees clipped the *NEW YORK TIMES, WALL STREET JOURNAL, CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, WASHINGTON POST, ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH* and other newspapers as well as some periodicals. After the magazine ceased publication in 1968 a reduced staff continued to clip these publications and file the material under appropriate headings.

The morgue is therefore up-to-date and constitutes a reference resource on the past 25 years.

The gift from Ascoli was announced by Dr. James Ralph Scales, president of Wake Forest. Scales also announced that MISS RUTH AMES, who began the collection and was librarian and director of research for *THE REPORTER,* will join the university library staff and will be archivist for the material.

Miss Ames is a graduate of the University of Utah and did work in library science at the University of Oregon. She began working for The Reporter in Washington in November, 1947, before the magazine began publication.

Wallace Carroll, former editor and publisher of the *WINSTON-SALEM JOURNAL and SENTINEL* and a consultant to Ascoli in the founding of *THE REPORTER,* arranged the acquisition for Wake Forest.

"This is one of the three or four best morgues in the country," said Carroll, "and no other university will have a research facility like it. Scholars who take advantage of this collection will be spared hours, days and even weeks of drudgery and eyestrain."

DR. MERRILL BERTHRONG, Director of the Wake Forest University Libraries, said that, until scheduled library renovations take place, the material will be housed in the corridor of the third level of Z. Smith Reynolds Library, where it will be available for supervised use by students and others. He said the collection will be kept up to date, though probably not to the same extent as in the past. Miss Ames will have

charge of supervision, maintenance and additions for the collection. She will begin work March 1.

The morgue consists of 173 file drawers of newspaper clipping classified and cross-referenced under subject headings, tear sheets of magazine articles and other material, on domestic and foreign politics, government and economics; social subjects such as health, housing, civil rights, education, conservation; business and finance; the arts; and other subjects. A biographical file covers about 1,000 personalities and includes articles and speeches. There is a file of leading columnists, and about 25 drawers of up-to-date pamphlets.

CHARLES B. LOWRY has been appointed to the Library Faculty of the UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHARLOTTE at the rank of instructor. Mr. Lowry is a recent graduate of the School of Library Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. He holds a B.S. degree from Spring Hill College, an M.A. from the University of Alabama, and is a Ph.D. Candidate in History at the University of Florida. He will be responsible for the coordination of the Atkins Library's reference and bibliographic services in the Social Sciences.

A $100,000 Trust Fund has been established for the UNION COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY by Dickerson, Inc. for the purchase of books and other related materials.

From SALEM COLLEGE LIBRARY: The new Library Lecture Series was initiated on November 21, 1974 with a talk on "The Originality of Greek Architecture" by Dr. Frank M. Lazarus, head of the college's department of classics.

From DUKE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY: WARREN P. BIRD has been named as director of the Duke University Medical Center Library, succeeding G. S. T. Cavanagh, who will remain at Duke as Professor of Biomedical Literature and Curator of the University's Josiah C. Trent Collection in the History of Medicine. The Reference Department's Committee on Library Instruction is conducting a literature search on material relating to the teaching function of librarians. Material since 1970 is of particular interest. Suggestions will be welcomed. MRS. ANNE STONE, librarian of the Undergraduate Library, is the president of the Librarians' Assembly — made up of the professional staffs of the Perkins system and the Medical Center Library. DR. MATTIE RUSSELL is visiting Associate Professor of Library Science at UNC-Chapel Hill, teaching a course this Spring in the Administration of Archives and Manuscript Collections.

From the UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT GREENSBORO LIBRARY: The annual Friends of the Library dinner is scheduled for April 3, 1975, featuring Dr. O. B. Hardison, Jr., Director of the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington.

From EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY: On December 1, 1974, the Joyner Library began classifying its new books according to the Library of Congress classification systems. Reclassification of the present collection began after February 1, 1975. MISS SHIRLEY TARLETON, Librarian of Winthrop College, is serving as a consultant to help get the project underway. Library Director RALPH E. RUSSELL has an article appearing in *THE LIBRARY SCENE'S* September, 1974 issue, entitled "Branch Library Policy Statement." The handsome new addition to Joyner Library is nearing completion and the staff hopes to begin the move over the Easter holidays.

From UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT WILMINGTON LIBRARY: The Friends of UNC-W presented a check to LENOX G. COOPER, library director, for $2,500 to purchase library materials. Acquisitions Librarian RONALD JOHNSON has been appointed to a two-year term on the Reference and Subscription Books Review Committee of ALA. The Rare Book Room

has been named for former library director, HELEN HAGAN.

From JOHNSON C. SMITH UNIVERSITY LIBRARY: The Charlotte Chapter of Links, Incorporated presented a United Nations flag to the library.

From APPALACHIAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY: CHARLOTTE ROSS is compiling an Appalachian Bibliography, which goes to press in January, 1975, and will contain over 9,000 items.

From UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL LIBRARY: DR. ISAAC COPELAND, Director of the Southern Historical Collection, was the speaker for the annual dinner of the Henderson County Friends of the Library. CHARLES H. STEVENS, executive director of the Southeastern Library Network (SOLINET) spoke to the library staff on the developments of the network, December 6th. Under the guidance of Humanities Bibliographer MILTON H. WOLF, the library is developing a Science Fiction and Fantasy Collection. University Archivist MICHAEL G. MARTIN, JR., spoke to the Davie Poplar Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. The North Carolina Collection has acquired a rare document, dating 1632, relating an unsuccessful attempt to establish a colony in Carolina three decades before the granting of the Carolina Charter in 1663. MRS. ELIZABETH HENDERSON COTTEN, a pioneer worker in the development of the Southern Historical Collection and later an employee in the North Carolina Collection, died in February. The widow of the late Lyman A. Cotten and sister of the late Archibald Henderson, she helped organize the Friends of the Library. DR. H. G. JONES, Curator of the North Carolina Collection, spoke on "Changes in Agricultural and Rural Living" at the Granville County Forum in Oxford.

From the DAVIDSON COLLEGE LIBRARY: DR. LELAND PARK addressed the faculty of the University of Evansville, Indiana, and the library staff of Tennessee Technological University in January.

DR. SHIRLEY TIPPETT JONES has been named Dean for Learning Resources at CRAVEN COMMUNITY COLLEGE following a two-year leave of absence to complete the Ed.D. degree in Adult and Community College Administration from North Carolina State University at Raleigh. Dr. Jones also has been named to the state committee for organizing the processing of non-print materials for the North Carolina Community College System.

SOURCES AND RESOURCES is the title of the newsletter from UNC-CHARLOTTE begun in January. Drop them a line if you are interested in getting on the mailing list.

The METROLINA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION's winter meeting in Charlotte featured MR. MORRIS KEA, Manager of Institutions, N. C. State Department of Corrections, who discussed the role of the library in the correction system.

Treasurer's Report

January 1, 1974 - December 31, 1975

Balance January 1, 1974			$16,394.94
Receipts:			
Dues		$ 4,881.93	
Association	$ 1,938.00		
Sections	2,943.93		
School Librarians	$ 337.00		
Public Librarians	39.00		
Trustees	372.50		
College Librarians	1,886.28		
Junior Members	31.00		
Resources and Technical	16.00		
Junior College	16.00		
Children's Services	246.15		
NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARIES		$ 2,819.65	
1973 Conference		10.00	
Interest		1,467.66	
Gifts		45.00	
Miscellaneous		39.15	
Total Receipts		$ 9,263.39	
Receipts Plus Balance			$25,658.33
Less Expenditures (See List)			20,831.17
Balance December 31, 1974			$ 4,827.16

FUND BALANCES AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1974

Checking Account	$ 4,827.16
General Fund Savings	17,743.24
Scholarship Fund Savings	11,481.77
Loan Fund Savings	3,165.00
Bond — $20,000 Federal Land Banks 7.4% 10/20/75 (General Fund 64%, Scholarship Fund 36%)	20,000.00
Total Resources	57,217.17

Date: January 31, 1975

Richard T. Barker, Treasurer

EXPENDITURES

January 1, 1974 - December 31, 1974

Executive Office — Salary	$ 2,157.97
Executive Office — Expenses	
Telephone	510.55
Postage	485.29
Printing and Stationery	675.31
Computer Charges	147.35
Supplies	12.91
Other Office Expenses	107.21
President's Expenses	461.58
Treasurer's Bond	125.00
Audit of Treasurer's Books	150.00
ALA Representative	107.22
1973 Conference	96.19
Sections	4,929.47
Governmental Relations Committee	133.72
Scholarship Committee	9.36
State Documents Committee	21.60
NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARIES	8,319.94
A.L.A. Dues	55.00
A.L.A. Washington Office	100.00
NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARIES Index	360.17
Scholarships and Loans	1,600.00
Spring Workshop and Executive Board Meeting	102.90
State Council for Social Legislation	100.00
Checks Returned	30.00
Miscellaneous	32.43
Total Expenditures	$20,831.17

NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Sections Balance Sheet — December 31, 1974

	NCASL	PLS	TRUSTEES	COLLEGE
Bal. Jan. 1, 1974	$4,209.85	$ 821.67	$ 406.68	$ 399.93
Receipts	337.00	39.00	372.50	1,886.28
Total	$4,546.85	$ 860.67	$ 779.18	$2,286.21
Expenditures	3,673.23	147.94	139.36	866.70
Bal. Dec. 31, 1974	$ 873.62	$ 712.73	$ 639.82	$1,419.51
Savings C. D.	$2,000.00	$ 0.00	$ 0.00	$ 0.00

	R & T	JMRT	JR. COL.	CHILD. S.
Bal. Jan. 1, 1974	$ 239.34	$ 116.57	$ 97.00	
Receipts	16.00	31.00	16.00	$ 246.15
Total	$ 255.34	$ 147.57	$ 113.00	$ 246.15
Expenditures	0.00	102.24	0.00	0.00
Bal. Dec. 31, 1974	$ 255.34	$ 45.33	$ 113.00	$ 246.15

NORTH CAROLINA LIBRARIES

Balance January 1, 1974		$ —7.32
Receipts		$ 8,327.26
Subscriptions	$ 500.65	
Ads	2,319.00	
Transferred from General Fund	5,507.61	
Total Balance and Receipts		8,319.94
Expenditures		8,319.94
Balance December 31, 1974		0.00

LOAN FUND

Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements
for the Twelve-Months Ended December 31, 1974

Balance at January 1, 1974	$ 3,000.00
Receipts: Interest	165.00
Disbursements	0.00
Balance at December 31, 1974	$ 3,165.00

Represented by Bank of North Carolina NA: Certificate of Deposit 11-0471

SCHOLARSHIP FUND

Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements
for the Twelve-Month Ended December 31, 1974

Balance at January 1, 1974	$10,954.65
Receipts: Interest	527.12
Disbursements	0.00
Balance at December 31, 1974	$11,418.77

Represented by Bank of North Carolina NA: Certificate of Deposit 37-0029
Savings Account 11-507632-20

GENERAL FUND

Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements
for the Twelve-Months Ended December 31, 1974

Balance at January 1, 1974	$16,835.81
Receipts: Interest on Savings Accounts	907.43
Disbursements	0.00
Balance at December 31, 1974	$17,743.24

Represented by Home Federal Savings and Loan Association

Savings Account 43932	$ 9,197.90
Savings Certificate 02545	$ 8,545.34