

John Carroll University
Carroll Collected

Masters Essays

Master's Theses and Essays

2020

AN EXAMINATION OF LOCAL TELEVISION ARCHIVES

Lisa Lewis

John Carroll University, llewis@jcu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://collected.jcu.edu/mastersessays>



Part of the [Television Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lewis, Lisa, "AN EXAMINATION OF LOCAL TELEVISION ARCHIVES" (2020). *Masters Essays*. 137.
<https://collected.jcu.edu/mastersessays/137>

This Essay is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses and Essays at Carroll Collected. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Essays by an authorized administrator of Carroll Collected.

AN EXAMINATION OF LOCAL TELEVISION ARCHIVES

An Essay Submitted to
The Office of Graduate Studies
College of Arts and Sciences
John Carroll University
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of
Master of Arts

By
Lisa A. Lewis
2020

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction.....5

Chapter Two: Literature Review.....7

 Local Television News Archives.....7

 Value.....7

 Historical Development.....9

 Administration Issues.....10

 Archive Content.....12

 Content Users.....12

 Metadata.....13

 Condition of Materials.....14

 Preservation of Materials.....15

 Licensing Rights.....15

 Archive Funding.....16

 License Fees/Usage.....17

 Promotion.....19

 Prioritization.....20

Chapter Three: Methods.....21

 Sample.....21

 Procedure.....22

 Data Analysis.....23

Chapter Four: Results.....24

 Content.....24

Table of Contents (cont'd)

Type of Content.....	24
Date Range.....	25
Quantity/Format.....	25
Online Database accessibility.....	26
Content users.....	27
Archive Condition.....	28
Overall condition.....	28
Digitization.....	28
Licensing Rights.....	29
Funding.....	30
Overall Funding.....	30
Fees.....	31
Archive Promotion.....	33
Prioritization.....	34
Chapter 5: Discussion.....	36
Content.....	36
Metadata.....	36
Format.....	37
Content users.....	37
Condition.....	38
Digitization.....	38
Licensing.....	39

Table of Contents (cont'd)

Funding.....	39
Promotion.....	40
Prioritization of needs.....	41
Methodology issues.....	42
Limitations.....	43
Future Research.....	44
Conclusion.....	44
References.....	46
Appendix.....	49

Abstract

This study examined local television archives and collected data on the administrative issues of content, condition, funding, licensing rights, fee structure, promotion, and prioritization of needs. One intent of this work was to create a plan for the John Carroll University Northeast Ohio Broadcast Archives (JCU NOBA) that addresses operational concerns to provide suggestions for future development. Twenty-five local television archives responded to a survey on these administrative areas.

A subset of local television news archives was developed to draw comparisons between all the respondents and the more focused subset group. Most results saw large similarities between the all the respondents and the local television news subset. Areas emerging from the research as notable were database management, digitization, licensing, funding, and promotions. One of the major problem areas for local television archives is a lack of digitized materials. For aging video formats, this has become an urgent issue.

Survey results indicated that future research should be conducted around licensing and funding. The results also indicated that the greatest area for funding was from the institution that oversees the archive. There is a variance in licensing rates and a need for increased promotion. There are direct connections between promoting the archive and funding the archive. With greater promotion, archives are likely to experience greater income through licensing fees. Overall, the best way to ensure an archive's success is for archive directors to develop a multi-faceted approach to operations. This plan should include funding, promotion, and preservation.

Chapter One: Introduction

In 1987, John Carroll University in Cleveland, Ohio established a local television news archive named John Carroll University Northeast Ohio Broadcast Archive (JCU NOBA). The local American Broadcast Company (ABC) affiliate, WEWS, donated their film and videotape that dated back to the 1950s. The archive began with one thousand cans of film and eight-hundred videotapes.

In 1995, the university added materials from another local station; a network affiliate in Cleveland, WKYC, donated their daily news film. JCU NOBA added radio air checks from local stations, personal collections of two longtime Cleveland television journalists and one news photographer. The JCU NOBA archive grew to include over 255,000 individual clips of video.

Local television news archives have provided resource material for researchers in academic and commercial film areas. The material housed in these archives was originally created for daily news consumption; it has since also provided moving images for many documentaries, feature films, and television programming.

Much of the research regarding local television news archives reviewed the condition of video and the urgency to preserve the images. Research focused on analyzing the large number of analog and physical digital recordings on obsolete formats that were actively degrading (Casey, 2015). Very little research has examined issues of administrating local television archives. As a result, archive directors such as JCU NOBA's are left with valuable materials and little direction on how to administer them. One of the first attempts to gather information to address these issues was a survey by The Association of Moving Image Archivists (AMIA) in 2017. AMIA's research addressed content, condition, licensing rights, and funding. In

concluding, AMIA called for further research on fee structure and promotion of local television news archives.

The current study examined existing research and literature on local television news archives, and collected data on the administrative issues of content, condition, funding, licensing rights, fee structure, promotion, and prioritization of needs. In addition to adding to current research, one intention of this study was to prioritize operational concerns for the JCU NOBA archives and provide suggestions for future development and research with local television archives.

Chapter two of the thesis reviews the existing literature and research on television news archives. Chapter three outlines the methodology used. Chapter four presents the results of the study. Chapter five discusses the findings from the survey of local television archives and provides direction for research. A plan for prioritization for JCU NOBA is included in the appendix.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Local Television Archives

This chapter reviews the research on local television archives. These archives hold television recordings from as far back as the 1950's. Much of the research conducted on local television archives focused on their condition and preservation. In this review, research findings are discussed in two general areas: value and historical development and administration issues involving content, condition, licensing rights, funding and need prioritization. *Value* explains the worth of the collection, both financial and tangible. *Historical development* explains the process in constructing archives. *Content* explains what type of materials (format and subject) are held and offered for research, who uses them and what information is recorded for each video clip in the database. *Condition* identifies if the material is digitized and able to be duplicated along with efforts for preservation. *Licensing* describes the process for those using the archive materials. *Funding* explores methods of financially supporting the archives.

Value

The primary focus of local television stations is the daily production needs of broadcasters. "Hundreds of stations hold film and video that could be preserved, reformatted and reused to the advantage of the station itself, and by others for research, production, and entertainment" (Local Television A Guide to Saving Our Heritage, n.d., p. 1). The old footage provides access to the past for a new audience. For documentarians and feature film producers, the archival news footage deepens the context of the story they are telling. Lester (2018) wrote, "It is the information of archives that are routinely given prominence over their material properties" (p. 73). Archival materials can ground us in our culture. They provide points of connection that link people to their history. Booth (2015) states that one of the key duties of

archivists is to preserve the materials in their custody and within those records are the stories, the histories, and the legacies of people. Television news archives explain cultural history in a clear and compelling way through the video images they contain. The images from the original recordings allow the viewer to engage in a topic more readily than simply listening to an audio recording or reading a text. Producers who have used local television archival footage provide their projects with authentic historic references.

By reflecting on recordings from local news stations, a community connects images with events. By saving the news footage, local stations and those entrusted to care for the collection ensure the preservation of some of the most important events in history. Edmundson (2004) and Stephenson (personal communication, 2005) agreed that audio-visual archives document and preserve cultural heritage. The effort to digitize these collections has made it possible to re-discover archives' hidden materials. Televised stories from the past are suddenly accessible. Broch (2019) contended that understanding of ordinary people's stories from the past, told to a broadcaster, could easily give insight into our culture and way of living at different times. "It can help us to understand our own or others' past and to find or form our identities in the future" (Broch, 2019, p. 12).

Local television archives support cultural, educational, social, and political interests. "Our heritage would be diminished if this vast record of our culture can vanish (Murphy, 1997). Documentaries that utilize archival news footage to share stories enrich and deepen our culture, fostering a more informed and connected world. Hagedoorn and Agterberg (2016) argued that reflection on the past is a necessary part of how a culture is shaped and developed. Local television archives offer a high research value, but their lifespan is limited. As stewards of a

culture's collective knowledge, archives face the reality of degradation and obsolescence (Zastrow, 2014).

Historical Development

Producers and researchers who seek to use the historic footage in their projects approach local television stations to find images that support their narrative. Seeking stock footage is an orderly process. The local television station is usually the first step in this process. Local news footage enriches a production because it is usually not available through any other resource. "Documentary filmmakers seeking access to television news footage, typically face a two-pronged problem: either the stations aren't interested in making their footage available for licensing, or they aren't interested in preserving and maintaining an archive" (Deutsch, 2013, p.2). Some stations were not set up to handle a request of this nature. For many local television stations, managing archives with the volume of footage they owned was impractical.

The average viewer would be led to believe that the original focus of a local television station was to provide the viewing audience with news and entertainment programming. The general manager or owner of the station decided what to do with the programming they recorded. Local stations often lacked the staff, funding, and storage space needed to archive and make their recordings available to the public. Unable to do more than safeguard the aging materials, some stations chose to preserve their film and video by donating it. Many local television stations lacking the storage space for film cans and videotapes prompted a partnership with universities, colleges, historical societies, or museums to create repositories. Their donations represent tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands of 16 mm film and videotape clips.

When donated, an agreement between the station and the institution was created, the terms of which varied from station to station. The agreement would indicate who maintains

physical ownership, rights, and title of the materials. The Association of Moving Image Archivists [AMIA] (2018) suggested the receiving institution provide proper storage and handling of the materials as well as fulfilling requests from the public for access. As demand for news archive film and videotape increases, archival producers learn that there is no centralized source or directory of local television news archives. The list they compile is a result of years of researching local television news footage.

Administration Issues

The donation of film and video to universities, museums or historical societies helped to ensure its proper care. The managers of the collections valued the connection to the past that the footage created. Being responsible for the collection included making decisions about what to retain and what to preserve. Gracy (2007) wrote that today, “we rely largely upon cultural heritage institutions or archives to select which material is most worthy of expending limited resources on its care” (p. 187). Administrative issues for archival managers involve the content, condition, licensing rights, funding and need prioritization.

Very little research has been done on the administration issues archive directors face. In 2017, the AMIA conducted a critical study on some of these issues. With the intent to gather data about local television archival collections, questions were asked about demographics, content, accessibility to users, ownership rights, and grants. The AMIA sent their survey to directors of local television archives and specifically looked for information on news footage produced by local network affiliates within the United States. The survey did not seek information from public, educational, or community access cable program archives. Directors’ responses addressed each collection they held. For example, if one archive had five collections, the director responded five times with answers dependent upon each individual collection. Overall, AMIA

collected responses from 39 individuals, representing archival material from 88 television stations.

The survey asked where the institution was located, using Census Bureau Divisions as response choices. Of the nine census divisions, respondents came from six of them. The order of the 39 responses was: Pacific division (CA, OR, WA) with 9 (23%) : West South Central (TX, LA, AR) with 7 (17.94%); West North Central (IA, KS, MN, ND, NE) 5 (12.82%), East North Central (MI, IL, OH, IN) had five (12.82%), Middle Atlantic division (NY, PA) four (10.25%) and the South Atlantic division (MD, GA, WV) had four (10.25%).

Of the responding directors, 17 of 39 (43.58%) represented universities or colleges; six (15.38 %) represented government archives; four (10.25 %) represented historical societies, three (7.69%) public libraries; two (5.12%) museums; and one (2.56%) self-identified as a television station-studio archive. The size of the market or size of the institution where the collection was being held was not considered. When the AMIA (2017) asked archive directors to describe content, condition, licensing, and funding, it is unclear which responses were from local television stations or other institutions. The background of the AMIA study provides a context for their findings, which are included in the following individual sections on administration issues.

Archive Content

Producers or anyone seeking local television news footage expect to find recordings in an archive of daily news events, government events or announcements, extreme weather stories, results of sporting events, and various human-interest stories. Most all the recordings are of a local nature. On occasion, stories entered the national spotlight. These types of stories were sometimes extraordinary. For example, the Kent State shootings in 1970, the race riots of the

1960's, the Love Canal tragedy, or any local story that became of national interest. Some archives hold strictly news content, some hold strictly entertainment content, and some hold a combination of the two.

To develop an understanding of what materials comprised the content of local television archives, the AMIA (2017) study asked archive directors which decades their collection of news footage covered, which format types were held (16mm film, 3/4" U-Matic tape, VHS tape, etc.), and what related broadcast materials (logs, scripts, photographs) they held. Fifty percent of the archive directors reported having footage from the 1970's—more than any other decade. Archive holdings from the 1980's ranked second, followed by the 1960's. Material from the 1950's was approximately half the number of the 1970's. Archive collections participating in the AMIA study primarily held 16mm film, more than any other format. This was followed closely by 3/4" U-Matic tape. The AMIA's study did not specify how many days, weeks, or months were included for each decade per station responding nor if there were breaks in archive coverage.

Content Users

The AMIA (2017) survey asked archive directors to identify all user groups and indicate the most frequent user of their local television collections. Feature film producers and documentarians were the most frequent group followed by research groups and community members.

Metadata

In determining content, one needs to know what the film/tape covered. If the footage did not arrive on-site with any descriptions, one of the first tasks for archival managers is to review each clip to gather the metadata. When film or footage is lacking the metadata, it becomes difficult to identify the content of the clips. Footage received with no description can be used

only after it is viewed and properly labeled. Ideally, each clip should contain a date, subject, and location.

Once descriptions are assigned, the archive manager's next step is to identify a data management program suitable for the collection. The program should allow for searching by various means (keyword, date, etc.) Often producers seeking archival footage do not have a comprehensive list of search terms. They merely have a proper name or a date. In local news, when the footage was labeled by the station who recorded it, identifiers were merely intended to differentiate one clip from another at the time. Local television archive directors, such as the JCU NOBA director, found these clips, many times, had generic labels such as "building fire" or "car accident". Dates and names are helpful when searching for specific clips.

For archives that cannot offer an online database for the public to search the collection, this presents an obstacle for the archive's promotion. Such was the case for the majority of the AMIA's (2017) survey responding institutions. Seventeen respondents indicated the lack of an online database as a primary obstacle increasing the use of their archives. Respondents reported that their materials were under-discoverable, or not discoverable at all, due to a lack of processing, description, and access.

Condition of Materials

From the discussion of the historical development earlier, we know that stations did not always preserve the footage carefully. Over time videotape ages and breaks down. That means problems of sticky shed syndrome, oxidation, curling, binder break down, and scratches may cause the videotape to lose its picture and sound components. A heightened concern lies with videotape, as it breaks down more quickly than film.

Additionally, both formats experience aging playback machines. Allen (2008) described the old film and the machines used to playback the footage as obsolete, with the opportunity to preserve both footage and equipment slipping away. Casey (2015) explained that potential peril of losing the images that were recorded is within less than a generation and that major risk lies in the near-to-mid-term.

When a collection moved to a new location, whether a university, college, historical society, or museum, the condition of the footage needed to be assessed. The managers or caretakers of the film and/or videotape review materials for preservation needs. “Risks from degradation include catastrophic failure of a recording so that no content is recoverable, partial failure so that only parts of the content are recoverable, or diminishment so that content is recoverable but at a lesser quality” (Casey, 2015, p.6).

Ideally, the new home for the audiovisual materials would include handling film in a clean environment, minimizing exposure to dust, keeping food and drink away from film, keeping the film away from direct heat sources, and storing in a dry (62 – 66 degrees Fahrenheit and 40 percent humidity) space (Library of Congress, Preservation, 2020).

Preservation of materials

Digitizing recordings is an ideal way to preserve and to share them with the public. O’Sullivan (2013) explained that the process can be painstaking and costly, but the educational value of archives is immense. Problems can occur when preserving both film and videotape recordings. As film ages, the condition is affected by how well the stock was manufactured, how the film was developed, and whether it has been stored properly (Video Guidance, 2020). The storage conditions have a big impact on the condition of the footage whether film or videotape. The expectation of decay, combined with the inevitability of continuing format change, have an

ultimate consequence: image and sound content can survive and continue to remain accessible but only through the transfer of content from one format to another (Edmondson, 2004). Besides the erosion of the tape, an additional problem arose as videotapes were reused. As a result, many of the shows from the early days of videotape use were wiped or erased and the tapes re-used. Videotape was not seen as a long-term archive format (Lee, 2010).

Licensing Rights

When local television stations donated film and videotape to an institution, the organizations often developed an agreement to indicate the recipients' responsibilities and rights. The agreement includes licensing as a legally binding contract that can be written in formal language, but this is not always the case. The contracts or agreements can vary in length from institution to institution. Allen (2008) suggests any policy adopted by the newly created archive consider factors such as legal, historical value, and economic value. Additionally, Allen (2008) called for broad criteria in selecting which materials the archive chose to maintain. For example, a caretaker would specify guidelines for which material was saved, taking into consideration the significance of the cultural representation, as well as the condition of the film or videotape and the cost of labor and materials to make that footage usable.

The AMIA (2017) study indicated that 71.76% of respondents do retain property rights of the footage they hold in their archive. The AMIA survey also asked whether respondents own *intellectual* property rights of their collections. They found that 37 (41.11%) of 90 archive collections do not and 31 (34.44%) do own intellectual property rights of their collection.

Archive Funding

Funding is a critical concern for archives. Local television news archives faced costs associated with the issues of storage space, funding, and ample staffing. While archives rely in

part on institutional funding, grants and donations also contribute to the overall financial support of operations.

Much of the research on funding has focused on grants. The AMIA (2017) study found 11 of 13 institutions applied for an average of 2.5 grants each in the last five years. Of the 13 institutions applying for funding, nine were university libraries and archives, all others, having one respondent per group, were historical societies, government/institutional archives, and online archives. Not having sole ownership/physical property rights of the collection posed an issue with 71% of respondents to AMIA's (2017) study. Additionally, applying for grants requires resources that archives were lacking.

The Council on Library and Information (C.L.I.R. Fellowships and Grants, 2020) offers a grant program that helps institutions prioritize and develop practical strategies for digitizing their collection. The council's *Recordings at Risk program* awards grants to archives with limited resources and/or technical expertise to act against the threats of degradation and obsolescence.

License Fees/Usage

Multiple types of fees generate funding to support the archives. The first fee is by providing a transferring service or making a copy of the images for preview. For this service, archives may charge an hourly fee for the labor to prepare the copy or screener. Some archives charge a flat fee per copy with a runtime or length of footage maximum. Other archives charge no fee for the preview 'screener' but do charge for licensing. The second fee is for services provided. This would include duplication of recordings and reformatting of recordings. AMIA (2017) findings indicated 66 (89.18%) of 74 archive collection directors sometimes or always charge patrons a fee to digitize materials. In addition, the AMIA (2017) study indicated that 53

(63.09%) of 84 archive collection directors reported never licensing materials for commercial purposes; 21 (25%) always did; and 10 (11.9%) sometimes did.

One standard in archival footage use rights is that ‘license fees are calculated from the on-screen time of footage used in the completed production. Usage Calculations are rounded up to the full second per shot, as appears in the production’ (ABC Library Sales, 2017). Research does not address this aspect of archive administration.

Areas of consideration for fees charged for footage used are coverage area, duration, and frequency. Coverage area considers *where* footage will be seen. This could include specific areas such as broadcast television, both free- to-view and pay-per-view, online streaming, film festivals, or theatrical/cinema. The all-inclusive option for coverage area is worldwide, which includes all the above. Duration considers *how long* the agreement lasts. This is calculated in years, depending on the individual archive, exceptions can be made. The all-inclusive duration period is in-perpetuity. Frequency considers *how many times* the footage will be viewed. This aspect is difficult to predict and leads producers to seek the all-inclusive All Media, Worldwide, In-perpetuity coverage. Specific rates charged vary greatly. The rates charged are almost exclusively by the second with a minimum number of seconds required for use.

Additional factors in determining the rate for licensing footage include resolution, rarity of the clip, and amount of labor to prepare and deliver. Licensing of archival news footage may consider the rarity of the footage when determining the fee. Consideration is given to the type of project in which the footage will appear. Feature films, commercials, network television, cable television, streaming provider, internet, industrial, single-play live audience, or personal use are among the many options available to licensees. Russell (2020) cited the rising production costs of filming features and documentaries as a reason for the increased popularity in local television

news archives as sources of content (H. Russell, personal communication, April 8, 2020). No standard fee structure among archives was determined. This presents an issue for producers when budgeting for a project. They are not able to predict the actual cost of archival footage. If prices are too high, the producers have the problem of not affording as much footage.

Promotion

A logical first step beyond the initial promotion efforts is outreach. Weir (2009) insisted that archives must identify and keep in touch with their public. This included promoting the archive through speaking with students, lecturing to professional archive societies, offering exhibitions, and seeking coverage through local or regional media.

There are many ways to promote archives through daily operations. People love to see behind the scenes to learn how things work. Norling (2015) suggested that archives do this by promoting the work they do to care for and deliver archival materials; for example, posting short videos to social media. Producing a documentary about the building of a documentary would serve as public interest and as a tool for educators.

While planning a program for promoting an archive can be exciting with the temptation of organizing large exhibitions, it can also occupy a large portion of the staff's time and much of its resources. Weir (2009) suggested creating a plan that provided a framework for any promotion. Utilizing this structured approach keeps the plan for promotion organized and does not detract from the daily operations of the archive itself. Bryan (1964) described a campaign for promotion as one that began with a grassroots effort. This method reminds people of the rich heritage contained in the archive and its worthiness for preservation. Historical societies,

museum groups, civic organizations, church groups, educators, and film producers are all among potential supporters of news archival efforts. They are likely to have a personal stake in the use of and preservation of archived materials. Visiting local schools and libraries to present the archive offerings is one way to present an archive's promotional material. Bryan suggested additional promotion of any services that an archive may provide such as duplication or re-formatting would help inform the public.

A gap in the literature shows very little understanding of how these archives make researchers and documentarians aware of material that is available. AMIA (2017) asked about what were the primary obstacles for *increasing use* of an institution's local television archive collection, but did not ask specifically about how archive directors promoted the respondent's collection. The promotion of local television archives is one of the administrative issues that has not been previously addressed in literature

Prioritization

All the above issues are concerns for archive directors; however, no research asked directors to prioritize their needs among preservation, funding, promotion, or searchable databases. As most researchers have focused on the need for preservation, one might assume this is the number one priority. For archive directors to administer archives effectively, it would be important to know whether this is the priority and be aware of what other archive directors think. Having the benefit of shared information on content, condition, licensing rights, and funding would lead to run archives more efficiently.

The following six questions emerged

RQ1: What is the content of the archives surveyed?

RQ 2: What is the condition of the archives?

RQ 3: What are the licensing rights?

RQ 4: How are archives funded?

RQ 5: How are archives promoted?

RQ 6: What is the prioritization of needs archive managers reported?

Chapter Three: Methods

Sample

An email Qualtrics survey was sent to 56 television archive professionals. The primary researcher developed the list of 56 possible participants by referencing states' publications of broadcast television news stations, and personal industry referrals. Three additional participants asked to be included, increasing the total potential sample to 59 (See Appendix A). The sample drew from Eastern and Mid-Western United States television markets, as the intent was to provide a comparison to JCU NOBA. Respondents held a variety of positions from Archive Director to Associate Producer at local broadcast stations and at a variety of colleges and universities. The response rate was 42.37% (25 of 59).

Of the 25 respondents to the survey, 16 identified their type of institution as: six (37.5%) Public University or College; three (18.75%) Private University or College; five (31.25%) Television Station; and two (12.5%) answered Other. Those answering 'Other' indicated that their archives were a private, non-profit historical society and a statewide history organization.

Of the nine respondents from universities and colleges: three (33.33%) responded that their institution had over 30,001 students; one (11.11%) between 20,001 and 30,000 students; two (22.22%) between 10,000 and 20,000 students; two (22.22%) between 3,001 and 5,000 students, and one (11.11%) fewer than 3,000 students. The largest number, six of the nine that

maintained archives at a college or university were in Ohio. Other respondents were from the Eastern and Mid-Atlantic United States.

Focus was placed on a subset of archives that indicated they maintain a local television news archive. Among the 25 total archives that responded to the survey, 15 of them were in the subset. Taking a closer look at the responses of just this subset provided a more in-depth analysis closely related to JCU NOBA. Subset respondents included eight universities/colleges, four television stations, and three private archives. Of the 15 local television news archives, eight (53.33%) indicated that their archive held 75% or greater news footage.

Procedure

This study looked at local television archives with attention to content, condition (state of digitization), licensing, funding, promotions, needs prioritization of their collections and was developed to provide information on archive operations for local television news archives. Based on the author's experience as an archive director, it was important to include administrative issues that were not covered in the literature. All participants received 28 questions on the areas of interest. Six questions replicated AMIA's (2017) research on content and licensing rights.

Multiple question types were included in the survey. Using a variety of question types allowed survey respondents to provide additional detail in their answers. The survey asked about licensing fees. Respondents were asked to specify the cost to license one minute of their footage. Additional details of distribution area (where the finished project would be viewed), what form of media (television, video-on-demand, theatre, festivals, promotional movie trailers, up to and possibly including all forms), location area (for example, worldwide includes any location on earth), and for what length of time (for example, in-perpetuity includes for all time). (Appendix B)

Data Analysis

Results were analyzed by cross-tabulation and are reported in terms of frequency of responses for all participants. As not all respondents answered every question, the number of respondents for each question is also reported. In analyzing the outcomes of the responses, care was taken to ensure that the final reporting did not skew the results.

Chapter Four: Results

Results are presented for all 25 survey respondents and followed by the subset of those who indicated they had local television news in their archives.

Content

RQ1: What is the content of the archives surveyed?

Participants were asked about the type of footage in their archive, news or entertainment and what percentage of the archive it represented.

Type of Content

All-respondents. Of the 25 respondents to the survey, 23 indicated the type of footage their archive held. Thirteen (52%) indicated that their collection is comprised of 70% or greater news footage. Nine (33.33%) indicated that their collection held Entertainment footage. Of the nine holding entertainment footage, two indicated that their collection is comprised of 100% entertainment footage. Six indicated that their collection is comprised of 20% or less Entertainment footage, and four (14.81%) indicated Other. Of the four respondents who indicated 'other', one specified 'other' to be commercials. The remaining three respondents who replied 'other' did not indicate a description.

Local Television news subset. Of the 15 respondents answering yes, 14 (93.33%) of them indicated what percentage of their collection was local television news or entertainment. Seven (50%) of the 14 respondents have a collection holding greater than or equal to 85% news or entertainment programming. Two (14.28%) hold between 60 - 75% news or entertainment programming in their archives. Five (35.71%) hold less than 10%.

Date Range

Date range included earliest date to most recent date in the collection and if the date span contained any gaps in coverage.

All Respondents. Thirteen (86.67%) of 15 responding archives hold greater than 21 years of footage, 1 (6.67%) holds 11 - 20 years, 1 (6.67%) holds 6 - 10 years and no responding archives hold less than five years. Eight (53.33%) of 15 responding archives indicated that their collection does contain gaps in dates. Seven (46.67%) of 15 indicated that their collection does not have gaps. None of the respondents who acknowledged date gaps indicated how long those gaps were.

Local Television news subset. In the 15 local television news subset archives, 11 (73.33%) hold 21 or more years of footage. Two (13.33%) archives hold 20 years of footage, one (6.66%) holds eight years of footage, and one did not indicate a date range of their holdings. Seven (50%) of the 14 respondents indicated that they do have gaps in the date range of their holdings.

Quantity/Format

Participants were asked to identify what quantity of each format their total collection held. The following list was provided: 1" tape; 2" tape; ¾" tape; VHS tape; Beta Cam tape; DV Cam tape; DVC-Pro tape; Digi Beta tape; 16mm film; 35mm film; and other. Each responding archive could have listed more than one format. Results are listed with number of archives followed by the quantity of each format they hold.

All respondents. Ten (37.03%) of the 25 survey respondents indicated they hold ¾" tape with quantities ranging between 500 – 14,000 tapes. Nine (29.62%) hold 16mm film, with quantities ranging between 5 – 160,000 reels. Six (22.22%) hold 2" tape with quantities ranging between 10 – 300. Six (22.22%) hold BetaCam tapes with quantities ranging between 20 –

24,800. Five (18.51%) hold DVC-Pro tape with quantities ranging between 200 – 4,000. The remaining four formats (1” tape, VHS tape, DV-Cam tape, and 35mm film) were indicated by three archives for each format having quantities ranging between 20 – 7,000.

Local Television News Subset. Nine (60%) of the 15 archives hold over 1000 ¾” tapes each. Five (33.33%) of the 15 archives maintain at least 1000 reels of 16 mm film and as many as 160,000 reels. Five (33.33%) hold 2” tape with quantities ranging between 10 – 300 reels. Five (33.33%) indicated they hold Beta-cam with quantities ranging between 50 – 24,800 reels. Five (33.33%) indicated they hold DVC-Pro with quantities between 200 – 4,000 tapes. The remaining formats (1” tape, VHS tape, DV-Cam tape, and 35mm film) were indicated by three (20%) archives with each format quantity ranging between 5 – 7,000.

Online database accessibility

Participants completed questions regarding accessibility to an online database and software program used.

All Respondents. Of the 12 respondents to the question regarding an online search aide, four (33.33%) indicated that they do have a search aide available to the public, eight (66.67%) indicated that they do not. The four respondents indicating that they do, specified what software program they currently use. The indicated software programs included ArchivesSpace, Minisis, Collective Access, and a hybrid of several programs.

Local Television News Subset. From the subset group, four (26.66%) indicated having an available search aide. Seven (46.66%) of the local television news subset archives do not have an available search aide. Four archives from the local television news subset declined to answer the question. All four respondents answering yes used the same four software programs represented in the full survey response.

Content Users

Respondents to the survey were provided a list that included feature film, documentary, television programming, public presentation, academic use, and personal/private use.

Respondents indicated the use of their collection by percentage. Results are presented in terms of number of archive directors reporting the percentage of user requests (See Appendix C).

All Respondents. Ten (83.33%) of the 12 respondents indicated that documentaries represented between 20 – 95% of their footage request usage. Nine (75%) answered television programming, reporting percentages between 3 – 100%. Seven (58.33%) listed personal/private request use and indicated the percentage of use between 2 – 100%. Five (41.66%) listed academic/research request use with use ranging between 2 – 30%. Five (41.66%) indicated public presentations with requests ranging between 5 – 40%. Four (33.33%) said feature films, with request use ranging between 5 – 65%. Other was listed by three (25%). The other category did not allow any further explanation of use.

Local Television News Subset. Seven (63.63%) of the 11 respondents indicated that documentaries represent the most use of their footage. Two (18.18%) indicated television programming. Six (54.54%) of the 11 subset archives indicated that personal/private requests represent the use of their archive. Four respondents (36.36%) indicated feature film. Five (45.45%) respondents listed public presentation and academic research.

RQ 2: What is the condition of the archives?

Archive Condition

The condition of archival material considers the playability. Poor conditions mean the film or tape has experienced some damage so that when it is played back, the picture image is

less than pristine. Material in good condition can be digitized. Film or tape that has been digitized has been transferred to a digital file format.

Overall Condition

Respondents to the survey were provided a list that included: Poor – more than 50% of collection has breakdown or damage; Fair – at least 25% has breakdown or damage; Good – less than 10% has breakdown or damage; and Very Good – less than 5% has breakdown or damage. Survey participants indicated the condition of their archive materials.

All Respondents. Nine (64.29%) of 14 respondents indicated that the condition of their archive collection was good, and five (35.71%) indicated that the condition of their collection was fair. No responding archives selected poor or very good as a condition of their archive.

Local Television News Subset. Nine (60%) of the 15 consider their archives to be good, four (26.66%) of the 15 indicated fair, and two of the 15 did not list the condition of their archive.

Digitization

When asked what portion of their collection was digitized, respondents answered providing the response as a percentage of their entire collection.

All Respondents. Eleven (78.57%) of 14 respondents indicated that between 1 – 25% of their collection is digitized. Two (14.29%) indicated 26 – 50%, and one (7.14%) indicated 51 – 75%. None of the respondents has digitized collection greater than 75%.

Local Television News Subset. Ten (66.66%) of the 12 responding local television news subset archives indicated having between 1 – 25% of their collection digitized. Two (13.33%) have digitized between 26 – 50%. One indicated having 51 – 75% of their collection digitized. Two declined to answer this question.

RQ 3: What are the licensing rights?

Licensing Rights

The questions on licensing addressed how people used the footage. Respondents were asked if they retain/own licensing rights and if they are permitted to license their footage. The archives were also asked who is permitted to license their footage. Respondents were provided with a list of choices that included – The general public- personal requests; academic researchers; documentarians/feature film producers/television producers; and all the above. Each responding archive could have listed more than one type.

All Respondents. Ten (71.43%) of the 14 responding archives indicated they do retain/own intellectual property rights of their collection. Four (28.57%) do not. Three responding archives indicated they were permitted to license their footage. One (33.33%) of the three indicated they are *not* permitted to license their footage. Two archives indicated other.

Ten archives responded to who can license their footage. Two (20%) indicated documentarians/feature film producers/television producers license their footage. Eight (80%) of the 10 responding archives indicated that they license their footage to the entire list above.

Local Television News Subset. Nine (69.23%) of thirteen respondents indicated that they do retain/own intellectual property rights of their collection. Four (30.76%) do not. No respondents indicated that they were permitted to license their footage. Two (13.33%) indicated other and twelve (80%) did not answer. Nine local television news subset archives responded to who can license their footage. One (11.11%) of the nine respondents answered documentarians/feature film producers/television producers. Eight (88.88%) indicated all the above from the list of choices provided.

RQ 4: How are archives funded?

Funding

Funding was examined in two parts, overall funding sources and fees.

Overall funding

Twenty-two respondents indicated what their total funding source was by percentage. Respondents chose from a list that included Institution; Grants; Licensing fees; Private individuals/Donations; or Other. Respondents could choose more than one source.

All Respondents. Eight (80%) received funding from their institution with percent funding ranging between 25 – 100%, four (40%) received grant funding with percent funding ranging between 1 – 10%, six (60%) charge licensing fees with percent funding ranging between 2 – 100%, and two (20%) received donations from private sources with percent funding of 5%. Two (20%) of the 10 respondents listed – other as a source of funding, specifying endowment from a family foundation or private funding as the provider with percent funding of 20%. (Appendix D)

Local Television News Subset. Six (40%) of the 15 subset archives received funding from their institution with percent funding of 25 – 100%, three (20%) received grant funding with percent funding of 1 – 10%, four charge licensing fees (26.66%) with percent funding of 2 – 100%, one (6.66%) received donations from private sources with percent funding of 5%, and one (6.66%) indicated other with percent funding of 20%.

Fees

Participants were asked about fees charged for academic research/reference purposes and fees charged for obtaining a screener/preview copy of their archive footage. They were also asked what the cost per finished minute was to license footage from their archive. Participants

were provided the parameters of – All Media-World Wide-In-Perpetuity. The survey asked if there was a minimum number of minutes/seconds needed for licensing footage.

All Respondents. Eight (72.73%) of 11 surveyed archives replied they did not charge a fee for academic use for reference purposes only. Three (27.27%) indicated that they did. Those three specified their fees. One indicated that the fee varies but did not elaborate on how it varies or what the fee might be. A second respondent explained “if the film prep time is over 2 hours, there will be a prep fee of \$50 per hour, after the first two. The third respondent indicated that their fee is the same as its licensing fee.

Nine (75%) of 12 respondents indicated that there is a fee to obtain a screener copy of their footage and three (25%) did not charge a fee. Of the nine that charged a fee, only eight identified the fee. Responses ranged from no charge to those who charged a fee only if labor exceeded two hours, to one that charged \$500.00 per request.

Nine respondents indicated the cost per finished minute to license their footage. Two (22.22%) indicated their fee is between \$1,001.00 and \$2,000.00. Two (22.22%) indicated their fee is between \$2,001.00 and \$2,500.00. Two indicated their fee is between \$2,501.00 and \$3,000.00. Six indicated that their fee is over \$4,000.00.

Four (40%) of ten respondents indicated that they do have a minimum number of seconds/minutes one must license. Six (60%) do not require a minimum. The minimum length of time required varied among respondents. Of the four archives requiring minimums, time length ranged between 10 seconds to 1 minute.

Local Television News Subset. Seven (46.66%) of the 15 subset archives do not charge a fee for academic use for reference purposes. Three (20%) indicated that they do. These subset archive directors indicated that the fee varied. One charged only after two hours of labor; the fee

is \$50 per additional hour. Another charged the same fee amount as they charged for the licensing fee.

Eight (72.72%) of 11 responding local television news subset archives indicated that they do charge a fee to view or obtain a screener copy of their footage. Three (27.27%) do not charge for screener copies. Those charging a fee included: \$20.00 per copy after the first three; between \$100.00 to \$500.00 flat fee; \$25.00 per hour; relaying vendor charge to reformat the request.

Eight (53.33%) members of the subset indicated the licensing fee charged by their archive. Two (25%) charge between \$1,001.00 and \$2,000.00 per minute, one (12.5%) charges between \$2,001.00 and \$2,500.00 per minute, two (25%) between \$2,501.00 and \$3,000.00, and three (37.5%) charge over \$4,000.00 per minute. Four (50%) indicated that they do have a minimum number of minutes/seconds for licensing. This ranged between 10 seconds and 1 minute. Five (62.5%) of the 8 responding local television news subset members do not require a minimum number of minutes/seconds for licensing.

RQ 5: How do archives promote their collection?

Archive Promotion

Respondents were provided the following list of choices about what was their major way to promote their collection: Website; Social Media (Twitter, Instagram, Facebook); Professional organizations; Word of mouth; Brochure/Pamphlet (printed material); and Other. Some respondents checked all that applied, rather than the primary method.

All Respondents. Of the 11 responding, five use their website, five use social media (Twitter, Instagram, Facebook), and four use professional archive organizations, nine use word of mouth to promote their collection, and one uses brochures/pamphlets or other printed materials.

Local Television News Subset. Five of the 10 subset members responded that they use website and social media to promote. Four indicated using a professional organization, nine indicated using word-of-mouth. One indicated using brochure/pamphlet/printed material to promote. One indicated no promotion of their collection (See Appendix E).

RQ 6: How do news archives prioritize problems facing their collection?

Prioritization

Respondents were asked to rank from 1 to 5 what they consider the top problems facing their archive, with 1 representing the largest problem. Archives were provided the following list: breakdown of tape coating due to age or over use/damage to film; damage due to poor storage conditions; lack of storage space; not having a searchable database (online or otherwise); not enough promotion; licensing issues; digitization of materials; and Funding.

All Respondents. Eleven (84.61%) of the 13 responding archives indicated that digitization of materials was among their top five largest problems. Seven (63.63%) listed digitization of materials as one of their top two largest problems. Of the 13 question respondents, nine (69.23%) listed having no searchable database (online or otherwise) as a top five problem. Of those nine, four (44.44%) archives indicated this as their #1 problem. Funding problems ranked overall with nine (69.23%) of the 13 responding archives placing it among their top five problems. Three (33.33%) of these nine listed it as their #2 problem. Breakdown of tape coating due to age was indicated by nine (69.23%) of the 13 as being among the top five problems faced. However, breakdown was ranked 3rd, 4th, or 5th by those responding archives who listed it among their top five problems (Appendix F).

Local Television News Subset. Three (25%) of the 12 responding local television news subset archives indicated digitization of materials and not having a searchable database (online or otherwise) ranked as the #1 problem. Two 16.66% of the 12 indicated a lack of storage space

was considered the largest problem. The categories, breakdown of tape, not enough promotion, licensing issues, and funding were indicated by one (8.3%) archive each of the 12 responding local television news subset archives as being their top problem. Five selected *other* as one of the top problems they faced. The archive director who selected *other* as their top problem indicated not having enough staffing. Another archive director who ranked *other* as number four, indicated lacking knowledgeable personnel to provide metadata. Of the three archive directors who ranked *other* as number five, two mentioned not having enough staff, and one reported maintaining playback equipment as a difficulty.

Chapter Five: Discussion

This study analyzed administrative issues for local television archives. The survey expanded on the research of AMIA (2017) and discovered additional information about the content, condition, funding and need prioritization for archive directors. Each of these areas provides needed material for archive directors of local television news archives.

Content

On the issue of content, this study supported many of the AMIA (2017) findings. Like the AMIA, the current study found local television archives have most of their collection from the 50s, 60s, 70s, and 80s. Additionally, the responses between the *all-respondents* and *local television news subsets* were consistent. Fourteen (93.33%) of 15 respondents answering what date range their collection covers are members of the *local television news subset*. Thirteen (92.85%) of the 14 respondents in the *local television news subset* hold a date range of twenty years or more. The one archive holding less than twenty years has 12 years of footage. One

difference was that the *local television news subset* had larger blocks of date coverage. Having larger blocks of date coverage could indicate a priority was given to news footage over entertainment footage. This could also tell us that news footage was perceived to be more valuable than entertainment footage by local television stations.

Metadata

Without metadata, archive materials cannot be retrieved for use. Metadata is a key component used to build a searchable database. Both this study and AMIA's (2017) study showed nearly identical results for archives having an online, searchable database. Both studies reported one-third (33.33%) of respondents indicated they do offer an online, searchable database. The low percentage of online databases puts archives at a disadvantage for sharing this historic footage with the public and researchers. A larger audience and providing easier access for archive materials could help generate more fees for the archive and help offset costs.

Format

The various materials that an archive holds are referred to as formats of media. For example, 16 mm film, ¾" U-Matic videotape, DVC-Pro videotape, are all forms of visual media formats. This study found all formats represented, but not *all-respondents* had material in all formats listed. *All respondents* indicating, they have ¾" U-Matic tapes in their collection were also members of the *local television news subset*. The *local television news subset* archives had the largest quantity of 16mm. That supports AMIA (2017) findings for local television news archives. This difference in the format between *local television news subset* and *all-respondents* archives might lead to differences in storage and digitization needs.

Content Users

Producers and researchers are among people seeking archival local television news footage. They create feature films, documentaries, television programming, and conduct academic research hoping to find the perfect image for their project. The user would follow the designated use for local television archive materials. For example, if documentaries are the most frequently requested use of an archive's materials, we can conclude that documentarians are the most frequent user. Similar to the AIMA (2017) study, the current study found that seven (58.33%) of the 12 responding archives indicated documentarians request use of their footage from 50 – 95% of the time, representing the most frequent use of footage. Unlike the AIMA study, the current study found television programming use was also high with nine archive directors indicating use. The percentage, however, for television programming use was much lower than for documentaries. Documentary was rated at an average of 59.66% among *local television news* subsets compared to television programming at a use rate of 27%. The emergence of television programming suggests a new market for archives (Appendix C).

Condition

Casey (2015) warned that degradation, the breakdown of tape coatings could mean catastrophic failure of a recording in the very near future. However, the current study found that 64.29% of local television archives consider their materials to be in good condition.

Digitization

Furthermore, 11 (78.57%) of 14 *all respondent's* archives have digitized between 1 – 25% of their collection. The *local television news subset* showed similar indications to *all-respondents* with 10 (66.66%) having 1 -25% of their collection digitized. In a comparison to *all-respondents*, the *subset of local television news archives* showed a lower percentage having between 1 – 25% digitized, but a higher percentage having between 26 -50% of their collection digitized. It is

difficult to estimate the digitized percentage of a collection due to the volume of 16 mm film. The length of film is measured in linear feet that translates to duration. Archives with a large volume of film often estimate rather than measure due to this labor-intensive process. Digitization could mean that television stations and archives are realizing the high value of digitized collections and moving to digitizing more of their collections. Digitized collections make them more accessible for users, therefore potentially increasing the organizations' revenue.

Licensing

On the issue of licensing rights, the AMIA (2017) found that 71.76% of respondents do own the licensing rights of their local television footage. The current study confirmed this finding with a nearly identical number, 71.43% for the *all-respondents* group. However, within the *local television news subset* group, the group most like AMIA's respondents, only 60 % reported owning the rights and 26% reported not owning the rights to license their collection. Approximately fourteen percent did not answer this question. Owning rights is critical for licensing fees and obtaining grants.

Funding

While grants were the focus in funding for AMIA, 2017, this study looked at overall funding. Only one responding archive director was not also a part of the *local television news subset*. This study found that seven (87.5%) of eight responding archive directors are members of the *local television news subset* that rely on institutional support for funding. Of these seven, four listed institutional support as between 80-100%; one at 70%; one at 60%, and one at 25%. The one respondent, a member of the *local television news subset*, not identifying institutional support identified 100% of their funding came from licensing fees. Grants were listed as a source of funding by only three respondents in the *local television news subset* and then between 1-10%.

(Appendix D) These findings are valuable for institutions particularly at universities in explaining to administrators that a large percentage of the costs are born by the institution.

While AMIA (2017) asked about how the archive determined its licensing rate, they did not ask for licensing fee amounts. It is helpful for archive directors to know how other archives value their holdings to compare and to charge appropriate fees. The current study asked what the cost per finished minute was to license their footage, as well as asking if there was a minimum number of minutes one must license. The *all-respondent* participants indicated four (44.44%) of 9 required a minimum. Compared to *the local television news subset* that showed four (40%) of 10 require a minimum. This would indicate the television station archives realize the value of their archival footage, both historic and monetary.

As archives move forward, the revenue generating aspect of fees means they may rely less on grants to operate. Generating fees can allow them to become more self-supporting as one archive director reported in the source of funding response. The revenue earned from licensing fees can support projects such as digitization, promotion, and database updating. It is difficult to predict the potential revenue since there is such a variance in licensing fees. However, this is an area where future research could examine licensing rates and potential increases in revenue.

Promotion

While the AMIA (2017) asked a question of what were the primary obstacles for increasing use of your institution's local television collections, existing research did not show any suggestions on promoting the local television archive. The current study asked how archives promote their holdings and a follow up question as to the major way they promote their collection. Most respondents to this question came from the *local news subset* group.

The current study found the major way of promoting their archives for nine (34.61%) respondents was through word of mouth (Appendix E). Use of a website or social media (Twitter, Instagram, and Facebook) were used by fewer archives (five, 19.23% for each promotional tool).

If archive directors want their collections known and their primary promotional focus is word of mouth, this limits the audience. Archive directors should consider both website and social media use as important tools to promote their archive. By increasing the archive's online presence, the number of users would increase and in turn, licensing fees would increase as well.

Prioritization of needs

Prioritization of needs is a critical factor for an archive director. While AMIA (2017) asked the major obstacle for increasing use of a local archive collection; they did not ask respondents to rank problems. There were no studies that specifically compared and ranked archive problems together. This study asked archive directors to rank their top five problems for their archive as identified in a list of nine issues.

Ten of 13 respondents included digitization as one of their top three problems. Four of the 13 respondents ranked digitization of materials as their top problem. Another three ranked it second, and three ranked it third. These findings support previous literature (Casey, 2015) that digitization is a significant issue. Eleven (84.61%) of 13 respondents are in the local television news subset. With only two not in the subset, their rankings were like the subset group and did not stand out.

Funding was ranked by six of the 13 among their top three. One archive ranked it as their primary issue. Three ranked funding as their second largest issue and two ranked it third. Once again, the two archives in the *all respondent* group but not in the *local television news subset*

offered similar results. Digitization is often linked with funding because many archives are unable to digitize their collections internally. They need to hire an outside vendor to perform the digitization work. This can be a costly process. These findings confirm previous research that identified preservation and digitization as key issues.

The *all-respondents* and *local television news subset* groups differed when reviewing the remainder of problem issues. The group of *all-respondents* ranked lack of storage as number three, licensing issues as number four, and not enough promotion as number five (tied with *other*). The *local television subset* responses were more spread out; breakdown of tape coating, lack of storage space, licensing issues all showed equal representation.

This supports previous conclusions that funding and digitizing collections are key to archives' futures. Addressing these two factors are key to becoming self-sustaining.

Methodology issues

One question that needed addressing was whether a difference existed between the results of the *all-respondents* group and the *local television news subset*. AMIA (2017) focused solely on local television news archives, like those that comprised the subset group for the current study. This study examined whether this is an important distinction.

Comparing the results of the *all respondents group* and the *local television news subset*, there were few differences between the two. However, in reporting the data *the local news subset* was included in the *all respondents group*. While 25 respondents answered questions about demographics and content, they did not complete the entire survey. If the *local news subset* was removed from the *all respondents* in the areas of content, metadata, licensing, condition, funding, fees, promotion, and prioritization of needs the number of *all respondents* would drop to 1-2 respondents. Even though there were fewer responses from *the all respondent group* to these

questions, their responses were consistent with those of the *local news subset* which would suggest there are no major differences in these types of archive collections. However, given the small number of responses not from the subset, no conclusion can be drawn as to whether these types of television archives need to be separated for future research.

Limitations

One limitation of the survey may have been the length and the amount of information asked. Although the response rate was high, not all questions were answered. Those responding may not have known all aspects of the archive, therefore leaving certain questions blank. Future studies might focus on specific areas such as funding or fee structure only to avoid this problem.

Another limitation was in the structure of some of the questions. Questions asking for a percentage made it difficult to analyze the results. Several questions, such as the ones on funding sources and state of digitization, were open-ended. This allowed the respondent to give a range of percentages, providing a somewhat vague answer. Ultimately, for questions on use of materials and promotional tools used by archive directors, having respondents check all answers that applied created unclear responses. The wording of the question created difficulty determining frequency of use.

Future Research

As mentioned earlier, the current study found few differences between local television archives and local television news archives. One suggestion for future research would be to look at archives collectively rather than segmenting them. Looking at local television archives would allow for a larger number of respondents and provide more data for analysis. Future studies should also consider the effect that an online presence (including social media) has for an

archive. Making the collection readily accessible to the public would more than increase awareness, it would increase potential licensing revenue. Posting highlight clips of the collection footage would allow end users to preview subjects and quality of the video.

Because archives are run independently, no collective operations method exists, especially in licensing and fees. Among areas to examine, future studies can add to the body of research by looking at how fee structures differ between television news archives and other video archive sources. It is important to understand the challenges archive directors face in maintaining and advocating for their collection. Ideally, archives would work to build relationships with filmmakers and to make their footage easily accessible (S. Johnson, personal communication, January 29, 2015).

Conclusion

Television archives provide great value to their communities. The local television news archives retain culture, preserve local history, and help us to remember meaningful events. To accomplish this, we need to understand administrative issues for archive directors in funding, fee structure, licensing, promotion and prioritization of needs. This study provided needed information in these areas to allow archive directors to develop administrative plans. One direct result was a plan for JCU NOBA (Appendix G).

As Zastrow (2014) pointed out, you cannot just put material on a shelf and expect to be able to access them a decade later like you can with a book. Videotape and film do not have the structure to last as long as a printed book. Results have shown that archive directors recognize the potential benefits to increased funding and licensing opportunities. This study advances what we know about local television archives and adds to the existing body of research in several

ways. One of the key findings is that funding is critical. That is why more research should be done on licensing and uses of funding. Archive directors, film and television producers, grantors, and television stations should work more collaboratively to share information on these topics.

As Weiss (2018) advised,

In most cases, it takes a multilateral approach to get the job done. The station gives what it can, the archive does its best, but without a third or even fourth party the resources just might not be there. That extra party can be a granting agency, a philanthropist, the station's founding family or a highly motivated user. Open many doors to possible participants. (p.1)

References

ABC Library Sales. (2017). Footage Rate Card.

<https://www.abccommercial.com/librarysales/footage/footage-rate-card>

Allen, R., & Johnson, K. (2008). Preserving digital local news. *The Electronic Library*, 26 (3), 387-399.

Association of Moving Image Archivists. (2019). Local TV Survey Report.

<https://amianet.org/>

Association of Moving Image Archivists. (n.d.). Local Television: A Guide to Saving Our Heritage [Guide]. <https://amianet.org/wp-content/uploads/Resource-LTV-Guide-1.pdf>

Booth, S. (2015). Archives Change Lives [Video file].

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HXI5G9ptXxo&t=1s>

Broch, L. (2019). The hidden jewel in public service broadcasting: Communicating local stories. *Journal of European Television History and Culture*, 8(16), 1-14.

Bryan, M. (1964). The Georgia Archives Building: A case study in promotion. *The American Archivist*, 27(4), 499-501.

Casey, M. (2015). Why media preservation can't wait: The gathering storm, *International Association of Sound and Audiovisual Archives*, 44, 14-22.

Council on Library and Information Resources. (n.d.). Digitizing Hidden Collections.

Applicant Resources. <https://www.clir.org/hiddencollections/applicant-resources/>

Deutsch, R. (2013). The past is never dead. *International Documentary Association*.

<https://www.documentary.org/feature/past-never-dead-news-archives-keep-history-alive>

- Edmondson, R. (2004). Audiovisual archiving: Philosophy and principles. *UNESCO*, 44-51.
- Gracy, K. F. (2007). Moving image preservation and cultural capital. *Library Trends*, 56 (1), 3-4.
- Hagedoorn, B. & Agterberg, B. (2016). The end of the television archive as we know it? The National Archive as an agent of historical knowledge in the convergence era. *Media and Communication*, 4 (3), 162-175.
- Lee, J. K. (2010). Critical studies in television: Scholarly studies in small screen fictions. *Critical Studies in Television*, 5 (2), 68-72.
- Lester, P. (2018). Of mind and matter: The archive as object. *Archives and Records*, 39 (1), 73-87.
- Library of Congress, Preservation. (2020).
<https://www.loc.gov/preservation/about/faqs/general.html>
- Murphy, W. T. (1997). A Report on the current State of American Television and Video Preservation. Washington, D.C.: The Library of Congress.
- Norling, S. (2015). *Archives Change Lives* [Video file].
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HXI5G9ptXxo&t=1s>
- O'Sullivan, S. (2013). The economy of memory: Archive-driven documentaries in the digital age. *Journal of Media Practice*, 14 (3), 231-248
- Video Guidance. (2020). Preservation. Determining the Condition of Materials.
<https://www.archives.gov/preservation/formats/video-toc.html>
- Weir, C. (2009). Selling yourself: Outreach & promotion in the Nottinghamshire Archives Office. *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 12 (1), 15-25.

Zastrow, J. (2018). Keepers of Knowledge in the Post Literate Future. *The Digital Archivist: Trends in Curation and Digital Preservation for Special Collections*. 38 (7), <http://www.infoday.com/cilmag/sep18/Zastrow--Keepers-of-Knowledge-in-a-Post-Literate-Future.shtml> (pp. 1).

Appendices

Appendix A

List of Institutions/Local Television Stations that Received the Survey

Public/Private University or College	Location
Arkansas State University	State University, AR
Case Western Reserve University	Cleveland, OH
Cleveland Public Library	Cleveland, OH
Cleveland State University - Special Collections	Cleveland, OH
John Carroll University Northeast Ohio Broadcast Archives (JCU NOBA)	University Heights, OH
Kent State Libraries	Kent, OH
Kent State University	Kent, OH
Ohio University	Athens, OH
University of Akron	Akron, OH
University of Baltimore	Baltimore, MD
University of Georgia	Athens, GA
Walsh University	North Canton, OH

Public/Private Library	Location
Mid Pointe Library	West Chester, OH

Television Stations	Location
KCRA	Sacramento, CA
Television Stations (cont.)	Location

KWGN	Denver, CO
KWQC-TV	Davenport, IA
WAGM-TV	Presque Isle, ME
WANE	Fort Wayne, IN
WBZ-TV	Boston, MA
WCAX-TV	Burlington, VT
WEEK-TV	Peoria, IL
WEHT	Evansville, IN
WEVV	Evansville, IN
WEWS	Cleveland, OH
WFIE	Evansville, IN
WFIE-14 News	Evansville, IN
WIPL	Lewiston, ME
WJW-TV Fox 8	Cleveland, OH
WJZ	Baltimore, MD
WKYC	Cleveland, OH
WLIO	Lima, OH
WMAR	Baltimore, MD
WMBD	Bloomington
WOIO	Cleveland, OH
Wolfson Archives	Miami, FL
WPSD-TV	Paducah, KY
Television Stations (cont.)	Location

WPTZ	Plattsburgh, NY
WPXG	Boston, MA
WQPT	Moline, IA
WSB-TV	Athens, GA
WSJV	West Chester, OH
WTCT	Marion, IL
WTIC-Fox 61	Hartford, CT
WTIC-Fox 61	Hartford, CT
WTNH	New Haven, CT
WTOV-TV	Steubenville, OH
WTVJ	Miami, FL
WTWO	Terre Haute, IN
WVIT	New Britain, CT
WWNY-TV	Carthage, NY

Independent Collections	Location
Intermuseum Conservation Association	Cleveland, OH
Ohio History Connection	Columbus, OH
Privately held collection	Baltimore, MD
Spark Innovation Studio	Kent, OH
State Library of Ohio	Columbus, OH
Wolfson Archives	Miami, FL

Other	Location
Mid-Atlantic Regional Moving Image Archive (MARMIA)	Baltimore, MD
Ohio Genealogical Society	n/a

Appendix B

Survey

Question 1:

Do you maintain a local television news or entertainment programming archive?

- No
- Yes

Question 2:

What percentage of your collection is local news or entertainment?

Question 3:

In what type of institution are your local television news or entertainment archives held?

- Public University/College if checked go to #3
- Private University/College if checked go to #3
- Public Library
- Private Library
- Television Station
- Independent Collection
- Other

Question 4:

If you answered a or b, what size is your university/college?

- Fewer than 3,000 students
- Between 3,001 and 5,000 students

- Between 5,000 and 10,000 students
- Between 10,000 and 20,000 students
- Between 20,000 and 30,000 students
- Over 30,000 students

Question 5:

What is the content of your local news or entertainment collection? List % 0 - 100

- News
- Entertainment
- Other

Question 6:

How many years of material does your local news or entertainment television archive cover?

- 0 - 5 years
- 6 - 10 years
- 11 - 20 years
- 21 + years

Question 7:

What is the date range of your holdings?

Earliest date

Most recent date

Question 8:

Is the collection chronologically complete in that there are no gaps between the earliest and most recent dates?

- Yes - there are no gaps
- No - there are gaps

Question 9:

How long are the gaps in your collection?

- Days? Enter number
- Months? Enter number
- Years? Enter number
- Other

Question 10:

What is the approximate quantity of each format type you hold? (Enter quantity next to format type)

- | | |
|---------------|----------------------|
| 1" tape | <input type="text"/> |
| 2" tape | <input type="text"/> |
| 3/4" tape | <input type="text"/> |
| VHS tape | <input type="text"/> |
| Beta Cam tape | <input type="text"/> |
| DV Cam tape | <input type="text"/> |
| DVC-Pro tape | <input type="text"/> |

Digi Beta tape	<input type="text"/>
16 mm film	<input type="text"/>
35 mm film	<input type="text"/>
Other	<input type="text"/>

Question 11:

What is the current condition of the materials in your local TV archive?

- Poor - more than 50% has breakdown or damage
- Fair - at least 25% has breakdown or damage
- Good - less than 10% has breakdown or damage
- Very Good - less than 5% has breakdown or damage

Question 12:

What portion, if any, of your collection is digitized?

- 1 - 25%
- 26 - 50%
- 51 - 75%
- 76 - 100 %

Question 13:

Does your archive retain/own intellectual property rights of the local to footage?

- Yes
- No

Question 14:

Are you permitted to license the footage?

- Yes
- No
- Other

Question 15:

Who can license your local to news footage?

- The general public - personal requests
- Academic researchers
- Documentarians/Feature film producers/Television producers
- All of the above

Question 16:

Is there a fee associated with academic research use for reference purposes only?

- Yes - If yes, what is that fee?
- No

Question 17:

What is the cost per finished minute to license the footage from your local to archive for All Media, World Wide, In-Perpetuity?

- < \$1,000.00 per minute
- \$1,001.00 - \$2,000.00 per minute
- \$2,001.00 - \$2,500.00 per minute
- \$2,501.00 - \$3,000.00 per minute
- \$3,001.00 - \$4,000.00 per minute
- Over \$4,000.00 per minute

Question 18:

Is there a minimum number of seconds/minutes one must license if interested in licensing any of your local to news or entertainment footage?

- Yes - # minutes/seconds
- No minimum

Question 19:

Do you require attribution for use of materials in a commercial project?

- Yes
- No

Question 20:

Is there a fee to view or obtain a screener copy of footage from your local to news or entertainment archive?

- Yes - If yes, how much is the fee?
- No

Question 21:

With regard to funding, what percentage would you say comes from each of the following sources? List 0 - 100% for each.

- Institution
- Grants
- Licensing fees

- Private individuals/donations

- Other

Question 22:

How does your archive promote its holdings? Check all that apply.

- Website
- Social Media (Twitter; Instagram; Facebook)
- Professional organizations
- Word of mouth
- Brochure/Pamphlet/Printed material
- Other

Question 23:

What is the major way that you promote your collection?

Question 24:

Is there a search aide available to the public? (i.e. an online searchable database)

- Yes
- No

Question 33:

What software program is used for your searchable database?

Question 25:

What is the predominant use for your local tv archive materials? List in percentages 0 - 100%

Feature Film	<input type="text"/>
Documentary	<input type="text"/>
Television programming	<input type="text"/>
Public presentation	<input type="text"/>
Academic use (research)	<input type="text"/>
Personal/private use	<input type="text"/>
Other	<input type="text"/>

Question 26:

What do you consider the top problems facing your local tv archive? *Please rank from 1 to 5 with represent 1 representing the largest problem.

- Breakdown of tape coating due to age or over use/damage to film
- Damage due to poor storage conditions
- Lack of storage space
- Not having a searchable database (online or otherwise)
- Not enough promotion
- Licensing issues
- Digitization of materials
- Funding
- Other
-

Question 27:

What is your role with your local tv archives?

Question 28:

How many years have you worked with your local tv archives?

Question 32:

If you would like a copy of the results, please enter the email address where you would like them sent.

- Enter email address

Appendix C

Uses of Local Television Archive Material

Respondents (n=12)												
Use												
Feature Film		65		5			5			5		
Documentary	40	25		75	95	80	65	20	75	55		50
Television Programming		10		20	3	5	5	55	25	20	100	
Public Presentation	20						10	10		5		40
Academic Use (research)	30				2		5	5		3		
Personal/Private Use	10		100			15	5	5		2		10
Other							5	5		10		

- Participants were asked to indicate predominant use of their archive collection by percentage
- Percentages reported by the *Local Television News Subset* appear shaded in blue; all-respondents in white

Appendix D

Archive Funding Sources by Percentage

Respondents (n=8)								
Funding Sources								
Institution	80	25		90-100	98	60	70	100
Grants				1-10		10	5	
Licensing fees	20	75	100		2	10	20	
Private Individuals/ Donations							5	
Other						20		

- Participants asked to list percentage of total funding for all sources that apply
- Percentages reported by the *Local Television News Subset* appear shaded in blue

Appendix E

Archive Promotional Tools (Check all that apply)

Respondents (n=11)											
Promotional Tools											
Website					X	X	X	X	X		
Social Media (Twitter, Instagram, Facebook)					X	X	X	X	X		
Professional Organization						X	X	X	X		
Brochure, Pamphlet, Printed Material								X			
Word of Mouth	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X
Other										X	

- Participants asked to check all that applied to their collection.
- Percentages reported by members of the *Local Television News Subset* appear shaded in blue

Appendix F

Top Five Problems Facing Local Television Archives

Respondents (n = 14)														
Problem														
Breakdown of tape coating due to age, overuse, damage to film			<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	5		<u>2</u>		<u>3</u>		<u>2</u>	<u>4</u>
Damage due to poor storage conditions				4		3			3				3	
Lack of storage space	5				2		1	4	4	4			5	
Not having a searchable database	4	1	4				4	1		1	4		4	1
Not enough promotion	3	2	5			2				5				
Licensing issues				1	5		3			2	5			2
Digitization of materials	1	3	2	2	1	4	2	3		3	1		1	
Funding	2	4	1	3		5		2	5		2			3
Other		5			4			5	1					5

- Percentages reported by members of the *Local Television News Subset* appear shaded in blue

Appendix G

Prioritization of Needs Plan for JCU NOBA

As we look toward future operations for JCU NOBA, we must begin with a prioritization of needs. Issues of funding, fee structure, promotion, digitization and staffing will be addressed in an organized and timely manner.

Funding

Funding is necessary to manage daily operations and to support growth projects. One growth project is the preservation of the collection via digitization. Funding can be derived from various sources for this purpose. An archive's institution can provide needed funds such as JCU NOBA receives support from John Carroll University. An archive can also receive funds by licensing the use of their collection.

While licensing revenue for JCU NOBA has grown significantly in the past five years, it does not fully support the JCU NOBA archive. Licensing fees for the past five years have averaged \$23,891.50 annually. Based on the current study, we know that nearly one-third (27.27%) of responding archive directors indicated licensing fees as a revenue source. The licensing rates indicated by the current survey responding archive directors, show that other local television news archives charge a 60% higher rate than the JCU NOBA licensing rate. Therefore, JCU NOBA could comfortably increase their current rates to increase potential revenue. An increase 150% to the five-year average licensing rates would yield \$35,837.25 on average per year. An increase of 200% would yield \$47,783.00 on average per year. Materials from this increase would go to digitalization, promotion and staff needs outlined below. Once the JCU NOBA collection is fully digitized, an additional increase would be warranted based on a

comparison to the current study results. A fully digitized archive can fulfill requests in a more efficient manner, justifying this increase.

Promotion of Current Materials

JCU NOBA should update and activate its website. This should include a current rate sheet for licensing of footage and available services. It can also create social media accounts. Instagram, for example, would provide a good match given that it is image driven and provides the ability to post both still and video images.

JCU NOBA should also make professional archive organizations aware of its collection and services. Considering their location on a college campus, an additional option for JCU NOBA would be to offer a short film contest for students. The American Film Institute (AFI), sponsors an annual film festival that has grown in popularity. It is a terrific way to highlight independent films. JCU NOBA could sponsor a film festival specifically for documentaries using local television news footage from its collection.

Staffing

With increased exposure comes increased requests. In preparation for this, JCU NOBA needs to add staff to accommodate the processing of footage requests.

Once archive materials are digitized, staffing requirements will shift. No longer will someone need to pull a physical asset off the shelf, cue, splice, clean, and transfer for the customer but they will need to locate the digital files, and prepare for delivery. This requires the staff member to be knowledgeable in video editing software. Filling these roles could be accomplished through an internship program or through the placement of graduate assistants.

Digitization

Considering the age of the collection, there are materials that have begun to breakdown. The continuation of digitization of those materials would improve the quality of and preserve the image. The formats needing immediate attention are identified as the ¾” U-Matic videotapes and the 16 mm film. We need to digitize the total collection of these format because the materials are breaking down; even viewing them once could destroy the tape.

The intended purpose of digitizing materials is to improve productivity by minimizing preparation time and streamlining the ability to search and retrieve digitized video files. To complete this goal, we must address funding issues.

The archive director should address researching vendors to digitize materials, prepare to accept the digitized files, secure funding for this service, and begin to anticipate staffing needs. JCU NOBA has engaged with a digitization vendor who has begun the process of digitizing the collection.

Once the tapes are transferred and digitized, the files need a secure storage space. Be sure there is enough storage space for the completed files. A cloud based digital asset manager, like Google Drive, is an option that would minimize web browser complications. This set up would allow for virtually unlimited storage.

Once files are digitized and securely stored, the archive will need a software program to enable viewing of the files. The archive will need the ability to trim stored video clips and add a watermark for security before delivering to the customer. In addition, a PC with a standard definition (SDI) video card is needed.

Completing the above is the beginning of preservation of over thirty years of Greater Cleveland, Ohio history as recorded by local television news outlets. Considering its size, content, and quality, JCU NOBA has the potential to become a premiere television archive.