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Introduction

LORENA A. GARLOCH

For many years the librarians in urban universities have been struggling with problems brought about by the uniqueness of their locations in urban areas. Not until the Washington Conference in 1959, however, did a group of urban university librarians formally organize as a committee of the University Section of A.C.R.L. This committee had a program at the Montreal Conference in 1960, an open meeting under the auspices of the University Section at the Cleveland meeting in 1961, and are now presenting the unique features of their problems in an issue of Library Trends.

Birenbaum's article is an introduction to the atmosphere of city life with its urbacultural complexities. These complexities extend into the university, into university libraries, and affect the men and women who are librarians in these urban institutions of higher learning.

Grazier in his “Development of the Urban University Library” gives amazing statistics on the growth of the urban university library. But the truly interesting point brought forth so strongly in his story of the development of the urban university library is the question of the future part which this type of library should play in the continued growth of the university: “Should it lend its resources and services to the cause of the good urban society?”

The clientele of the urban university library reaches far beyond the faculty and university students themselves, and it is the problems of this diversified clientele—high school students, alumni, business and industry—which are dwelt upon by Hardin Craig, Jr., and Richard Perrine of Rice University, by Donald T. Smith of Boston University, and by Natalie Nicholson of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The public librarian of the metropolitan area of Miami, Florida, states that “The American Public Library is there for whoever will use it.” However, he realizes that the American college student has

Miss Garloch is University Librarian at the University of Pittsburgh.
greatly increased the problems of public libraries and that the public
and university librarian must work together for common solutions.

Robert Talmadge and Roy Kidman of Tulane University in New
Orleans discuss the nonresident student, the student so common to
the urban university. He may work part-time; he may work full-time;
he may commute. Questionnaires were sent to 38 urban universities,
and the answers were so different that few generalizations could be
made. This result confirms the realization that the problems of urban
universities are even greater than they seem to the casual observer.
The state, the region, the city, and the type of university, whether it
be municipal, state, or private, all affect the type of student body.

Haas has presented statistics for the New York metropolitan area
which might appear pertinent only to the unique area of New York
City and not applicable elsewhere. And yet, a closer reading of the
article reveals that to a lesser degree the same general findings would,
in all probability, apply to Los Angeles, Chicago, Boston, or Pitts-
burgh.

The off-campus unit has become a powerful force in the urban uni-
versity. The University of Chicago, the University of Illinois and
Northwestern University have three such units in the city of Chicago.
Rutgers University, located in New Brunswick, New Jersey, a city of
some 40,000 persons, has its off-campus unit at Newark is in a much
more heavily populated area than that of the parent institution.
Newark has a population of almost 406,000. Off-campus units in urban
areas have a rugged path, for they are too far away from the parent
institution to utilize the main library. Because they are in an urban
area, there is a great tendency to allow them to be dependent upon
the public library, upon the libraries of other educational institutions
in the community, or even upon special libraries.

In the great population centers with clusters of institutions of higher
learning it would be natural to try to establish a program for coopera-
tive purchasing among those institutions. In Pittsburgh the feeling
of cooperation was at one time exceedingly high. The public library,
the university libraries, the college libraries, and the special libraries
worked together to promote cooperation. In spite of promotion, will-
ingness, and pilot projects, efforts directed toward cooperative pur-
chasing could not be termed completely successful. Where and how
the plan fell short, Miss Moore attempts to explain. Even without
total success the Pittsburgh project is worthy of study because where
one area has fallen short another may succeed.
Introduction

And what of the future demands upon the urban university libraries? Everett Moore of California makes pronouncements. All types of libraries must become knowledgeable of each other in respect to services, books, and personnel. As time goes on, the libraries at urban universities will be in greater and greater demand, not only with the student, but with the public, with industry, and with business. It will only be through the greatest cooperative effort with all libraries that these urban university libraries may continue to be useful and productive.

This issue of Library Trends ends with a short article on recruiting by the chairman of the recruiting committee of the Pennsylvania Library Association. The urban area is a fertile field for recruitment in any profession. Unfortunately, librarians have come nowhere near to realizing its full potential.

Urban areas are under constant study. Such recent books as Jane Jacobs's The Death and Life of Great Cities, James B. Conant's Slums and Suburbs, and Jean Gottmann's Megalopolis, evidence this great interest. The city is emerging as an area of extreme controversy—should there be a central city; is migration to the suburbs permanent? The whole span of urban life presents problems which have not been solved. But they are being studied, and answers to some of them are unfolding. The urban university, too, is changing just as completely as is the city. And like its parent institution, the university library is undergoing change. How and to what extent, and the nature of the relationships involved, the contributors to this issue of Library Trends have tried to assess. Like the city itself, the problems of urban university libraries are being studied, and answers to some of them may be unfolding.
The Urbacultural Opportunity

WILLIAM BIRENBAUM

The urbanization of this country follows inevitably from the flowering of science and technology. Industrialization is the handmaiden of the global growth of population. Affluence merely underscores the potential of urban life. The economic and cultural maturation of the nations of the world will accelerate the rate of city growth. The American experiment from this century forward will occur in cities. What is done now with and in our cities will help to shape the future planetary pattern of human life.

The quest for the Good Life by men living together has always involved a struggle between men and their environment, which includes fellow men. Two out of three Americans now reside in defined metropolitan areas; the question is whether or not the Good Life is possible among a people whose society is rapidly becoming citified. It is far more realistic to ask this question than to indulge in the nostalgia and myth surrounding the legendary log cabin, the covered wagon, or the rural town. The flight to suburbia, the decay of the central cities, and the disintegration of community life are symptoms of intellectual crises as well as of physical and technological problems. It is doubtful that life in the legendary log cabin, the covered wagon, or the village in which the town hall flourished was more conducive to democracy, equality, cultural attainment, and physical or material ease than is life in the slums of the great cities or in the sprawling suburbs surrounding them. In any event, the agricultural epoch has passed. This country is now an urbacultural nation.

The tremendous complexity of our urban life has created deep frustrations among leaders in all pursuits. The reaction to the frustrations has two basic expressions: deep concern with the technological and

Mr. Birenbaum is Dean of the New School for Social Research, New York City. This article was a speech given before the University Library Section of A.C.R.L. at the annual convention of the American Library Association, July 13, 1961, Cleveland, Ohio.
economic ramifications of the complexity and a dangerously extensive devotion of leadership talent to highly specialized urban pursuits.

It may be assumed that an attack upon the problems of poverty, health, slums, urban design, traffic control, air pollution, and government organization is a condition precedent to the realization of the Good Life among the people. Consequently, chambers of commerce, industrial relocation boards, housing and traffic control authorities, governmental study commissions, tax reform groups, urban planning committees and welfare agencies abound. The administrators of these agencies are influential in the formulation and expression of the urban issues. Onto their boards are channeled the talents of the most powerful leaders of industry, commerce, and the professions. These agencies compete among themselves for the public's attention and money. Each acquires its own mystique as well as its own staff and technique. Each develops its own jargon. Finally, the effectiveness of leadership in each comes to depend upon the skillful manipulation of the special technology and the jargon, and the acquisition of highly specialized skills.

The assumption that improved health, the greater consumption of goods, the expansion of physical comfort, and the promotion of more efficient government are conditions precedent to the enjoyment of the Good Life is not uniquely American. These ends are primary aspirations shared by Russians, Africans, Cubans, and Indians. What is unique here is the almost unqualified scope and influence of the assumption, notwithstanding the other value pretensions of American society. One may ask how a healthier, more comfortable, and more efficiently governed mankind will differ from the societies imagined by Messrs. Huxley and Orwell. Should those urban institutions charged with a special intellectual and cultural responsibility do something different in 1984 from what they do now?

Faith in the application of technology and the manipulation of the economic is doubtful at that point where it begins to preclude a concern with and an attack upon the intellectual and spiritual complexities generated by the urban environment. At that point, the paradoxes of the cultural environment become apparent. At that point, one may observe citizens who do not have enough food to eat and university presidents who do not have enough time to think; one may encounter poverty-ridden citizens who lack the energy and the impulse to read well, and keepers of the storehouses of our knowledge who are not well read. Amidst such paradoxes the American conception of free-
dom may become meaningless, and the city may return to its primitive functions—the physical protection of the tribe and the facilitation of an exchange of products.

Parallel to the growth of urban complexity and related to it is the fantastic accretion of what one professes to know. As the sheer bulk of what is known doubles with each decade, it is increasingly difficult to distill droplets of human wisdom from the swelling sea of human knowledge. In each city, on each campus, for each thoughtful man, the explosion of new facts and printed symbols dwarfs in importance even the spectacular population explosion of university students, museum visitors, and library users. The growth of knowledge threatens to do to the city of man's intellect what the dramatic growth of population is doing to the city of men. In one case the resulting slums and congestion stunt human life; in the other the mind and the spirit are debilitated.

Urban-cultural complexity naturally leads one to admire the simplicity of the agricultural past. In the biological world the simplest organisms languish in the slime. The complex organisms display the greatest aptitude for the successful struggle with environment. Man's rank in the hierarchy of living things depends upon his superior complexity. Complexity in environment stimulates and agitates those qualities in a species most critical to its survival. In the case of man, his mind is tried. Increased complexity and growing rationality are two sides to the same coin. The introduction of order into environment is the natural thrust of the intellect. Order cannot be equated with simplicity nor is chaos a natural function of complexity. The new urban order is destined to be complex. The challenge to urban cultural and intellectual institutions is bound to be more complex.

Urban life is the challenge of creating complex order out of simple chaos. Intellectuality is the process of transforming specializations into wise generalizations. The creation of complex social order out of simple urban chaos is an intellectual task. The cultural and academic institutions in the city stand on this free society's intellectual frontier.

The challenge to the university in the city is unique. The difficult problems of urban life do not conform with the way most universities are organized. Most universities are organized the way known knowledge is classified, by disciplines. The difficult problems of urban life disregard these classifications. These urban problems no longer revolve basically around training men to make livelihoods or around up-dating professionals who once were exposed to a higher
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education. The difficult problems arise in the realm of each citizen's public associations with his fellows—in the areas of public philosophy, government policy, cultural quality, and men's views generally regarding their relationships to God, the state, and their nonoccupational connections to each other.

Among the issues arising from these categories are the public responsibilities of the mass media, gerontology, juvenile delinquency, the popularization of culture, the question of religious affiliation in public life, the plight of the Negro in American life, the conduct of our government with regard to the Cuban revolution, and peace. Each of these issues comes to a peculiar focus in the urban arena, for no one of these problems can be approached successfully without the mobilization of the talents and power uniquely present in the cities.

In a very real sense the urgent and most interesting urban issues are controversial, and the really significant issues are those which draw men out of their occupational slots into public arenas where their conduct will be governed by knowledge and experience unrelated to the know-how they possess as wage earners. A city can almost be diagrammed and defined in terms of the sheer number of public controversies among a given population living in proximity, the variety of opportunities for individuals to participate in these controversies, and the general tone of the population which encourages or discourages engagement in the public life and controversy. If one uses this measure it is clear why most suburbs and the rural town could never be classified as cities. Both the bulk and the configuration of power in the true city are different.

The university institution, as it confronts the uniqueness of city complexity, is often inept and ill-equipped. The assumption is frequently made that the university can simultaneously be neutral, catalytic, and intellectual; that fire, oil, and water can mix. A catalyst is by its nature not neutral. It is a force which releases energy in a given direction. The fruits of the intellect are never neutral, particularly when the fruits are eaten by those sitting at the table of public action. The university is seriously weakened by the over-extension of the fiction of its neutrality. Universities in most societies, but particularly in American society, are social institutions and social forces.

The difficulty of the city problems is not only that they demand the application of specialized knowledge, but that they desperately require wise generalization. So long as the universities regard themselves as loose confederations of specialized disciplines, served by
men whose stations depend only upon the refinement of their special knowledge, the universities will provide technical services rather than intellectual leadership in the urban arena.

Moreover, it is a mistake to assume that the universities are always the best reservoirs of our knowledge, know-how, and wisdom. In many cities, public library systems, for example, are more extensive and accessible compendiums of knowledge than universities. Many urban art museums possess both scholars and treasures superior to those possessed by universities. Practicing politicians often display far greater wisdom than practicing political scientists. Throughout American society—particularly in the urban politics—many institutions other than universities provide laboratories and workrooms for some of the nation's keenest minds. The growing position of the intellectual in the working community is one of the more exciting developments in American history. But their rise to leadership in nonacademic institutions does present a special problem to the universities as they advance their pretensions. Beyond the universities one need only look to the Pentagon, Solidarity House, the Rand Corporation, the Committee on Economic Development, or the General Motors Technical Center to grasp the competitive point. However, even the more traditional realms of scholarship, the Institute for Advanced Studies, the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, or the growing influence of the great private foundations accent the stresses upon the universities' claims to fame.

The unique opportunity of the university in the American city is to be found in the way it works to restore the integrity of urban life, of man as he lives and works among and with his fellows in cities. To confront this opportunity the universities must first come to grips with the threats to their own wholeness—the over-specialization of their own parts; the breakdown of connections within the humanities, the social sciences, and even the sciences, as well as the obvious gulls separating these categories from each other. To discover the integrity of life in an urban society, the universities must reconsider the problem of their own integrity. This is essentially an intellectual problem—in many ways, the intellectual problem.

The library should be one of the common denominators of the way a university is and of what it aspires to be. From his ground the librarian should enjoy the best view of the whole. Indeed, he, better than most, should be able at least to describe the whole. But like most of the rest, librarians have sought their status in the mastery
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of techniques. Too often they retreat into the perfection of the doing, rather than facing up to the more difficult and troublesome problems of the basic causes of the complexity of what they do.

The rationale and spirit of an institution finally turn upon the reason and spirit of the men who lead it. Men shape the varying character and morale of different cities. Just as the integrity of our cities may be defined through the restoration of the wholeness of the academic institutions in them, so the wholeness of the academic institutions is contingent upon the leadership of whole men.
The Development of the Urban University Library

ROBERT T. GRAZIER

Persons or institutions form a committee, found an association, or publish a journal to solve problems or at least to share in the frustration of failing to solve problems. There is no better index to the woes of librarianship than the list of associations, divisions, sections, committees, round tables, institutes, and groups in the annual organizational issue of the ALA Bulletin. Despite this impressive roster, urban university librarians have lagged behind their presidents in turning to group therapy. In November 1914 the Association of Urban Universities was formed to promote the study of problems of particular interest to urban universities. It was 43 years later that an informal committee of university librarians met for the first time to chat about their particular problems—some of which are set forth in this issue of Library Trends to edify and instruct their professional colleagues.

Why this late flowering of metropolitan library concerns? Certainly some of the elements of some of the problems discussed in this issue have been a part and parcel of the milieu of the red-brick university. Like the city's poor, the alumnus, the high school student, and the man in the street have always been with us. (True, there are more of each than there were a generation ago, but by definition any metropolis has a great many of them.) Commerce and finance have always congregated in the city, and most communities could boast of a public library before they had a university.

It seems plausible that changes in the urban university library and its environs are producing a cultural and instructional resource that attracts the attention of the alumnus, the high school student, the merchant, and the engineer. It is possible that in some cities the urban university library may begin to rival the public library in its resources
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and, if available to the community, will be called upon to serve a clientele which may range far beyond the sidewalks of the campus. It may be possible that the more sophisticated users of informational sources in the metropolitan area may see the urban university library as a source to supplement the public library in meeting their professional and intellectual demands.

"Urban university" is a loose term. Usually it refers to an institution of higher education, located in a large city, enrolling large numbers of students, most of whom commute and many of whom work full-time and go to school part-time. Terms such as "large city" and "many students" are too imprecise to produce a very exclusive classification. Some urban universities are pure examples of the breed; others are hybrids. The Association of Urban Universities, for example, includes state universities, technical schools, denominational institutions, and such typically large privately controlled urban universities as New York University and Temple. Its membership ranges from Harvard to Little Rock.

The libraries of these institutions reflect such variety that statements about the genus must be treated with the customary precautions applicable to most generalizations. Since book stock and book expenditures are conventional measures of library growth and vigor, these items were inspected for a selected group of urban university libraries. Three criteria were used in choosing the sample. First, the institution had to be a member of the Association of Urban Universities. Second, it had to be included in group one or group two of "Universities of Large Institutions of Complex Organization" in the annual Walters' survey, "Statistics of Attendance in American Universities and Colleges, 1960-61." Third, it had to be located in a standard metropolitan statistical area which had a "central city" with a population of at least 100,000. This screening produced a group of forty urban universities, slightly less than half of the eighty-four members of the Association of Urban Universities. The institutions within the sample differ considerably in terms of size of the community, enrollments, type of control, age, and prestige, but are likely to be as typical as any sample unless it is one deliberately drawn to obtain a more homogeneous group. Three of the universities are in cities with a population of 100,000-249,000; eleven in cities of 250,000-499,000; twelve in cities of 500,000-999,000; fourteen in cities of 1,000,000 or more. Eleven are publicly controlled; twenty-nine are privately controlled. Their enrollments range from approximately 2,200 to 41,000.
In three decades the combined holdings of these urban libraries more than quadrupled, and the median figure for the group in 1959-60 was more than seven times the median in 1929-30 (Table I). In 1929-30 the median library spent an estimated $8,025 for library materials; in 1959-60, $60,495.

The improvement of urban university libraries in three decades is more impressive than a comparison of their current status with that of the libraries of several other groups of large universities. Table II compares the urban group with the admittedly prestigious members of the Association of American Universities.

This table underscores the bibliographical poverty of the urban university. The A.A.U. libraries boast three times as many books and spend four times as much for more books. Urban universities have the students, but they do not have the libraries. The urban group receives a larger share of the institutional budget but the urban university's pocketbook is not as fat as that of its more affluent and better established cousin. The comparison of expenditures per student and library expenditures as a percentage of the institutional budget dem-

---

**TABLE I**

**Volumes in Urban University Libraries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1929–30</th>
<th>1959–60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,841,317</td>
<td>16,637,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>47,800</td>
<td>347,131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**TABLE II**

*Comparative Statistics of Urban Universities and Members of Association of American Universities, 1959-60*

(Data are for the median institution in each item.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Library Expenditure as Ratio of Institutional Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad. Grad. Total</td>
<td>Volumes in Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Univ. Assn. of Amer. Univ.</td>
<td>347,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Univ. Assn. of Amer. Univ.</td>
<td>11,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE III
Library Statistics, Urban Universities and Class I Institutions,
(Data are for the median institution.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Volumes in Collection</th>
<th>Expenditure for Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Universities</td>
<td>332,172</td>
<td>59,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class 1, CRL Institutions</td>
<td>469,877</td>
<td>106,558</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III demonstrates how foolish the 5 per cent ratio is as a library standard. What counts is the size of the slice, not its relationship to the size of the pie.

Table III compares the urban university libraries with the Class I institutions which report statistics to *College and Research Libraries*. This is a large and heterogeneous group of 116 institutions and consequently represents a broader cross-section of American universities than the highly selective Association of American Universities.

These simple comparisons offer some perspective on the caliber of urban university libraries. The question, however, is not whether the urban university library still lags behind its campus cousin, but whether it has become a cultural potential for its own community. The urban university library need not be a Widener in order to attract non-university clientele.

The last thirty years have produced significant changes in the comparative size of the book collections of the urban public and university libraries (Tables IV, V).

In 1930 the public libraries had five times the number of volumes that the urban university libraries had; by 1960, only two and half times the number. As a whole, the public libraries’ collection doubled in this thirty-year span; university libraries’ collection quadrupled. For the fourteen cities in Classes I and II, the university libraries’ collection in 1959-60 surpassed that which the public libraries had in 1929-30. In 1929 the entire group of urban university libraries had about two million fewer volumes than the fourteen public libraries in the Class III cities; in 1959-60, they had three million more. Both types of libraries have grown more rapidly in Class II cities, but the rate of growth of the university library has been spectacularly faster than that of the public library. In 1929-30 the median size of the university
library collection was 47,800 volumes; in 1959-60, 347,131. For the public library it was 343,736 in 1929-30; in 1959-60, 847,312.

Expenditures for materials by the public and university libraries show the same trend as book stocks.\(^5\) Public libraries still spend considerably more for books than do the university libraries, but their rate of growth is less impressive (Tables VI, VII). Only in Class IV cities has the rate of increase in expenditures for materials kept pace with that of the university libraries; in all other classes the university rate is significantly higher. The university libraries spent more for books in 1959-60 than the public libraries did in 1940-41. Material

TABLE V

Comparative Growth of Book Collections of Public and University Libraries in Selected Cities

\(1929-30 = 100\)
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TABLE VI
Expenditures for Library Materials by Public and University Libraries in Selected Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of City</th>
<th>1940-41 Public</th>
<th>1940-41 University</th>
<th>1959-60 Public</th>
<th>1959-60 University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I (100-249,000)</td>
<td>77,523</td>
<td>28,066</td>
<td>199,676</td>
<td>192,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II (250-499,000)</td>
<td>382,841</td>
<td>125,926</td>
<td>1,243,244</td>
<td>582,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III (500-999,000)</td>
<td>762,710</td>
<td>216,309</td>
<td>2,094,267</td>
<td>1,101,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV (1,000,000+)</td>
<td>1,296,289</td>
<td>376,152</td>
<td>4,502,119</td>
<td>1,302,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,519,363</td>
<td>746,453</td>
<td>8,039,315</td>
<td>3,179,390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of Cases: Forty university libraries and thirty-two public libraries in thirty cities.

Expenditures for the median university library in 1959-60 were $60,495. For the public library in 1940-41, they were $48,288. In the Class I cities the current difference is negligible.

Insomuch as the quality of a library may be measured in total volumes and expenditures for materials, it would seem that the urban university library of today at least equals the metropolitan public library of thirty years ago. In reality, the university library of today is probably a much better informational source than the public library three decades ago. Public libraries with their branch systems duplicate so much more heavily for popular titles in fiction and nonfiction that a university library of 300,000 volumes is a more significant collection than a public library of the same size.

Libraries, like art galleries and historical museums, are structure

TABLE VII
Comparative Expenditures for Library Materials by Public and University Libraries in Selected Cities

(1940-41 = 100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of City</th>
<th>1940-41 Public</th>
<th>1940-41 University</th>
<th>1959-60 Public</th>
<th>1959-60 University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I (100-249,000)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>257.6</td>
<td>687.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II (250-499,000)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>325.4</td>
<td>462.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III (500-999,000)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>274.8</td>
<td>539.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV (1,000,000+)</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>347.4</td>
<td>446.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All libraries in sample</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>319.1</td>
<td>426.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as well as content, form as well as function. Their public image is likely to be determined as much by their architecture as by their book collections. When the urban university squeezes its library into a few rooms on the third floor of the Administration Building, the citizen scholar does not intrude. Frequently the students do not either. If the same collection is placed in a new multimillion dollar building it will attract attention.

In the last decade the urban university has put out a tidy sum for new library buildings. Between 1950 and 1960, fourteen of the institutions in this sample had erected either new libraries or major additions to existing plants at a total cost of something between 33 and 35 million dollars. Even red-brick construction is not cheap. Six of the buildings cost over $3,000,000, and only one less than one million. Over half of them provided enough space to house a half million volumes or more. The sixties promise as much or even more of a building boom in urban university libraries. Eight of the forty have built or have had construction authorized since January 1960. Six other libraries are in the planning stage. Within a year or so, over half the libraries will have built new plants since 1950 with space for approximately ten million volumes.

Perhaps more pertinent to the ultimate role of the urban university library than its own physical rehabilitation are the ongoing plans and blueprints for the physical development of the university itself. The plight of the American city has imperiled dozens of urban universities. Decay and blight, especially within the last two decades, have forced the universities to join the battle to restore the "central city." While some of the urban universities are comfortably ensconced in relatively stable residential areas, a goodly number are in the midst of cultural and civic centers or have joined with municipal and federal agencies to rehabilitate their blighted surroundings into such civic and cultural centers. Fortunately, recent federal legislation has broadened the concept of urban renewal to include the needs of institutions of higher learning and numerous universities have planned, or are planning, substantial renewal projects which blueprint the university as a major component in metropolitan cultural areas or civic centers. (It seems quite possible that as the land-grant university was founded to serve a farm economy and has gained stature in developing rural America, so may the urban university play a similar part in civilizing urban America.) Programs and scale models of such developments frequently include research parks and low-rise and high-rise residen-
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tial units for the faculty and professional staffs of the museums, institutes, galleries, and schools of University City.

Such developments exist beyond the blueprints of university architects and the technical reports of city planning commissions. The University Circle cultural center in Cleveland, Ohio, is a full-blown example. The cultural center is composed of institutions such as Western Reserve University, Case Institute of Technology, the Musical Art Association, the Cleveland Art Museum, the Western Reserve Historical Society, the Cleveland Institute of Music, the Cleveland Institute of Art, the Cleveland Museum of Natural History, Mt. Sinai Hospital, and the Academy of Music. A recent directory of the institutions in the Cleveland development listed fifty libraries in a one-mile radius of University Circle. The University of Kansas City is surrounded by the Nelson-Atkins Gallery of Art, the Memorial Medical Center, Rockhurst College, the Medical Research Institute, the Kansas City Art Institute, and the Linda Hall Library of Science and Technology. Within one city block of Wayne State University in Detroit are the Detroit Public Library, the Detroit Historical Museum, the Detroit Institute of Art, University of Michigan Extension Center, the headquarters of the Detroit Board of Education, the Society of Arts and Crafts, and the Merrill-Palmer School. Fordham has established a new campus with new libraries in the Lincoln Center of the Performing Arts in New York City, joining the Metropolitan Opera, the New York Philharmonic, and the Juilliard School in forming what promises to be the most glamorous of the cultural centers. These are but a few examples of current and planned civic developments that are engaging the energies, efforts, and money of the urban university. (The Department of Urban Planning at Wayne State University is currently analyzing university participation in urban renewal for the Urban Redevelopment Administration and reports that ninety universities are carrying on or are studying possible participation in urban renewal projects.)

Cultural centers and urban renewal may seem only remotely related to the development of the urban university library, but when the university as a whole involves itself in such programs, it willy-nilly commits its parts. Much of the city's impact on the urban university library grows out of the university's involvement in the community. At one time or another, most of the city's concerns come to the campus. The university conducts seminars on labor-management relations, sponsors institutes on race relations, joins with the City
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Council to negotiate contracts with the federal government for urban redevelopment projects, and sponsors career days for high school students. The city and the university thrive on fruitful co-existence. If co-existence presents problems for the library (and this issue of Library Trends so affirms), the principle of "selective intrusion" will likely multiply these problems. "Selective intrusion" is a gobbledygook term denoting a university's efforts and aims to bring desirable and related community and cultural organizations on, adjacent, or near, to the campus. When and as this happy union takes place, the visitor to the art gallery may be closer to the university library than the students in the School of Art, and the director of the historical museum may be able to reach the 900's more quickly than can the professor of American history. This kind of physical merger of town and gown will press the university library to define its institutional responsibilities.

The library is a self-educating institution. This has been a traditional role of the public library. It offers a kind of instruction which dispenses with course registrations, prerequisites, matriculation, classroom attendance, examinations, and the rest of the paraphernalia of formal education. It may be suggested that at some point an academic library in an urban setting reaches a stage in its development when a similar role is thrust upon it. The urban university fosters self-improvement by its adult education programs, educational television, and public lectures. It provides a staple of after-dinner speakers, consultants, and experts for almost any field of human enterprise. Professors of education lecture to the Parent-Teacher Association; professors of marketing advise the Chamber of Commerce; the music professor conducts the pop concerts. Such off-campus activities bring off-campus people to the library, and the library then becomes in fact a continuing adult education activity of the university. As the university deliberately sets about to instruct, enlighten, and elevate the citizens of a metropolis, it develops a new clientele for its library, possibly the easiest and least demanding of the university's facilities for the citizen-student to use.

In short, the decade of the sixties finds the urban university libraries with enlarged book collections, housed for the most part in separate multimillion dollar buildings on expanding campuses which are adjunct to or part of cultural centers of the metropolis. These factors, plus the university's traditional concern for the educational welfare of the community, have created at least some of the problems raised in this
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issue of Library Trends. It is doubtful that there are any tidy solutions or right answers to these problems. It is likely that some introspection and reflection about the proper role of the university library in an urban environment may produce a more rational and logical policy than mere expediency in reacting to some of the current stresses on collections and services.

The urban university library can abide by the conventional wisdom that its sole obligation is to serve its community of scholars and tuition-paying students. It can plead impoverished collections, cramped quarters, lack of stacks; it can cite precedents, issue fiat, and draw up regulations to the end of permitting it to operate more effectively within the intellectual circle it has compassed for itself.

On the other hand, the library may hold it fitting that it directly support the university’s commitment to the community and that generous library privileges to the citizen are as educationally beneficial as sunrise lectures on Channel 56. It could recognize the wholeness of the educational process and aid the city’s hard-pressed school and public libraries by serving citizen-students as well as student-citizens. It could strive to give substance to the university’s pronouncements that the urban university is of the city and for the city. It could lend its resources and services to the cause of the good urban society.
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Problems of Urban Universities: Library Services for the High School Student

HARDIN CRAIG, JR.
AND
RICHARD H. PERRINE

The library of a college or university situated in a city is often called upon to provide service for members of the community outside the campus limits. Presumably such a library in a small college town would face the same demand, but the degree would be different and the academic community would not be outnumbered by a hundred to one. No one will blame the urban college library for putting the needs of its faculty and student body first, but there is a feeling that it should serve the community as well. No one has put this into the form of an ethical principle, but no modern librarian likes to sit as a watch dog on his books; and besides, there is such a thing as good will and community support.

Therefore, there are favored classes, and each library must make its own selection: alumni, professional people such as doctors, teachers and ministers, and the research staffs of the laboratories maintained by industry. Undergraduates of other colleges in the same city will hardly be given borrowers' privileges, nor will high school students, but the question is, shall they be admitted to the library?

All users of libraries cost the library something: of course, normal wear and tear on building and books, and (more expensively) the demand upon staff time necessary to answer questions and locate materials. Beyond this, however, is the question of space, a problem recently canvassed by Metcalf with his usual perceptiveness as to the true costs of any library operation:

In most libraries the readers and reader services occupy far more space than books. A fair generalization, based on formulas that will

Mr. Craig is the Librarian, and Mr. Perrine is the Reference Librarian of Fondren Library, Rice University, Houston.
be described in my book on library building planning, is that twenty-
five square feet in a reading room, plus twenty-five square feet else-
where in the building, are required for each reader and the services
he needs. This total of fifty square feet may well cost something like
one thousand, two hundred and fifty dollars in construction at today's
prices. When the demands on a library approach the limit of its ca-
pacity, the student or professor from another institution who uses it
does not simply occupy space that would otherwise go to waste; he
hastens the day when a new building will be necessary. This point
should not be overemphasized, but in a number of our metropolitan
institutions it is pertinent.¹

It is just here that high school students pose the most serious prob-
lem for the urban college library, for they will almost certainly out-
number the college students, and they will come to the library to see
the books, especially since they are not permitted to take them out.
They pose other problems as well, in some ways more trying than
those raised by adult users.

High school students are likely to be less familiar with the ways
of using a large library and therefore make disproportionate demands
upon the staff (probably already overburdened) in interpreting the
card catalog and in locating material, in addition to asking all the
questions which are the lot of reference librarians. They also usually
arrive in the evening or on weekends when only part of the staff is
on duty.

In the opinion of some librarians, but not all, high school students
tend to be less respectful of library materials, indiscriminately remov-
ing volumes from the shelves and even tearing out pages. In this, it re-
mains to be proved that high school students do more damage than
any other kind of student, but certain it is that a civics class can move
through the Congressional Record stacks like a swarm of locusts, leav-
ing the shelves bare and creating a backbreaking job of replacement
for the shelvers. This occurs, of course, in an open-stack library; in a
closed-stack library the work will consist of bringing out the material
for use.

Not all high school students come to a college library to use the
Congressional Record, or indeed any record. For them it is a social
function, perhaps a necessary part of growing up, but distracting. As
a recent editorial in The Thresher, student newspaper of Rice Uni-
versity, said: "noise seems to increase with the influx of high schoolers
who wish to use the facilities of the library. Not that Rice men are
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opposed to high school girls using the library; they literally welcome them with open arms.” A concurring opinion is that of Edward Weeks of The Atlantic Monthly, at the dedication of the University of Akron Library, April 16, 1961: “I don’t know which is more distracting, a reader with sniffles, or one who hums to himself as he turns the pages. But far worse than either is a well-stacked girl with a touch of perfume who keeps rearranging her legs.”

Additional signs of the disruption of college students by the high school visitors are evident in the recent request of the Adviser to Women at Rice University that the library publicize standards of dress for female visitors. The Adviser had received complaints that high school girls were appearing in the library in shorts or slacks and that this mode of dress could be a reflection upon the young women enrolled in the University. This request was given point when the mother of a visiting high school girl called the Circulation Desk in an effort to locate her daughter; she stated that the young lady could be recognized from the fact that she was wearing peacock blue pedal-pushers.

This survey is confined to the high school students and libraries of Houston, Texas, a city with about one million people in its metropolitan area. Further, the study is largely from the point of view of the university librarians, based upon the reports of students and upon their own observations, not all of them susceptible of statistical proof. There is very little library literature on this subject, and if there were, it would have to be revised constantly and reinterpreted.

High school students in Houston may be impelled toward the college libraries in greater numbers than their counterparts in other cities. The U.S. Bureau of the Census in its “Preliminary Reports” for the 1960 census of population shows Houston to be among the 30 Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas with population increases of 50 per cent or more between 1950 and 1960. This extraordinary expansion, added to the effects of a rise in education levels, has challenged the ingenuity and resources of the school systems. New school buildings have kept pace with the burgeoning population, and although the school libraries in Houston may be better than those in cities with older schools, they are below the recommendations in Standards for School Library Programs for seating space, number of volumes, size of staff, and budgets.

The standards advocate 10 books per student for schools with more than 1,000 students after the school has been open four years. Among
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the libraries of Houston high schools the highest ratio of books per student is 6.6 and one school which has been open for six years has only 3.3 books per student.

Seating capacity, according to the standards, should be for 10 per cent of the enrollment. The most generously planned Houston high school library can seat only 4.1 per cent of the students. Consequently there are severe limitations upon the time any student may use the school library. Outside of scheduled hours when a class visits the library, the student has but brief periods before school, during lunch time, and after school for using the library. The libraries in Houston high schools are open eight hours a day, generally from 7:45 a.m. to 3:45 p.m., five days a week.

In cities where a strong public library has been developed with well-located, well-stocked branch libraries and resources to support growing services, high school pupils learn that the public library system can do much to supplement the high school library. In such situations the public libraries can coordinate their efforts with those of the schools, offering effective services which relieve the pressure upon the other libraries in the community. Houston does not enjoy such a happy situation. The total budget of the Houston Public Library is considerably less than that of the public libraries in all cities of comparable size around the country, and the book budget is actually less than the book budgets of the public libraries in Dallas, Fort Worth, San Antonio, and many other cities with smaller populations. The librarians of the Houston Public Library system are well aware of their responsibilities toward high school students, but their good intentions are hampered by the lack of sufficient financial support.

High school students in Houston who find their school library difficult to use during school hours, inaccessible or closed at times after school hours, or lacking the material they feel they need, are apt to be frustrated if they turn to the Public Library or one of its branches. In such circumstances, if a college library is convenient, or if it is suggested as a source by a parent who attended the college, by a friend attending the college, or by a high school teacher, the ambitious (or curious) high school student may venture into the college library. If he is not turned away and is not overawed, he may find that he can use the library to his advantage.

In Houston, all of the university libraries are attractive in appearance and of recent construction (the oldest dates from 1949). In
Problems of Urban Universities

addition, they are all air conditioned, an extremely important consideration in an area where summer weather begins early and lingers late.

In addition to those high school students seriously seeking better material, less crowded conditions, and longer time to use a library, others come to the college library for reasons less readily attributable to shortcomings of the school and public library systems. These may be drawn to the college library because it is close to their home, because of the attraction of studying in the collegiate setting, or because (in the case of the high school girls just mentioned) of hopes that their visits will not go unobserved by college boys.

The incidence of high school student use of the college and university libraries in Houston has been highest at the Fondren Library of Rice University and the M. D. Anderson Library of the University of Houston. The campus of Rice University is adjacent to large residential districts in which high schools are so located that many homes are considerably closer to the university than to the schools. The Houston Public Library is several miles removed from this area and the nearest branch library is, like the school libraries, not as accessible from much of the residential areas as is the university library. Thus, the physical situation of Fondren Library makes it convenient for many high school students. The library has the richest collection (392,000 volumes for 2,000 students) of any academic library in the city, and this collection attracts the high school student seeking a wide variety of library materials. The local prestige of Rice University undoubtedly serves as an added appeal to some.

The University of Houston is located in a more industrial area. Adjoining residential districts are not well served by the Houston Public Library or branch libraries, but they do include high schools more favorably situated to be convenient to students. Although the M. D. Anderson Library attracts fewer high school students than does Fondren Library, the enrollment of the University of Houston is 12,000, and the competition for the library collection of 232,000 volumes is such that a small number of high school students can be a proportionately greater burden.

The University of St. Thomas (enrollment 670) is less than a mile from Rice University and more on the fringe of the large residential sections. For these reasons and because the library collection is small (23,000 volumes), the number of high school students attracted to the library is at present not excessive.
Texas Southern University (founded for Negro students) has an enrollment of 3,600 and a library of 100,000 volumes. The campus, within a mile of the University of Houston, is easily accessible to only a small proportion of the city's high school students and a high school is several blocks away. The Texas Southern University library attracts a relatively small number of high school students.

The urgency of the problems of high school student use at the libraries of Rice and of the University of Houston, and the potential difficulties at the University of St. Thomas and Texas Southern University, led librarians from the four institutions to confer on this matter in the spring of 1961. Realizing that any action should be based upon better knowledge concerning the visits of high school students to the libraries, the librarians prepared a questionnaire form calculated to shed light on the motivations of the students, on the type and subject of the materials they sought, and on their methods of using the libraries. Copies of the questionnaire were made available to high school students using the four libraries during several weeks of the late spring and the early fall of 1961. Over 500 completed forms were turned in during these periods.

The total number of high school students visiting the four libraries while the survey was conducted was undoubtedly greater than the number of completed forms received. None of the libraries maintains a completely effective check point, and the methods of giving out and collecting forms did not assure complete coverage. Therefore, the fact that 85 per cent of the forms were received at Rice University, 10 per cent at the University of Houston, 3 per cent at Texas Southern University, and 2 per cent at the University of St. Thomas may not accurately reflect the differences in attendance.

The forms called for the name of the high school attended and the grade of the student, but not the name of the student. It was felt that omission of the latter might permit more candid answers. As might be expected, the largest number of high school students at any college library was from high schools serving residential areas close to the college, but among those visiting Fondren Library at Rice University there was at least one from each of 21 different junior or senior high schools, and 14 per cent were from schools more than three miles away from the campus. Forty-three per cent were high school 12th graders, 34 per cent were 11th graders, 18 per cent were 10th graders, and 5 per cent were 9th graders. Students of the two lower grades appeared more often during weekends than during the week. Dur-
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ing some weekends Fondren Library at Rice was host to over 100 high school pupils. The students of an independent college preparatory school constituted a sizable percentage.

To indicate their reason for using the library the students could check one of several statements or write their own explanation. Thirty-one per cent checked “The high school library does not have the material needed.” However, there was no way of verifying if the resources of the high school library had indeed been exhaustively explored. One pupil visiting the M. D. Anderson Library at the University of Houston was asked by a librarian there if he had consulted his high school librarian for the material he wanted. He replied, seemingly unaware of this possibility, “No, I just looked for it myself at the school library and couldn’t find it.” The college librarian suggested that he ask his school librarian for help, and then, if the material could not be located there, he could return to the university library. This response may have opened up a new world for the pupil (unless it discouraged him) since he has not been observed at the university library again.

Twenty-five per cent of the forms were checked at the statement “The high school library is not open at this time.” This is unquestionably a valid reason. None of the school libraries is open after four o’clock on week days; none is open at any time during weekends.

Nine per cent showed the reason for visiting the college library was that the Public Library either did not have the material or that it was not as easily accessible. One form included the complaint that there was no free parking at the Public Library.

Thirty-five per cent of the forms contained reasons for using the library, expressed in writing by the pupils. Of these the largest number indicated a search for better materials than were available in the school library. Representative statements are as follows: “Wider selection of books,” “Needed more detailed information,” “Far more periodicals than the school library has,” “Debate sources are more comprehensive,” “This library has more extra materials than needed,” “Research themes usually require more references than the high school library has,” “I feel that any material I wish to find is in this library,” “To explore further into genetics.”

The most frequent expressions showed that high school students visited the college library because it was closer than the high school library. Following this in frequency were indications of the appeal of such qualities as more space, quietness, less competition for books,
and the collegiate atmosphere. On one form the reason for using the library was a frank “to look at the boys” (a motivation suspected of many of the less out-spoken high school girls). Another explanation rather amazed the college librarians who often have difficulty in interpreting the card catalog to university faculty members: “It is so much easier to find the materials and to understand the card catalog.”

Extensive use of the card catalog by high school pupils is evident in the fact that 85 per cent of the forms showed that the desired material was located by consulting the card catalog. The remaining 15 per cent indicated that help was obtained from a librarian or another user of the library.

The subject fields investigated were shown to be: history, 28 per cent; literature, 25 per cent; science, 11 per cent; social science, 9 per cent; current events, 8 per cent; philosophy, 4 per cent; religion, 4 per cent; arts, 3 per cent; languages, 2 per cent; and technology, 1½ per cent.

With regard to the form of the materials used the indications were as follows: general reference works, 31 per cent; books, 24 per cent; current periodicals, 12 per cent; a specific book, 11 per cent; and bound periodicals, 10 per cent. Nine per cent of the forms showed that the high school pupils brought their own books to the library for study purposes, and 3 per cent did not give any indication of use of material. It is assumed that these latter pupils either did not find any material they could use or were not in the library for the purpose of consulting any library materials.

The majority of the completed forms revealed that the purpose of using the material was for a report or theme. Ten per cent showed the purpose to be for a panel discussion or other types of classroom assignment, eight per cent showed that it was in preparation for a debate, and six per cent indicated that the visit to the library was for recreational reading or pleasure (whether for reading or otherwise was not always clear). One pupil, noting that a high school teacher had recommended the visit commented, “I couldn’t find anything I wanted. This is too big and complicated. I will never come back.”

The forms called for the students to show the length of time they spent in the college library. Twenty-five per cent indicated less than one hour (which is about the limit of time permitted for them to visit the high school library); 38 per cent showed a stay of from one to two hours; 22 per cent had been in the library for two to three hours;
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11 per cent stayed three to four hours; and 6 per cent used the library for a period of more than four hours.

The students who filled out the forms were asked to indicate whether they were visiting the library for the first time or had visited it previously. Twenty-nine per cent showed that they were in the library for the first time, and 71 per cent noted preceding visits. During the two periods of the survey (each of about three weeks’ duration), 30 per cent of the high school students filled out more than one of the forms, and thus signified repeated visits to the library. It is apparent that some high school students are in the habit of using the college library regularly. This might be inferred from such statements made on the forms in explaining the reason for using the library as the following: “Just to study,” “To do regular homework,” “This library is closer, and open nights and Sundays.”

When one considers the great variety of factors concerning the use of the college libraries by high school students—the different motivations, the diverse materials and methods they employ, and the varying degrees of library competence and intelligence—it is evident that there is no one sure way (except to exclude all high school students) of solving all the problems their visits pose for the college librarians and other users of the library. The most promising course probably lies in piecemeal methods calculated to improve particular situations.

Steps may be taken to give special treatment to, or perhaps take special precautions against, groups of high school students displaying similar patterns of college library use. The debaters, for instance, although they made up only 8 per cent of the students who filled out forms, seemed more prone to misuse library materials than did other groups. Debaters have been detected removing books and magazines from the college libraries without authorization. Some of these materials, when recovered, were found to be marked with guide tabs and to have many passages underlined in ink of various colors, obviously for ready reference, but the books and magazines were ruined for library use. This problem might best be met by communicating with all the debate coaches in the high schools and by suggesting that they caution their debaters against committing depredations on the libraries of the area. The instructors could escort their debaters to a college library, introduce them to the librarians, and explain their library needs. In addition, attempts might be made on a statewide basis to change a system which obviously puts too much pressure upon the young people involved by requiring infinite amounts of source ma-
terial and by giving bonus points for having the original books and articles produced on the platform. Such measures would result in more proper use of the college library materials by high school students preparing for debates.

Another group problem that it is possible to treat is that of the student unable to locate material needed for a classroom assignment in the high school library. The school libraries may be supplied with referral forms which the librarian fills out for the student to submit to a librarian in a college library. The college librarians are much more willing to take time to help high school students who present these forms, since they indicate that the resources of the high school library have first been thoroughly investigated. The forms are then returned to the school library and may assist the librarian in building up the subject area in which the form indicates a weakness.

Referral forms of this type have been furnished to Houston high school libraries during the past year by the M. D. Anderson Library of the University of Houston. The student may enter the library and use available books without a referral form, but he may not ask for the assistance of librarians without it. These forms are regarded as beneficial, but only a relatively small number have been presented. From this it would appear that very few of the students visiting the college library had actually asked their high school librarians for the material. Although the referral method does add a helpful element of control when high school students visit the college library on the suggestion of the high school librarian, it is of course not effective with students who frequent the college library because they live close to it, those who realize they need library material after the school library is closed, and those merely drawn by the college atmosphere or in hopes of meeting college students.

A long-range solution (or better, long-range plan, for there is no “solution”) will be to encourage the buildup of public library service, particularly in a community like Houston where the public library is not yet supported as it should be. On many occasions the college librarian is tempted to be stony-hearted and to deny library privileges, in the hope that the disappointed applicant will go out and pressure the public libraries, or better, the Mayor and the City Council, into providing the books and services he needs. But he has an uneasy feeling, amounting almost to certainty, that things will not work out that way. Instead he will make an enemy for the college, and the public library will not be a whit the better.
Similarly, long-range planning must aim at better high school libraries, but it does not seem likely that these can ever completely satisfy the needs of their own students. Even if a school library were open all afternoon, it would get little patronage. When school is out, the bus or the car pool is waiting, and the music lessons, dancing lessons, and football practice are about to begin.

A school library might receive more use in the evening if it could be kept open, but this is a very costly operation and not as simple as it sounds; usually the whole building would have to be kept open, or at least supervised, since it would be rare to find a high school library with its own entrance, adequately separated from the main building.

It has been said that college librarians should publicize the idea that their libraries are no substitute for good school and public library service. This statement is true up to a point, but one might as well say that public and high school libraries are usually no substitute for college libraries in those communities fortunate enough to have all three types.

The truth is that the high school student is here to stay, and the problem is to make the situation bearable, lest the Metcalf Law (referred to above) go into effect. High school libraries and the public libraries and their branches should be improved by all means, but even if this is done the population will still be pressing closely on its literary subsistence. As the Red Queen told Alice, "it 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."

Perhaps the word should be opportunity, rather than importunity, for here is an early chance to civilize and educate the young. Over the last forty years every college professor in the land has audibly wished that his students were better grounded in the fundamentals before they ever came to college. Surely library use is such a fundamental. Many professors are rightly disturbed at the lack of knowledge of even graduate students who can find their way to the catalog and to the *Encyclopædia Britannica* perhaps, but who are stymied when confronted with a real reference problem.

If one-half of what the national magazines say about future high school and college enrollment is true, there will be need for all the libraries obtainable. And if one-half of what they say about the severely-trained and grimly-determined Russian youngsters is true, there will be need for a generation whose serious education begins as early as possible.
No college wants to turn away its future students, but it has the right to a little protection. Turning itself into a reference library, with no lending of books except to its own people and to professional persons, is an obvious course. As to those who do come in, some sort of referral system may be the answer. The use of referral forms as permission to ask questions and receive services will save the librarians, but not the books or the space.

Nevertheless, a referral system, although its purpose can be defeated, will serve to reward the conscientious student and restrain the immature. There will undoubtedly be a demand from those who have not thought to obtain such a permission at school: perhaps a request slip, filled out and signed at the door, would impress the signer and provide the librarian with control of the student, who could not deny that he had read the rules and come in to use, not abuse, library material.

In this connection, an interesting experiment in enriching education opportunities for the superior youth of the nation has been described by Helen D. Simpson. A group of above-average and gifted pupils of ninth grade level was given a special course at the University of Utah Library in the use of university library materials. The conclusion was, in part, that "Advanced library instruction in the use of university library materials proved to be a stimulating challenge, apparently and admittedly, and lent greater breadth and depth to participating pupils' educational experience. Ninth grade pupils with superior potentials demonstrated a genuine interest in, and appreciation for, the vast resources that are available in libraries."

So many of the Houston questionnaires emphasized the need for "quiet, well-equipped surroundings," "a nice place to study," "a good place to study—no quiet anywhere else," that it would seem a pity not to provide what all teenagers need in varying amounts—a chance to get away from home. There is surely as much reason to think that young people will respond to a high standard, sympathetically administered, as they will to the attractions of less academic pursuits, enticingly extended.
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Service to Alumni and to the General Public

DONALD T. SMITH

Every day one makes numerous value judgments, whether or not he is completely conscious of them. They may relate to whether a thing or act is good or bad (ethics), beautiful or ugly (aesthetics), true or false (logic), or utile or useless (pragmatism). One’s vocation determines which category of judgments will preoccupy him. If there is any category of judgments which is predominantly the concern of librarianship, it is undoubtedly the last. This conclusion can be explained by a consideration of the criteria for judging libraries themselves.

All libraries are judged essentially upon one attribute—service. Both the quantity and quality of service are considered when a library is evaluated. The library administrator judges each policy, existing or proposed, upon whether or not it is useful in promoting the services he wishes to be representative of the particular library he administers. Then value judgments of the library administrator are pragmatic, being judgments based upon whether or not a policy, procedure, position, person, or thing is useful in increasing service. It should be well understood that all aspects of a library serve the library’s clientele in some manner. The cleanliness of the building as provided by the janitors is a service to the clientele. Prompt acquisition of materials needed by the clientele is another service. Anticipation of the needs of the patron is a selection service and is just as meaningful if the need is anticipated by 50 minutes or 50 years. The catalog is a service; the lending of library materials is a service; the availability of reference assistance is a service. What the resulting evaluation of a library is, depends upon the variety and quality of the services given by it.

In the academic (i.e., college and university) library, service is primarily geared to the library’s primary patrons, namely, the students and the faculty. Life, never being as simple as one may some-
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times wish it, has made it possible for students to graduate and become alumni, to be replaced by subsequent classes of students who in due time become members of an ever enlarging body of alumni. There are a number of factors which assist in determining the degree to which an academic library may be called upon, or may desire to offer, to serve the institution's alumni. The urban academic library tends to have a greater number of alumni who are potential patrons than does the rural one. The professional (e.g., law, medicine, theology) academic library tends to have more potential alumni users than does the general academic library. In both instances the proximity to an academic library of public, special, and other academic libraries, coupled with the adequacy of these other libraries, will proportionately raise or lower the need or demand for service to alumni.

Similarly with the faculty and students of other institutions, the nearer institutions are to one another, the more use will be made of them commonly, or will be asked for, by the faculty and students of all of the institutions. While this situation is more typical of the urban centers, the situation common to both urban and rural academic libraries is the student home for the holidays who wishes to use the library of his home town college or university. The general public, that is, the persons who should normally be expected to use the local public library, often use or expect to use the services of the academic library. The proportion of use again is dependent upon the proximity and adequacy of the public library in comparison with the academic library. The farther away the public library is from the academic library, and the less satisfying its collection, the more general public which the academic library can expect to ask for service. The same is true of high school students, especially if the school libraries are either nonexistent or inadequate.

The question would seem to be whether or not an academic library should offer service to its alumni and the general public. The answer is a qualified "yes." The academic library should give as much service (quantity), and the best service (quality), in as many ways (variety), to as many persons (universal service) as possible, consistent with precedence as required by the educational purposes of the parent institution and financial responsibility. It would be desirable to give unlimited service, but such a plan is not feasible. Why not? Because of the limitation placed upon this solution by the amount of money available to implement it. There is a simple equation: the more money = the more service.

[483]
When funds are scarce, certain services must be eliminated, or if never provided before, must remain as a possibility for the future. Services must be relative to the amount of funds budgeted to support them. Services must be limited accordingly in quantity, quality, variety, and application. The real question, then, is not whether or not to offer service to the alumni and the general public, but what is the precedence of services consistent with the institution's educational purposes? Obviously, these purposes will vary the precedence and in some cases eliminate services which one might hope would be offered. Excluding special purposes peculiar to certain institutions, it may be assumed that the common purpose is educating the student body and that another purpose should be the sharing of knowledge with the academic community to the best of the institution's ability.

It is beyond hope that all will agree with the precedence of services hereinafter proposed. Nevertheless, it is offered as a criterion for comparative purposes.

(1) *Administration.* It may be taken for granted that there must be an administration to organize any library.

(2) *Space.* A library must have sufficient space in which to function and offer its services.

(3) *Collection.* No variety of services will be of any use whatsoever without the books and other materials basic to all other subsequently listed services.

(4) *Selection.* A collection is worth little if it is not continually added to with a definite, justifiable purpose.

(5) *Acquisition.* The handmaiden of selection.

(6) *Cataloging.* It would be possible to function as a library with only the first five essential services. This sixth service is the first of those which could be eliminated if finances so dictated. True, the library could not function well, but it could function. The libraries of most academics (or for that matter, most personal libraries) exist with the first five requirements and lack this sixth convenience. The college or university library is a cooperative venture intended to serve the faculty and students of the institution, much as if the faculty and students pooled their personal uncataloged libraries. But with increased size and impersonal connection comes the need for organization of the collection and an index to that organization.

(7) *Circulation.* In order to be used the cataloged collection must circulate. In an academic library where the clientele are sup-
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posed to be intelligent, this service should take precedence over other services not yet named.

(8) Reference. The academic library has a variety of services. It has five basic services and three highly desirable (but not essential) and commonly offered services, reference being the last of these.

(9) Universal application. One of the most difficult tight ropes of decision a library administrator must walk is the one that has the universal application of services to all comers on the one hand, and an increase in the quality and quantity (depth) on the other. One cannot say that quality and quantity should take precedence over universal application. The latter should come first until it becomes a financial burden. Then it must be stopped or slowed down to reasonable limits. It is for this reason that so many university libraries now charge substantial fees to faculty and students of other institutions who wish to use their services.

(10) Variety. Variety of service takes the bottom rung on the precedence ladder. It is a matter of local needs as to which additional service is to be added. It could be interlibrary loans, photoduplication, provision for smoking, or any of a number of other services which could be given if they are not now given. Also, local needs may make it desirable to increase the depth of service in one or more of the eight common services in preference to an increase in variety. Whether additional funds are to be spent upon space, books, staff, or equipment is an administrative decision that can be made only with consideration of local conditions. There is no general rule of precedence applicable.

There is one obvious observation which can be made. The amount of money required for services numbered two through six above is dependent upon the number of books, while for services numbered seven and eight the amount is dependent upon the number of readers. Budgets should be calculated accordingly.

The order of precedence of services is based upon a rational decision of the dependency of one service upon another and the resulting conclusion as to which ones could be spared. The obvious rebuttal is that in an academic library, without all eight services the library would not be academic. The answer is that there are, for example, academic libraries in Latin America which are not cataloged, in Japan which do not circulate, and in the United States of America which give no reference service. It is a matter of where one "draws the line." The offering of services is dependent upon the availability of funds.
Most academic libraries manage to have funds sufficient to offer the eight common services with varying degrees of success. Many can afford to offer these in depth and with variety.

The academic library should be as generous as it can be in offering its services to the alumni of its institution and to the general public. Knowledge is not a commodity to be bought and sold in the market place. The academic library as a service unit of a college or university should be placed in the financial position of being able to pay the institution's obligation to the community. In the larger communities, the academic library should not try to compete with the public library for the privilege of serving the general public. The public library can and should do it better. But in the small town in which the academic library may find itself, it is foolish for the public library to try to compete with the academic library by trying to match its collection. The academic library should serve the public's need for the uncommon books. Geographical location determines obligation.

In general, the academic library should not serve the high school or elementary grade student (although it is impossible to prevent the faculty and staff from borrowing for their children) since it tends to stifle the growth of school libraries. However, it should serve the "honors" high school student who cannot find the materials he needs in his school or public library. This is really done in enlightened self-interest, being merely educational pump-priming.

The rest of the general public should be liberally served, with the exception of government officials for an analogous reason to that for which high school students are an exception: it tends to stifle the growth of the public (or municipal) library. Again, the size of the community would be a determining factor. In any community an institution cannot ask for gifts from within the community without expecting to be obligated to repay them with knowledge in the form of library or other services.

Alumni are part of the general public, and all that has been said of it applies equally. It is only when library finances do not permit extension of services to all of the general public that alumni should receive preferential consideration because of their enduring affiliation with the institution. There is here a subliminal assumption that the alumnus enjoys the distinction of graduation from a distinguished academic institution, while reciprocally the institution enjoys the reflected glory of his success and shares in his material accumulations. If this is
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not the case, generally, then alumni cannot be distinguished from the general public.

Faculty of other institutions should be treated with equity. If it can be afforded, photoduplication should be provided without charge to the faculty of the parent institution and visiting faculty as well. Prompt and liberal photoduplication would eliminate much of the need for faculty to travel to the library with unique material, and for that matter, much interlibrary and local lending of material. Knowledge cannot be hoarded. When in the form of library materials, it must be shared. Possession determines obligation.

There has not been in this discussion a compilation of statistics of what is done at various academic libraries, because the writer feels that the concern should be with what should be done rather than what is done.

It might seem that this discussion of service to alumni and the general public has wandered rather far afield, but that is not really so. It has examined the opinion that as much service as possible should be offered to alumni and the general public consistent with financial responsibility. It has stated that financial responsibility requires a hierarchy of services which take precedence over other services and that service to alumni and the general public comes low on the list. While services to these groups should be given, whether or not they need to be given is a matter of local decision dependent upon geographic location, proximity to other academic libraries, and local service requirements. Whether or not they can be given is dependent upon wealth.
Service to Business and Industry

Natalie N. Nicholson

In the early years of this century business and industry's recognition of a need for information services led to the concept and establishment of company libraries. Such libraries continued to increase in number until there are now approximately 10,000 special libraries in the United States. Many of them, particularly those in banks, insurance companies, and advertising agencies, formed good working collections, but from the beginning practically all relied upon larger libraries for supplementary material.

Public libraries in metropolitan centers responded to the information needs of business by the establishment of special departments, such as that for Business at the Newark (N.J.) Public library in 1904, and the Technology Department of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh in 1905. Libraries of academic institutions, too, cooperated by loaning to companies; but it was not until the 1920's that the volume became of enough significance to be mentioned by their librarians. In the 1925-26 Report of the Librarian of Massachusetts Institute of Technology it was noted that interlibrary loans were issued to 10 corporation libraries (about 17 per cent of all libraries loaned to). By 1928-29 the number of industrial libraries using interlibrary loan privileges had increased to 32 (47 per cent of all libraries loaned to), causing the librarian to comment, "In common with other college libraries the Institute has considered means of reducing the strain put upon it by outside borrowing, but it is necessary to go slowly in formulating restrictions because the reciprocal privilege of borrowing from other libraries is extremely valuable." The Institute's response to the demands of national defense and its participation in World War II accelerated industrial interlibrary loans, with the result that by 1944-45, 61 per cent of all libraries loaned to were company libraries.

During this period such interlibrary loan service, coupled with com-
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paratively free access to library resources by individuals, was consid-
ered part of the national war effort. In fact, an affirmative approach
by academic libraries was recommended by Brown, then President of
the American Library Association, “Obviously some research depart-
ments do not know of the material available in the nearby libraries,
especially periodical files. They should be informed. Some of them
have had unfortunate experiences in attempting to obtain material
from libraries. The present opportunity is a most excellent one for
bringing the libraries and the faculties of our universities into con-
tact with the research departments of industries. The university li-
brary can well be the connecting link.”

The end of World War II brought no decrease in industry’s require-
ments for library and information services. The age of science, with
its information explosion, was ushered in. Grants from government
agencies for research and development brought an expansion of exist-
ing companies, intensifying their research activities and turning them
to new fields of experimentation. Many new firms were established,
while universities, too, assumed increased responsibility for basic re-
search programs. This new era of research and development was
accompanied by the establishment in large industries of libraries with
respectable research collections of their own. Many had developed
Technical Information Centers, where their control of specialized in-
formation materials often outstripped that in a large public or aca-
demic library. However, as Henkle has noted, “Company libraries
alone, even in the largest firms, cannot acquire all of the needed ma-
terial. They must depend in part on the large research library. Smaller
business and industrial concerns must depend on such libraries almost
altogether.”

With the increasing emphasis upon basic research, the continued
growth of scientific literature all over the world, and the application
of new business and managerial methods, the dependence of business
upon academic libraries is of such magnitude that it seems appropriate
to take stock of the situation, consider some of the intricate problems
involved, and indicate possible directions of solutions. Although this
article considers primarily urban university libraries, the problems
discussed exist in all academic libraries serving business and industry
anywhere—they are simply intensified in the large metropolitan areas.
Included are such libraries as those of Princeton and Stanford which,
although not located in strictly urban areas, have large numbers of
industrial and research laboratories in the community.

[489]
Business, research and industry require several kinds of service. Interlibrary loan is the traditional and most measurable form. In almost all urban universities this is a heavy load. Interlibrary loans to industry amounted, for example, in 1959-60 to 61 per cent of the total at Drexel, in 1960-61 to 44 per cent at the University of Pittsburgh, and to 93.8 per cent at California Institute of Technology. The University of Pittsburgh figure includes journals as well as books loaned, and the California Institute of Technology figure includes the number of photoduplicates of journal articles substituted for loan.

Industry is usually in a hurry for its material. In order to speed up delivery many companies have established their own messenger services to collect and return books. One sends a messenger daily to two libraries on round trips of some 25 miles each. Telephone requests for interlibrary loans are usually accepted, although they are more difficult for the lending library to handle efficiently than are requests mailed on interlibrary loan forms. Whatever the method, there can be delays. References, all too frequently incomplete, must be searched in the catalog. Campuses have many departmental libraries, and either the borrowing or lending library must discover which unit contains the item, and whether or not it is available for loan.

The new pattern evolving is one of a gradual decrease in interlibrary loans, caused primarily by restrictions upon journal loans and made possible by the greater availability of photocopying facilities. Since the fiscal year 1959-60, Drexel has offered photocopies of material, and its percentage of interlibrary loan to industry has decreased from 63 per cent in 1958-59 to 49 per cent (ten months) in 1960-61. This is a healthy trend; it enables industry to have a copy which it may keep, and at the same time leaves the material in the library for consultation.

When good copying services are available, industry will purchase heavily; 61 per cent of the M.I.T. Microreproduction Laboratory orders came from industry in 1960-61. The bulk of such orders came by mail, although many were received by telephone or brought to the desk. Some type of microfilm and photocopying service is available on most university campuses today, and there are several campuses with fine laboratories in their own library buildings. For special research jobs, or in libraries where copying facilities are not available, companies occasionally bring in their own equipment. Over and over again industrial librarians stress that speed, not low cost, is what they require, and libraries will do well to remember this in setting up
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their services. One company librarian has defined rapid service as receiving an item within forty-eight hours from the time an order is placed by phone. With the adoption of the Freehafer report on copyright, which recommends that "it be library policy to fill an order for a single photocopy of any published work or any part thereof," full use of the various copying methods available, at suitable prices, should enable most libraries to provide industry with this vital service, at little extra burden to themselves.

The necessity for rapid service has been met also by personal library use, by librarians, and by individual company employees. This service is performed either on a free, or fee basis, depending upon library policy. Direct use by individuals, for borrowing, consultation and browsing, is of some consequence in heavily research-oriented areas, but actual figures are not readily available. In a 1959 survey made of four of M.I.T.'s libraries during 47 per cent of the hours they were open in one week, 24.3 per cent of the outside users represented industry and government. Sixty-three individual companies and ten government agencies were represented in this brief sampling. In 1960-61 the M.I.T. libraries issued 861 Library Privilege Cards and 323 one-day room use cards to individuals from companies and government agencies. Many others use the reading rooms without applying for cards.

The dependence of some firms upon a nearby academic library warrants their librarian's spending as much as day a week at the university; some engage a graduate student to work for them on a part-time basis. Such arrangements save a considerable amount of library staff time, once initial instructions in the use of library materials have been given.

It is in the area of reference and bibliographic assistance that definitions of policy are most difficult. It is even difficult to ascertain just how much of this type of service is given to industry. Telephone, and even desk inquiries, are not always easily identifiable, and they come to many departments of a university library system. Inconclusive as they are, it may give an indication of trends to note the results of statistics kept in the M.I.T. libraries from July 1960 through June 1961 on M.I.T. vs. non-M.I.T. reference and information activities, at the desk, by telephone, and by mail. In all, 36,220 questions from M.I.T. users and 15,282 from non-M.I.T. users were recorded, making a total of 51,502. If one applies the percentages of a 1959 two-week study of the Reference Department's questions from
industry, government, and educational institutions, he can assume that 3,586 (13.2 per cent) of the total desk inquiries, 8,262 (34.9 per cent) of the telephone calls, and 443 (66.6 per cent) of the letters were from industry.

Reference librarians are finding it more and more difficult to give complete service when asked for information. Increasing numbers of requests from their own university clientele, who have priority, must be handled along with those from the outside. The latter come all too often in an incomplete and unreferenced form. Geraldine Anderson says, after speaking of the interlibrary loan form and code, “As far as I know, there is no written code for other types of library cooperation. This is one area of library work in which many of us err. In requesting assistance with reference questions from another library, there should be a similar code. To ask another librarian to do work which we should do disregards this unwritten code of ours. I feel I can speak impartially in pleading that special librarians be more considerate of larger libraries when asking for assistance.”

This statement can be interpreted also as a plea for more trained, competent librarians; these librarians would not be guilty of making unwarranted requests of other libraries. But there are just not enough of them to go around. Recruitment and better training programs are urgently needed to provide the personnel who can distinguish with imagination and intelligence the proper roles of industrial and educational libraries in their mutual information problems. In the meantime, various stop-gap methods are being used to help the untrained librarians help themselves. Several librarians report that they seize every opportunity to instruct those in charge of company libraries in the use of large library facilities, particularly the mechanics of interlibrary loan. Frequently the occasion is a meeting of the local chapter of the Special Libraries Association. The Science-Technology Group of one chapter recently gave a short course for “beginning or untrained librarians.” Though not completely acceptable to all members of the profession, it met a real need and, as a by-product, interlibrary loan and reference librarians of the local research libraries now receive more knowledgeable requests from the participants. One library, which has a membership plan for industry, invited all participating members to spend an entire day at the university, where staff members explained the function, use, and services of various departments. The guests also toured the library and met personally the librarians with whom they deal in their day-to-day requests. The
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result has been better cooperation between the library staff and its outside users.

It would be interesting if the type and amount of service given by all urban university libraries to business and industry could be neatly tabulated, but there is not enough information available. However, the writer has information on the practices of thirty libraries, almost all urban, and all serving business and industry. The following statements, based upon an analysis of these thirty, probably give a fair picture of the situation. For the most part the statements apply to business and industry specifically, but sometimes the policy cannot be separated from that applied to all outsiders, whether from government, industry, or the academic world.

Interlibrary Loan

Twenty-four lend to company libraries on interlibrary loan without charge.

Two charge for interlibrary loan, both of these as part of the formal plans for industry.

Three do not provide interlibrary loans to companies in the area. One lends to individuals only.

Photocopying

Twenty-nine have some kind of photocopying service available, either in the library or on the campus. In many instances the charges are for materials and service only.

Use of Library by Individuals

Twenty-eight allow room use without charge.

One charges after one month's use.

One charges after one day, or slightly longer, depending upon the individual case.

Loans

Thirteen lend without charge.

Nine charge for loans, the fee ranging from $5 per year to $50 per semester.

One waives the fee for alumni.

One has a lower fee for alumni. One does not lend.
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One does not lend except to alumni, who are charged a very nominal fee.
Six statements are not clear on this point.

Reference Service

All give information and reference service over the desk and by telephone without charge.
Three indicate that it is limited reference only.

Nominal fees or contributions occasionally given voluntarily by a company enable a library, like Alice, only to stand still while running as fast as it can. There are very few plans for industry's use of university libraries which allow for the expansion of facilities to meet the service involved, while the library carries on, at the same time, its primary obligation to students and faculty. Meeting that primary obligation is a strain in itself with the increased enrollments and burgeoning research programs on university campuses.

Readers may be interested in the details of two plans which show a recognition of the real expenses involved, one on the West Coast, one on the East Coast. In 1958, the Stanford University Libraries estimated that they were supplying scientific and technical journals and other library services to about 3,000 research and development people on the Peninsula and that this number was rapidly increasing. To better serve the long-term interests of both industry and the University, a Technical Information Service department was established within the libraries. It is supported by subscribing industries, known as the Stanford Industrial Library Associates. All requests from industry for technical information are channelled to the staff of this department. Services include library privilege cards for the professional staff of companies, loan of books and journals, or alternatively, photocopies at no extra charge, and extensive translating, abstracting or literature searching, the latter services to be extra charges, billed at cost.

Annual membership fees are scaled according to the extent of the Associate's use of the service at an approximate ratio of $50 for each 50 loans (or photocopies). This fee is calculated to reflect both the direct cost of operating the Technical Information Service and a reasonable contribution toward the infinitely larger stand-by cost of selecting, acquiring, cataloging, binding, and housing the University Libraries as an organized research facility.
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The East Coast plan is that at M.I.T. which established a library Membership Plan for Industry in January 1960. The reasons were similar to Stanford's; the library desired to continue the Institute's traditional policy of fostering scientific research in the community and the nation and to make its facilities available to serious researchers from outside M.I.T. Members were invited to contribute to the support of the collections and services, since the rapid growth of scientific research and literature continues to accelerate the cost of maintaining a first-class library in terms of books, journals, space, and staff.9

Services to members of the plan include room use of all materials in the libraries, interlibrary loan, library privilege cards for designated company members, and complimentary copies to each member company of Current Serials and Journals in the M.I.T. Libraries and of the M.I.T. annual list of Publications from the Institute and Theses for Advanced Degrees. Journals may not be borrowed, but complete reproduction facilities are available at cost. Literature searches cannot be performed for the companies, but the library attempts to locate qualified personnel.

The annual fee of $250 entitles the member company to ten Library Privilege Cards issued in the name of individuals authorized by the person designated by the company as contact officer, usually the Librarian. A Library Privilege Card entitles the holder to use the reading rooms for one year and to borrow not more than fifty books, excluding journals, in accordance with the usual regulations.

This plan has been integrated with the Institute's much larger cooperative program called the Industrial Liaison Program. Companies belonging to the latter make substantial annual contributions to the general support of M.I.T. and are automatically members of the Library plan. The I.L.P. companies constitute the heaviest library users, accounting, for example, for two-thirds of the interlibrary loans to industry; the M.P.I. members account for the other one-third. There have been no interlibrary loans to other companies since a charge of $5 per loan was announced two years ago.

 Provision has also been made for individuals to purchase Library Privilege Cards, for which the fee was increased from $25 to $50 a year ago.

Although it does not have a formal industry plan or service, Columbia modifies its usual individual charge for those not associated with the University in the case of groups of research workers—institutional,
governmental, or industrial. The annual charge is $100 for each of the first three individuals, and $50 for each additional individual in the group.

Other universities are contemplating arrangements for financial contributions from industrial corporations. Princeton University, located in a growing center of electronics and space research, is planning to establish a contributory plan for the many corporations now using their libraries on a guest basis. The library director of a large state university recently stated, "Service to local industrial concerns, which was of relatively minor consequence a few years ago, is now a significant additional load on several units of the library system. . . . if the load becomes much heavier, the present policy of providing this service without charge, may have to be reviewed. Presently the problem of loans to this group of users is not as great as the reference service involved in telephone inquiries, which, at busy times, is difficult to handle except at the expense of good service to campus patrons." 10

The phrase "at the expense of good service to campus patrons" is significant. Faculty and students should not have to wait at a reference desk while the librarian aids an engineer from a nearby aviation company, nor should their access to a book be delayed because the material is charged out to a local electronics library. Yet as the load of industrial use increases, such incidents will become more and more frequent.

Obviously, fees which pay for both the direct service costs and the maintenance of great research collections imply reasonable service in return. Letters received by the author from some of the most competent librarians in industry emphasize this. While expanding their own collections they recognize their ultimate dependency upon the research libraries for certain classes of materials. They are sympathetic to the present-day problems of university libraries, but complain that in some instances the university library is reluctant to give the full service for which industry is willing to pay.

In contrast to the financial arrangements of the universities mentioned above is the position of some city or state-supported institutions. It is their belief that as long as they are supported by government they should provide free service to tax-paying citizens. Some maintain that support of the university by local industries obligates its library to give free service to all business and industrial firms in the area. The University of Pennsylvania, for example, undertakes
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an extensive free service to all Pennsylvania citizens and to any employee of industry in the area.

More and more frequently, one of the considerations in site location of new plants is proximity to universities. Several libraries recently received an inquiry from a firm of location consultants concerning their library policy toward industry. The latter explained that one special aspect of the selection of a site for an industry is the availability of library facilities. The advantages of such proximity are obvious. Generally speaking, private companies do not have the space for large retrospective collections in their own subject interests, much less for material in peripheral fields. Reader access to the neighboring university library gives company staff members the advantage of browsing in a larger collection where they may discover pertinent material, or where they may, for example, scan an article in the original Russian before asking the company to spend money having it translated. Even further, they may discover through the wider reference sources available that it has already been translated.

The bibliographies and lists of new books issued by departments and divisions of large libraries are often useful selection tools for special libraries. Indeed, the card catalog itself has enabled many small company librarians to classify and catalog their own books by copying out the classification number and subject headings.

The university library staff members, too, contribute to the success of a company library when the officials in charge of research consult them on the informational and library needs of their firms. It would be beneficial in establishing working relationships if more such consultations could be held, especially in the case of a new or fast-growing company where management is not always giving full support to its own library.

The advantages to university libraries of cooperation with industrial libraries are many, though perhaps not as obvious as in the reverse situation.

The indirect benefits which academic and research libraries have derived from the professional contributions of special librarians are among the most important. Their initiative, imagination, and leadership have produced many tools of incalculable value. One of the first was the four-volume *Special Libraries Resources*, published between 1941-1947. As Henkle says, "A project of this magnitude would have been impossible without the cooperation of the libraries of the United States and Canada—not only special libraries but also public, college
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and university libraries containing special subject collections of research value." Publication of such bibliographic aids has continued—the Guide to Metallurgical Literature, or Sources of Commodity Prices, for example. Material at the Translations Center in the John Crerar Library, largely provided by donations from industry, is of equal use to university and special libraries.

Special librarians are usually willing to give reference help and often will lend from their highly specialized collections. One such librarian writes, “the amount of information produced today is too great to expect any library, even a large and well-run university one, to handle completely. One answer... is greater use of industrial libraries to supplement university collections.”

The technical librarians of industry have been, by and large, the leaders in furthering research, experiment and action on machine methods of coping with the scientific literature problem. University libraries, where the problems are compounded by size, are beginning to cooperate in the research and experimentation necessary for progress in this field and will undoubtedly be more active in the future. If expectations materialize for retrieving information by machine from bibliographic centers and for terminal reading equipment at remote locations, some of the problems of interlibrary use being discussed here will be solved.

The libraries of business and industry are represented sparingly in the national union lists or in card catalog files of regional bibliographic centers. Possibly this practice is wise. Sass quotes Eleanor Campion, Director of the Philadelphia Bibliographic Center: “Quite frequently a new industrial library ceases operations after ten or fifteen years; or moves out of the area; or changes its management or its importance in the company structure; or has a constant turnover in its staff and sometimes non-professional management. All these situations are difficult for the Catalog because the quality of the cataloging varies from excellent to poor.” Nevertheless, exclusion of industrial libraries from such union catalogs makes it much more difficult for small libraries to tap each other’s resources, or for the larger libraries to utilize the specialized resources of the smaller. The urgent need of a company’s research contract will sometimes enable purchase of materials that an academic budget could not permit—for example, complete files of English translations of Russian journals. The university library is more likely to feel that its role demands collecting the original, which it can do more easily than the company library.
With mechanized methods of compiling and updating lists becoming more sophisticated every day, thought should be given to more regional union lists, at least of periodical holdings, in order to distribute and equalize borrowing and purchasing loads.

Elizabeth Ferguson has summed up the need for cooperation: “The time is long past when any one library can hope to have under its own roof all the materials it may need to give satisfactory service to its patrons. It’s obvious that professional practices must be observed, that expenses must be reckoned with, and that more and better tools and organized exchange units must be developed.”

The service to business and industry of large public libraries, mentioned in the beginning of this paper, may well expand to help meet this growing need. In cities where the public library has built up excellent departments in business, science, and technology, extensive reference and loan services to local industry already exist, and thus lessen the burden on university libraries in those areas. Rose Vainstein mentions as notable examples the services provided by the Enoch Pratt Free Library to the Martin Company in Baltimore, and the Seattle Public Library to the Boeing Airplane Company. Often industrial librarians mention that they try to use the public library first, the university library second. More may be able to do this in the future. Hamill, in his survey of the problems of the public library in a metropolitan area, examines methods of breaking down the barriers which now prevent full service to all, and mentions particularly a hopeful trend toward state support of public libraries which will make it possible for them to truly serve as reference and research centers for their areas. Already legislative bills enabling this support have been passed in some states—Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, for example.

A far-reaching proposal, affecting all research libraries in New York, is that outlined in a report of the New York State Commissioner of Education’s Committee on Reference and Research Library Resources. The needs of the industrialist and researcher are included, indeed emphasized, in the proposals for a regional network of reference and research libraries. To give adequate library service to the professional and research community of the state it is recommended that “the State assist the development of a cooperative program of library service for the professional and research community by providing annually a minimum of $5 for each professional person in the State.”
There are, in addition, private libraries especially equipped to serve business and industry. The best known is probably the John Crerar Library in Chicago, which established its Research and Information Service in 1947. Kansas City has the excellent collections and services of the privately endowed Linda Hall Library of Science and Technology. The Library of the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia is expanding its resources and services. Professional society libraries such as those of the Engineering Societies and of the Chemists' Club in New York serve their own members.

E. B. Jackson predicts that the alliance between industry and university libraries will become even closer in the future:

In 1980 there will be university-managed and industry-sponsored special libraries that are arising and will arise in the vicinity of the principal universities. Their advanced use of new methods of bibliographic control, information retrieval, and data exchange will make their operations indistinguishable from those of special libraries of outstanding profit-making organizations in the same subject fields. . . . Significant assessments will be made on the participating organization in research parks not only for the financing of day-to-day operations of facilities, especially set up for their benefit, but also for the total enrichment of the university library resources.¹⁸

There is no question that, in addition to the increasing public and private library resources, business and industry will continue to require services which only a university library can provide. With a recognition of the necessity for equitable fees in return for services, the volume of the latter can be controlled and this mutually valuable cooperation between education, business, industry, and research will continue.
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Some years ago, one of the state librarians took note of the heavy pressure being put upon the public libraries of his state. “There has developed in the last several years,” he wrote, “a feeling on the part of some college librarians — perhaps public librarians, too — that their interests are widely divergent from that of the public library and the two fields have nothing in common, that the college library has its own problems and there is no reason why these two groups should meet together at library conferences.”

Certainly in the past decade both public and college librarians who held to such doctrine have been jarred loose from their position. A multiplicity of evidence is at hand to demonstrate that college and public librarians must cooperate if their interests and those of their mutual library users both are to be served. The problem, and one uses the term over the protests of many public and college librarians, is not new. It differs only in degree and perhaps in character. Wherever librarians gather, sooner or later the conversation will turn to student use of the library. It is significant that at a conference of Swedish and American public librarians in Lysekil, Sweden, last year, one of the three areas of common concern chosen for discussion was this same question of service to students.

Until fairly recently, emphasis has been upon the question of the secondary school student whose way of academic life was recently subjected to marked change. The impact of the revolution in the American educational scene has been thoroughly explored by H. L. Hamill, Los Angeles City Librarian. The rather precise definition of the respective provinces of the public and school library no longer has validity — to use his words: “the neat and sturdy wall we had erected between the functions of the public library and the school

The author is the Director of the Miami Public Library, Miami, Florida.
library . . . lies in the dust." He offers no panaceas. He does suggest that there are measures that may be taken to achieve cooperation between schools and public libraries, that there should be an expansion of studies of student use of public libraries now underway.

The question of college students and their use of the public library is not as far removed from that of the secondary school student as it would at first seem. True, college students are not driving adults out of most public libraries or creating major discipline problems. They do wear out books. At least a fair share of the considerable growth in theft and mutilation may be laid to college students. Conversely, they constitute an important part of the public library users. The same factors that upset the long established balance between most public libraries and their secondary school clientele—the postwar school population explosion and the assignment of more difficult problems in greater variety than ever before—are likewise affecting college-public library relationships. A considerable proportion of secondary school students are finding their way into junior colleges (now springing up everywhere), colleges, and universities. They carry with them their public library experiences and expect to use the public library as before, although their demands for material will be more exacting. Any hope that the use of public libraries by the college student is a transitory increase vanishes when one studies the present and estimated future number of students in college: 3,500,000 in 1960, 5,379,000 in 1965, 7,020,000 in 1970, and 9,018,000 in 1980.

Public librarians have never been completely free of an anxiety over the amount and kind of use which the college student makes of the public library. For years they were disturbed by repeated requests for textbooks or multiple copies of books used for collateral reading and by the sudden denuding of shelves when an instructor of a survey course made a mass assignment. Term papers took a heavy toll of periodical, pamphlet, and clipping files. On the other hand, some assignment patterns were so well established that public librarians could almost predict when a particular topic or project was going to be assigned and make preparations for the onslaught. Files of fragile newspapers were photostated and later microfilmed when the medium became generally available. Some of the larger systems purchased duplicate files of most frequently used periodicals; others, if notified in advance as they requested, would duplicate specific materials for student use. In some instances, expediency dictated an informal working arrangement in which certain materials were
withheld from undergraduates. Then, as now, the most difficult fact for the public librarian to accept was that college students found his institution an inviting study hall. His gall was compounded of annoyance at the seeming lack of consideration for the "citizen" who might need that space for legitimate library use and chagrin that the institution was not accorded its rightful recognition as a repository of knowledge.

Many a public library staff conference has stalled under the weight of the student problem, perhaps because until very recently there has been a scarcity of reliable statistical recordings of student use of public library facilities. Public library department heads had a fair idea, based upon long experience, that the college student load had increased measurably. Larger quantities of books were circulating; more periodicals, documents, and other research materials were being sought and used. At vacation times, too, college students home for the holidays flocked to the public library, and if they were not recognized for what they were, they were not at all reticent in putting the librarian on notice, quite often by making offhand invidious comparisons of the local collection with the outstanding ones at their respective colleges or at nearby public libraries.

Public library staffs also devoted a part of their conference time to a consideration of the reasons college students use public libraries. While the great majority did not attempt to make an accurate survey of such use, more or less independently they reached essentially the same conclusions as to the appeal of the public library for college students. At the head of the list stands convenience. Since increasingly larger proportions of the student bodies come from the environs of the college—as much as 70-80 per cent in many urban areas—the public library is often closer to their homes. It is frequently open longer hours than is the college library, and its books may be borrowed for longer periods of time. Sometimes materials are available only in the public library. Again, there are those who prefer the public library because they have been familiar with it and its collections over the years.

In metropolitan New York, a study of the library habits of higher education students revealed that more than eight out of every ten answering the questionnaire used a library in addition to the one in their respective schools and that one-half of them did so at least monthly. This use, furthermore, was not caused essentially by the belief that better things are found abroad. The responses showed some
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concern for the size of the collection and moved progressively to larger libraries in accordance with their needs. Only one student in two considered his own school library to be inadequate as to physical plant, hours, or staff. Four of ten, however, felt that their libraries’ collections were inadequate, largely on the familiar basis of too few books or too few copies of those in demand.

In 1958 the Los Angeles Public Library, concerned with the adequacy of its library service to students, appointed a committee of six librarians to survey the situation and to make recommendations. In 1960, the system ran two four-week test periods to determine student use: in the branches, junior college and college students made 13.5 per cent of the requests; in the central library, 56.8 per cent.

Watching students virtually monopolize the library with increasing frequency and alarmed that they are unable to meet their full obligations, public librarians have sought for remedies—so far, not very successfully. They have felt, too, that school, junior college, college, and university libraries and faculties have not recognized the problem, or if they have, have ignored their responsibility.

With the purpose of determining what various libraries were doing to meet the increased pressure upon their facilities, in November 1960 the ALA Special Committee on Inter-Related Library Services to Students mailed out a well-conceived questionnaire (questions below) to 46 public libraries and received a return of 37.

1. Is student use, either college or secondary school, of your public library a “problem”? Do you have any reliable information on how much such students use your library?

2. Do you know where these students come from and in what proportion: secondary schools in the community; college or university in the community; students attending school or college outside the immediate community?

3. What in your opinion are the causative factors for such use? Inadequacy of college or school library. Convenience of your library from the standpoint of location, hours of opening, length of loan period, ability to withdraw books. Large numbers of “commuting” students. Other.

4. In your opinion, is high school or college students’ use of the public library a real problem or are public libraries making “a mountain out of a molehill”?

5. Have you or your library board met or discussed the situation
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with school and college administrators in the area: If so, please give details.

6. If so, have any solutions been worked out to solve the problem? Give details.

7. What solutions do you think would enable the student to use libraries wherever he found it convenient and at the same time not create an undue hardship upon such libraries?

8. In your opinion, are the administrative programs of college, school, and public libraries in the average community so different that three separate levels of library service must be maintained, although students make no distinction in their use of them?

9. Do you think it would be advisable for the public library to refuse to serve students?

10. Is there a reliable way for the public library to determine what is Student Use?

11. In the following space please describe any different or additional experiences you may have had in giving service to students, in working out problems of such service with other libraries, in setting up cooperative procedures, in discussions aimed at better mutual understanding of difficulties incident to such services, etc.

Because this questionnaire and the one to college librarians deserve a full discussion in another article, the answers will be only summarized here. An overwhelming majority of those answering are convinced that a very real problem exists, not so much in student use of the library but in the fact that present facilities, staff, and collections cannot meet the demands made upon them. At least half of the libraries replying keep no statistics and, of the others, few keep an accurate check. Further, not many of them know the proportion of college to secondary school students and whether they come from within or without the immediate community. As to the reasons for student use of the public library in preference to their own school libraries, the majority feel that the inadequacy of the school library is the major cause; and in descending scale of importance they listed location, hours of opening, length of loan period, and the ability to withdraw books. Various administrators feel that the increased emphasis upon individual work, superior book collections and even the "social' atmosphere of the public library" account for some appeal.

For the most part, individual libraries are making a concerted effort to seek the cooperation of college and secondary school supervisors.
By and large, too, conferences with school superintendents, supervisors and librarians are becoming more frequent. In many instances, the public library director and the college library director have been able to establish a working arrangement and eliminate some points of friction.

The Los Angeles Public Library has given much thought, time and effort to solving its problem with the high school and college student. While it reports that "there have been no solutions," it does list steps which it has taken:

1. A 'Student's Request Form' was evolved and is in use.

2. A letter asking help in curbing mutilation has been mailed for four consecutive years; principals and superintendents have cooperated in bringing the problem to faculty attention.

3. Copies of the Survey on student use of the library were widely distributed to school administrative personnel and the findings considered by committees and at some general meetings.

4. An institute for secondary school faculty on 'Using Library Resources' was held. Public librarians were on the program. Similar institutes in each district are planned for the spring of 1961.

5. Our own professional staff participated in workshops on school and public library relations with emphasis on the consideration of possible solutions. This provided a better understanding and more uniform attitude on the part of staff. Some good suggestions were also offered for possible solutions.

6. Children's librarians and young adults' librarians have been making particular effort to visit, become acquainted with and establish communications with librarians and teachers.

7. Talks given to P.T.A.'s have also included information on the situation.

One of the principal difficulties which public libraries face with the college student is his lack of knowledge about the proper use of library tools and collections. Colleges must give some instruction in the use of bibliographies and in research methodology much earlier than graduate school or the senior year.

When librarians are asked if the public library ought to refuse to serve students, the answer is "No," although some seven libraries feel that a limitation should be placed upon the hours during which students may use the library and upon the materials they may consult.

One aspect of the problem not adequately explored is that of pay-
The Relationship between the Public and University Library

ment of the cost of full-scale public library service to college students. More books, more seats, and a greater variety and depth of reference materials will all cost money. Shall this be supplied as it has been in the past at the taxpayers' expense? Can a municipal library system supported by local taxes alone charge a nonresidency fee of some metropolitan residents but except college students? Should the municipality have to bear the financial burden of supplying extensive and expensive reference materials to the student body of a college or university lying outside its territorial limits? These are questions with which to conjure. One can sympathize with the student editor who, after conceding that the fee charged by the nearby municipal library system was reasonable enough in view of the many benefits received, found it "not even palatable, let alone friendly."

The reaction of the college librarian to the problem was sought also by the ALA Special Committee on Inter-Related Library Services to Students. About 75 per cent (63) of the college libraries circularized replied to the questions listed below:

1. Do you consider the resources of the library you administer adequate to meet the library needs arising from normal assignments given to the students in your institution?

2. If adequate, does a student confine his library use for such assignments to your library?

3. If the answer to either of the above is "no," where does the student go to satisfy his library needs?

4. If he uses other library facilities, do you have any reliable information on approximately how much he uses them?

5. What in your opinion are the causative factors for such use? Inadequacy of your library; convenience of other library from standpoint of location, hours of opening, length of loan period, ability to withdraw books; other factors.

6. In your opinion, is the college students' use of the public library a real problem or are public libraries making "a mountain out of a molehill"?

7. Have you or your institution's administrators met with or discussed the situation with public library officials in the area?

8. If so, have any solutions been worked out to solve the problem?

9. What solution do you think would enable the student to use li-
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libraries whenever he found it convenient and at the same time not create an undue hardship upon such libraries?

10. In your opinion, are the administrative programs of college, school, and public libraries in the average community so different that three separate levels of library service must be maintained, although students make no distinction in their use of them?

11. Do you think it would be advisable for the public library to refuse to serve students?

12. Is there a reliable way for the public library to determine what is student use?

Most college and university librarians believe their libraries to be adequate, but a number concede that they cannot properly provide for "research papers" or changes in faculty assignments. "No library," writes one, "is ever entirely adequate. We manage, but we need more books, more space and more staff." The majority indicate, too, that they do not have accurate information about student use of public libraries, although some refer to studies by public libraries in their areas, notably Los Angeles, Detroit, and Queens Borough. As to what stimulates the students to use public library facilities, here again the answers are not far afield from those of the public librarians: special research materials not available at the college, the wide range of research projects now being assigned, inadequacy of college holdings in peak periods, or "closer to home or work." Two replies are particularly intriguing: "They pamper the student, page his periodicals, etc."; "a conviction, not always well founded, that the other libraries have more material." A surprisingly small proportion (17) thought a real problem existed, but few were willing to charge the public librarians with making a "mountain out of a molehill."

Fewer than half of the college librarians or administrative officers of their institutions have attended conferences with public library officials. In those instances where meetings have been held, however, constructive action included a request that the school be notified when there were heavy demands in a particular area, and it would purchase "extra resources when notified." One public library invited faculty members to submit assignments in advance.

College librarians varied in their opinions as to what public libraries might do to enable the large number of college students to use their facilities without creating a hardship. Such solutions ran from establishing college reading rooms with a reserve reading collection to a
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"reciprocal privileges agreement or a subsidy," or to the suggestion that the public library insist that its books be read in the library, a variant of the reserve book room technique. From a public librarian's standpoint, most significant were the suggestions that college library collections be brought to a level where they would meet student need, both as to types of materials and duplicates, and keeping the college library open longer hours.

One interesting approach to the cooperation between public libraries and colleges in their locality is the suggestion of Helen M. Brown, librarian of Wellesley College, that stations be established in public libraries. These stations would be manned by college library staff members who would also spend a part of their working time in the college library. They would be placed in the main library or in branches strategically located in relation to student homes, and they would have collections that supplemented those of the colleges. They would provide collateral reading for the larger or introductory and survey classes. The upper classes would rely upon the college library facilities.

The proposal that a contract be worked out between the college and the local public library has several variations and has been successfully employed, but certainly it is not widespread. Almost a decade and a half ago, Walter Brahm, Ohio State Librarian, questioned whether public library service ought to be free to college students. He contended that a college would not expect the local board of education to provide a teaching staff at the taxpayers' expense; so why should it provide without charge library service, certainly a necessary adjunct to a college? No public library should be penalized because it "happened to be in a community where a college is situated." He offered the very practical suggestion that the college librarian and his college president could assist the public librarian by appearing at budget hearings; and the public librarian could appear on behalf of the college librarian at the proper time. He, too, thought a contract could be arranged to make a division of work between the two libraries.

The New York Commissioner of Education's Committee on Reference and Research Library Resources recommends, in the light of present-day demands, a policy almost directly the opposite. While stating flatly that "there is no substitute for a library capable of supporting every segment of the instructional program at each college and university," it realistically recognizes that because of financial limita-
tions, the numbers of students, and their "insatiable demands," this support will probably never be realized. It proposes, therefore, that there be a network of five regional reference and research library systems and that the "state [should] aid in the development of regional cooperative programs for college and university students" to the extent of an annual minimum contribution of $10.00 for each student "enrolled at all levels and in all categories."# Under such a program, the question of local tax jurisdictions would be eliminated.

College students in public libraries, if they are not a problem as some insist, will continue to be a major consideration in the mind of the administrator of the public library. Whether he is able to achieve a "working agreement" with the college authorities, successfully raise funds to meet the increased pressure on the library, or absorb the heavier load, he must recognize the obligation to serve the person who walks in the door. The American public library is there for whoever will use it. It must meet its obligation.
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A tacit assumption seems to pervade the extensive professional writings which for many years have reflected the deep concern of university librarians with high quality service to their readers; viz., on his own campus, the university librarian has a quite clearly-defined clientele; it is comprised of a full-time, resident faculty which is engaged in research and in the instruction of undergraduate and graduate students who are also resident and full-time. ("Off-campus" is something else again. If his institution undertakes an extension program, an "extra" obligation is imposed on him. His worries about how to provide library service to the extension classes or, indeed, to efforts in adult education which may have been undertaken by his university have prompted him to write about them for publication.) While an assumption of a full-time, resident—indeed, secluded—community of scholars is largely valid for the nonurban university, it is far from true, as the title assigned for this article rightly suggests, for the majority of urban universities. Just how far will be outlined shortly. The title also suggests that there may be special problems for the urban university library in trying to serve those in its community who are not full-time and resident, or for the students when it comes to using the library. The matter was given close attention on the local level (and excellently stated) in at least one case—the New York University self-survey in the early 1950's—but the lack of attention given it in library literature per se is curious. The present study has revealed numerous instances of a library's having taken special steps—or half-steps, at any rate—to alleviate the
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vicissitudes of library use faced by part-time, working, commuting students. However, difficulties for both library and student seem persistent is not inherent. Beyond these problems, the findings also appear to justify a serious question as to the quality of the education these particular people are receiving.

Perhaps the writers' experience will explain why others have not previously published general treatments of the matter. Finding little in the literature, they decided to query 38 urban university librarians. The replies—32 in number—were generally thoughtful and helpful concerning each local picture, but collectively they were so extremely lacking in uniformity that few generalizations seem safe to make; virtually a case-study treatment of each campus situation seems required. Variation is pronounced as to the percentage of the total student body classifiable as “part-time, working, commuting”; as to the composition of this group (here data are often incomplete); as to the existence (or lack) of special provision for such students on the part of the universities; as to the composition of the faculty; and as to virtually all aspects of student use of the university library. Clear patterns refuse to emerge, and the caveat needs to be entered that such generalizations as are risked are more likely than not to be dead wrong in the case of one urban university or another. This effort has thus devolved to the status of a preliminary, exploratory survey, far from definitive. It is thought, however, that it has produced evidence of a real need for more careful scrutiny of the library (and possibly other) problems of part-time, nonresident students, both generally and on many a local campus.

While any one or any combination of the terms “part-time,” “working,” or “commuting” may apply to a given student, the individual with whom one is centrally concerned here is usually in one of two situations. He attends a regular university class, say in the morning, and must then immediately dash across the city to get to his job on time; he may work until late evening, and then begin studying toward his next class. Alternatively, he comes to an evening class, after having already put in a full day’s work. The latter seems the more typical case. More than two-thirds of the universities replying to our inquiry have separate divisions (variously entitled University College, School of General Studies, Evening College, and the like) for their evening and special students.

The evening student may have driven miles. Miss Garloch, editor of this issue of Library Trends, writes: “many of them commute from
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places as far as fifty miles... from Pittsburgh," and the writers recently met a young Tulane alumnus who mentioned having driven eighty miles to New Orleans to attend a class meeting one night per week. While these undoubtedly constitute the more extreme cases, they are illustrative of a principal point: many a student comes to the campus only for class, and then with little time to spare. Consequently, he has problems in use of the university library quite outside the experience of the student who lives on campus, and for the library in turn he represents a special problem. He sprints into the building minutes before his 6 p.m. class is to begin, or perhaps he has an hour in which to study before class convenes. He may rush over again during a mid-evening intermission, this time to check out the books that have just been assigned as his reading for the following week. His chief identifying feature is that he is in a great hurry: "soon the people in the public service departments learn that they must produce for him at once or else." (The Tulane alumnus mentioned here spoke feelingly of waiting twenty to thirty minutes for a book to be delivered from the bookstack, only to be informed that it could not be located.) Another common characteristic, however, makes him worth "producing" for: he is perhaps five or six years older than the average undergraduate; he is in dead earnest; he is going to unusual effort to gain his education. In the questionnaire it was asked whether or not he caused unusual problems of discipline in reading rooms or otherwise. One library replied in the affirmative, but several respondents did not stop at a simple "no" answer; typical are the comments of J. P. McDonald at Washington University (St. Louis): "evening school students require far less discipline than do day students. The adult student is more mature, better motivated toward his educational goals, and much more serious in his attitude towards his studies." Despite the frequent efforts of the library to give him special consideration, the lot of such a student is too often ad astra per aspera.

The question of numbers deserves attention. So heterogeneous are urban university libraries as a genre that it cannot even be stated that all necessarily have a significant proportion of commuting students. Several have retained an almost wholly residential character, their librarians removing themselves from the scope of this study by such comments as "oriented entirely towards regular, full-time students" or "such a small proportion of our total student body... as to be negligible." Included were Brown, California (Berkeley), Emory, McGill, and M.I.T. In effect Harvard also may be classified here, with only
6.6 per cent commuters, all full-time, plus a larger but unspecified percentage of part-time people among graduate students. (Interestingly, Harvard’s Dudley House, a “commuters’ center coordinate with the eight residential houses,” has its own library of 4,500 volumes and is open 1-5:30 p.m., Monday-Friday.)

As noted earlier, a breakdown of enrollments according to the separate categories of part-time, working, and commuting is not available in most of the universities, and strictly comparable data are thus lacking. However, from estimates, couched in varying terms, which were provided by most respondent librarians it was possible to derive approximate percentages of enrollments other than full-time resident.

In several cases a university’s entire enrollment comes within the category. At Brooklyn College, all students commute; about 54 per cent are part-time. At Drexel, 93 per cent commute; 19 per cent of all students are counted as part-time, graduate, or special. U.C.L.A. is now building dormitory housing to supplement fraternities, sororities, and two cooperative residence halls, but Assistant Librarian Page Ackerman reports that as of 1959, when a survey was made of library use, “U.C.L.A. was almost completely a non-resident institution.” Wayne State’s report resembles that of Brooklyn College: virtually all students commute, and 53 per cent (11,501 of 21,534) are part-time; 70 per cent work full- or part-time. All students at the University of Illinois Undergraduate Division at Chicago (Navy Pier) are commuters, but all are full-time; about 60 per cent have jobs, most of them near their homes. Here all classes are daytime, and the library is closed evenings, weekends, and holidays—a striking example of the effect a singular local configuration can have on the library. Minnesota reports a high though unspecified proportion of commuters, but a relatively small number of students enrolled part-time; Director of Libraries E. B. Stanford estimates that of some 27,000 students more than half hold part-time jobs in the Twin City area. Columbia reports 90 per cent commuting and 50 per cent part-time.

By contrast, part-time students constitute only 10 per cent of Ohio State’s enrollment, only 11 per cent of Northwestern’s at Evanston. (On Northwestern’s Chicago campus, however, the figure is 82 per cent.) Somewhat higher percentages appear at Temple (22), Tulane (24), and Miami (29).

Extending across the middle of the scene, and completing the case
for heterogeneity, are 9 universities estimating from roughly one-half
to three-fourths of their respective enrollments as being other than
full-time resident: Boston University (50), Houston (60), Johns Hop-
kins (66), Pennsylvania (48), Pittsburgh (68), St. Louis (61 per cent
commuting, 25 per cent part-time), Syracuse (44), and Washington
University at St. Louis (50). New York University noted in 1956 that
three-fourths of its nearly 40,000 students did not attend on a full-
time basis.8

Widely varying as are these figures, certainly the overall picture
is clear: thousands upon thousands of urban university students are
unable, by reasons of time limitations imposed by employment or
travel, to make use of their respective central university libraries on
the same basis as their colleagues who live on campus. In many in-
stances the residents constitute a distinct minority.

The trend—large as part-time commuting students already loom
on the urban campus—seems clearly upward. Amid predictions of
soaring university enrollments nationally through 1970 and beyond,
most of the librarians expect the percentage of such students in their
total enrollments either to remain constant or to become still higher
than at present. Although a few librarians expect a declining per-
centage—some of them mentioning dormitory construction—it seems
questionable whether new student housing is likely to keep pace with
enrollment. If not, even these universities will experience increases in
absolute numbers of nonresident students. Commenting upon the
trend is Librarian H. G. Bousfield of Brooklyn College:

In the last ten years there has been a steady increase in the number
of students registered in the School of General Studies . . . as well as
in other divisions of the College. According to Professor Edwin H.
Spengler, Director of the School of General Studies, who is also
Executive Secretary of the Association of University Evening Colleges
which has a membership of 140 evening colleges throughout the
country, this is consistent with the national trend of an increase in
enrollment of part-time students who are fully occupied in some other
pursuit.

Earlier in this paper is an attempt to create a word-picture of the
part-time, working, commuting student and his difficulties in using
the university library. The presence of only a few such students is
unlikely to be felt by the library; if they are frustrated and take the
trouble to announce the fact, exceptions to rules can usually be made
for their benefit. When they are multiplied by the thousands, how-
however, their impact upon the library can be severe indeed, calling for special measures and revisions of policies and procedures virtually throughout the library. Again, there is a lack of uniformity in the reports of the various libraries, but certain problems seem to press first and hardest.

**Lending Policies.** Commuting students coming to the campus only for class on a Monday-Wednesday-Friday, Tuesday-Thursday, or once weekly schedule obviously cannot deal with an overnight reserve system. Accordingly, most libraries have adjusted. Often it is done simply by making special exceptions for individual students on an ad hoc basis. In other cases this has been made systematic, and one or two libraries have worked out quite elaborate arrangements. These measures may include clear distinctions between day and evening students, as at Brooklyn College: “For the Reserve Collection, day students are required to return books by 10 a.m. next morning, for overnight loans. For evening students, however, who generally attend classes only twice a week, Monday and Wednesday, or Tuesday and Thursday, the Reserve Room makes the following concession. The student with a class on Monday may bring back his books on Wednesday at 7 p.m. . . . [etc.]”

Differentiation between categories of students may carry over into fines. Again, Brooklyn College, among all libraries reporting, has generally gone furthest in custom tailoring: “The Reserve Room also distinguishes between day and evening students in regard to fines. Day students pay 25¢ the first hour the book is overdue, and 5¢ for each additional hour. Evening and graduate students are fined 25¢ per school day for overdue books.”

Inquiry was made about any special troubles with commuting students concerning the collection of fines or of payments for lost books. Replies indicated that they seldom occur; such charges may often be deducted from a deposit. A small number of libraries noted occasional difficulty on this score because the usual sanctions—denial of re-registration, withholding of transcripts—are ineffective if a student is transient and has dropped out with no intention of resuming course work. A deposit appears to be the solution if such defaults are numerous.

Obviously, if both commuting and resident students are on hand in quantity there may be a collision of interests. Columbia comments: “As a good proportion of the student body is part-time and/or commuting, the reserve book loan regulations attempt to meet the con-
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flicting demands of those who wish to use the books in the library and those who wish to take them home. Usually, all but the last copy of a reserve title may circulate at 3 p.m. for overnight. . . ." A number of libraries have moved the reserve check-out hour from the evening up into the afternoon. Pennsylvania points up the quandary: "The time for releasing overnight books for outside use is geared to the commuting student and therefore benefits the part-time student. The same is not true of the time for returning such books however. The resident student must not be penalized by the commuter." Interestingly, things worked the other way in one case, at Washington (St. Louis): "Formerly such [reserve] books could be borrowed at 3 p.m., but now do not leave the building until 8 p.m., thus enabling evening students to read assignments before class, or in some cases to procure copies for home use after class."

The typical two-to-four-week loan period for regular books is of course sufficiently long to cover the needs of all students. Ordinarily, however, serials do not circulate, at least to undergraduates, and no exemption is granted the commuter. This is (or should be) a serious handicap for the commuter, much more disadvantageous for him than it is for the resident student. There are, to be sure, exceptions. Brooklyn will occasionally make a special dispensation in an emergency. Drexel lends serials other than periodicals, proceedings, or transactions. Johns Hopkins is prepared to place serials on two- or three-day or even longer reserve. At Pennsylvania, "serials are handled in the same manner as monographs." Easing the situation in some of the libraries are quick-copying facilities; several others expressed the hope of acquiring them soon. Finally, willingness to meet a student's emergency need extends so far at St. Louis University as to be startling: "serials, reference books, and all materials which normally do not circulate may be borrowed in an emergency on a reserve loan (2 hour, 1, 3, or 7 days)—this is to be determined by the department responsible. . . ."

Purchases and Technical Services. Given large numbers of part-time, commuting students combined with extra-long reserve loan periods for their benefit, the need to purchase reserve books in greater than normal quantities is to be expected. This was affirmed by several libraries, these for the most part being the ones indicating the higher percentages of commuting students. There is extremely little duplication, however, of other kinds of materials—monographs, sets, or serials. With very rare "bare minimum" exceptions, policies of
not buying textbooks are firmly observed. Wayne, in addition to purchasing reserve books in greater than normal quantities, has set up a system of buying “extra” rental copies of both reserve titles and heavily used journals.

While use by urban university students of libraries other than their own is being dealt with by others contributing to this issue of Library Trends, this may be the appropriate point to interpolate that in responding to our inquiry both Johns Hopkins and Maryland spontaneously commented upon the availability to their students of other libraries, both of them specifically mentioning (not without real appreciation) Enoch Pratt. The 1959 survey of student library use at U.C.L.A. similarly referred to quite heavy student use of other libraries. It should be added, however, that these instances were outnumbered by the libraries which recounted considerable problems in serving their own students owing to heavy use by nonuniversity patrons.

Technical service departments are little affected by the presence of part-time, working, commuting students. Four libraries reported occasional rush placement of book orders, or rush cataloging, attributable to their special needs, but none indicated a significant problem.

Reader Services. While no library of any type is likely to be immune from peak periods of reader service load, the problem is exceptionally severe in the urban university having a large part-time, nonresident student population; indeed, for the library it is probably the most serious and pervasive implication of working, commuting students. No two libraries have quite the same experience. In some instances the load may tend to be spread evenly through the library’s scheduled hours because the day students have departed before the evening students arrive on the scene. On the other hand, if peak periods of resident and commuting or day and evening students happen to coincide or overlap, the situation is compounded and things may become “particularly frantic.” Fortunately, in most libraries the patterns of peak load over the day and the week are at least regular and predictable; staff is of course scheduled accordingly, if possible. This provision may be awkward if the peak periods are frequent but last only 15 minutes. Financial difficulties may arise: “More staff should be scheduled at peak periods but it is impossible to do this within our budget . . . there are many many disgruntled part-time students.”

Any hours of day or evening may bring peak loads to one library or another. In addition to the surge just before or after an evening
class, there is an understandable coincidence of reported times of peak load with the local release hour for reserve books. Mention of the 5-7 p.m. period on week days and of Saturday mornings is ubiquitous in connection with commuting students; this is in sharp contrast to the residential university where these are characteristically the quietest moments of the entire week for the library. The uncommon prevalence of daytime commuters at Minnesota illustrates what a singularity in local conditions can do to the library: "There is a serious parking problem here that results from the tremendous influx of commuters in the morning. This means that people who come early to get a parking place arrive at the libraries somewhat earlier than was the case several years ago. We open at 7:45 and there are always students in the library fifteen to thirty minutes before our service areas are opened. We have set up a basement lobby study area where they congregate until our major departments are able to offer service."

Peak loads may affect any reader service department: Reserve Book Room, Circulation, Reference, Periodicals. They may come at different times for different departmental libraries or subject reading rooms on the same campus according to the school (Education, Business) served. Open stacks are of tremendous benefit to students and library staff alike. Brooklyn College comments: "Since our collection is on open shelves, the urgent desire of the student to get his books is simply reflected in the rapidity of the student's own progress from the card catalog to the book shelves. Once the student has made his selection, the use of IBM cards at the central Circulation Charging Desk enables him to charge his books out in a very few minutes."

Weekend loans at Brooklyn require manning of three checkout points at noon on Friday in the Reserve Room. At Drexel the pasting and labeling area is adjacent to the Reserve Book Desk, permitting staff to be drawn off to help charge out books at rush periods.

The reserve collection may be larger than usual, as noted by Pittsburgh: "Many instructors, sensitive to the part-time student's time schedule, place books on reserve where they are directly accessible. In normal circumstances, these same books would not be placed on reserve."

While in recent years a number of the libraries have extended their hours of service later into the night or over more of the weekend and others feel constrained to do so, relatively little of this is attributed by the librarians to the part-time, commuting students. The
pressure has instead come largely from graduate students and faculty. Some part-time students may naturally be benefiting from the changes.

To the general picture of library problems confronting the evening student there must be added three distinctly depressing facets. At several of the universities he finds some, if not all, departmental libraries, along with Special Collections and perhaps Government Documents, closed to him. The reason may be budgetary: "their main handicap, it seems, arises from the fact that some of our 'one man' departmental libraries do not offer evening service, for lack of funds to hire the necessary additional staff hours." Or it may be decentralization, physical and administrative: "Some departmental libraries . . . remain inaccessible to most students at night . . . These specialized departments seem to feel that it is sufficient for graduate students and faculty to have keys to these libraries and for undergraduates to use them only during daytime hours. Occasionally a persevering evening student will arrange for the central library to borrow needed books from a library not offering evening service and to make these books available in the central library, but it is an unusual student who will go to this trouble."

Secondly, the evening student may well have a definitely lower quality of library staff service than do resident or daytime commuting students: "There is no doubt that evening students have less staff assistance . . . than day students enjoy. An evening student who comes to the library one night a week may never even see the Chief Reference Librarian, much less receive help from her. Further, many service points (including departmental libraries) are manned by student assistants during the evening hours, so that the night school students seldom receive the benefit of professional attention."

In both of the above respects, it need hardly be added, some libraries shine forth as prominent exceptions.

The third gloomy note to be added to this growing picture of underprivileged or neglected status for the evening student is that he is far less likely than his daytime colleagues to know his way around the library, this for lack of the tour or other instruction they have received. In a clear majority of the universities this is a problem acknowledged as unsatisfactorily solved or completely unsolved; comments upon orientation ranged from a blunt "they get none" to "sporadic" or "haphazard." It is typically tied to freshmen English classes, or it may be voluntary, and seldom are orientation tours offered at night. The few
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librarians who judged their situation satisfactory all indicated the same solution: library orientation is required at their respective universities.

This report, focused as it is on the urban university's central library and on commuting students making use of it, must nevertheless verge briefly over into the area of extension, taking due note of the lack in some instances of clear delineation—administratively, geographically, functionally—as to where the university proper leaves off and university extension begins. The two may overlap considerably. A case in point is establishment now and again of a "University College Library" to serve a separate extension campus downtown. An example is the University of Chicago's University College, located at the edge of the Loop and offering evening classes (some of them for credit) where S. E. Gwynn, Assistant Director for Readers' Services, reports a separate one-man library "of about 6,000 volumes intended primarily to serve the reserve book needs of the evening classes but having also a modest general reference collection." It is nine miles from the main library. A similar service appears to exist at Syracuse and to be developing at U.C.L.A.'s Hill Street Building. Such libraries, although essentially extension in nature, may often resemble an extra departmental library or reserve book room and thus need to be taken into account as part of the added (and perhaps more convenient) resources and services available to the part-time, working, commuting students who may routinely use the main campus library. Unique among the reporting libraries is Maryland, which has a University College Librarian who not only maintains contact with University College faculty of both the on-campus evening division and off-campus centers throughout the state, but also provides library service through the use of a bookmobile to off-campus courses.

Study Facilities. A local pattern of extreme peak loads may require far greater library seating capacity in relation to enrollment than formulae normally call for. On the other hand, if resident and commuting students regularly use the library at different times—or if, as often reported, part-time students do their studying at home—seating requirements may actually be less than normal. Again, Minnesota's many daytime commuters make a difference: "Another implication . . . is the need for larger seating capacity during daytime peak periods than are needed in institutions where the majority of the students live right on the campus . . . This is because thousands of students are on campus without any particular headquarters throughout each day and
therefore flock to the libraries during the periods between their . . . classes."

It is obviously essential that any urban university library engaged in building planning take such factors into account. Only a careful study of local patterns and trends of library use will produce the correct answer; formulae which have been employed either by residential university libraries or by any other urban university library may well be far off the mark. As for equipment, except for quick-copying facilities, commuting students seem to have little effect upon needs. The problem of discipline referred to by one librarian lay chiefly in the lack of conversation rooms for students. Wayne mentioned a demand for drive-up book deposit chutes to accommodate car-driving commuters.

Summary

The Library's Problem: Summary. After one has pondered the returns, it is possible to risk the following hypothesis. Derived from a wealth of conflicting data, it is strictly tentative, admittedly subjective. It seems that for the urban university library, part-time, working, commuting students are least likely to be a source of distress if they constitute either a very high or a very low percentage of total enrollment; they are most likely to represent a dilemma if in numbers they happen to equal or moderately exceed the residential enrollment. If this is valid, the reason may be fairly clear. Library administrators will attempt in all conscience and earnestness to aim for the greatest service to the greatest number. If commuters make up, say, 90 per cent or more of the student population, the library is likely to be geared accordingly. If, on the other hand, some 75 per cent or more of the students live on campus, the remainder who commute on a part-time schedule tend to be submerged and largely out of sight. At the break-even or higher point, however, the quandary of conflicting interests to be served is rather clearly at its worst.

Traditionally the university library's orientation is toward a residential, full-time population; conceivably the librarian may be slow to discern a gradual shift. Still, he may recognize it clearly and promptly but be unable to adjust owing to limited staff, limited budget. For that matter, if choices must be made, the equities involved may be difficult to weigh. If a university has 20,000 students, the total number of courses taken by 5,000 enrolled full-time may equal or exceed those taken by the remaining 15,000 who are attending part-time. To take one obvious puzzle: provided with only a minimum of profes-
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Professional staff in reader service departments, should daytime professional staffing be sharply curtailed and rescheduled for the benefit of evening students? If a coin really needs to be tossed on such a question, it may be worth pointing out that full-time resident students are in a position to adjust to this kind of change, coming to the library in the evening to gain first-rate staff assistance, whereas the evening commuting student has no option. True, if the residents thus "adjusted" en masse, the effect could be to compound existing evening problems of peak periods or inadequate seating capacity. It seems in any event that such questions, and the equities, deserve re-examination on more than one campus. Obviously best served are those evening students using a library which is geared fully as much to their needs as to the needs of resident or daytime students. There seems good reason to worry, however, about the fate of the students who are "submerged" unless one is prepared to argue that full access to library resources and full service by professionally-trained and specialist library staff are unimportant in higher education. The writers are, rather, prepared to argue the opposite.

The Student's Problems. It will already have become apparent that there is cause for concern, not only about the special difficulties faced by urban university libraries, but also about the plight of the part-time, working, commuting students attempting to make effective use of library resources. However, that concern has come to extend beyond the library-student relationship alone; as noted early in this article, a basic question of quality of higher education presents itself.

Inquiry was made about the faculty: the extent to which the universities employed for their evening and special courses the services of part-time faculty recruited from industry and the professions locally; any special library problems of maintaining appropriate contact with such faculty, as for example in getting reserve lists on time; and the access of such faculty to book funds. The replies were characteristically lacking in uniformity except in two respects: equal access to book funds is the rule, and part-time faculty seldom submit purchase recommendations, much less participate significantly in collection development.

In some universities nearly all evening college faculty are regular faculty members who accept evening assignments for additional pay, and there is obviously no unusual problem of liaison for the library. In others, as many as 84 per cent of evening college faculty may be part-time, drawn from industry or from other local educational insti-
tutions. Here questions of liaison may be serious: "There is certainly not a close co-ordination between the library and the faculty"; "The problem in maintaining contact with part-time faculty seems to be not so much getting reserve lists on time as getting them at all." These problems, however, are not insoluble. Persistent use of telephone or of first-class mail by the library staff should answer most of them. Moreover, transgressions regarding reserve lists are likely to be brought to the attention of faculty relatively quickly by the students.

The basic concern about the quality of evening college education does not spring from such essentially mechanical problems. (Neither, let it be said, is there reason to question the qualifications of the faculty who teach evening college courses.) However, it is unsettling to read such comments as: "Few of them use reserve books"; and "These men . . . are very busy, and only come to the campus in the evening."

A warning of more than local pertinence is contained in New York University's 1956 final report of its self-survey: "In a university with so many commuting and part-time students, there is a great temptation on the part of the faculty to limit the course reading to that which is available in textbooks rather than to make assignments in the library. The temptation finds justification if reasonable library assignments cannot be performed by students for lack of sufficient copies of books or library study space. But the University must resist the temptation with every device it can summon." 10

This admonition gathers force in the face of the following quite unsolicited but blunt comments which appeared in the replies to the inquiry. They are stated here without indication of their five different sources; none, however, is from N.Y.U.:

We suspect that faculty members, aware of the handicaps inherent in evening classes for part-time students, modify or even alter the out-of-class assignments that depend upon library sources chiefly. For example, we are aware that classroom instruction is occasionally skipped with the time given over to library usage. We believe there is also more reliance upon textbooks and class discussion.

As the faculty points out, students simply do not have time to read extensively. . . . As a result, perhaps instructors tend to tailor assignments and teaching methods so that less outside reading is required.
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... Instructors do not require the same amount of work or the use of varied materials in the off-campus and evening programs.

... Part-time evening courses are not at par with full-time day courses. They rely heavily on textbooks, rather than library materials.

We are aware that evening faculty and students make far less use of library facilities and services than do their day school counterparts.

If the smoke-means-fire cliché is valid, there seems evidence here of a possible conflagration. An underprivileged status in terms of use of his library appears not to be the most serious problem confronting the part-time, working, commuting—particularly the evening commuting—student, widespread as this situation may be. His much more ominous problem in too many universities, whether he knows it or not, is that in an evening course he is receiving education of considerably lower quality than he would have if he had enrolled in the same course in the same university in the daytime. It seems clear that the evening standards are not as high as day standards. When one is reminded of the thousands of students who are enrolled at night for credit and are working on degrees, reminded again that these thousands are typically more mature and more highly motivated than the average daytime student, this seems to warrant serious reflection and reappraisal by urban university faculties and administrative officers, and perhaps by accrediting agencies as well. The evening commuting student in the urban university may be in the position of the gambler and the roulette wheel: he knows that it is rigged, but it is the only one in town. It may be assumed, however, that neither the students nor the authorities in charge of other urban universities are any more desirous of dilution of the quality of the higher education provided than is N.Y.U. A number of their librarians, obviously, firmly believe that such dilution of quality prevails in their universities.

It was suggested earlier that all facets of the problem—urban university library service to part-time, working, commuting students—should receive more extensive and intensive examination than it has been possible to provide in this study. It bears repeating. More than one librarian has grave doubts about the adequacy of the service he is now providing. It is interesting to realize that a number of the urban university librarians, hard-pressed as they now are, would be
under still greater pressure were the quality of education the same, day and night.
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Student Use of New York's Libraries

WARREN J. HAAS

The simple fact that the libraries of New York City are heavily used by college and university students is news to no one. It has become almost traditional for the New York Times to run a picture of the Christmas holiday hoard of students that regularly flood the Reference Department of the New York Public Library, and it is the rare urban public librarian who cannot expound on the college student "problem," at times in strong and positive terms. But in only a few instances has any specific information been assembled about the amount of this use or the reasons behind the extensive and apparently growing interlibrary migration of students.¹ ²

To acquire this kind of information for a study of the potential of interinstitutional cooperation, a survey of student use of New York's libraries was made during the spring of 1960. The findings were used to blueprint a long-range cooperative library program designed to satisfy the requirements of college students in metropolitan New York. The project was sponsored by the Council of Higher Educational Institutions in New York City.

The purpose of the study was to determine in detail the amount and the nature of the use which higher education students make of metropolitan New York libraries to supplement the library resources provided at their own schools. The findings reported here are based upon responses to a questionnaire sent to a carefully drawn sample of 5,000 students enrolled for credit courses at every higher education level on either a full- or part-time basis. Since slightly more than 200,000 individuals were enrolled for credit in the eighty metropolitan area higher education institutions at the time of the survey, the sample represented about 2.5 per cent of total enrollment. Over 66 per cent of the questionnaires were completed and returned, strong evidence of the active interest students have in the library resources available to them.

Mr. Haas is Associate Director of Libraries, Columbia University.
Students were asked to identify "other" libraries used during the 1959-60 academic year, to note the frequency of use, and to indicate reasons for this use. Additional information was requested to permit analysis of use in relation to three possible determinants: (1) the academic characteristics of the students; (2) the geographical relationship between the location of the library used and that of home, school, or work; and (3) the quality of the library service available to the student at his own school. The responses were tabulated and the results analyzed in a report prepared for the Council's Library Advisory Committee. The principal findings of the general parts of that report follow.

How Heavily Do Students Use Metropolitan Area Libraries?

More than eight of every ten students who returned a questionnaire indicated that they had used a metropolitan area library at least once during the 1959-60 academic year. (Unless otherwise indicated, the library at each student's own college is excluded in all discussions and tabulations. This report is concerned only with student use of "other" libraries.) This gross use figure varied by only 11 per cent among the several categories of general schools, i.e., universities, large colleges, smaller colleges, and junior colleges. Among the group of specialized institutions, represented in the sample by medical, music, theological, and scientific schools, this use dropped slightly; but even here, over two-thirds of the students made some use of other libraries.

Making this high sheer use figure even more meaningful and impressive is information on the number of different libraries used by students and on the frequency of use. More than half of all respondents reported using two or more different libraries during the course of the year (Table I).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Different Libraries Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used one other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total users</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonusers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3,322)
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The following paragraphs, selected from comments made by students in their responses, indicate something of the complexity of this extensive migration. One wrote: "I used the Academy of Medicine for special assignments in my physiology courses. The 42nd Street Library was used for the same reason. The other Manhattan branches were used for other course assignments and reading for enjoyment. . . . The Municipal Library was used for information on public health course assignments dealing with various departments in New York City."

Another full-time student, an undergraduate majoring in classics at a Manhattan university and living in New Jersey, wrote: "I used the 42nd Street Library for certain obscure items I could not get at [my school]. I used the Bronx branches for ordinary circulation items that were already borrowed. . . . The only Manhattan branch I used was the Music Library at 58th Street, which I used quite often since my role as accompanist of our Glee Club demanded it. I used the East Orange Library, which is near my home. . . . I also used the Newark Public Library very often, going so far as to buy a non-resident card there, because their circulation collection is in my opinion, better than that at any public library system I have seen. . . ."

A chemistry major, a junior, probably typifies many "three library" users in this brief statement: "New York Public, 42nd Street,—used this library on weekends for convenience rather than traveling to college library. Used specifically for term papers. Branch library—for general reading. Chemists' Club—for specific work in field of chemistry."

Frequency of use is an equally important element of the pattern, since one student using a library monthly or more often through the year is, from a service standpoint, the equivalent of several users making less frequent visits. Almost half of all respondents indicated that they were in this "regular user" category, and three-fourths assessed their use as something more than infrequent (Table II). It should be noted that the tabulation of the responses showed that the most frequent users of metropolitan area libraries are also likely to be the users of more different libraries.

Since the sample was not controlled for geographic distribution, a tabulation of the reported use of each library in the metropolitan area would be meaningless. Taken collectively, however, there is no doubt that units of the three public library systems of New York City are second homes, in a bibliographic sense, for a great many students.
TABLE II

Frequency of “Other” Library Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Used at least one library:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least weekly</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least monthly</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>several times</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrequently, or only once</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total users</strong></td>
<td><strong>83%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonusers</strong></td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number (3,305)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic libraries (excluding, of course, each student's own) were used by about 5 per cent of the respondents while another 5 per cent used libraries of nonacademic institutions such as museums, medical societies, and court libraries. Company and business libraries were used by 2 per cent. The extensive multiple use of libraries by many makes it certain that over 75 per cent of all students in the New York area made some use of a public library unit during the academic year studied.

From these facts, it is evident that most of New York's higher education students use, and use heavily, the wealth of library resources available to them in New York City to supplement, and no doubt, in some instances, to supplant, the libraries provided at their own schools.

Which Students Are the Most Frequent Users?

The fact that the great majority of students made some use of a metropolitan area library during the 1959-60 academic year precludes identification of any significant characteristics that might distinguish the user from the nonuser.

Even when attention is focused exclusively upon the regular or heavy user, only a few of the more obvious possible determinants seem to have even a moderate influence. The factor of employment, for example, has little effect upon library use. Students working up to 30 hours a week use “other” libraries at the same rate as those who do not work at all, and those who work full time report only slightly less use. The related element of course load also seems to have no effect on library use.
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TABLE III
Frequency of Use Related to Degree Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program</th>
<th>At least weekly</th>
<th>Monthly, or several times</th>
<th>Infrequent or none</th>
<th>Total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The academic level of a student is a somewhat stronger factor. The most intensive users as well as the largest proportion of nonusers are to be found among the advanced degree students. Undergraduate students, the largest category by far, tend to be "monthly" or "several times a year" users (Table III).

As might be expected, subject field also has a moderate but distinct effect upon the frequency of use. The liberal arts generate more intensive student migration to supplementary libraries than do most professional fields. Education, where professional work is generally closely tied to a liberal arts field, closely follows the liberal arts pattern (Table IV).

Stimulants of "Other" Library Use: The Search for Books

The size of the book collection at a student's own college and his personal evaluation of that collection are two factors that have a substantial influence upon the amount of use made of other libraries.

One of every three students considered the book collection at his

TABLE IV
Frequency of Use Related to Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Field</th>
<th>At least weekly</th>
<th>Monthly, or several times</th>
<th>Infrequent or none</th>
<th>Total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and history</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social sciences</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other professions</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE V

**Frequency of Use Related to Student Evaluation of Own Library**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book Collection Considered:</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least weekly</td>
<td>Monthly, or several times</td>
<td>Infrequent or none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

own college (or, in a few instances, access to the collection) inadequate for his needs. These students used more "other" libraries more frequently than did their better-satisfied fellows (Table V). The dissatisfaction, while diverse in specifics, stems from too few books, either in general or in a specific subject, from a shortage of up-to-date books, or from too few copies of books in heavy demand.

This judgment of collegiate library book collections tells only a part of the story, however. In all, about two-thirds of the more than 2,700 students who reported use of area libraries reported that they did so to borrow or otherwise use books to supplement the resources of their own school. Almost 1,000 respondents related use to formal course work—assignments, required reading, and term papers. Almost as many who did not specifically relate use to course work left little doubt that such was the case. Five hundred students indicated leisure or nonacademic reading as one reason for "other" library use, but with few exceptions this kind of use was coincident with the pursuit of academic materials.

In an effort to assess the relationship between college and university book collection size and student dependence upon "other" libraries, the libraries of the twenty colleges and universities represented in the sample were categorized. The university libraries were grouped by collection size on the assumption that this factor is significant when educational programs are extensive in both scope and depth. The colleges were divided on the basis of volumes per student; this method was judged to be a more realistic measure than total size at the collegiate level.

These units of measure are admittedly crude. They do not take into consideration rate of growth, collection age, serial subscriptions in force, or any of many other pertinent elements. (Though, within school types, it was found that there is often high correlation between
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many of these factors and collection size.) But crude as they are, these measures serve to indicate a definite relationship between collection size and other library use.

Table VI relates collection size to frequency of “other” library use by students in four different groups of schools offering general, as distinct from specialized, programs. In almost every instance, “other” library use drops significantly as the university or college library resources increase in quantity. That the smaller college with the best volume per student ratio also has a relatively large number of resident students is a fact that should be noted, since it accounts for the low level of use of “other” libraries.

The relationship to use of both collection size and perceived adequacy is demonstrated in Table VII. Within each institutional category the pronounced and consistent difference in regular use between the dissatisfied student from the “small library” school and the satisfied student from the “large library” school indicates the effect of objective measures and subjective judgments. In this table, the term “regular” means that another library was used once a month or more often. Students reporting less frequent or no use are not included in this tabulation, so percentages are not totaled.

Stimulants of “Other” Library Use: The Element of Convenience

In the realm of libraries, one operating principle of many students is supremely practical. Simply stated, it is to use the closest accessible

TABLE VI
Frequency of Use Related to Collection Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection Size</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At least weekly</td>
<td>Monthly, or several times</td>
<td>Infrequent or none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Universities</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 1,000,000 vols...</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000—2,000,000...</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000,000 plus........</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Large Colleges</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10—18 vols./student....</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19—27 vols./student....</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Smaller Colleges</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63—71 vols./student.....</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72—80 vols./student.....</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Junior Colleges</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 10 vols./student...</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
library that can supply the book or information needed when it is needed.

In a city where most students live at home and not at school, the closest library is often not his college or university library, but rather a public library branch or central building. This tendency is a fact of urban life. Even students at schools with exceptional libraries make substantial use of “other” libraries when such a course is easier. More than 800 respondents identified convenience as the primary reason for their use of “other” libraries. Most specified or implied convenience to home. The relationship between place of work and the location of libraries used seems significant only in Manhattan. The effect of school location is somewhat more important, but is still not a major factor in determining the pattern of use.
TABLE VIII
Circulating Library Use Related to Place of Residence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Per Cent of all students residing in borough and reporting some use</th>
<th>Per Cent of all students not residents of borough and reporting some use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan Branches</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bronx Branches</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Branches</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens Borough Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total numbers:</td>
<td>Manhattan 547</td>
<td>The Bronx 568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richmond 55</td>
<td>Brooklyn 1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queens 441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table VIII relates place of residence to the geographic location of circulating public library units in the city. It is obvious that only a small part of student use of library facilities in a given borough is generated by nonresidents of the borough (Table VIII).

The Reference Department of the New York Public Library is a notable exception to the general pattern. Table IX shows that this unit draws its student users from all parts of the metropolitan area to a far greater degree than does any other library. Students use this library less frequently than any other library considered in the study, but more different students (44 per cent of all respondents) use it at one time or another than use any other library in the city. It might be implied from this that "search for books" dominates even the element of convenience when the chips are down. In fact, a more detailed analysis of data than is presented here indicates that this library is the keystone in the remarkable complex of libraries—public and private, general and specialized—used by the thousands of New York City higher education students.

Stimulants of "Other" Library Use: Minor Factors

The search for books, either titles in great demand or those that are less common, and the element of geographic convenience are together the prime movers of students. Other factors affect use and
determine which libraries are used, but are of far less importance.

For example, weekend and vacation hours have some effect. One student who reported using the Brooklyn Public Library central building, concluded his comments by saying, "the only drawback to Sunday is that every student in Brooklyn is using the library on that day."

Some looked with favor upon open stacks when the same privilege was not given at their own school. Two-week rather than two-hour loan periods, availability of specialized equipment, skilled staff assistance, and comfortable surroundings were all counted as assets by significant numbers of students.

The working, part-time student has some problems not shared by his full-time counterpart. Because this group is large (one-third of all respondents reported working more than 30 hours weekly) their needs would seem to require special consideration. Sometimes library hours prove a handicap. More often the regulations governing circulation, especially of reserve books, are strongly criticized, since those rules are most often geared to the needs of full-time students.

There was no intent in this study to evaluate the quality of library service provided students in the public and other libraries used, but many respondents volunteered opinions. The limitations of branch libraries, which are of course generally not intended to serve collegiate students, were noted by a substantial number of students. Most adverse criticism related to collections, but other complaints concerned, somewhat ironically, the noise made by high school students, curtailed hours of service, and procedural practices.

---
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**TABLE IX**

*Use of the New York Public Library Reference Department Related to Place of Residence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of residence</th>
<th>At least weekly</th>
<th>Monthly, or several times</th>
<th>Infrequently</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Total number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bronx</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staten Island</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Suburbs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A Postscript

In one sense, the information developed from the study reported here does little more than verify a generally recognized condition. In another way, however, this same information, along with the process of acquiring it, has had a far greater impact. For the first time, both public and academic librarians are conscious of the magnitude and the implications of student migration to "other" libraries.

Based upon this and other studies, and upon discussions among librarians and administrative officers of many institutions, is the report *Cooperative Library Service for Higher Education* prepared for the Council of Higher Educational Institutions in New York City. As New York's student population grows, and the demands upon libraries of all kinds increase, it is intended that the plans advanced in this report will be put to use to help create more libraries for the use of students.

These proposals call for the creation of a system of supplementary academic libraries to be built and operated in the metropolitan area. Perhaps as many as five such libraries, each located with an eye to transportation facilities, college and university location, and residential concentration, would be developed over the next ten years. With collections up to 200,000 volumes and seating for a thousand or more readers, these libraries would serve to supplement the collections of individual schools. They would bridge the gap between the general collegiate collection and the large research library. At the same time, they would provide a meeting ground for public and academic libraries. But first of all, they would be additional libraries of high quality for the use of college students.

It is anticipated that these libraries would be financed and administered by a regional reference and research library system, such as proposed in a series of continuing studies made under the direction of a Committee appointed by the New York State Commissioner of Education.
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Libraries in Off-Campus Units

DONALD L. RYAN

Among the many facets of urban education are off-campus units. These are institutions which are under the sponsorship of, and bear the name of, a larger college or university located elsewhere and which offer at least a two-year undergraduate liberal arts curriculum to full-time day students. The term “off-campus unit” has been used in preference to “extension campus,” to avoid the connotation of service to part-time students. In some cases, independent institutions have been absorbed for financial or administrative reasons; in others, they have been created anew. While many of these are rural schools, the majority have been set up in urban areas. Their purpose may be to siphon off students from an overcrowded main campus or to provide an inexpensive, quality education for those who cannot afford to leave the urban environment for their college work. This type of institution is not new: Texas Western, part of the University of Texas, and the University of California at Los Angeles were both made branches in 1919. Most others have come into being since World War II, with at least three opening their doors in 1946 and 1947 to serve the pressing needs of veterans. The numbers of these off-campus units are still increasing, with one or two new ones being established almost every year.

A questionnaire was sent to twenty-four libraries which appeared, from information given in the American Library Directory (2nd edition, 1960) and American Universities and Colleges (11th edition, 1960) to be branches with some dependence upon a main library elsewhere. Obviously independent institutions, such as the various units of the State University of New York and the University of California, were omitted. Also omitted were those separate campuses located in the same city as the parent school, such as the New York University library system. A surprising response was received from 18 libraries.

Mr. Ryan is Librarian, Newark Colleges, Rutgers—the State University, Newark, N.J.
and the writer wishes to express his gratitude to the librarians for their assistance.

Those institutions which were questioned included 19 state-supported, 3 Catholic, and 2 private institutions. Two were in the South-west, 5 in the South, 10 in the Midwest, and 7 in the Northeast. Fewer than half of the respondents offered a four-year curriculum; the remainder offered only the first two years of college instruction. One noteworthy exception was the new University of Michigan Dearborn Center, which was established to serve students in the final two years of college. This system could pose some interesting problems in acquiring books for the new library; perhaps they will have to run before they can walk. Surprisingly, half of these schools also provided some graduate courses, with many of them offering full programs for graduate degrees.

The sizes of these schools varied considerably. The lowest figure given for full-time equivalent undergraduate enrollment during 1960-61 was 106 at the George Mason College of the University of Virginia; 9 schools enrolled over a thousand undergraduates, and the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee was the largest with 5,300.

The University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee had also the largest library with 135,000 volumes. Six others had 45,000 volumes or more in their collections. None of these could really be considered a research library, although several definitely appear to be moving in that direction. The University of Louisiana at New Orleans, already over the 100,000-volume mark, added nearly 40,000 volumes a year to its collection. Five others added 10,000 or more volumes. Only three, where the student body was small, reported adding fewer than 1,000 volumes a year.

Important to the off-campus unit, and to the degree of dependence upon the main library, is the distance involved. The greatest distance was at the University of Nevada where the Southern Regional Division at Las Vegas is located 500 miles from the main campus at Reno; 165 miles separate the Duluth campus of the University of Minnesota and its parent institution. The shortest distance was about 10 miles between Seton Hall University College of Newark and the South Orange campus. Twelve others ranged from 25 to 95 miles between campuses.

The results of the survey indicated that some of the 18 off-campus units were no less independent than the University of California and the State University of New York and had little communication with the main institutions. This administrative independence naturally af-
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affected library policies. Ten of the libraries sent their annual reports to a local administrative officer, 3 to both a local person and the head librarian at the main campus, and 5, including the University of Connecticut at Waterbury, University of Kentucky at Ashland, the East St. Louis campus of Southern Illinois University, Seton Hall in Newark, and the University of Illinois at Chicago, reported only to the head librarian. Those libraries which were subject to local jurisdiction tended to maintain their independence in most aspects. Most of the larger off-campus libraries were autonomous, although it might be assumed that some of their librarians would be in an ambiguous position between the head librarian on the main campus and the off-campus administration. Only two libraries, the University of Maine at Portland and the George Mason College of the University of Virginia, mentioned any conflicts, and these were apparently between persons on the local campus. The administrative lines seem to be pretty clearly defined in most cases.

The East St. Louis campus of Southern Illinois University, and possibly some of the branches of Seton Hall, seemed to have the only libraries where their status as such a unit affected the acquisition policies. In all other cases, the librarian reported complete independence of the main library in book selection. In some cases, such as the University of Nevada at Las Vegas which is such a great distance from the Reno campus, or the Dearborn Center of the University of Michigan, which at present contains only about 16,000 volumes when the library system at Ann Arbor is rapidly approaching the three million mark, it is obviously ridiculous to discuss an acquisition policy which would attempt to limit duplication between the two libraries. If, however, the distance between the two institutions is short enough to make a 24- or 48-hour delivery service feasible, and the budget of the off-campus unit is large enough to permit the purchase of expensive and infrequently used items, more consideration might be given to assigning subject areas for specialization between the parent library and its offspring. The establishment of policy concerning which types of material, such as documents, etc., should not be duplicated in the university might also mean a richer collection for the university. Faculty and students might not be willing to go along with such a policy, but an efficient mail service, plus a union catalog in some form on all campuses within a system, might lessen their sacrifices, and a noticeable increase in the total number of titles as opposed to the mere increase in volumes available to them might make these sacrifices worthwhile.
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Any library in an off-campus unit faces the decision of independent or dependent development early in its existence. In cataloging as well as in acquisition, the independent policy has had widespread and apparently unquestioned acceptance. Again, only Seton Hall and the East St. Louis center of Southern Illinois University had all their cataloging done at the main library. The Altoona campus of Pennsylvania State University did report some cataloging done at the main campus. Most off-campus units, regardless of size, do all their own cataloging. The reasons given for doing this fell primarily into one of two categories, time and local control. The idea that decentralized cataloging saved time presumably meant that it took less time for the book to arrive on the shelves of the library off campus, not that staff time was saved.

Possibly some of these libraries, especially those relatively close to the main library, might do some studies to see just how much, if any, money could be saved by centralized cataloging. Delay in getting the book to the shelves can be cut to a minimum by having the books delivered from the publisher or wholesaler to the place where the cataloging is to be done and then having an efficient campus mail system deliver the books to the library concerned. A little delay in time should not be terribly important for most of the books needed in an academic library. Where it could loom large would be for the relatively few books ordered on a rush basis. Here a genuine sacrifice not worth a possible financial saving may be involved.

The desirability of control so that cataloging can be adapted to local conditions also seemed important. This, too, can be a factor outweighing any cost considerations. However, with cataloging costs rising, more and more college libraries are accepting Library of Congress without question, and changing their cards only in rare cases. Any library which has instituted this policy has already foregone tailor-made cataloging. The question of centralized versus decentralized cataloging has been argued in many other places, and recently summarized by M. F. Tauber. Most discussions have been in terms of nonacademic libraries or departmental libraries on university campuses, but much of what has been said would still apply to off-campus libraries. Tauber indicates the need for more tested facts. Cost studies might reveal that the saving would not be as great as one would suspect. However, centralized cataloging might presumably save more in an off-campus unit library where 80 to 95 per cent of the titles would also be cataloged for the main library.

[544]
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Only ten of the libraries polled indicated that a union catalog containing at least main entry cards for books on both campuses was in existence. In all cases except that at East St. Louis, this union catalog was located on the main campus. While this is not at all surprising in terms of cost, certainly it is in terms of need. A union catalog at the branch would mean much more extra work than one at the main library, but in most cases, there should be considerably more interest at the branch in the main library's holdings than the reverse. While the desire on the part of administrators to have a catalog for the holdings of the entire university available on the central campus is valid, it should be suggested that there is an equal off-campus need for such a reference tool. This is particularly true when the two libraries have, with mutual agreement, refrained from purchasing some items already in the system. Here, a union catalog becomes a key to university-wide resources which the off-campus unit has not the privilege, but the right, of using. The telephone is not an effective substitute since most searches end with the catalog and every step further tends to make the user lose heart.

Most libraries permitted students and faculty of the off-campus unit to borrow directly from the main library if they could get there. One institution even provided transportation. Most also would request that the main library send books for the borrowers' use. But some seemed to depend upon interlibrary loan from other institutions in preference to the parent library. Those using the main library were frequently able to fill requests in 2 or 3 days. Others took as long as 10 to 14 days. The average was 5 to 6 days.

Although not asked specifically in the questionnaire, two libraries, the Dearborn Center of the University of Michigan and the Northern Center of the University of Kentucky, mentioned considerable reliance by faculty and students upon nearby public libraries. Others utilized university libraries in the area. The George Mason College of the University of Virginia is fortunate enough to be a short distance from the Library of Congress. This is an emergency approach, but as a permanent solution it has serious defects. These libraries are not close enough to be reached between classes, and they cannot be set up to serve the special needs of borrowers from other schools. Nor do most of these libraries feel they have a primary obligation to users from these off-campus units. Some, if they are overcrowded with their own public, may be annoyed by the presence of these students.

This description has given an indication of what exists on a nation-
wide basis. Perhaps a detailed discussion of one system may be of value. The Rutgers University library system has been described elsewhere and a further dissection here may appear superfluous. It is hoped, however, that if the situation is viewed from the point of view of the off-campus unit, a contribution can be made. Furthermore, the system has many unique facets, together with much that typifies an off-campus system. The study will be limited to the two libraries outside New Brunswick which serve the urban undergraduate schools in Camden and Newark, with emphasis upon the latter. These libraries have not been included in the survey results.

Rutgers-The State University of New Jersey, has held that title for some of its divisions since 1917. In 1945, the designation was applied to the entire University, and the state became the principal means of support for the University. In 1946, the University of Newark was absorbed by the state and by Rutgers. In 1950, the College of South Jersey in Camden came into the fold. The divisions in Newark and Camden are integral parts of the University, with the various deans reporting directly to the Dean of Administration in New Brunswick. Yet each is a separate institution with a full-time undergraduate student body and a four-year curriculum, and, in addition, some graduate schools which are not found on the main campus. In Newark, there are the Newark College of Arts and Sciences, the Graduate School of Business, the College of Nursing, the College of Pharmacy, and the School of Law. All but the last two are served by the Newark Colleges Library, or, as it is otherwise called, the John Cotton Dana Library. In addition, the Graduate School of Social Work and the Graduate School of Library Service offer courses in Newark. The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences also offers courses and has its students working under faculty in Newark.

The colleges in Newark, as part of the New York metropolitan area, willingly accept their role as urban schools. Almost all students commute, and in the future, dormitory facilities will be available only for the professional schools. No classes begin before 9 a.m., and despite great overcrowding, Saturday classes are ruled out because of the large number of students who find it necessary to work on Saturday. Each year the junior and senior classes are larger than the previous sophomore and junior classes as a result of students transferring from other institutions chiefly for financial and geographic reasons. A new campus is being planned, and its site has been deliberately chosen with little to offer other than proximity to transportation and the downtown area.
Libraries in Off-Campus Units

There is a laudable determination on the part of faculty and administration to give a first-class education to students who cannot afford to live at a campus university. The situation in Camden, adjacent to Philadelphia, is similar but on a smaller scale. Equally dedicated to the commuting student, it is located near the heart of the city. There, the College of South Jersey, University College, the Graduate School of Education, the Graduate School of Social Work, and the South Jersey Law School give courses, the latter having its own library.

The Dana Library in Newark has about 75,000 volumes to serve 2,000 full-time students. In Camden 32,000 volumes serve slightly more than 700 full-time students. This figure compares with 700,000 volumes in the main library serving roughly 8,000 students.

The University Librarian, who is the direct superior of both the off-campus libraries at Camden and Newark, is responsible for the allocation of the entire university book budget to these various units. This approach has a definite influence upon book selection policy. As these libraries fill in their undergraduate collection and, as is especially true in Newark, attempt to acquire a few research materials for faculty and graduate students, the problem of duplication manifests itself. According to the Statistics for College and University Libraries for 1959-60, collected by the Princeton University Library, the entire Rutgers budget for books, periodicals, and binding ranks twenty-third among 42 members of the Association of Research Libraries. If statistics were kept for titles added, the picture would be radically different. With four general libraries to support, Rutgers has a very high rate of duplication in titles purchased. Duplication of purely undergraduate materials is not questioned. The purchase of duplicates of more specialized items, already located elsewhere in the system, is considered reluctantly on the part of the librarians. No systematic attempt is made to avoid duplication with other libraries; most order requests are not even screened to see if the books are located elsewhere, but the occasional specialized and expensive item may be checked and questioned either by the off-campus librarian or by the University Bibliographer in New Brunswick. When book funds come from the same source, this reluctance is a natural reaction. Equally natural is the reaction of the faculty member who wants the book at hand, not 30 miles away.

University policy on promotions sets uniform standards of publication in terms of quality and quantity throughout the university. University-wide departmental committees in some departments help
to enforce the standards. The obvious question has then been raised: How can faculty at the off-campus units publish if the resources are not available to them? The answer, of course, has not been found, but some steps have been taken. An acquisition policy has been instituted which specifies that bibliographic tools will be purchased in depth, so that people doing research will at least be able to identify what material exists. This policy which was influential in the decision to purchase the new *British Museum Catalog of Printed Books* for Newark has, so far, been inadequate. The faculty have attempted to solve their research problems by going to other libraries in the area or by making frequent trips to New Brunswick. Consequently, many faculty, even those conscientiously involved in research, do not make any use of their own library whatsoever.

There is no cataloging or ordering done in Newark. Titles are searched and verified in Newark, then routed to New Brunswick where the final order form is processed. The books are received in New Brunswick where they are cataloged and labeled. The only processes performed in Newark are recording their arrival in the local order file and accessioning them. Approximately 29 days lapse from the time the order for nonrush United States trade books leaves Newark until the time the books arrive. In order to maintain this time schedule, it is necessary for the catalog department to give priority to books going to the off-campus libraries. This does not mean that a backlog has developed for the main library. However, processing for the main library is delayed a few days. This system is essentially the same for Camden.

Maintenance of the catalog itself is primarily the responsibility of the off-campus unit, although the catalog department usually has someone assigned as liaison who occasionally makes trips to the library to give personal supervision. This is a problem which the Rutgers libraries have in common with divisional and departmental libraries on many large university campuses. While divisional libraries are frequently too small to have professional catalogers, perhaps Newark and Camden could each have one full-time cataloger on their staffs to give supervision to catalog maintenance.

One attempt to bring the libraries together and make materials available on a university-wide basis has not been entirely successful. There is a campus mail with daily pick-ups and deliveries between Newark and New Brunswick. Camden is too far from New Brunswick for this service and relies upon the U.S. Post Office. An intra-library
loan system has been established and theoretically could give 24 hour service at Newark. In practice, two-thirds of the intra-library loan requests take three days or longer. This intra-library loan service is open to all persons associated with the university, including undergraduates. An interesting sidelight is that Newark lends to New Brunswick almost as many titles as it borrows. The answer probably lies in the catalog. In the New Brunswick catalog there is a main entry card for every title owned by Newark. In Newark and Camden the telephone has to suffice for information on holdings in New Brunswick. This inconvenience has apparently prevented the people at Newark and Camden from utilizing the University's collections as a whole and from considering them as a part of their own collection.

The campus mail is the vehicle for another service accorded to faculty members in the off-campus units, i.e., the regular routing of journals. Those who wish may have recent issues of journals not in Newark sent to them regularly for a brief period. This service permits scanning quickly many journals which would not otherwise be available to the faculty; for those who utilize it, the service has proved of major importance in their work. This practice, of course, is a time-consuming operation for both libraries and occasionally puts the user of the main library at a disadvantage, since many of the routed journals do not otherwise circulate.

It was previously noted that the faculty seek their research materials elsewhere, and this is also true of many students. The Newark Public Library has the happy (or unhappy) fortune to be located closer to many of the school's dispersed classrooms than does the college library. Its excellent collection is also a large drawing card. While it has welcomed the students in the past, its building is becoming more and more crowded, and there may be an increasing desire to have the students rely more heavily upon their college library.

These circumstances mean that besides providing an improved physical plant with a better location, Rutgers will need more books. This is a major problem that presents itself to almost all the off-campus libraries questioned. The only exception may be Louisiana State University at New Orleans. This library is the only one which felt that its collection was satisfactory. This paucity of books, of course, plagues most libraries, but it is especially true of the off-campus unit. Most are relatively new institutions which have serious gaps in their collection as far as older titles are concerned. Many cannot even keep up with current publishers' output. When a faculty
member is hired for one of the institutions, he is frequently attracted by the name attached to it, and he may be required to possess the same qualifications as his counterpart on the main campus. His promotion, too, may be subject to the same criteria as those of his colleague. In large universites, these criteria may be reduced to quality and quantity of publication. The small independent school is either not so insistent upon publication, or the faculty member expects to make his own adjustment. It is a different situation for the off-campus unit, especially if it does attract by its name and appoints and promotes on the same basis as the main campus. The faculty member wants the same right to have readily accessible a book collection which permits him to do research. If major research collections are nearby, he may not be vociferous in his complaints. If they are not, what can the library do? Two of the campuses at the University of California have found the most nearly perfect solution. Two separate major research collections have been established. Although the size of these collections will probably never be reached by any of the off-campus units included in this survey, some seem to be trying to develop true research collections, notably Louisiana State University at New Orleans, the Southern Illinois University Southwestern campus at Alton, and the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee. Rutgers-Newark, the University of Illinois at Chicago, and the Norfolk College of William and Mary may yet head in that same direction. This solution is the expensive one.

Failing this, the off-campus unit can attempt in several ways to bring the collection of the main library closer to its faculty, if one can assume that the mileage is not too great, as at the University of Nevada. Many of the libraries surveyed had no special provision for intra-library loan, and made no distinction with inter-library loan. An efficient intra-library loan system could be of great use, especially if it were coupled with an off-campus union catalog. Whichever method they use, these libraries could offer a real service to the students and faculty if books could be secured from other libraries within one or two days. The librarian of the Flint College of the University of Michigan suggested the use of one of its own library employees at the main library as a research assistant to gather materials needed by a faculty member in advance of a trip to the main library. This practice would presumably avoid the common difficulties met by faculty, who sometimes waste half a day locating some of their references. Such a service could be largely bibliographic and for that reason might rightly
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fall under the responsibility of the library. Lastly, some thought might be given to the possibilities of building up a solid bibliographic collection such as Rutgers is attempting to build, which would at least give the faculty a key to what is available in their fields. None of these approaches is going to solve the problem, but the patchwork approach of sending borrowers to neighboring libraries has not solved it either. It is probable that California’s two huge libraries have not even completely erased it.

Many off-campus libraries appear to be in a great state of flux with new buildings being planned, increases in book funds expected, and major administrative changes contemplated. The recent establishment of these libraries and their rapid growth are undoubtedly major factors in this change, just as it is in their lack of books. This state of flux appears to be carrying them towards more independent development, which may be what can be expected in the future. On the other hand, perhaps as the off-campus libraries grow, they will become more closely allied with the main library in an effort, desperate or calculated, to meet the demands upon their inadequate resources. Other libraries without administrative ties have found that cooperative agreements can ease some of their problems. Might this not also be true of parts of the same university?
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Library Cooperation in an Urban Setting:
The Pittsburgh Story

HELEN-JEAN MOORE

Only in an urban community in the United States it is possible for such conditions to exist as those which result from the concentration of faculty and students pursuing similar ends in private institutions of higher education, each maintaining services and facilities worth millions of dollars. The duplications are fantastic. Each institution has its hierarchy of administrative officers, its administrative staff, and its service staff devoted to producing the milieus within which the faculties and students function. When there are five colleges and universities within a distance which can be covered in a half-hour drive in city traffic—as there are in Pittsburgh—there are five English departments organized to teach parallel courses; five philosophy, music, fine arts, classics, speech, history, economics, political science, sociology, biology, chemistry, mathematics, physics, psychology, and perhaps other departments—expensively staffed and provided with city-valued space for offices, classrooms, and laboratories—all devoted to offering courses leading to what each institution regards as a liberal education. All five provide professional education as well: two only on the bachelor’s level; three on the master’s, doctoral, and postdoctoral levels. All grant accredited degrees which entitle graduates to enter schools for further study or to work in the professions to which their degrees apply. These neighboring institutions—the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Duquesne University, Chatham College, and Mount Mercy College—educate more than 19,000 undergraduates and more than 4,700 graduates yearly at an estimated annual expenditure in excess of $43,000,000.

To serve the nearly 24,000 students and approximately 3,000 fac-
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ulty and professional staffs, these institutions maintain 5 libraries which represent huge capital investments, occupy city real estate, and employ costly professional and clerical staffs. For their 27,000 users, the libraries offer an aggregate collection of 1,355,173 volumes and expend $960,000 yearly. Less than 40 per cent of this expenditure, however, is devoted to the purchase of library materials. Staff costs exceed $595,000 for the libraries involved. To consider students, collections, and costs in the aggregate is not to define the full extravagance of this typical American situation. Each entity is fundamentally concerned with providing for its own students, faculty, and staff, and since these individuals have to use similar sources for their results in knowledge, each of the 5 libraries is spending a large percentage of its funds yearly to buy exactly the same books, periodicals, and documents as are purchased by the four neighboring institutions and a larger percentage of its annual budget to provide parallel services. The collections as they exist represent huge duplications. Twenty-four thousand students, with their diverse interests and intensified twentieth-century demands, cannot draw upon 1,355,173 different works. They would be indeed fortunate if as many as a third of the total represented variety.

One might well ask whether or not this American system is worth maintaining when one considers costs and reviews the library facilities available at these costs. In the Soviet Union, where frightening educational rivalry has developed, the situation is not like this. At the urban University of Moscow for 30,000 students and 2,350 faculty, the library is said to contain 5,500,000 volumes. In the absence of precise data for comparison, one can only speculate upon the relative prices of maintaining 5 private institutions for 24,000 students and of maintaining a single institution for 30,000 students. One would probably have to conclude that of the two types of institutions in urban environments, the Soviet system is producing more impressive library results than the American system at what is probably a lower cost for institutional setting.

When one considers educational results, however, one finds overwhelming justification for American extravagance. The 5 private institutions in Pittsburgh—maintaining their 5 sets of facilities and their 5 individualized philosophies of education—contribute to the protective diversity which perpetuates a democratic system. For this one must pay, and one pays willingly. To eliminate some of the bad features of the system, one must apply intelligence to planning. In
Pittsburgh, certain plans have already been developed to meet the library needs of the local student and faculty population.

Students in Pittsburgh, like students in other urban centers in the United States, draw upon the resources of a great public library. The Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh adds over 1.5 million volumes to the 1,355,173 volumes held by its neighboring colleges and universities. The drive which swings one past the colleges and universities also takes one past the library's doors. The nature of its collections and services as well as its location places it in a position to be involved with the library problems of the educational institutions.

In recognition of the problems, the heads of the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, and Mellon Institute requested the formation of the Committee on the Coordination of Libraries in the Oakland District. Members of the Committee were the librarians of the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, and Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. The Committee's task was essentially to apply human intelligence to the task of maintaining diversity while eliminating the worst effects of institutional independence on library development. All the work of the group had to be accomplished within the restrictions imposed by the legal structures of the separate institutions and within limits set by the obligations of each to a separate constituency. There was no outside, overall financial support. In spite of the severe limitations, however, the Committee made progress in solving the local problems, and their actions resulted ultimately in the extension of privileges and advantages to the three institutions not represented on the Committee.

The Committee studied and rejected the possibilities of a joint library building and of joint storage facilities because of the obligations of each to its own public, but it took other actions which have helped to make the collections mutually available, and it outlined a program for purchasing which made each library responsible for certain types of material in particular fields of knowledge.

Beginning in 1948, as a result of Committee recommendations, faculty and graduate students of Carnegie Institute of Technology and of the University of Pittsburgh have had mutual direct borrowing privileges, and these were almost immediately extended to other local faculty and graduate students. In return, Duquesne University, Chatham College, and Mount Mercy made their facilities available on similar terms. Undergraduates have gained mutual library use of
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reference, document, periodical, and book materials, and, under certain circumstances, they have also been given borrowing privileges. Mount Mercy lends books to all local college students. Senior tutorial students at Chatham College have borrowing rights, upon payment of the fee charged to general members of the community, at the University of Pittsburgh during the period in which they are preparing their theses. During regular college and university vacations, when local students are not in residence, Pittsburgh's library resources and services are heavily used by students from outside institutions.

A second action of the Committee was to liberalize local interlibrary loan services. The original agreement applied to the University and Carnegie Institute of Technology and provided that loans be made for faculty and graduate students of materials not available on the individual campus and not restricted to reference or reserve use at the home institutions. The loans were made for two weeks with renewal privileges for works not in demand. For research purposes, special school-term loans could be arranged for certain types of important material. Because of the nature of its commitments as a public-supported institution, Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh has not provided interlibrary loan services to local colleges and universities. The original agreement between the two institutions continues in effect, and it has been extended so that the other colleges and university enjoy similar rights and offer them. Although none of the libraries involved in this mutually beneficial system compiles statistics measuring the number of transactions involved, all interlibrary loan librarians report that the exchange is large. The University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, and Duquesne University report that a substantial proportion of their interlibrary loan services is extended to local business and industrial libraries.

Further to facilitate mutual use of resources, two union list projects were sponsored by the Committee—one of which has continued successfully. Because of the enormous expense involved, the Committee rejected the idea of a complete union catalog of the holdings of the three libraries in favor of a limited union catalog maintained by each of the libraries. A plan was instituted to exchange author cards in certain fields and to file these in the respective catalogs of the three participating libraries. The purpose of the system was to make graduate students and faculty immediately aware of the location of a desired work and to inform library staff responsible for the development of collections of the local availability of certain works.
The theory behind the plan was excellent, but in practice the system became difficult and expensive to maintain as the libraries' growth accelerated, and, in consequence, the project has been abandoned.

The second union list project has flourished, however, to the great benefit not only of the 3 institutions responsible for its financial support, but also of all local libraries. In 1948, the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, and Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh took over the list of serial holdings of local libraries begun by the Pittsburgh Chapter of the Special Libraries Association. Under the Association's direction, 2 printed editions of the list were issued in 1926 and 1934, and a later printed edition was discussed as late as the spring of 1955, but publication was given up in favor of retaining service from the card file. As originally prepared, the list contained technical journals. In 1948, however, when the list numbered 5,000 titles, the cooperating institutions agreed to widen its scope to include periodicals in all fields and the number advanced in that year to 8,000 titles. By November 1, 1961, the number had increased to 13,661 titles. Since 1948, the number of calls made upon the list, which is housed in the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, has increased nearly 330 per cent. Currently, 56 libraries report holdings.

The great usefulness of the list can hardly be overstated. It facilitates interlibrary loan. Nearly 1,300 needed serials were located in 1960. Of 1,907 requests during the year, only 3 came by mail; 1,378 were telephone inquiries, and 526 were calls in person. The list serves the function originally intended by Pittsburgh's Special Libraries Association; it provides an indispensable community service. In addition, the list has important usefulness in guiding purchase. At the University of Pittsburgh, Acquisitions personnel consult it faithfully before recommending purchase of major serial publications of specialized interest and, as a result, have been able, through information furnished, to divert nearly $18,000 in the past year to materials not already held in the district.

It was to this problem of duplication that the Committee on the Coordination of Libraries further addressed itself, and it is in this area where its usefulness was potentially the greatest that its task was most complex. The Committee stated as its operating principle that it would concern itself with costly and rarely used materials—that each institution would have to be responsible for the materials supporting its own teaching and community commitments. Accordingly, it made the following large divisions of responsibility for the
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fields of knowledge, divisions which recognized the positions of the institutions at the time of agreement: University of Pittsburgh—research materials in the humanities, social studies, and biological sciences; Carnegie Institute of Technology and Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh—research materials in the physical sciences, engineering, and fine arts.

Within this framework, adjustments had to be made. Carnegie Library, through its Technology Division, had and continues to have obligations to local industries for materials both in the applied and pure sciences. Carnegie Institute of Technology, while its interest was and continues to be primarily in the field of pure science, nevertheless, needs much material in the realm of applied science. In December 1948, the Committee, wrestling with this problem, was forced to conclude that—except for mathematics in which Carnegie Institute of Technology had primary interest—the "division of purchases must be based largely upon special needs and ability to purchase individual items" and that the two technical libraries "must always complement each other in the same general fields, rather than develop in sharply divided areas." 9

Since 1948, however, the situation has changed for the University of Pittsburgh: there have been such developments in mathematics and other sciences and in engineering that the University has had to take a more active role in the collection of research materials than it did at the time the agreement was promulgated. Even at the time of the agreement, further clarification of the position of the libraries in relation to fine arts materials had to be made. The importance of the Henry Clay Frick Library of Fine Arts of the University of Pittsburgh had to be considered and the respective interests of Carnegie Institute of Technology and of Carnegie Library had to be defined. The interest of the latter two in the performing arts was emphasized. Again, however, the shift of institutional emphasis is apparent in this area; the University now has programs in painting, in music history, and in dramatics which require library support.

A striking example of the effect of changing institutional needs occurred in the matter of the decisions made in an agreement of 1955, between the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, for the divisions of responsibility for back files of the New York Times and of United Nations documents. In that year, the University agreed to make its nineteenth-century files of the Times available to users referred by Carnegie librarians, and the public library
agreed to assume responsibility for the microtext edition of certain classes of documents published by the United Nations. The extreme lateness of this material—sometimes the lag has been as much as three years—forced the library to buy published versions of many documents to meet requests. But with the establishment of the University’s Graduate School of Public and International Affairs in 1958, the pressure of demand increased, and in the summer of 1961, the University, to meet the needs of its own students, placed a standing order for United Nations’ documents. Within six years, changes in the needs of one of the libraries involved made the agreement untenable.

These adjustments which have had to be made over the years indicate the basic problems faced by institutions existing under the necessity of evolving cooperative programs. No agreements can be set up by the wisest library administrators which apply for all times in the institutional lives with which they are dealing. Within the framework provided by the Committee on the Coordination of Libraries in the Oakland District in 1947 and 1948, there is still opportunity for sensible and constant cooperative effort. The mutual use of research collections is a requisite for cooperative acquisition, and enlightened administrations have extended this use and assure the continuance of this fundamental. The immensely useful union catalog of serials goes on and grows. Increasingly, librarians responsible for the acquisition of rare and costly serials consult it before purchase. An attitude of cooperation prevails among local librarians. When Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh considered the purchase of the latest monumental Italian dictionary, a call to the University of Pittsburgh assured the possession of the Bompiani to one library in the district. When Carnegie Institute of Technology considered the five volume Biographical and Bibliographical Dictionary of the Italian Humanists, a similar call prevented unnecessary duplication. The University of Pittsburgh was saved expenditure on Mansi’s Sacrorum Conciliorum and on St. Louis University’s microfilm series of Vatican materials because these are already held by Duquesne University and will be made available to all district scholars for whom this rare and valuable material is significant. But these efforts and others like them, important as they are, are not enough.

The Committee existed for only two years; no mention of this cooperative project appears in the annual reports of the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, or Carnegie Library
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of Pittsburgh after 1948. In the past 13 years, major changes have occurred in the 3 institutions represented on that Committee. Both the University of Pittsburgh and Carnegie Institute of Technology have new administrations and new administrative goals. Both are being dynamically changed to meet the exigencies of a complex time. The Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, too, has altered; it now serves Allegheny County and not the city alone, and under Pennsylvania's library legislation of 1961, it has broadened responsibilities. All 3 of the institutions brought informally into Pittsburgh's cooperative library effort also have new administrative officers who have enunciated new philosophies and new goals. The nature of these changes has not been such as to eliminate the need for coordination of libraries; rather it has intensified the necessity.

To serve the combined library needs of the 24,000 students and 3,000 faculty concentrated in one section of Pittsburgh, a new Committee on Library Coordination should be formed, and its membership should be expanded so that it has representatives from the 5 urban colleges and universities as well as from the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh. To make the Committee function as more than a discussion group, however, its members must be able to come to its work with full knowledge of the specific institutional ends which each is to serve. Basic to the accomplishment of any real cooperative effort is the definition of academic and research plans of the institutions involved. Only from such knowledge can intelligent judgments on the allocation of individual responsibilities be made. Only within each institution can provisions be made for giving the representative to this Committee the immense detail about immediate and projected programs for which his work should provide library resources.

Almost equally important to the effective functioning of the Committee proposed is some financial support—funds independent of the budgets of the libraries represented. All of the recommendations of the original Committee had to be determined by the ability of the separate libraries to make certain purchases. If a library had the funds available, it could acquire research materials which contributed to the common good; if the funds were not there, even needed material had to be passed by. Most libraries function on such an economy. Purchase is determined by ability to pay, and within limits, perhaps, the necessity operates to produce a desirable selectiveness in acquisition. The limits can be reached, however, easily enough. If a
committee well informed upon local needs had funds at its disposal, it could contribute immeasurably to the richness of local library resources. Its function would be clearly limited to the area in which the research needs of the separate institutions intersected. Library autonomy would be maintained in all areas of unique research and for all general programs.

In the last annual report on the Union List of Serials in the Pittsburgh Area, the librarian in charge explains a decrease in 1960 in the percentage of journals located on the grounds that the demand for foreign technical journals, particularly Russian and Japanese, had increased markedly. The holdings of these in a city where major research in technical subjects is being carried on by important collegiate and industrial institutions is not adequate to the demand. This is one sort of material which the Committee, if it were in command of funds, could acquire. There are others. In 1958, the University of Pittsburgh was compelled, because of budgetary considerations, to refuse to participate in a cooperative project to microfilm the Pittsburgh Press. This, too, is the sort of venture a cooperative Committee might well sponsor. Committee support might go also to significant materials in the social sciences and the humanities since these disciplines have not, in this society as they have in the Soviet, been relegated to the unimportant.

In Pittsburgh, as in other urban centers in the United States, where institutions of higher education flourish, cooperation among libraries is an imperative economy if one is to enjoy the vital luxury of diversity. Only by maintaining a constant awareness of the emphases of the separate institutions and by constant mutual consultation can the costly and unnecessary duplication of research materials be avoided. This important awareness, it would seem, might best be assured through the establishment of a continuing group—with some financial power—whose function would be to take awareness to consultation in an orderly committee framework. The American system almost guarantees the continuance of 5 private colleges and universities within 50 city blocks. The American system should also guarantee that they can cooperate with one another and with the public library which is their neighbor.
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7. Draft of February 26, 1947, by R. E. Doherty of Carnegie Institute of Technology summarizing a meeting of institutional heads. Subsequent details in this article are drawn from the annual reports of the librarians of the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Institute of Technology, and Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, and from memoranda of meetings made available by the Librarian of Carnegie Institute of Technology.


Anticipating Demands of the Future on the Urban University Library

EVERETT MOORE

AN INVESTIGATION of why some of the “major growth industries” of the postwar era have concentrated themselves in two states, Massachusetts and California, was the subject of “The Editor’s Easy Chair,” in Harper’s Magazine, September 1961. J. Fischer, writing under the title “Money Bait,” found that it was not promotion that attracted them, nor were there such lures as tax concessions, cheap labor, or freedom from labor union trouble. Such lures, he said, if they had formerly attracted old-fashioned industries like steel, textiles, and automobiles, never would have brought such new industries as those he was thinking of, which produce “items of small size but great value: transistors, magnetic tape, automation-control instruments, micro-bearings, computers, missile-fuel pumps, pharmaceuticals, inertial-navigation systems, to mention a few.”

These industries do not use huge tonnages of raw material and fuel, and so they do not have to be near ore bodies or coal mines. Their plants, he says, usually operate without noise, smoke, or smell, and actually are often an enhancement to a community. Since their personnel include many scientific and other white-collar workers who are almost impossible to organize, they are not greatly concerned about unions.

“T...
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deis, or at Caltech, Stanford, or one of the many campuses of the University of California."

By extension, if one accepts his thesis, one may conclude that the presence of great universities presupposes the presence of great and useful libraries. The industries that depend so heavily upon brains make extensive use of libraries in the communities in which they are situated, insofar as these libraries can be made available to them.

If the community setting with its intellectual industries and essentially related universities is thus dramatically epitomized in these two regions of the United States, it is to be found in many another urban area, though perhaps to more modest scale. And Fischer looks for similar developments on a major scale in such spots as in North Carolina, between Chapel Hill and Durham, and in the Sterling Forest area in New York, close to Tuxedo Park and West Point, where New York University plans to establish a major campus for advanced scientific study. Though not quite "urban" areas, they are actually or potentially intellectual centers.

If one attempts to predict the demands of the future on urban universities, the development of such modern industries, wherever they become a significant force in the university community, will have to be given a good deal of attention. This is not alone because of the obvious and pressing problems already experienced by every urban library in meeting off-campus demands for research materials. These problems have been under study by each library that finds itself in the center of modern industrial growth such as Fischer describes. Some problems are on their way to solution through extensive use of photocopy substitutes for original materials, through new methods of distributing articles to scientists, and through contractual arrangements for specialized service. Considerable thought has been given to developing regional cooperative schemes, and these may hold great promise if technological developments will permit quick location, assembling, and transmission of material within the region, so that cooperative use becomes more than competitive sharing.

The demands that are to be made upon the urban university library will perhaps be governed significantly by the extent to which public and special libraries fulfill their own obligations and recognize their full potential for service. The university library in an urban setting has learned that it owes certain services, direct or indirect, to research interests in the wider community, just as it does to its traditional clientele—its students, faculty, and researchers. Yet it has also learned,
or has been forced to recognize, that it cannot serve as a kind of public
library and grand central special library and also take care of its more
immediate needs on campus. Over-generous service to nonuniversity
users, though undertaken in a spirit of cooperation and good will,
can lead a library into an impossible attempt to please all comers, and
it is sure to result in unhappiness for all groups when its resources
are spread too thin. Several of the preceding articles have indicated
this in some detail.

Community-wide recognition of the interdependence of libraries
of all kinds seems essential to sound library economy. Though com-
plete master-planning may not be possible, or even desirable, libraries
of each type can attempt to define their objectives, map their areas of
service, and promote the fullest possible cooperation one with an-
other. Abundant opportunities for cooperation among libraries of all
types will no doubt continue to present themselves in years to come,
as experience of the past several decades has shown. Of utmost im-
portance will be the development of better coordinated systems of
libraries in urban areas.

A striking proposal for a centralized metropolitan public library
service is that for a new central library to serve the metropolitan area
of Washington, D.C., by F. Gutheim, an architect, writer, and planner,
and Director of the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies.
Addressing the annual meeting of the District of Columbia Library
Association, on May 17, 1961,\(^1\) he remarked that the great and sig-
nificant growth of libraries in the Washington area had occurred in
the suburban counties, and that with the suburban population boom
(two-thirds of the total population now live outside the boundaries
of the District of Columbia) these counties were just hitting their
stride in library growth. He compared this spectacular growth of li-
braries in the suburbs to the growth of hospitals, higher education,
and other community institutions and services, and noted that li-
braries' efforts had gone largely into making good the elementary
shortages of library service. As with other services, a strong central
library had not been created, and certain of the specialized types of
service were generally underdeveloped.

A large regional library was needed, Gutheim said, to serve the
growing needs of the whole metropolitan area. He pointed out the
need particularly for reference service for the "diversified and highly
demanding Washington business community." And in observing that
another two million population was forecast for Washington, he
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remarked that the suburbs were not only growing but were also diversifying. The large industrial parks with their characteristic research-and-development plants were being supplemented by heavier industries.

A single library system to serve the entire complex Washington area, Gutheim said, would reflect “not only the needs of individuals, families, and communities, but of the federal agencies, the universities with their educational and growing research activities, the industries in the area and especially those engaged in research and development work, the one thousand national associations, professional societies, and labor unions with headquarters here, and finally the demands of this growing hub of national and world communications.”

The day was not far off, he observed, when the District of Columbia, with its virtually stationary population of 800,000, would have as neighbors four counties, some of which would have larger populations, and all of which would be entitled to regard themselves as urban counties, with comparable populations, employment, and wealth, and with a far larger area. (It should be noted that the four counties are in two states.) “To serve this interrelated group of five major jurisdictions, in an age of increasing income, leisure, mobility, and higher cultural levels, we need a new library concept, one big enough to embrace the whole metropolitan area and its vast and expanding needs.”

The pertinence of such a bold concept for other metropolitan areas in the United States is clear. Pertinent also, for example, are the recommendations of the Cleveland Metropolitan Services Commission for a metropolitan library system, made in 1959, which proposed coordinated library services for the entire Metropolitan area of Cleveland and its suburbs. Subsequently, a second study group gave further consideration to the problem of library service for the citizens of Cuyahoga County and recommended initiation of legislation providing for the formation of metropolitan library districts.

Public library standards, as enunciated by the American Library Association in 1956, call for free access by every individual to “the full range of modern library facilities provided by regional, state, and federal library agencies.” According to the section of the report on the structure and government of library service:

By developing plans for joint and co-operative programs, public libraries will be tied together in a network that goes far to equalize
library opportunity and to bring the resources of the strongest libraries to all the people. Each separate taxing district in the country cannot maintain full library resources. Larger cities and counties should be able to do so, providing in one or more centers facilities that meet full standards even though these are not achieved in all neighborhood units. Groups of smaller taxing districts can also provide access to resources that meet these standards, if they operate together in library systems. The immediate availability of the full range of facilities will differ from locality to locality, depending on population and wealth, but there is no reason for sub-standard facilities in any part of the country or in any section of a state.\footnote{5}

In February 1961, an institute on “Cooperative Planning for Public Libraries,” sponsored by the School of Library Science of the University of Southern California, explored the possibility of establishing bibliographic and reference centers in southern California. Prominent among the proposals made in this conference was one for a system of regional reference libraries in the Greater Los Angeles Metropolitan Area, to serve population centers and commercial trading areas of 100,000 or more people. More specialized and technical inquiries would be referred to the Los Angeles Public Library, or to the State Library, for interlibrary loan. The plan would be contingent upon state aid. It would be developed and administered by formation of a federation of library jurisdictions, organized under a council of directors representing the participating libraries.

Development of such metropolitan systems will depend upon the success with which the problems of interrelating metropolitan governments themselves can be met. Some useful documents and references on the subject were published in the report \footnote{7} on the California State Library’s 1958 Workshop on Problems of Library Service in Metropolitan Areas.

Among a number of plans under consideration for regional reference service on a statewide basis is New York’s Cooperative Program for the Development of Reference and Research Library Resources. The report of the Commissioner of Education’s committee on the program \footnote{8} recommended a network of 5 regional reference and research library systems to serve as part of a comprehensive plan of library service for residents of the state. It would be an extension of the existing services of college, university, and special libraries, and would be subsidized by state aid. Its integrated program of library service would “assist college and university students—tomorrow’s lead-
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ing citizens—and the research workers and scholars who contribute to the advancement of both fundamental and applied knowledge."

Other patterns of regional reference library service are being developed or are under consideration in the states of Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Massachusetts, and in the metropolitan areas of Metropolitan Toronto, Westchester County, New York, Denver-Tri-County, San Joaquin Valley, California, North San Francisco Bay, Baltimore County, and Los Angeles County.9

University libraries in urban areas will need to become increasingly interested in such efforts at coordinating public library systems and husbanding community resources. Only through the success of such schemes will they be preserved from inappropriate and excessive pressures upon them to provide services that are better provided by public and special libraries. The newer-fashioned industries—electronics, space research, systems development, and the like—will presumably have to develop aggressively their own special library services, individual or cooperative. The need for greater special libraries will become increasingly apparent as nearby university libraries find that they must turn their attentions more and more to meeting the needs of their own greatly extended programs.

Differentiation between a university's scientific and technical libraries and industry's libraries, however, will be growing less marked. Both are "special" libraries, and both are concerned with problems of improving scientific communication. Present difficulties of extending service to industry will be largely overcome as progress is made in developing new methods for supplying technical articles to scientists, as, for example, through purchase of single articles at a unit price, pre-selected through improved and comprehensive indexing. A recent article in Science by J. A. MacWatt10 explores the possibilities of this proposal. This is but one of a number of such schemes recently proposed for the purpose of furnishing low-cost reproduction services to researchers and making unpublished research available to the public. Special libraries will be enabled to become more self-sufficient as a result of such developments, and will need to call less on university libraries for scientific materials.

It is not only for the scientist that the university library must search for ever better ways of organizing its collections for use. Vastly greater numbers of students and advanced scholars in all fields must depend upon library resources, which, in many cases, have not been expanding at the same rate that educational programs have. New
universities and colleges are being established, and both undergraduate and graduate programs are burgeoning, but in many instances their libraries are not receiving the massive support that would seem to be necessary to start even the basic undergraduate programs. Support of doctoral programs often lags disgracefully.

The major universities in the United States have become renowned for their well organized and efficient facilities for research, particularly by comparison with libraries in the old world. Scholars, provoked though they may be by misplaced and lost books, petty annoyances in circulation rules, and deficiencies in collections in their own special fields of interest, come back from sabbatical leaves with more kindly feelings for our library services if they have encountered some of the library systems in Europe that are hedged by antiquated restrictions or strangled by inadequate systems of classification and organization. But even the most efficient and well stocked libraries have found that they must find ways to function more efficiently than they do in the face of the proliferation of literature reporting the results of research and the growth in the number of people using the literature.

Members of the Association of Research Libraries recently listed these research activities and operating services as necessary in meeting the accepted library goals:

(1) Finding additional ways to integrate materials into research library collections with greater speed and economy.

(2) Studying methods of preservation of research library materials and promoting the use of permanent and durable paper.

(3) Searching for ways to recruit and train the professional manpower needed to carry out the work of research libraries.

(4) Investigating the potential and promoting the effective application of new technology to library operations.

(5) Promoting the effective use of research materials by the research community.

The revival of the book catalog is one of the immediately promising developments growing out of new publishing techniques. The printed Library of Congress catalogs, the National Union Catalog, and New Serials Titles, on a national scale, and in a regional system, the book catalog of the Los Angeles County Public Library, have opened unlimited prospects for extension of the techniques to other libraries and to subject collections. D. C. Weber, speaking in July 1961 before
Anticipating Demands of Future on Urban University Library

a meeting of the Book Catalogs Interdivisional Committee of the A.L.A.'s Resources and Technical Services Division and the Reference Services Division, said that there was evidence that many libraries would be undertaking to publish book catalogs of at least parts of their collections in order to make their own systems more efficient, to make their collections better known, and to satisfy demands from nonresident scholars.

The University of California has recently been authorized by its regents to print in book form the catalogs of its libraries at Berkeley and Los Angeles, not only to make their resources better available to the 5 other campuses of the University (soon to be increased to seven), but also to enable other libraries to locate research materials. In a state like California, in which a number of new university campuses and state colleges are now being developed and where new privately endowed colleges and universities are being established and older ones expanded and developed, the book catalogs for two of the state's largest research libraries will be of great importance. The state's master plan for development of public higher education specified that the library facilities of the University should be made available, where reasonable, to faculties of the other state-supported institutions.

Further development of schemes for cooperative access can be expected to grow from such already established and notably valuable institutions as the Midwest Inter-Library Center. This library enjoys the advantages of broad regional participation and of the varied program not only of storage of individually owned materials but of joint acquisition of some collections. And it has ventured into the field of central administration of collections such as that of foreign newspapers on film, which benefits libraries everywhere by enabling them to borrow or purchase film copies for their own users. Extension of the kind of program developed by M.I.L.C. seems inevitable, either on regional or national or even international bases, if library resources are to be made widely and quickly available.

Urban university libraries, then, face an era in which they will be called upon to provide services for unprecedented numbers of students and to supply more efficient facilities for searching out and making quickly available the materials of research than are generally in use in libraries now. Effective development of such facilities by research libraries, and the extension of their resources to other libraries that are dependent to some extent upon them, by utiliza-
tion of whatever technological devices are reasonably applicable, will appear to be their main objectives. These can be achieved only if the potentialities of other libraries in the university library's community—the public and school libraries and the special libraries of industry and research—are also fully realized.
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Recruiting in Urban University Libraries:
Some Suggestions

HELEN-JEAN MOORE

Librarians recognize that recruiting is now more than ever their business—that they must attract to their profession able young people for whom librarianship is a positive choice, made in the full knowledge of what it has to offer and of what resources of intelligence and personal force they can bring to it. Because librarians in urban colleges and universities have access to the largest concentrations of student population, they have a particular responsibility for launching effective recruiting programs.

City universities and colleges, located in the neighborhood of a library school, can establish vital traineeship programs. Talented and ambitious graduates enroll in those programs for advanced study in which they can support themselves. They exist on meager stipends as graduate assistants, reading papers and teaching large classes, during the grind that produces the doctorate. Libraries can more than meet the competition of other departments by paying adequate salaries for these subject-trained students. Imaginative attention to their work assignments so that their skills are challenged will make them valuable as employees during their period of professional education and will ultimately send into the field mature, experienced new librarians. Furthermore, librarianship still has the advantage of offering—a rarity in the learned professions—a marketable degree at the master's level. The work-study period need not be unduly prolonged, and the graduate enters his profession early.

Urban university librarians can work with guidance personnel on their own and on other local campuses. Their campaigns to inform directors of the variety of opportunities in librarianship and of the breadth of talent and educational background useful in their field

Miss Moore is also Chairman of the Recruiting Committee of the Pennsylvania Library Association.
may be aimed at many sources. Placement officers are grateful for suggestions which help to solve the career problems of liberal arts majors of broad, rather than narrowly channeled intellects. They need to be informed that majors in the humanities, social studies, and natural sciences, in education, business, and other professions, can be placed in college and university, special, public, and school libraries. And they need to be told that libraries are not the last refuge of the introvert—that they are dynamic, rather than static institutions.

University librarians working in a city have unparalleled opportunities for conducting public relations programs. Radio and television stations and transportation systems will carry messages about library careers as public service features. Clubs of all kinds welcome well informed speakers from academic institutions. Newspapers print releases which explain the library world. Urban university librarians are in a position to speak authoritatively through these media to large numbers of parents who influence the career choices of their sons and daughters. In city universities especially, librarians can raise their voices and be heard.
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<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Scientific Management in Libraries</td>
<td>Mauritius F. Tauber</td>
<td>Jan. 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Availability of Library Research Materials</td>
<td>Dorothy M. Crossland</td>
<td>April 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>William F. Kollam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 3</td>
<td>N. 1</td>
<td>Current Trends in Personnel Administration</td>
<td>Bernard Van Horne</td>
<td>July 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Services to Readers</td>
<td>Leslie W. Dunlap</td>
<td>Oct. 1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Library Associations in the United States and the</td>
<td>David H. Clift</td>
<td>Jan. 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>British Commonwealth</td>
<td>Robert Vesper</td>
<td>April 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Current Acquisitions Trends in American Libraries</td>
<td>David C. Meares</td>
<td>July 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew H. Horn</td>
<td>Oct. 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>State and Provincial Libraries</td>
<td>Maurice F. Tauber</td>
<td>Jan. 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paxton P. Price</td>
<td>April 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 4</td>
<td>N. 1</td>
<td>American Books Abroad</td>
<td>Dan Lacy</td>
<td>July 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mechanization in Libraries</td>
<td>Charles Bohte</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peter S. Jennison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Manuscripts and Archives</td>
<td>Arnold H. Trotier</td>
<td>Oct. 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Rare Book Libraries and Collections</td>
<td>R. W. G. Vail</td>
<td>Jan. 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Howard H. Peckham</td>
<td>October 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 5</td>
<td>N. 1</td>
<td>Current Trends in Circulation Services</td>
<td>Wayne E. Yawmee</td>
<td>July 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Research in Librarianship</td>
<td>A. A. E. Breitweiler</td>
<td>Oct. 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Manuscripts and Archives</td>
<td>R. W. V. Vail</td>
<td>Jan. 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Legal Aspects of Library Administration</td>
<td>Howard H. Peckham</td>
<td>April 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 6</td>
<td>N. 1</td>
<td>Current Trends in Book Publishing</td>
<td>Wayne E. Yawmee</td>
<td>July 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aspects of Library Public Relations</td>
<td>A. A. E. Breitweiler</td>
<td>Oct. 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Current Trends in Bibliography</td>
<td>Howard H. Peckham</td>
<td>April 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 7</td>
<td>N. 1</td>
<td>Current Trends in Book Publishing</td>
<td>Roy B. Stokes</td>
<td>July 1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Current Trends in Library Administration</td>
<td>Ernest J. Peckham</td>
<td>Jan. 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Current Trends in Bibliography</td>
<td>Roy B. Stokes</td>
<td>April 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 8</td>
<td>N. 1</td>
<td>Current Trends in Adult Education</td>
<td>C. Walter Stone</td>
<td>July 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Current Trends in Newly Developing Countries</td>
<td>Wilfred J. Plume</td>
<td>Oct. 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Photoduplication in Libraries</td>
<td>James E. Skipper</td>
<td>Jan. 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Music Libraries and Librarianship</td>
<td>Vincent Duckles</td>
<td>April 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 9</td>
<td>N. 1</td>
<td>State Aid to Public Libraries</td>
<td>S. Janice Kee</td>
<td>July 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Current Trends in Bookmobiles</td>
<td>Harold Goldstahl</td>
<td>Jan. 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Current Trends in Antiquarian Books</td>
<td>Hallmuth Lehmann-Haupt</td>
<td>April 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 10</td>
<td>N. 1</td>
<td>Future of Library Service: Demographic Aspects and</td>
<td>Frank L. Schick</td>
<td>July 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implications, Part I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implications, Part II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maurice F. Tauber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Library Trends

Forthcoming numbers are as follows:


The numbers of LIBRARY TRENDS issued prior to the present one dealt successively with college and university libraries, special libraries, school libraries, public libraries, libraries of the United States government, cataloging and classification, scientific management in libraries, the availability of library research materials, personnel administration, services to readers, library associations in the United States and British Commonwealth, acquisitions, national libraries, special materials and services, conservation of library materials, state and provincial libraries in the United States and Canada, American books abroad, mechanization in libraries, manuscripts and archives, rare book libraries and collections, circulation services, research in librarianship, cooperation, legal aspects of library administration, book publishing, public relations, library administration, bibliography, adult education, newly developing countries, photoduplication, music libraries, state aid, theological libraries, bookmobiles, antiquarian books, the future of library service, and periodical publishing.