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The Year 1975–1976

Nineteen seventy-six marks the twentieth year of operation for the Council on Library Resources. It seems an appropriate time to review the highlights of the past two decades, to describe current activities in the context of the past, and to relate those activities to the Council's present perception of the development of an improved library system in the United States and abroad.

Because it has no interests to serve other than those of libraries, the Council has had a unique opportunity to view the library world as a whole. Its attempt to discern patterns and trends, to pinpoint library problems through study and research, and to encourage the most promising solutions has, we hope, allowed it to exert some positive influence in library development. The Council has long held the view that many of the needs of libraries and therefore of their users can best be served through the activities of a national library system composed of cooperating networks of various kinds and drawing upon centralized resources. Because of its flexibility and relative independence as a private, operating foundation, the Council has often been in a position to coordinate some of these developments, to act as a mediator or catalyst when required, and to work toward ensuring that emerging systems will be compatible and contribute to an evolving national system.

At the same time, the Council has attempted to give other important areas of activity the attention they deserve. Programs have been devised and implemented in order to increase the competence and skills of librarians, to assist libraries in better serving their users, and to preserve the collections.

The chapters that follow will perhaps serve to measure how nearly we have met our goals.

Fred C. Cole
President
The First Fifteen Years

The year 1956 was a singular one in the library world, typifying the atmosphere of conflicting hopes and doubts that characterized society generally during the mid-fifties. On the one hand, there was optimism growing out of the twin beliefs that libraries would profit much from the advances made in technology almost daily and that society was becoming increasingly conscious of the importance of libraries to the nation. As evidence, one could point to the enactment on May 8, 1956, of the Library Services Act, the first legislation providing federal money for libraries. Library holdings and services were expanding; book publishers produced more titles in the first 11 months of 1956 than in the entire previous year; and the American Library Association’s Library Community Project was well on its way toward the goal of determining the proper role of the public library in adult education.¹

This sense of hope was counterbalanced by fears in some quarters that the new technology would lessen the need for traditional library services, if not, in fact, replace the book. The future of the book had been hotly debated in 1955 at the 20th Annual Conference of the University of Chicago Graduate Library School and in the succeeding literature. Indeed, it was chosen the next year as the subject of the seventeenth R. R. Bowker Lecture at the New York Public Library. Despite general agreement that neither the computer nor microform would actually replace the book, real concern was voiced about the way libraries of the future would provide access to a growing volume of information in all forms. Working in fields like science, where recorded knowledge was growing at an exponential rate, rising numbers of patrons were creating new demands on libraries, which struggled with limited resources to satisfy them.

The foundation funds then being channeled into libraries were for the most part earmarked for the erection of buildings and the improvement of local or special collections, thus failing to attack the major sources of difficulty. Although the average cost

of paperbound books had dropped to 25¢ per volume, the cost of the hardbound book required for library collections together with that of cataloging, housing, maintaining, preserving, and circulating it was beginning the rise that would reach even greater heights in the sixties and seventies. Confronted with increasing costs, staff shortages, and outdated buildings and procedures, libraries were falling far short of their own goals, as well as of the expectations of their users. The need for change was apparent; in the words of the Bowker lecturer, "Perhaps never has the future presented the certainty of so great a change coupled with so great an uncertainty of its direction."2

This, then, was the climate when, on September 18, 1956, the Ford Foundation announced the establishment of the Council on Library Resources, Inc. (CLR), with an initial grant of $5,000,000. Recognition of the need for such a research and development organization was one result of a study begun two years earlier by the Ford Foundation in order to determine the most useful kind of aid it could provide for libraries. The inquiry culminated in two day-long meetings at the Folger Shakespeare Library, where 50 librarians, scholars, and university administrators considered the problems of libraries and the means for solving them.

On the basis of the recommendations of the Folger group, underscored by its own investigations, the foundation concluded that it could best help libraries through sponsorship of an independent, nonprofit organization under distinguished leadership, prepared to address itself exclusively to library problems over a suitably long period of time. Free to range widely through research and development in all fields, this organization would accelerate library development by encouraging and coordinating new attacks on the traditional problems. Its most valuable characteristic would be its flexibility; its charge, broad enough to cover any eventuality. It would exist "for the purpose of aiding in the solution of the problems of libraries generally and of research libraries in particular, conducting research in, developing and demonstrating new techniques and methods, and disseminating through any medium the results thereof, and for making grants to other institutions and persons for such purposes; and for providing leadership, and wherever appropriate, coordination of efforts (1) to develop the resources and services of libraries and (2) to improve relations between American and foreign libraries and archives."3 Thus the Council on Library Resources came into being, with former Chief Assistant Librarian of Congress Verner W. Clapp as its president.

The problems were great; the funds, limited. From the outset, it was apparent that no organization, no matter how great its resources, could begin to correct the many inadequacies of individual libraries. It therefore became the Council's policy to provide support only for programs that might contribute to solving the problems of

31.5. Citations in this form refer to the Council's annual reports; for example, to the 1st Annual Report, page 5.
libraries in general rather than in specific, local terms. Since all issues could not be attacked simultaneously, the Council developed a kind of priority listing of target areas. This has changed from time to time as some problems were solved and others emerged. In its 20-year history—a period during which annual library and information costs (exclusive of buildings) increased from the millions to the billions—the Council received $29 million in grants from the Ford Foundation to assist in its efforts.

The Early Years

Of all the problems facing libraries in the mid-fifties, perhaps the greatest cause of concern was the difficulty encountered in attempts to adapt new technologies effectively to library needs. Indeed, a central conclusion of the Folger conference discussion was "... that libraries, though suffering from all the effects of a machine age, have gained disproportionately little benefit from it; that because libraries do not in many cases provide a market large enough to stimulate the supply of special equipment for their particular needs, many potentially applicable developments in science and technology have not been brought to library tasks."4

Thus the Council's first priority seemed clear, and during its first ten years attention was focused primarily "on the exploration of technological means to solve problems that confront libraries in their service to scholarship and research."4 Basic research, characterized by a fresh look at the processes of distribution, organization, storage, and communication of knowledge as these affect libraries, was seen as the key to resolving these problems. The Council launched its effort by probing into the three areas that seemed most crucial to the library's capability of providing information and knowledge to a reader: bibliographic access, physical access, and administrative arrangements.

Bibliographic Access

The Council's efforts to improve bibliographic access to library materials resulted in several remarkable achievements in the first decade. They included the publication of certain bibliographic tools of national significance, among them the third edition of the Union List of Serials (New York, 1965), The National Union Catalog of Manuscript Collections (Washington, 1962–), a Library of Congress classification scheme for Anglo-American law materials, and Choice (Chicago, 1964–), a current book-selection guide for college and university libraries. Each of these publications allowed librarians throughout the United States to guide patrons to requested resources more easily and more quickly than ever before.

Several seminal studies in the application of computer technology to bibliographic processes were undertaken. The National Library of Medicine (NLM) received the first grant for this purpose when, in 1958, it sought to improve through mechanization the pro-

4Leon Camovsky, "C.L.R."
duction of its *Current List of Medical Literature* (Washington, 1941–1959), then the world's largest service (in terms of quantity of material indexed) for the literature of a special subject. Retitled *Index Medicus* (Washington, 1960–), the resulting publication grew eventually into MEDLARS (Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System), one of the best known computer-supported information systems of the present day, now utilized by medical researchers throughout the world.

Another early grant went to the Library of Congress (LC) for a study to determine the feasibility of applying automated techniques to LC operations. Following the 1963 publication of *Automation and the Library of Congress*, a second, more finite, study was commissioned, this time dealing with possible methods of converting the data printed on LC catalog cards to machine-readable form. A conversion of this sort would enable the Library to supply these records on magnetic tape to many libraries where they could be used to support the production of such widely used items as catalog cards, book catalogs, and bibliographies. The two studies and several conferences signaled LC's move toward automation of its system and the construction of an automated national data base.

A different kind of effort to improve bibliographic access also took place during those early years. In 1958–59, LC and a group of publishers were supported by CLR in a cooperative experiment to print cataloging information in the book itself. Although the "cataloging-in-source" project was discontinued by LC because of cost factors and technical problems, it provided valuable experience upon which a successful attempt was built over a decade later. Other early CLR-supported projects involved the use of computer techniques to improve access to legal materials, the development of cataloging rules for books in exotic languages, and the first steps toward achieving international agreements on basic cataloging rules.

**International Access**

The Council's interest in international activities dates from its first year of operation, when, in June 1957, a CLR grant allowed the American Library Association to send a representative to an important cataloging conference in Lübeck, Germany. Programs to promote international agreements in cataloging practice have continued to take up a substantial portion of Council time and funds, for these agreements provide great benefit to libraries all over the world. The major breakthroughs in reaching agreements have occurred through the efforts of the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA).

IFLA had already been working toward the coordination of cataloging practices when the Council in 1958 provided the organization with funds to plan the 1961 Paris International Conference on Cataloguing Principles, which was supported by a later Council grant. With more than 200 participants and observers, the Paris con-

---

ference resulted in substantial agreements among nations in an area where accord had previously seemed almost impossible.

Other library organizations were also attempting to reach agreements that would allow for greater international understanding. A series of grants to the Music Library Association allowed that organization to send a key representative to participate in the deliberations of the International Cataloging Code Commission of the International Association of Music Libraries. The commission’s discussions resulted in the approval in 1965 of international rules for the full cataloging of music. Other grants supported the preparation of a standard list of subject headings in Spanish for the use of Latin American libraries and the inclusion of orientalist librarians in two important international scholarly congresses held in 1967 and 1971.

Making library and archival materials more accessible on a world-wide basis was the focus of other CLR grants in the early years. A series of awards supported the Répertoire International des Sources Musicales (Munich, 1960-), a joint venture of the International Association of Music Libraries and the International Musicological Society. Projected to appear in 30 volumes, 18 of which have been published, the Répertoire will inventory the sources held all over the world for the history of music to 1800.

The Association for Asian Studies received CLR funds in 1965 for the development of a Chinese Materials and Research Aids Service Center in Taipei, Taiwan. On the other side of the world, Council grants in 1962 and 1967 made it possible for distinguished American librarians to conduct surveys and make recommendations relating to the development of research collections in Canadian universities.

Improvement of bibliographic access to materials meant that library users could more easily identify the books, journals, and other resources that would be useful for their work. Finding that a book has been published is of little value, however, if the work is physically inaccessible. It may only have been published abroad, for example, and thus be difficult for a local library to purchase. Or it may be an older work that has literally crumbled into dust.

Of equal importance in the Council’s scheme of priorities, then, was concern for the improvement of physical access to library resources. Projects involving library use of photocopies and microforms, the preservation of library and archival materials, and the development of mechanical devices to aid in library research were actively supported.

One of the Council’s first grants in the important area of preservation went to William J. Barrow, an expert in the history and technology of inks and papers, for systematic research into the causes of paper deterioration and how it could be economically halted or delayed. Subsequent investigations by Barrow and the staff of the W. J. Barrow Laboratory, Inc., established by Barrow and CLR in 1961, resulted in specifications for permanent and durable paper,
now commercially available from several mills. Other studies carried out by Barrow during the first decade of Council support concerned the physical characteristics of catalog cards, book-binding adhesives, and performance standards for library bindings.

A series of CLR grants began in 1961 to support studies conducted under the aegis of the Association of Research Libraries, resulting in a national plan for the preservation of deteriorating research library materials. Among other recommendations, the plan called for a pilot preservation project at the Library of Congress to investigate procedural problems associated with a scheme to salvage LC's "brittle books." Funded by CLR, the project came to a successful conclusion in 1969. Today, the Library's extensive microfilming program for brittle books is supported by appropriated funds.

**Acquisitions Programs**

Two important acquisitions programs affecting large numbers of libraries—the Universal Serials and Book Exchange (USBE) and the Farmington Plan—received Council aid in the early years. Founded in 1948, USBE serves as a center for the exchange among libraries of duplicates of books and periodicals having potential value for research but insufficient market value to attract dealers. Council grants in 1957 and 1971 enabled USBE to study its operations and procedures and explore possibilities for future expansion and financing. The Farmington Plan also started in 1948 when some 60 American libraries began to share responsibility for the acquisition of foreign publications in certain subject fields. Over the years the Council has supported several evaluative studies of the plan and its successor, the Public Law 480 Program. Administered by the Library of Congress, the P.L. 480 Program, now known as the Special Foreign Currency Program, has acquired nearly 20,000,000 foreign publications for its participants since 1961, when it began.7

**Microform Mechanisms**

The Council has always been concerned with the need for reducing unit costs of library operations. From the first, one of the most alluring possibilities for this was through the use of microforms, both for preservation of deteriorating resources and as a means of low-cost publication and storage. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, the Council moved on many fronts to overcome the disadvantages of microfilm, at that time the most prevalent type of microform used. Attention centered on the equipment used to read microfilm, but it soon became apparent that some of its limitations were only partially amenable to remedy. In one such project, the Council conducted a concentrated research and development effort aimed at producing inexpensive, hand-held viewing devices that would allow readers to use microfilm almost as easily and pleasurably as books. In the end, none of the readers produced was completely satisfactory. However, each effort added to the store of knowledge from which later equipment designers worked.

---

Examples of prototype equipment for library use developed with CLR support in the 1960s:

Top left: A "scholar's camera," intended to allow researchers to copy documents, catalog cards, etc., in libraries that lacked photocopy facilities.

Top right: A portable microform projector that weighs only 3 pounds.

Lower left: The Minimatrex reader was part of an experimental information storage and retrieval system based on coordinate indexing methods.

Lower right: A hand-held microform viewing device composed of a compound microscope with detachable folding plastic base.

The Council also funded several attempts to develop prototype microcopying equipment, among them a microfiche camera, an automatic book cradle/page turner, a low-cost microfilm reader-printer, and a high-density, direct-access photostorage and retrieval system. The latter consisted of an electromechanical device that could store a million pages in microform in a cubic foot of space and could find and display or reenlarge any one of them in seconds. Because it could serve only one user at a time, it proved to be too expensive for practical application.

Another area of interest was the possibility of using microforms to make research materials more readily available to the user. One of CLR's early grants was for experimental micropublication of the scientific journal *Wildlife Disease* (Washington, 1959–). A 1961 study on the bibliographical control of microforms, sponsored by the Association of Research Libraries and supported by the Council,
led to a revision of the rules for cataloging microforms and opened the way to other developments, including the establishment in 1965 at the Library of Congress of the National Register of Microform Masters (Washington, 1966–). This publication provides a central source of information on the existence and location of masters from which duplicates can be made. Further, to help librarians deal with the growing amount of equipment associated with microforms, the Council subsidized the first edition of the National Microfilm Association’s Guide to Microreproduction Equipment (Annapolis, Md., 1959), which has long since become self-supporting.

The Council also pursued the development of other kinds of equipment and processes for copying and reproducing documents. The need for an economical means to duplicate catalog cards caused the Council eight times in the early years to attempt the development of prototype equipment for this purpose. Generally the prototypes met some but not all of the needs. Two attempts to construct cameras that would allow scholars to record pages quickly and easily in libraries lacking copying machines were not completely satisfactory. Several explorations in the use of television and telefacsimile transmission were also undertaken. While much was learned from each attempt, technical difficulties combined in some cases with high costs to preclude widespread adoption of the equipment by libraries.

Perhaps the most effective and long-lasting Council-supported project to deal with the problem of physical access was the Library Technology Program. After assisting the American Library Association (ALA) with a feasibility study, CLR made a grant in 1958 for the establishment of an ALA unit called the Library Technology Project (LTP).* Its purpose was to collect and disseminate to the library profession information and guidance concerning the use of modern techniques and machines in libraries.

Projects undertaken by LTP have been as numerous and varied as the needs of libraries, ranging from the investigation of booktruck casters to an examination of carpet underlays. The emphasis has been on the practical, providing information about the things that consume a large share of the library budget—chairs, desks, photocopy machines, electric typewriters, shelving, and the like. Besides testing commercially available products, LTP has itself sponsored and guided the development of needed new equipment, such as the Se-Lin labeling system which produces long-lasting, tight-sticking labels and applies them to the spines of books.

In addition to books on many aspects of library technology, LTP has since 1965 issued Library Technology Reports, a loose-leaf publication containing the results of LTP testing programs. Appearing now as a bound quarterly with an annual microform cumulation, Library Technology Reports continues to provide authoritative consumer information on library equipment, systems, and supplies.

---

*II:29-31; III:38-39 and subsequent annual reports.
CLR grants (nearly $2 million in 12 years) encouraged ALA to establish and maintain the LTP in order to fill the need for a central source of technical information upon which all libraries could draw. By 1966, less than half its support came from the Council; by 1971, Council funds were no longer required for general operating expenses, although grants are still occasionally made for specific projects.

Administrative Arrangements

Administrative arrangements in libraries, including such elements as the design of buildings, the training and organization of staff, development of sources of financial support, etc., made up the third major category of grants during the Council's first ten years. Studies of possible cooperative acquisition arrangements in several regions were undertaken during this period. A CLR-funded study of federal libraries led to the establishment in 1965 of the government-wide Federal Library Committee. Handbooks on data processing and on planning academic and research library buildings were published with Council help. Further, CLR support led to the publication by the American Library Association of the 1,559-page third edition of American Library Laws (Chicago, 1964). Proceeds from its sale made possible the publication of a later edition. The most recent product of this revolving fund is the first supplement to the fourth edition.

Two major surveys had far-reaching results. In cooperation with the American Library Association, the Council supported a Small Libraries Project, designed to tailor new administrative practices and techniques to the needs of libraries serving communities of 10,000 or fewer persons. ALA issued a series of 16 manuals that were subsequently used by many small libraries in the United States and Canada. In 1962, a survey of state archival programs was begun. The published report, American State Archives (Chicago, 1964), was credited with having an immediate catalytic effect on the development of new state archival programs and on the improved organization, administration, and funding of others.

Library Statistics

In the late 1950s, libraries experienced great difficulty in assessing their progress because of the incompatibility of library statistics. Although by 1961 there were 156 major recurring statistical surveys in the United States, their lack of agreement on definitions of the most fundamental terms—a book, library use, reference service, etc.—made them impossible to use for comparative purposes. Sharing the concern felt by major library and standards organizations, CLR contributed funds for partial support of a study to develop standardized practices and terminology. The result was the publication by ALA of Library Statistics: A Handbook of Concepts, Definitions, and Terminology (Chicago, 1966), still used by statistics...
gathering agencies today. The Council has also encouraged the development of international standards in the area of statistics through support for a series of meetings and conferences on the topic.

At the conclusion of its first ten years, the Council undertook a summary of its endeavors and in its 10th Annual Report listed both projects and resulting publications. Approximately $8.5 million had been expended for 346 grants. With the publication of the King report on automating the Library of Congress (cited earlier), the goal of adapting the techniques of automation to library use seemed within reach.

**Transitional Years**

A shift in priorities took place during the opening years of the Council’s second decade, resulting from a combination of factors. It had become clear that the size of investment necessary to develop marketable equipment was beyond the capacity of an organization with limited funds and unlimited responsibilities to libraries. Fortunately, at about this time commercial enterprises became interested in the potential of the library market, particularly in the area of microforms, and began research and development projects of their own. The Council could now shift its attention and energies to such other activities as

- strengthening the management skills of the administrators of large research libraries, whose predicted exponential growth had transformed them into large bureaucracies with budgets in the millions;
- development of creative programs to meet the changing requirements of library users;
- responding to new patterns of education predicated on concepts of lifetime learning and enlarging the role of the public library as a people’s university.

At about the same time, a shift also occurred in the administration of CLR: upon Mr. Clapp’s retirement in 1968, Fred C. Cole became its second president.

**Automation**

One important area has remained a priority of the Council from its inception—the application of computer and related technology to library processes. In addition to the work at the National Library of Medicine cited earlier in this report, CLR funded innovative projects in automatic indexing, searching law by computer, computerized maintenance of serials records, research into the library of the future, computer-controlled typographic composition, optical scanning, and many others. With the development of NLM’s MEDLARS, computers acquired the ability to handle bibliographic information more effectively. They now could command lower- as well as upper-case type, diacritical as well as Arabic numerals, and non-Latin as well as Roman characters.
MARC Then in 1968, an important event occurred that opened the door to real change: with Council aid the MARC (Machine-Readable Cataloging) pilot project was undertaken by the Library of Congress. 11

From 1961 to 1968, the Council expended over a quarter of a million dollars to implement the development of MARC at LC. Through the distribution of MARC magnetic tapes containing official LC cataloging data, libraries even at great distances could cut costs in two ways: first, by reducing the amount of original cataloging, much of it duplicating LC's work, that had formerly been required; second, by using the MARC tapes in local computer facilities to produce catalog cards, book catalogs, reading lists, and the like. The structure of the MARC format was accepted as a national and international standard, in 1971 by the American National Standards Institute and in 1973 by the International Standards Organization. Thus MARC could provide what had heretofore been lacking, a standard method for the transmission of bibliographic data on magnetic tape.

With the development of the MARC format came an abundance of activity in the field of automation. For the first time it was possible to think in terms of the cooperative creation of a national data base, one that could be shared by libraries across the U.S. The way that sharing should be organized became an almost immediate concern, for machine-readable bibliographic data bases began to develop independently and almost simultaneously throughout the country, with little or no official guidance.

RECON The first steps toward a national data base evolved from MARC and were taken at the Library of Congress. Although MARC was beginning to build a data base, it contained only current English language books cataloged after the system was created; the data base could not be regarded as complete unless it included records for books in other languages and for books cataloged prior to MARC's appearance. Accordingly, in 1969 LC embarked on a pilot project to experiment with the conversion of those earlier, or retrospective, titles to machine-readable form. 13 The RECON (REtrospective CONversion of catalog records) project was supported by CLR, with additional funding from LC and the Office of Education. RECON demonstrated the technical feasibility and established the unit costs of various approaches to a full-scale retrospective conversion project at the Library of Congress. In light of its other obligations, however, the Library concluded that large-scale conversion would be too costly in terms of staff, space, and funds to undertake without massive outside support, and the project was discontinued. The published results of the pilot project have been useful, however, as other agencies have begun to convert their records to machine-readable form.

---

13XIII:14-17; XIV:22; XV:22-23; XVII:11-12.
A National Serials Program

At the same time, work started on the development of a coordinated national approach to the bibliographic control of serials, generally defined as items published on a regular, continuing basis in numbered volumes and issues. Under contract to the Joint Committee on the Union List of Serials, the Library of Congress in 1967 began work on a project (funded in part by CLR) to build a national data bank of machine-readable information on all serial publications. This proved to be too massive an undertaking at the time, so a second project was conceived, this time to be carried on, initially at least, outside of the Library of Congress. Its purpose was to experiment with machine-readable bibliographic data on selected serials held by the three national libraries (Library of Congress, National Library of Medicine, and the National Agricultural Library). Project planners hoped to learn as much as possible about the problems involved, to build files, and to establish techniques and procedures under which a national serials program could later be built. The Association of Research Libraries was designated the executive agent for the project, under the aegis of the National Libraries Task Force, which included on its staff two Council employees. With the successful conclusion of this project, in 1972 the National Serials Data Program moved back to the Library of Congress as an official unit of the Processing Department.

Other Automation Projects

By 1967, the Council was allocating more of its funds to projects in automation and national library services than to any other program category, a reflection not only of the Council's concern and continuing interest, but of the expense of research and development in the area. Efforts to apply new thinking to computer technology and organization continued—at the Library of Congress and elsewhere. Two studies at LC explored the possibility of automating the files in the Archive of Folk Song and the feasibility of obtaining automated control of thematic map collections. Work on a manual of systems design for librarians began and in 1967 the new Journal of Library Automation received support. CLR made awards for projects on the computer indexing of archival collections and the development of a computer classification scheme for slides.

NELINET

Perhaps the most important venture in library cooperation during this period, and the first to explore the application of MARC tapes for the purpose, occurred in New England. In 1966, CLR made the first of a series of grants to the New England Board of Higher Education for its New England Library Information Network (NELINET). By 1970, NELINET had developed the capability of producing, on demand from subscribing libraries, sets of catalog cards (with a local call number option), spine labels, and book pocket labels for books whose titles were included in the MARC tapes. NELINET continues to be an important part of library operations in the New England states.

Project Intrex at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology was another major effort of the transitional years. The goal of the project, which received its funding initially from the National Science Foundation and others as well as from CLR, was to develop a possible configuration for the technical library of the future. During the five years of Council support, a system was built that drew together the capabilities of the computer, television, and microform technology. The costs were high, however, and in the end it was determined that the Intrex system was not economically feasible for most libraries at that time.

In order to demonstrate the application of the Intrex system in a library setting, the Council provided additional funds for a model unit in the M.I.T. engineering library that offered a variety of techniques to assist users. Several of the model library's activities have been of benefit to academic libraries in general, notably point-of-use instruction—packaged programs of audiovisual materials to assist the patron in the use of specialized library tools at the point at which he needs to use them—and “Library Pathfinders,” single sheet guides to published information in specific subject areas.

The rapid advance of computer technology also affected other areas of Council concern. For example, in 1956 computers and microfilm were looked to as prime but separate paths to solutions of library problems. Now, recent projects using computer output microfilm (COM) have shown that combining the two technologies can have beneficial results. In the area of management, the need to incorporate computer technology smoothly into library systems has added to the complexities of library administration, increasing the requirement for highly trained personnel and for a fresh look at the applicability of current management theories to library problems. Further, while providing new tools for library users, the computer has at the same time highlighted the importance of a new assessment of library services and their organization. Finally, the impact of computer technology quickly crossed national boundaries to become an equal force in international terms, making it clear that the same requirements exist for standards and compatible systems on an international as on a national basis.

Experience gained by Council staff in monitoring these and other projects enabled the Council to state in its 14th Annual Report (1970) its perception of the requirements for the development of a national library system, along with a view of how that development should proceed. This statement established the Council’s enlarged scheme of priorities for the seventies. The new agenda provides a useful organization for a discussion of the Council’s current program, which will be viewed in the context of developments of the seventies. During fiscal 1976, 70 projects were active. New grants and fellowships amounting to $1,148,011 were awarded, and the Council board authorized an additional $778,673 for Council-administered awards and project costs.

15XI:14-15 and subsequent annual reports.
CLR's 14th Annual Report projected a future world in which the United States would have "a single national library system wherein the optimal degree of centralization insured the optimal use of resources to provide the best possible services to library clientele." In this system cataloging would be handled at a central source, as would procurement of materials; thus all libraries would share in the timely receipt of cataloging records as well as books and other library materials. There would be a single national data base in machine-readable form encompassing all types of library materials and representing the combined holdings of all libraries. Finally, the assets of this national system would be freely available to all libraries and their users through a vast coordinated communications network.

The report recognized the realities of the situation, however, realities that still apply today. Not only are the large sums of money required for such a system unavailable, but in the U.S. a completely centralized system is not feasible, politically or otherwise. Nevertheless, in 1970 some of the elements that seemed to presage a national library system were evident. For one thing, the development of MARC appeared to point the way to the growth of a national data base of records for books, or monographs. Work was progressing toward creating a similar data base for serials. Movement toward the provision of national library services—services performed by central sources and available to all libraries in the country—had clearly begun, and, in the six years since, has taken a quantum leap.
With national library services, libraries could reduce high technical processing costs by eliminating the need for each library to duplicate the efforts of others, a wasteful procedure in terms of time as well as money. With the development of a national data base, libraries could draw necessary bibliographic information from a central source without repeating the effort involved in producing it. This data base would be the foundation of a system of national bibliographic control, defined as a coherent effort, coordinated at the national level, that would marshal all the nation's complementary resources and capabilities to provide comprehensive control over each bibliographic item (book, journal, etc.) and disseminate effectively to the user the products and services made possible by that control.

The Library of Congress, with items in its collections numbering in the millions and both its cataloging data and format accepted as de facto standards, has long been in the Council's view the key node in any national system of bibliographic control. The first public indication that the Library saw itself as the logical agency to serve as the national bibliographic center and was ready to assume those functions occurred at a June 1975 meeting of the Council for Computerized Library Networks. "The Library's role," as described by William J. Welsh, now Deputy Librarian of Congress, "... is to develop and maintain standard bibliographic devices that will promote consistency in decentralized input to a comprehensive national data base."16

In 1972, an important step in the development of a national serials program took place. With support from the three national libraries and the Council, the National Serials Data Program was made a separate entity within the Library of Congress.17 Its main goal was to develop a national machine-readable bibliographic data base for serials that would uniquely identify each title, supply important cataloging information to all libraries, and permit the uniform transfer of data on serials.

Because its work was limited to the files of the three national libraries, it soon became apparent that the program could not build a national serials data base fast enough to satisfy the requirements of all libraries, especially as to retrospective records. A reasonable solution seemed to be to make use of the resources and efforts of others outside of the government to construct the needed comprehensive data base.

Thus, a cooperative file-building effort was initiated and entitled the Conversion of Serials (CONSER) Project.18 Recognizing the dual need for a formal entity to administer the program and for the management to reside outside of the administrative structure of the participants, the Council agreed to fund and manage CONSER in the
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initial phases. In December 1974, CLR signed a contract with the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) for the use of its computer facilities. The Library of Congress, the National Library of Canada, and the University of Minnesota made their machine-readable serials files available as the initial data base. Nine other libraries currently participate on-line to add new records, and to upgrade and correct others in the basic file. It is projected that this integrated, cooperative file will eventually contain from 200,000 to 300,000 serial records. As of June 1976, it held more than 125,000 such records.

Included in the initial CONSER data base are serial titles in the field of the humanities, processed by LC National Serials Data Program staff. This segment of the project is supported by matching grants from the Council and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). A parallel effort to accelerate the availability of serial records in science and technology is supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) and involves participation by the National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing Services. This is an important first step in cooperative data base building across professional lines.

Two CLR systems specialists have worked full time on the CONSER Project since it began nearly three years ago. During this fiscal year—in November 1975—the Council made a grant to the Library of Congress to support the systems design and programming required to integrate the functions of the CONSER Project with the other technical processing activities managed by LC. The Library plans to assume eventual responsibility for the management and permanent maintenance of the data base and for distribution of resulting products.19

A National Data Base for Monographs

The management of a national serials system is only one function of the Library of Congress as the national bibliographic center. In 1974 the Library launched, with CLR support, three other programs contributing to the development of its national bibliographic service,20 the first of which is COMARC (Cooperative MARC).

Under the COMARC pilot project, LC accepts machine-readable records created locally by selected U.S. libraries and based on LC cataloging copy derived from cards, proof sheets, and entries in the National Union Catalog. The Library then removes the duplicates, compares the records with the official catalog, updates them for consistency when required, and redistributes them through the MARC Distribution Service—thus broadening the scope of LC’s MARC coverage of books. If successful, COMARC will demonstrate the validity of a concept critical to the early establishment of a national bibliographic data base: decentralized input combined with central bibliographic authority. "Decentralized input" means that many agencies share the responsibility for supplying records for the data base, thus allowing for faster growth and greater currency. The
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quality and consistency of the data base are assured by designating an agency (or agencies) as a "central bibliographic authority" to insure that the records are accurate and to eliminate duplication.

During the past year, Boston Theological Institute, Cornell University Library, Northwestern University Library, 3M Co. Library Systems (formerly Information Dynamics Corporation), the University of Chicago, and the Washington State Library were selected to participate in the COMARC project. They were chosen on the basis of the completeness of the data content of their records and their adherence to MARC encoding. The first COMARC records were made available through the MARC Distribution Service with the subscription year that began on April 1, 1976.

For the second endeavor, CLR funds enabled the Library to contract with an outside consultant who, together with the LC staff, conducted a study of the requirements for the design and implementation of a core bibliographic system. The results of the study, which took into account the Library's internal processing requirements as well as those necessary for its projected national bibliographic service, will provide part of the blueprint for the hardware and software systems the Library will need.

The third aspect of the three-phased project was an attempt to develop a machine-readable format for libraries to use when reporting their holdings to the National Union Catalog. The format would be based on the MARC record for each title but would contain fewer data elements, in the hope that the information could be made available to users more quickly than is possible at present. A report has been prepared and its implications are presently being studied by the Library of Congress.

CIP

It will of course be some years before all libraries are able to tap into automated bibliographic resources, and the need to catalog materials quickly and accurately is and will continue to be pressing. In this connection, a different kind of program at the Library of Congress, supported by the Council and the National Endowment for the Humanities, has already produced cost benefits for libraries of all types. The goal of the Cataloging-in-Publication (CIP) program, first attempted in the late 1950s and revived ten years later, is to make LC cataloging information available more quickly to all who purchase books. Drawing upon the results of the earlier experiment, project planners reevaluated the cost factors and resolved the technical problems. Now over 1100 publishers submit books in the galley stage to the Library of Congress so that cataloging data can be prepared and subsequently printed in the book itself. More than 82,000 titles have been processed since July 1971 when the program was put into operation. Cost reduction benefits for libraries result from the fact that official cataloging information for each book may be obtained quickly and easily by those libraries that cannot afford MARC tapes or the time of professional librarians. Further, the cataloging data is
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immediately available for use, eliminating the time lag between receipt of the book and the arrival of the LC catalog cards or MARC tapes, time when the book was usually unavailable for use by library clientele.

The Library of Congress is only one of the institutions important to the development of a national system for handling information. Abstracting and indexing services, publishers, book dealers, and other professionals also are concerned with the way such a system may be constructed. In April 1974, at a meeting sponsored jointly by the National Science Foundation and the Council on Library Resources, 45 participants representing various sectors of the information community met to design "programs of action" that would "constitute some of the building blocks of the improved national bibliographic system." One outgrowth of that meeting was the appointment of a Committee for the Coordination of National Bibliographic Control (CCNBC), supported by CLR, NSF, and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS). The Council administers the funds for the committee, maintains the files, handles correspondence, and implements the committee's decisions.

The committee members were given eight specific charges at the initial planning meeting:

- Define the minimum bibliographic record required for item identification;
- Study the requirement for additional standards in the fields of libraries, documentation, and related publishing practices, and recommend action to the proper agency;
- Promote the interchange of bibliographic records among libraries, systems, and across professional lines;
- Devise record formats and content designation schemes for journal articles, technical reports, and other forms of literature not presently covered by the MARC formats;
- Study the problem of coupling noncharacter representations, such as graphics or numerical data, to the related bibliographic records;
- Promote improved bibliographic access across professional lines;
- Devise a national bibliographic name authority system; and
- Study the problem of subject access and make recommendations aimed at solutions.

CCNBC has thus far devised four different approaches to carry out its task. It appoints working parties to deal with particular problems, commissions studies, holds planning meetings on specific subjects, and recommends formal standards activity.
Working parties on Formats for Journal Articles and Technical Reports and on Bibliographic Name Authority Files held their first meetings in the summer of 1975 and have continued to meet on a quarterly basis. By the end of June 1976, each group reported progress toward developing formats that may result in accepted standards in their respective areas.

The complexity of issues surrounding the possible use of bar codes on books called for a different kind of approach—initiation of a series of meetings to examine the problem and to determine how it might be investigated.

Bar codes are vertical lines representing coded numbers and/or letters that can be read by automated devices called optical scanners. An example of this is the Universal Product Code (UPC), used primarily for items on sale in supermarkets. The UPC translates product identification numbers into a form that can be easily and quickly read by optical scanners located at a supermarket’s checkout counters. Its purpose, with the aid of a computer, is to automate customer sales transactions and capture individual product data. The code can be used for product control by manufacturers, distributors, wholesalers, retailers—in short, by everyone who handles the item from the time it is packaged until a consumer carries it out of the supermarket door.

In recent months, book jobbers and vendors have become interested in having publishers print bar codes (or some other form of optical code) on books and magazines, so that they may also be handled automatically. To determine how the bar code issue could best be examined, CCNBC called a meeting in May 1976 of representatives of the library community, book vendors, and publishers. On the recommendation of that group, the committee plans to hold another larger meeting, to include representatives of various bar code encoding schemes, equipment vendors, abstracting and indexing services, etc.; discussion here will center on the possible effects of the use of bar codes on the library and associated information communities.

Another number used for the control of books, especially by publishers for processing book orders, is the International Standard Book Number (ISBN). The CCNBC has commissioned a study to discover whether this number also can be used effectively by libraries for purposes other than ordering books. This exemplifies the third method used by the committee in meeting its charge.

The fourth approach concerns the area of standards. When committee discussion results in a matter that seems to require the preparation of a formal standard, the problem is forwarded to the appropriate agency for consideration. When, for example, the need to standardize the way serials holdings are recorded in bibliographic records arose from work on the CONSER Project, the problem was referred to the committee. CCNBC felt discussion of the problem had proceeded to the point where a committee of the American National...
Standard Institute (ANSI) should begin officially to define a standard. ANSI Committee Z/39, responsible for standards work in this area, accepted the charge and during the past year set up a subcommittee to prepare a standard format for serials holdings statements.

The value to libraries of cooperative endeavors has been demonstrated many times over in the last 20 years. With the advent of automation, the need for cooperative action became even more pressing, for applying technology to manual systems has proved, initially at least, to be very costly. Except for a few of the largest institutions, most libraries have been able to take advantage of automated procedures only through the forming of various kinds of consortia.

In the last six years, the growth of these networks and consortia has accelerated rapidly in response to the initiative and needs of libraries in a particular region or with other characteristics in common. This has not, however, been the result of a coordinated national effort, nor has official leadership emerged to insure the achievement of an entirely realistic goal of a flexible confederation of library systems working toward a national bibliographic system.

The Council has long attempted to aid in the formation of such a system. One way is through the selection of programs for support. For example, the Council attempts to focus on those programs that appear to offer solutions to current library problems and to apply automation knowledgeably in support of day-to-day operations. Other criteria include how well they fit the overall pattern of national development, whether they have the enthusiastic support of this sponsoring institution and a commitment for continued funding upon reaching operational status, and whether they are sound in concept and realistic as to schedule. Another most important consideration is the expertise and experience of the proponents themselves.

The Council tries to assist in a less structured way as well, through the advice, evaluation, and assistance provided on demand by CLR systems specialists who attempt to prevent wasteful duplication of effort and to promote a rational division of labor. To encourage coordination of efforts, CLR has on occasion provided an opportunity for network proponents to talk directly with each other and discuss their mutual concerns. To this end, the Council this spring supported a meeting at the Library of Congress of major network directors. A second meeting is scheduled for late summer.

Perhaps the best known bibliographic network emanates from the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) in Columbus, Ohio. OCLC began as an operating system for Ohio libraries in the early 1970s and now serves over 750 libraries throughout the nation. Its automated bibliographic data base, combining records from MARC tapes with those introduced locally by members, contains over 2.25 million entries. One of its most valuable services is the provision of
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OCLC's early developmental aspects had been funded by the U.S. Office of Education and by participating Ohio libraries. CLR began to share these costs with a small grant in 1970; by 1973, new and substantially increased developmental funds were being provided by the Council. By 1975, the first of OCLC's six long-range designs for its on-line system—an on-line union catalog with shared cataloging capability—had become fully operational. The use of OCLC's computer facility to create a national serials data base under terms of the CONSER Project is helping the center progress toward its second long-term goal: serials control. The other projected elements, some of which are being developed with grants from other funding agencies, include capabilities for control of acquisitions, interlibrary loan communication, remote catalog access, circulation control, and subject retrieval.

OCLC received its fourth CLR grant in May 1975 for the development of acquisitions and authority file subsystems and for installing a subject retrieval capability by contracting with the Battelle Memorial Institute for use of its search system (BASIS).

An acquisition subsystem would support the acquisition of new materials by OCLC member libraries by first allowing an on-line search to determine whether the desired item is already on hand or on order. It would then automatically prepare order forms, process invoices, issue claims for orders not received, and account for funds. An authority file subsystem would enhance the quality of the on-line catalog by providing, for example, the authoritative form of authors' names, together with cross-references to other versions of the names, thus allowing for ready identification of a particular author. Utilization of the BASIS system would enlarge the search capability of the catalog, since it allows for free-text searching on words contained in bibliographic records in addition to those designated as subject terms.

At the end of June 1976, a study of the utility of authority file subsystems was nearing completion, along with implementation of the BASIS system. Work is under way on the claims component of the acquisitions subsystem.

Although OCLC has become the largest library network in existence, it has by no means solved all the problems involved in library automation and networking. The Council believes that a variety of approaches must be explored, that the growth of separate but compatible regional networks is a necessary step in the evolution of a national library system. Thus CLR has provided support for several other large cooperative programs, as well as for a few that seek to attain very specific objectives. For example, in 1973 a small grant to the Washington State Library provided solely for the development of an on-line acquisitions module to enhance its state-wide computerized bibliographic network.26
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Shortly after OCLC opened its doors to Ohio libraries, a second pioneering on-line system went into production at Stanford University in California. Support for BALLOTS (Bibliographic Automation of Large Library Operations using a Time-sharing System) came initially from the U.S. Office of Education; it has been continued with funds from the Council and the National Endowment for the Humanities. BALLOTS' primary function is to assist the technical processing activities of the Stanford University Libraries; by extension it supports and improves services in other California libraries. MARC records form a major portion of the BALLOTS data base, which also contains records of titles being acquired and cataloged by Stanford. In addition to cataloging and serials maintenance, the system now supports the ordering, claiming, canceling, receiving, and in-process control of material received on approval or under blanket order plans, on regular or standing order, by exchange, or as gifts.

In 1975, additional funds from CLR and NEH enabled BALLOTS to undertake the development of a new complete MARC-character-set video terminal and to improve the design of the file in order to make the system more readily usable as a network by interested libraries. At about the same time, seven California public libraries, members of PLAN (Public Library Automation Network), started to use the BALLOTS cataloging system. Now other public, academic, research, special, state, and federal libraries have begun to use specific support functions of the system.

In June 1976, the BALLOTS Center announced that it could provide its members with catalog cards, presorted and ready for filing into a library's catalog. By September 1976, subscribing libraries will be able to store on-line their locally produced catalog records, update their own records, and review or copy records contributed by other local libraries.

The Council’s assistance to the New England Library Network (NELINET) was cited earlier. Another regional networking effort, for which Council support has now ended, took place in the Southwest. In 1971, the state librarians and library associations of Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Arizona, and New Mexico formed the Southwestern Library Interstate Cooperative Endeavor (SLICE), which also extended services based on MARC tapes to its members. Council funds enabled SLICE to staff an office for its first four years, during which a systematic regional plan was developed for increasing and stimulating the sharing of library resources, services, and expertise within the region. SLICE continues to be an effective force for cooperation in the area it serves.

Council assistance for another regional network, the Southeastern Library Network (SOLINET), ended this year. SOLINET's principal outside support comes from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation.
The ten-state cooperative was organized following the expansion of OCLC's services to regional groups outside of Ohio. One of SOLINET's functions has been the placement and operation of OCLC terminals in its member libraries, thus allowing them direct access to the OCLC data base. CLR awarded a small grant to SOLINET in 1974 to support a training program for librarians participating in the network. In May 1976, SOLINET published a terminal training manual consisting of a workbook and audio-tape kit of instruction to assist new operators in the use of the OCLC 100 computer terminal. It is believed that the manual will find wide utility among OCLC users in other networks.

**WICHE**

Last year, the Council made a grant to the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE) for design and developmental work leading to a Western Interstate Bibliographic Network. A reorganization within WICHE caused delay in completing the work projected in the proposal. In April 1976, the name of WICHE's library program, formerly the Western Network, was changed to the Western Interstate Library Coordinating Organization (WILCO), with the states of Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, South Dakota, and Washington as members. WILCO now operates under the direction of the Western Council of State Librarians. At the end of June, WILCO personnel were beginning to explore the ways in which the coordination of current bibliographic and resource-sharing activities in the western states could be improved.

**Chicago's Library Data Management System**

For almost ten years, the University of Chicago has been striving to develop and complete a comprehensive Library Data Management System. Beginning in 1968 with a relatively unsophisticated automated system that primarily supported products, the university library has developed one of the best concepts in the country for the design of a total system for a single institution. A joint grant from CLR and NEH, made in 1970, assisted in this effort. In 1975, CLR awarded a new grant to the university for continued development of the system, this time to include an examination of how it could be made available to other libraries. At the end of June 1976, the library reported that it was preparing to initiate testing of a pilot circulation system. It is projected that by 1977 the general circulation system will be fully operational and the existing manual system will be closed. Other internal library functions currently supported by the system include data base search and retrieval; on-line input and update; LC-distributed MARC record processing; selection, ordering, and check-in of library materials; gift and blanket order processing; cataloging; and binding and labeling record processing.
Council support for automation projects has not been limited to large libraries or networks. Funds have been provided for smaller automation projects when they show promise and contribute to the overall development of computer application to library use. In the early 1970s, for example, a small grant enabled Bucknell University to experiment with a program that allowed students to retrieve information from a central bibliographic data base using remote terminals; another project goal was the development of a model subject search capability. Later, the Ohio State University Library conducted a statistical study of transaction activity in their large online automated circulation system.

Four new grants this year paved the way for additional applications of automation to library processes and associated activities. Last fall, CLR awarded funds to the American Society for Information Science (ASIS) for preparation of a 25-year cumulative index of the journal of the society, JASIS. Published in early 1976, the Cumulative Index provides a "core collection" of library and information science periodical literature that appeared in the magazine from 1950 to 1974. The project can provide a model for the utilization of generally accepted indexing terminology and standards.

Increasing the accessibility of legal materials was the subject of an April 1976 conference of law librarians, legal editors, computer experts, and attorneys held in Concord, New Hampshire, with some support from the Council. The PTC Research Foundation of the Franklin Pierce Law Center sponsored the meeting on "Computer Access to Secondary Legal Materials." Its goal was to develop a uniform method of abstracting articles in legal periodicals for computer storage and retrieval. Proceedings of the conference are to be published in IDEA, a quarterly law journal published by the center.

Improving on-line accessibility to bibliographic records contained in computerized data bases is the purpose of two new projects receiving CLR awards this year. The library of the University of Illinois College of Law plans to program and evaluate a computer on-line reference service for library users, particularly valuable when professional help is not available in the library, for instance at night or on weekends. Utilizing the university's on-line computer system, PLATO (Programmed Logic for Automated Teaching Operation), the law library will initiate a pilot project that concentrates on its collection of state and federal documents.

The premise of the second project is that subject access to monographs can be improved by augmentation of MARC records. The experiment will be carried out by the Syracuse University School of Information Studies with the help of a CLR grant. Working with a
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The Need for Standards

Standards and standardization are referred to frequently in this report, for the adoption of acceptable standards is basic to progress in the library field. Standards have assumed even greater importance as libraries have moved toward automation and cooperative arrangements. In the context of the Council's work in national and international bibliographic control, standardization means the development and adoption of codes, definitions, rules, and procedures that will permit a common understanding of the format, control elements, and intellectual content of bibliographic records. If it is to be possible for libraries to exchange information about their holdings, to share the task of constructing data bases, or to work together in consortia and networks, there must be absolute agreement on the conventions that govern library processes.

The Council has for many years pressed for the development of standards as a necessary step in the evolution of a national library system. Essential to the development of a coherent national serials program, for example, is the requirement that each title be uniquely identified, in this case by a single number. This unique number will allow a user to retrieve the correct bibliographic record no matter how often a journal changes its title. Council staff members served on both national and international standards committees that worked on this problem. This committee work led to the promulgation and acceptance in 1970 of a U.S. standard for serial numbers and the 1973 adoption of an international standard serial number (ISSN) based on the U.S. format.

The administrative responsibility for standards work in the U.S. lies with the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). A federation of more than 160 technical, professional, and trade organizations and 1,000 companies, ANSI acts as the national clearinghouse and coordinating agency for voluntary standards in the United States. Since 1961, CLR, together with the National Science Foundation, has supported the work of its Committee Z/39, which is responsible for standards in library work, documentation, and related publishing practices.\(^4\) Two new CLR grants, successively covering
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the period from April 1976 through June 1978, will allow for expansion of Z/39's professional staff, for the development of its capability as a national information center for standards from any source that come under the committee's purview, and for necessary travel in connection with standards work.

In 1975, three new Z/39 standards, covering the numbers assigned to technical reports, romanization of Hebrew, and advertising of micropublications, were published. In addition, the committee has agreed to administer two subgroups of the International Standards Organization, of which ANSI is a member; this requires regular and active participation in primary international standards work. The subgroups oversee standards work dealing with character sets and numbering systems in documentation.

Apart from committee work and the sponsorship of key meetings, the Council has also funded specific projects devoted to the development of standards and the encouragement of their use. In 1975, a grant was made to the American Library Association on behalf of the Joint Steering Committee for the Revision of the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules (AACR), a basic tool for catalogers as well as a powerful force for standardization. Members of the committee include representatives of ALA, the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, the (British) Library Association, the British Library, and the Library of Congress; these organizations also contribute to the total cost of the work. Scheduled for completion within the next two years, the revised edition will take into account both the promulgation of recent international standards and new categories of library materials, such as audiovisuals.

Agreement on adoption of standards is not enough; they must also be widely used and adhered to in order for the greatest benefit to be obtained. In 1975, a small grant to the Boston Theological Institute (BTI) assisted in a program of encouraging publishers of theological serials to print assigned ISSNs on the covers of their publications. In an April 1976 report to the Council, the project director wrote that in almost every instance serials publishers who were approached agreed to print the ISSN either on the front cover or within the publication. The project thus far has demonstrated the usefulness of an aggressive information campaign promoting adoption and use of standards. A supplemental grant this year allows BTI to complete the project by communicating with publishers of an additional 709 titles.

Programs in the area of automation, networks, standards, and national library services have over the years consumed 45 percent of available Council funds. Grants totaling $489,213 and allocation of an additional $25,000 for future activity were made in this category during fiscal 1976.
The program areas covered in this section of the report—the preservation and conservation of materials and the application of microform technology to library needs—have been of concern to the Council from the outset. In fact, 40 percent of the funds granted in the first two years of Council operation went to projects intended to deal with these matters.

As time has passed, activities in the two areas have more and more come to relate to and complement each other. Since mid-1972, they have been the province of one program officer with, we believe, benefit to both. His knowledge and awareness of developments in micrographics have hastened and enhanced their application to some of the preservation problems discussed below.

Although library collections have expanded to include a wide variety of nonprint media (e.g., films, cassette tapes, recordings, and occasionally even power tools and appliances), books are still the library's chief stock-in-trade; a concomitant problem, then, remains the deterioration of paper. The Council has used several approaches to the problem of deterioration. It has supported research into the causes of deterioration and the methods for halting it and repairing its effects. A second approach involves exploring the potential of transferring information to microforms when the paper on which it appears has disintegrated past the point of salvation. This method may also be used when the item is too valuable for general use and
circulation or too costly to maintain in its original format. A peculiar twist to the problem of paper deterioration is that it is not the oldest papers that are the most in jeopardy, but rather the newer books and journals that have been printed since the mid-nineteenth century by relatively sophisticated technological processes. Investigation into the deterioration of bookstock was one of the Council's earliest priorities. Although many developments since then have helped to define the problem and successful remedies have been applied, support of preservation activities remains, after 20 years, an important facet of the Council's work.

Several organizations have received support for research into and applications of methods to prevent papers from disintegrating. The Council's first grant in this area was made in 1957 to W. J. Barrow, working as a documents restorer at the Virginia State Library, to investigate the cause of paper deterioration. Support for Barrow and, following his death, the W. J. Barrow Research Laboratory, Inc., has continued to the present day. In addition to Barrow, within the last six years both the Library of Congress Preservation Research Office and the New England Document Conservation Center have received CLR grants. CLR has also extended support for projects involving research into the special problems occasioned by flooding of archives and libraries and for the preparation of a manual on conservation. Any discussion of the Council's work in preservation, however, must begin with William J. Barrow to whom must be given the credit for early determining the primary cause of paper deterioration.

In the first half of the century, there was a belief that atmospheric pollution, particularly in urban areas, was the main factor leading to paper deterioration. Barrow disputed this notion, and by the late 1950s his experiments led him to conclude that the deterioration was caused primarily by internal, rather than external, agents, namely chlorides from the bleach used in paper manufacture and alum from the size. The use of these chemicals produces highly acidic papers—this acidic property causes deterioration.

Following this discovery, Barrow turned his attention to developing methods of deacidifying the paper in existing books, continuing to use his one- and two-bath processes, which are commonly employed by many conservators today. These processes, however, treat individual sheets; application to any substantial number of books requires impractical amounts of time and labor.

After Barrow's death in 1967, the Barrow laboratory staff concentrated on methods of deacidifying whole books by impregnating them with a class of compounds called organic amines. Morpholine was chosen as the most suitable of these for further experimentation. The laboratory staff subsequently developed a morpholine vapor deacidification process and related equipment capable of deacidifying five to ten books at a time, for the most part without deleterious side effects.

---

24: 21–22 and subsequent annual reports.
The Barrow laboratory is testing this morpholine vapor deacidification processor, which is capable of treating 50–100 books simultaneously in less than an hour.
The National Endowment for the Humanities joined the Council this fiscal year in supporting a large-scale test of the morpholine vapor deacidification process, to be undertaken by Barrow laboratory staff in cooperation with the Virginia State Library. A portion of the $176,000 grant will be used to construct a larger version of the original processor, this one designed to treat 50-100 books simultaneously in 30 minutes or less.

The collections of the Virginia State Library, representing deterioration problems common to many libraries, will be used for the test. The Council has arranged with Research Corporation, a nonprofit organization, to patent the process. If morpholine vapor deacidification is demonstrated to be practical and safe for routine use in libraries, Research Corporation will promote the process and license its use. Any profits from the venture will be used for further research.

**Permanent/Durable Paper**

Problems of preserving deteriorating books and periodicals would be greatly lessened if an acid-free paper were used in the first place. Following his identification of acid as the primary factor in deterioration of paper, W. J. Barrow had begun to work on specifications for production of a permanent and durable paper that would also be economical to manufacture. In addition to being acid free, it would possess characteristics enabling it to resist damage from folding and other hazards of daily use. Success came in 1959 when the Standard Paper Manufacturing Company of Richmond “produced five tons of a fine 60-pound book-paper, the first paper deliberately manufactured as a strong, stable (permanent) paper for general use at a competitive price.”

Although permanent/durable paper based on Barrow’s specifications and with a useful life of hundreds of years is now commercially available, it regrettably has not been widely used. However, two developments in the past year indicate an increased interest in ensuring, before publication, that documents will endure, rather than attempting to reverse the degeneration process once it has begun.

In consultation with the American Association of University Presses, the National Historical Publications Commission has issued recommended standards of paper quality for the historical publications that it sponsors. These standards are based primarily on the specifications developed by the W. J. Barrow Laboratory. The second development concerns paper used for copying purposes. Although many documents are copied for short-term use, others are copied for use in archives, for legal purposes (e.g., wills, contracts), or for original publication (theses, dissertations), where long-term preservation is essential. A major manufacturer of copying machines has now developed an “archival bond” paper to be used in these

---

instances; it was produced according to specifications developed by the National Bureau of Standards for the National Archives.

Micrographics

Council interest in the development and use of microforms stems from more than its desire to find practical, economical methods of preserving paper. Microforms are a second answer to the problem of deteriorating materials, but to this reason for using microforms must be added several others that have become important in recent years.

Microform publication can be substantially less costly than conventional printing. Because of this, many publishers of scholarly and specialized materials have begun to produce large microform collections of uncopyrighted or out-of-print works. *Literary Marketplace* (New York, 1976) lists 50 U.S. firms as “micropublishers” specializing in this format. Because of the physical space saved by use of micropublications, small libraries can now provide large collections of material to local users. As an illustration: subscribers to the microfiche collection of the ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) Document Reproduction Service can obtain each month approximately 800 noncopyrighted educational research documents on about 120 microfiche. The ease with which microforms can be produced and their relatively low cost make them particularly useful for publishing materials (e.g., catalogs) that must be frequently updated.

The rapid growth of micrographics technology has led to the almost daily introduction of new products and services aimed at the library market. To help librarians assess the potential of and distinguish among these offerings, CLR acts as a consultant when requested, providing at no cost informed and unbiased assistance. To be further helpful, CLR attempts to serve as a monitor and advocate for libraries vis-à-vis the microform industry.

Microforms—Preservation and Accessibility

The Council's early efforts in applying microform technology to libraries centered on the development of prototype equipment designed to make microforms easier to use, less costly to produce, and more adaptable to library processes. Although the requirement for more extensive funding than was available to the Council and the growing interest of commercial vendors combined to lessen the importance of this activity as a Council priority, a further effort was made in 1973. The need for an automatic camera designed especially to film catalog cards was heightened during the late sixties and seventies when many academic libraries began to microfilm their card catalogs as a hedge against natural disaster and vandalism. CLR therefore entered into a contract with Mega System Design of Toronto, Canada, to develop a prototype card-filming camera that operates at relatively high speed and produces high quality images.39 Mega has since built improved cameras of this type, based on what was learned from testing the prototype.

---
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Other projects designed to preserve fast-deteriorating materials such as newspapers or to make them more readily available for scholars were also funded in the transitional years 1968–71. Council grants in 1968 and 1969 supported the establishment at the University of Pennsylvania of a central archive of microfilms of medieval manuscripts held in European institutions. A center for the coordination of foreign manuscript copying had been established earlier at the Library of Congress with the assistance of the Council. A 1969 study conducted by the Association of Research Libraries with CLR assistance resulted in the expansion of ARL's Foreign Newspaper Microfilming Project to include the establishment in 1973 of a Foreign Newspaper Microfilming Office at the Library of Congress. A small grant to the Dartmouth College Library in 1971 allowed that institution to make available to other libraries microfilm editions of its holdings of such rare materials as presidential election campaign documents for the years 1868–1900, the papers of Augustus Saint-Gaudens, and other collections for the specialist.

By 1970, rising costs of paper and book production helped to stimulate interest in a development that combined the best features of both microform and computer technology—speed in the case of the computer, low-cost production and size in the case of microforms. This development was computer output microfilm (COM).

Computerized bibliographic data bases can be used for many purposes. They are useful not only for searching and quickly retrieving discrete items of information, but also for producing lengthy bibliographies, book catalogs, and other research tools and management information documents at high rates of speed. Today's computers are capable of prodigious output, often reaching one million or more characters a second. A basic problem has been to capture that output in a human-readable form, in order to take full advantage of the computer's production capability.

In the 1950s and early 1960s, the solution to that problem was generally to attach to the computer a high-speed printer, capable of printing an entire line at once. These "line printers" could produce copy at what seemed an astonishing rate of speed. Since that rate rarely exceeds 3,000 characters a second, however, line-printers are entirely inadequate for dealing with computer output generated at a rate over 30 times faster. Although line printers are still, and will continue to be, the principal output device used, a higher speed printout is desirable for many projects.

The first breakthrough in providing higher speed printout occurred in 1956, when the first computer output microfilmer appeared. This device, which converted the computer's electronic signals to characters on microfilm, was the first example of what we now call a COM recorder.

Despite this early start, it was not until the 1970s that significant growth in COM began to occur, both in sales of COM recorders and in experimentation with new applications. The Council's interest in COM's potential dates from the CLR-supported Index
Medicus project at the National Library of Medicine in the early 1960s, where new phototypesetting techniques were a precursor of later COM activity. The first Council grant made specifically for a COM project was awarded in 1970 to the Tulane University Library. Its investigators proposed to utilize COM in the production of a short-title catalog and to test its acceptance by librarians and library users. A sizable number of libraries, in addition to Tulane's, have converted or are converting their catalogs from card and book format to a COM format. COM is also being used to turn out such products as union lists of holdings, authority files, patron files, and on-order lists.

COM reader devices receive information either from magnetic tape or directly from computers and recreate it on the television-like screen of a cathode ray tube computer terminal, from which it is automatically recorded on microfilm. New COM recorders can eliminate the display step by imprinting from 10,000 to 50,000 lines of a text a minute directly on film. Depending on the reduction ratio used, a single reel of microfilm can contain the bibliographic data representing the records held in a sizable library's entire card catalog (e.g., 250,000 items) with space left over. Moreover, this reel can be duplicated as necessary with no significant loss of quality. In most instances, COM catalogs cost less than book catalogs, no matter how the latter are produced. What is more, because of the low cost, the information contained can be easily updated and the catalog reissued. Thus, savings in both space and cost combine with availability of current information to enhance the potential of this new medium.

In 1976 the Council brought together a panel of micrographics and computer experts to establish the specifics of an inquiry into the degree to which COM hardware, software, and services can be effectively applied to library services and operations.

In the first meeting, the advisory panel developed a series of questions, chiefly concerned with bibliographic applications of COM, to be answered by the principal investigator during the course of the project. His report will cover such matters as the present and prospective cost ranges for generating COM output of bibliographic data, the availability of various character fonts and page formats, the suitability of the readers and reader/printers currently available, limitations of COM formatting, reactions of users to the medium, and the identification of existing bibliographic products that are good candidates for conversion to COM. By the end of June, most of the necessary field work had been completed and an initial draft of the report was in preparation.

The Library of Congress joined the ranks of COM publishers during the year covered by this report. As an experiment, in late 1975 LC produced a microform version of the eighth edition of the Library of Congress Subject Headings, using both COM and other techniques.

---
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that simulated it. Not only did the microform version appear months ahead of the printed version, but subscribers were receptive to the format and a number were enthusiastic about it. After evaluating the experiment, the Library decided to publish a COM version of its Register of Additional Locations (RAL) in 1976. The Register has been published in printed form since 1965 as a supplement to the National Union Catalog and contains additional locations for titles published from the year 1956 to the present. New locations reported to the RAL through 1975 have been entered into a machine-readable file that now contains approximately 1.75 million titles with an average of 12.4 locations per title. Since the Register can quickly give a library the names of other institutions owning a desired book, it is widely used to facilitate interlibrary loan.

A CLR grant was made this year to the Library of Congress for two studies related to the Register of Additional Locations. The first study will identify machine readable data bases from which location reports can be obtained, thus allowing for a rapid expansion of the RAL data base. A survey of libraries having machine-readable data bases will be conducted, followed by on-site interviews with those whose data bases seem to be likely prospects from which to draw location information. Should the Library be able to capitalize on existing data bases, the resulting enlarged RAL file might be an important element in the development of a national interlibrary loan network.

The second study will be carried out concurrently with the publication of the Register in microform. Purchasers of the Register in the new format will be asked to participate in an LC survey. Their responses will, among other things, assist the Library in determining the most desirable frequency of publication of the microform Register and whether, in fact, this edition could supplant the printed version.

Three smaller projects, two of which came to an end during the past year, have explored other aspects of microform use. They involved an experimental microfiche service, an aid to the evaluation of microfiche readers, and a guide to large microform collections.

In 1973, the Governors State University Library received a CLR grant for a nine-month experiment to test the feasibility of using the Selected Research in Microfiche (SRIM) service of the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) on a university-wide basis. Under the grant, the library prepared subject interest profiles of individual faculty members and combined the categories into a single order, thus making possible extremely low unit costs to subscribers. NTIS furnished the documents on microfiche and the library reproduced the microfiche in the necessary quantities, distributing them to the participating faculty members and keeping the master copy for its own collections. Because organization problems within NTIS caused serious delays, the library concluded that despite

---

Microforms—Other Aspects
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its cost-effectiveness, the program could not function efficiently on a long-term basis.

In late 1975, the Council published *Evaluating Microfiche Readers: A Handbook for Librarians*. The 64-page book, written by William R. Hawken with the assistance of the ALA's Library Technology Project and the Council's micrographics specialist, was the result of a CLR-initiated project to find a means of helping librarians determine inexpensively and reliably the most suitable microfiche reader for their purposes. The handbook contains four test microfiche that allow a person without technical training to evaluate microfiche readers and reader-printers intended for use in libraries. Copies were sent by the American Library Association to subscribers to the *Library Technology Reports* and by the Association of Research Libraries to its members. In addition to providing copies for review, CLR distributed the balance of the 2,612-copy edition to requesting libraries.42

Producing materials in a microform format and organizing them into a coherent collection would be useless endeavors without the existence of a guide to help potential users locate desired documents. For reasons of economics, micropublication of uncopyrighted works or out-of-print works no longer covered by copyright is normally in the form of large sets, containing hundreds or thousands of items. Bibliographic aids provided with the sets are frequently scanty and the production or acquisition of catalog cards for individual items is too expensive to consider. The Council this year awarded a small grant to Suzanne Dodson, head of the Government Publications and Microforms Division of the University of British Columbia Library, to enable her to complete a book designed to facilitate the use of these large collections in microform. The guide will contain descriptions of approximately 200 sets of wide general interest. The entries will incorporate details of the contents of each collection, along with references to published reviews.

Although Council allocations for preservation activities have lessened in recent years, its attention to programs in micrographics has increased. In fiscal 1976, grants of $102,313 were awarded in these areas and $20,000 was allocated for ongoing Council-administered projects.

---
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Library Management

The study of management as a discrete discipline is a product of the twentieth century, resulting largely from the performance of industry (especially American industry) during World War II. Until recently, management studies have focused on business and industry, for there the results of management decisions can be easily measured. Since the turn of the century, however, the growth of public service institutions has been phenomenal, to the point where management expert Peter Drucker estimates that from 50 to 60 percent of the gross national product goes not to the business sector, but to or through public-service institutions. "The nonbusiness, public-service institutions do not need management less than business," he wrote recently. "They may need it more... Managing the service institution is likely to be the frontier of management for the rest of this century." ²³

The need to adapt for library use sound management techniques developed in government, business, academic administration, and elsewhere is made even more critical by the phenomenal growth experienced by libraries in this century. This growth may be illustrated by statistics published in 1975 by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). The hundred ARL members reported that together they held over 217 million volumes in their collections; at the same time, their combined operating budgets had swelled to over $522 million.²⁴ In contrast, a hundred years ago the total income of all colleges and universities, in which their libraries shared, was approximately $4.5 million, and a university library could be designated as a "major academic library" if it had at least 5,000 volumes.²⁵

The Council has always had as one of its major goals the improvement of library administration. In the early years, CLR-supported management projects focused on specific aspects of administration: planning for buildings and for space utilization, studying manpower shortages, developing personnel practices and policies, analyzing the relationship of the library to the bookseller, and dealing with fire insurance and legal requirements. In 1968, the Council initiated discussions with librarians, educators, and university administrators that resulted in a more coherent, coordinated program designed to improve academic library management practices.

The first grant in this area went in 1969 to the Association of Research Libraries for a preliminary study by Booz, Allen & Hamilton of management practices in large university libraries. The study

team was assisted by an advisory committee of leading academic librarians and university presidents, who supplied the insights, guidance, and specialized knowledge that were needed as the investigators moved into what was, for them, largely unexplored territory. The resulting publication, Problems in University Library Management (Washington, 1970), has been the point of departure for much subsequent activity. One important outgrowth was the establishment within ARL of the CLR-funded Office of University Library Management Studies (OMS), now in its sixth year of operation.

Since the Booz, Allen & Hamilton study dealt with general management applications for all large university libraries, it was felt that a logical second step would be to apply those principles to some of the operational aspects of a specific institution. Accordingly, in 1971 the Council contracted again with Booz, Allen & Hamilton, which by now had a fair amount of useful experience in the area, to conduct a study of the organization and staffing of the Columbia University Libraries. Duane Webster, the newly appointed director of ARL’s Office of University Library Management Studies, worked as a member of the Booz, Allen team, gaining invaluable on-the-job training for his challenging assignment.

Since August 1970, when OMS was established, the Council has made grants of more than $550,000 toward its work. An increasing amount of support each year has come from ARL and from the sale of the office’s products and services.46

OMS activities are grouped around management research, information collection and dissemination, and organizational training. In the area of research, the office’s most significant contribution has been the design and application of the Management Review and Analysis Program (MRAP), a highly structured procedure for university library use in conducting an internal assessment of management practices, goals, and objectives. To carry out its self-study, each library appoints a team that uses MRAP procedures to examine the decision-making process and to recommend organizational changes that are needed to improve day-to-day library operations. Johns Hopkins University began its self-analysis in September 1975, bringing to 22 the number of institutions that have participated in MRAP.

The office’s main effort in the exchange of information is through its Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC). SPEC collects data and documentation related to academic and research library management and makes the material available to the library community. The information is issued primarily through SPEC Flyers, two-page brief analyses of the data collected, and SPEC Kits, which contain a variety of related documents. Of the nine flyers and kits issued during 1975–76, four include information gleaned from a major survey of user services conducted by SPEC in November 1975. Information compiled from OMS research activities is also disseminated through the ARL Management Supplements and Occasional Papers as well as articles in library journals.
To promote organizational training and development, the OMS staff carried out several programs during the 1975-76 year. The first Library Management Skills Institute, held in Philadelphia in July 1975, was well received; three more are scheduled for the balance of 1976. The office also added several titles to its collection of training films. These are loaned with accompanying discussion materials to requesting libraries. A further endeavor involves the design of topical training modules, which, when testing is completed, will be made available to libraries at a modest cost. The first of these, on performance appraisal, is currently being tested in a pilot program at McGill University.

MRAP Evaluation
A project to evaluate the impact of the OMS Management Review and Analysis Program will be undertaken by two Pennsylvania State University faculty members: Edward R. Johnson, associate librarian and assistant dean of libraries, and Stuart H. Mann, associate professor of operations research. The goal of the 12-month Council-funded study is to determine whether behavioral, attitudinal, or organizational changes have occurred in the climate, overall performance, and effectiveness of libraries that have gone through the MRAP process. Information will be collected by means of a survey that combines questionnaires and personal interviews. The study is expected to result in an evaluative tool that will be useful to the Association of Research Libraries, to MRAP participants, and to other libraries wishing to assess organizational development programs.

Management Planning and Research
The study of the Columbia University Libraries, described earlier in this section, resulted in a report that not only evaluated the existing organization and staffing of the libraries, but projected future requirements, recommended a plan of library organization, and prescribed a detailed staffing pattern. In order to implement the recommendations, Columbia established a Libraries Planning Office, funded for its first three years principally by the Council and partially by the university itself. The office is now entirely supported by the university.

A revised edition of the Planning Office's report on the new administrative organization of the Columbia University Libraries was published in late 1975. It contains detailed organizational descriptions of the libraries housing distinctive collections, such as the Health Sciences Library, the Rare Book and Manuscript Library, the East Asian Library, and the Columbiana Library. The report represents a significant milestone in the further implementation of Columbia's reorganization plan.

The Columbia study and the subsequent work of the Planning Office have provided one model for an approach to improving library management. Council support for a related effort, the establishment of a model research and development (R & D) unit within a
single library system, ended this year. The Joint University Libraries (JUL) of Nashville, Tennessee, established an R & D unit in July 1970. The unit's mission was to apply research and development techniques to library problems defined by the JUL constituent libraries (Vanderbilt University, George Peabody and Scarritt colleges) and to publish reports and studies that could be helpful to other academic libraries as well.

In the final report, the unit's director listed 32 major projects completed during the past six years. The wide-ranging activities dealt with such topics as the preparation of uniform statistical forms for use in all libraries, an affirmative action plan, development of a library service policy, the design of a government documents section as a separate entity within the library system, and planning for the implementation of JUL's participation in SOLINET. Three important projects were concluded in the past year. The first was a technical services cost study, designed to give more credibility to JUL's program budgeting mechanism that had been developed earlier in the grant period. Second, the R & D unit developed a planning document to provide the foundation upon which to base both short- and long-range planning for the JUL system. The third project was a study of the organizational roles of the divisional libraries in JUL's cooperative structure. This study, along with other organizational analyses, resulted in an administrative reorganization within JUL to take effect on July 1, 1976.

Management problems are not restricted to large university libraries or library systems. Small and mid-sized academic libraries face similar pressures caused by rising costs, rapid technological developments, and increased demands to be more accountable to students, faculties, and college administrations. In the belief that some of the experience gained through the MRAP process could be usefully applied to smaller college and university libraries, the Council initiated the Academic Library Development Program in 1975. The program began with a grant to the University of North Carolina at Charlotte (UNCC) for a pilot project enabling the library to engage in a broad range of self-studies, similar to MRAP but tailored to meet the needs of smaller institutions.

Following the appointment of North Carolina Central University professor P. Grady Morein as project coordinator, a team composed of UNCC library staff members began its study of the broad issues of general concern to the library. These included historical and environmental assessments, consideration of the library's internal needs, and an analysis of library goals and objectives. In the spring of 1976, the study team appointed task forces to provide detailed reports and recommendations on management structure and processes, human resource development and use, library resources and services, and future demands for technology and facilities. A major product of the pilot program, scheduled for completion in fall 1976, is a manual for a self-study that may be used by other small to
moderate-sized academic libraries. From the beginning, the UNCC project has been assisted by the director of the ARL Office of University Library Management Studies and by an advisory committee composed of area college presidents, academic librarians, library school professors, and an official of a higher education association concerned with accreditation.

By the end of fiscal year 1976, it had been determined that to ensure the greatest benefit of the model program to libraries, further testing at other institutions would be required. The Council made a supplemental appropriation in May to cover the costs of testing and evaluating the Academic Library Development Program at several institutions of appropriate size and character.

While most of the foregoing programs of the 1970s have dealt with the improvement of management practices in a broad sense, during the last six years the Council has continued as well its earlier support of programs that focus on specific aspects of library administration. For example, a 1972 Council grant made it possible for the Cornell University libraries to undertake a twelve-month program of staff development, with guidance from the Center for Planning and Development of the American Management Association. A CLR-supported study entitled Economics of Academic Libraries, by William Baumol and Matityahu Marcus, was published in 1973 by the American Council on Education. It contains formulas and procedures to guide administrators in the projection of their library's future growth and in budget preparation. A study of library lighting and a survey of administrative information concerning business school libraries also received CLR support during this period.

A grant this year to Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri, provides another example of support for improving specific administrative procedures. Washington University Library staff will attempt to develop a procedure to improve the internal financial auditing of university libraries, using their own institution as the study site. An advisory group of university auditors, representatives of comparable universities, and the ARL Office of University Library Management Studies will aid in reviewing and refining the criteria to help assure their applicability to other university libraries. After careful testing, a manual containing the auditing criteria will be prepared.

The Council's efforts in behalf of improved management functions in academic libraries of all types have grown in recent years to the point where projects such as those here described account for a significant portion of program funds—an average of 10 percent in the last five years. During the fiscal year $61,509 was allocated for new management programs and $200,000 earmarked for continuation of an ongoing program. It should be remembered, also, that management improvement is an important goal of other projects, such as the Academic Library Management Intern Program, described elsewhere in this report.

---

Much attention has been given in this report to projects intended to improve the internal procedures and processes of libraries. The use of computers, the cultivation of networks, and the application of microform technology are indirect means to a common goal: the improvement of library services for users. The Council since 1956 has devoted approximately one eighth of its program funds to projects with this aim. On the campus and within the community, libraries are attempting to help people cope with the modern world through providing a more efficient information service and by actively assisting them to improve their own investigative skills. The Council's special clientele has always been academic and research libraries; in this area of activity, as in all others, particular attention has been given to their needs.

In the 1960s, concern was expressed with the often passive role played by academic libraries in the education of undergraduates. A more active role in the teaching process seemed desirable in order to introduce greater numbers of students to the potential resources of the library and set a pattern of lifetime learning. The Council's investigation of the problem led to the conclusion that a new approach was necessary, one that would stimulate college and university administrators, faculties, and librarians to take a fresh look at how the library should function in the academic community. Thus the Council in 1969 initiated the College Library Program (CLP) and with NEH established a fund (totaling $1,600,000 to date) from which matching grants could be made to individual colleges and universities.51

The program calls for librarians, administrators, faculty, and, in some cases, students in four-year undergraduate institutions to develop cooperative projects that will enhance the library's role in the education of students. Creative yet practical plans receive grants for five-year periods, during which the institution must match the CLR-NEH contribution with funds not already allocated to the library. To date, 23 institutions, varying widely in size, type, and geographic locale, have participated in the College Library Program. Four of the institutions can be classified as state-supported universities with 20,000 students or more; five are small, private colleges with enrollments of under a thousand. At least half have enrollments of from 1,000-5,000 students. Six have predominantly black enrollments; three are for men and one is for women. Nineteen states are represented, from coast to coast. In each of the institutions a program has been developed that appears to suit the current academic environment and to represent a significant step beyond past efforts at that institution.

In the summer of 1975, a team of evaluators visited 12 of the libraries in an attempt to determine whether the College Library Program had so far been successful. Despite the problems encountered by the participants (nearly all had to make major modifications in their plans at the end of either the first or second year), the evaluators found that the program had provided many benefits. For example, the team learned that, at a minimum, the joint program focused the attention of the college administration on the importance of the library in the total teaching effort. At the most, the learning process was greatly strengthened, since the program brought faculty and librarians together (for the first time on some campuses) in efforts to enlarge the educational perspectives of students and improve their investigative skills. The fact that more students were actively encouraged and given occasion to use the library than had previously been the case could not be overlooked. Finally, because each program had elements that could be adapted profitably to other libraries, a ripple effect was often produced, as evidenced by requests for information from nearby colleges desiring to develop programs of their own.

After measuring these results against their necessarily flexible yardstick, the team members concluded that "the need to continue this program is in short a firm conviction." They further concluded that new guidelines for the program would not only aid interested colleges in obtaining a clearer understanding of the program's goals, but would enable the Council and NEH to learn much more about the institution and its plans during the review process.

No CLP grants were awarded during fiscal year 1976 while the evaluation was being conducted and procedures revised. Following approval of the new guidelines, proposals will be considered for programs to begin in the 1977–78 academic year.
Project LOEX

Directly related to the CLR-NEH College Library Program is Eastern Michigan University's Project LOEX (Library Orientation-Instruction Exchange), a clearinghouse for information and materials relating to academic library orientation and instruction. LOEX was established in May 1972 as a result of Eastern Michigan University's Library Outreach Orientation Program, a recipient of a CLP award, and has grown rapidly since. Over 500 academic libraries are members of the clearinghouse with the privilege of borrowing such contributed materials as workbooks, video tapes, program descriptions, surveys, and bibliographies. On an informal basis, LOEX staff assist librarians who are conducting research in the field and participate in workshops and meetings. Traveling exhibits of LOEX materials were used in thirteen states and Canada in 1975. A three-year CLR grant made in 1974 provides LOEX with the funds it needs until Eastern Michigan can take over its support.

Library Service Enhancement Program

As has been noted in other sections of this report, CLR has supported a variety of approaches to the solution of a particular library problem. The same multi-approach technique has been used in efforts to improve library services to undergraduates and to encourage libraries to assume a greater responsibility for their education. The Library Service Enhancement Program (LSEP) was initiated by the Council this fiscal year to stimulate additional activities intended to result in the more imaginative, effective involvement of the academic library in the teaching/learning process. These goals are the same as those of the College Library Program—the difference is in the approach.

Under the Library Service Enhancement Program, library directors designate a project librarian to explore with faculty, students, and administrators ways of integrating the library more fully into the educational process. With faculty assistance, the project librarian designs and implements creative programs intended to expand the library's role in the academic life of the college or university. The grant provides funds up to the total salary and benefits of the designated librarian, who is relieved of normal duties for the academic year in order to spend full time on the project. Project funds are used to appoint for the year a beginning professional librarian and to pay for necessary travel and project expenses.

The Council received over 600 requests for applications, and 212 college and university libraries completed the application process. Applicants were divided into four groups so that institutions of generally similar size and characteristics would be competing. A seven-member review committee first rated the applications, then narrowed the field further in a day of discussion. Following site visits to a number of institutions, the committee made its final selection. The successful libraries, serving student populations ranging from 842 to over 20,000, are located at Cornell University,
DePauw University, Earlham College, Lawrence University, Lewis and Clark College, University of New Hampshire, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical University, Oregon State University, Presbyterian College, University of South Carolina, State University College at Potsdam (N.Y.), and West Georgia College. The enthusiastic response to the program has encouraged the Council to offer it again for the 1977–78 academic year.

As sources of information expand, libraries continually need bibliographic tools to provide scholars and other library patrons with quick and easy access to the materials they require in their research. However, because of the vast number of potentially useful projects in this area and the limited funds available for their support, the Council can aid only those that seem to provide the greatest benefit to libraries and scholars.

The most helpful bibliographic tools are of three basic types: union lists, bibliographies, and book selection aids. Union lists direct users to the particular libraries and repositories that have specific items in their collections. Bibliographies may direct researchers to the best books and journals in a field or to all those concerning a specific subject. To help librarians choose the most useful items for their own collections, book selection aids are needed.

Book selection tools are also useful when libraries must limit their purchases due to budget restrictions. With the cost per volume soaring (the average price per volume of hardcover books was $16.19 in 1975), the necessity for college libraries to choose wisely is critical. The Council's early recognition of this need was demonstrated by its support of Books for College Libraries (Chicago, 1967), which listed more than 53,000 basic titles. Because lists of this sort are out of date the moment they appear, a proposal was made for a periodical publication that would evaluate books on a current basis. Thus CLR provided developmental funds through the American Library Association to establish Choice (Chicago, 1964–), a monthly book selection journal, which became self-supporting in 1969.

While Choice and Books for College Libraries (BCL) provide academic librarians with extremely useful tools for book selection, both demand that the libraries using them develop their own selection procedures to determine which of the listed books will be acquired. Unfortunately, many of the country's most understocked college libraries are also understaffed; often both the time and the training required to make the proper decisions are lacking. It was to address this problem that the Council developed a plan for a core collection—the 40,000 basic titles any four-year liberal arts college must have in its library if it intends to provide students with an adequate education. After some discussion with ALA's Association of College and Research Libraries, it was determined that the core
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A new feature would be the use of computerized techniques to produce the catalog. Utilizing the Library of Congress’ MARC format, reducing the number of titles to be included, and expanding the amount of cataloging per title, the second edition of *Books for College Libraries* was designed to be more than a revision. As stated in the introduction, the project’s purpose was to produce a “highly selective retrospective tool as a counterpart to the current services of *Choice*.” In 1975, ALA published *Books for College Libraries: A Core Collection of 40,000 Titles* in a six-volume paperback set. The format design and the use of computer technology make it possible to revise and update the work to provide a continuing and useful service to the undergraduate library.

During the past year CLR provided funds for two specialized bibliographic tools. In July 1975, the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) received an award to support a survey of medieval Arabic manuscript collections in the United States. The survey was unanimously recommended by the ACLS Arabic Studies Group as a project of “fundamental importance to the future of Arabic scholarship.” Dr. Thomas J. Martin, a research associate in New York University’s Department of Near Eastern Languages and Literatures, is carrying out the survey. During the year its scope was broadened to include Persian and Turkish manuscripts as well as Arabic, since all three languages use the same script and are often housed together.

The second CLR grant went to Frank Rodgers, director of libraries at Portland State University, to assist him in completing research for a “Manual of British Government Publications.” The manual is designed to be a general guide to British government publications comparable to Boyd and Rips’ *United States Government Publications* (New York, 1949). Mr. Rodgers spent the major portion of his 1975-76 sabbatical leave in England, where he surveyed and prepared annotations for documents in several libraries, principally in the University of Southampton and the British Library.

Public as well as academic libraries can play an important part in education. A Gallup poll released in January 1976 declared that 49 percent of the adults surveyed reported using a library in the last two years; in three-fourths of the cases, the one most frequently used was a public library. These libraries have been equally beset by physical and fiscal problems and have had to face as well broad social, educational, and political questions in an era of changing values.

In 1971, the Council and the National Endowment for the
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Humanities provided funds for a critical study by the Public Library Association (PLA) of the goals of public library service. *A Strategy for Public Library Change*, the resulting report, described the current role of the public library and analyzed the forces that are creating pressure for change.

In the late '60s, the vision of ever more and better libraries began to fade. Although the population was increasing, use began to decline in terms of book circulation. Today, financial support, never too secure, is diminishing at the same time that costs of operation continue to rise. Societal changes shaking all established institutions to their foundations also threaten to engulf the public library. Its most enthusiastic supporters are hard pressed in the face of the harsh, cold scrutiny of rebellious taxpayers. The public library is further endangered by the emergence of new services, agencies, institutions—apparent competitors, threatening to replace it.*

Responsibility for leadership in coordinating library services at the local level was placed squarely on the shoulders of the public library. The report went on to suggest the steps that must be taken to return public libraries to their essential community role.

**Books-by-Mail**

Although the portion of Council funds awarded for programs directed at the particular needs of public libraries has not been large, several projects have had significant effect in helping libraries to find new ways of serving their readers. One of these involved taking the library’s services beyond its walls through home delivery. The Council assisted several experimental projects and conferences dealing with this new service, now known popularly as “books-by-mail.” The San Antonio Public Library, which received CLR funds for an experiment of this nature in 1968, has continued the program as part of its normal activities. Now numerous books-by-mail systems have been initiated by local, county, state, and regional libraries in both the U.S. and Canada, many funded under Title I of the Library Services and Construction Act. “The growth of Books by Mail programs continues nationally,” reports the U.S. Office of Education, “influenced by the increasing operational costs of bookmobile service, as well as by the success of such programs in reaching unserved persons.”

**User Surveys**

Books-by-mail programs succeed because they meet the needs of a particular type of potential library user. The study of users and their requirements has always been important, especially for public libraries serving diverse clienteles. In the 1970s CLR sponsored two surveys of public library users and nonusers, one in New York’s Bedford-Stuyvesant area, the other in Los Angeles. Information services available to New York State government departments have
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been surveyed as part of a third CLR-assisted study, this time carried out by the New York State Library. With the assistance of two outside library consultants, the library has been developing a coordinated plan for providing information services to the executive, legislative, and judiciary branches of the New York State government. A final report on the project is expected in late 1976.

When the executive board of the Public Library Association received the recommendations contained in *A Strategy for Public Library Change*, it immediately took steps to carry out the four-part plan of action. The first part called for a publication to be commissioned "which will be an eloquent statement to direct widespread attention to the American public library as an active community agent capable of meeting the real needs of real people today and in the future. This should be presented in layman's language, designed to capture the attention and imagination of the public at the same time that it synthesizes the concerns of librarians and governing bodies of all types of libraries." A strategy group was appointed to develop a plan for such a publication. In their view, what was needed was a "Consumers' Handbook for Public Libraries," a guide to public library services offered to specific groups, such as children, youth, women, students, businessmen, homeowners, blacks, Spanish-speaking, and so on.

In July 1974, a small Council grant to PLA enabled the group to commission prominent individuals (e.g., *Saturday Review* editor Norman Cousins, U.S. Senator Jacob Javits, novelist Sol Yurick) to prepare chapters for the handbook, which will be followed by essays from equally prominent librarians. During the past year, several of the 35 chapters have been placed with major periodicals for publication during 1976. The American Library Association plans to publish a paperback edition of the consumers' handbook in 1977.

One of the strongest forces affecting the development of public libraries is the movement toward nontraditional education and life-time learning. In *A Strategy for Public Library Change*, external degree programs in England and the College Level Examination Program (CLEP) in the United States, along with scattered university programs granting credit for home study, were identified as the "vanguard of the movement." "To provide adult and continuing education" and "to support education—formal and informal" were two of the six goals commonly agreed upon by all public librarians participating in the strategy study. Determining the best way public libraries can meet the demands of nontraditional education has been a major challenge of the 1970s.

The Council helped to stimulate the involvement of libraries in the early planning stages of nontraditional educational activity. In the late 1960s, even before widespread interest in the subject surfaced,
Students in the Dallas Public Library’s Independent Study Project make frequent use of cassette and cable television courses.

CLR acted to bring together the nontraditional planners and the public library leaders. Then, with the College Entrance Examination Board (CEEB) and NEH, from 1971 to 1973 the Council supported an experimental program at the Dallas Public Library to determine the role the American public library might play in external degree work. In their evaluative account, project leaders Jean Brooks and David Reich explain, "The concept of the Dallas Public Library Independent Study Project was that the library, functioning as a viable learning resource center, could be an active agent in orienting the unaffiliated adult student to the process of learning, helping him to recognize how his jig-saw pieces of experiential, often short-termed, and seemingly unrelated learning episodes fitted into an organized whole." 62

Working closely with Southern Methodist University and other neighboring institutions of higher education, the Dallas Public Library offered individuals who were unable or unwilling to attend regular class sessions an opportunity to receive academic credit on the basis of independent study and CLEP examination scores. The two-year project demonstrated, however, that to serve this emerging educational need, libraries would have to provide staff with training in academic counseling and guidance, to develop specialized materials, and to establish a central coordinating body to serve as a source of communication and information.

Thus in 1972 the Council joined with the College Entrance Examination Board to plan and establish, at CEEB, the Office of Library Independent Study and Guidance Projects. 63 Its purpose was to provide the materials, training, and other planning resources public
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libraries need to become effective community learning centers. The office has received support from CLR, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the U.S. Office of Education, and CEEB itself.

During its first three years, the office embarked on a series of efforts that culminated in its design of a Learner's Advisory Service. Public libraries in Atlanta, Baltimore, Denver, Miami, Portland (Maine), Salt Lake City, St. Louis, Tulsa, and Woodbridge (New Jersey) joined in the experimental service, defined as a flexible program of learning opportunities for adults interested in working independently. The service adapts itself to a variety of adult interests: learning a skill, acquiring knowledge in an academic area, studying for educational credit through CLEP or the GED (high-school equivalency) certificate, or learning for leisure activities. A learner's advisor-librarian must have a strong commitment to the educational role of the public library, in-depth skills in educational counseling, and a wide knowledge of educational sources both inside and outside the library.

A new Council grant this fiscal year to CEEB for the Office of Library Independent Study and Guidance Projects provided for an expansion of the Learner's Advisory Service to other public libraries in the United States through a structured program of information dissemination. NEH and CEEB also assisted in this effort. The key to the program is a series of 25 seminars that were held from April to June 1976 in various sections of the country. Conducted by resource faculty teams composed of librarians and administrators from the original nine libraries, the seminars were "designed to provide a balanced and realistic exposure to the possible benefits, pitfalls, and ramifications of implementing a Learner's Advisory Service."

Grant support for the Office of Library Independent Study and Guidance Projects came to an end on June 30, 1976. To carry on the task of coordinating and directing the continued development of their institutions as community learning centers, the nine project libraries named earlier have formed a Consortium for Public Library Innovation, with the Minneapolis Public Library as the tenth member. The consortium plans to develop its own goals and structure, but an important part of its endeavors will be the continued support of the Learner’s Advisory Service. It is the Council's intention to provide some assistance in this effort.

The Council will continue to search for ways of improving library services to users and of reaching those who have not yet benefited from library programs and activities. During fiscal 1976, awards of $239,243 were made in this significant area. An additional $210,000 has been designated for continuation of the Library Service Enhancement Program.
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While most of the other areas of Council interest can be traced to programs initiated in its early years, it was not until the late 1960s that the Council was able to turn its attention to another serious matter: the need to recruit additional well-qualified individuals to the library profession, and, once there, to retain them. Librarianship can count among its members many persons with needed talents and competencies, high levels of intellect and insight, and dedication to service. But for many years there appeared to be an insufficient number of first-rate people available to assume the leadership of the nation's academic and research libraries.

Part of the problem can be related to the economic welfare of academic librarians—does the profession pay enough to attract highly competent young people in sufficient number? In an attempt to answer this question, the Council has supported a series of salary surveys of college and university librarians. Donald F. Cameron and Peggy Heim prepared the first three surveys for the academic years 1969-70, 1970-71, 1972-73, providing comparisons of the compensation structures of academic librarians and faculty members. A comparison was also made of the average compensation...
structure in various kinds of academic libraries (e.g., public university, private university, church-related college, etc.), as well as the average compensation by library function.

In 1975, ALA's Association of College and Research Libraries successfully sought Council support to continue the series by collecting and publishing information on the salaries and fringe benefits of academic librarians for the 1975-76 academic year. In December 1975, questionnaires were mailed to all academic libraries in institutions participating in the American Association of University Professors' salary survey. The analysis of the response will attempt to show how much, if any, improvement has occurred in the economic status of librarians since the 1972-73 survey and how salaries of academic librarians compare with those of the classroom faculty. Data has also been collected on the number of women and minorities employed in academic libraries and their rates of compensation. The final report will be published in October 1976.

Another aspect of the problem is the lack of opportunities for librarians to increase their skills and enrich their professional experience. Such opportunities have been available to their faculty colleagues for many years. In 1969, CLR introduced the first of several programs whose primary focus is to provide librarians with opportunities for professional development and thus augment the reservoir of top-level talent available to undertake the challenges of library service in the years to come.

**Fellowship Program**

Over 180 outstanding midcareer librarians have participated in the Fellowship Program since it was initiated in 1969. Each Fellow utilizes a leave of absence of at least three months to pursue a self-developed study project aimed at improving his or her competence in the substantive, administrative, or technical aspects of librarianship. Many of the recipients have published books and articles based at least in part on their experiences and have reported to their colleagues at conferences, seminars, and workshops.

This past year, the following librarians received fellowships for the 18-month period that will end in September 1977.

**Mae Benne**, professor, School of Librarianship, University of Washington. To identify the current functions and changes of central children's rooms in 31 metropolitan libraries and to analyze the effect of changes on organization and services.

**Elizabeth Beyerly**, chief, Reference and Loan, UNESCO Library, Paris. To study the current theoretical foundations of the United Nations and UNESCO depository system and to determine the status of this system in selected African libraries.

**Susan D. Csaky**, head, Department of Government Publications, University of Kentucky Libraries. To study the organizational structure and publishing policies of the European Community for the
The purpose of developing a functional classification system for European Community documents.

Shirley E. Edsall, assistant professor, School of Information and Library Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo. To study the administration, utilization, and collection development policies of government document collections in community college libraries that have been designated as depositories.

Richard D. Hershcopf, assistant director for public services, Colorado State University Libraries. To make a comparative and historical study of the subject-divisional arrangement of collections.

Paul Jonan Ho, catalog librarian, East Asian Library, University of Pittsburgh. To investigate Japan's library resources on the People's Republic of China and to study ways of facilitating their use through international library cooperation.

Orlyn B. LaBrake, assistant director of libraries, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. For a short-term internship program to enhance her management skills.

Isaac T. Littleton, director of libraries, North Carolina State University. To study the role of state commissions or boards of higher education in the development of libraries.

William M. McClellan, music librarian, University of Illinois at Urbana. To develop guidelines for the use of institutions of higher education in evaluating their music collections and services.

Robert L. Mowery, humanities librarian, Illinois Wesleyan University. To study continuous revision policies of the Library of Congress classification system.

Katherine Anne Peters, head librarian, Kauai Community College. To examine learning resources and tutorial services in study centers of the British Open University and determine their possible application to the situation in Hawaii.

Elspeth Pope, associate professor, College of Librarianship, University of South Carolina. To study bibliographic control and use of bibliographic data for books published in England, partially through an internship at the British National Bibliography.

Catherine J. Reynolds, head, Government Documents Division, University of Colorado Libraries. To study space planning for government document collections in research libraries.
Katherine M. Rottsolk, reference librarian, St. Olaf College. To examine orientation and instruction programs at several colleges for the purposes of designing a comprehensive program for students at St. Olaf College.

Anita R. Schiller, reference librarian/bibliographer, University of California, San Diego. To examine the interface of the commercial sector and the academic library in the provision of social science data base services, to determine the library's impact on these services, and to analyze emerging policy implications.

Philip Schwarz, automation development librarian, University of Wisconsin, Stout. To examine the role of locally generated title derivative indexing in academic and public libraries.

Initiated in 1973, the Academic Library Management Intern Program is designed to assist in the development of managers for the nation's large research and academic libraries. This fall the third group of five management-minded librarians will embark on the internship experience; each will spend a full year working closely with the director and top administrative staff of one of five large academic libraries, selected for their recognized administrative excellence. During their year, the interns will have a unique opportunity to observe the techniques used by top management for dealing with day-to-day problems and to share in finding solutions to these problems. The interns will also participate in special projects that are helpful in their host institution and at the same time increase their management skills.

The Council pays the salary and benefits (up to a total of $20,000) of each intern, based on the amount received the year prior to the internship. For this year's program, the Council responded to over 250 requests for applications, with 30 candidates completing the application procedure. The five who were chosen to begin their internships in the fall of 1976 are:

Stanton F. Biddle, Howard University, to work with Richard M. Dougherty at the University of California, Berkeley. Mr. Biddle received a B.A. in government from Howard University in 1965, an M.L.S. from Atlanta University (1966), and an M.P.A. from the New York University Graduate School of Public Administration (1973). He was named associate director at the Howard University Library in 1973.

William Joseph Crowe, Jr., Indiana University, to spend his year with Frederick H. Wagman at the University of Michigan. Currently enrolled in Indiana University's Ph.D. program in library science, Mr. Crowe holds a B.A. in European history and French language from Boston State College (1968) and an M.L.S. from Rutgers (1969). He joined the Indiana University library in 1971,
first as order librarian, then as coordinator of processing for the six regional campus libraries.

Peter C. Haskell, Colgate University, to work with W. Carl Jackson of Indiana University. After receiving his B.A. from Bowdoin College in 1961, Mr. Haskell spent four years as an intelligence officer with the U.S. Army in Germany. Rutgers awarded him an M.L.S. in 1969. In 1973 he assumed his present position as associate university librarian at Colgate.

Wilson Luquire, Indiana University, to intern with Frank P. Grisham, Joint University Libraries in Nashville. Mr. Luquire completed bachelor’s (Furman University, 1963) and master’s (Indiana University, 1968) degrees in music before turning to the library field. He received his master’s (1970) and Ph.D. (1976) in library science from Indiana University. Mr. Luquire has worked at the Indiana University Libraries since 1969; his present title is associate librarian and senior cataloger.

Merrily E. Taylor, University of South Florida, to work with Rutherford D. Rogers, Yale University. Ms. Taylor received her B.A. in English education (1965) and M.A. in English literature (1973) from the University of South Florida. In 1968 she was awarded an M.L.S. by Florida State University, Tallahassee. In 1971 she undertook the supervision of both the circulation and reserve departments at the University of South Florida. A new department for collection development was created in 1974, with Ms. Taylor as its head.

During 1975–76 the Council initiated a new professional development program, this time addressing the need of research and academic libraries for librarians with advanced study competence to work effectively with faculty, graduate students, and other scholars. The goal of this program is to develop a pool of highly qualified “scholar-librarians.” To this end, successful candidates will spend an academic year pursuing full-time graduate course work in a scholarly discipline—one traditionally considered to be within the liberal arts and sciences—at a graduate school of distinction in the chosen field of study. The program is not intended to support work in professional areas, such as library science, education, law, business administration, or management, nor may the funds be used for travel or writing a dissertation. Advanced Study Scholars receive stipends up to $15,000, based on salary and normal benefits received the year prior to the study. The Council also pays graduate school tuition and fees. The first Advanced Study Scholars, scheduled to begin their studies in the fall of 1976, are:

Ellen Hodges Brow, Latin American bibliographer, University of Kansas Libraries. Ms. Brow will spend her year at the University...
of Wisconsin, Madison, pursuing studies in Iberian history. A doctoral candidate at that institution, Ms. Brow holds master's degrees in librarianship (San Jose State University, 1966) and Ibero-American area studies (University of Wisconsin, 1969).

Jill R. Cogan, who will study British imperial history, concentrating on South and Southeast Asian history, at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. She received master's degrees in library science (1966) and history (1973) from the University of California, Los Angeles, where she is currently a doctoral candidate. Although her most recent professional position was as associate music librarian in UCLA's Music Library, Ms. Cogan hopes to continue her career as a subject area bibliographer.

Barbara Crawford Halporn, librarian for philosophy, classics, history and philosophy of science, psychology, Indiana University Libraries. She received a master's degree in library science from Indiana University in 1966 and one in classics from the same institution in 1975. Currently enrolled as a Ph.D. candidate in classics at Indiana, Ms. Halporn plans to continue a study of the Greek language, history of science, and the classics at Harvard University during her fellowship year.

Gloria Jean Hubbard, reference librarian, Humboldt State University, Arcata, California. Ms. Hubbard received a B.A. in Slavic languages from UCLA in 1963 and continued as a graduate student both there and at the University of Zagreb. In 1968 she was awarded a master's degree in library science from UCLA and completed an M.A. in English at the same institution this spring. Ms. Hubbard will pursue work in comparative literature at the University of California, Berkeley.

Nancy Whitten Zinn, university archivist and librarian for the history of the health sciences, University of California, San Francisco. Ms. Zinn was granted an M.A. in history by Bryn Mawr College (1959) and an M.S. in library science by Drexel University (1962). The next year she completed an internship in medical librarianship at Emory University. Ms. Zinn plans to undertake studies in the Department of History of the Health Sciences at her home institution, with related courses on the Berkeley campus.

The selection process for each professional development program is rigorous. Applications are reviewed by both screening and selection committees composed of eminent librarians and scholars who have knowledge particularly suited to the demands of each program. For the Management Intern and Advanced Study Programs, interviews with leading candidates are also part of the final selection process.
In its attempt to broaden the reservoir of talent available to libraries, the Council took an experimental step when in 1974 it funded a program at the University of Chicago Graduate Library School to support work leading to the master's degree in library science for current holders of the Ph.D. in fields other than librarianship. The program was based on the realization that talented scholars from many disciplines had found rewarding careers as librarians, as well as on the belief that libraries have much to gain from the special competencies afforded by persons with proven intellectual skills and a dedication to service.

Six candidates completed their studies and received the M.A. in librarianship under the program in August 1975, and two more began during the past year. The Chicago program will draw to a close in 1977, at which time a final assessment will be made.

The Council continues to seek ways in which it can help librarians enlarge the professional skills that will enhance library services in whatever form they may take. The volume of response from librarians to the present programs of this kind reinforces our conviction that these are important activities—to librarians and those they serve. Professional development programs accounted for $59,230 in new grants and fellowships this fiscal year. The grants made under the Management Intern Program and the Advanced Study Program had been authorized in the preceding year, and are therefore not included in this total. The board also appropriated $323,673 for another year of the Council's three major programs in this area.
"International library cooperation is assuming much greater importance to librarians in all parts of the world and is likely to be a major concern in the next quarter of a century." With these words, Norman Horrocks, director of the School of Library Service, Dalhousie University, Canada, opened a recent discussion of the role of the United States in world librarianship. Dr. Horrocks went on to describe the shifting focus of international cooperation: "While in the past we have thought of such things as international agreements for interlibrary loans, cooperative agreements between nations in the provision of abstracting services, the services of visiting consultants, pilot projects for public library service or assistance with the development of library schools, the future will be more technically sophisticated with the sharing of computer software and the use of advanced communications networks linked with computerized retrieval systems."66

What has been expressed in this statement is the logical corollary of the earlier projection of a national library system composed of a federation of compatible networks—that is, an international library system comprising national and multinational networks and using a variety of computerized and manual techniques to exchange bibliographic information about the world's publications. The requirements for careful planning and acceptable standards in the growth of a national system apply equally to an evolving international library system. It is only in recent years that the development of such a system has seemed remotely possible.

IFLA

By 1970, it had become apparent that the careful planning required for building an international library system could be achieved only through effective international cooperation, channeled through an organization in which many countries, including the United States, participated on an equal basis. The International Federation of Library Associations seemed the logical choice, for it already had
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consultative status in UNESCO and for many years had provided an international forum for the discussion of library problems.

In 1971 and again in 1974, CLR made grants that enabled IFLA to strengthen its administrative and staff operations while it restructured its dues schedule and moved toward self-support. In September 1975, IFLA reported that the new dues system had indeed helped to make administrative operations self-supporting and had also stimulated membership growth by over 153 percent. As of June 1976, 644 associations and libraries from 100 countries had joined the federation.

At the federation’s 1975 General Council Meeting in Oslo, discussion centered on a new organization plan calling for IFLA to undertake an active program of substantive work, supervised by a professional board. Under the plan, new professional divisions, sections, round tables, and working groups will be created, organized either by type of library, library function, or regional activities. To administer these activities, the existing secretariat will expand to include a professional unit, headed by a deputy secretary-general. In addition to its other duties, the unit will serve as a clearinghouse on international library activities.

To support the proposed program activities of the IFLA secretariat, the Council this year made a grant of $174,000 for the period of March 1, 1976, to December 31, 1978. In its first action under the new grant, IFLA appointed Charles S. Fineman, a humanities bibliographer at Yale University, as the deputy secretary-general. Formal approval of the proposed structure is expected to be given at IFLA’s August 1976 General Council Meeting in Lausanne, Switzerland.

One of IFLA’s most important activities has remained the promotion of international cataloging agreements. At a CLR-supported meeting of cataloging specialists in Copenhagen in 1969, a proposal was developed for the establishment of a permanent secretariat for the IFLA Committee on Cataloguing in order to furnish needed continuity and coordination of its important work. In 1971, the Council awarded funds to IFLA for the Cataloguing Committee secretariat, which has since engaged in a number of activities leading to major developments in the cataloging field. Among those activities is a publications program that includes definitive works on standards for international cataloging and the quarterly journal *International Cataloguing* (London, 1972-). In 1973, the Cataloguing Committee secretariat presented a long-term program for developing a worldwide system for the exchange of bibliographic information—a system based on the concept of universal bibliographic control (UBC). The following year, the IFLA executive board approved a plan to make the realization of UBC a major goal of the Cataloguing Committee secretariat and renamed it the IFLA International Office for Universal Bibliographic Control.68
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As explained by Dorothy Anderson, UBC office director, “UBC envisages a system in which each country undertakes the responsibility of recording the publications (with that word used in its widest possible sense) produced in that country and makes those bibliographical records in accordance with standards which are internationally accepted and acceptable.” In global terms, then, each publication would be cataloged only once, in the country of origin, and the bibliographic record thus produced would be used in information systems all over the world. In order for the record to be most useful, it must be made immediately after the publication is issued; this presupposes the establishment in each country of a coherent system of national bibliographic control.

Two Council grants covering the three-year period that ends June 30, 1977, have made it possible for the UBC office to carry forward its activities. The office also receives some financial support from UNESCO and a number of national libraries.

In addition to its publication program, the UBC office:

- acts on suggestions for products made by IFLA sections and committees and other members of the library and information communities;
- functions as a clearinghouse for information and as a coordinating, publishing, and consultative center;
- sets up working groups, services them, and publishes the results of their work;
- promotes standardization in the UBC area.

A major step forward in gaining acceptance of the concept of UBC occurred when the UNESCO Intergovernmental Conference on the Planning of National Documentation and Archives Infrastructures, held in Paris in September 1974, recommended that UBC be promoted by UNESCO in cooperation with IFLA as a major policy objective. Accordingly, through its NATIS (National Information System) Program, UNESCO is sponsoring a Conference of National Bibliographies to be held in the fall of 1977. The UBC office is closely involved with the preparation for this conference.

Perhaps the most significant area of UBC office activity is the development of standard formats for preparing bibliographic records to be exchanged in the universal system. The office coordinates the activities of a number of working groups concerned with various standard formats called International Standard Bibliographic Descriptions (ISBD). Recommended ISBDs for monographic publications and serials have already been published by the UBC office; in preparation are draft descriptions applying to nonbook materials and cartographic materials. A general ISBD is also under consideration to ensure compatibility among all other specialized ISBDs. While not intended for use on its own by catalogers, it will contribute to the development of cataloging codes. The IFLA Working
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International Network Study

The IFLA Office for Universal Bibliographic Control is taking an active part in an international bibliographic network study, recommended and approved at a Paris meeting of national librarians in October 1975. A CLR grant of $11,000 to the Library of Congress enabled it to join with the national libraries of Australia, Canada, France, and Great Britain in funding the study. The UBC office acts as secretary and treasurer for the project and will undertake a survey of bibliographic incompatibilities among nations likely to arise when exchanging MARC records. A steering committee—composed of representatives from the national libraries of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Great Britain, and the Federal Republic of Germany, the Library of Congress, UNESCO, and the IFLA Office of Universal Bibliographic Control—has been appointed to consider the final report and make recommendations.

International Council on Archives

The success of the enlarged IFLA secretariat and the activities of the Office for UBC encouraged the Council last year to make another grant of this type, this time for the purpose of strengthening the new secretariat of the International Council on Archives (ICA) by making possible the addition to the secretariat staff of an executive assistant and a bilingual secretary. During the past year the secretariat engaged in numerous activities designed to foster the development of archives throughout the world. These included the formulation and translation of the agendas, working documents, and minutes of various international archival meetings; developmental missions to nations such as Ethiopia and Somalia in order to negotiate archival programs; and support services for new committees and sections within ICA. For several years the International Council on Archives has worked closely with UNESCO, IFLA, the Federation Internationale de Documentation (FID), and other international organizations in support of world archival needs.

In addition to income received from contracts and the sale of publications, ICA is supported by dues from member archives. During the grant period, ICA hopes to increase its revenues from these sources to the point where no outside financial help is needed. The French National Archives houses the secretariat at no cost and West Germany's Federal Archives has provided additional staff.

Opportunities for International Exchange

While the Council's work in promoting international cooperation in the last few years has been largely through the activities of IFLA, its concern has been demonstrated in other ways as well. Because of the implications for libraries, the Council has followed with interest the

---
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work of the Federation Internationale de Documentation and has assisted several of its conferences and meetings. Support has also been given to other conferences, meetings, seminars, institutes, etc., of importance to librarians all over the world, such as the three U.S.-Japan Conferences on Libraries and Information Science in Higher Education that have been held so far. Two inter-American seminars received Council aid in 1973. The first dealt with integrating the information services of libraries, archives, and documentation centers in Latin America and the Caribbean, while the second concentrated on centralized cataloging and the use of MARCAL (MARC for Latin America).

From its inception, the Council has recognized that international cooperation will come about only through the efforts of individuals, motivated by their roles as representatives of organizations and by their personal desires to learn and apply new techniques of librarianship developed throughout the world. In the exchange of information across national boundaries, both U.S. and foreign librarians have significant roles to play, for there must be cross-fertilization of ideas before mutually beneficial solutions to library problems can be reached. Accordingly, the Council has from time to time set aside small sums to help defray travel costs incurred by individuals with leadership responsibilities in international gatherings. Prior to making grants of this nature, CLR draws heavily on the advice and knowledge of outside consultants in appropriate related fields to ensure that the Council's support will have a significant impact in promoting international cooperation in librarianship. During the past year, Council aid enabled the U.S. branch of the International Association of Music Libraries (IAML) to send a representative to the deliberations of the IAML Cataloging Commission in Norway in August 1976. Two librarians—an American and an Egyptian—with important contributions to make to the profession, received grants that permitted their attendance at the IFLA World-Wide Seminar held in Seoul, Korea, in June 1976.

Occasionally, Council support provides influential librarians with opportunities to study in other lands developments in their particular fields of interest, thus promoting an international awareness of library programs and methods. A grant this year to the director of the National Bibliographic Center, Bibliothèque Nationale (Paris), enabled him to undertake a three-week study tour focusing on automation in U.S. libraries.

Librarians, like professionals in many other disciplines, have become increasingly cosmopolitan in their outlook; they know that the effect of national decisions on international commitments can no longer be ignored. The Council shares this viewpoint and will continue to monitor events and support those activities that appear to contribute to the solution of library problems world-wide. In fiscal 1976, a total of $187,109 was allocated for programs in this area of increasing importance.
Most of the Council's grants fall quite neatly into the six well-defined areas discussed so far in this report. Each year, however, the opportunity comes to provide assistance for helpful programs that cannot properly be said to belong in any of the established categories of activity. Some of these have to do with surveys, publications, meetings, and a variety of matters important to libraries and those who use them. Others deal primarily with archives—options closely related to libraries. All of these are discussed in the pages that follow.

The Council's original charge drew attention to the need for coordination among archival programs, as well as among libraries. This report has mentioned several such CLR projects, the most current being assistance for the secretariat of the International Council on Archives discussed earlier in these pages. Two other leading archival organizations, the Society of American Archivists (SAA) and the U.S. National Archives and Records Service (NARS), have received CLR grants for projects to solve the special problems that face repositories of archives—records, manuscripts, and other specialized documents.

The earliest grant to the Society of American Archivists resulted in the major survey of state archives described previously. In 1967, another grant to the society enabled the author of the state survey, Dr. Ernst Posner, to conclude a study of ancient archival practices. Published by Harvard University Press, Archives in the Ancient World (Cambridge, Mass., 1972) was a co-winner of SAA’s 1973 Waldo Gifford Leland prize. Patricia K. Grimsted was the other winner that year for her Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Moscow and Leningrad (Princeton, N.J., 1972). In 1971, the Council and the National Endowment for the Humanities had provided a matching grant to Dr. Grimsted for the preparation of a two-volume companion to her prize-winning study, also scheduled for publication by Princeton University Press. This work will provide a directory of archives and other manuscript repositories in the fifteen republics of the USSR, together with an annotated bibliography of published guides, catalogs, and other research aids. While continuing work on the manuscript, Dr. Grimsted has published interim reports as articles in The American Archivist and the AHA (American Historical Association) Newsletter.
In 1966, SAA joined with the American Historical Association and the Organization of American Historians to form a committee to study the situation surrounding the integration of the U.S. National Archives and Records Service with the General Services Administration. NARS had formerly been an independent agency, and its change in status led to widespread concern about its ability to function efficiently within the new framework. The Council assisted the study, out of which grew both a report with recommendations and a book-length account of the history and current situation of the Archives, entitled *The Records of a Nation; Their Management, Preservation, and Use* (New York, 1969) and written by the committee's secretary.\(^7\)

For the past ten years, NARS has been involved in another project utilizing computer technology to index existing finding aids for archival and manuscript materials and to create new ones. In 1967, NARS received a two-year CLR grant to test and improve the SPINDEX (Selective Permutation Indexing) program in order to make it as useful as possible to all archives.\(^7\) This program had been successfully applied by NARS several times, for example, to index the White House files of President John F. Kennedy.

In SPINDEX II, NARS undertook the creation of a new computer software package for use with collections of almost any size and with enough versatility to allow for the idiosyncrasies of differing collection descriptions. During the first year of the project, computer programs were written that could be used by any archival institution or manuscript depository to index materials held by one institution or to coordinate related materials held by different depositories. This is especially important in creating single indexes to varied collections, such as those held in the presidential libraries.

Although NARS has worked with other institutions to ensure that the program would provide compatibility, the largest records files are located in its own buildings, and it is there that most of the system implementation has taken place. NARS has used SPINDEX II to produce an automated index to the *Guide to Cartographic Records in the National Archives*, to create a *Catalog of National Archives Microfilm Publications*, and to design findings aids and indexes to captured German records and the *Papers of the Continental Congress*. *SPINDEX II, Report and Systems Documentation*, published by the Archives in 1975, provides a description of the project as well as a detailed guide to its application.

Archival collections frequently contain large quantities of nonbook materials that require special handling. These may be in the form of photographs, manuscripts, microforms, slides, etc. The Council has made several grants for the preparation of handbooks and manuals, equally valuable to archives and libraries, that discuss methods of
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organizing, preserving, administering, and servicing materials in special formats.

Two CLR grants to the American Association for State and Local History (AASLH) serve as examples. A 1970 award resulted in the publication of the 376-page *Modern Manuscripts* (Nashville, 1975) by Kenneth W. Duckett. Described by one reviewer as "an essential, if not indispensable, tool," the guide contains practical information on the management, care, and use of manuscript collections. In 1972 a second grant enabled AASLH to begin preparation of a manual dealing with photographic collections. The soon-to-be-published book—"The Collection, Use, and Care of Historical Photographs"—will discuss the philosophy of photographic acquisition and the practical problems of establishing and maintaining a collection.

In addition to earlier efforts to provide standards for gathering library statistics, the Council has also furnished funds for specific surveys. In 1968 a Council grant of $20,000 to the American Association of Law Libraries (AALL) initiated a project to collect and analyze important data concerning law libraries. Although the original proposal called for a comprehensive survey of all law libraries, it was found to be more practicable and useful to conduct separate surveys for four distinct groups—law school libraries, libraries serving a local bar, governmental law libraries, and law firm libraries. The association also determined that data collection of this nature should be a continuous activity rather than a one-time venture. Hence a new proposal was written, and in 1970 the original grant was revised and extended to allow for the new (and improved) approach. Since then a number of surveys have been conducted and the results published in the association's *Law Library Journal*.

Especially notable were the results obtained from surveys of law school libraries, conducted annually with the cooperation of the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law Schools. The latest report of this survey, which appeared in the May 1976 issue of *Law Library Journal*, contains detailed information on the salaries, fringe benefits, and education of law school library staff, along with figures for each library's collection size, staff, expenditures, facilities, hours of operation, and use. AALL now plans to continue the annual survey of law school libraries and to conduct surveys in the other three categories on a triennial basis. To assist in this effort, the Council has agreed to extend the period of the grant to June 30, 1979, with no increase in funding.

During the past year the Council supported another type of statistical study, this time concerning the nation's 34 historically black public colleges. The study was made under the direction of the Office for Advancement of Public Negro Colleges, a division of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. By the end of June, responses to questionnaires were being analyzed.
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**XIII:37-38; XVI:32-33.**
to elicit comparative information on the size of collections, staffs, facilities, grants received, services to students, and interinstitutional cooperative arrangements. The final report is expected by the end of the summer.

A CLR-funded study of private research libraries in England, conducted by Valerie Bloomfield, was completed during the past year. Under the general direction of Sir Frank Francis, CLR consultant and director emeritus of the British Museum, Mrs. Bloomfield surveyed 50 libraries in order to determine the extent to which the declining economy and inflation have affected their services and to discover what measures have been taken to improve their effectiveness. The collections of these special libraries have been officially recognized as being of national and international importance; the study provides an assessment of the main problems that may be jeopardizing their future.

**Books for Building Planners**

Two books promising to be of substantial interest to library building planners have received recent Council assistance, and one is nearing completion. William S. Pierce, chief of facilities planning at Pennsylvania State University, used a six-month sabbatical leave during 1975-76 to complete the photography and text for a book tentatively entitled "Planning the Library Interior." Marcel Dekker, Inc. has contracted to publish the book, which Mr. Pierce expects to complete by September 30, 1976.

Ellsworth Mason, head, Special Collections Department, University of Colorado, and a library building consultant, received a small CLR grant in June 1976 to enable him to visit libraries in the United States and Canada in preparation for a book on library buildings. Dr. Mason plans to revise material previously published on the topic and to add new material, some of it critical reviews. Scarecrow Press has agreed to publish the volume, tentatively entitled "Mason on Library Buildings."

**Federal Library Policy**

Federal policy and library planning is the topic of a Council-supported book written by R. Kathleen Molz, based on her five-year experience as the chief planning officer for library programs at the U.S. Office of Education. Now a faculty member at the Columbia University School of Library Service, Dr. Molz has completed work on the manuscript, which has been accepted for publication as a unanimous choice of the M.I.T. Press' advisory board. The book will assist librarians who must deal with federal programs by increasing their knowledge of the ways federal officials make decisions on the planning, budgeting, and administration of legislated programs.

Because most of the grants in this category are small ones, a correspondingly small share of CLR funds is allotted to it. During the past fiscal year $9,394 was awarded for projects of this kind.
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Part 1. Programs


SPEC Flyers: No. 20: Managerial and Technical Specialists
No. 21: Paraprofessionals
No. 22: Private Foundations
No. 23: Grievance Procedures, Termination Procedures
No. 24: User Surveys
No. 25: User Statistics and Studies
No. 26: Bibliographic Access in ARL Libraries


**Part 2. Fellowships**


*Note: Items cited in this column are not available from the CLR office.*
# CLR-Supported Projects Active in Fiscal 1976*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Unpaid 6/30/75</th>
<th>FY 1976 (Adjustments)</th>
<th>Payment (Refund)</th>
<th>Unpaid 6/30/76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Association for State and Local History, Nashville, Tenn. Preparation of</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$—</td>
<td>$—</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book on the collection, care, and use of photographs ($10,000-1972)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Modern Manuscripts ($34,604-1970)</td>
<td>2,680</td>
<td>$(1,121)¹</td>
<td>1,559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association of Law Libraries, Committee on Statistics, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>4,904</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>4,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of U.S. and Canadian law library resources ($20,000-1968)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Council of Learned Societies, New York, N.Y. Survey of Arabic manuscripts</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in U.S. libraries and other repositories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Library Association, Chicago, Ill. Consumers' handbook for public libraries</td>
<td>4,372</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($8,372-1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision of Anglo-American Cataloging Rules ($111,431-1975)</td>
<td>61,431</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>49,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of compensation structures of academic librarians, 1975-76</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,894</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Society for Information Science, Washington, D.C. Index to JASIS ($19,910</td>
<td>9,910</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9,910</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etta Arntzen, Athens, Ga. Revision of Guide to Art Reference Books ($8,000-1971)</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C. Office of University Library</td>
<td>231,774</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>81,774</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Studies ($81,136-1974, $210,000-1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. J. Barrow Research Laboratory, Inc., Richmond, Va. Research on preservation of</td>
<td>117,278</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>93,793</td>
<td>34,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>books and other library materials ($240,000-1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(11,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Theological Institute, Cambridge, Mass. ISSNs for theological serials</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>($1,000-1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ unaudited
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Entrance Examination Board, New York, N.Y. CEEB Office of Library</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$19,943</td>
<td>$34,493</td>
<td>$10,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Study and Guidance Projects ($50,000-1974)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia, University, New York, N.Y.</td>
<td>9,508</td>
<td>(6,702)</td>
<td>2,806</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University Libraries planning office ($126,308-1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council-Administered Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Library Development Program ($100,000-1975)</td>
<td>88,125</td>
<td>(52,079)</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>14,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Library Management Intern Program (100,000-1974, 265,000-1975)</td>
<td>243,561</td>
<td>(35,281)</td>
<td>77,895</td>
<td>130,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Study Program for Librarians ($115,000-1975)</td>
<td>114,695</td>
<td>(9,695)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee for the Coordination of National Bibliographic Control ($22,000-1975)</td>
<td>19,741</td>
<td>(19,741)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSER project ($250,000-1975)</td>
<td>225,726</td>
<td>(11,459)</td>
<td>75,174</td>
<td>139,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship Program (thru Sept. 1977)</td>
<td>86,056</td>
<td>52,583</td>
<td>54,360</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. M. al-Hagrassy, travel assistance</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>2,109</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint CLR-NSF conference on national bibliographic control ($4,275-1974)</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>(427)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Service Enhancement Program</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>27,328</td>
<td>172,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microform reader testing device ($10,650-1973, $4,000-1975)</td>
<td>4,166</td>
<td>(4,166)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants' expenses at meetings on networking and standards</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants' expenses at second networking meeting</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (foreign) by U.S. librarians for purposes important to profession</td>
<td>2,806</td>
<td>4,175</td>
<td>7,181</td>
<td>(200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel (other) by U.S. librarians for purposes important to profession</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel funds to enable selected foreign librarians to visit the U.S.</td>
<td>5,265</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,495</td>
<td>(141) 1,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Bloomfield, to study significant private libraries in England ($10,000-1974)</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>(5,850)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Dodson, University of British Columbia, Vancouver. Guide to large</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collections in microform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>FY 1976 Grants (Adjustments)</th>
<th>FY 1976 Payment (Refund)</th>
<th>Unpaid 6/30/75</th>
<th>Unpaid 6/30/76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Earlham College, Richmond, Ind. Periodical list for <em>Choice</em> ($7,500-1975)</strong></td>
<td>$5,200</td>
<td>$—</td>
<td>$—</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, Mich. Project LOEX ($41,969-1975)</strong></td>
<td>38,569</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>28,369</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governors State University, Park Forest South, Ill. Selective dissemination of microfiche ($5,138-1973)</strong></td>
<td>938 (758)$^1$</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>$—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Council on Archives, Washington, D.C. ICA Secretariat ($72,000-1975)</strong></td>
<td>66,500</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>44,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Federation of Library Associations, The Hague, Netherlands. IFLA general secretariat ($45,000-1974, $45,000-1975)</strong></td>
<td>26,443 (651)$^1$</td>
<td>25,792</td>
<td>$—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional activities secretariat</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>174,000</td>
<td>21,986</td>
<td>152,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office for Universal Bibliographic Control ($70,000-1974, $144,200-1975)</td>
<td>150,200</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>82,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>William V. Jackson, Nashville, Tenn. Study of Latin American libraries</strong></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donald M. Jacobs, Boston, Mass. Index of pre-Civil War newspapers ($500-1975)</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$—</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of hardware and software needs ($6,500-1975)</td>
<td>1,500 (27)$^1$</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>$—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National union catalog format study ($5,000-1975)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>$—</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>$—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International bibliographic network study</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>$—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of CONSER into national bibliographic service at LC</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>165,800</td>
<td>16,350</td>
<td>149,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey for microform edition of RAL</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich. University extension library services directory ($1,609-1971)</strong></td>
<td>402</td>
<td>$—</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R. Kathleen Molz, New York, N.Y. Book on federal policy and library planning ($8,000-1975)</strong></td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>$—</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>$—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Awardee</td>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>FY 1976 Grants (Adjustments)</td>
<td>FY 1976 Payments (Refund)</td>
<td>Unpaid 6/30/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Atlanta, Ga.</td>
<td>Status report on libraries of historically black public colleges</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Large-scale test of morpholine process for preserving books</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>$88,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toward a California Library Automation Network (CLAN)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$121,900</td>
<td>$121,900</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Library of Canada, Ottawa</td>
<td>To increase the library's ability to authenticate titles in CONSER</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio College Library Center, Columbus, Ohio</td>
<td>Development of on-line acquisition subsystem ($124,250–1975)</td>
<td>$79,250</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>$58,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC Research Foundation, Concord, N.H.</td>
<td>Conference on abstracting legal articles for computer storage and retrieval</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.</td>
<td>Assessment of impact of MRAP</td>
<td>$31,509</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$24,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William S. Pierce, State College, Pa.</td>
<td>&quot;Planning the Library Interior&quot; ($3,000–1975)</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Rodgers, Portland State University, Portland, Ore.</td>
<td>Manual of British government publications</td>
<td>$4,300</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. F. Shepherd, Ithaca, N.Y.</td>
<td>Travel to meeting</td>
<td>$163</td>
<td>$163</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern Library Network, Atlanta, Ga.</td>
<td>Training librarians to participate in SOLINET ($10,000–1974)</td>
<td>$3,400</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif.</td>
<td>Toward a California library automation network ($348,800–1975)</td>
<td>$243,800 (243,800)$1.3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.</td>
<td>Improved access to books by augmentation of MARC records</td>
<td>$76,615</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$51,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.</td>
<td>FY 1976 Grants (Adjustments)</td>
<td>FY 1976 Payments (Refund)</td>
<td>Unpaid 6/30/76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library data management system</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship program for holders of non-library Ph.D. degrees</td>
<td>37,600</td>
<td>34,350</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois Law Library Champaign, Ill. On-line computer reference service</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa, Iowa City, la. Conference on publication of American historical manuscripts</td>
<td>1,231</td>
<td>(405)²</td>
<td>826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C. Administration of ANSI Committee Z-39 through April 1976</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>9,290</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through June 1977</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>29,649</td>
<td>29,649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through June 1978</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>23,719</td>
<td>23,719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of The State of New York Albany, N.Y. (for State Library) Study of state government information needs</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. For its College Library Program: matching grant ($50,000–1970)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington University Libraries, St. Louis, Mo. To develop internal financial auditing procedures for university libraries</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,390,975</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,148,011</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,783,059</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less adjustments/ refunds</td>
<td>(275,913)²</td>
<td>(13,843)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(138,698)³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,390,975</strong></td>
<td><strong>$733,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,783,059</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. To restore unused portion to fund balance.
2. Amount reflects the portion of the grant allocated for administrative costs or unawarded appropriations that prior to June 30, 1975, were included with total grant. Beginning with this report, project costs for CLR-administered projects and unawarded appropriations will appear separate from the grants payable schedule.
3. Superseded by a matching grant to NEH for the purpose.
### Council on Library Resources, Inc.

**Schedule of Appropriations for Council Administered Projects**

June 30, 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Appropriations</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Project Costs Paid</th>
<th>Appropriated Balance 6/30/76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Library Development Program 1976-77</strong></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$47,046</td>
<td>$6,168</td>
<td>$46,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuation 1977-78</strong></td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Library Management Intern Program 1974-77</strong></td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>205,000</td>
<td>40,840</td>
<td>19,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuation 1977-78</strong></td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advanced Study Program 1977-78</strong></td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Committee for the Coordination of National Bibliographic Control 1975</strong></td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>15,658</td>
<td>6,342</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuation 1976</strong></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer Output Microfilm Study</strong></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,244</td>
<td>14,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conversion of Serials—CONSER</strong></td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>232,802</td>
<td>6,601</td>
<td>10,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fellowship Program 1977-78</strong></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library Service Enhancement Program 1976-77</strong></td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>193,399</td>
<td>12,373</td>
<td>14,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuation 1977-78</strong></td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study of significant private libraries in England</strong></td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,979</td>
<td>3,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel (foreign) by U.S. librarians for purposes important to profession</strong></td>
<td>5,875</td>
<td>4,175</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel (other) by U.S. librarians for purposes important to profession</strong></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$873,563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*unaudited*
Opinion of Independent Accountants

September 20, 1976

To The Board of Directors of
Council on Library Resources, Inc.

We have examined the balance sheet of the Council on Library Resources, Inc. (Council) as of June 30, 1976 and the related statements of activity under restricted Ford Foundation grant, of functional expenses and of changes in cash and investments for the two year period then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

The Council's operations are financed primarily through grants from The Ford Foundation. Effective July 1, 1974 the Council received a new grant of $6,000,000 for continuation of its program for a three year period. The Council considers its "business cycle" as three years coinciding with the term of the grant. Accordingly, as described in Note 2 to the financial statements, the results of activity and changes in cash and investments are presented in the accompanying financial statements for the two year period from the inception of the present grant, July 1, 1974. As further described in Note 2 to the financial statements, the full amount of the grant from The Ford Foundation is reflected as revenue in the accompanying financial statements although a portion of the grant proceeds is not due as of June 30, 1976.

In our opinion, the financial statements examined by us present fairly on the basis described above the financial position of the Council on Library Resources, Inc. at June 30, 1976, and the results of its activity and the changes in cash and investments for the two year period then ended.

PRICE WATERHOUSE & CO.
## Balance Sheet, June 30, 1976

### Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>$16,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>738,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued royalties (Note 3)</td>
<td>1,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant receivable from The Ford Foundation (Note 2)</td>
<td>3,230,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other receivables</td>
<td>11,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses and deposits</td>
<td>2,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,999,790</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Liabilities and Restricted Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants, fellowships and contracts payable</td>
<td>$1,783,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-sponsored grants payable</td>
<td>7,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable and accrued salaries, taxes and employee benefits</td>
<td>34,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,824,910</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Appropriated</th>
<th>Unappropriated</th>
<th>Total liabilities and restricted grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Ford Foundation grant</td>
<td>$873,563</td>
<td>1,301,317</td>
<td><strong>$3,999,790</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Statement of Activity Under Restricted Ford Foundation Grant

For the Two Year Period Ending June 30, 1976 (Note 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant awarded (of which $2,770,000 has been received) (Note 2)</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income</td>
<td>173,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalty income</td>
<td>9,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total support</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,182,777</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program services</td>
<td>4,020,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative services</td>
<td>473,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,494,091</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of support over expenses to June 30, 1976 before cumulative effect of a change in accounting method</td>
<td>1,688,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative effect on prior periods (to June 30, 1974) of applying retroactively the new method of accounting for grant expense</td>
<td>58,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous restricted Ford Foundation grants unexpended at June 30, 1974</td>
<td>427,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted Ford Foundation grant at June 30, 1976</td>
<td>$2,174,880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statement of Functional Expenses
For the Two Year Period Ending June 30, 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Automation, networks, standardization, and national library services</th>
<th>Libraries and their users</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Microforms</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Professional development</th>
<th>International</th>
<th>General</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Administrative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts</td>
<td>$2,117,106</td>
<td>$335,893</td>
<td>$298,555</td>
<td>$34,313</td>
<td>$208,000</td>
<td>$321,917</td>
<td>$462,415</td>
<td>$100,116</td>
<td>$3,878,315</td>
<td>$3,878,315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowships</td>
<td>125,406</td>
<td>125,406</td>
<td>125,406</td>
<td>125,406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council administered projects</td>
<td>45,915</td>
<td>12,373</td>
<td>6,168</td>
<td>16,228</td>
<td>45,103</td>
<td>5,084</td>
<td>130,871</td>
<td>130,871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less: Adjustments resulting from excess allocations of grants and fellowships</td>
<td>(503,657)</td>
<td>(6,702)</td>
<td>(758)</td>
<td>(39,902)</td>
<td>(42,045)</td>
<td>(4,010)</td>
<td>(644,098)</td>
<td>(644,098)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Support</td>
<td>1,659,364</td>
<td>348,266</td>
<td>298,021</td>
<td>49,783</td>
<td>168,098</td>
<td>450,381</td>
<td>463,475</td>
<td>53,106</td>
<td>3,490,494</td>
<td>3,490,494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation and employee benefits</td>
<td>252,023</td>
<td>13,433</td>
<td>15,888</td>
<td>40,992</td>
<td>59,569</td>
<td>28,254</td>
<td>15,933</td>
<td>10,938</td>
<td>437,030</td>
<td>$284,515</td>
<td>721,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant fees</td>
<td>11,891</td>
<td>6,895</td>
<td>5,655</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>9,210</td>
<td>8,408</td>
<td>1,875</td>
<td>44,084</td>
<td>44,084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and meetings</td>
<td>30,766</td>
<td>2,215</td>
<td>1,692</td>
<td>1,104</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>4,160</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>43,478</td>
<td>26,562</td>
<td>70,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4,844</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,746</td>
<td>5,746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit and legal fees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,243</td>
<td>21,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64,425</td>
<td>64,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment rental and furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,488</td>
<td>10,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and duplication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,787</td>
<td>17,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and other expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48,239</td>
<td>48,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,958,888</td>
<td>$370,984</td>
<td>$321,264</td>
<td>$92,257</td>
<td>$229,655</td>
<td>$492,400</td>
<td>$489,082</td>
<td>$66,302</td>
<td>$4,020,832</td>
<td>$473,259</td>
<td>$4,494,091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Statement of Changes in Cash and Investments

For the Two Year Period Ended June 30, 1976

**CASH RECEIPTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receipts from The Ford Foundation</td>
<td>$2,770,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts from co-sponsors</td>
<td>22,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from investments and royalties</td>
<td>191,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant and fellowship refunds</td>
<td>17,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,000,815</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CASH DISBURSEMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program expense</td>
<td>3,578,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expense</td>
<td>487,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,066,673</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Excess of cash disbursements over cash receipts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1,065,858)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in accrued interest</td>
<td>(6,924)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,827,440</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments, July 1, 1974</td>
<td>1,827,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,827,440</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments, June 30, 1976</td>
<td>$754,658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Organization
The Council on Library Resources, Inc. (Council) is a non-profit organization incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia in 1956 for the purpose of promoting library research. The Council's operations are financed primarily through grants from The Ford Foundation. Effective July 1, 1974 the Council received a new grant of $6,000,000 for continuation of its program for a three year period. The Council conducts its work through directly administered programs as well as grants to and contracts with other appropriate organizations or individuals.

The Council is a private operating foundation and is exempt from Federal income tax under Internal Revenue code section 501(c)(3).

2. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies and Changes in Accounting Methods
The Council considers as its "business cycle" the three years coinciding with the term of the grant from The Ford Foundation. Consequently, the results of activity and the changes in cash and investments are presented for the period from the effective date of the present grant, July 1, 1974.

In previous years, the Council reported its financial affairs on an individual year by year basis without regard to this three year "business cycle". Under the new reporting, the full amount of The Ford Foundation grant for the three year period is recognized as revenue as of the effective date of the present grant, July 1, 1974.

In previous years, the Council reported its financial affairs on an individual year by year basis without regard to this three year "business cycle". Under the new reporting, the full amount of The Ford Foundation grant for the three year period is recognized as revenue as of the effective date of the grant. Any grant funds not expended or committed by the Council within the three year term of the grant must, in accordance with the grant agreement, be returned to The Ford Foundation.

Grants, contracts and fellowships are recorded as expense when the recipient is notified that they are to receive the funds. The Council formerly followed the policy of recognizing grant and contract expense when the funds for the specific purposes were appropriated by the Board of Directors. The new method has been adopted to more properly reflect the liability created when the recipients have been notified of their selection. The effect of the change is to decrease grant and contract expense by $814,814 for the two year period ended June 30, 1976. The cumulative effect of the change in the method of recognizing grant and contract expense at July 1, 1974 of $58,593 is included in the accompanying statements to give effect to the retroactive application of the new method.

Purchases of office furniture and equipment are recorded as an expense in the year acquired.

3. Royalties
The Council receives royalties from the sale of a publication entitled Handbook of Data Processing for Libraries. The Council also receives royalties under an agreement relating to the publication and sale of a book entitled Economics of Academic Libraries. Both of these publications were developed under the Council's sponsorship financed by The Ford Foundation and accordingly royalties therefore are considered restricted funds.

4. Retirement Plan
Employees are eligible for participation in the Council's retirement annuity program which is administered through the TIAA/CREF insurance companies. Individual contracts issued under the plan provide for full and immediate vesting of both the Council's and employees' contributions. The Council's contribution amounted to $70,000 for the two year period ended June 30, 1976.

5. Commitments
The Council leases office space under a lease expiring November 30, 1977 providing for minimum annual rentals of approximately $30,500.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSER</td>
<td>CONversion of SERials project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FID</td>
<td>Federation Internationale de Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GED</td>
<td>General Educational Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICA</td>
<td>International Council on Archives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFLA</td>
<td>International Federation of Library Associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAML</td>
<td>International Association of Music Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTEX</td>
<td>INformation TRansfer EXperiments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBD</td>
<td>International Standard Bibliographic Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>International Standard Book Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSN</td>
<td>International Standard Serial Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JASIS</td>
<td>Journal of the American Society of Information Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUL</td>
<td>Joint University Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LC</td>
<td>Library of Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOEX</td>
<td>Library Orientation-instruction EXchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSEP</td>
<td>Library Service Enhancement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTP</td>
<td>Library Technology Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARC</td>
<td>MAchine-Readable Cataloging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCAL</td>
<td>MARC for Latin America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDLARS</td>
<td>MEDical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRAP</td>
<td>Management Review and Analysis Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NARS</td>
<td>National Archives and Records Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCLIS</td>
<td>National Commission on Libraries and Information Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEH</td>
<td>National Endowment for the Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NELINET</td>
<td>New England Library NETwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLM</td>
<td>National Library of Medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSDP</td>
<td>National Serials Data Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF</td>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTIS</td>
<td>National Technical Information Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCLC</td>
<td>Ohio College Library Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMS</td>
<td>Office of University Library Management Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLA</td>
<td>Public Library Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLATO</td>
<td>Programmed Logic for Automated Teaching Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R &amp; D</td>
<td>Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAL</td>
<td>Register of Additional Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECON</td>
<td>REtrospective CONversion project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAA</td>
<td>Society of American Archivists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLICE</td>
<td>Southwestern Library Interstate Cooperative Endeavor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLINET</td>
<td>SOutheastern Library NETwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEC</td>
<td>Systems Procedures and Exchange Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPINDEX</td>
<td>Selective Permutation INDEXing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRIM</td>
<td>Selected Research In Microfiche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBC</td>
<td>Universal Bibliographic Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCC</td>
<td>University of North Carolina, Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIMARC</td>
<td>UNIversal MARC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPC</td>
<td>Universal Product Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USBE</td>
<td>Universal Serials and Book Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Union of Soviet Socialist Republics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WICHE</td>
<td>Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILCO</td>
<td>Western Interstate Library Coordinating Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>