

Conclusion

The growth of OPACs highlights the need for standardized curriculum cataloging procedures. The cost effectiveness of placing curriculum materials in OPACs is closely associated with the availability and quality of records in the bibliographic utilities. The rising rate of member-input records in OCLC indicates the increasing commitment of curriculum centers to shared cataloging and rein-

forces the need for standardizing curriculum cataloging procedures.

The ease of transferring records from bibliographic utilities to OPACs provides further motivation for the establishment of such standardization. Cooperative sharing of bibliographic records through national utilities provides the opportunity to enhance access to curriculum materials collections. ■ ■

Special collections in the Southeast

By James B. Lloyd

*Special Collections Librarian
University of Tennessee, Knoxville*

and William B. Eigelsbach

*Senior Library Assistant
University of Tennessee, Knoxville*

A special report on special collections.

This survey of mid-sized academic libraries in the southeast came about in response to a specific administrative need—the perhaps universal desire for more staff. One way to prove our need was to prove that we had fewer people performing the same functions than other repositories of comparable size. Since it did not seem appropriate to ask colleagues to fill out another survey to meet such an immediate and personal need, we surveyed by phone. And we limited ourselves to mid-sized academic libraries in the southeast, since that is our environment, purposely omitting places like the University of Virginia because they are so much larger, and going no farther west than Arkansas.

As might be expected, we had some difficulty in interpreting our statistics, and sometimes were forced to call back for clarification. There seem to

have been several reasons for this. For one thing the faculty, paraprofessional, clerical staffing structure which we use here does not exactly match classifications used elsewhere. For another, the figures themselves may be deceiving. Staff may be dedicated to non-visible functions, i.e., functions which we did not survey, such as microfilming or staffing an isolated public service point. The size of a repository sometimes proved difficult to compare, since conversion formulas between items and feet differed so widely that we were forced to make some adjustments on our own. And sometimes even the volume count for rare books may be unreliable. In our case, we have a second collection of some 100,000 volumes which, though not rare books is part of Special Collections. If we had chosen to count these volumes, we would have appeared much larger than we really are.

TABLE 1
SPECIAL COLLECTIONS SURVEY: STAFF

Special Collection	Enrollment	Professionals	Paraprofessionals	Clerical	Total Staff
Auburn University	19,500	5.0	3.0	2.0	10.0
Clemson University	16,100	5.5	5.0	0.0	10.5
Duke University	9,700	8.0	10.5	4.5	23.0
East Carolina University	15,500	3.0	3.0	0.0	6.0
East Tennessee State Univ.	9,000	3.0	1.0	1.0	5.0
Florida State University	24,000	3.0	1.0	1.0	5.0
Louisiana State University	27,500	9.0	8.0	2.0	19.0
University of Alabama	17,100	4.0	3.0	1.0	8.0
University of Arkansas	14,000	2.5	6.0	1.0	9.5
University of Florida	33,700	4.0	2.0	0.0	6.0
University of Georgia	25,400	8.0	7.0	1.0	16.0
University of Kentucky	20,400	6.0	6.0	1.0	13.0
University of Louisville	23,300	8.0	2.0	1.0	11.0
Univ. of Southern Mississippi	11,000	7.0	3.0	0.0	10.0
University of Tennessee	21,200	1.0	3.0	0.0	4.0
University of West Virginia	18,000	3.0	7.5	0.0	10.5
Tulane University	13,800	6.0	10.0	1.0	17.0
Vanderbilt University	9,100	3.0	4.0	3.0	10.0
(Average)	18,200	4.9	4.7	1.1	10.75

TABLE 2
SPECIAL COLLECTIONS SURVEY: HOLDINGS

Special Collection	Volumes	Manuscripts	Archives
Auburn University	63,800	2,500	2,500
Clemson University	15,000	3,600	1,400
Duke University	100,000	13,000	6,000
East Carolina University	0	2,500	2,000
East Tennessee State Univ.	2,400	2,000	600
Florida State University	55,100	2,250	1,000
Louisiana State University	100,000	15,000	2,000
University of Alabama	25,000	6,700	10,000
University of Arkansas	28,500	7,500	500
University of Florida	40,000	6,750	2,400
University of Georgia	200,000	7,500	10,500
University of Kentucky	124,000	9,400	9,100
University of Louisville	80,000	7,000	7,000
Univ. of Southern Mississippi	78,000	4,950	1,600
University of Tennessee	50,000	5,000	3,000
University of West Virginia	28,000	6,500	6,500
Tulane University	82,000	9,000	2,500
Vanderbilt University	42,000	2,200	3,000
(Average)	61,900	6,300	4,000

We discovered a number of different administrative configurations which, though not part of Table 1, may be of some interest. Perhaps the most unusual is the University of Louisville, where, though there is one administrative unit, the physically separate archives/records center also collects regional manuscripts, and the book collection is

maintained in thirty-five separate entities, some of which contain manuscripts as well. In the most common arrangement, found in ten of eighteen institutions, special collections is responsible for university archives but not for records management. Only two schools have separately administered archives; three, including Louisville, have

separate archives/records management facilities; and only two special collections department are responsible for records management in-house.

Tables 1 and 2 require little explanation, but in the interest of completeness several conclusions might be drawn. The average special collections department in the southeast is supported by an enrollment of 18,200 and has a staff of 10.7—4.9 professionals, 4.7 paraprofessionals, and 1.1 clerical staff—who perform three functions. They administer rare books, 61,900 volumes; manuscripts, 6,300 linear feet; and archives, 4,000 linear feet. The University of Georgia has the largest rare book collection and the most processed archives, LSU the largest manuscript collection and Duke the largest staff.

And we should add a final caveat. It could be argued, and rightly so, that our choice of institutions was arbitrary. We included Duke, but not the University of North Carolina or North Carolina State. In our single foray across the Mississippi we included the University of Arkansas, but not the University of Missouri or any of a number of comparable institutions in Texas. We included East Carolina but not Western Carolina, the University of Southern Mississippi but not Mississippi State, etc. All true. And we have no defense to offer other than to point out that we were aiming for a representative sample, not comprehensiveness. ■ ■



News from the Field

Acquisitions

- **Bowling Green State University's Popular Culture Library**, Ohio, has recently acquired an important new collection of books and manuscript materials in the field of science fiction, fantasy, and horror literature from Sheldon R. Jaffery of Cleveland, Ohio. A special strength of the collection is Jaffery's near complete series of Arkham House books, the oldest and most prestigious publisher of weird and supernatural fiction. Founded in 1939 for the express purpose of perpetuating the writings of H.P. Lovecraft, this specialized press became the foremost showcase for the greatest writers in the genre of macabre fiction. Arkham House was where the works of Ray Bradbury, Robert Bloch, A.E. Van Vogt, Ramsey Campbell, and Fritz Leiber, for example, were first published in book form. These rarities are included in the Jaffery Collection at the Popular Culture Library. The collection also includes correspondence, manuscripts, research files, and notes that Jaffery used in writing more than eight books, research guides, and anthologies. Of particular value is the correspondence Jaffery conducted with many of the Arkham House authors while compiling his book *Horrors and Unpleasantries: A Collector's Price Guide and Bibliography of Arkham House* (1982) and the revised edition, *The Arkham House Companion* (1989). Manuscript materials for Jaffery's *The Corpse-Maker* (1988), an anthology of pulp magazine short stories by Hugh B. Cave, and *Fu-*

ture and Fantastic Worlds: A Bibliographical (1972–1987) Retrospective of DAW Books (1987) are also included in the collection.

- **Kent State University Libraries**, Ohio, have recently received the papers of actor-director Robert Lewis, whose 60-year career has taken him from Broadway to Hollywood to London. The collection includes letters from writers Sean O'Casey, Katherine Anne Porter and Truman Capote, composers Aaron Copeland, Stephen Sondheim and Virgil Thomson, and artists Don Bachardy, Cecil Beaton and Alfred Stieglitz in addition to hundreds of actors with whom he has worked. Lewis's papers also include annotated scripts of all the plays in which he appeared as well as those he directed. Kent's Department of Special Collections houses other significant theater research collections as well as the Collection of Motion Picture and Television Performing Arts which features clipping files on hundreds of actors.

- **Saginaw Valley State University's Melvin J. Zahnow Library**, University Center, Michigan, has acquired two major gifts. The Nancy Stube Collection consists of over 3,500 volumes in the areas of late 19th Century American history and the philosophy of political science collected over several decades. It was donated to the Library by Mrs. Stube in memory of her parents. The second acquisition is the personal library of Harold Anderson, former Professor of Psychology at Michigan State University and one of the founders of the study of child psychology. This collection represents 40