

# 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 occurring 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 non-print 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 Uni-

versity, 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 acquisition, 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 Uni-

versity 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

## **COLONIAL "out-of-print" BOOK SERVICE, INC.**

Specialists in supplying the out-of-print books as listed in all library indices (Granger Poetry; Essay and General Literature; Shaw; Standard; Fiction; Biography; Lamont Catalogue; Speech; B.C.L.; etc. . . .)

**"Want Lists Invited"**  
**"Catalogues on Request"**

23 EAST FOURTH STREET

NEW YORK, N. Y. 10003

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 multifarious. (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 Utili-

zation 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*, *PRE-VIEWS*, *MEDIA AND METHODS*, and faculty. Advisors send reviews of books and media to faculty, faculty initiate a request, and in this fashion the library assures 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 print-outs 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 col-

lege 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.