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The State Library And Network Planning In South Carolina

Betty E. Callaham
State Librarian

EDITOR’S NOTE: This article was originally presented to the S.C. Task Force on Library Automation and Networking on November 8, 1983.

During the next two years major decisions will be made concerning development of a statewide library network in South Carolina. As planning proceeds many voices will be heard, speaking from many different perspectives. Library organizations, groups of libraries, individual librarians, state and county officials, library trustees, and library users will have input. Today I would like to review for you the State Library’s evolving role, present responsibilities, and projections on network development — but first a bit of history as background.

Although authorizing legislation was passed in 1929, it was not until 1943 that South Carolina funded the agency then known as the State Library Board. From 1943 to 1966, the sole function of this agency was public library development. With existing public libraries being small and poorly funded and more than fifty percent of the population having no library service, the agency’s first objective was to develop units of service large enough in terms of population and funding to give good library service and the long term goal was statewide library service. To encourage the development of county library systems, State Aid was given only to systems providing county-wide service. With the passage of the Library Services Act in 1956, federal funds became available and were used to aid in the consolidation of nine county library systems and two regional systems. In 1976 the goal of statewide service was achieved when the forty-sixth county system was established and the last county extended bookmobile service into rural areas. Today we take pride in the fact that every South Carolinian has access to public library service through thirty-five county library systems and four multi-county regional systems.

Original Goal

Although its original goal was not attained until 1976, a dramatic change in the State Library Board’s responsibilities occurred in 1957. By gubernatorial order it was charged with administering the federal Library Services Act in the state. Because public library resources were deemed inadequate, the agency began building a reference and interlibrary loan collection to supplement local resources also initiated the Collection Improvement Projects which for ten years provided grants to strengthen local book and periodical collections.

When the Library Services Act became the Library Services and Construction Act in 1966, the State Library Board’s responsibilities were extended to include institutional libraries and service to the physically handicapped. Also, by virtue of LSCA Title III, the agency was charged with promoting interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing. Although Title III was not funded for several years, the State Library Board staff for the first time began thinking in terms of statewide cooperation or, in today’s terms, networking. Because both funds and experience were limited, the 1970’s were a period of experimentation with some false starts and some mistakes along the way.

The first plan called for the development of three Area Reference Resource Centers and three Metropolitan Libraries to supplement reference and interlibrary loan services in the state. Between 1968 and 1981, $517,000 in Title I funds were awarded to strengthen collections, but before sufficient Title III funds became available to fully implement the ARRRC’s, there had been a change in direction. Two Area Reference Resource Centers were allocated almost $100,000 between 1971 and 1980, but the emphasis shifted to staff training, interlibrary communication, and service to business.

The State Library Board was reorganized in 1969 and became the South Carolina State Library. The new responsibility of providing information service to State Government meant that the State began providing funds to build the reference and interlibrary loan collection. By the mid-70’s the decision was made to concentrate on building a single interlibrary loan collection at state level. The AARC’s, which never became self-supporting, were gradually phased out. LSCA Title III funds were then used to strengthen interlibrary loan and interlibrary communication. ILL postage, equipment, supplies, TWX in the early years and later In-WATS telephone, micro film editions of the State Library catalog, periodical lists, and newsletters were made possible by LSCA. Interlibrary loan activity grew steadily.

Today public, academic, institutional and special libraries may borrow directly from the State Library. School libraries, when appropriate, may borrow through the local public library. The service is strengthened because the University of South Carolina allows State Library to borrow from its collections for loans to other libraries. Usually we are able to fill 80% of all requests from our own collections or USC’s. At the request of the borrowing library we provide locations for another 5% from the OCLC data base. Approximately 10% of requests are inappropriate for out-of-state ILL and about 5% are unavailable or not for loan. During the past year we sent out approximately 25,000 loans to libraries and more than 26,000 loans to state government agencies.

New Impetus

In 1979 the movement toward networking was given new impetus when the S.C. Governor’s Conference on Library and Information Services recommended that the State Library develop and carry out a statewide plan for cooperation which would involve all types of libraries and be compatible with proposed national network plans. Shortly thereafter the State Library established the Task Force on Library Automation and Networking and began to actively explore networking issues. Sometime before, in 1975, the State Library had become a member of SOLINET, the Southeastern Library Network. Although late in joining SOLINET, the agency became an enthusiastic convert. SOLINET and OCLC, the national bibliographic utility, came to be viewed as essential to networking.

In 1979 the State Library considered the possibility of replicating SOLINET in South Carolina, creating an all-encompassing on-line network connecting all libraries. That scheme proved impractical on several grounds. The Regional Support System did not develop in the way envisioned by SOLINET at that time. The tremendous cost for hardware and communications, combined with a series of recessions, made it unlikely the State would finance such a system. And finally, a Network Feasibility Study commissioned by the State Library in 1981 introduced a new element in planning. Contrary to State Library expectations, most libraries in the state expressed satisfaction with interlibrary loan service and gave automation of internal library functions priority over enhancements of resource sharing.
From all these influences the State Library's concept of a state network has evolved. Today we foresee the development of a series of interlocking network segments. One segment will consist of the larger academic and public libraries having on-line access to the SOLINET/OCLC system. Other segments will be local area networks or clusters which will enable smaller libraries to automate functions such as accounting, cataloging, or circulation as well as improve their resource sharing efforts. The large libraries and the small libraries will require different types of network service. Rather than having one central computer center with large mainframes, we believe the local segments will be based on mini-computers. At the center of the network, the interface between segments, will be the State Library which we expect will continue to be the interlibrary loan center for smaller libraries as well as for any on-line library that chooses to use our resources.

To this point we have been following a very simple four-step plan toward development of a state network:

Four-Step Plan

Step I was to assist all libraries for which it is deemed economically feasible to join the SOLINET/OCLC system. This has been done to the extent practical at this time. Thirty South Carolina libraries are presently members of SOLINET, either individually or as cluster members, and five others are members of the Cooperative College Library Center which processes and enters their holdings in the OCLC data base. Twelve of these libraries joined SOLINET with the assistance of some $100,000 in LSCA Title III grants. We do not anticipate additional grants in the near future unless there is an opportunity for a cluster demonstration including a school library develops.

Step II of our network plan was to assist the major university and public libraries to complete retrospective conversion, thus building a state data base. This is nearing completion. To date seven libraries have received LSCA Title III grants totaling more than $105,000 to do RECON.

Step III was supposed to be the development of a state union catalog, utilizing archival tape of OCLC members in South Carolina. We had hoped to replace our State Library microfilm catalog with a union COM catalog by 1984. Budget restraints of the past two years delayed our plans, and now technological developments seem likely to result in a different approach. Possibly a COM catalog of non-OCLC library holdings will supplement the on-line data base.

Step IV will be development of the local area networks or clusters mentioned previously. These local networks may be either a single large library system or multiple clusters utilizing mini-computers and micro-computer terminals. Since each local network will be linked with the State Library which can function as a switching center, it will not be necessary for each network to have direct communications with all others.

Where do we stand today - legally and financially - and what are the next steps? There is no state law authorizing library networking in South Carolina. The Attorney General considers that the continuing gubernatorial mandate for the State Library to carry out LSCA programs plus the inter-library cooperation emphasis of Title III gives adequate authority for network development. Personally I will feel more comfortable with a clear-cut legal base and plan to request a legislative amendment for that purpose once we have a network design to propose.

Financially we are still poor but prospects are improving. As yet no state funds have gone into network planning or development. Between 1970 and 1983 South Carolina received some $1,054,000 in LSCA Title III funds which have been expended for ILL, ARRC's, SOLINET, and RECON as mentioned before. It now appears that we may receive the first state funding in 1984-85. The Budget and Control Board has recommended $50,000, one-half the amount requested, for network planning. Assuming the General Assembly approves these funds, we plan to combine them with approximately $150,000 in LSCA Title I and III funds to finance a design study and possibly one local area network as a prototype for future automation clusters.

While library plans have been evolving, there have also been some serendipitous developments - in and out of state - which will influence network development.

Telecommunications

Telecommunications will be a major cost consideration for any network. Fortunately the State has recognized a need common to many state and local government agencies. As a result the State has authorized implementation of SPOT - the State Plan on Technology - which provides for a microwave telecommunications system which will be available for a price to state, county, and municipal agencies. The Attorney General has ruled that all education agencies may be included, so we are optimistic that even private libraries may be part of the South Carolina Library Network. As an aside here, the State has also made a strong commitment to IBM or IBM compatible hardware. That does not necessarily rule out other major vendors such as Hewlett-Packard or DEC, but it means we must explore carefully how state plans impinge on library functions at the state and local levels.

Another consideration is that both SOLINET and OCLC are exploring ways of including small libraries in their services. For a state where most libraries are small by national standards this is an encouraging move. There are also many states which have moved ahead in network development. Several plans have been identified as having features which may be applicable to South Carolina. While waiting for funding we will be studying these network systems. Today's Task Force meeting is the first of a series of open information meetings we expect to have before the summer of 1984. The next meeting, to be held in either January or February will feature a member of the Wisconsin State Library staff who will describe network development in the state. Details of this and other meetings will be announced after the holidays. If you have suggestions of other state plans to be considered or for automation consultants you would like to hear, please contact me or John Landrum. Your suggestions will be welcome.

Although much remains to be determined about the statewide library network, we at the State Library believe four points have been established:

1) Externally, the state network should be linked to SOLINET/OCLC.
2) Internally, it must utilize the state telecommunications system.
3) Machine readable bibliographic records must be based on AACR2 standards and must be compatible with the MARC format so that a full MARC record can replace any short bibliographic records when needed.
4) The state network must be a system that will serve the needs of all South Carolina libraries including the many small libraries in the state as well as the large ones.

This is the State Library view of network planning at the present time, but we are not locked into any final plan. During the next few months I invite you to share with us your ideas and your recommendations, preferably in writing so they will be available for careful study and evaluation. Your help will also be needed to campaign for state legislation and state funding for library networking. We have a tremendous task ahead of us, and we need the input of everyone concerned with the improvement of library services in South Carolina.
A New Humanities Resource For South Carolinians

Elizabeth Brewer Caughman
Coordinator
S.C. Humanities Resource Center

South Carolina librarians who are engaged in program planning now have a new resource. Thanks to a cooperative project of Winthrop College and the South Carolina Committee for the Humanities, the South Carolina Humanities Resource Center houses an exciting and growing collection of films, videotapes, slide-tape programs, traveling exhibits, and print material on a wide range of subjects.

The South Carolina Committee for the Humanities (SCCH) is one of fifty state-based agents of the National Endowment for the Humanities. Like NEH, the SCCH funds humanities-related projects in hopes of fostering greater public appreciation of the humanities. By agreement, the committee receives copies of all products (from brochures, posters, and pamphlets to films, videotapes, and books) that result from the projects it funds.

In 1981, the SCCH voted to establish a resource center to house its growing multimedia collection, and to insure that material of high quality would continue to benefit audiences state-wide long after the projects that produced them ended. Proposals were solicited from interested institutions. In 1982, agreement was reached with Winthrop College to house the center in the Archives and Special Collections Department of its library.

Material representing almost one hundred projects dating back to 1972 was shipped to Winthrop in the fall of 1982. The collection was inventoried, previewed, and work was begun on a descriptive catalog. Much of the collection is oriented toward South Carolina history and culture. Other subjects represented include art, music, philosophy, history, architecture, historic preservation, urban planning, and religion.

Some subject areas have received a great deal of attention and offer a variety of possibilities for programs. The textile industry, for example, has been the subject of several projects. Two videotapes Thread/Work and John Bolt Culbertson examine contemporary problems of the textile industry, and the relationship between labor and management in South Carolina during the General Strike of 1934. Alvin Byers' history of the Olympia Mill Village, Olympia-Pacific: The Way It Was, 1895-1970, and a photographic exhibit, "South Carolina Mill Workers and Mill Villages," enhance the value of the collection as a resource.

There are several excellent programs on women. Women Leaders in South Carolina is a series of videotaped interviews with contemporary women. Among those interviewed are Carolyn Frederick, the former member of the South Carolina House of Representatives who introduced ERA; Estelle Walker, the former State Librarian who was instrumental in the development of public libraries in South Carolina; Juanita Goggins, the first black woman elected to the South Carolina House of Representatives; and Sara Liverance, a journalist from Anderson who helped in the effort to enable women to serve on juries in South Carolina. Women Themselves, originally produced for and aired on Public Radio, is a series on women in history. The struggles and hardships, as well as the inspirations and achievements of such women as Jane Hunter, Mary Chesnut, Grandin Moses, and Emma Goldman are portrayed through dramatic readings of their letters, diaries, and other writings.

Some of our most popular materials deal with unique aspects of South Carolina culture. Religious fundamentalists who handle poisonous snakes receive sympathetic treatment in the fascinating documentary People Who Take Up Serpents. Everything Change Up Now is a film about South Carolina sea islanders and the impact of the growing tourist industry on their lifestyles.

Audiences interested in history, photography, and folk music will enjoy One Third. The plight of rural southerners during the Depression is vividly recreated with now-famous Farm Security Administration photographs and Depression-era folk music in this videotaped documentary. Historic interest and strong visual appeal are also characteristic of the exhibit "John R. Schorb: Portraits of York County," a turn-of-the-century look at South Carolina through the camera of John Schorb, one of the earliest commercial photographers.

Specialized Material

Much of the material will appeal strongly to narrower audiences. One such slide-tape program compares the different approaches to historic preservation taken in Charleston and Columbia and explores the implications for other communities. Another features the renovation of an abandoned textile mill in Greenville.

Growth of the collection will continue through SCCH-funded projects and by purchase of high-quality programs such as American Short Story, and publicly funded projects from other states' humanities councils. An advisory board to make suggestions for purchase is planned.

In addition to the material on hand, users of the South Carolina Humanities Resource Center will have access to the collections of similar resource centers in other states. Catalogs describing the collections of many of the other centers are available, and a union catalog of the best programs available from all Humanities Resource Centers in the South is being compiled. The South Carolina Resource Center's own catalog will be mailed to most libraries in the state in early 1984.

Mini-grants are available to groups who wish to engage a scholar to speak in conjunction with a program from the Resource Center. Information on applying for grants may be obtained by writing the South Carolina Committee for the Humanities, 6 Monckton Boulevard, Suite C, Columbia, South Carolina 29206, or by calling (803) 738-1850. For people planning more ambitious projects requiring larger grants, a helpful guide to writing grant proposals and producing programs, Humanities Programming for South Carolinians, may be purchased for $7.50 from the Resource Center.

Requests for loans from the Resource Center may be made by calling us at 323-2131, ext. 10 or by writing Humanities Resource Center, Dacus Library, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, South Carolina 29733. Because our most popular items circulate frequently, advance planning and alternate use dates are strongly suggested. The Humanities Resource Center is located in the basement of the Dacus Library at Winthrop College in Rock Hill, and is open Monday - Friday 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. Visitors are always welcome.
Subscription Costs: A Five Year Comparison

H. Paul Dove, Jr., Director
James A. Rogers Library
Francis Marion College

The principal periodicals jobber for the James A. Rogers Library invoices subscriptions renewals during the summer preceding the actual subscription period, which is the calendar year. In the late fall and early winter, supplemental invoices arrive detailing price increases charged since the processing of the renewal invoice.

While the July 1983 invoice included 1,215 renewals, the supplemental invoices reflected 320 price increases for 1984 subscriptions. Since these charges amounted to a 6.9 percent increase over the July charges, the staff deemed it useful to identify the causes.

Some 53 titles evidenced significant increases. A comparison between the 1980 and 1984 charges for these 53 titles showed that 37 had increased 100 percent or more during the five-year period. (See Table A.)

Psychology journals showed the largest price increases as periodicals in psychology comprised 49 percent of the survey. Physics placed second with 24 percent. (See Table B.) Our initial guess would have laid the blame on traditional scientific fields, chemistry, physics, and biology, instead of on psychology. That psychology journals comprised ten of the fifteen highest increases further emphasizes a trend that had been unanticipated.

100 Percent Increase

Fifteen titles experienced price increases of 100 percent or more between the 1983 and 1984 subscriptions costs, as illustrated in Table C. Psychology publications accounted for all fifteen of these titles, and the American Psychological Association, which in 1984 added a third category, institutional, to their subscription structure, published thirteen of the fifteen journals.

Since 1971 the average price per subscription for Francis Marion College's library has tripled, from $20.06 to over $60.00 for 1984 renewals. The question arising from these findings, especially those where 1983 to 1984 charges doubled, asks whether these increases are geometric or exponential. In either case, it seems obvious that periodical costs will continue to wreak havoc with serials budgets, and more and more of our libraries will seek to reduce or at least contain expenditures by deleting subscriptions.

Since most libraries have had to pinch pennies for years anyway, one wonders at what point periodical holdings will deteriorate beyond limits of acceptability and impact drastically on the level or type of service rendered to the patron. Or are libraries rapidly approaching the time when few periodicals in hard copy will grace library shelves?
### Table A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Cost 1980</th>
<th>Cost 1984</th>
<th>Per Cent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Public Choice</td>
<td>$18.50</td>
<td>$88.00</td>
<td>375.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. American Psychologist</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>300.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professional Psychology</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>300.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Journal of Personality &amp; Social Psychology</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>220.00</td>
<td>266.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Physical Review: A</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>310.00</td>
<td>264.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Personality &amp; Individual Differences</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>180.50</td>
<td>261.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Journal of Experimental Psychology</td>
<td>78.00</td>
<td>260.00</td>
<td>233.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Contemporary Psychology</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>233.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Developmental Psychology</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>233.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Physical Review: B</td>
<td>190.00</td>
<td>620.00</td>
<td>266.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Journal of Experimental Zoology</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>436.00</td>
<td>223.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Neuropsychologia</td>
<td>142.00</td>
<td>456.00</td>
<td>221.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sex Roles</td>
<td>72.00</td>
<td>220.00</td>
<td>205.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Journal of Consulting &amp; Clinical Psychology</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Review of Scientific Instruments</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>210.00</td>
<td>200.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Physical Review: C</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>194.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Journal of Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>191.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Journal of Applied Physics</td>
<td>134.00</td>
<td>390.00</td>
<td>188.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Journal of Mathematical Physics</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td>375.00</td>
<td>188.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Journal of Abnormal Psychology</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>185.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Journal of Chemical Physics</td>
<td>235.00</td>
<td>660.00</td>
<td>180.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Reviews of Modern Physics</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>135.00</td>
<td>170.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Cognition</td>
<td>60.50</td>
<td>162.69</td>
<td>168.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Journal of Applied Psychology</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>150.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Journal of Educational Psychology</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>150.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Psychological Review</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>141.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Physical Review: D</td>
<td>170.00</td>
<td>410.00</td>
<td>141.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Psychological Bulletin</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>140.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Journal of Morphology</td>
<td>136.00</td>
<td>324.00</td>
<td>138.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. American Mathematical Society: Memoirs</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>147.60</td>
<td>127.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Communications in Statistics (A&amp;B)</td>
<td>220.00</td>
<td>490.00</td>
<td>123.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Dance Chronicle</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>114.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Women and Health</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>114.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Choice</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>112.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Journal of Physical Chemistry</td>
<td>128.00</td>
<td>268.00</td>
<td>109.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Educational Research</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>104.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Behavioral Neuroscience*</td>
<td>50.00*</td>
<td>136.00**</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1980 subscription excluded companion subscription. **1983 to 1984 increase was 100%.

### Table B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Number of Titles</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Average Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Psychology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>190.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Physics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>174.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. General</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>200.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>180.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Math</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>125.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>109.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fine Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>114.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>104.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 37 titles 100% 176.7%

### Table C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Cost 1983</th>
<th>Cost 1984</th>
<th>Per Cent Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personality &amp; Individual Differences</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>180.50</td>
<td>140.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Neuropsychologia</td>
<td>215.00</td>
<td>456.00</td>
<td>112.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. American Psychologist*</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Behavioral Neuroscience***</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>136.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Contemporary Psychology*</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Developmental Psychology*</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Journal of Abnormal Psychology*</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Journal of Applied Psychology*</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Journal of Counseling Psychology*</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Journal of Consulting &amp; Clinical Psych.*</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Journal of Educational Psychology*</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Journal of Personality &amp; Social Psych.*</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>220.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Professional Psychology*</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Psychological Bulletin*</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Psychological Review*</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*APA Publication. **Includes Journal of Comparative Psychology.
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A History of Godort In South Carolina

Frances Ellison
Documents Librarian
Winthrop College Library

One of the newest and most active parts of the South Carolina Library Association is the Government Documents Round Table (GODORT). While now a solid part of the SCLA organization, GODORT did not spring up overnight, but rather owes its existence to the efforts of documents librarians who saw the round table as a source of solutions to their common problems.

The forces that led to the founding of GODORT are exemplified by the situation at Winthrop College in the early 1970s. Despite the spacious new library building occupied in 1968, the documents collection was rapidly outgrowing the area allotted to it. Unlike most states, South Carolina did not have a "regional" depository which would accept older and less used documents from federal depositories like Winthrop. Thus, depositories in South Carolina were obligated to retain virtually every document sent them by the Government Printing Office.

Our first attempt to solve the problem was to find out if the University of North Carolina (the regional in that state) would or could serve us as a regional, even though we were located in South Carolina. While U.N.C.'s response was sympathetic, they were informed by GPO that their legal mandate did not permit them to serve libraries outside their state.

The investigation of the North Carolina situation was not a complete waste of time, however. Our look northward brought to our attention the existence of a government documents roundtable there. Since it had become obvious that South Carolina would have to solve its own problems, an organization of documents librarians like that in North Carolina seemed to be the first step towards those solutions.

On September 26, 1977, Frances Ellison sent a letter to the 17 depository libraries in the state inviting them to meet together at the SCLA meeting that fall to discuss common problems and common efforts to solve them. Most depository librarians as well as several other interested librarians attended and selected a steering committee to begin the process of forming a round table under the by-laws of SCLA.

The steering committee was composed of Mary Toll, chairperson, Lester Duncan, Myra Armistead, John McCormick, Norman Belk, and Frances Ellison.

This initial group agreed to submit a formal request to the Board of SCLA for affiliation as a roundtable. The request was signed by 25 persons in attendance at this meeting and was delivered to the SCLA president the same day. At this point, GODORT of SCLA was "off the ground."

Throughout the first year there were many meetings of the Steering Committee. A constitution and by-laws were the first order of business. The constitution stated: "GODORT's objective shall be to promote the collection, organization, and use of federal, state, and local documents in South Carolina and to work for the objectives of the South Carolina Library Association." This constitution was approved by SCLA in August.
1978, and officially accepted by GODORT membership at the October 1978 SCLA convention.

The stated goals of the new organizations were to: (1) establish a regional depository for federal documents in South Carolina, and (2) to work for the passage of a state bill for the establishment of state documents depositories. The most urgent issue was the latter. Efforts toward this goal had been underway for some time. It was felt that greater support could come through formal support and action.

At the request of Betty Callaham, state librarian, and Mary Bull, the State Library's documents librarian, letters asking for support of this bill went out to all S.C. representatives and senators from librarians across the state. There were days of discouragement, hard work and frustration for State Library personnel and others before the cause was won. Finally, on May 11, 1982, Act 348 of 1982, the State Documents Depository System Act, was passed. Ten state depository libraries, serving the entire state of South Carolina, are now furnished with a copy of virtually all documents emanating from the state agencies of South Carolina.

The next major goal of GODORT was to establish a regional federal depository in South Carolina. Problems with this goal were many. No one library could assume the enormous responsibilities of this role. Libraries under consideration were found to have a lack of personnel, lack of space and insufficient budgets to take on the increased technical operations involved.

Before the project could be further studied, GPO announced a plan of their own to encourage greater resource sharing and a more cost-effective program in all states. They requested each state to voluntarily draw up a plan whereby there would be a centralized library, such as the State Library, to serve as coordinator for implementing a plan suitable to the needs of all of the federal depository libraries in the state.

A meeting of all depository libraries was called by State Librarian Betty Callaham and her appointed designate, Mary Toll. This group met and a committee was appointed to work out the details for a plan to be submitted to GPO for a shared regional in South Carolina. Several similar plans used by other states had been studied previously. The Missouri state plan was chosen as a model for South Carolina.

U.S.C., Clemson, and Winthrop agreed to share the responsibility of acquiring, processing and housing all depository items offered by GPO. The State Library agreed to act as the clearinghouse for discard lists and to hold workshops for depository librarians. All depository libraries in the state would share resources as well as call on the three larger libraries for ILL needs. All libraries under this plan would be able to discard unwanted documents thus allowing space for more timely materials, while still retaining holdings of valuable historical documents in the state.

This proposed plan, approved by all depository libraries in the state, was submitted to GPO in October 1982. With the correction of a few details questioned by GPO, it is expected the state plan for a shared regional depository in South Carolina will soon be a reality.

Other important things have been accomplished through GODORT. Some of these included:

1. The organization and presentation of the first GODORT workshop on "Legal Reference." Others presented (some in cooperation with other SCLA units) were "Online Searching," "Four Miniworkshops," and "A Map Workshop."
2. The joint NCLA-SCLA GODORT meeting at the Charlotte joint conference.
4. Securing knowledgeable speakers for GODORT meetings at SCLA conferences, such as Dan McGilvrey and Leroy Schwarzkopf.
5. Participation in ALA/GODORT. South Carolina joined the national group in 1978.
6. Preparation of a directory of documents librarians in South Carolina with data on their documents collections. (Mary Bull, compiler.)

It is not enough to "rest on our laurels." There is a very challenging future ahead for GODORT. As we have achieved many of the goals set in 1977, we will be setting new goals regularly. Government documents departments should be a vital and integral part of each depository library, contributing in major capacity to the needs of patrons served--and that means all citizens of South Carolina. It is to that which GODORT is dedicated.

Footnotes
3. Ketsler, Ridley. Letter from Documents Librarian, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
7. The Missouri Plan for a Shared Regional Library (distributed by GPO).
The Education of Librarians: Retrospect and Prospect

Tom Smith
Formerly Asst. Docs. Librarian
University of Alabama

In the mid-1980s, as the profession of librarianship becomes more and more "computerized," the education of librarians deserves continuing scrutiny. In the current job market, not only in specialized but also in academic libraries, many positions, both beginning and intermediate, require an abnormal degree of technical training. This suggests that market forces outside of the realm of librarianship are now — and perhaps will be in the future — increasingly filling positions that rightfully fall within the province of librarianship.

This is not a wholly new situation. Indeed, the same issues which perplexed library educators and librarians decades ago are still with us, such as questions of professionalism and definitions of adequate library service. Thus, it's important for librarians periodically to question the profession, especially the educational background of those who wish to enter it. In Canada and the United States this review process is even more crucial now than ever, for numerous commercial firms are vying for a share of the services which were previously within the province of public and academic librarians.

The question therefore remains — are we giving adequate educational training to those about to enter the profession? How do we train librarians in a period of rapid change? How many library schools modify their curriculum to meet the expectations of the job market?

Fortunately, we have the example of one librarian who addressed this apparently ever-present problem some forty years ago. In an article entitled "Of the Librarian's Education" in the Winter 1943/44 issue of The American Scholar, W. Stanley Hoole chronicled the changing world of librarianship in the 1940s and the problems that plagued it. Some of the then-present professionalism, often cautious, still ring uncomfortably true today, especially in the light of the librarian's continuing struggle for academic status on many American campuses.

The purpose of this paper is to reflect on some of Hoole's ideas, not as a testimony to his powers of clairvoyance, but rather as an interpretation of the truth in the French axiom, "The more things change, the more they remain the same." Suffice it to say that we are now still asking ourselves the very same questions which Hoole asked four decades ago; perhaps we need another critique of the education for librarianships...one adaptable to the 1980s.

Hoole's paper begins with the observation that librarians ought to be as familiar with the insides of books as they are with the outsides. In his words, "The difference between the librarian who keeps the BOOK and another who keeps the WORD has been carefully drawn." Then, noting that a librarian's loyalty to his professional school depends upon how adequately he was "trained," Hoole notes that the "catch comes in the realization that he is trained to do one thing and expected to do the others." The professional training — professional competency equation — is still an interesting notion today. Are those in the field competent because of their training, or are they competent (as Hoole suggests) in spite of it, or competent at all?

Hoole next confronts the validity of course work taught in professional schools. On this point he does not equivocate: the need for more substantive courses for the preparation of librarians is urgent, he states. His fear that library schools produce rather librarians still has currency. The basic courses — those usually found in the "core curriculum" in Hoole's day — consisted of classification, cataloging, reference, administration, and bibliography. Today, because of the advent of automation and the need for librarians to become numerate as well as literate, this list has been expanded to include statistics, computer programming and other subjects, but the old basics still remain fundamental in a librarian's education. This de facto segregation of courses within the curriculum implies that they are somewhat more valid than others offered.

Hoole does not suggest that the basic courses are worthless. He does say that "The final test for the library school, as for all others, comes when its graduate is measured in terms of intelligent service. If he fails, the system goes down with him." Since about one half of a librarian's education is selected for him or her even before he enrolls, this is still a valid question. Job situations in librarianship are now so varied that one dare not say that a certain cluster of courses is better than another. On the contrary, one asks, "Do core courses make better librarians or do they merely give them a certain vague commonality that perhaps couldn't come from selecting one's own courses?" Hoole wisely doubts the validity of the core course curriculum and we should raise questions, also.

Hoole states that required courses inhabited a strong academic foundation in the education of librarians. To remedy this imbalance he calls for a "consolidated curriculum". Assuming all knowledge is related and that a librarian's duties are manifold, one asks, "Do core courses make better librarians or do they merely give them a certain vague commonality that perhaps couldn't come from selecting one's own courses?" Hoole wisely doubts the validity of the core course curriculum and we should raise questions, also.

Hoole's paper begins with the observation that librarians ought to be as familiar with the insides of books as they are with the outsides. In his words, "The difference between the librarian who keeps the BOOK and another who keeps the WORD has been carefully drawn." Then, noting that a librarian's loyalty to his professional school depends upon how adequately he was "trained," Hoole notes that the "catch comes in the realization that he is trained to do one thing and expected to do the others." The professional training — professional competency equation — is still an interesting
boom and the expansion in higher education have been contributing factors. However, with the decline of federal financial support and a contraction of the job market, many persons trained in other fields have sought refuge in librarianship. The influx into the profession by those with advanced degrees in subject fields — "scholar librarians," as Hoole calls them — is perhaps one result of his candid analysis (which, it must be added, was at the time considered "iconoclastic"). It has raised, as he so much desired, the level of professional education. While economics and demographics contributed, so, too, did the passage of time. Many library schools have now incorporated the "consolidated curriculum" concept into advance and six year programs, yet core courses are still with us. Plus ça change, plus c'est meme chose, indeed.

EDITOR'S NOTE: Dr. Hoole, dean emeritus of the University of Alabama Libraries, was born in Darlington in 1903.

Footnote

1 W. Stanley Hoole, "Of the Librarian's Education." American Scholar 13, no. 1 (1943-44), pp.110-121.

Government Documents: An Integrated Part of the BI Program in Colleges

Government documents—the repository for a tremendous treasure of materials—often seems to be the forgotten stepchild when BI librarians in an academic setting are teaching research strategy. Introducing this wealth of information and data from the federal government should be one of the objectives in a well-organized BI program. The use of government documents—not as an afterthought, but as a primary source of highly specialized and valuable materials—deserves more than passing reference, particularly in that first contact with the new student who is beginning research for a term paper.

Writing in North Carolina Libraries, Ridley Kessler offers sound advice and addresses some of the issues involved in setting objectives for the teaching of government documents. "A good documents instruction program should be simple. Very often, a program draws in trivial and unnecessary information... Because of the complexity of documents organization and the tremendous range of the material available, there is tendency for librarians... to overwhelm patrons with detail... Most patrons want particular information and they want to know how to find it in the simplest and most straightforward manner. They are for the most part not interested in the organization of the Government Printing Office, the history of the Superintendent of Documents classification system, or any sources that do not directly apply to their search. Keep to the basics. Save the rest for the proper time, if it should ever arise."

Teaching the use of government documents as an integral part of the bibliographic instruction program in academic libraries is not a topic receiving wide coverage in the professional literature. Most of the books on "library research" and "learning to use the library" do manage to include a chapter on the use of these important publications. However, very few of the many excellent guides on planning bibliographic instruction programs give more than cursory mention to federal documents, nor do they address the special issues involved in promoting the use of these materials.

In a recent article in RQ, "How to Teach People to Use Government Documents", Edward Herman discusses the factors involved in this aspect of library instruction and also cautions against overwhelming users with excessive detail. Emphasizing the importance of setting reasonable goals and of careful planning to determine both what should be included and what not to include, Herman concludes "... librarians have special responsibilities to promote the use of government publications... the inaccessibility of documents in most card catalogs and incorrect perceptions of the nature and value of documents among library users result in their underutilization... (necessitating) the development of well-planned bibliographic instruction programs."

For the freshman working on a first major term paper, for the upper-level student doing research or working on a special project, for faculty interested in keeping up with the latest information in disciplines ranging from business to education to the social sciences, a well-organized program of bibliographic instruction incorporating government documents can provide a necessary key to the vast information in our depository libraries.
Footnotes

2. Edward Herman, "How to Teach People to Use Government Documents," RQ 22:348 (Summer 1983)

Data on Dates:

May 3-4, 1984  Place: Ypsilanti, Michigan
Title: Marketing Instructional Services: Applying Private Sector Techniques
Contact: Carolyn Kirkendall, Director
LOEX Clearinghouse
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, MI 48197

May 10-11, 1984  Place: Gainesville, Florida
Title: 5th Southeastern Conference on "Bl: A Multi-Faceted Discipline."
Sponsored by: University of Florida Library Bl Comm. and Div. of Cont. Ed.
Contact: Barbara Wittkopf
114 Liberty West
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611
(904) 392-0361
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