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.
The actual relationship of the sections of the Act to administration, reference services, and the technical services, as well as to personnel and training, has been spelled out in the several comments of the preceding speakers. Points may be made on some of these comments.

Dr. Gosnell has directed his attention to the fact that the library (and library school, too) will need to have considerable organization of talent familiar with governmental procedure if the institution is to obtain the funds desired for a particular project. Know-how and ability to follow through are implicit, and anyone familiar with a government contract realizes that the operations may be tedious in some situations. Dr. Gosnell has indicated that in this case, however, there has been an effort to make applications for funds simple, and it is hoped that this simplicity will speed up decisions by review groups so that the funds will be quickly forthcoming and applied to the projects outlined. As a matter of fact, our Office of Education has done a remarkable job in their speed, and has caught some libraries and library schools unprepared. At New York University the administration decided that the library would be the coordinator of the matters relating to the Act. This is a satisfactory pattern in an institution which has had a decentralized policy in regard to such requests. In some institutions, it may be somewhat more complex, particularly if there is a centralized control. Whatever the pattern is, however, it is quite clear that there is an essential series of steps, related to many forms that are to be filled out, and records kept, for any funds provided for programs under the Act.

Mr. Moore, as a reference librarian, has singled out those aspects of the Act which may have implications for the reference services of libraries. He has called attention to the development of resources, and the introduction of procedures to make these resources bibliographically available on a wider scale than most of us dared hope for in recent years. Those of you who attended the University Libraries Section of ACRL—RTSD joint meeting Monday evening will recall the observations made by the various speakers on the potential for developing collections at the Library of Congress and for cataloging them quickly for library use. Mr. Skipper particularly pointed out that there appeared to be no limit to the opportunity, if the personnel were available for the task. This was also supported by Mr. Cronin in his remarks. Mr. Moore could not avoid emphasizing the need for sufficient and qualified personnel, as it is obvious that funds available could not be properly expanded unless staff could handle the obligations that the funds bring. Shortage of personnel, of course, is coupled naturally with inadequacies in operations, equipment, and technology. The need for research in technique, systems analysis, and national outlook are therefore cited. An important point, to which I will refer later, made by Mr. Moore is to the promise of research and demonstration.

Miss Welch, of course, had a wide opportunity in regard to the implications for technical services. The Act is quite broad in respect to this field of librarianship, and her comments on centralized cataloging, the Library of Congress potential, cooperative acquisitions programs, standardization, automation, serials, resources, personnel shortages, demonstrations, and international implications do not need to be repeated here. It may be said that they interweave with the comments by Mr. Moore, and give strength to the observation that the reference services are supported by effective technical services.

It is important to recognize a most significant ingredient in the acquisi-
tions aspect of the Higher Education Act. Resources in libraries have been developed by librarians but only in concert with bookdealers and other individuals concerned with the production of books such as publishers of all kinds and now, especially, reprint publishers. The markets for books are expanding rapidly, and stocks of older works are diminishing. Bookdealers and publishers all over the world will be put upon not only by the Act in terms of both acquisitions and cataloging but also by the greater demands which new or embryonic libraries will place upon them. The importance of streamlining acquisitions operations to help bookdealers is obvious. The effectiveness, energy, and interest of bookdealers in carrying out the implications of the Act are obviously of paramount importance. Fortunately, American bookdealers as a group have been friends of American libraries, and I feel certain that they will accept (they are even already in the middle of it, including wholesalers and general trade book sellers) the pressures that are involved in helping libraries develop their collections wisely. I understand that the Library of Congress, in its activities under the Act, is to use Stevens and Brown in London, Stechert-Hafner in Paris, and Harrassowitz in Wiesbaden. Dealers in Scandinavia, Spain, and Latin-America will also be used for this purpose. The Library of Congress has recognized the need for strong personnel in the various parts of the world from which it will seek its literature, and it is obvious that these people will be given full financial and other support to make the job as efficient as possible. In Latin-America the Library of Congress will establish lines of supply similar to those in Europe, and work on the success of the Latin-American Cooperative Acquisition Program (LACAP, as it is called) in its acquisitions program. Publishers similarly will be called upon to reprint many titles which have not been available to small and growing libraries.

Guidelines for Preparing Project Requests

At New York University, if Dr. Gosnell made his point, the procedures for requesting funds are well established. Undoubtedly, this is a pattern in other institutions. At Columbia University, for example, the Office of Contracts and Grants takes an intensive part in the preparing of request applications, and making certain that all elements involved in the request are included. Requests for funds for resources and construction are relatively simple. Requests for research require somewhat more detail. These requests follow a form of presentation, and contain not only a clear-cut delineation of the proposal but also a well-worked-out design, a precise statement of methodology, discussion of any possible built-in evaluative approaches, related studies (if a research project is intended), personnel descriptions, and an extended budget to show how the funds are to be used. Time schedules are always included, and should be marked out as carefully as possible, as many studies have been underestimated in terms of months or years needed. Overhead, of course, is always included, and may be as high as 20 per cent, and if on personnel basis only, as high as 30 per cent.

Indeed, the directions for filling out forms are rather direct and specific. Despite the clarity, however, as has been noted by Miss Krettek and others concerned, the institutions that have no special office for contracts and grants may be at a disadvantage in competition with the larger institutions which specialize in obtaining government funds. One can only say that every institution that is interested in obtaining such help should have staff members trained in developing such requests; if not, they should acquire such personnel by train-
ing individuals to do this work. The various agencies, such as the American Council on Education, for example, have issued bulletins to help institutions, and the April issue of *Special Report on Federal Programs*, of the American Council on Education, is entitled, “The College Equipment Grant Program,” which discussed Title VI of the Higher Education Act, which is “to improve the quality of the classroom.”

Although we have in library service Miss Krettek’s excellent reporting on what is going on in Washington, and how to take advantage of developments in legislation that affect libraries, it may be said that in education there appears to be a more direct assembling of related activities in this publication. Perhaps this is something that may be done by ALA for the smaller libraries, or the individual librarian who may not be aware of the developments and procedures. Indeed, it may not be too late to issue as quickly as possible a handbook for preparing project requests for government awards and contracts. Titles I, IV, VI mentioned by Miss Krettek are examples of an area that might be included.

Individual institutional requests for awards relating to building construction, teaching awards, or demonstrations of various kinds follow a pattern that has been related to forms and instructions for filling them out. As a reviewer for the Office of Education, and as a consultant in research proposals, I have seen many of these as they come in for examination and decision. The ones that receive high priority follow the stipulations set forth, and make sure that no single element in the series of requirements is omitted.

At this point, it may be worthwhile to refer to the general program of research and demonstration that the Office of Education is concerned with in Title II of the Higher Education Act. At a meeting of various individuals (librarians, library school educators, and representatives of library associations) in Washington in March 1966, which I was given the privilege to attend, there was a discussion of (1) Title II with emphasis on library research, (2) the provisions of Title II, Part B, and plans for program administration, (3) considerations that are required for implementation of the program, (4) policy decisions that are related to making the program most effective, (5) considerations of writing of the guidelines for library research programs, and (6) developments of priorities in research, and specification of research criteria.

At this meeting, which was directed by Lee Burchinal, who is acting director of the division for research training and dissemination of the Office of Education, it may be said that the effort has been so to structure the program as to make it easy to submit proposals. The review of Title II, Part B, particularly Section 223, dealing with grants for training in librarianship, and Section 224, concerned with research and demonstrations relating to libraries and the training of library personnel, and specification of review criteria was particularly useful to all members present.

The following comments may be made about this meeting that are relevant to the progress of the relation of libraries and library schools to the Higher Education Act. It was pointed out that there would be $103 million for research for education generally, and that part of the total allotted to library service could be applied on every level from elementary education to post-graduate training.

The character of the program in research is worth special comment, as some of you may not be familiar with the types of programs that are available. They are as follows:

1. **Small grant program.** This program includes studies with a grant of from $7,500 (minimum usually) to $9,000, which would be primarily on an eighteen-month basis, and which may
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be more useful even on a shorter period. These grants would be of the kind that might be particularly applicable to doctoral students in library schools.

2. **Regular projects.** These are those projects that may be carried on over a period of two to three years, and would go up to several more thousands of dollars over the small grant projects, if such funds are necessary.

3. **Program support.** This concept is directed to the support of an individual who has demonstrated capacity and has issued reports that relate directly to proposals. On the basis of past achievement, grants are given to such individuals for exploration of given areas. There is no set limit for funds, although there is tendency to limit grants to the periods involved.

4. **Research and development program.** This type of program involves the establishment of nine centers throughout the country, and would require interested institutions to match funds and make a substantial investment in carrying out the project. Large scale library projects are possible here.

5. **Regional laboratory program.** This is the largest effort applied to educational research, and is supported up to the needs of the project, and within the framework of the funds available to the Office of Education. It is not likely that libraries will be involved but it also is not impossible in terms of a major cooperative project.

At our meeting, the process for reviewing proposals was discussed in some detail. It was indicated that in the past some time would elapse between the submission of a proposal, and the decision on it. It was estimated at that time that it would be about three months. It was hoped that this would be reduced to eight weeks. This period would depend on the cooperation of consultants and readers in the field. The group made an effort to list areas of present concern, and to indicate the relationship of the U.S. Office of Education projects being received to those being considered by ALA (Library Technology Program with its Office of Research and Development), National Science Foundation, Air Force Office of Research and Development, National Institutes of Health and various other separate agencies of the government including major national libraries (Library of Congress, National Library of Medicine, National Library of Agriculture), and the new committee on Science and Technology located at the National Academy of Science (F. J. Weyle, executive director); this was an outgrowth of the work of Committee on Science and Technical Information (COSATI). It was also pointed out that ERIC (Educational Information Research Center), established at the Office of Education, with related centers distributed at other institutions, would be in a position to coordinate research activities, and to eliminate overlapping or duplicate research.

It was apparent that any research program in librarianship would need to examine priorities in the field. After various plans or analysis of the field, the following rubrics appeared to represent a consensus of the group:

1. **Values of librarianship,** including studies of users, uses, goals of services, and social utility.

2. **Intellectual problems,** involving bibliographic control, cataloging, classification, indexing, abstracting, and data processing and retrieval.

3. **Systems analysis and planning,** including allocation of resources, national responsibilities, and placement of men and machines.

4. **Operations,** involving mechanization, accounting, access to materials, and utilization of manpower.

5. **Social and professional issues,** including education of librarians, librarianship as a profession, and the pro-
gressive development of various types of libraries.

6. Resources and preservation, including the building of collections on a national basis, and caring for them in ways that we have not done in the past.

These areas are not new; they have been discussed in the literature of library service generally, as well as in library education. Verner Clapp includes them in his "Problems for Research" in The Future of the Research Library, issued last year by the University of Illinois.

IMPLICATIONS FOR LIBRARY EDUCATION

The preceding comments are directed at the problem of education for librarianship. I need not dwell on shortages in various areas of library service (and especially the serious gap in providing cataloging personnel, and personnel with some knowledge of automation). The development of new library schools in all parts of the country has raised the additional problem of staffing with teaching personnel. The Higher Education Act is concerned with developing personnel in these areas.

The need to inform all library schools of the implications of the Act is the basis for this meeting this morning, if any needed such information. The issuance of reports and papers on the Act, however, might be supplanted by the brochure suggested earlier, which would also include an explanation to all those in library education, of opportunities under various parts of the Act and related Acts. Miss Krettek has been trying to do this, and has done a remarkable piece of work, but the issuance of such an analytical bulletin, with instructions for procedure, might be of especial help to those libraries or institutions where there is not a mighty contracts and grants office.

In all library schools of any size, there should be an interest in obtaining funds available for improvement of the teaching personnel in the profession; announcements of advanced and doctoral study were made in May 1966. A large number of schools have been awarded grants for either advanced study or doctoral programs, with the expectation that many of these people (and it is going to be rough to recruit suitable personnel) will go into teaching.

The $3,550,000 available for research should be the basis for needed studies in the field as outlined earlier. There is a wide range of projects possible, as outlined in Section 225 of the Act, involving all levels of library service, and in all areas, including demonstrations, which would involve libraries themselves. This means that libraries, apart from individuals or library schools, can submit proposals separately, or in conjunction with library schools. The pattern of applications is quite flexible.

It is also quite clear, particularly after attending the meeting here of the Association of Hospital and Institutional Libraries division on Monday morning, that Section 223 (which is administered by another unit of the Office of Education, the Research Training Branch) should be coordinated with the Medical Library Assistance Act (which is supported by the Public Health Service) in terms of recruiting and training of personnel. The existence of this latter activity may be well known to medical librarians, but is not generally known to librarians as a group.

The implications for library education for individual schools of library service are quite clear. If library schools have not made proposals for obtaining funds for specific projects, they should do so. The various committees in library schools concerned with recruiting of students, and fellowships for advanced study, doctoral programs and research, or other relevant activities, should be involved in such proposals. Any projects of course imply that the schools are in a position, on the basis of personnel, facilities, and
equipment to perform on a high level if grants are awarded. All of us have a responsibility of not asking for funds if they cannot be used effectively. I am told that some of the nonaccredited schools or educational agencies are concerned about grants that have been given only to accredited schools. I am sure that eligible nonaccredited institutions are in a position to obtain grants and do effective work in the areas outlined. The law provides for criteria for selection and it is expected that some schools not now accredited will thereby improve their status and become eligible for accreditation. Title VI of the Higher Education Act (Public Law 89-329) established a new program of federal grants to institutions of higher education for the acquisition of laboratory and other special teaching equipment, or audiovisual materials. Miss Krettek has pointed out that this Act included libraries among the areas that might be assisted. The Act in general is intended to help those institutions that are making an effort to improve themselves.

Other Divisions of ALA

My assignment was to point out the implications for the various divisions of ALA. Mr. Moore and Miss Welch have done a complete job in describing relevant implications for the reference services and technical services respectively. In its various sections, the Higher Education Act cuts across all divisions of the association, and it would seem that each unit of the ALA should be concerned about obtaining as much assistance as it can in the months ahead, to further its specific program. This does mean that there probably should be committees or groups representing the individual divisions of ALA. They probably should be coordinated at some point, so that overlap and duplicative projects would be minimal or non-existent. The Reference Services Division, the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Resources and Technical Services Division, the Library Administration Division, the Public Library Association, the Library Education Division, and the various other divisions— the Children’s Services Division, the American Association of School Libraries, the Adult Services Division, and any other division of the ALA concerned with training of personnel (and all of them are), facilities, and services—are apparently able to qualify for participation in one or more of the several sections of the Act. We need to read the Act carefully, so that implications or possibilities are not overlooked. The Act, as I indicated earlier, has been written so that libraries can be helped to the utmost, if they take advantage of the opportunity. In addition to Miss Krettek, who has worked so tremendously at getting the act through, one might not overlook our legislative general, who has come through the wars with great success—our moderator, Edmon Low.