Collection Development and Nonprint Materials in Academic Libraries

MITCHELL WHICHARD

Introduction

COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT FOR nonprint or audiovisual software is not simply a matter of purchasing slides, records, audiocassettes, video, film, or computer software. It is also the selection and evaluation of the appropriate equipment or technologies. It is defining whose role it is to make those selections. Establishing how the audiovisual (AV) collection fits into the overall scheme of an academic library's mission is an important factor, as is planning for the effective long range use of AV software, whether as library tools or as educational supplements.

The purpose of this article is to explore the above principles by presenting some general ideas on how to formulate a collection development policy for audiovisual materials in academic libraries. Several basic questions must first be raised about collecting nonbook materials for academic libraries: Why should academic and research libraries become involved with nonprint materials at all? If they do, should collection policies for audiovisual software be directed only at supplementing faculty classroom needs, or can they be used as a resource for academic research? Should there be separate funds for AV materials, or can existing book funds be stretched to purchase these expensive items? Should all librarians be equipped to select AV materials, or should it be the job of faculty/librarian committees or one "media specialist"?

There are other concerns, including the need for a reasonable amount of planning for storing, cataloging, and circulating materials. However, two other considerations are perhaps the most important for

Mitchell Whichard is Nonprint and Reference Librarian, Robert B. House Undergraduate Library, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

academic libraries developing AV collections. The first is the danger of building in obsolescence—of devoting too much of a library's AV funds and technology to too narrow a range of software and machinery. The other involves the temptation to expand into media only to meet transitory user demands for more of everything, thus overlooking the need to plan carefully how a collection grows. Both can contribute to the notion of a library media collection as an arcade.

Why Collect Media in Academic Libraries?

While preparing this article, I discussed with a friend and colleague the possibility of applying for the videotaping rights for a PBS program—"Civilization: Heritage of the Jews"—from the Television Licensing Center (TLC). When we asked one professor whether he could make use of the program in his classes, his response sounded familiar—everything he saw on television was for entertainment. He undoubtedly did not intend his statement to be interpreted as some kind of broad indictment of nonbook materials, but the underlying assumption was that printed sources are a presumably superior medium of information for academics and researchers, and for their students as well. It would be pointless to pursue this line of reasoning any further. If an academic or librarian prefers the printed word to any other source of knowledge, media librarians should not take it upon themselves to challenge such opinions. Their immediate task must be to search for ways to fulfill the curricular needs of the university community in the best and most practical ways possible.

Those faculty whose pedagogic and philosophical perspectives are flexible enough to adapt to sources other than books will embrace many new learning tools. Indeed, they will often suggest themselves that the library investigate a variety of intellectual resources.

Much more important considerations for libraries and their development of media collections are such mundane issues as:

1. Establishing what the media needs of an institution are.
2. Integrating those media needs into the general collection-development policies of the library.
3. Making the existing AV budget stretch as far as possible while at the same time developing new funding resources for media that do not always compete with book dollars.
4. Establishing a priority system for selecting materials, and for rotating the materials requests among the various disciplines.

5. Developing a clear-cut idea of what general selection practices for the library already exist.
6. Formulating a media software collection-development policy that reflects understanding of the rapidly changing trends in technology and software.
7. Having a collection-development policy that indicates what purpose media should play in an academic library.

This last goal will be the most difficult to achieve. In academic libraries an entrenched feeling for the research and scholarship methods that employ books is still a major barrier for those interested in adding media collections to the library. Nonbook materials have been slow to gain full acceptance from some academics. Nevertheless, every new media format has had to undergo a period of skepticism and confusion about its value before gaining acceptance. Some formats historically referred to as nonprint materials—e.g., maps, realia, and the micro-forms for journals and periodicals—have become more readily accepted. Learning resources that require machines often encounter a built-in resistance at first, and university faculty and researchers can sometimes be more afraid of them than their students. This fear may make it difficult to convince academics that a film or videotape is as valid an intellectual tool as a book or journal.

Building a media collection requires careful planning. The research needs and goals of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) member schools, for instance, are hardly the same as those for other colleges and universities. Part of any collection-development process must be the evaluation of whether a library's patrons have a real need for media, and what overall profile the library has as a research or teaching institution. Use patterns must be thoughtfully considered for all materials acquired and equipment needs adjusted accordingly. Like books, AV software gets lost, worn, or damaged, while machines break down or wear out. Because of the relative expense of the formats and equipment, one can see how media might become a great "black hole" of wasted dollars, space, and working hours. The planning aspect of collecting AV materials consequently becomes even more vital. Collections should not expand just to meet short-term demands by a constituency as transient as that of a university. A constant guessing-game mentality may be required: What are the maximum benefits for library users if we buy this film or that video? Will buying so much of format x over y mean we paint ourselves into a costly, obsolescent software and technology corner? Is the purpose and mission of the library being needlessly altered for the sake of technological and media materials' "trendiness"? These

questions require that academic librarians look to a number of sources for guidelines and information.

Library Literature

Library literature on the subject of collection development of audiovisual materials is hard to obtain. Perhaps the most succinct analysis of what constitutes AV collection development can be found in Bonk and Magrill's *Building Library Collections:*

> The selection of non-book materials is, of course, based ultimately on the same principles as for the selection of books: one seeks the best materials available in terms of authority, accuracy, effectiveness, or presentation, usefulness to community, etc. A key question is whether or not the medium used is an effective one for presenting the chosen topic. As with books, selection will be affected by the type of library, its size, the community in which it functions, and librarians' conception of the purpose of the institution. The library will try to have selection done by people who are informed about the subject matter presented in the non-book form, and it will employ sources of reviewing for the evaluation of each item, just as it would for a book.[1]

William A. Katz, in *Collection Development: The Selection of Materials for Libraries,* offers an excellent and concise discussion of the process of developing media collections in academic libraries.[2] Though he is not as emphatic as Bonk and Magrill about the absence of real difference in selection media and books, Katz's general arguments match theirs almost exactly. He also does an excellent job of synthesizing the most important evaluative points of selection for AV materials— purpose and scope; difficulty; authority, honesty, and credibility of producer, director, and performer; subject matter; comparison; timeliness; format; price; curriculum support; and demand.[3]

It is difficult to improve upon the soundness and simplicity of Katz's and Bonk and Magrill's humanistic approach to media collection development. The other relevant literature on the specifics of AV selection and acquisition is brief and disappointing. For the most part, it deals with AV collection development too abstractly, from a theoretical perspective rather than a practical, problem-solving one.

Implicit in both Katz's and Bonk and Magrill's assessment of how academic libraries should collect media is the belief that successful AV materials selection is the same as that for printed materials. Since a key issue for academic libraries is whether media selection should concern itself primarily with research or instructional support, the problem of how collections are acquired is singularly important. The most logical

solution would be to have media reflect the same standards and purpose attached to book selection. Equating AV software to books is essential to assuring that AV software shares the intellectual credibility attached to books, especially at this stage of media's development in academic libraries.

The tangible differences between books and journals and any AV program—film, video, or computer software—are too obvious to discuss here. What is less obvious is their ultimate interchangeability with the printed word as a pedagogic and research tool. A videocassette of Shakespeare's *Macbeth* is as valid an interpretation of the play as a 500-page study printed by a university press. The nuances of performance, speech patterns, expressiveness of performers, and directorial style help create that interpretation. Add to that the fact that several different performances of the same play offer interpretive diversity—the BBC version *v.* Orson Welles's *v.* Kurosawa's *Throne of Blood*—and the relationship to a written analysis is complete.

As with books, the ultimate aim in collecting AV materials is to provide library users with a useful artifact for learning. If media professionals continue to argue that AV software is somehow rarer and more exotic than books, they will force libraries to make either/or choices that would not now prove favorable to media. At the same time it is important to consider that form alone is not the only thing that makes AV materials different from books—cost, physical fragility, and timeliness are involved as well. In a later section of this article, the formats most suitable for an academic library environment will be discussed with respect to the ultimate goal of integrating AV materials into the mainstream of collection-development policy.[4]

Audiovisual Equipment

Recognizing the changes and advances in AV technology and equipment does not require that librarians have great technical skills. It does demand, however, that individuals responsible for media collection development seek to become familiar with the equipment. In fact, the relationship between software format and the playback technology for that format is of supreme importance. One does not exist without the other. Any media collection must maintain a clear balance between materials selected and the most compatible equipment for that material.

The chief AV equipment or "hardware" used in media centers are 16mm film projectors; video players and recorders (one-half inch VHS, three-quarter inch U-matic, Beta, and videodiscs); 35mm slide projec-

tion machines (projectors, caramates); audio player/recorders (record, cassette, reel-to-reel, some digital cartridges); and filmstrips. All of this equipment except video has been used extensively for a number of years and there have been few major changes in these traditional formats. (One exception is reel-to-reel tape, which is far less prevalent than in the 1960s.) The new digital technology has few applications for libraries as long as archival collections of music and spoken-word recordings are not transformed to match the new equipment.

Slide and filmstrip projection have hardly changed. Carousel trays, caramate, and 35mm projectors are still the most prevalent and functional means of viewing a slide program, though rear-screen projectors do make slides accessible for larger audiences and remove the noisy machines from the open.

The greatest area of development in AV technology is in video. This format has great potential as a tool for individual research and study, and as a versatile instrument for storage and retrieval of information resources. Even though video technology is still undergoing rapid change, the machinery is not as forbidding to users as 16mm. The popularity of videotaping in the home has made it a nearly universally used and accepted technology.

Library literature makes much of the potential for video technology, especially the videodisc.[5] In the educational media marketplace, however, there are few programs available for general curricular needs. The most commonly designed packages now available are aimed at medical, technical, and industrial markets. There are packages in the fine arts (such as the National Gallery of Art collection on laser disc) and some feature titles are sold even though the home disc player has been overwhelmed by the cassette player. Nevertheless, the disc is a costly medium from which to reproduce noncommercial software, and low production volume minimizes the amount of materials available. There are few published sources that list videodisc programs; even fewer catalogs, brochures, or fliers are available from producers. The major educational media producers and distributors are not very interested in disc either, and the videotape is the only visual alternative that they have considered marketing with 16mm films.

Audiovisual Formats Collected

Audiovisual formats and academic libraries do not generally mix very comfortably. The nonbook medium must still struggle in a "book" environment. This situation is changing, however, as 16mm film, video, audio recordings, 35mm slides, and filmstrips become standard

formats collected by libraries. Obviously, software is the next area of development for media collection.

It should be noted before discussing these various formats—each of which presents different problems for libraries—that there is not a "books-in-print" type of reference for librarians to use when selecting AV materials. The *Audio Video Market Place: A Multimedia Guide* (AVMP) is a very useful compendium of producers, distributors, services, and labs, but it does not include titles and prices. For that information, one has to rely on either fliers and published catalogs or the reviews of media mentioned later. Several speakers at a RTSD (Resources and Technical Services Division-ALA) cataloging workshop in October 1984 discussed the desirability of such a "books-in-print" guide for media. The main problem facing the publisher of such a reference volume would include arranging the many vendors and suppliers, as well as treating the sliding scale of prices for different formats. Prices vary radically from vendor to vendor and there is no uniform pricing code for film and video. Film and video rental and lease arrangements help muddle the picture as well.

Films

Film has been the longest-lived of "educational media." The best, the worst, and the dullest of instructional material has been put on 16mm and 8mm film stock. Libraries and media resource centers are often filled with dated, totally unusable films. All the past and present difficulties (real and presumed) in acquiring, maintaining, and especially selecting AV software for libraries can be seen in the history of the educational film.

Instructional and "educational" programs designed primarily for classroom use were first made available on 16mm film. The major source of short (45 minutes and less) programs suited for the average class period is the 16mm film. There are literally thousands of films available in hundreds of subject areas. Titles on 16mm that are suitable for the most advanced levels of study and research may still be limited in many areas—advanced humanities and social sciences films, for instance—but overall they are good AV sources for academic libraries, either as rentals or purchases.

The kinds of films large academic libraries collect are substantially different in content, scope, and purpose than much of the material treated in most media indexes and guides. The traditional sources for reviewing media—*Film Review Index, Media Review Digest,* and *Film Review Annual*—are generally more than adequate selection tools, but

the materials they cover are often directed at students less sophisticated than those who attend four-year colleges and research institutions. While reviewing sources such as *Choice* and *Booklist* do offer some help, the best reviewing source for an academic community will be the interested faculty. Because of the relative expense of film titles—the price usually ranges between $350 and $2500—only the most well funded library could afford to invest randomly in films. Faculty can judge from experience and previews whether an advertised film can satisfy their instructional needs.

Academic libraries commited to creating 16mm collections must recognize several important facts:

1. Arbitrary selection is not reasonable unless the film budget is extremely generous.
2. When collections are developed and funds are limited, the selection process should include advice from faculty familiar with the specific areas where a film might be most useful.
3. The preview process is essential. The library should determine if it will pay preview costs (if any) or have interested departments assume the cost.

Academic media librarians must seek to acquire film titles useful across disciplines whenever possible. These films should have a reputation as standard resources. Most important, all of the previous criteria must be met at the most reasonable price.

Although there is no one selection tool that can provide all the information one needs for selecting films, a look at the most thorough film references available in the *NICEM Indexes* (National Information Center for Educational Media Indexes, 8th ed. 1984, Access Innovations Inc.) and the *Educational Film Locator* (2d ed. 1980, R.R. Bowker) will help in assessing the many titles available in the educational market-place. These references also give some clue as to the number of institu-tional and commercial sources which can answer inquiries on price and availability.

The selection process should be flexible to accommodate the wealth of sources, but not quite as random as with books, given the especially high cost of films. Still, having a strong core collection of film titles is vital. There are films in the humanities, sciences, and social sciences that may be best suited for a particular campus' curricular needs, and the library must discover what those needs are. The library that acquires an existing collection—as occurred at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill—has a head start.[6] If the acquired collection was heavily used in the past, there is likely to be a pattern that can be easily

recognized. The selection process also becomes less of a challenge under the circumstances since presumably there already exists a good line of communication with vendors, distributors, and producers. With the reviewing media for educational materials so heavily directed at school and college levels, sales information of every kind will likewise be very helpful. These same sales fliers and company catalogs—taken in conjunction with the *NICEM Index* and the *Educational Film Locator*— are the chief tools for 16mm film selection.

There are a number of major academic research institutions with large film collections, but they seldom are part of the collection. Indiana University, Penn State University, and the University of California— Berkeley, for example, each have huge film depositories that serve as key sources for film rentals by other institutions, but their services have been established as income-generating businesses and not as research archives for the parent institution. The library collecting films must determine early on if the purpose of having a collection is to provide materials to its local community or to serve as a fee-based resource for other borrowers as well.

Video

The emergence of video technology and its accompanying software—videocassettes and videodiscs—have made and will continue to make the acquisition of film titles by libraries and others more feasible. Videocassettes are widely available commercially, are compact and are usually much less expensive on a per-title basis than 16mm. This format also has the advantage of subject diversity in areas such as feature, documentary, and instructional films, while an abundance of outlets for purchase, both local and national, permits comparison shopping.

The reviewing patterns for video resemble those for books more than any other AV format except audio titles. Because of the huge commercial market for video, sources are as diverse as daily newspapers, film industry trade papers, and popular publications like *Video Review* and *Variety*. *Booklist* and *Choice* are the two best professional sources for academic libraries. There are extensive commercial and institutional catalogs produced by vendors and distributors, but the most complete reference and information guide is probably the *Video Sourcebook* (5th edition, Professional Volume, National Video Clearinghouse, Inc., 1985).

The 1985 *Sourcebook* lists over 35,000 programs and 700 sources from which to rent, purchase, or lease videotaped materials. As with

16mm films, educational programming on video is often well suited for in-class instruction because of the length (45 minutes or less). Since video was initially marketed for home use, it has lagged behind in offering strictly educational titles until recently. The huge home market is part of what makes the overall prices relatively low, though educational video still averages from $200 to $300 for VHS titles and $250 to $450 for three-quarter inch U-matic titles.

Purchasing video titles through vendors is not the only selection technique available to libraries. Pertinent titles broadcast on commercial and public television can be videotaped by an interested institution through the Television Licensing Center (TLC)—a subdivision of one of the largest 16mm rental sources, Films Incorporated. Licensing fees are currently $125 per broadcast and are valid for the life of the tape. Large savings are also possible through off-air taping. The WGBH series "Vietnam: A Television History," for example, would have cost $450 an episode in a prepackaged form.

Relying on off-air recordings, however, does involve some special requirements:

1. Programming schedules need to be consulted constantly to insure that the desired program is recorded. Knowing that a particular item will be rebroadcast is also helpful. The biggest drawback is that interested faculty often want a title after they have seen it, sometimes long after its initial broadcast.
2. Recording assumes that the library has, or has access to, a videotape recorder equipped with tuner/timer for this type of material.
3. Getting video programming requires the expenditure of funds for blank videotapes.
4. Having a television with good reception is vital. The quality of what costs $125 is only as good as the television reception.

Off-air videotaping considerably expands the selection possibilities. At the same time, it emphasizes the relationship between AV formats and the machines that record, project, or play back the programs acquired. It is not realistic to consider video or any other audiovisual format without determining if the format required is appropriate for an institution's needs. As noted earlier, video will undoubtedly become the predominant technology used in academic institutions. It is the one format that can be recommended without reservation as the cornerstone of a newly-established media collection.

Computer Software

The place of computers in libraries gives rise to a variety of questions for which there are no readily discernible answers. There are few software packages designed expressly for libraries and commercially available products are often too expensive and fraught with potential copyright problems. Review sources for computer software range from professional titles like *Booklist, Choice,* and *Library Journal* to the many computer magazines such as *Byte, PC World,* and *Computer and Science*. This is still too unsettled an area for coherent library collection development. Besides, it must still be determined whether computer software will become part of the public service and reference areas in academic libraries. Much like microforms, collecting computer software ultimately may not be a concern for media librarians at all.

Until the computer market develops into something approaching uniformity, collecting software for librarians will be only as reliable as reviews and producer "hype" allow. As with video and audio, there is currently no lack of vendors or distributors from which to choose.

Computers are already a permanent part of academic libraries, serving as key components in online bibliographic and cataloging services. Many institutions are now producing online catalogs yet the next areas which computers will influence remains uncertain. For example, the implications of computer software for technical services processes—acquisitions, cataloging, and collection development—are not completely clear. Many existing programs—biblio filing, business, and word processing—can be adapted to meet some aspects of technical services specifications, but these few programs conceivably could have drawbacks (such as slow-filing bibliography programs, or programs with limited text-handling capabilities). There are even some packages for circulation though they are most appropriate for very small collections or for operations such as fines and billing.

The most frequent problems are the limited capacity of computer programs (or the computers) to store and retrieve large quantities of information and the sticky issue of copyright. Even more frustrating is the American computer industry's refusal to make software compatible across the board. For every individual manufacturer of computers there are software packages designed only for that particular brand. In some cases, programs that were compatible with an earlier model cannot be used on subsequent models of the same company's computer; often, too, software development slows or stops for earlier models of a microcomputer.

Perhaps the best approach for libraries to take with computers is to establish banks of machines with multiple copies of software for use

only in the library. Or perhaps libraries merely should make space available and turn over the selection of software and equipment to interested departments and users. Computers and computer software in academic libraries, at least as far as traditional circulation and selection procedures are concerned, could become one of those infamous "black holes" where money and staff time vanish without substantial advantage to the library's overall purpose.

Traditional Audiovisual Materials

Along with 16mm films, the most universally accepted audiovisual formats are audio recordings and photographic slides. There are few libraries (see appendix D) without some spoken-word or music recordings in their collections. As for slides, the availability of so many science, historical, and art packages makes them almost as acceptable in libraries as audio. Fewer collection-development problems exist here, compared with film, video, and computer software; and vendors, catalogs, and review sources are as numerous for these formats as they are for books.[7]

The brevity of the discussion of these formats is not meant to denigrate them, but to suggest that as they are presently used and collected, catalogers and selectors in academic libraries have little difficulty handling them. It is with one of these formats—photographic slides—that some of the earliest experiments with the storing, reproduction, and retrieval capacity of the disc technology are being connected. Although the Library of Congress' Optical Disk Project is a prototype storage and retrieval project, it will be some time before optical disc technology is available in any marketable form for the rest of the library world. Even when it does arrive, it will create more collection and selection problems, particularly involving affordability and the copyright question.

Conclusion

Several conclusions about collection development of audiovisual materials for academic libraries may be drawn. First, professional literature in this area is next to nonexistent, a situation that needs to be rectified if librarians hope to gain a clear perspective of what nonprint media means to the academic world. It is also vital that media professionals and librarians work hard to insure that audiovisual materials achieve an equal intellectual status with printed materials, something that cannot be achieved if librarians keep insisting that the collection,

selection, and acquisition of these resources are absolutely different from what is appropriate for books. At the same time librarians should not fall into the trap of engaging in theoretical discussions on media and libraries, but rather adopt a more pragmatic approach in viewing media's costs, technology, available formats, and selection tools.

Librarians must otherwise understand that media format (software) and technology (machines or "hardware") are interactive. One is useless without the other, and when selecting and acquiring them that fact should be kept in mind. It is also essential to keep abreast of the advances in media technology and to select software based on state-of-the-art technology and market availability of pertinent nonprint programs.

Finally, librarians must recognize that the selection tools for media are diverse, eclectic, and often random. Some of the more traditional reviewing and selection sources were originally designed for school and technical institutions and not the curricular needs of major research universities and libraries. While there are other means of selection, those means are as random and varied as the sources for books. Faculty must certainly have a key role in recommending programs, but the librarian should insure that expensive formats (such as 16mm film and educational video programming) can be used across as many disciplines as possible and not become obsolete shortly after they are purchased.

I began research on this article hoping to use library literature and collection-development statements from a select number of academic libraries to determine recent trends in media collection development. I also consulted the *Undergraduate Libraries Newsletter* (UGLI) to observe the statistical patterns among its member libraries, most of which are also institutions belonging to the Association of Research Libraries.

The collection-development statements turned out to be of negligible use. Indeed, there was rarely any mention of media at all. When statements were included, they were brief, general, and frequently similar to the statement of principles on media issued by the American Library Association in 1976. The statistical data in the *UGLI Newsletter* confirmed this state of affairs in many ways (see appendixes A-D). A number of the ARL institutions had media collections, usually located in the undergraduate library. This choice of location was due, most likely, either to the centrality of the building or the fact that the main focus of the collections was support of undergraduate instruction rather than research. The appendixes to this article illustrate the growth (or lack of growth) of AV collection sizes in a number of *UGLI Newsletter* libraries. While these statistics lead to no definitive conclusions about

media in academic libraries, they do suggest that media seems to have some role to play.

The future of the AV collections in academic libraries is closely related to how well we go about selecting these materials. "The dragon of everything," as one authority has stated, "is not really dead until we have fashioned the lance of selectivity—and used it."[8] We must make rather than find or wish for, clear-cut policies on selecting and collecting academic media resources, and closer attention to that process in the literature would be a good place to start.

Appendix A

UGLI Newsletter Statistics
Audiocassettes

	1976	1979	1981	1983
Harvard	N/A	0	29	29
Ohio State	70*	N/A	4487	4446*
Berkeley	N/A	N/A	174	362
UCLA	2834*	N/A	3006	4280
Michigan	299	573	833	N/A
UNC-CH	2041*	640	N/A	1356
Texas	0	202	346	5720
Washington	2497	N/A	7690	-
Maryland	0	8527	7338	N/A
Indiana	870	14433	13371	N/A
Tennessee	0	5500**	-	5744
Stanford	388	389	N/A	7795*

*These numbers refer to total number of recorded items, regardless of format.
**No distinction was made between tape and cassette. Tape could be reel or cassette.

Appendix B

UGLI Newsletter Statistics
Films (16mm)

	1976	1979	1981	1983
Harvard	-	-	-	-
Ohio State	70	N/A	1253	1327
Berkeley	-	-	-	-
UCLA	-	-	-	-
Michigan	-	-	-	-
UNC-CH	-	N/A	8	481
Texas	-	-	-	-
Washington	192	N/A	227	298
Maryland	-	-	243	N/A
Indiana	-	159	N/A	N/A
Tennessee	-	-	-	-
Stanford	55	70	N/A	74

Appendix C

UGLI Newsletter Statistics
Video

	1976	1979	1981	1983
Harvard	-	-	-	-
Ohio State	70	N/A	747	785
Berkeley	-	-	115	N/A
UCLA	-	-	60	366
Michigan	91	190	235	N/A
UNC-CH	-	-	-	350
Texas	-	4	9	27
Washington	822	-	1660	1861
Maryland	-	2198	1253	-
Indiana	247	442	544	N/A
Tennessee	435	910	-	1171
Stanford	-	2	-	1

Appendix D

UGLI Newsletter Statistics
Records (Discs)

	1976	1979	1981	1983
Harvard	N/A	9274	9350	8770
Ohio State	70*	N/A	N/A	967
Berkeley	N/A	N/A	3384	3379
UCLA	2834*	N/A	3428	2596
Michigan	13516	14641	15264	N/A
UNC-CH	2041*	1651	N/A	2329
Texas	4412	5743	6742	7466
Washington	2842	N/A	3741	N/A
Maryland	N/A	3393	3461	N/A
Indiana	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	-	-	-	-
Stanford	5355	3393	N/A	7795*

*These numbers refer to total number of recorded items, regardless of format.

References

1. Bonk, Wallace John, and Magrill, Rose Mary. *Building Library Collections,* 5th ed. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1979, p. 125.

2. Katz, William A. *Collection Development: The Selection of Materials for Libraries.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980, p. 226.

3. Ibid., p. 231.

4. *Integrated* here is meant to suggest that audiovisual materials should be perceived as educational and research sources on a par with books and journals. The idea of physically integrating AV materials into the book collection seems naïve, and could result in a shelving and circulation nightmare. More important is the way such a policy might infringe on copyright laws. Economically, the idea is impractical. As much as we want AV materials to become a fully accepted and legitimate academic library resource, we cannot do so by recommending practices that would contribute to wasting resources. To pursue these kinds of "integrated" systems would be a move toward making the software collection side of AV materials as expensive a "black hole" as the hardware side.

5. There are few videodisc software catalogs, brochures, or fliers available to audiovisual librarians and collection developers. No listings of software packages useful for general academic purposes are readily available. The optical disc is still in an early stage of development and interested institutions will have to bear the expense of conducting disc projects themselves. Nevertheless, since the optical disc format is being touted as the most appropriate technology for information retrieval, why is there not more news of developing software packages and disc technology systems?

6. The University of North Carolina is used only as an example. The Nonprint Materials Collection was formed in a joint effort by the Media and Instructional Support Center and the UNC library. The Nonprint Materials Collection serves the entire academic and health affairs community.

7. There have been *National Information Center for Educational Media Indexes* for audiotapes, filmstrips, records, 8mm film, and 35mm slides, although new additions for many of these are lacking. NICEM also provides an index to microform material, on microfiche of course. *Choice, Booklist,* and *Library Journal* provide reviews for these media. The most prevalent selection literature are catalogs and brochures from producers such as Caedmon; National Public Radio, Educational Media, Inc.; Audio Forum; Chambers Records; and dozens of others.

8. *The Libraries of Stanford University Collection Development Policy Statement. 1980.* Stanford, Calif.: Collection Development Office, Stanford University Libraries, 1981, p. iii.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank