



Libraries in Smaller Institutions of Higher Education

EILEEN THORNTON

LIKE THE TAIL OF A COMET, panic about United States higher education soared with the first Soviet Sputnik, four years ago. As the air cleared, the tumult over the specific areas of science and technology gave place to a broader and perhaps more reasoned concern over the whole body of American higher education.

Many higher institutions found that traditional content and methods must be re-examined in the light of the need for quality of education, quite apart from the quantitative needs. Fear of throwing the baby out with the bath, plus the built-in inertia of large and complex social institutions (and even a small college is surprisingly large and complex) has made evolution rather than revolution the way of change for long-established colleges. There are, of course, notable exceptions, such as Dartmouth's shift from a two-semester multiple-course program to a three-term, three-course program and the attendant reconstruction of its whole curriculum. There are many educators who believe that though fundamental reforms are necessary, they will be achieved only piecemeal, too little and too late, unless new and distinctly experimental institutions are established. And new institutions are being established, experimental and traditional, and largely public.

It has become increasingly evident that in many subject fields students can learn at least as well as they now do with far fewer class hours than are commonly used. So far, because of the initial planning involved, the experimentation in this area shows little saving of faculty time, but once new patterns are set and in cycle, faculty time should be saved. There is broad interest in the best use of student time, too. In the smaller academic institutions, from one-fourth to one-half of the graduates may go on to graduate study; this constant extension of the

Miss Thornton is Librarian, Oberlin College Library.

EILEEN THORNTON

years spent in preparation is exerting pressure to squeeze wasted time out of secondary education via advanced admission to college, and out of college years by means of proficiency and comprehensive examinations, round-the-year schedules, and other means of acceleration. Teaching machines, television, and other devices will be used increasingly. While the most traditionalist element in the faculty will continue to decry them, some educators will see over the top of the device-mountain to a land where such aids serve a middle purpose and can be turned to educational profit in skillful hands. All such explorations, while still unorganized and unsystematic, point to one conclusion: the next twenty years will see more students taught by relatively fewer and fewer teachers. The burden has to go somewhere; students and librarians are the obvious legatees.

Within twenty years we must know objectively what is and what is not effective teaching. In that time span, some of the present dissatisfaction with the nature of the preparation of college teachers will have been dissipated through research and experiment. For example, the Mathematical Association of America and the American Mathematical Society are already backing a program leading to the Doctor of Arts in Mathematics. This program differs from the traditional Ph.D. program with its emphasis upon a research project in that the candidate will seek instead a maximum of breadth in the field, with the intention of teaching it.

There is grave concern that our most promising young people be able to go to college and be financially able to stay in college, and that each get to the college that is right for him. There is concern that the less able student shall not be crowded out. Already students and their parents are discovering that college attendance for pure status reasons, or even for that extra \$100,000 in life earnings which almost any college diploma is said to assure, has no blank allotted to it on application forms.

Colleges of known excellence will always have an obligation to attract superior students and to lead the way in demonstrating what can be done with first-rate faculties, superior libraries, and other outstanding facilities. But even the Sunday supplements of metropolitan dailies now call attention to the existence of dozens of undergraduate institutions where excellent education is available. These smaller institutions have a precarious future. Many feel that they will succumb, especially those under private aegis, because of the burden of costs and the terrible competition for personnel, but others believe that

Libraries in Smaller Institutions of Higher Education

they can survive and gain strength if they achieve a better economic unit upon which to operate.

Studies on changes in attitudes and values between freshman and senior years indicate that the student culture in the college is the prime educational force at work.¹ Those who know smaller institutions know that they do tend to have an ethos, and that it is a truism that students are educated by each other as much as by the faculty. The interaction of all elements in college life, with special concern for educational implications, is bound to receive more study in the coming years.

There is confusion about the institutions needed. On the one hand, we find a passion to establish a community college at every cross-road, no matter what the prospects of quality and persistence of that institution may be. On the other hand, we see the perilous life and times of already established small institutions. Geographical handiness cannot explain away this seeming paradox. Study of the need for institutions of various kinds in various places is urgent and inevitable, and it is hoped that such study comes before old institutions are allowed to die or before too many new institutions are jerrybuilt on sand. This situation may call for the revamping of old institutions to meet new needs.

There are rumors of coercion. State agencies might control faculty licensing, curricula and specializations, admissions, and other central issues. There are statements like Beardsley Ruml's² that chill some faculties because administrators and trustees might wish to jump abruptly in the direction of Ruml advocates. There are voices decrying the traditional *laissez-faire* policies which permit the student to be largely the sole judge of the career he wishes to prepare for and stay with; these voices say that perhaps it is time to abandon this policy and direct the student forcibly into those vocations and professions where trained personnel are needed. Against such trends there are voices which urge voluntary cooperation, far more thoroughgoing than is common today, among institutions; the development of better guidance of potential college and graduate students; greater attention to the students not at the very top of measured promise; and thoughtful rather than sentimental preservation of the best aspects of institutional individuality.

A few years ago a grade school diploma was the union-card into adult employment. Shortly thereafter the high school diploma became the standard. Today college graduation—any college will do—has be-

come the necessary mark. The next twenty years must recognize and dignify all types of higher education, or we shall have turned the process into a stamping machine. While we would welcome a certain standard of common excellence as the result of secondary education, advanced education should, in the eyes of many, provide a wide spread of kinds of excellence. And after sixteen years or more in the educational process, our young adults should emerge with an education suited to society's needs and to their own best talents.

If demographic and economic needs actually do prove the desirability of proliferating the two- and three-year institutions, the drain-off to such institutions will radically affect degree-granting institutions of all sorts. If some of these institutions are terminal/vocational and if they can achieve an attractive status, they will not only provide a body of trained personnel likely to be needed for many years to come, but they will also free the degree-granting colleges and universities of the heartbreaking problems of massive drop-outs. If some of these two- and three-year institutions are truly comparable to the lower levels of liberal arts undergraduate colleges, the influx of transfer students in their third and fourth collegiate years could profoundly affect colleges and universities. Whether the numbers of transfers would be large enough to alleviate one of the greatest problems current in higher education is difficult to predict: that problem is the very high cost of tiny enrollments in advanced course work. If a typical four-year college were to have more well-prepared juniors and seniors than it had freshmen and sophomores, the change in teaching assignments alone could make vast changes in financing, curricula, and library need. In fact, such change might create the lifeline many small but good older colleges may have to find if they are to stay afloat.

Some of these big questions facing all of higher education will have to be answered on a wider front than in the past. Education at any level is a national need. National research and national findings will give us a greater variety of educational choice rather than a narrower field, if the coming twenty years build on the scattered experimentation of the past and invest enough in real research in the future:

It is anomalous that through research and the training of research workers, higher education has made discoveries, developed techniques, and built devices which have literally made over most of

Libraries in Smaller Institutions of Higher Education

man's workaday world, but has not applied this same brilliance, imagination, and ingenuity to fundamental research on the educational process and to the development of ways in which schools and colleges may increase their own productivity. . . . It is unthinkable that the application of sustained, dedicated intelligence to the improvement of educational processes and procedures will not produce similar discoveries and changes. The investment in research on the country's problems of agriculture, business, labor, and health has yielded tremendous dividends. Basic research on crucial problems in education will be equally rewarding.³

Federal money, evidence of belated federal concern, is finally being invested in projects which aim to study American education—its content, its personnel, its methodology, its successes and failures—on a broad and serious scale. It is high time. As L. G. Derthick said in testimony before a congressional committee: "I pause, Mr. Chairman, to ask how much longer are we going to be satisfied with less information about our children than we have about our hogs."⁴

What happens to academic libraries in the next twenty years depends upon what happens in higher education, in librarianship, and in communications. And what happens in those areas depends upon what happens in population growth and dispersal, in the economic situation, in manpower needs, and in international relations. Librarians in smaller universities and colleges may well wonder what the future holds for the libraries and the clientele they serve.

We all know that the population tide is rising like the waters in the *Sorcerer's Apprentice*. We all know that now a larger part of the college-age population wants to go to college than ever before. We all know that the predictions of college enrollment are so staggering that they seem unreal; perhaps this is the reason that we find little concrete planning to meet this tremendous influx. In the smaller institutions, and particularly in the private colleges, there is a general feeling that the tide may affect other institutions, but not us, except by a carefully planned 10 per cent or 15 per cent, which is, after all, a whip to flog the budget horse but not a whip laid across our own backs.

The battle of the bulge is heaviest in the already massive institutions and in the publicly supported institutions of middle size. To the latter group, this may not be a disaster. The "short, happy life of the teachers' college" has led to the shift in a historically minute span of time from the normal school to the teachers' college to the arts

college which also does much teacher preparation. Many of these institutions can and do accommodate more students, much to the profit of the students and the organization. But even they will feel the pinch when their enrollments suddenly pass the point of comfortable accommodation in classrooms, libraries, laboratories, dormitories, and curricula.

However, the large public institutions, which have traditionally had less control over admissions than have private institutions of all sizes, will probably get the brunt. Already there is a calculated dropout rate; dormitories are planned to accommodate fewer students than are admitted because the fall freshmen will be weeded out radically, and the houses will hold what is left.

To try to generalize about those institutions loosely classified as junior colleges is, as anyone who has tried knows, a very dangerous procedure. Their only point of comparability with others of their classification is that they do not offer the bachelor's degree. Some have day schools of college-age students—perhaps only in the hundreds—and evening schools of a very mixed student body and program involving thousands of students. Others have strictly liberal arts programs essentially designed as terminal in themselves or preparatory for senior college work. Some have programs purposely aimed at vocational preparation, though these tend more and more to require some nonvocational basic work.

Some are parts of federations or systems, as in New York and California, and some are seen as extensions of secondary education, while others are viewed as part of higher education. Some are in existence to serve a purely local population; others draw students from everywhere. Some have libraries of fewer than a thousand volumes, and a few have libraries of more than 60,000 volumes. Perhaps the only safe generalization to add to the one already made is that many, especially those with liberal arts or preprofessional programs, will stretch up and become four-year, degree-granting colleges. Sometimes this situation will be forced upon the institution by its constituency, and sometimes it will be the outcome of a planned development much wanted by the institution.

Everywhere one turns he hears of faculty shortages. In a publication read more by librarians than by others, it is useless to point out the even greater shortage of librarians, and the dim prospects that this situation is going to improve in the next decade or two.

Library school enrollment has been nearly static for years, despite

Libraries in Smaller Institutions of Higher Education

rising figures for college-graduate population, library salaries, proliferation of attractive library positions, and such. In the literature on new ways to meet the teacher shortage, there is constant emphasis upon relieving those teachers a college does have of paper work, upon new methods of using teacher/student time, upon devices and gadgets and do-it-yourself learning, and most of all upon independent study. One comes upon innumerable references to "turning the student loose in the library to do more for himself," but almost no references to the implications in hard fact of what all this may mean to academic libraries. In the National Defense Education Act the word "library" does not, I think, appear: it is quite easy to secure money to advise students to go to college or to support programs heavily dependent upon library resources (sciences and foreign languages, for instance), but it is close to impossible for small libraries, unless there is a lawyer *manqué* on the team, to wangle money for materials to support any part of any program. It can be done, but the cost of doing it, in terms of time and pother, is beyond the reach of librarians in smaller institutions.

The median number of professional staff, size of collections, and total library operating expenditures by type for four-year institutions is given in Table I, by enrollment size for four-year institutions in Table II, and by enrollment for two-year institutions in Table III.⁵ This level of support does not secure many man hours, and the prospect of serving even the median number of students as independent scholars, plus trying to acquire and to organize collections adequate for such study, is patently staggering. Compared with the A.L.A. Standards as illustrated in the Introduction to the July 1961 issue of *Library Trends* (p. 7), the gap is indeed wide because 57 per cent of privately controlled and 21 per cent of the publicly controlled four-year institutions have professional staffs of fewer than three professional librarians; 78 per cent of private and 71 per cent of public two-year institutions have fewer than two professional librarians on their staff. In four-year institutions 60 per cent of those under private and 33 per cent under public control have collections of fewer than 50,000 volumes. In two-year institutions the situation is even more drastic because 90 per cent of the privately controlled and 84 per cent of the publicly controlled institutions have collections of fewer than 20,000 volumes.

Already doubling in brass for every sort of service to their clientele—and the differences in demand upon the smaller libraries as

compared with those serving the massive institutions lie more in degree than in kind—it is difficult to see how present needs can be met, to say nothing of the new needs created by radically changed enrollments and experimental teaching methods which throw more of the educational load on the library.

The fact that astonishes is that out of these smaller institutions, and especially out of the four-year, liberal arts institutions, comes a higher proportion of eventual scholars and persons of other kinds of distinction than comes out of the large institutions. Findings on this proportion have varied with respect to years and to fields as well as to criteria of distinction, but the generalization still holds true. While this may be a source of comfort to the three librarians in Minimum College and perhaps of embarrassment to the 150 librarians of Maximum University, it should give all librarians pause. If an acknowledged outcome of higher education in smaller institutions (with small libraries) is a higher proportion in graduate study admission and performance, has it been the close teacher-student relationship which produced results? If that relationship is to be replaced in some measure by independent use of library resources, can small library collections and small library staffs meet the need?

Mrs. Knapp's⁶ report on the meagerness of actual library use by students in an excellent small college, and the program she now directs at Monteith College^{7, 8} of Wayne State University may first jolt and then rouse to action college librarians and faculties. The aim of the Monteith program is to stimulate and guide students in developing a sophisticated understanding of the library and an increasing competence in its use. There are times in the life of every college librarian when he feels that the curriculum goes along one track and the library a parallel track, and that there is no way to break this geometric dilemma. More studies of the actualities of library relevance to educational programs and teaching methods must be made.

Occasionally shrewd and informed guesses can short-cut research. One expert advises that

The plant of experimental colleges and programs be developed around a large library-student union building. . . . While the library is typically described as the heart of the campus it is often more like the liver for it is often a large structure whose significance lies in the potential it may not be called on to release. What is proposed here is that the library be made the heart of the academic enterprise, in fact, and that it be made to deliver something like its full potential.

Libraries in Smaller Institutions of Higher Education

The student union may seem to be an unlikely place for scholarship. To the extent that this is true it has departed from an ancient university tradition.⁹

Foreign study, often for a full college year, will become more and more important. The study of foreign languages will become more thorough and widespread, the students' interest will lie not in the language as that of a literature alone, but in the language as a key to a total culture. Implications of these facts for libraries could be serious. Provision of library services abroad, either by cooperation or contract with foreign libraries, or by direct supply of materials and services, will become a real problem as study abroad becomes a more and more important part of undergraduate life.

In his article, Branscomb stresses the urgency of making the public aware of the need to invest in higher education. Within the academic world, it is urgent that college officers and trustees be made aware of the library's share in this need. While the diversity and depth of curricula may have more to do with the cost of materials than has sheer size of enrollment, the shift from classroom work to greater emphasis upon independent study will put a greater burden upon college libraries and librarians. Almost none of the literature which blithely advocates greater student dependence upon the library mentions the fact that this inevitably must mean better libraries and more and better librarians. It is up to librarians to see that this fact of academic life is made known where it matters.

The A.C.R.L. Standards for College Libraries and for Junior College Libraries aim to state minimal satisfactory conditions of finance, staffing, stock, quarters, and service. For many existing college libraries, the standards are low; for many, the suggested minimum library budget figure of 5 per cent of the total Educational and General Expenditure figure is the wild blue yonder. It is nearly impossible to generalize about the Junior College standards, thoughtful as they are, because for lack of well defined sub-categories, such a wide variety of institutions must be lumped together. If, however, such a minimum could be set for all those institutions not now spending 5 per cent of the Educational and General budget on their libraries, the dollars let loose for library purposes would revolutionize holdings, staffs, and services.

It is necessary that studies be made to discover the relative value of greater investment in libraries and librarians as opposed to greater investment in new institutions, in faculty costs, in general physical

facilities, and in other elements of institutional costs so constantly taken for granted as of enormous importance. It is also up to librarians to work closely with those entrusted with formal education for librarianship in developing programs beyond the first professional degree. The aim to share in educational responsibility and faculty status can be more readily achieved if librarians will expect more of themselves in the way of scholarly study and published research. At a time when preparation for college teaching is under scrutiny and perhaps ready for some changes, it would be wise to see if we should demand more preparation for college librarianship.

Miss Reagan's study showed that the most telling force for and against joining the library profession is the effect of other persons upon the individual.¹⁰ College librarians might ponder their role in recruiting with this fact in mind. Certainly from the thousands of students still undecided upon post-college careers, we might identify and interest those who would be welcome additions to the profession. We might discover those already determined to become librarians and have them help in recruiting others. The shortage of well prepared librarians is now acute and probably will continue to be so. If, from each of the thousand or more higher institutions offering liberal arts undergraduate degrees, one candidate for library school might be sent each year, the improvement in the personnel situation would be startling. In addition, every effort should be made to urge trained persons, especially women with growing children, to return to the fold. Unless librarians themselves take a larger share in recruiting, the situation will be extremely difficult. Even with a systematic and broad attack on this problem, it is not likely that the market will be glutted; so no present librarian of any competence need fear for his job.

We already have some clear-cut examples of effective cooperation among smaller libraries, but we have a distressing number of instances where cooperative ventures have failed to work out or have consumed inordinate amounts of time and energy for the benefits derived. Many academic libraries are currently caught on rather choppy seas of cooperative ideas. Sometimes it is a group of colleges which have joined forces at some level such as the Great Lakes College Association, with twelve colleges from four contiguous states, or the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, with ten colleges from contiguous states. In these cases, the cooperative enterprise did not rise out of interests in library cooperation but for total institutional purposes. In other instances, some of these same institutions are involved in purely library co-

Libraries in Smaller Institutions of Higher Education

operative planning, but planning that does not coincide with the geographic concepts of the two associations mentioned above and that does include libraries in other institutions and in other states.

Interlibrary cooperation based upon the examples of M.I.L.C., H.I.L.C., the Farmington Plan, the New England Deposit Library, and other well known formal arrangements may come to be far more common than it is today. To arrive at formal schemes, however, will take a real investment in time and money, and above all some larger leadership than can be expected to come from the librarians of the smaller institutions. That there is need for overall planning and action is becoming more obvious every day.

Smaller institutions cannot hope to provide all the research materials their faculties need. If more and more faculty members are to join teaching staffs before the completion of their doctorates, and if there is to be increasing emphasis upon independent undergraduate work, the scope of each college collection will have to be widened. It cannot be widened by developing each library to meet all needs. The needs must be met through communal ownership, through lending and borrowing, through copying, through sending scholars to materials, and through other methods, some of them yet to be devised.

Little libraries are reluctant to continue borrowing primarily from large libraries; yet the problems of developing both coverage and depth through cooperative schemes seem close to hopeless. The crux of the matter, of course, is the ever-widening sea of print and the problems of selection of materials. With barely enough money to buy and process the daily essentials, the really small libraries cannot undertake to supply the larger needs of scholarship through a division of fields of responsibility, through joint purchase of research publications, and through elaborate systems of loans to each other. It looks as though the strong research libraries will still be called upon to support the research needs of faculties everywhere, and, to some extent, the specialized needs of the thousands of students who are to be put on their own to educate themselves via libraries. Perhaps this problem could be at least partly overcome by the creation of a national research library to lend lavishly to this particular group of higher institutions.

In smaller colleges, interest in effective book selection media continues to be a vital question. Even though it must be admitted that librarians and faculties probably do not make full use of reviewing

media already at hand, the need for more systematic, speedy, and appropriate analysis of new publications persists as does the need for evaluative guides to older literature. The dangers of indiscriminating use of published lists will not be belabored here. The Council on Library Resources is supporting exploratory studies pertaining to tools of selection for the college library. In the next few years there should be practical help in this area. The matter of judicious elimination—selection in reverse—is a grave problem for all kinds of scholarly libraries. It is hoped that studies now going on at Yale and Chicago on selective retirement will serve as guides to lesser libraries.

Indeed, in many aspects of librarianship in smaller academic institutions, librarians will have to depend upon the findings of major agencies and large libraries for the solution to problems and for improvement of services. Almost every problem that is faced by the great research library is faced by the small library. In some ways the problems are more complex for smaller libraries, where every staff member must be versatile rather than a specialist, and where each book purchased may cost one-hundredth rather than one-ten-thousandth of the book budget.

College libraries feel the pressure from the general public, and public libraries feel the pressure from school and college students. If all libraries are to try to serve all publics, those with academic commitments and few dollars will constantly be torn between direct obligations to their special constituency and the public relations requirement to be kind to outsiders. Many see this failure to define the roles of various kinds of libraries as a false democracy. The next twenty years must resolve this confusion in the interests of the users of libraries. It is they, rather than the libraries as institutions, who will lose if not. Here again the relations among demography, bibliographic control, and manageable objectives must be sorted out without passion. Only when we have a clearer idea of who needs what, and where, and when, and what library unit can respond to these needs can we offer library service of the richness and diversity we really need for the national good.

Librarians are deluged with advertisements that make it clear that anything can be reproduced in any form, at the speed of light, and at an astonishing variety of prices. Copyright law is bound to change, and some changes could greatly benefit libraries. With enormous increases in enrollments in programs from the cradle to the grave, alert

Libraries in Smaller Institutions of Higher Education

publishers will compete for the market. In collegiate work, if the predicted swing away from texts and toward individualized study materializes, both the individual buyer and the library buyer will be impressive, commercially speaking. According to Booher, the printed object itself could be produced by new processes and in satisfactory form at a fraction of present cost.¹¹ If this is so, the college library book dollar may, for once in its history, go farther than in the past.

At the heart of the situation for the smaller institutions lies this need for fundamental research. Isolated librarians, administrators, and small faculties can look closely at the situation at home, but are helpless when it comes to organized, objective, adequately financed studies so necessary in all of higher education and librarianship. Close behind organized research comes the pressing need for systematic reporting and synthesis of research findings.

In the meantime there is much that college librarians can do to help themselves. They can work with their faculty colleagues in guiding more young people into the profession of librarianship; they can make clear to their administrators the implications for libraries of growing enrollments and of changing teaching methods and of the response libraries should make to these changes. They can take a close look at the actual relationship, course by course, teacher by teacher, student by student, between libraries and learning. While a massive research effort on a national scale is called for, there is also profound need for smaller studies, and these smaller studies will have to be done, in many cases, where the library and the student and the teacher meet. Librarians in smaller institutions should not be too modest about their roles. They should help pinpoint areas where research is needed, and out of their experience and imagination should suggest ways of meeting library problems. If the increase in numbers of students will have, as one effect, greater student dependence upon libraries, librarians should recognize this as a chance to prove what libraries can really do. They should not be content with anything less than major planning to meet a major opportunity.

In brief, these are the prospects we face: there will be a doubling of the number of students in higher education; the load will fall unevenly to various kinds of institutions; there will be many new institutions and some mortality among old, small institutions; there will have to be planning on a national scale if appropriate institutions, educational programs, and placement of students are to be achieved; teachers and librarians will be in short supply; changing methods of

TABLE I
 Median Number of Professional Staff, Size of Collections
 and Total Library Operating Expenditure
 in 4-Year Institutions (by Type) 1959-60

Type of Institution	PUBLIC CONTROL				PRIVATE CONTROL			
	No. of Instit.	Personnel in FTE	Collection in Vols.	Expend. in Dollars	No. of Instit.	Personnel in FTE	Collection in Vols.	Expend. in Dollars
Universities	89	19.7	405,500	360,800	59	20.0	450,900	308,900
Lib. Arts Colleges	87	5.0	67,300	81,900	668	2.0	42,900	29,900
Teachers Colleges	167	4.0	51,700	51,900	29	1.0	20,000	18,800
Technological Schools	27	3.0	34,500	49,400	25	2.5	41,000	57,200
Theological Schools	—	—	—	—	165	1.0	32,300	14,600
Other Prof. Schools	11	3.0	43,200	50,700	109	1.0	9,800	10,000

SOURCE: U. S. Office of Education. Library Services Branch. *Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1959-60. Advance Analytic Report.* J. C. Rather and Doris C. Holladay, comp. Washington, D. C., July 1961. OE-15030.

TABLE II
 Median Number of Professional Staff, Size of Collections
 and Total Library Operating Expenditure (in \$)
 in 4-Year Institutions by Size of Enrollment 1959-60

Enrollment Size (No. of Students)	PUBLIC CONTROL				PRIVATE CONTROL			
	No. of Instit.	Personnel in FTE	Collection in Vols.	Expend. in Dollars	No. of Instit.	Personnel in FTE	Collection in Vols.	Expend. in Dollars
Fewer than 500	29	1.0	22,700	17,800	482	1.0	23,300	12,800
500 - 999	57	2.0	32,700	28,000	271	2.0	42,500	28,500
1000 - 2499	125	4.0	56,200	57,600	203	3.5	63,500	45,600
2500 - 4999	81	8.0	103,400	117,800	38	6.0	114,000	93,300
5000 - 9999	43	15.0	277,800	337,400	39	11.7	208,700	373,600
10,000 or more	46	33.0	623,500	559,000	22	37.2	516,500	536,600

Sources: See Table I.

TABLE III
 Median Number of Professional Staff, Size of Collections
 and Total Library Operating Expenditure
 in 2-Year Institutions by Size of Enrollment 1959-60

Enrollment Size (No. of Students)	PUBLIC CONTROL				PRIVATE CONTROL			
	No. of Instii.	Personnel in FTE	Collection in Vols.	Expend. in Dollars	No. of Instii.	Personnel in FTE	Collection in Vols.	Expend. in Dollars
Fewer than 500.....	164	1.0	5,900	7,100	170	1.0	10,600	7,200
500 - 999.....	62	1.0	8,500	13,100	23	1.0	12,600	12,200
1000 - 2499.....	52	1.9	13,400	22,800	5	2.0	30,000	22,500
2500 or more.....	39	3.0	24,600	53,500	—	—	—	—

SOURCE: See Table I.

Libraries in Smaller Institutions of Higher Education

instruction will challenge libraries in every aspect of their operations. A host of studies must be made in both higher education and in college librarianship.

D. H. Burnham, architect and early planner of cities, formulated a motto for his own guidance. That motto might serve us today, in higher education and in library service to higher education: "Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood and probably themselves will not be realized. Make big plans; aim high in hope and work, remembering that a noble, logical diagram once recorded will never die, but long after we are gone will be a living thing, asserting itself with ever-growing insistency. Remember that our sons and grandsons are going to do things that would stagger us. Let your watchword be order and your beacon beauty."¹²

References

1. Freedman, M. B.: Impact of College. In U.S. Office of Education *New Dimensions in Higher Education*, No. 4. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960.

2. Ruml, Beardley: *Memo to a College Trustee; a Report on Financial and Structural Problems of the Liberal College*. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1959.

3. Little, J. K.: Trends Affecting Contemporary Educational Planning; the Program in Higher Education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 32:192-198, April 1961.

4. U.S. 85th Congress: Scholarship and Loan Program: Part 2. In *Hearings before Subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, Feb. 19, 1958, p. 906.

5. U.S. Office of Education: *Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1959-60. Advance Analytic Report*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, July 1961.

6. Knapp, Patricia B.: *College Teaching and the College Library. A.C.R.L. Monograph No. 23*. Chicago, American Library Association, 1959.

7. Wayne State University, Detroit. Monteith College: *The Monteith Library Program: Experimental Project in Library-Instructional Coordination*. Proposal approved by the Cooperative Research Branch, U.S. Office of Education, March 1, 1960. Patricia B. Knapp, Project Director (Mimeographed).

8. Wayne State University, Detroit. Monteith College: *Project No. 874: An Experiment in Coordination Between Teaching and Library Staff for Changing Student Use of a University Library*. Report No. 2, July 1, 1960-Jan. 30, 1961 (Mimeographed).

9. Hatch, W. R.: *The Experimental College*. In U.S. Office of Education *New Dimensions in Higher Education*, No. 3. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960.

10. Reagan, Agnes L.: *A Study of Factors Influencing College Students To Become Librarians. A.C.R.L. Monograph No. 21*. Chicago, Association of College and Research Libraries, 1958.

EILEEN THORNTON

11. Bocher, E. E.: Books and Their Market. *Publishers' Weekly*, 179:20-24, March 6, 1961.
12. Moore, C.: *Daniel H. Burnham, Architect, Planner of Cities*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1921, Vol. 2, p. 146.