The Higher Education Act of 1965

my slip printed, and any number of copies sent round by book-post to every library in Europe. With a little arrangement, every English book might be catalogued at the British Museum, every French book at the Bibliothèque Nationale, every German book at the Royal Library at Berlin, every Russian book at St. Petersburg, &c. At a trifling expense these printed slips might be sent to every small or large library, and each of them might have three or four kinds of catalogues—an alphabetical catalogue of the authors, a chronological catalogue, a local catalogue, a catalogue classified according to subjects, &c. Even when a library is too poor to buy a book, the slip might be useful in its catalogue. The saving that might thus be effected would be very considerable. The staff of librarians might be greatly reduced, and the enormous expense now incurred for catalogues, and mostly imperfect catalogues, would dwindle down to a mere nothing.

Perhaps one hundred years later, in 1976, the anonymous ex-librarian's rational suggestion may well be a reality. ••

FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION

BY CHARLES F. GOSNELL

ALTHOUGH I have not been asked to be brief, my remarks will be. Anything that brings in new and usable money—to an administrator—is certainly good.

The implication of my assignment, given months ago, was that there were or would be many problems to which we should give deep thought and attention. My paper was to be submitted many months ago, so that day after tomorrow, you might read again what you hear here today. I objected to that time schedule for two reasons. One was that things might happen between the deadline for the paper and today. I did not want to be in the position of throwing overboard what had been written months ago, and what would be published next week, for something really worthwhile today. As you all know we did get the money like lightning, just two weeks ago.

The administrator is supposed to be a problem solver. Last March, as far as I was concerned, the only problem was that we did not have any problems. There was a law, but there was no money, no rules and regulations, no blanks to fill out. I felt like an MS student at Columbia library school of years ago, trying to get a thesis subject approved. The problem was to find a good problem. My only problem was to explain to my President why we were not doing anything—no money.

It is characteristic nowadays for the federal government to take off with grandiose plans, to pass ambitious enabling legislation—to please everybody—and then fail to provide any money. What problem we had was a political one. It was handled admirably by our ALA Washington office and by our college and university presidents.

By now you may suspect that I had some skepticism about this program. I did. I still do, but not as much. It got off to a good start in the best bureaucratic fashion, there were regional meetings to explain everything to everybody. Of course the real details could not be explained, because there were none. And nobody knew when, if ever, there would be any money.

When it began to look as though we might get the five thousand dollar basic grant, I ventured the opinion that it might take some $5,000 in administrative time and effort to gather data, fill out forms, etc., to get the $5,000. That often happens, particularly in a large and efficient organization. But I was wrong.

We studied the provisions of the law, and tried to guess what we would have to do. Fortunately, we did not work too hard at it.
On May 13 the President signed the supplemental appropriation bill. Within two weeks we had the application forms. Miraculously these forms were unusually simple.

A few names and addresses were asked for, a few boxes to be checked, and eight simple financial figures which any well administered library should have on hand anyway. The form was quickly filled in (seven copies, to be sure) and within another two weeks the approval came. What could be simpler?

Paxton Price and his associates deserve a hearty, "Well done!"

I objected to an assignment which implied that I should indulge in prophecy and pontification, rather than comment on real facts and definite situations, but now I shall proceed to do the armchair bit. I am in the position of the fellow who began by saying, "Before I begin my speech I have something important to say." I have said it, and now I shall take off into the wild blue yonder.

Getting money from the federal government has become a profession in itself. Washington is full of experts, who, for a fat fee, will help you get federal money. The federal bureaucracy has created conditions where these experts can flourish. The basic fallacy is that the government tries to treat everybody exactly alike. There is almost infinite accountability. But no two people or institutions are exactly alike. The professionals are the people who can take unlikes and make them look like the very model which the legislators had in mind. They take rugged individuals and dress them in plausible uniforms to qualify for the handouts.

Soon after the Higher Education Act of 1965 was passed and the regional meetings were held, New York University took formal administrative action and designated its director of libraries to be coordinator of the university by program for Title II. Other coordinators were appointed for other sections corresponding to their respective official concerns. This only demonstrates that NYU is an old hand at getting federal money, and has an effective operating procedure. On December 15 the director of libraries made a report to the Administrative Council of the university outlining the legislation, its background, and its purpose.

Being an administrator he immediately began to try to figure out how much money would be available and when. Under maximum terms NYU might hope to get as much as a quarter-million dollars; so far, we have received ten thousand.

We do not have a library school and I cannot presume to speak on that aspect.

Spending the basic grant, for a large institution, even in a hurry, is no problem. Spending the quarter million will take a little more effort—and we will have to wait for the appropriation and the guidelines.

For the very small institutions the basic grant may be a relatively large sum, and may even involve difficulty in matching. But with a little planning ahead, this should not be a serious problem.

For large and small alike any help to the Library of Congress for centralized cataloging should be no problem, but a great benefit.

On its face, section 203, "Supplemental Grants" does not look too difficult, especially if the guidelines follow the path marked in May 1966.

Section 204, "Special Purpose Grants" looks more tricky, and I hesitate to let my imagination run wild to conjure up the flights of fancy that might be proposed as eligible for "Special Purpose Grants."

Section 205 provides for an advisory council to advise the commission on supplemental and special purpose grants. This seems to be a very good idea. At this time there has been no appropria-
tion for these purposes, and I have no information that the committee has been appointed.

Section 206 provides for nonaccredited institutions on a provisional basis. This is in line with what seems to be the underlying philosophy of the Act, "a little something for everybody."

Section 207 bars use of grants to buy material for religious purposes.

Section 208 represents a passing nod to the agencies responsible for higher education in the several states. This administrator concludes that so far, at least, the Act has posed no serious problems. Some of the later sections will necessarily be a little more difficult to handle, and may contain "sleepers." More generous appropriations are needed to make the Act really effective. A continuation of the present policy of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare will certainly be welcome.

GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF GRANT REQUESTS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR LIBRARY EDUCATION AND ALA DIVISIONS

BY MAURICE F. TAUBER

When Miss Brown wrote to me some time ago, she told me that my responsibility was to summarize the other papers that would be presented by Miss Krettek, Dr. Gosnell, Mr. Moore, and Miss Welch. I was to single out those areas of concern that our membership should be aware of, if the greatest advantages are to be made of the sections of the Higher Education Act (Public Law 89-329), affecting libraries. This did not seem to be an impossible assignment, unless the participants failed to write papers. I did not think there would be any trouble from this angle. I was wrong in at least one instance, and in another I received the paper Monday afternoon. Dr. Gosnell has indicated the reason why he delayed writing his paper. I think he thought if he waited long enough he might not have to write it at all.

My assignment, however, when the first supplement of *College and Research Libraries* appeared in May listing the program, had been enlarged to the following: "Guidelines for the Preparation of Grant Requests, Including a Summary of the Working Papers (those presented to you), Implications for Library Education, and Recommendations for Future ALA Divisional Activities." Thus, I have a wide range of targets, and if I miss any or all of them it is not because I have not been given the chance to shoot. Within the framework of some facts, and also some fancy or speculation, I will try to summarize the points made in the papers, suggest guidelines, so far as I can, for the preparation of grant requests, discuss library education and research, and to indicate general implications for ACRL and other ALA divisions.

BACKGROUND AND ADMINISTRATION

The points made by Miss Krettek, as always, are to be the heart of the matter. The Act has been described, and the extent of the potential aid to libraries analyzed. Miss Krettek and Mr. Low, too, must be praised again and again for the wording of the statements regarding the library assistance, because it is quite obvious that librarians have been given every opportunity to utilize the available funds in direct relation to their problems. Both of them, I understand, had much to do with the eventual wording. The various librarians who have gone to Washington to support the legislation should also be thanked for their aid.