

to the president and the instruments of large scale planning, and of making him less vulnerable to pressures of academic department heads. Such rank is the librarian's, for example, at the University of Minnesota and in the large schools of the Pacific Northwest. Actually, of course, in universities where this pertains, the librarian is still in a sense competing with the deans of the schools of engineering, medicine, law, etc., just as the college librarian must who is placed in the position of one academic department head among many responsible to the dean of the faculty. The various professional associations are still just as difficult to satisfy too.

In the literature of higher educational administration and business management, precepts referring to the library are very sparse indeed, often appearing in some such form as "The library should certainly be close to the president's heart."⁵ Of general books on college administration published between 1900 and 1949, Harriet Wise reports in a master's paper at Western Reserve that only 23 of 53 had any information about the library, and most of that in scattered references.⁶ There is a wealth of doctrine on the broad subject of the institutional budget, with an occasional allusion to the library, usually as a special problem. These references frequently reveal what a librarian would consider a lack of understanding or specious standards of judgment.

John Millett, whose 1952 *Financing Higher Education in the U.S.* made some oft-quoted critical statements about libraries, has more recently approximated an accurate statement of "the library problem" which deserves consideration here:

The importance of a library to the academic community is too well known to require any comment. There are some very real issues, however, to be resolved in library administration. Ideally, the library function is closely related to the academic objectives of a particular college or university. At the same time, library management has become a professional specialty in the academic community: The ordering, accessioning, cataloguing, custody, preservation, and distribution of books and periodicals must be carried out in an orderly, technical fashion. The work of helping students and scholars to use reference guides and to locate desired library materials relevant to a particular field or subject has also become a specialized activity. Moreover, the library facilities of a college or university must be operated some eighty to ninety or more hours a week. Ordinarily no other academic building on a college or university campus is so intensively used as a library.⁷

Academic Budgets and Their Administration—1962

He goes on to say that two major issues confront library management today: the development of specialized library facilities and how far a university will go in establishing them, and secondly, how large a collection a college or university should maintain.

This observation is worth quoting here because, for almost the first time, a prominent spokesman for academic administration has stated clearly the dilemma of the library's place in the administrative structure. He has gone on to imply inescapably that library management and institutional administration must work very closely in planning for the future. Here we come to the heart of the matter. For if it can be said that excessive departmentalization characterized higher education in the twenties and thirties and that general education or divisional area studies appeared in reaction to this practice, to dominate the early postwar years,⁸ certainly the past decade was one of extensive administrative change. The wave of GI enrollments tested academic organization and led to adjustments as complex and bureaucratic as they were necessary. And with considerable help from the Ford Foundation, certainly private institutions have had to accept long-range planning as a way of life rather than a textbook principle.⁹

Reorganization of higher educational administration and realistic long-range planning then are major new factors affecting college and university library budgeting today. What this fact means was spelled out in 1955 by John Dale Russell and Richard Paget. Russell feels that the highest administrative authority in an organization as complex as a modern university should have reporting to him no more than eight and preferably as few as four major administrative officers. He shows that recent efforts at reorganization in colleges and universities have been consistent with this, and that a pattern is emerging which recognizes four major administrative areas. They are the academic program, student personnel services, business and financial management, and public relations. A high level officer is placed in charge of each of these areas, and all administrative functions are carried out through these officers.¹⁰

Paget points out that in well managed institutions, the budget function is a year-round activity, as well as a part of long-term planning. He emphasizes that "from an organizational standpoint the responsibility for budget making, for budget execution, and for the review of costs should be fixed in an officer who reports to the president."¹¹ Segments of this should be delegated in larger institutions to the officers in the major administrative areas.

In the context established here, what is the actual performance among libraries of higher education today? To help answer this question several sets of queries were addressed to slightly more than 100 of this country's better known colleges and universities. Included among the 90 per cent responding are private and state institutions, ranging in each category from small colleges to the largest universities. In some cases conversations with the librarians were also possible; in others publications supplemented the replies. In a meeting at Carleton College in October 1962, the business managers of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest discussed library budgeting and fiscal practice at some length with the writer. From these sources it is possible to draw some helpful information. (The Associated Colleges of the Midwest include Beloit, Carleton, Coe, Cornell College, Grinnell, Knox, Lawrence, Monmouth, Ripon, and St. Olaf.)

First let it be said that no evidence could be found indicating that librarians in higher education have adopted "performance budgeting" as it is recently described.^{12, 13} This is evidently considered a public library technique, especially since institutional libraries must conform in manner and presentation of budget to the general institutional pattern. Whether feasible or not, it has not been adopted by colleges and universities.

An examination of the bulletin pages listing administrative officers of 40 institutions (16 large state universities, 14 large private universities, and 10 colleges) indicates very strongly that the administrative structure described by Russell and Paget is being widely adopted. Titles such as Vice President in Charge of Academic Administration appear to be more numerous than they were a decade ago. In 29 of the 40 institutions, interposition of a dean or vice president between the president and major department or service directors is certain or virtually so. In several instances this change has taken shape in the last year or two. For this and other reasons there is not yet enough detail available to permit calculation of the correlation between levels of library support and types of institutional administration. From the uncertain evidence at hand, however, it appears that the same elements of chance remain under the librarian-to-dean-of-administration-to-president scheme as formerly prevailed in the simpler librarian-to-president arrangement. Personalities and external pressures such as trustees, legislatures, and foundations remain key factors, along with established patterns and practices of each institution.

Academic Budgets and Their Administration—1962

Several studies of special cases or areas have recently been recorded. At Cornell University no such document as a library budget for the university as a whole had been prepared for 60 years. There the problem has been complicated by the fact that part of the University is endowed and part is supported by the state. The complexities implicit in this situation are being reduced by a five phase plan intended to be completed this year, with the objective of a better overall appraisal of library support, planning, coordination, and control of development and operation.¹⁴ Here is certainly a case in which the growth of the times has brought about an improved and strengthened library program.

A 1959 thesis by D. R. Watkins describes the administrations of five Minnesota colleges—Carleton, College of St. Catherine, Gustavus Adolphus, Hamline, and St. Cloud State—and shows that the patterns of administrative and budgetary relationships may vary in detail without any clearly correlated difference in immediate support of the library. St. Catherine prepares no book budget at all.⁴ Among other midwest institutions, one has just recently discontinued submission of a budget, and another recommends modifications of the previous year's budget without ever in recent years initiating a complete presentation. This library is not identified in the legislative request (although postage and janitors are!), and legislative cuts or additions are prorated to the various services of the institution. Offsetting this is the practice by the administration of turning over to the library considerable amounts of year-end "tailings" from other unexpected accounts. The library can sometimes use these funds to begin projects which later must be continued by regularly allocated institutional funds. Since such windfalls are unreliable, much of the library program develops in an accidental or erratic fashion. That it succeeds at all is due largely to the skill and vigor of the librarian who must work in the larger institutional structure, over which he has no control.

William Harbold reports from the Pacific Northwest that the college and university librarians of that area generally have the approximate standing of a dean or director of an independent service. Practice tends to support his statement, and librarians are given much independence in the operation of their charges: "The final determination of the budget is the major continuing and regularized limitation upon library autonomy, but occasionally the administration or the faculty exercises authority in regard to such matters as book fund alloca-

tions. . . ."¹⁵ The same writer later cites library budget cuts without consultation, because of legislative reductions in Washington in 1951 and at Oregon State in 1957.¹⁶

A pragmatic measure of the librarian's place in the administrative structure when he is budgeting is whether or not his budget presentation includes personnel. As with most questions of library administration, no simple yes-no pattern exists. Some librarians present estimates for clerical staff only, and some accomplish the same thing through occasions other than the annual budget request. However, of 95 librarians questioned on this point, 78, including librarians of all the largest institutions, answered flatly that they do include the library staff in their budget. Three others specified nonprofessional personnel only, and 14, consisting of 11 colleges and three universities of medium size, responded negatively. Two further questions in this regard showed that only three large university librarians of the entire 95 budget for building maintenance and only one of these includes "utilities," presumably other than telephone expenses.

What influence has the faculty library committee upon present-day budget practice? Lyle's description of its function can perhaps be summed up in two words, *advisory* and *liaison*; most frequently one finds its foremost duty described as the responsibility to advise on allocation of book funds for the use of instructional departments. Here, however, practice varies widely among institutions. Actually, although the question was not specifically put to the libraries queried on budget practices, there were indications that the library committee does not play a large role in financial matters, with the possible exception of supporting requests for additional book funds. In the first place, 17 of the 95 librarians questioned state that they do not allocate book funds. Of those who do, 18 use a "formula" which, once established, presumably minimizes the involvement of a faculty committee in further decisions about allocations. Still other librarians, affirming that they do allocate book funds, suggested in various ways that the decisions were not formed with committee guidance: "No, except by the library," or "The Librarian sets up within his book budget a rather flexible distribution among the academic fields," and "not really," "usually not," or "in a special sense only," were typical remarks. Others, answering in the affirmative and asked if a formula were used, indicated a "rough one" or "a rule of thumb formula" or that experience served. The comment from one librarian that a formula "was used but I've dropped it and there have been no complaints" also suggests that the library

Academic Budgets and Their Administration—1962

committee no longer scrutinizes this procedure as it did formerly at this particular school. While four colleges stated unequivocally that the allocations of the book fund are made by the library committee, two others reported that they no longer even have a library committee.

In the small college where communication is frequent and personal, the normal role which the library committee is expected to play is superfluous if allocation is not practiced or if it is systematized by a formula or an experienced librarian. In the larger, more complex organization of a university, perhaps some representation of faculty interest must be delegated to a committee to advise and interpret, but the question arises as to how representative a workable committee can be. As Harbold speculates of the Pacific Northwest libraries,

It is uncertain whether a faculty committee is the device for a more positive role in the process of allocating departmental book funds. Librarians and interested faculty have for some time been looking for an objective standard in terms of which this distribution could be made; none has so far appeared that satisfies more than a few . . . perhaps, it is precisely because of that limited budget and relatively restricted needs of a small, liberal arts college that this system [allocation] works. That it could meet with success in a larger and more diversified institution is uncertain.¹⁷

There is thus no clear-cut trend or state of affairs, no widespread satisfaction or dissatisfaction, but apparently a working truce exists based upon local conditions. William Dix of Princeton expressed the various and practical considerations when he wrote:

. . . we make no formal allocation of book funds to departments. We do for our own internal use make informal allocation to subject fields; these estimates are revealed to various teaching departments or not as it seems expedient. In other words, when a department that is very active in recommending purchases is obviously spending what seems more than its rightful share of the available money, we do set an arbitrary limit. These allocations are not based on any formula, but are simply estimates based on past experience. Actually, there is a kind of built-in allocation procedure. Something more than half of our expenditures each year come from endowed and supplementary funds. The majority of these funds are for purchases in specified fields. In deciding how much money we should spend in each field each year, we take account of what is available from endowed funds in each area, then plan to supplement it from the general annual appropriation. . . .

None of this is very scientific. In general, our aim is two-fold: to

enlist the interest of as many members of the faculty as possible in surveying the state of our collections and recommending additions, then to restrain those overly enthusiastic members in order to keep a reasonable balance in the growth of the collection.¹⁸

A few more words should be said on the subject of allocations. Although very little new has been written about it since 1952, there is a continuing interest in it among the four out of five librarians who practice allocation in some form today. Of this four-fifths, none allocates the entire book fund, the highest proportion allocated being 85 per cent, and the lowest 10 per cent. The average amount allocated is 54 per cent, which leaves in most of the libraries represented, therefore, a substantial part of the book budget at the discretion of the librarian. Reference works, general and interdisciplinary material, recreational reading, and special noncurricular collections absorb some of this money; duplicates, continuations, out-of-prints, and large and unusual sets are also often charged to this balance. One aspect which has intriguing possibilities for any librarian beset by endless faculty appeals for new magazine subscriptions is the idea of also allocating funds for journals. Eighteen of the 95 librarians questioned do allocate for journals, and an additional 15 allocate for "some," presumably those in branch libraries or the first few years of new subscriptions. In connection with the periodical budget, a study in 1952 showed that in the thirties about 20 per cent of the library budget went for periodicals. It further found that this figure approached 30 per cent by 1950.¹⁹ There is now some indication that funds earmarked for journals exceed 30 per cent of the book fund, although this conclusion is difficult to demonstrate since the College and Research Libraries and U.S. Office of Education statistics have lumped the book expenditures with "other library materials."

Finally, in a discussion of the practice of allocating, with business managers as well as librarians, it is evident that it is almost entirely an internal matter of library accounting. Fewer than two business officers in ten do the bookkeeping for departmental subdivisions of the library book fund. In fact the average number of separate accounts carried for the libraries of 20 institutions is 17, usually including various wage, salary, and benefit accounts. For most libraries enjoying the benefits of endowed book funds, the number of accounts is significantly greater. Among the 20 libraries questioned, two had a high of 50 accounts, one had 46; all others have from 30 down to one account; more than half had fewer than 12. The reason that this breakdown is worth

Academic Budgets and Their Administration—1962

noting is that the fewer accounts the librarian has to adjust with the business manager, the greater the discretionary authority remaining to him. Business managers apparently do not object to this. Except insofar as state accounting strictures affect the publicly supported institutions, it seems to be generally recognized that there are special problems peculiar to library purchasing, together with special competence concerning the where, why, and how of doing it, which librarians are best left to do. What this can mean is detailed in an article describing simplification of purchasing which has permitted direct ordering at Ohio State University since 1957.²⁰

Testifying to this implicit confidence is the fact that 71 of the 95 librarians have discretionary authority to make shifts or adjustments between different accounts of homogeneous nature—that is, between book, periodical, and binding accounts, for example, if they are distinct; or between wages and salaries. Of the 24 which cannot do so, seven are colleges and 17 are large universities, and of this number three are state colleges and 13 are state universities. For those purchases distinctly the province of libraries (books, journals, etc.), 90 of the 95 questioned designate suppliers, whether purchase orders are sent directly to suppliers or through the business or purchasing office. Actually 54 libraries do send their purchase orders direct, and an additional 17 do so for books only. Those which cannot are equally divided between the public and private sector.

It should be of some interest to note that 35 of the libraries can “carry over” all encumbered book funds into the following fiscal year rather than have the orders outstanding assessed against the new budget. Several more have from one to six months’ latitude only, and one is limited to “5 per cent” [whether of encumbrances or of total book budget was not clear]. Forty-one, including some of the above, report that they carry over gift or endowed funds, but since it is unlikely that any library having gifts or endowments unspent would lose these funds entirely at the end of the fiscal year, this response is taken to imply that the funds carry over automatically without reference to the business office. Of the libraries which could not carry over book accounts or encumbrances of any description, all but two were in small colleges, and none were large universities. The twenty-one institutions which could carry over funds other than books were about equally divided between large and small, public and private institutions. Twenty-two make a distinction between purchases for repair or replacement and new purchases of material other than equipment;

of these only four are state institutions. Seventy-three libraries do not make such a distinction or do so only internally and not for business office accounting. Further analysis of the responses of this national sample tends to support the finding of Fritz Veit that about 12 per cent of the publicly supported institution libraries in the Midwest can carry over encumbered book funds at year's end.²¹ Actually from the budgeting or business managerial standpoint, little importance attaches to whether encumbrances "carry over." Most business managers insist that, with the exceptions noted, each year's budget start afresh, and the budget of the year ended is a closed chapter. Since no library apparently has funds for everything it wants, librarians in institutions with no "carry over" simply over-encumber by one means or another. From one year to the next, these things seem to even out.

Summarizing then, one sees that in the past decade the academic world has had to come to grips realistically with unprecedented growth and complexity. Many institutions are reorganizing their administrative structures and engaging in long-range planning in a sustained and systematic manner. The exact status of the librarian is probably not improved unless the officer to whom he is responsible happens to be predisposed to give special treatment to the library in such matters as the budget. However, the librarian generally has unusual latitude and autonomy allowed him by the finance officers and by the administrative structure of the institution. Whether or not he allocates, he seems to enjoy the confidence of the business managers and faculty to a high degree.

Moreover, if the library committee is to make any contribution larger than whittling up book funds, it would seem to be in areas of long-range planning and major development of library resources. In a decade when most colleges and universities are reappraising their readiness for surging enrollments it is to be expected that self surveys, plans for new facilities, and major fund raising programs all touch the library to some degree. The library committee can serve as a genuine channel of communication and a vital aid to the librarian seeking representation in the planning sessions.

In 1962 the practice of budgeting and accounting in academic libraries seems generally to follow the principles outlined for it. That there are kaleidoscopic variety, shades of emphasis, and highly individual variations, cannot be denied. But there is also a large measure of precedent, confidence, and opportunity, and it is all of these that do indeed make the annual budget estimate "the most important ele-

Academic Budgets and Their Administration—1962

ment in the college library financial picture" and its administration a fascinating occupation.

References

1. Lyle, Guy R. *The Administration of the College Library*. 3d ed. New York, H. W. Wilson, Co., 1961, pp. 34-36, 325-330.
2. Frodin, Reuben. "Finance and the College Library," *Library Quarterly*, 24:374-381, Oct. 1954.
3. Wilson, Eugene H. "Government and Control of the College Library," *Library Quarterly*, 24:304-305, Oct. 1954.
4. Watkins, David R. "A Study of the Relationship between the Librarian and the Administration of Five Minnesota Colleges." Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Minnesota Library School, June 1960.
5. McVey, Frank L., and Hughes, Raymond M. *Problems of College and University Administration*. Ames, Iowa, Iowa State College Press, 1952.
6. Wise, Harriet A. "A Study of the Treatment of the College Library in General Books on College Administration." Unpublished M.S. report, School of Library Science, Western Reserve University, 1949, p. 3. Cited in Wilson, *op. cit.*, p. 304.
7. Millett, John D. *The Academic Community: An Essay on Organization*. New York, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962, p. 216.
8. Ellsworth, Ralph E. "Trends in Higher Education Affecting the College and University Library," *Library Trends*, 1:13-14, July 1952.
9. *E.g.*, "Long-Range Planning for Colleges and Universities," a panel session reported in the *Proceedings* of the Second National Assembly of the National Federation of College and University Business Officers Associations, held at French Lick, Indiana, July 1960, pp. 64-74.
10. Russell, John Dale. "Changing Patterns of Administrative Organization in Higher Education," *American Academy of Political Science Annals*, 301:26, Sept. 1955.
11. Paget, Richard E. "Operating Costs and University Management: Methods to Effect Economies," *Annals, op. cit.*, p. 191.
12. Maybury, Catherine. "Performance Budgeting for the Library," *ALA Bulletin*, 55:46-53, Jan. 1961.
13. Price, Paxton P. "Performance Budgeting in Practice," *Library Journal*, 84:797-800, March 15, 1959.
14. McCarthy, Stephen A. "Centralization and Decentralization at Cornell," *College and Research Libraries*, 22:334-338, Sept. 1961.
15. Harbold, William H. "Policy Making and Control in College and University Libraries," In Morton Kroll, ed. *College, University and Special Libraries of the Pacific Northwest* (Pacific Northwest Library Association Library Development Project Reports). Seattle, University of Washington Press, 1961, Vol. 3, p. 14.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 48-49.
18. Dix, William. Letter dated November 2, 1962.

JAMES H. RICHARDS, JR.

19. Headings, Bernice E. "The Formulation of a Book Budget Policy for a Small College Library," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, 26:389-391, Jan. 1952.
20. Matthews, Sidney E. "Simplifying Library Acquisitions with University Purchasing," *College and Research Libraries*, 18:331-334, July 1957.
21. Veit, Fritz. "Book Order Procedures in Publicly Controlled Colleges and Universities of the Midwest," *College and Research Libraries*, 23:33-40, Jan. 1962.