RESEARCH REPORTS IN UNIVERSITY AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Walter A. Kee

An attempt to present a thorough discussion of the selection and acquisition of research reports reminds me of a slogan printed on my teen-age daughter’s jacket: “Do you have a minute? Tell me all you know.” I am reminded of this slogan for two reasons: (1) the subject is a complex, many-faceted, rapidly changing one and a topic about which nobody, I suppose, has all the facts, and (2) I certainly lay no claim to being an expert, even though I am more than 100 miles from home.

Within the limits of my knowledge, I will present a brief outline of the recent growth of research, some effects of this growth upon the body of report literature, some problems of the government which inhibit reporting on research, efforts of the government to improve the flow of information, and a generalized discussion of the selection and acquisition of reports. I should state at this point that in my paper I will discuss primarily scientific and technical reports resulting from government-sponsored research and development. I have limited myself to this topic because it is one about which I have a modicum of knowledge.

All of you have been exposed to a surfeit of reading matter on the growth of research and on the information deluge. Almost every type of publication, from a scientific journal to a library journal to Readers’ Digest, seems to come up regularly with a hash, rehash, or re-rehash of one or both topics. At the risk of boring you, however, I shall present a few brief statistics on the growth of research since 1940. My purpose is to place in context some remarks concerning the report literature which will be discussed later in this paper.

This growth is summarized in a paper written by Dwight Gray of the National Science Foundation, in which the author notes, “Whereas just prior to World War II, U. S. expenditures for pure and applied science totaled less than $300 million, in Fiscal 1961 the amount was some $14 billion. It is estimated that the nation’s R&D (research and development) bill in Fiscal 1963 will be in the neighborhood of $18 billion, of which roughly two-thirds will come directly or indirectly from federal funds.” In 1962, total federal R&D funds were estimated at $9.5 billion; and of this amount, educational institutions were to

receive 11 per cent, or a little over $1 billion. In terms of basic and applied research, the amount spent in 1939-40 was $27 million, a figure which rose 2600 per cent to $734 million in 1957-58.2 The total government expenditure for basic and applied research in 1962 was estimated to be almost $2.3 billion, which represents a growth of 3700 per cent over the amount spent in 1939-40. Of this amount, based upon the actual 1961 statistics, the educational institutions were to receive 44 per cent, or slightly over $1 billion. It seems apparent, if my arithmetic is correct, that almost all of the funds available to educational institutions were spent for basic and applied research.

Unfortunately, no comparable figures exist for the expenditure of R&D funds by industry, nor for the portion of such funds made available to universities. A statement by Fred R. Cagle, however, clearly delineates the current situation:

Although the prosperity of much American industry is based upon knowledge produced by university-initiated research, corporations contribute relatively little to the support of scholarship in the university. In fact, much that they ‘contribute’ is provided in the form of rigidly defined research contracts that require specific services. Industry may not only specify narrowly limited research, but frequently expects the university to contribute substantially toward the costs.3

What does the future trend in R&D seem to be? The report Federal Research Projects and the Southern University, by Mr. Cagle, contains a number of interesting comments on this topic:

Based on changes to date, it seems reasonable that the future pattern of research support could include these developments:

1. Funds for research and training in science (including social science) and technology (available to universities) will be increased at least ten fold.
2. The social sciences will be provided an increased proportion of total research and training funds.
3. The international programs of universities, especially in science and technology, will be better financed.
4. Funds for university-associated research centers (or institutes) in many fields will be provided.
5. Institutional grants providing as much as 25 per cent of total project support will be made.
6. The project system will be continued and expanded to provide research support for university scholars in all fields.
7. Grants and contracts will pay the full cost of research as identified by the institutions.
8. Federal funds will be made more generally available for the purchase of equipment. The requirement of matching funds will be abandoned.
9. Funds for capital facilities will be provided by either loans or direct grants.

10. Funds will be provided for information centers in the universities.⁴

Immediately afterwards, however, he adds this note of warning: "The government will move in these directions only if the leaders of higher education present their problems clearly and emphatically, demand changes, and make politically feasible the actions required of Congress."⁵

What are the prospects for additional support from industry? Lloyd Berkner has stated that

... a great growth of industrial support must be generated. Industry stands to benefit directly from the ideas emergent from fundamental research. I think it is not too much to expect that ultimately something like 1 per cent of the gross output of American industry should be made available to the universities and related academic activities for their pure research as distinguished from the educational effort.⁶

It is evident from the foregoing data that funds for R&D have been increasing at a tremendous rate and will continue to increase rapidly for some years. No librarian needs to have explained to him what this increase has meant and will mean in terms of an increase in the report literature. As Dwight Gray has stated the problem,

Then came the deluge—of federal funds to support R&D, of the R&D these funds spawned, and of the information this R&D has generated. Most floods abate after a while; this threefold one hasn't. On the contrary these 'waters,' far from receding, have continued to rise.⁷

—and I might add, will continue to rise.

What direct financial help have university and research libraries received to support the acquisition and organization of this flood of literature? In his paper Mr. Gray states the thesis that since

... every research project uses information as an essential raw material... [and]... information is an important product of research, ... the processing and dissemination of the results of research—that is, of scientific information—is [sic] as integral a part of the total research sequence as experimentation is.⁸

But he goes on to say:

In neither case—fundamental or applied research—has the dissemination of the results of experimentation really been treated as an integral element in the research process. Thus, the system has had the basic defect that variations in the magnitude of the effort in the experimental phases of research are not accompanied
automatically by corresponding changes in the information handling and dissemination capabilities.\(^9\)

Mr. Cagle has this to say:

No provisions were made in any university for the diversion of income from project funds to support the libraries. Research budgets often included funds for the purchase of reference books, but these were not ordinarily placed in the university libraries.\(^{10}\)

A similar situation pertains, I am sure, relative to the acquisition of research reports. As the result of his contract a scientist receives reports on distribution, but few such reports, I suspect, ever find their way into the library collection. This statement is supported by numerous comments in Mr. Cagle's report to the effect that most universities have no central administrative control over research projects. They do not control the acceptance of contracts, the funding, or the administration. Therefore, it is safe to assume that, in general, universities have not established any centralized unit to receive and control incoming reports sent for project use or the reports generated by these projects. Mr. Cagle suggests that central control over research projects should be established and that

The federal agencies should adopt a policy that permits the individual applying for research funds to include the cost of library services as a direct cost. Ideally, perhaps such budgeted funds should automatically be diverted for support of the library.\(^{11}\)

While this policy has not been adopted, Public Law 87-638 does provide for a method of payment of indirect costs of research and development. The law states

That hereafter provision may be made in cost-type research and development contracts (including grants) with universities, colleges, or other educational institutions for payment of reimbursable indirect costs on the basis of predetermined fixed-percentage rates applied to the total, or an element thereof, of the reimbursable direct costs incurred.\(^{12}\)

Application of these principles would provide more adequate funding for libraries, would permit the hiring of sufficient staff to handle the reports collection, and would enable the university to establish centralized control over its report program: a central record of incoming documents and of reports generated on site.

Before going into a specific discussion of the selection and acquisition procedures for reports, I should mention a few problems, internal to the federal government, which make the selection and acquisition of reports by university and research libraries more difficult:
1. The wording of the contract clauses which discuss reporting requirements is indefinite and vague. As a result, contractors may report in an inadequate fashion, may issue only administrative reports (no scientific or technical ones), or perhaps may publish no reports at all.

2. Some agencies have no statutory requirement to disseminate information. For instance, the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) and National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) do have; the Department of Defense (DOD) and numerous other agencies do not. As a result, agencies which do not have such a requirement tend to think only of their own internal needs. They usually publish in small print runs, probably provide limited distribution, and may or may not send copies to the Office of Technical Services (OTS).

3. Prime contracts may not include a requirement for the submission of subcontractors' reports to the sponsoring agency. Senator Humphrey, as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, states in a memorandum to Congressman George H. Mahon: "ASTIA [Armed Services Technological Information Agency] receives practically no technical reports from the D.O.D.'s estimated 300,000 sub and lower tier subcontracts." The same situation holds true, to a greater or lesser degree, with the other agencies.

4. A substantial number of reports are never processed into any centralized report dissemination system. After one reads a recent report by John I. Thompson and Company, it is apparent that some agencies have no policy governing the distribution of reports and that some have antiquated policies, while in some the established policies are not being carried out. I would like to quote some figures from a memorandum of Senator Humphrey about the ASTIA situation. ASTIA is used as an example solely because this is the only agency which has assembled any reliable data: "ASTIA receives less than 19% (27,000 technical reports per year) of the total reports produced by D.O.D. prime contractors and associate contractors." I suspect that data from other agencies, if they were assembled, would not indicate a very spectacular record for these agencies either.

5. The declassification program of some agencies leaves much to be desired. There are no programs for a regular review of the classified publications and for downgrading that information which no longer endangers the national security. In addition to the security classifications, certain agencies assign "Official Use Only" and "For Military Use Only" markings to a substantial number of documents. A look at the titles of some reports with such markings makes one wonder what is so official about
them or how proprietary rights could be involved. An associated problem is that unnecessary fragments of classified or proprietary information are included in reports which might otherwise have been issued as unclassified, readily accessible reports. Unfortunately, it is much easier to stamp a restrictive marking on the report originally than it is to remove it later.

6. Insufficient monetary and administrative support of some of the federal information programs is another factor. As Senator Humphrey stated, "Despite its significant service its [ASTIA's] role has been construed by higher authority as a relatively limited one; its manpower, space and other resources have been consequently restricted." The same comments can be made about numerous other agencies. Dwight Gray has attempted to provide some estimate of the adequacy of the monetary support of information programs. He states that identified information funds in the government total 1 per cent with perhaps 1 per cent of unidentified funds:

making total federal expenditures for scientific information of the order of 2 per cent, plus of the [federal] R&D budget . . . . Allowing for the present inadequacies of both public and private scientific information systems, one might estimate 4 to 5 per cent as a minimum order-of-magnitude portion of R&D funds that could justifiably and effectively be devoted to the control and dissemination of the results of research.

7. Lack of appreciation by scientists and management in government (and, indeed, in general) of the importance of information is another contributing factor. Dwight Gray states that

whereas this kinship [information and research] actually is a blood-relation kind, information has been treated by the overall research and development community as a slightly suspect in-law or a cousin several times removed.

8. Research and development is oriented within an agency, as it should be, primarily towards the agency's mission. Unfortunately, in some instances, the information generated from such R&D is considered to be of interest only to the sponsoring agency. To quote from a recent report prepared by John I. Thompson and Company under a contract with the National Science Foundation (NSF):

There is no coordinated, Government-wide policy for the dissemination of scientific information . . . . In the absence of overall standards or guidelines for research reporting, such department or agency establishes its own policy. The differences in interpretation, among these various agencies,
of what constitutes technical reporting results in failures to reproduce and distribute certain categories of reports. . . . Nonavailability or delay of such information can cause serious delay in the advancement of other current research projects.18

So far, I have presented a brief description of the growth of research, the growth of the report literature, and some problems within the government which militate against report dissemination. Let us now take a look at the current announcement and acquisition situation.

About 90 per cent of the reports generated as the result of government-sponsored research and development are issued by DOD, NASA, and AEC. The remaining 10 per cent of the reports are issued by a relatively large number of agencies. The DOD announces some 27,000 unclassified, unlimited distribution reports annually, covering the areas of physical sciences, engineering, technology, and social sciences, in the Technical Abstract Bulletin (TAB) issued by ASTIA. One of the difficulties in using TAB is that ASTIA also announces classified reports with unclassified titles and limited distribution reports in addition to unclassified ones in this publication. Care must be taken during the selection process not to select such material unless a university has contracts which will permit the acquisition of classified reports.

Each issue of TAB contains descriptor (subject), source (corporate author), and report number indexes. Beginning with January 1963, these indexes will be cumulated quarterly, semiannually, and annually. The public availability information is given with the abstract in the unclassified (white) portion of TAB. In July 1962, ASTIA began the reissuance of its classified TAB. This journal will follow the same indexing pattern as the unclassified version. The classified edition is available only to government agencies and their contractors who have a "need to know."

However, as stated previously, ASTIA receives only about 20 per cent of the unclassified reports issued within the DOD, so that if ASTIA received all of the reports, the total would be some 135,000 a year. Some estimates place the figure for unclassified, classified, and limited distribution reports as high as 300,000. A special task force has been set up within the DOD by the Secretary of Defense to study the total information system. It appears that, as a result of this study, directives will be issued to ensure the receipt of reports by ASTIA, and efforts will be made to improve the position of ASTIA within the management hierarchy, to provide additional space, and to provide additional manpower. ASTIA has had some additional positions allotted to it in Fiscal 1963.

NASA, of course, is still developing its information program, although in many aspects it will resemble that of the AEC. It has
established a centralized information system through which all NASA laboratory and NASA-contractor reports as well as pertinent non-NASA reports of the United States and other countries are announced in Technical Publications Announcements. It was estimated that 15,000 to 20,000 reports would be announced during 1962, and it is projected that some 25,000 will be announced during 1963 since NASA is developing procedures to ensure the receipt of contractor reports and to establish exchange programs with foreign countries.

In January 1963, NASA began to support the publication of International Aerospace Abstracts, which is published by the Institute of Aerospace Sciences. This journal will cover the published literature and will complement the Technical Publications Announcements. NASA will produce the indexes for both publications by computer so that complete indexes will be included in every issue of both journals with quarterly, semiannual, and annual cumulative indexes. The public availability information for reports will continue to be included with the abstracts in Technical Publications Announcements. These two journals will provide rather comprehensive coverage of this body of literature.

NASA also issues a publication which announces classified publications, Confidential Technical Publications Announcements. After January 1963, it will be issued in the same pattern as the unclassified journal. The classified version is available only to government agencies and their contractors who need this information and who have justified this need through the proper channels.

The AEC announces the major portion of its unclassified reports in Nuclear Science Abstracts (NSA). NASA includes the reports of the Commission and its contractors, other government agencies and their contractors, foreign government agencies, and nongovernmental organizations both in the United States and abroad. Currently, NSA is announcing some 6,000 unclassified reports but eventually may announce 8,000 to 9,000 a year. This growth will result partly from improved programs ensuring the receipt of all AEC generated reports, but to a large extent from an active exchange program under which the AEC receives reports of other atomic energy agencies throughout the world.

Each issue of NSA contains a subject, corporate author, personal author, and report number index. This latter index contains information on public availability, including sales price from OTS and availability at AEC depositories. These indexes are cumulated quarterly, semiannually, annually, and quinquennially. The cumulative report number index, published annually, contains a listing of reports announced in all volumes of NSA and its predecessor Abstracts of Declassified Reports. The AEC also publishes, irregularly, Research and Development Abstracts, which announces publications that describe
AEC-sponsored R&D which does not fall within the scope of NSA. The indexing pattern is identical to that of NSA.

Classified and limited distribution reports are announced in Abstracts of Classified Reports. This journal is available only to the AEC and its contractors and to those other government agencies and their contractors who can justify an official "need to know." The AEC also issues special lists of bibliographies and translations, a bibliography of bibliographies, a bibliography of translations, and other publications that are useful in the selection process.

The remaining 10 per cent of reports are issued by a large number of government agencies. Some of these reports are announced in the Monthly Catalog of U. S. Government Documents, others in U. S. Government Research Reports, some only in publications issued by the sponsoring agency, and some are not announced publicly in any manner.

There are a number of problems involved in using the announcement services listed above for selection purposes.

1. The reports are announced in broad subject categories which, in theory, should simplify the selection process. However, each report is listed only in its primary category even though it may also contain information belonging in other categories. Therefore, to be sure one is selecting all pertinent information on a subject, he cannot rely solely upon scanning a category but must search the subject index.

2. There is no standardization of categories or subject headings among the services. The user must become familiar with the format of each publication. A start on standardization has been made, however, through the request of ASTIA for interagency assistance in preparing the new edition of its Thesaurus, due in December 1962. Also the Datatrol Corporation recently issued a report entitled, Experimental Study of Convertability between Large Technical Indexing Vocabularies, which was prepared under a contract with NSF. Additional studies and programs along this line undoubtedly will be forthcoming. Recommendations for a government-wide announcement system based upon a standard thesaurus were made in the recent report published by Thompson:

A more practical solution, therefore, would be the establishment of one central announcement system which would cover all new reports generated through Government research and which would furnish announcements to Government R&D activities, their contractors and their grantees . . . . Further the announcement service should be made available to the general public under a payment-for-service plan. \(^{20}\)
3. The announcement and retrospective searching functions are combined into one publication. In my opinion, in order to be most effective, each of these two functions requires a different style of presenting the information. Additionally, the preparation of the abstracts and indexes delays the announcement of new reports since a longer publication cycle is required for this type of journal. A separate announcement publication can be issued promptly.

4. The large number of announcement publications makes it almost an impossible task to scan them all.

5. With the anticipated growth in the number of reports being issued, the selection process will become increasingly difficult.

Some progress has been made in establishing a government-wide announcement system. Beginning in July 1961 the U. S. Government Research Reports (USGRR) began to announce all unclassified NASA and AEC reports, unclassified, unlimited distribution ASTIA reports, and reports of other agencies. Efforts are being made to include all reports of government-sponsored research and development in this publication.

Unfortunately, at present, USGRR consists of one listing which includes older military, AEC, and NASA reports and a second listing which is a reproduction of the unclassified portion of TAB. This arrangement requires two separate report number indexes and two subject indexes in each issue. At present, the Office of Technical Services is issuing only a semiannual cumulative index to USGRR. In order for one to obtain a consolidated index to USGRR, it will be necessary for ASTIA, NASA, and the AEC to establish a standard or convertible system of subject headings or descriptors. To issue such an index promptly, it probably will be necessary for these agencies to provide duplicate computer tapes or decks of IBM cards to OTS.

A more recent publication to be issued by OTS is its Keywords Index, a permuted title index, the first issue of which was published in June 1962. Since the indexing for this semimonthly journal is prepared on a computer directly from the titles, it is possible to merge all reports into one consolidated listing. This publication, however, is not particularly useful as a selection device. The reports are not arranged in subject categories but are scattered throughout the publication under many keywords.

An OTS publication which may be useful in identifying translations of foreign reports is Translations Monthly, which announces translations of government agencies, industry, universities, and commercial firms of the United States and abroad and those acquired by overseas translation centers. Each issue contains author, subject, journal, and number indexes, which are cumulated annually.

In part, this listing duplicates the announcement of reports covered by the other services, including some translations. However, it is necessary to check the Catalog if a library wishes to be thorough in its searching for new reports.

Under the "Depository Library Act of 1962" each component of the government is required to submit to the Superintendent of Documents a monthly list of all documents issued, except those required for official use only, those required for strictly administrative or operational purposes which have no public interest or educational value, and those which are classified. The Superintendent of Documents may select any titles from these lists for distribution to the depositories.

At the request of the Public Printer an interagency committee has been established to work out the details for implementing this program. Numerous problems exist: (1) Shall only the publications issued by field and departmental printing plants be included, in addition to those printed by GPO, or shall those published by contractors of governmental agencies also be included? (2) Will reports be included as part of the GPO depository collections and, if so, will agencies, such as the AEC, have to supply full-size copies of those reports they now issue only in microform? It seems evident that in the future the Catalog will announce many more publications than it is currently announcing. It may or may not announce reports, depending upon the definition by the Public Printer of what constitutes a public document.

The services just discussed, of course, are the primary announcement publications which cover the major portion of government-sponsored research and development reports. However, the balance of the reports are announced in annual bibliographies, accessions lists, announcements, journal publications, press releases, and a variety of other media. Additionally, industry, universities, and private institutions throughout the world also use a variety of media for announcing their reports. In my opinion, it is utterly hopeless and fruitless for any university or research library to attempt to scan all of the possible announcement sources. My recommendation is one which all of you follow, I am sure, that is, for a library to decide precisely in what subject areas it will support educational and research programs and then to search only the major announcement publications which list reports in the pertinent areas. With the greatly expanded coverage one may expect from the government abstracting services over the next few years, these publications should announce most of the reports resulting from government-sponsored research. In addition to these services, the library should identify a few major non-governmental organizations which do research in the selected subject areas and obtain their announcement publications. Beyond this clearly delineated selection program, the library should rely upon specific requests to determine the other reports it needs.
Now we come to the crux of the matter, how to obtain reports once a library has made a selection. There are, of course, numerous channels through which a university or research library can obtain reports. Let us take a look at a few of these.

One channel through which a university can obtain unclassified and/or classified reports is as the result of having government or industrial research contracts. The sponsoring agency generally will provide reports needed to support such research. For Department of Defense contracts, the sponsoring agency may provide some reports directly and can arrange for the university to receive reports from ASTIA by having it submit a Field of Interest Register through the cognizant military contracting officer. Both classified and unclassified ASTIA reports are distributed in accordance with a category arrangement. NASA reports can also be obtained as the result of having a contract. It is possible to be placed on the distribution for all unclassified reports, all classified and unclassified reports, or on special distribution for specific categories. Currently only NASA "in house" reports are being distributed, but it is planned to add contractor reports, many of them of them on 5" x 8" microfiche, to the distribution system. It will be possible, however, for official requestors to obtain full-size copy of reports originally supplied in microfiche. Nonprofit organizations can be placed on the distribution for unclassified NASA reports even though they have no contracts. At the present time, contractor reports will not be distributed to such organizations, although they may be able to borrow a copy from NASA Headquarters in Washington. Requests for loans of foreign reports or translations also may be addressed to Headquarters.

The AEC distributes both its classified and unclassified reports by a category distribution system. Contractors can be placed on distribution by submitting a request through the appropriate operations office. The AEC distributes about 25 per cent of its reports in full-size copy and 75 per cent on microcards. New reports are evaluated, and those considered to be more important are printed in full-size. However, a contractor can obtain a full-size copy of a report, available in its collection only on microcard, by submitting a request to the Division of Technical Information Extension. As part of the distribution, a contractor receives Nuclear Science Abstracts, Abstracts of Classified Reports, if appropriate, other bibliographic publications, reports received from abroad, and translations.

Other government agencies have a variety of systems for distributing their reports. A review of the Thompson report clearly points up this fact. Some make a distribution "in house" only, some distribute "in house" and to certain other government agencies, some have special distribution lists for each report or series of reports, and some make no distribution outside the local issuing component.
Additionally, some agencies, such as the National Institute of Health (NIH), issue no reports but the results of all their research are published as journal articles.

The universities can help themselves in accumulating a collection of reports received through such research contracts. There are at least two do-it-yourself projects. The first is for each university to establish a contract administrator. As Mr. Cagle stated in his report,

Few institutions have assigned responsibility to a single position in the university for maintaining an overall view of the sponsored programs and their interaction with the established, continuing university programs.22

Such officials could arrange with the agencies to have all incoming reports sent to the library and all reports generated on campus distributed by the library. Probably this practice would require the establishment of a reports center and additional manpower.

This brings us to the second self-help project. The universities can, by acting in concert, convince the government agencies that a portion of research funds should be allocated to library support. Thus, funds would be available to procure additional reports, to obtain needed equipment, and to provide the additional manpower.

A second method of obtaining reports, of course, is by procurement. The Office of Technical Services currently makes available all unclassified, unlimited distribution ASTIA reports since it receives these reports on 35mm microfilm, all full-size unclassified NASA "in house" reports. OTS is negotiating to receive all contractor reports on microfilm, all AEC unclassified reports either in full-size or on microfilm, and certain reports from various other agencies. Additionally, OTS makes every effort to obtain older ASTIA reports which were not released publicly. In general, reports must be ordered individually, but a standing order may be placed for all AEC reports or those in any subject category. All purchases can be charged to an institution's GPO deposit account.

The storage of all reports in reproducible microcopy enables OTS to keep all reports in print. With the reproduction facilities available at OTS, requestors now can choose to receive either microfilm or full-size copy of reports in the OTS files.

The unclassified AEC reports also are available on microcards from Microcard Editions, Inc. It is possible either to place a subscription for all reports issued every month or to purchase individual reports. Full sets of reports issued to date are also available.

Of course, reports available from the Superintendent of Documents can also be purchased on a GPO deposit account. Under the new depository library program, it is possible that additional reports may be announced in the Monthly Catalog. Copies of such reports will
have been obtained for distribution to the GPO depositories and, I suppose, some extra copies will be procured for sale. To express a personal opinion which has no official status, I sincerely hope that arrangements can be worked out to keep the report sales and depository system separated from the GPO sales and depository program. That is, any reports identified by GPO (from the lists) will be turned over to OTS for inclusion in its sales and depository system. In addition to establishing more comprehensive reports collections in the Regional Technical Reports Centers, this procedure will establish one sales agent for reports and will keep reports "in print" since OTS has microfilming facilities and GPO does not.

This statement leads us to a discussion of the next method of obtaining reports. That is the depository library system, or I should say systems, since each agency has established its own system independently of any other.

At the present time, there are 604 GPO depository libraries, but under the new depository act the total eventually could become about 1,200. A number of these new depositories undoubtedly will be established in universities. A particularly interesting feature of the new Act is one that provides for regional depositories to be designated in each state. Such libraries will have to retain all documents permanently either in full size or in microcopy while regular depositories can dispose of documents after retaining them for 5 years. This arrangement will enable the regular depositories to stabilize the size of their GPO collections and to rely upon the regional depository for the interlibrary loan of documents not in their collections.

The Regional Technical Report Center program is a relatively new development established under the programmatic management of OTS. Each of the 12 centers will receive 35mm reel microfilm of ASTIA reports, full-size and 5" x 8" microfiche (sheet microfilm) of NASA reports, full-size and microcards of AEC reports, and full-size of 35mm reel microfilm of the reports of other agencies. It is obvious from the above statement that a lack of standardization exists in the type of microcopy, but not as obvious is the fact that there is no standardization in reduction ratio. These centers are required to provide reference service and interlibrary loan service and either to reproduce copy, as required, or to obtain such copy from which universities can obtain needed reports.

ASTIA has no depository library system of its own, but as has been stated previously, NASA will distribute all of its unclassified reports, or only those in certain categories, to universities which need this information.

The AEC has operated a depository library system for some years. Presently there are 87 depositories in the United States (12 of which are also Regional Technical Report Centers) and 88 depositories overseas in some 63 countries. Each depository receives a
collection of reports consisting of about 25 per cent full-size copies and 75 per cent on microcard. A depository is expected to provide reference service and to loan the full-size copy and microcards. For loan purposes each depository can obtain full-size copy of reports available in its collection only on microcards.

Although the emphasis of this Institute is upon procedures, I want to state what, in my opinion, should be the basic philosophy of university and research libraries with regard to report selection and acquisitions. It is this: libraries should exercise more care in selecting and acquiring reports than any other type of literature and should maintain a continuous program of weeding. What are my reasons for making this statement?

1. The number of available reports is expanding rapidly. The present production is estimated at 100,000 a year but may soon total 150,000 to 300,000. Various programs within the government will make a much larger percentage of this production available to the public.

2. The reports will continue to remain available. The microfilming program at the Office of Technical Services will keep reports "in print." The Government Printing Office regional depositories and Regional Technical Reports Centers will provide a continuing source of interlibrary loans.

3. Reports in general are relatively ephemeral. Numerous studies have shown that about five years after issuance most reports have little reference value. The information has been superseded or incorporated into some more permanent form of publication. Reports are neither literary masterpieces nor rare books and should not be treated as collector's items.

First, libraries should use prudent judgment and select and acquire reports in only those subject areas needed to support the research efforts of their organizations. Second, even within these subject areas an attempt should be made to acquire reports on a selective basis. To state it another way, academic libraries should not try to be comprehensive in their acquisition of reports from all sources within the subject areas. Rather, they should establish a basic collection of reports and place greater reliance upon procuring other reports as needed or upon obtaining them through interlibrary loan.

The handling of reports, once received, should be as simple as possible. Almost all of the reports will have been brought under bibliographic control by U. S. Government Research Reports, Nuclear Science Abstracts, Monthly Catalog of U. S. Government Documents, Technical Publications Announcements, Technical Abstract Bulletin, and Technical Translations. In my opinion, it is just as unthinkable to consider cataloging all reports as it is to consider cataloging all journal articles. The report indexes should be used for searching the
report literature just as journal indexes are used to search the journal literature. I should explain that, whatever they are, reports are not serials. They will not arrive in nice, neat numerical sequence as serials do. There are a number of reasons for this situation: all reports—classified, unclassified, or limited distribution—are issued in one numerical sequence; some reports are delayed in being issued; numbers are assigned to certain reports which are never published; and reports originally issued as classified may be declassified and made publicly available at a much later date. Therefore, gaps will appear in the number sequence of any report series, particularly in a collection of unclassified reports. It is not recommended that reports be bound in volumes like journals or other serial sets. All that one needs, at most, is a simple record of holdings. For reports some libraries are using check-in cards similar to those being used for serial records. A card is prepared for each series of reports; for example, AD, ANL, ORNL, NASA. Other libraries prepare a shelf-list card, containing only the report number, title, and date for each report. These records can be prepared by the receiving group (acquisitions, serial, or document unit), and the reports can be placed directly onto the shelves without processing them through the cataloging unit.

Cataloging may be worthwhile for certain special items received as part of report collections, such as proceedings of conferences or symposia and translations of complete books or complete volumes of journals. These publications have more permanent reference value and undoubtedly will receive more extensive use if they are fully cataloged. Some libraries procure a second copy of such reports for cataloging rather than to remove any reports from the report collection. Others catalog the original copies and place a notation of the call number on the appropriate cards in the shelf list for reports.

In summary, the research and development effort is continually expanding, and as a result the accumulation of report literature is growing rapidly. Certain programs in the government will make a much larger percentage of the reports available and thus additionally increase the body of report literature. Congressional pressure and agency action give promise of better bibliographic control of this literature, better and continuing availability of reports for purchase, and systems of regional depositories from which reports can be borrowed. In the light of these developments, university and research libraries would be well advised to carefully assay their need for reports. The collection should be limited to those subject areas and in that depth needed to support the on-going educational and research efforts. Since reports are, to a substantial degree, relatively ephemeral and are being brought under increasingly better bibliographic control, they should not be given full cataloging treatment. As in the case of
journals, searching should be performed by using the appropriate abstracting and indexing services.
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