



Cooperation Among Colleges

EILEEN THORNTON

“THE PRESIDENT’S COMMITTEE ON Education Beyond the High School” is a distinctly clumsy title, but it was apparently chosen in order to encompass all forms of higher education. To some extent we are faced with the same problem when we consider cooperative library schemes in the academic world. It is fairly simple to separate the universities from other forms of higher institutions, but what shall be included under the umbrella of “college” is more difficult. For the purposes of this report, the colleges will include the four-year college, the two- or three-year college, the teachers college, and the professional and technical institution of less than university proportions.

These do not form a homogeneous group; not even one sub-group within this spread forms a homogeneous cluster. Their points of similarity are mainly negative: most do not have extensive graduate and research programs, most do not have large and diversified library staffs, most have meager library budgets and collections in comparison with universities, and most of the college libraries have limited freedom to move toward cooperative ventures. Undergraduate colleges which are parts of universities will not be probed. It is assumed that if there are moves afoot to coordinate and cooperate among these units, these moves are parts of whatever schemes serve the parent university libraries.

In examining the state of the non-university academic libraries, it seems important to have in mind some basic facts concerning their number, type, staffing, collection-size, support, variety, enrollment, and distribution, because these factors affect their ability and will to cooperate. In its fall 1955 enrollment survey, the U. S. Office of Education found that of the 2,720,929 students enrolled in higher institutions, 56% were in publicly controlled and 44% in privately controlled institutions.¹ In 141 universities there were 1,241,101 students, or

Miss Thornton is Librarian, Oberlin College.

45.6% of the total enrolled. The remainder—more than half of the students in higher education—were attending some 1,700 other institutions. It is these 1,700 institutional libraries that form the universe of libraries on which this chapter attempts to report. In 732 liberal arts colleges there were 712,685 students or 26.2% of the total enrollees, in 480 separately organized professional schools 415,423 or 15.3% and in junior colleges 351,720 or 12.9%.

While the college and university library statistics as reported in *College and Research Libraries*² represent only a part of the total number of collegiate institutions in the United States, and while the categories which form these groups differ somewhat from the U. S. Office of Education summary, a study of these data gives a clue to the state of college libraries. The ninety-two Group II college libraries which reported their 1955-56 figures had collections, for instance, that ranged from 23,000 volumes to 418,000 volumes, with a median of 121,552. In the Group III libraries, with 112 reporting, the range in size of collections was from 16,435 volumes to 166,091, with a median of 46,009. In this relatively large sample of 204 collections, only ten contained more than 250,000 volumes, and only thirty-six contained more than 150,000 volumes. Some eighteen of the libraries in Groups II and III had total operating expenditures in excess of \$100,000, but characteristically the operating budget was far lower.

The undergraduate enrollment in Group II institutions ranged from 389 to 8,434 students, with a median of 1,316, and graduate enrollment from zero to 957, with a median of seventy-six. In the Group III colleges, enrollment of undergraduates ranged from 114 students to 2,548, with a median of 619, and graduate enrollment from zero to 196, with a median of sixteen. While the Group II sample of ninety-two institutions probably represents a sizable proportion of the college libraries which fit the description of that category, the Group III sample is a far smaller proportion of the universe of roughly comparable college libraries.

The junior college statistics for 1955-56 presented some figures for 147 institutions—a good sample in terms of size and diversity of this type of institution. Here the great differences between private and public institutions are vivid, affecting enrollment, book needs, finances and staffing. The range in bookstock was from 600 volumes to 87,910, in day student enrollment from thirty to 7,456, in evening student enrollment from zero to 12,617. Library operating expenditures ranged from \$641 to \$135,385 and the number of staff members from one-

Cooperation Among Colleges

half to nineteen. Generalizations concerning this group of institutions are obviously preposterous, but it is safe to assume that the staffing of both Group III libraries and junior college libraries typically consisted of from two to three persons, one-half of whom were trained librarians. The characteristic staffing of the Group II libraries consisted of about six professional and five non-professional persons, a total of just under eleven persons.

The teachers colleges also presented an interesting statistical picture. Their 1955-56 library figures, collected from ninety-three libraries, showed collections ranging from 13,735 volumes to 174,577, with a median of 53,073. Their staffing was normally somewhat heavier on the professional side, with about four trained persons to two non-professional assistants. The characteristic total staffing in the libraries of the teachers colleges reporting was five persons.

The median book budgets reported were \$17,600 in Group II libraries, \$6,300 in Group III, \$2,250 in junior colleges, and \$9,000 in teachers colleges.

The pertinence of these data to a study of cooperation on the college level is this: staffing is minimal, money so meager that it must go into bread-and-butter materials, and collections often too small for the demands placed on them. There are outstanding exceptions in every category, but the broad picture is one of small institutions with small libraries, spattered across the map of the country.

Inter-institution cooperation for both public and private college libraries requires as a base permissive support from the parent institutions. While, as K. D. Metcalf³ and others have pointed out, the seemingly inevitable growth of academic libraries and library budgets calls for cooperation among institutions, many factors stand in the way of effective action. Institutional rivalry, the heritage of institutional autonomy, inertia, the dread of inconvenience which obscures the view of potential benefits, the dearth of obvious collaborators, financial and legal obstacles, lack of time and skill required for fact-finding studies of cooperative possibilities—these are only a few of the barriers to be overcome on the way to effective joint action. But the proliferation of materials pertinent to college programs, the swelling of enrollments, the dearth of librarians, the dwindling buying power of library budgets, the crowding of library quarters, and the increasing emphasis on independent work for able students and on research facilities for faculty members are counterbalancing factors, in many ways. For the libraries that have good collections and are able to maintain them at

a satisfactory level, the cooperative schemes now in motion constitute a "share the wealth" program. For the really small libraries which are seriously short of material and personnel, comparable projects might turn out to be "share the poverty" programs. Their problems are to acquire much needed basic books and periodicals and enough staff to render their collections of real use.

There is real danger that schemes which work among one group of libraries will be assumed to be universal panaceas. Each college has the obligation to offer to its constituency the essential materials for higher education, including a reasonable minimum of supporting material for faculty study; in each college this core is determined by the nature and compass of its curriculum and the methods of instruction selected by its faculty. It is a truism that the college library exists to serve the specific purposes of the parent college, but all too often the elaborate course descriptions found in the college catalog cannot possibly be adequately taught from the library resources at hand. Either the program must be modified to match the limitations of the library resources or the library resources must be modified to match the demands of the program. The library can be modified in two basic ways, and often both are required for successful achievement of academic claims: the library within the college must be enriched, and access to less commonly needed materials must be found. It is the latter that calls for cooperation.

Various elements are necessary for any form of joint effort. First, there must be others with whom to cooperate, and in the cases of hundreds of smaller institutions physical isolation from other libraries of any sort make direct joint schemes of questionable value. Second, there must be fundamental unity of purpose among cooperating institutions; if their purposes are too dissimilar or their other differences too great joint action may be impractical. (After negotiating a "reciprocal" agreement with a large college library, one waggish junior college librarian reported, "I've done the cooing; they'll have to do the operating.") Third, the power for cooperation among college libraries must come from the colleges rather than their libraries alone. Frequently the bases of control and support for institutions that can see benefits in joint library action differ so greatly that the legal and accounting problems offset the library gains. Fourth, it takes man-hours to investigate and develop and maintain workable schemes of cooperation and the staffs of most of the smaller institutions find, like the Queen in *Alice Through the Looking Glass*, that ". . . here, you see, it

Cooperation Among Colleges

takes all the running you can do, to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that!" It is hard to get hold of one's bootstraps while running.

Many of the known cases of cooperation among college libraries occur with fairly strong and large libraries. Because they promise some help for all sizes and kinds of academic libraries within their boundaries, two state-wide efforts to help libraries are worth examination. Neither has moved quickly, and neither has achieved even a fraction of its objectives, but both show signs of success in the long run. If these projects do succeed, they may be of particular value to a large number of smaller colleges which might otherwise never be enabled to work cooperatively.

The Ohio State Plan. Two organizations, the Ohio College Association and the Ohio Library Association (through its College and University Section), are movers and shakers in the area of library cooperation. The Ohio College Association has a College Librarians' Section, and its members are, in the main, members of the College and University Section of the Ohio Library Association. This common denominator has been of benefit in helping the two organizations move toward certain library goals.

Like many efforts at cooperation, the state-wide concept in Ohio has sprung from informal beginnings. In December, 1951, the librarians of a group of colleges and universities—Akron, Denison, Kenyon, Ohio Wesleyan and Wooster—met to discuss the possibilities of library cooperation. Seven areas were considered: (1) revision of the *Regional List of Serials in the College and University Libraries of Ohio*, (2) planning cooperatively for the acquisition of expensive, scholarly works, (3) encouragement of the use of various types of photographic reproduction, (4) planning for acquisition, retention, and binding of specified serials for use of all libraries in the cooperating group, (5) development of a regional or Ohio bibliographic center, (6) development of a cooperative housing and acquisitions center, and (7) investigation of possibilities of cooperation in the Midwest Inter-Library Center. These last three considerations were recognized as requiring the endorsement of the college and university administrators. Later the group was made a formal joint committee of the Ohio College Association and the College and University Section of the Ohio Library Association. In addition, a committee of college presidents was named by the Ohio College Association to further this work.

Concurrently, there were further moves toward joint action: the

state librarian early offered his assistance, cooperation in the Regional Union List at Western Reserve University Library was extended to include more libraries, pilot studies were made on specific problems, and a sub-committee of the Ohio Library Association committee continued to study the need for some type of centralized service library.

In the spring of 1953, the joint committee recommended that a survey be made, under the auspices of the Ohio College Association, to determine particular ways in which Ohio college and university libraries could most advantageously cooperate. An appeal for outside funds to make this survey failed, so no survey was made. Forward movement on a state-wide basis stopped, but at least one cooperative project in a smaller geographic area was initiated. With the help of a United States Steel grant, Denison, Kenyon, and Ohio Wesleyan resumed work on a union list of their periodicals and concrete efforts were initiated to make the total holdings of the three libraries less overlapping, more diversified and of greater usefulness.

Interest in state-wide library cooperation persisted in both the Ohio College Association and the Ohio Library Association. The state librarian, meeting with the joint committee in early 1957, proposed that the State Library, rather than any newly created library's library, be considered in any plans for integration and support of academic libraries in Ohio. At this meeting, too, the newly appointed Governor's Commission to Study Higher Education in Ohio was considered as an agency through which the long-desired college library survey might be effected.

At the April, 1957, meeting of the Ohio College Association,⁴ proposals were presented for action: one to request the Ohio State Library Board to establish a program which would permit the State Library, through increased funds and quarters, to extend its services to the academic libraries of the state, and the second that a thorough survey of libraries be included in the proposed survey of colleges to be made by the Governor's Commission to Study Higher Education in Ohio. This second proposal was endorsed by the Ohio College Association, but the first proposal was referred back to the College Librarians' Section for detailed recommendations relative to its implementation and operation. The next step, then, is a more precise development of plans whereby the State Library would act as a supporting library for colleges and universities in Ohio.

The New York State Plan. Late in 1952, The Board of Regents of New York State, at the request of C. V. Newsom, then associate com-

Cooperation Among Colleges

missioner of education, appointed a Temporary Advisory Committee on College Library Problems, consisting of nine university, college, and research library representatives. Meeting with this committee were representatives from the State University and the State Education Department, including the State Library. The aims of this group were to explore "ways in which greater integration of effort and resources may be developed among the college and university libraries of the state with the State Library . . . to advise on any studies that may be necessary, to help in the interpretation and presentation of the findings, and to assist in the development of policies that may follow."⁵

After several meetings, it was decided by the group that the problems facing college libraries were fundamentally different from those facing university and research libraries, so the committee was divided into two sub-committees. The college sub-committee, in cooperation with members of the State Education Department, surveyed college libraries by means of a questionnaire and visitations. With the data thus gathered and after more meetings to discuss facts and theories, a report was presented, "A Plan for Meeting College Library Problems. . . ."

As was hazily known at the start, the study of the 150 academic libraries in institutions below the university level showed vast differences in problems, needs, and possible courses of action. Crowded buildings were characteristic of many, even though the typical collection was small. In the area of metropolitan New York, it was obvious that students relied heavily on other libraries than those in the institutions in which they were enrolled. In many instances this was a reasonable and desirable state of affairs, but in many others it was obviously unreasonable and undesirable. Most college libraries proved to have need of periodical files, documents, and other research materials which they did not own, but these needs differed radically from college to college. In up-state New York, faculty members were critically short of materials for their own professional development or research. While interlibrary loan was used sporadically to relieve this situation, the lack of finding tools and the circuitousness of procedure seemed to limit the usefulness of this service. Above all, it was apparent that the big problem for the smaller institutions was not the elimination of less active material but the procuring of basic material on the home-plate plus access to more abstruse materials from an appropriate source.

College presidents, deans, and financial officers tended to view

favorably the idea that the State Library, rich in a variety of fields, might be more fully used to supplement the collections of the local colleges. Librarians and faculty members were more skeptical; they feared that library budgets—already too small for routine purchases—might be cut and that reliance on the State Library and other college libraries might prove cumbersome and inefficient. Because it was clear that the typical college library in any type of undergraduate institution in the state must define and then carry its own proper load, the report described in detail the nature of that load. The summary of that description follows:

The committee wishes to re-emphasize its conviction that the first requirement for all colleges is a good library on the premises. This means quarters which are appropriate for their purpose and adequate in size for both readers and books. It means a competent and sufficiently numerous staff. It means a book budget large enough and stable enough to assure the purchase of books, periodicals and other library materials pertinent to the college's program.

The committee does not envisage an enrichment of the State Library which takes the place of an enrichment of the individual, on-the-spot college libraries. It does hope that the State Library can be rendered able to supply materials and services which, though they may be out of reach for the separate colleges if each tries to supply them at home, will prove to be economical, efficient and highly beneficial if offered by one center for all.⁶

Seven basic recommendations were made by the college subcommittee:

1. The State Library should be strengthened to serve as a "library's library" for New York State. In place of the creation of any new unit to serve as a supporting tissue for academic libraries in New York State, the State Library should be strengthened to meet these needs. For years the State Library had offered its services and resources to the colleges, but it required more support and staff to enlarge its college-related activities. Its collection already contained much that would meet the extraordinary needs of colleges. The tax dollar would be spent more effectively by adding to the State Library than by starting a new library's library from scratch. The legal relation of the State Library to all educational institutions within New York, public or private, makes it an appropriate source of help: the facilities of the State Library are available as a right rather than a privilege.

Cooperation Among Colleges

The State Library's general areas of responsibility would be: (1) periodicals—as many and as much of the scholarly periodicals and continuations as possible; (2) reference works beyond the reach of smaller libraries; (3) rare books and very expensive books; (4) “background” books (the vague “less-used” category); (5) government publications—federal, state, local; (6) college and university catalogs in retrospective files; (7) theses and dissertations; (8) corporation and other reports; (9) lesser works of major writers; (10) duplicates of books outdated and commonly held by many colleges; (11) bibliography; (12) library literature; (13) developing fields.

2. A catalog of the State Library holdings should be prepared and distributed to the college libraries.

3. A position of college library consultant should be created.

4. Publicity on the State Library and its functions should be increased.

5. The State Library should have a photoduplication service.

6. Interlibrary loan facilities in the State Library should be improved.

7. Further research on specific problems should be undertaken.

Some of the recommendations have been implemented. The State Library book budget has been increased, though no special emphasis was placed on its intention to orient its acquisitions program to meet the needs of colleges. Until detailed studies are made of college library needs, a precise program for the State Library, in both acquisitions and services, cannot be laid out. A short-title catalog of the social sciences was printed and widely distributed. Its primary function is a finding-list aid in interlibrary loan. Other volumes are to follow if the first volume proves useful.

The position of college library consultant was established for a trial flight from January through June 1955. The writer was appointed college library consultant for the six months' trial, in part because it was felt that a librarian who had served on the college library sub-committee might be better equipped to move quickly and to evaluate the potentialities of the job.

The work of the consultant tended to fall into three areas: a study of the State Library in terms of its capacity to support college libraries, visitations to colleges, and research into as many aspects of college and college library needs as was possible. All activities had to be carried on concurrently as the time was so short, and much that was set in motion could not be completed in the time allowed.

The study of the State Library indicated that its collections could, with relatively little extension, serve many college library needs insofar as it was then possible to pin-point those needs. The primary difficulties faced by the State Library lay in the areas of services. The staff were already overloaded in many areas, hence interlibrary loan service was cumbersome and very slow. The short-title catalog was in preparation, but in general the college librarians throughout the state had no clue to the availability of material in the State Library except from general descriptions of its strengths and weaknesses. Because of a lack of manpower and money, the library was severely handicapped in its efforts to produce photocopies of its holdings. Its gifts and exchange staff was too small for the regular load, and without more information from the field and more money and personnel within the library, no development of an exchange program for college libraries could be handled. Certain pilot schemes worked well. They indicated that the State Library could serve lesser libraries with great effectiveness if supported adequately. A typical instance involved a term-long loan of art books to a junior college where a new course was on trial. The books were used intensively but carefully in the junior college. There were two by-products of this assistance: the college decided to retain the course in its program, which it probably might not have done without the temporary enrichment of its library, and the college started its own acquisitions program in art with real evidence of the value and usefulness of specific titles.

Other instances of the State Library's successful help include relations with colleges in the Albany area. Among the working schemes is one involving messenger service which circles from one to another of the local colleges and the State Library, making prompt borrowing feasible. The State Library has the will to serve, and its officers are creative and responsive. They need the evidence that can probably be supplied only through the agency of a permanent college library consultant if they are to obtain staff, space, equipment, and funds to supply excellent service to New York State college libraries.

The visits to colleges were made only on the invitation of the institution. The college library sub-committee's recommendation was that advisory services be offered, as the position would lose in usefulness if it became authoritarian. About thirty-five excursions were made to colleges, some lasting two or three days. The consultant usually met with the president, dean, and faculty members as well as with the librarians, and discussion was informal in all cases. The aim of the

Cooperation Among Colleges

consultant was to explore the situation of the particular college and its library, to give factual information or to undertake to supply it later, to advise on policies and procedures and to listen. In many ways, the chance to discuss their problems and ideas with an interested and relatively expert outsider served as a sort of therapy; by trying to make matters clear to the consultant, the officers and librarians often clarified their own aims and found their own solutions. Other visits were undertaken as a part of a team from the office of the associate or assistant commissioner. These were more formal, but again the most fruitful results came from advisory and informational services. College presidents and librarians expressed great interest in having the position of college library consultant made permanent.

The third area of activity of the consultant was the amassing of data on colleges and their libraries, and of all sorts of information relevant to library developments elsewhere. It also included some original research on library problems, with special reference to cooperative possibilities, building and equipment, collection development, and staff betterment.

As of July, 1957, the position is about to be established on a permanent base; it has taken two years to get budget authorization and to find suitable candidates.

The way in which the new college library consultant will operate will depend very largely on his personal approach to the job. Purposely no formal job-description was made, because the individual must be free to exploit every avenue which might lead to improvement of the individual libraries and of the academic library picture as a whole.

The report of the sub-committee on the college library was essentially a plan, and as such is still sound. Its major recommendations are the enrichment of the State Library so that it can effectively extend its resources and services to college libraries of the state, and the creation of the position of college library consultant as the moving force and liaison officer in stimulating and coordinating library development. With the institution of the permanent consultant in 1957-58, real progress can be made on the state-wide college library problem.

The College of Seminary Library, Naperville, Illinois. Some smaller colleges, located close to each other, but differing in government, purposes and size, may feel that joint operations are too complicated to be feasible. They might take heart, however, from one known instance where cooperation between very different institutions has

gone the whole way—one building, an amalgamated collection, a central staff.

Two higher institutions in Naperville, Illinois, have joined forces to create a joint library.⁷ They are the Evangelical Theological Seminary and North Central College. The former is a graduate professional school of about 150 students, and the latter is a liberal arts, coeducational institution with an enrollment of about 800 students. Both are affiliated with the Evangelical United Brethren Church, though each has its own Board of Trustees and is separately administered.

Apparently the Seminary was the first to feel the sharp pinch of need for library quarters and staff. Across the street, the college was planning to build additional science laboratories. After due consideration by both institutions, it was decided to build one library to serve both groups, and to convert the old library of the college into laboratories.

In 1954 a handsome new joint library was dedicated, with a common administration and service center, and with distinct book and reading wings for the college and the seminary. Articles of Incorporation were patterned after those of the Joint University Libraries at Nashville. Ownership is vested in the College and Seminary Library, Incorporated, which has its own Board of Trustees. This Board is composed of nine members, four from the group elected by the Trustees of the college, three by the Trustees of the seminary, plus the presidents of the two institutions.

The Board has at least three committees: Executive, Finance, and an Advisory Committee consisting of three faculty members of the college, two faculty members of the seminary, and the presidents. The director of the library is responsible to the Executive Committee. All books previously owned by a constituent institution remain vested in that institution, unless transferred to the College and Seminary Library, Incorporated. Books acquired after the act of incorporation are the property of the College and Seminary Library, Incorporated. The Board of Trustees of the library annually determines the sum which each institution shall be requested to contribute to operate the common library.

When the libraries were amalgamated, the college owned about 40,000 volumes and the seminary 18,000. The capacity of the building is 140,000 volumes. It seats 340 readers. When the money was raised for the building, an additional amount was procured to become an endowment which yields an annual income used for the support of

Cooperation Among Colleges

the library. A staff including four professional librarians serves the total constituency, and according to the librarian, the unified library is efficient, economical, and satisfactory to all concerned.

The North Texas Project. Seven libraries in the North Texas region, with a bookstock in 1943 of 810,000 volumes, and all within an hour's driving distance of each other, joined forces in late 1942 to see what could be done cooperatively to better their holdings and services.⁸ A. F. Kuhlman, director of the Joint University Libraries at Nashville, surveyed the situation and recommended: the organization of the North Texas regional libraries with a coordinator or director; the mimeographing of a union list of serials; the expansion of the serial resources through planned, cooperative purchasing; cooperative acquisition of additional reference and bibliographic tools; a regional program for collection of government documents, newspapers, and manuscript collections; a union catalog of books; proper financial support; systematic planning for the strengthening of library resources; and local coordination of libraries.

As reported in the January, 1949, issue of *College and Research Libraries*, two of the recommendations had been put into effect: the mimeographing of a union list of serials, and the expansion of the serial resources through planned, cooperative purchasing. At a meeting of all the libraries represented in the North Texas Regional Union List of Serials, held in the fall of 1953, it was decided to discontinue the project as various libraries had already withdrawn. The recommendation was made that at some future date a new project be brought into being if means of support could be found.

The St. Paul Project. Since 1951, four colleges in St. Paul, Minnesota, have been involved in a cooperative project.⁹ These colleges are Hamline University, Macalester College, the College of St. Catherine and the College of St. Thomas. All are liberal arts institutions. Two are coeducational, one is for men and one for women. At the time of the start of their venture, their collections averaged about 65,000 volumes.

Like many cooperative schemes, this one started extremely informally and has progressed to a more sophisticated program. The first meetings of the librarians of these colleges were discussions of specific problems and an interchange of helpful information concerning dealers, binders, and the like. Somewhat later, the librarians turned their attention to the periodicals problems which faced them all, and out of this consideration developed a project for a union list of periodical

holdings. This first list was primarily a finding list and was valuable in terms of interlibrary usage.

In April, 1952, a new venture called the Inter-College-Hill Reference Library Project was started. A grant of \$2,500 was made by the Trustees of the Hill Family Foundation to finance a survey of the libraries and an exploration of various ideas for developing a cooperative college library project that would include not only these four college libraries but the James Jerome Hill Reference Library in St. Paul. This survey was also made by Kuhlman. Two major library projects have resulted thus far from the Kuhlman report. They are the union list, *Periodical Holdings in Eight Minnesota Libraries*, and the dextrigraphed catalog of the holdings of the Hill Reference Library. The union list of periodicals includes not only the holdings of the four original libraries, but those of Carleton College and St. Olaf College in Northfield, Minnesota, which is close to St. Paul. It includes also the holdings of the Hill Reference Library and the St. Paul Public Library. These last two libraries are housed in conjoined buildings. According to Harold Hughesdon and Gertrude Costello the resulting list is more than a finding list. It is intended to serve as a guide in planning cooperative storage, the selection of new titles, the exchange of holdings, and the discarding of duplicates. Contrary to what might have been expected, the first half of the list showed that more than one-third of the titles were currently received in only one of the St. Paul libraries. In short, the diversity of titles among the libraries was greater than one might have expected, and hence the list has increased value. Now that the list has been completed, the plan is to consolidate holdings by transferring or depositing both complete and partial sets in the library in which they will be most useful.

The grant also financed the other major library project, the dextrigraphed classed catalog of the Hill Reference Library. A copy of this catalog has been placed in each of the four St. Paul college libraries and in the St. Paul Public Library. It is hoped that this catalog, available to faculty and students in each institution, will make for better book selection and will provide better facilities for locating materials in the area. It is still too soon to report on the success of this venture.

Honnold Library: The Associated Colleges at Claremont. The Honnold Library serves as the central library for five colleges: Pomona College, Claremont Men's College, Claremont Graduate School, Harvey Mudd College, and Scripps College.¹⁰ The staff also has charge of and services five science libraries on the Pomona College

Cooperation Among Colleges

campus; the science materials for the other colleges are in Honnold. Scripps College, in addition to contributing to the support of the Honnold Library, maintains its own library although all cataloging, ordering, binding, and interlibrary loans for that library are handled in Honnold by the Honnold staff.

The expenses are divided into two categories: (1) joint service costs (cataloging, ordering, binding, and interlibrary loans), and (2) public service costs (circulation, reference, reserve room, documents, rare books, periodicals). The costs of joint services are assessed in proportion to the amount of work done for a college—books cataloged, ordered, and bound for that college. The costs of public service are assessed according to the number of students and faculty members in the particular college. Library service for the California Theological Seminary, which is not a member of the Associated Colleges, will be sold to that institution at \$25 per student or faculty member.

On the favorable side, it is safe to say that the five colleges are getting better library resources and services as a group than they could possibly afford separately. The library has served as a unifying force for the colleges.

On the unfavorable side, it is possible that the colleges have lost, in some degree, the small college atmosphere they have sought to maintain, because of having one single and relatively large library. In any difficulty arising between the students or faculty of any college on the one hand and the library on the other, the college administration in question is apt to take the view of its students or faculty members. To offset this, the other college administrations will be able to view the situation quite impartially and the library will frequently gain support from the other administrations. This situation has its undesirable features. It is necessary to bear in mind that any friction between the colleges will be bad for the joint library, and the library should avoid being the cause of it. To prevent problems from arising which may become administrative matters, and to avoid seeming to favor one college above another, is often difficult.

As the collection is used by all members of all colleges, the system of assessing each college for the number of books bought and processed at its request may be basically inequitable. In effect, it tends to penalize that college which seeks most strenuously to improve the book collection.

The Hampshire Inter-Library Center. The Hampshire Inter-Library Center is operated by a group of college libraries that are distinctly

atypical. All are old libraries with large and unusually rich holdings. The curricula they serve are enough alike to provide, in general, a common base for acquisitions, yet the emphases in each college differ sufficiently to make consolidation of some holdings feasible. Smaller college libraries can learn much from a study of the literature concerning H.I.L.C. because that literature is explicit about the difficulties to be encountered as well as the extent and kind of gain to be expected. Implicit in the development of H.I.L.C., however, is the assumption that the first obligation of each participating library is to supply commonly needed materials in each library, and to share only those items which are less in demand. Until small colleges, no matter how convenient their physical relation to each other, can be sure they are meeting their local obligation, there may be little left-over money or manpower to launch and maintain any major cooperative scheme.

From the number of times that its pattern has been imitated, it is obvious that the Joint University Libraries at Nashville is a successful prototype of cooperative effort. Detailed consideration of this project belongs in the university library context, but its principles apply in a college context as well. Again the literature is available and plentiful on this well-established operation. The example of the Joint University Libraries should help institutions that are adjacent but different in type of control to overcome the technical difficulties of joint action where the gains of such action would be significant.

In summary, it seems fairly clear that the typical academic library on the college level is isolated. It is limited in funds, collection, and manpower. It is in need of the kind of support that might come from larger cooperative efforts rather than a tit-for-tat collaboration with one or two other small libraries. Large units of service, such as states or regions, may be slow to develop, but offer the advantages of know-how and greater resources of all sorts. Characteristically there are few satisfactory instances of worth-while cooperation among the lesser libraries, at least there are few reported instances of successful cooperation. Perhaps there would be more were there more publicity given to those which a diligent search of the literature failed to identify. Lest this seem too gloomy an account, final emphasis should not be limited to the obstacles but placed squarely on the benefits to be derived. There is need for objectivity, but even more there is need for imagination, courage, and the will to explore new ideas.

Cooperation Among Colleges

References

1. Irwin, Mary, ed.: *American Universities and Colleges*. 7th ed. Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1956, p. 32.
2. Bentz, D. M., et al.: College and University Library Statistics, 1955/56. *College and Research Libraries*, 18:48-79, Jan. 1957.
3. Metcalf, K. D.: *The Hampshire Inter-Library Center; A Survey of Its Background and Its Problems with Recommendations for the Future*. South Hadley, The Hampshire Inter-Library Center, 1957.
4. Ohio College Association. *Transactions of the 86th Annual Meeting*. Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, April 5-6, 1957.
5. New York State University. Regents' Committee on Integration of College and University Library Resources in New York State. *A Plan for Meeting College Library Problems*. Albany, University of the State of New York, State Education Department, 1954, p. 4.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
7. Orth, Gustave, and Kraemer, Ruth: Co-operative Venture, *Library Journal*, 79:2371-2374, Dec. 15, 1954.
8. Sampley, A. M.: Five Years of Library Cooperation in the North Texas Region. *College and Research Libraries*, 10:24-26, Jan. 1949.
9. Hughesdon, Harold, and Costello, Gertrude: An Experiment in Cooperation, *A.L.A. Bulletin*, 51:129-133, Feb. 1957.
10. Davies, D. W.: Letter to Eileen Thornton dated July 19, 1957.