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Introduction

RALPH H. PARKER

The objectives and achievements of libraries, like most undertakings which involve groups of people, are shaped largely by their financial administration. Provision and allocation of funds determine the level and emphasis of specific operations, and the effectiveness of financial controls has a profound influence upon the responsiveness of the total operation to guiding policy. The articles in this issue undertake an evaluation of recent developments in the many aspects of financial administration.

Certain limitations were necessary. For example, discussion of capital expenditures and of endowment investment and management has been excluded. The financial problems of special libraries are so divergent that trends are difficult to identify. The administration of school libraries is in general indistinguishable from other school administration. This issue deals solely with current operations of public libraries and those in institutions of higher learning within the United States.

In organizing the contents of this issue, the editors have proceeded from inquiries into the sources of financial support, through consideration of the purposes for which expenditures have been made and of forces which have caused changes in patterns of expenditure, and finally to a discussion of developments of administrative procedures and techniques.

A maturing and increasingly literate society, together with an opulent economy, has contributed to increases in financial support for libraries, but these have in large measure been offset by continued inflation and the failure of libraries to benefit from the general increase in productivity of labor which has occurred in industry.

Although automation has not yet made much impression upon the finances of libraries, there is now significant interest in the subject. Financial records will perhaps be the first area of general automation.

Mr. Parker is University Librarian, University of Missouri, Columbia.
in libraries because the problems of such records are similar to those in business and in other institutions which have adopted such systems. There have already been developments in procedures in budget formation and control, in purchasing, and in cost accounting, which are essential preliminaries to automation.

The development of these techniques may well reverse the trend of the past quarter century for personal services to consume an increasing share of the library budget. There are already signs that the rise in library salaries is slowing, and with the potential increase in productivity of library staffs, this facet of library costs may not increase more rapidly than the price levels of the economy as a whole.
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EDWARD A. WIGHT

One of the characteristics which distinguished the evolution of the social library of the colonial and pre-1850 period from the contemporary public library is the shift from the almost complete dependence of the former upon private sources of support to the dominating dependence of the latter upon governmental support.

Under our constitutional form of government, powers not delegated to the federal government "are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people." Local governments, such as cities, townships, and counties, have only those powers which are delegated to them by the respective states. Normally, it requires a specific delegation of power or authority from the state to the local government to enable the latter to establish a public library or to levy a tax or to make an appropriation for this purpose.

The Massachusetts General Court (legislature) in 1848 authorized the city of Boston to levy a tax for the support of a city library. The principle established by this act was later extended to permit cities in general to appropriate money for public library purposes. In general, this has been the social and legislative process by which the powers of cities have been extended.

Until early in the twentieth century the property tax was the chief source of most governmental tax revenue in the United States. As late as 1902 slightly more than one-half of the tax revenue raised by federal, state, and local governments combined was raised by property taxes.¹ No other single form of tax produced as much as one-fifth of the total tax revenue.

The introduction of the income tax, made effective at the federal level by the Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution, made a tremendous change in the access to tax income. In 1956 the income tax produced 60.7 per cent of the total tax revenue, while the property

¹ Mr. Wight is Professor of Librarianship, University of California, Berkeley.
tax produced only 12.8 per cent. Taxes on motor fuels were a relatively new source of tax revenue, producing 4.1 per cent of total tax revenue in that year, while sales, gross receipts, and similar taxes accounted for 10.1 per cent.¹

As shown in the foregoing paragraphs, the sources of governmental tax revenue have undergone a tremendous change in the present century, from primary dependence upon property taxes (51.4 per cent in 1902) to major dependence upon income taxes (60.7 per cent in 1956). Combined with the major change in sources of tax revenue is an even more startling one in the level at which tax revenue is collected. In 1902 the local governments raised 51.2 per cent of the total tax revenue; the federal government, 37.4 per cent; and the state governments, 11.4 per cent. By 1956 the local governments collected only 14.2 per cent of the total tax revenue, and the federal government, 71.2 per cent. The position of the state governments remained the same, with 11.4 per cent of the total tax revenue in 1902 and 14.6 per cent in 1956.¹

The displacement of the local governments by the federal government during the present century as the chief collector of tax revenue does not mean that our local governments have declined as collectors of tax revenue and spenders of money. In 1956 the local governments collected 18 times as much tax revenue as in 1902. However, during this period the tax revenue of the state governments multiplied 86 times, and the federal government 127 times!¹

At the risk of over-simplification, it may be pointed out that the relative shifts in the sources and levels of tax revenue are due to at least two factors. One important change is the form in which wealth is now held. Whereas in the early years of our country the chief form of wealth was real property, much of which was subject to property taxes, currently much individual wealth is in the form of securities (stocks, bonds, mortgages, and similar “paper” forms). Corporations may hold property in many localities and countries, and the owners of corporate property are widely scattered. The local government is not an effective tax collector for the form of wealth which is characteristic of the modern business corporation. The federal government has been proved to be the most effective collector of taxes upon income.

Second, the need for more income for the expanding functions of government at all levels required the development of sources other than the property tax. Whereas the property tax produced more than
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one-half of the tax revenue of our governments at all levels in 1902, it produced only 13 per cent of all tax revenue in 1956. The local governments, having only the tax sources which are permitted to them by the states, are the least able to develop new tax revenue sources to meet their expanding needs for improved schools, libraries, recreation, police and fire protection, and the other services which are the primary responsibility of local governments.

The squeeze in which local governments have found themselves, as a result of their relatively restricted sources of tax revenue, has been largely responsible for the development of programs of federal and state aid. The interest of the federal government in the promotion of “the general welfare” of its people is expressed in the Preamble to the Constitution. It is no new doctrine, although determination of what constitutes “the general welfare” is a matter for each generation to interpret through its legislators. The interest of the federal government in programs such as highways and education is not a twentieth-century phenomenon. Even before the adoption of our federal Constitution, Congress had expressed, in the ordinances of 1785 and 1787, its concern for the education of its citizens.

To the present writer, the development of programs of state and federal grants-in-aid for education and for libraries is primarily the result of factors already mentioned: the broadened interpretation of “the general welfare” provisions of our federal Constitution and the more effective access of the higher levels of government to new and varied sources of tax revenue, since the property tax has proved to be an inadequate base.

In spite of the weakness of the general property tax, this continues to be the chief source of tax revenue of the local governments (county, municipality, township, school district, and special district). In 1902 the general property tax produced 88.6 per cent of all tax revenue of our local governments; in 1956 the figure was 86.9 per cent.

Pressures against continued increases in the local property tax have caused municipalities to look for other sources of tax revenue. Taxes on sales and gross receipts seem to have been the most productive. These sources produced 6.8 per cent of local tax revenue in 1956 and 7.2 per cent in 1961. Municipalities have also sought non-tax sources of revenue, such as special service charges made upon users of certain municipal services, as parking, sewers, garbage disposal, etc., and special assessments to finance certain types of improvements.

Most municipalities have not been successful in tapping the income
tax as a source of revenue. This is the second largest source of tax income of the states, now exceeded only by income from taxes on sales and gross receipts.

Access to the broader income base of the states for the benefit of local government has been achieved, however, through wide adoption of the grant-in-aid principle. In fiscal 1961 local governments raised approximately 20 billion dollars in taxation, and received slightly over 10 billion dollars in grants-in-aid from the state governments. The state governments received more than six billion dollars as revenue from the federal government.

Of special importance is the fact that per capita tax revenue tends to vary directly with the population of the city. For 1961 the per capita tax revenue for cities with less than 25,000 population was $31.13; for 100,000 to 199,999 population, $66.42; and for 1,000,000 or more, $137.38.

Statistics of Public Libraries: 1955–56 reports the following percentages of total public library income from local property tax or appropriation: 1939, 87.6 per cent; 1945, 87.8 per cent; 1950, 87.4 per cent; and 1956, 87.3 per cent. Even though total income reported for all public libraries rose substantially from 1950 to 1956 (up 58.4 per cent), the percentage from local sources changed by only 0.1 per cent. The increase in total income without increase in the percentage from local sources is due primarily to the increase in the property tax base during the period of inflationary price rises, which is reflected in the total property tax base.

In most of our states the general property tax is the chief source of income for the public library, and provisions for such support are usually written into the general municipal and county library laws. The library legislation in some states provides a ceiling which specifies the maximum rate of the property tax for the public library. No comprehensive study of the relation between the maximum allowed rate and the rates which are levied is known to the present writer, nor any study which compares the library tax rates in jurisdictions which operate under a tax ceiling with those which operate under legislation which provides no such maximum.

In California the county library law provides for a maximum tax rate of 30 cents per $100 of assessed valuation. The maximum rate was increased from 10 cents to 30 cents by legislation passed in 1957. In its annual statistics for public libraries News Notes of California Libraries publishes the tax rate per $100 for each library, where this
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Figure is reported to the state library. For fiscal 1961 the median rate for county libraries which reported the data was 8 cents and the range was from 1 to 13.9 cents.

Among California municipal public libraries the median 1961 tax rate was 17 cents, with a range from 3 to 30 cents. Some of these municipal libraries are established under the general library law for municipalities and some under city charter. Under the charter provisions of California law the chartered city or county is free to set its own charter provisions for tax limitation and may set such limitations or fail to specify a maximum. In general, there seems to be little tendency for the governmental jurisdiction to reach a tax rate for the library that is equal to the maximum provided by legislation.

The public library has no major source of income other than local tax revenue. Income from gifts and endowments was only 4.3 per cent of the total in 1956, although it amounted to almost $8,000,000. This percentage is smaller than that reported in 1950 (4.8 per cent), and in 1939 (5.5 per cent). More than half of the total endowment funds reported are held in one state, New York.

Probably the most significant recent trend in the sources of public library income, particularly in the light of much of the earlier discussion in this paper, is the increasing percentage from state grants. This was reported as 0.5 per cent in 1939, 1.5 per cent in 1945, 1.7 per cent in 1950, and 2.7 per cent in 1956. The total income from state grants reported for 1956 by 6,202 library jurisdictions was approximately $5,000,000. This amount is exceeded by a single state, New York, in 1961. The total grants-in-aid reported by 26 states for public libraries for 1961 is $12,545,668.

Funds from the Library Services Act, passed in 1956 and extended in 1961, had not become effective in the fiscal year for which the last Statistics of Public Libraries was published. Because of the small amounts of the annual federal appropriations, ranging from $2,050,000 in 1957 to $7,500,000 in 1962, they will have only a slight effect upon the total income pattern of public libraries in the country. The appropriation for 1957 amounted to slightly less than 1.5 per cent of the total income reported by public libraries in fiscal 1956. However, since LSA funds are used only in "rural" areas of less than 10,000 population, they have had a distinct effect upon library service in such areas. One of the effects of the federal grants under the LSA has been to stimulate appropriations for the state library agencies, and this will, in turn, probably stimulate to some extent, through state grants
or assistance in financing LSA projects and through the effect of field consultants, the local support of public library service.

It seems reasonably clear that one of the effects of the traditional state grant of the same amount to each public library was to perpetuate the many small and generally ineffective public libraries. Perhaps it could be more accurately stated that until recent years the state grant had not been used as an effective instrument for improving the quality of the local public library.

With the appearance of Leigh's *Public Library in the United States* the position was clearly stated and documented that the individual public library with meager resources of materials, staff, and annual revenue cannot effectively perform the functions which its professional leaders assume to be its role. As late as fiscal 1956, 70 per cent of the 6,202 reporting public library jurisdictions in the United States spent less than $5,000 annually. Forty-nine per cent of the main libraries were open fewer than 25 hours a week. It is now generally recognized that substantial improvement in the range and level of service can probably come most effectively by grouping the small library jurisdictions in some sort of voluntary federated or cooperative system.

Therefore, it seems important that state-aid programs be designed to assist in the improvement of public library service by distributing grants to small libraries in such a way as to require their inclusion in some form of cooperative or consolidated "system." The state-aid program in New York state has been notably successful in promoting the formation of systems among previously independent library jurisdictions and seems most nearly designed to carry out the basic principle of the current ALA standards.

In the strictest sense the American Library Association has no standards for the financial support of public libraries. A supplement to the "Public Library Service Standards" gives four examples of budgets for specified population figures, with suggested expenditures for objects appropriate to a typical budget. For each suggested budget a per capita figure is given. These figures range from $3.05 to $3.96.

The first official statement adopted by the Council of the American Library Association concerning a per capita revenue was proposed at the December 1921 meeting by the then Chairman of the Library Revenues Committee and began: "The American Library Association believes that $1 per capita of the population of the community served is a reasonable minimum annual revenue for the library in a com-
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munity desiring to maintain a good modern public library system with trained librarians.”

In December 1933 the ALA Council adopted “standards for public libraries,” which incorporated the earlier figure of $1 per capita, and *Post-War Standards for Public Libraries*, published by ALA in 1943, contained the official statements of standards prior to the 1956 document.

*Post-War Standards* was, in a sense, a product of the depression of the 1930’s. In 1933 the “National Planning Board of Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works” was created. This became, in 1939, the National Resources Planning Board, established in the Executive Office of the President. A basic purpose of the National Resources Planning Board was to make factual studies and inventories as a basis for blueprints of socially useful projects which could be put into effect to forestall the anticipated post-war depression. A grant to ALA from the National Resources Planning Board produced *Post-War Standards*, whose Foreword gives a very brief statement of the purpose: “The preparation of these standards is the first of three steps in an effort to plan for the improvement of library service and for its extension to all people now without it, as soon as possible. The second step is to compare existing library service throughout the United States with the standards. The third is to prepare some kind of working program for the future.” It was anticipated that the second and third steps would be carried out largely on a regional and/or state basis.

It seems reasonably clear to the present writer that it was never intended that the per capita income figures should be taken as a specific guide or standard for a specific library, except, perhaps, as a rough rule-of-thumb. A part of the confusion which has resulted from the use of a per capita income standard results from uncertainty as to whether or not the figure is to be used as a planning goal to be reached on some future date, as a working standard to be currently reached in order to have “a good modern public library,” or as a minimum operating standard which most public libraries should currently reach.

In the opinion of the present writer the original intent of the per capita income figure in *Post-War Standards* was to suggest that regional or state studies be made to determine the status of public libraries, including the level of per capita income or expenditures, and to use these data to develop working programs designed to improve the statewide level of service through the improvement of individual
libraries. This three-step program envisaged by Joeckel was not carried out, although a number of states have, in recent years, moved in this direction.

It has been frequently pointed out that the total revenue allocated to public libraries is an insignificant item “in relation to the whole governmental budget.” Armstrong estimated that the 1948 expenditure was “less than one sixth of 1 percent of the budget for operating governmental services of all kinds and at all levels.” 11 At the local level Armstrong estimated, using data from the U.S. Statistical Abstract, 1949, the Compendium of City Government Finances in 1948, and the Yearbook of the National Recreation Association, “that about 1.5 cents of the municipal tax dollar goes to public libraries, compared with 4 cents to public recreation, and nearly 25 cents to the public schools.” 11 In 1961 about 1.7 cents of the general expenditure dollar of cities went to library service.8

Figures published in October 1962 for the fiscal year 196112, showing direct general expenditures by function of governments at the three levels, national, state, and local, make it possible to compute the following percentages of direct general expenditures which are for libraries: all levels, 0.3 per cent, state 0.1 per cent, and local 0.9 per cent.2 Expenditures for library services for the national government are not reported. Because of the different sources of data and possibly different methods of allocation by function, it is not possible to say whether the more recent figures show improvement in the relative position of the library function in total government finance. Armstrong’s figure of “about 1.5 cents” is for municipal expenditures only, while the 0.9 cents given for local governments in 1961 includes all local governments—municipalities, counties, and school and other special districts.

Figures published by the California State Controller for 1961 make it possible to compute for each municipality the percentage of general city expenditures for public library service. Data for 54 cities in 14 counties show a median of 4 per cent, and range from 2 to 12 per cent.8

Summary

State and federal grants-in-aid are primarily recognition of the fact that (1) governments at all levels are interested in “the general welfare” of the people and (2) the higher levels of government are more effective collectors of tax revenue than are the local governments, although the latter may be equally competent to administer the expendi-
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ture of funds. The property tax is the major source of tax revenue of local governments; however, most public library jurisdictions which have a tax-rate ceiling do not appear to be receiving the proceeds of a maximum legal tax rate. Local governments in 1961 receive about half as much money from state grants as they collected from tax revenue. State grants-in-aid were available for public library service in half of the states in 1961, but only a small percentage of total public library income comes from this source.

Current national standards for public libraries do not make use of a per capita income figure; however, such a figure may be useful as a rule-of-thumb measure of the extent to which funds are available for public library service in jurisdictions serving relatively large populations (approximately 100,000 as a minimum).

The percentage of general revenue which is appropriated to public library service is typically small at all levels of government, tends to vary widely among jurisdictions, and is largest at the level of government which has the most restricted sources of revenue—local government, primarily cities. The rationale for public library support is the value of the services rendered to the public, as interpreted by the elective legislative and appropriating bodies.

References
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Outside Funding of Academic Libraries

DAVID KASER

The past decade has been one of burgeoning budgets in academic libraries. During 1950-51 a random sample of 25 college and university libraries spent a total of $7,318,000 for general operations; in 1960-61 the same libraries spent $18,135,000—an increase of almost 250 per cent. The total institutional operating expenditures of these same colleges and universities, however, increased so phenomenally during the period that the average percentage of their expenditures devoted to the operation of libraries moved almost imperceptibly from 4.01 per cent to 4.08 per cent. When the increase of costs during the period, especially for books and journals, is also taken into account, the apparent affluence loses some of its lustre, and it begins to appear as though academic libraries have come a long way to stand still. Yet there are probably few among us who would not feel that these libraries are coming closer to accomplishing their function today than they were a decade ago and that much of the progress has been due largely to these new dollars.

It is not the purpose of this paper to study the uses which have been made of these increased funds. Recent trends in that aspect of academic library finance are being examined and reported elsewhere in this symposium. Rather the present paper will survey the sources whence these funds have come into library budgets—especially those which lie outside the parent institutions—and will examine the effects which they have had upon library operations and activities. These sources include private donors, foundations, and government agencies.

Private Donors. It is a matter of record that since the beginnings of institutional libraries, private philanthropists have played a major role in their development. In the United States such names as Widener, Clements, Clark, Firestone, Sterling, and more recently Olin, are sometimes used synonymously with the word "library." Also, great book

David Kaser is Director, Joint University Libraries (Peabody, Scarritt, and Vanderbilt), Nashville, Tennessee.
collections in academic institutions are frequently associated with the names of public benefactors; among others the names of Annmary Brown and James Ford Bell come readily to mind, and almost any list could be compounded many times over. The histories of the larger library philanthropies are well known, but the stories of similar benefactions of lesser magnitude—and they are numerous—are not well known. They are documented, when at all, in dusty files of librarians' annual reports, in the yellowing pages of college catalogs, and in the crumbling newsprint of the local presses. A full-length narrative account of their very important role in library development remains to be drawn.

Yet there is a sizable corpus of literature concerning the broad area of gifts to libraries. Donald E. Thompson itemizes some three-score published reports and articles in his recent review of the state of scholarship concerning gifts, but a glance at his bibliography reveals some interesting lacunae in the attention which has been devoted to them. In his entire survey, for example, Thompson is able to muster only five references to money gifts to libraries—and those are for public libraries. Gifts of book collections have received more generous treatment, although they too are lacking what might be considered a fair share of print. By far the majority of the references cited by Thompson concerns the handling of gift volumes after they have arrived in the library. The more important problems of how to get them there in the first place, and their meaning once there in the second place, have been almost uniformly ignored. One exception to this generalization is that articles about "Friends of the Library" groups, which seem to be about the only kind of fund-raising activity most professional librarians can envision, are perennial in their appearance and, parenthetically, almost minimal in their contributions to knowledge.

In a paper read at the last meeting of the University Libraries Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries, Ralph Hopp examined briefly the amount of money presently being donated to the larger academic libraries of the country. His research showed that in 1960–61, eighty-two university libraries received gifts for current operations totalling some $3.5 million. This figure amounted to approximately 7 per cent of the total operating expenditures of the same group of libraries for the same period. Whether or not this percentage could be extrapolated to apply to other and smaller academic libraries is problematic, but in any case this amount obviously represents a substantial portion of the year's work of academic libraries.
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Previous studies of this subject are practically nonexistent and permit little or no valid comparison of the situation today with that of earlier periods. One of the few earlier examinations of this topic was the pioneering effort by Benjamin E. Powell in 1958. In results that were at considerable variance from Hopp's, he found that a sample of private institutional libraries was then deriving fully 18.5 per cent of its total operating expenditures from gifts, while a sample of public, tax-supported libraries was receiving only 2.5 per cent of its expenditures from cash gifts. (Hopp's findings were 7.3 per cent and 8.2 per cent respectively.) Of course, these two studies conducted only four years apart cannot reveal a trend, and guessing at this point would only be courting hazard. It perhaps suffices to say here that the great importance of dollar gifts to libraries has continued over a long time and that it is to be hoped that such studies as Hopp's and Powell's will be repeated and expanded in years to come so that the impact of donations upon libraries may be more readily and accurately plotted.

Foundations. It is trite to observe that we are living in an age of change: every age is an age of change. Yet society's patterns are ever-altering, and current ones are having marked implications for academic library financing and must be observed here. Recent tax laws have been so structured as to encourage the establishment of philanthropic foundations rather than the direct disposal of private fortunes. It is estimated that new foundations are being born at a rate of 1,000 or more per year. For this reason, appeals for outside funding are being screened with increasing frequency by the boards of dispassionate reviewers who are retained by these agencies and less often by prospective private donors, who might otherwise decide with greater dispatch and sometimes with less objectivity for or against a proposal.

Notwithstanding their less venerable antiquity, philanthropic foundations are a very important source of financing in academic libraries. In a recent study Gustave A. Harrer identified no fewer than 59 foundation grants, each in excess of $10,000, made to academic libraries during a four-year period. These grants totalled almost $13.5 million and were divided between private and public institutions at a ratio of approximately 70 per cent to 30 per cent respectively.

Most foundation money has been going for capital expenditures and consequently does not directly affect the present study. An examination of Harrer's list of grants shows that only $3,760,000 of the total amount given could be used for current purposes. No doubt a list of grants smaller than $10,000, if one could be compiled, would add
considerably to this sum, since it is probably safe to assume that a larger percentage of them would be for current operations. Even a conservative estimate of these amounts would probably place the total annual foundation contribution to academic library operating funds in excess of a million dollars per annum. At any rate, it must be allowed that foundations, as private donors, are a major source of income to libraries.

Also as in the case of private philanthropies, one must regret the lack of accurate historical data from which to plot developing trends, but it appears that foundation giving to academic libraries is increasing and will continue to increase for some time to come. A definitive history of foundation support of academic libraries remains to be written and promises to be a challenging and fruitful area of examination for the person who ultimately attempts it. Until that time comes, however, surely an agency such as the Foundation Library would be performing a great service by publishing annually an enumeration of the year’s grants to libraries, indicating the granting agencies, the grantees, the amounts granted, and the purposes for which the grants were made.

*Federal Government.* The role of the federal government in academic library development is also being rapidly changed by the flux of social circumstances. The government is, in fact, assuming a new role. Since it was learned some two decades ago that American libraries lacked adequate information about certain parts of the globe to enable our armies to wage war in them, the federal government has wondered if we have enough information for the successful waging of peace. Information is, after all, the primary weapon in the struggle for men’s minds. Also, the nation has been growing increasingly uneasy during the same period about an ill informed electorate. Furthermore, the recent demands of national defense have been pressing colleges and universities for an ever larger cadre of scholars in all fields.

For these reasons the country is now beginning to look upon its network of research libraries as a vast national resource which is essential to its information needs and which ought therefore to be nourished from public funds. This is a new idea in the American scheme of things, however, and it has been slow to catch on with the forces that control the federal coffers. Unfortunately, as members of a profession, librarians have done little to gain public acceptance of this concept of social responsibility, and the generally received notion has consequently remained that libraries are a local matter and should be locally
funded. In the eyes of most laymen the library's mission is still a very delimited one, and until libraries mount a forceful, articulate, and dynamic public relations program, it will probably deserve to remain so.

As a result, for the most part, of the comprehensive lobbying program of the American Library Association and of the propaganda efforts of the Librarian of Congress, with a critical assist from members of the scientific community, the Congress is beginning to manifest tendencies toward a willingness to learn of this inexorable dependence of the nation upon its research libraries, although it properly remains to be convinced. It has even made a few recent cautious incursions into the area of direct academic library finance. Indirect aid has, of course, long been available through such activities as document depositing and, more recently, through the establishment of technical reports centers and the implementation on a pilot level of Public Law 480. Indeed, the federal government spent almost $100 million in fiscal 1962 in technical information activities, including indexing, abstracting, publishing and distributing reports, preparing bibliographies, and translating. Obviously libraries profit immeasurably from these activities, but they benefit only indirectly.

In 1962 when Russell Shank examined the current state and future prospects of direct government aid to academic libraries, he found a situation which appeared promising. He was able to identify $274,000 in the academic year 1960-61 which was budgeted to libraries under the matching provisions of the National Defense Education Act Title VI. For the same year he noted some $6 million paid to graduate schools under NDEA Title IV which could be expended for faculty, library, or laboratory development. Because not all institutions budget these funds in an identifiable manner, the exact portion of this amount to come to libraries is not determined. In addition, $383,000 was granted by the National Science Foundation for refurbishing or renovating departmental library and reading room space, but this outlay is of a capital nature. These amounts will no doubt increase in future years.

Universities also receive huge amounts of money from the federal government as overhead allowances on research contracts and grants, although most university administrators doubt that these sums are adequate to cover all indirect costs incurred by the fulfillment of the contract. For the most part through recent efforts of the Association of Research Libraries, government contracting officers and auditors
are now allowing a higher overhead percentage because of library costs than they did formerly. This was an essential change, especially since it is very seldom possible for book purchases to be budgeted into a contract as direct costs. It is rather assumed that library costs of a contract are indirect and should be met out of overhead, and library administrators have frequently felt that the portion of university overhead income ultimately to reach the library has been inadequate to meet the book needs of the researcher. Some few institutions, such as the University of Oregon and the University of Minnesota, actually assign to their libraries a specific percentage of contract and grant overhead, but since this is an uncommon practice it is impossible to determine the total dollar benefit derived by libraries through this kind of federal government activity. Without question, however, it is a very large amount.

In this area, as in so many others, the future looks rosier than the past. In the last Congress several provisions were considered which included direct grants to academic libraries. The Academic Facilities Construction Bill narrowly missed becoming law; it would have provided large capital sums for academic library construction. Also an amended Library Services Act was introduced into both houses which would have made $10 million available annually as matching grants for the purchase of books in college and university libraries. Although neither of these proposals passed, the notions that prompted their consideration are still in circulation, and it appears likely that eventually academic libraries may expect to receive funds through the provisions of some similar kind of legislation.

The Impact of Outside Funding. The desirable results of outside funding are obvious, but as would be expected, there are some effects which are undesirable. The old law that “the decision lies where the money lies” tends to operate here as elsewhere, but it can be controlled. Librarians long ago learned to look gift horses in the mouth, screening out bequests and donations with what sometimes appear to be crackpot requirements. In their funding foundations and government agencies are usually more sophisticated than are private donors and profess a desire not to influence academic decisions. After all, they point out, they do not generate programs; rather they limit their work to deciding for or against proposals presented to them by academicians. This point is valid, but the influence is present nonetheless in a negative, but equally pernicious sense; that is, academic programs can become influenced by what foundations and government agencies will not finance.
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In its early years, for example, NDEA Title IV funds were available for a wide range of academic subjects, but recently the Congress has pushed for a stricter definition of “defense” in establishing the priorities of programs competing for fellowships. Thus, institutions have become discouraged from applying for programs in the classics, art, music, the theater, and similar disciplines. Dean Lumiansky reports that Tulane’s Title IV program in Medieval and Modern European History could only be renewed last year if “Medieval” were stricken from its title. The strength of Tulane’s book collections in medieval history will no doubt suffer because of this circumstance, and most academic librarians could cite other examples from their own institutions.

Political expediency and opportunism have been evident in past library legislation and will more than likely continue to appear in future legislation. Librarians know what they need, but when they obtain outside help, it is frequently somewhat different from what would have done most good. “The purists among librarians,” Shank has pointed out, “will be horrified, no doubt, to find idealistic proposals faced with noneducation influences when federal educational policy is at stake.” But these are political facts of life.

A different, but equally deleterious extra-educational influence attaches itself to some foundation giving. Foundations have an inherent problem of purpose which often arises when they try to draw a line between those deserving projects which they feel that they should fund and those which they feel that they cannot fund. This problem, however, does not arise for them when they are considering unusual or bizarre projects or projects which have not yet and may never come into the realm of normal academic activity, and foundations are therefore more likely to respond favorably to requests of a less usual nature than to those in which they have to decide among many similar presentations. Foundations can consider feasibility grants without facing this problem, or they can grant money for establishing a program and then back out, leaving the institution to seek elsewhere for funds for its continuation, or they can plant what they like to call “seed money.” All American academic libraries have similar needs, but they know that they could not expect to be successful if they all went to foundations for a 25 per cent increase in operating funds. Yet this sort of increase is what such libraries need most.

These circumstances provoke the somewhat anomalous conclusion that the most successful fund-raisers may not be the best fund-raisers. Rather, they may be those with the most fertile and agile and creative
imaginations for producing exotic schemes that will present a unique appeal to foundations. The judging of fund-raisers must rest at least in part on the purposes for which they are able to elicit funds. The function of research librarians is clear: it is to furnish information needed by readers, and librarians need money most to enable them to do better what they are now doing. Unfortunately, this is the most difficult kind of money to raise.

Academic library administrators usually hold a trump card in this matter; it is that when outside or special funds are available for one project, it is frequently possible to divert funds that were previously budgeted to that project into some other deserving but lacklustre channel. Without this redeeming possibility, budgets could conceivably become intolerably distorted by outside funds. On the other side of the ledger, of course, must be recognized the fact that most university presidents and chancellors knew of this old dodge before librarians did and have been known to work the same scheme against libraries.

One important result of the developing opportunities for outside funding of academic libraries is that more and more librarians are becoming fund-raisers. The “tin cup” that has so long been a major prop for the principal officers of such institutions is becoming increasingly necessary to successful librarianship. College and university librarians are also learning, as other academic officers have learned, that this task is a difficult one for the director to delegate. The staff can develop the proposals, research the sources, and even drive the director to the airport, but the actual pitch is most successful when made by the director, since he alone can alter his proposal, tack with the changing winds, or make policy decisions in the middle of his discussion with a fund source. Also his increasing absence from his home base has implications for his organization chart, because someone obviously must “run the store”; his absence thus encourages the further development of staff management at the middle echelon. It appears likely that librarians may expect to see, again analogous to the development of the academic presidency, the future selection of library directors determined in part upon the basis of their prospective success as seekers of off-campus financial support of their libraries. The librarian is going to be increasingly called upon to keep his hand out to private donors, to keep his proposals on the desks of foundation directors, and to keep on a constant alert for such funds as might be forthcoming from the federal government.
Outside Funding of Academic Libraries
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The Costs of Public Library Service

HENRY T. DRENNAN

The costs to local governments of operating public libraries have increased greatly in the past two decades. In 1939, local governments expended $48,832,000 for public library operational purposes. An estimate made for this study, based in part upon state library agency reports, shows an increase in expenditures of 400 per cent from 1939 to 1961. In 1961, 8,250 public library agencies, financed in the main by local governments, are estimated to have expended $285,567,000.

This increase in the cost of public library service occurred in a period when, from 1939 to 1961, the population of local governments providing these services increased 102 per cent. In 1939, 74 million persons (49 per cent of the total population) resided in areas with local public library service. By 1961, the number of these persons had increased to 89 per cent of the country's total population—an estimated 160 million persons.

In this period of expansion the increased outlay for public library purposes has been accompanied by a steady growth in the average per unit cost of operations. Beginning in 1939, the average operating expenditure per library was $8,500 annually; by 1950 it had reached $18,000, and in 1961 the figure was $42,000.

From 1939 to 1961, the number of agencies reporting expenditures increased by 25 per cent. The relatively slow increase in numbers of administrative units has resulted not only in an increase in unit expenditures, but also in a marked increase in the size of population per unit. For the year 1939, the average population served by each public library was 13,600 persons. This figure had grown to 25,000 persons in 1950 and reached, by 1961, an estimated 27,000 persons. In terms of the profession's interest in larger units of service, this is an
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important trend to note. However, much of the increase seems to have come from the increasing urbanization of our country, for the number of public library administrative units continues to increase. This increase (25 per cent) should be contrasted with a decline (55 per cent) in the number of school districts from 84,000 (1950) to 40,000 (1960).\(^2\)

While these reports of greatly increased outlays by government for public library service, locally financed, are interesting, they may be understood more readily when compared with other governmental expenditures, viewed in terms of per capita expenditures, analyzed in terms of fiscal capacity, studied by population category and, where possible, related to quality of services.

In 1942 state and local governments expended $45.5 billion for all outlays. By 1961, that sum had grown to $165 billion. In a slightly longer span, 1939–1961, the costs of public library operation by both state and local governments grew from $48.8 million for 1939 (included are about $270 thousand in state funds for public library purposes) to $310.7 million in 1961, including $25.1 million expended by the states for local public library expenditures.

The percentage increase for all local and state governmental operational outlays has grown, then, from 1942 to 1961, by 264 per cent. Public library operational expenditures have, by contrast, increased from 1939 to 1961 by 537 per cent. A related expense to state and local government, expenditures for general education, has increased, from 1942 to 1959, 415 per cent.

When measured in terms of "adjusted" dollars, the per capita costs for all operations of local governments have not expanded as rapidly as would be expected. For example, Los Angeles city tax revenues were per capita $54.51 in 1921 (in "constant" dollars, 1947 base) and in 1958 were somewhat less, $51.90. There was a similar decline in the Cleveland metropolitan area where a reduction of approximately 10 per cent in terms of per capita expenditures for all local governments occurred.\(^3\) Although revenue and expenditures are not strictly comparable, these examples tend to reflect lesser per capita tax requirements. The per capita costs to local governments for public library operations have increased; yet that increase is not too impressive when measured in terms of the changing value of the dollar. In 1939, local governments expended for public library operations the equivalent of $1.15 per capita. In 1961, this per capita expenditure had increased 35 per cent to $1.55 (adjusted); the unadjusted per capita figure for 1939 is 61
cents, and for 1961, it is $1.78. In the 22-year period since 1939, public libraries have experienced a geometric mean annual increase in per capita operational expenditures of 1.3 per cent.

By analyzing public library operating expenditures in terms of the relation of national capacity to the expenditures themselves, one may obtain some idea of the commitment to public library objectives. Such a perspective is available through the construction of an “Effort Index.” Per capita personal income (a crude but useful measurement of financial capacity), when related to public library operational expenditures, can give such a guide to trends nationally and regionally. A caution should accompany any conclusions derived from the index: the index does not measure the excellence of public library service; it does not tell how wisely or how badly public funds are expended for public library purposes; nor does it tell anything of the organization through which these funds are expended. The index is limited to depicting commitment in rough terms of financial outlay as related to capacity to pay.

Public library operating expenditures represent but a tiny percentage of the nation’s personal income. In the year 1961, the public library operating expenditures of local governments was .07275 per cent of the national personal income. By treating this percentage as an absolute number, 72.75, and rounding it to 73, one obtains the index number for the national commitment for public library service for that year. Thus, for the nation, the “Effort Index” for local public library expenditures shows this historical trend: for 1939 the score was 62; for 1950 it had dropped to 49; and for 1961 it had recovered to 73. In 1950, public library operating expenditures were lagging behind the nation’s ability to finance them. By 1961, the nation was financing public libraries in terms of its capacity to afford them only at a somewhat higher rate than it had 20 years previously in the late years of the depression. Table I below arranges the “Effort Index” for local expenditures by state and region, giving both the score by years and the national ranking by years. There are some surprises in the table when local effort by state is analyzed. The general impression to be drawn from the “Effort Index” is not only that those who have more spend more; it is also that they tend to commit a higher share of their capacity to pay to public library services.

In 1939, the Office of Education reported that $277,000 was contributed by the states to public libraries as grants-in-aid. In 1956, the states’ expenditures for public library purposes were $12,236,000. Five
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### Table I


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN ATLANTIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREAT LAKES &amp; PLAINS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTHEAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE I—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region &amp; State</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WEST AND SOUTHWEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region &amp; State</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii ²</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Rank order determined on basis of unrounded figures.
² Figures not available for 1939, 1950, and 1956.
³ Hawaii's scores are included on Table II.

years later, these expenditures had grown to $18.5 million (a growth of more than 50 per cent).

From 1957 through 1961, annual federal expenditures under the Library Services Act increased from $2.5 million annually to $7.5 million annually. In this period, state expenditures for public library purposes were growing at the geometric mean rate of 8.7 per cent a year to an annual outlay of $18.5 million.

To elucidate this trend, the commitments of state governments to expenditures for public library purposes are ranked below in an "Effort Index." As in the "Effort Index" for local expenditures, the individual scores have been obtained by calculating the percentage of per capita personal income by state that was (in this case) devoted to public library expenditures from state sources. Thus, in 1956 the state of Alabama expended the equivalent of .00162 per cent of its personal income for public library expenditures. This percentage treated as an absolute number, 1.62 (rounded to 1.6), provides Alabama's score for that year.
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TABLE II
Effort Index Scores and National Ranking of State Expenditures for Public Libraries, by State: 1956 and 1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score 1956</th>
<th>Score 1961</th>
<th>Rank 1956</th>
<th>Rank 1961</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistical basis for the personal income components of the "Effort Index" for state expenditures is derived from "Personal Income by States, 1929 to 1960" (Table 431), Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1962; and the expenditure for states for public library purposes was derived from the file of Forms DSR-359 (1961) in the Library Services Branch, U.S. Office of Education.
**TABLE II—Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score 1956</th>
<th>Score 1961</th>
<th>Rank 1956</th>
<th>Rank 1961</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah 2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska 2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii 3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Utah and Alaska state library agency figures not available for 1956.  
3 In the state of Hawaii public library expenditures are totally financed from state sources.

Comprehensive information concerning the expenditures of public libraries for all agencies has not been collected since 1956. At present, the Library Services Branch is collecting overall operating data for the year 1962. The most recent selected information for public library expenditures, collected for the year 1960, included only data for public libraries serving populations of 35,000 and above.

Although only some 800 of the nation's 8,250 public libraries are included in that group, they provide the largest share of public library service. Such is the disparity between numbers of agencies and concentration of resources that these 10 per cent provide public library services for 65 per cent of the population with such service and expend an estimated 80-85 per cent of all annual operating expenditures. In 1960, their total annual operating expenditures was $194 million. To the majority of the nation's public library patrons these 800 agencies are the public library.

If one adopts the figure of $100,000 as the lower limit per unit for effective public library expenditure in the bracket of libraries serving populations of 35,000-49,999, he finds that this norm (first mentioned in 1950) is more of a goal than a standard. Only 14 per cent of the local governments in this category expended $100,000 or more for the operations of their public libraries in 1960. Too, in this group of 250 governments there were only 7 per cent that spent more than $3.00
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per capita. In 1960 the mean per capita operating expenditure for these public libraries was $1.47.

Seven and one-half per cent of the 318 local governments serving populations of 50,000 to 99,999 expended $250,000 or more for public library operational purposes. East Orange, New Jersey, in 1960 ranked first with an outlay of $484,248. In 1955, there were four library systems with annual expenditures above $250,000; by 1960, there were 20 local governments making such expenditures. In the same group, 28 cities (9 per cent) expended $3.00 or more per capita in 1960. The mean expenditure in this group of public libraries was $1.43 per capita for 1960.

Sixty-six of the local governments serving populations of 100,000 or more expended $500,000 or more in 1960 for public library operational outlays. This was 26 per cent of the 255 agencies reporting. In the same group, 35 governments expended more than a million dollars in operating expenditures. This group had grown from 25 in 1955. The mean per capita operating expenditure for the total group was $1.92.

Although another article in this publication will consider the cost of library materials, the table below gives data on some selected expenditures:

**TABLE III**

*Per Capita Expenditures for Books and for Salaries in Public Libraries of Certain Sizes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100,000 or more</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 to 99,999</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Figures given are for 1957—not collected in 1955.
2 Professional salary data not collected for 1955.

The table above should be read with qualifications. The material for the year 1955 contains statistics from municipal libraries only. It does not contain the reports from county and regional libraries. Consequently, because separate figures for municipal libraries are not readily available for 1960, the per capita figures for 1955 are from a more advantageous base than those for 1960.

Despite these discontinuities in reporting, an important conclusion
based upon the per capita expenditures for books may be drawn: larger public libraries serving populations of 100,000 or more were expending 21 cents per capita in 1955 for the purchase of books. This per capita outlay had advanced to 25 cents in 1960. The index of book prices reports in this period an advance of 18 per cent (1947-1949 base year). When this increase is applied to the 1960 per capita outlay for books in these public libraries, it becomes clear that the purchasing power of their expenditures has declined slightly. They have dropped from an expenditure of 21 cents per capita in 1955 to 20.6 cents per capita in 1960.

The Women's Bureau has recently issued a study that includes some information on the salaries, as of 1960, of male and female librarians two years after receiving their master's degrees. The median salary for women was $5,080 and that of men $5,170. The average annual salary, derived from reports to the Library Services Branch, for all professional public librarians (irrespective of experience) was $5,570 for those employed in public libraries serving populations of 100,000 and above; $5,275 for the population group 50,000-99,999, and $5,000 in the group serving populations from 35,000-49,999. These are only overall figures; no corroboration and no further details are available. A more thorough study of the status of librarians would provide more meaningful data.

The share of funds (as reported to the Office of Education) devoted to budget categories has continued to shift in favor of expenditures for personal services from 1939 through 1956. This growth in the wage share of the budget has been obtained mainly by a shift from the materials budget, with a lesser inroad in binding and general operating expenditures. However, the shift in the proportion of operating funds devoted to personal expenditures may be slowing. The following table illustrates the trend nationally by type of expenditures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Distribution of Public Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenditures by Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Operating Expenditures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The rapid increase in urbanization in the United States, confirmed by the 1960 census, is reflected in the finances of large municipal public libraries (those in the 50 cities of over 250,000 population). Public library service has been an urban phenomenon to a marked degree, and the trends in recent public library finance reflect this orientation. These 50 large libraries offer service to areas with 42 million inhabitants—28 per cent of the total population with public library service available. This concentration of persons is likely to continue.

Twelve years ago, in 1950, the 50 largest cities expended $2.8 billion for all operations. This sum had increased by the year 1960 to $4.7 billion. The increase of 65 per cent, while considerable, is much less than the percentage increase in funds devoted to public library operational purposes. In 1950 these 50 cities expended $50 million for their public libraries' operations. At the beginning of the 1960's, this sum had grown almost 100 per cent to an outlay for public library operations of $99,820,000.

While the growth in expenditures is important, the most significant trend may be one already contained in the statements above. The public libraries' share of these municipal budgets has been increasing during the last decade. The median share of these budgets devoted to public library departments has been arranged for comparison in Table V.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Share</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000 or more (5)</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 to 999,999 (16)</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000 to 499,999 (28)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1960 the per capita costs of public library operations in the municipalities of 250,000 to 499,999 population had a wide distribution. For the 28 cities, the mean per capita cost for public library purposes was $2.01, ranging from 69 cents for Tampa, Florida, to $4.33 for Newark, New Jersey. But neither Tampa nor Newark defined the range of the public library's share of the municipal budget. The least share was 0.7 per cent (Norfolk, Virginia) and the largest was 6.9 per cent (Dayton, Ohio).
The group of cities from 500,000 to 999,999 population had the largest mean per capita operating expenditure in 1960 for public library purposes, $2.60. Its range of per capita operating expenditures was wide also—from 64 cents (Houston, Texas) to $5.43 (Cleveland, Ohio). Here, the per capita range coincided with the library’s budgetary share of governmental operating expenditures. Washington, D.C.’s public library expenditures represented 1.2 per cent of the total municipal budget, and Cleveland’s expenditures were at the top—7.5 per cent.

America’s largest municipalities, those with populations exceeding 1,000,000, expended an average per capita sum of $2.41 for public library purposes in 1960. The range of the per capita expenditure of these five cities was from $1.92 (Philadelphia) to $2.78 (New York City). The range of the share of these municipal budgets for public library purposes was from 1.2 per cent (New York City) to 3 per cent (Los Angeles).

Any conclusions based upon the increasing outlays for public library purposes by cities remain irrelevant unless these expenditures are related to the adequacy of the services they obtain. To establish a measure of adequacy the author has constructed an “Adequacy Index” using the operational statistics of 27 metropolitan public libraries for 1960. Constructing an Adequacy Index that will measure a public library’s operational adequacy involves a tentative acceptance (perhaps a willing suspension of disbelief) of a set of public library standards. More accurately, it involves a set of statistical norms derived from those standards. In proposing such a set of norms for this paper, the writer is aware that they can only approximate a depiction of adequacy. However, the construction of any satisfactory statistical index is largely a matter of “cut and try” until the resultant device creates a consensus of acceptance on the part of its users.

The creation of an index of adequacy for public libraries is essentially a task of devising a statistical model of an ideal public library. Actual operating statistics are then compared with the model. The resulting comparative measurements provide some measure of relative adequacy. Table VI lists the Adequacy Index scores of 27 libraries.

Three operational norms and one fiscal norm were arbitrarily selected to provide a model of operational minimum adequacy of a public library serving populations of above 500,000 persons: (1) the public library should have one staff member for each 2,500 persons in
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TABLE VI
Minimum Adequacy Scores for 27 Metropolitan Public Libraries for Size of Staff, Size of Collection, Acquisitions, Per Capita Operating Expenditures and Total Score: Fiscal Year 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name or Location of Library</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Size of Collection</th>
<th>Acquisitions</th>
<th>Per Capita Operating Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Worth</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>63.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>89.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: The scores for the Adequacy Index were obtained by first calculating the percentage of attainment that each library achieved in each of the four norms. Then the library is assigned whatever score it obtains for that norm as a percentage of the potential maximum score, 25. Thus, for the Atlanta Public Library, its staff of 157 persons (reported in 1960) is 66 per cent of what minimum adequacy would require with a norm of one staff member for each 2,500 residents. Sixty-six per cent of the potential score of 25 (assigned equally to each norm) is 16.5. A parallel procedure applied to each of the three other norms yielded these scores: 17.7 (Collection Size); 19.5 (Acquisitions); 11.2 (Per Capita Expenditures). When the four scores thus
the area to be served; (2) the library should have one and one-half volumes per capita in its collection; (3) the library should add one-tenth of a volume per capita annually to its collection; and (4) the library should expend at least $3 per capita annually for operating expenditures.

The above norms are susceptible to alteration and refinement, but their use may serve to give some insight into the adequacy of service of these public libraries. One caution should be made here: the norms are for minimum adequacy. Achieving them means no more than that; the index does not measure optimum adequacy, and the achievement of these standards would imply only the lowest level of acceptable operations. Another word of caution: since no generally accepted scheme is available to measure the relative importance of the four norms (factors) involved, this index is based upon the assumption that each of the four norms carries equal weight. By stimulating discussion of appropriate ways of measuring the adequacy of public library service we will have made the first step in the creation of a more sophisticated formula.

Upon analyzing the scores of the individual libraries of this group, one sees that, of the 27 agencies listed in Table VI, the standard most fully met was that for acquisitions: the high median percentage of attainment, 88 per cent, and the high third quartile percentage of attainment, 100 per cent, make this norm the most fully achieved in the set of four norms. Somewhat more difficult of attainment was the norm for the size of collection. The least attainable norm was that of per capita expenditure. Only four of these libraries attained adequacy of per capita expenditures. Although the small number of cases will not allow one to claim a correlation between expenditure and attainment of standards, these four (and no others of the group) also attained minimum adequacy in the three other norms. A more complete "model" of a public library, in terms of standards compared with a larger number of cases, might provide important insights into expenditures as related to quality of operations.

\[
\text{Minimum Adequate Size of Staff} = \frac{\text{Population}}{2,500}
\]

\[
\text{Degree of Attainment} = \frac{\text{Actual Staff Size} \times 100}{\text{Minimum Adequate Size}}
\]

\[
\text{Score for Size of Staff} = \frac{\text{Degree of Attainment}}{4}
\]

[374]
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Summary

Although governmental expenditures for public library purposes have increased greatly in the last two decades, the per capita cost of such operations has not increased in the same degree. Despite the increased general outlays for public library purposes, from a study of larger agencies there is reason to believe that public libraries are falling short of "minimum adequacy."

The most encouraging development is the general tendency for metropolitan public libraries to share to a greater degree in municipal operating budgets. Although the libraries' median share of these budgets was small in 1960, the trend toward capturing a larger portion of governmental outlays indicates an effective representation of the public library's needs on the part of boards of trustees and library administrators.

The continuing trend toward urbanization in the United States can lead one to believe that the public library will command larger total outlays from local governments. It will be particularly important to attain sufficient funds to insure adequacy of operation and equalization of opportunity for good public library service. One who reviews public library operational statistics cannot but be struck by the disparate levels of services offered in the same size class of public libraries—this is a national problem.
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Operating Costs of College and University Libraries

RALPH H. PARKER

The cost of operating libraries of colleges and universities has been increasing for more than a quarter century. This fact is neither startling nor unique to libraries. Yet the increases have been of growing concern to librarians and to administrators of educational institutions. In 1933–34, total operating expenditures for libraries of institutions of higher learning in the United States were $13,387,000; twenty-five years later the total had increased to $110,510,000, an eight-fold increase. During this period, the average cost per student to provide library service had increased from $15.31 in 1939–40, to $29.23 in 1951–52, and to an estimated $62.30 in 1957–58.

These increases in costs of operation resulted from three factors: heavier enrollment, the changing nature of the students enrolled, and the inflation which characterized the entire period under study. Enrollment increased slowly before World War II, climbing from 1,150,000 in 1932 to 1,400,000 in 1941–42. During the war enrollments declined, but more than doubled immediately after its close, then settled back to about 2,300,000 when the veterans had passed through. Again, in the late 1950’s, enrollments began to increase, so that in 1957–58 the total was 3,218,000.

Along with the increase in enrollment has come a greater portion of students pursuing higher degrees. In 1942, for example, only 6 per cent were classified as graduate students; in 1956, 9 per cent were so classified. This change in composition may be presumed to affect not only the total cost of education but also the distribution of those costs.

Total expenditures for educational and general purposes of all institutions of higher learning rose from $369,661,000 in 1933–34 to $3,634,142,000 in 1957–58. Distribution of expenditures for selected educational purposes as reported in the Biennial Survey of Education is shown below:

Mr. Parker is University Librarian, University of Missouri, Columbia.
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**TABLE I**

_Distribution of Expenditures of Degree Granting Institutions for Selected Educational Purposes in Selected Years 1933-1958_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Educational and General Per Cent</th>
<th>Resident Instruction Per Cent</th>
<th>Organized Research Per Cent</th>
<th>Libraries Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1933-34</td>
<td>$369,661</td>
<td>$217,486</td>
<td>$17,063</td>
<td>$13,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>$525,539</td>
<td>$281,667</td>
<td>$28,121</td>
<td>$19,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-46</td>
<td>$820,326</td>
<td>$375,122</td>
<td>$86,812</td>
<td>$26,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>$1,933,645</td>
<td>$827,737</td>
<td>$320,362</td>
<td>$60,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957-58</td>
<td>$3,634,142</td>
<td>$1,477,350</td>
<td>$733,857</td>
<td>$110,510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In thousands of dollars.

These figures reveal the extent to which the nature of educational institutions is being changed by the increase in organized research, much of which is financed by the federal government. The presence of larger numbers of graduate students makes possible the staffing of research projects, while the availability of research assistantships further encourages graduate enrollment. Librarians have become increasingly concerned with the special service demands arising from large research projects and have undertaken better methods of calculating costs of such services. The costs for graduate instruction and research were found, in a number of institutions studied, to be considerably higher than for undergraduate instruction, in some cases up to five times as high.7

In the period 1933-1958, the percentage of expenditures for research increased four-fold, from 4.6 per cent to 20.2 per cent; that devoted to resident instruction declined markedly, from 58.8 per cent to 40.7 per cent. Yet the combined total of instruction and research declined from 63.4 per cent of the total to 60.9 per cent. The cost of library service, which can be assumed to relate most closely to these two activities, declined in percentage at a somewhat greater rate, from 3.6 per cent to 3.0 per cent of the total. Thus, it appears that the greatest increase in the costs of educational institutions was in the general area of administration, physical plant operation, exten-
sion services, and the like, rather than in the more narrowly defined educational activities.

The effects of inflation upon the cost of library operation have been varied and have resulted in a continuing redistribution of the cost factors as well as in greater total costs. The following table, compiled from data collected by the Library Services Branch of the U.S. Office of Education in the quinquennial surveys of libraries begun in 1939, shows the distribution of library operating expenditures by object:

**TABLE II**

*Distribution of Operating Expenditures by Object in Academic Libraries in Selected Years 1939-1957*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total*</th>
<th>Staff Salaries*</th>
<th>Student Wages*</th>
<th>Personal Services (Per Cent)</th>
<th>Library Materials Amount*</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Other Expenses*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>$17,976</td>
<td>$9,384</td>
<td>$1,252</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>$6,531</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>$810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-47</td>
<td>34,622</td>
<td>17,887</td>
<td>3,051</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>12,076</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>1,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>61,294</td>
<td>33,785</td>
<td>5,274</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>19,508</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>2,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-57***</td>
<td>88,603</td>
<td>48,693</td>
<td>7,733</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>27,786</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>4,391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In thousands of dollars.

** Because coverage in the 1956-57 survey was exceedingly poor, figures for that year have not been published. The figures quoted in this Table have been supplied by the U.S. Office of Education.

The totals in Table II above vary considerably from those in Table I because the above figures are derived from special studies and in general include fewer institutions.

The data reveal that there has been a continuing increase in the proportion of the library budget devoted to salaries and wages, increasing from 59.2 per cent in 1939-40 to 63.7 per cent in 1956-57. These increases have occurred in both staff salaries and student wages. Likewise, there has been a decrease in the proportion of the budget devoted to library materials, from 36.3 per cent in 1939-40 to 31.4 per cent in 1956-57. Miscellaneous expenses, including supplies, communications, equipment maintenance, etc., have remained quite constant, varying only from 4.5 per cent to 4.9 per cent without any definite trend.

If one considers only the two factors, personal services and library materials, he observes that the ratio of expenditures for library materials to those for personal services expressed as percentages has declined as follows:

[378]
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-47</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-57</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This shift in distribution may be attributed largely to the differential rates of inflation which have prevailed. The consumer price index increased by approximately 208 per cent from 1939 to 1958. Had this average rate applied equally to salaries and to books, there would probably have been little shift in the distribution of costs.

Although salaries throughout the economy have increased more rapidly than the costs of commodities, there has probably been a greater differential in libraries than in the economy as a whole because of the depressed salaries of librarians which obtained during and immediately following the depression. Over a period from 1939-1957, the average salary per full-time employee in libraries of colleges and universities is listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>$1,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-47</td>
<td>2,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>3,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-57</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The increase is, therefore, 267 per cent over the period. Salary scales have increased, for professional staff at least, more than these averages would indicate: in 1939-40, 69.8 per cent of all full-time library staff were classified as professional; in 1956-57 the percentage had been reduced to 55.4.

Arrival at a precise composite index of book prices as it affects the total library budget is even more difficult than for an index of salaries. Too little is known of the proportionate expenditures for new books versus old, for books in one subject as compared with another, etc. A different approach, estimating the cost per volume of materials acquired, was undertaken. From data available on 100 selected libraries, the average expenditure per volume acquired was computed by dividing total book expenditures by the gross number of volumes added to the collection. Included in the volume count were all gifts and exchanges as well as purchases; included in the expenditure total were binding and subscriptions, as well as book purchases. The computations follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost/Volume</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>$2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945-46</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[379]
The overall percentage increase in the unit cost of materials was 203 per cent, as compared with an increase of 267 per cent for salaries.

Under continued budgetary pressure, librarians have sought avenues for reduction of costs, either through elimination of services or through mechanization, often through a combination of both. The two areas most frequently approached are circulation procedures and cataloging.

Simplification of circulation procedures has taken various forms, including transaction number control systems with which the library sacrifices the ability to answer the question "Where is any specific book"; punched card call slips, which replace the older double charge system; or the Brooklyn College system, which is a combination of both with further use of machines. During the same period, and perhaps for the same reasons, there has been a shift to open stacks with customer self-service. In many cases the shift has been made for the avowed purpose of increasing the effectiveness of the library's educational function, but the possibility of reducing costs was probably always considered.

Literature concerning open access to stacks is almost nonexistent. Earlier studies have confirmed that open stacks were common among small college libraries before 1940, but few large universities opened their stacks except to faculty and perhaps to graduate students. Among the large universities there appears to have been an extensive shift after World War II to open stacks and limitation of paging services. This conclusion is based upon an examination of plans of libraries constructed since 1947 and upon informal conversation with other librarians.

Reduction of cataloging costs has taken two chief directions: limited cataloging of certain books and use of Library of Congress cataloging and classification without modification. Some institutions, like the University of Kansas for example, have recognized that uncataloged arrearages exist and that they are likely to continue. Having acknowledged the situation, they have selected groups of materials of small probable use, have listed them by main entry, and have shelved them in arbitrary order without subject classification. There has not yet been time for the practice to be evaluated in library literature.

A growing number of libraries have looked to the use of Library of Congress catalog cards without modification as a means of reducing professional cataloging load. A number have changed classification
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schemes to make possible a more thorough utilization of the work already done.

Ironically, the Library of Congress has been exploring the uses of shelf classification in research libraries, with the possible result that it would discontinue subject classification. The study, financed by the Council on Library Resources, has not yet been concluded.13

Libraries have for many years made use of existing business equipment to improve their operating procedures, but the approach has always been that of limited applications. Only recently has there been talk of systematic automation of routine procedures; at present, activity is limited almost entirely to talk. Many of the uses of machines, particularly those referred to as information retrieval, are still far from practical economic accomplishment. Others, more prosaic in their appeal, await the time when a conservative profession will accept the change.

Most of the exploration is in the use of data processing equipment, specifically punched cards and punched paper tape. The use of tape operated automatic typewriters to reproduce catalog cards was probably first made at the United States Naval Postgraduate School at Monterey, California, in 1955.14 Since that time the system has been applied in numerous libraries, particularly research institutions which acquire many titles for which Library of Congress cards are not available. The University of Missouri is in the midst of developing an integrated system, a project expected to require at least ten years. It includes the use of IBM equipment for ordering and accounting, Friden Flexowriters for making catalog cards, and eventually an electronic computer which will integrate the two.15

The only thorough study thus far made of a library's operation looking toward complete automation of records is that by the University of Illinois Chicago campus. The proposed system contemplates an integrated operation, as nearly automatic as possible, from the time a book is recommended for purchase, through ordering, cataloging, lending, and finally to withdrawal and replacement. Human labor, once performed, need never be repeated; all subsequent utilization of the results would be through the medium of high-speed automated machine procedures.16 The results of the study have a broad usefulness to libraries of universities, but offer nothing for the small independent college.

Recognizing that small libraries can profit from the technological revolution which is about to occur only through joint action, the state-
supported colleges and universities in Colorado have undertaken a project of joint acquisition and cataloguing. Each library will thus be able, for example, to have a computer compiled catalog if it is economically feasible for any library to have one. In these and other ways, academic libraries are seeking—and must inevitably continue to seek—ways of reducing costs in order to make available funds go as far as possible.
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Cost of Library Materials

HELEN M. WELCH

Collections of library materials are the raison d'être of libraries; personnel and buildings exist only to make the materials available. Yet the adequacy of budgetary support to keep these collections effective has been and is gradually diminishing. First of all, the budget item for materials has not held its own against the pressure for a greater salary budget. Wheeler and Goldhor point out that library materials commanded 18 per cent of total current operating expenditures in public libraries in 1939, a figure which dropped to 15.7 per cent in 1956 and to 14.2 per cent in 1960.¹ The 1956 American Library Association standards for public libraries give 20 per cent as the portion which should be allocated for materials if minimal standards are to be met.² University book budgets have also suffered as the library portion of the institution's operating budget has dropped and as the portion of it allocated to materials has decreased. According to statistics reported by UNESCO, the percentage of total operating budgets of university libraries in the United States assigned to books, periodicals and binding has been as indicated by the following figures:³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-47</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-52</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, funds available for library materials have become increasingly inadequate; as costs of library materials have increased, more publications are available than ever before, new areas of interest are competing for the acquisition dollar, new forms of material are available, and the number of potential library patrons has increased.

The establishment of cost indexes for U.S. books, periodicals, and serial services by the ALA Committee on the Cost of Library Materials

Miss Welch is Acquisition Librarian, University of Illinois Library, Urbana.
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Index has given librarians an accepted and continuing basis for estimating budgetary needs as affected by price changes. Average prices and index figures for 19 subject areas and the total book production of the country are available for the base years 1947-1949, and for 1953, 1956, 1958, 1960, 1961, 1962. These figures are based upon the tabulation of the books recorded weekly in Publishers' Weekly and do not include paperbound books, textbooks, government documents, and encyclopedias. The average prices and indexes for the total production for these years are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Average Price</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1947-49</td>
<td>$3.59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>115.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>128.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>142.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>146.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>162.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>164.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In commenting upon these indexes Wheeler and Goldhor, after noting that science publication increases ran highest and fiction least, point out that these indexes do not go into the increased length and complexity of much recent nonfiction. This is true. The index figures do not measure or explain the elements which cause the increases in price; they are designed simply to measure the amount of price change and to guide the library-consumer as he plans and justifies his budgetary requests.

It is interesting to compare the cost studies of fragments of the total publication picture, upon which librarians used to be forced to rely. Such comparisons either can confirm a faith in the indexes or can lead to some interesting speculation in attempts to explain the differences. One comparison, interesting because the figures are all from Publishers' Weekly, is of the 1962 average prices listed in the three categories—novel, biography, and history—which PW has covered for many years. The comparative figures follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Fall Announcement Issue</th>
<th>PW 1962 Listings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Novel</td>
<td>$4.52</td>
<td>$3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biography</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In each case the average price for books listed in the Fall Announcement issue is substantially higher than the corresponding average for the books actually listed as published throughout the year in the PW weekly record.

In closer agreement with the ALA indexes is the study made by Marjorie Donaldson of adult books purchased in 1957 by the Pasadena Public Library. She found an average list price of $5.09 for all types and subjects of books, excluding paperbacks under $2.00. Although the ALA indexes offer no figure for 1957, they do give an average price of $4.61 for 1956 and $5.12 for 1958.

Three additional studies based upon prices paid for books selected for specific collections offer some interesting points. Most useful, because it extends back to a time before the establishment of the ALA indexes, is that made by William Carlson at three of the Oregon institutions of higher education covering the years 1939-40 through 1949-50. Mr. Carlson took the average cost per volume of acquisitions at the University of Oregon, Oregon State College, and the Oregon College of Education for each of the 10 years covered by the study. The resulting index figures, using 1939-40 as the base year, show the startling rise in prices in the five-year period following the end of World War II. The index figures at the institutions for 1949-50 were respectively 185, 178, and 180. This represents a much faster increase than the ALA indexes show during the fifties with the possible exceptions of books in art, science, and technology. In a study of prices paid for a sampling of 500 English language scientific books of interest to the Celanese Chemical Company, Frank Wagner found an average price for 1959 acquisitions of $8.28. This price can be compared with the ALA figure of $8.09 for technology and $9.16 for science in 1958, and $8.89 for technology and $10.21 for science in 1960. Flora Ludington's study of the average cost of volumes bought by Mount Holyoke College Library during the decade of the thirties and the later years of the fifties shows figures comparable to those of ALA. The average cost of the 3,194 volumes purchased during 1957-58 was $4.51 compared with the ALA index figure of $4.61 in 1956 and $5.12 in 1958. However much variation there is among the average prices, all of the studies prove one fact: book prices are increasing.

ALA indexes for U.S. periodicals are available for 24 subject areas and for U.S. periodicals as a whole. Again the base period is 1947-49, and indexes have been computed for all of the years since then through 1962. The indexes through 1960 may be consulted in The Cost of Li-
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Library Materials, by Frank L. Schick and William H. Kurth. The 1962 figures were published in Library Journal. Unfortunately the 1961 figures are available only on a mimeographed sheet distributed at the Resources and Technical Services Division Hospitality Booth at the 1962 summer conference in Miami. It is hoped that the Schick-Kurth pamphlet will be brought up-to-date and these figures made more widely available. The overall periodicals index rose to 163.5 in 1962, with the three highest average prices in the fields of psychology, medicine, and chemistry and physics. These same three had the highest average prices in the base years 1947-49.

ALA indexes for serial services are available in the areas of business, law, miscellaneous, and U.S. documents, as well as a combined figure for all of the 476 services used in computing the indexes. They have been computed for all of the years after the base years of 1947-49, and may be consulted in the Schick-Kurth pamphlet, with the figures for 1961 and 1962 in the Library Journal issue mentioned above. The combined total index for this rapidly growing area is roughly comparable to the index for periodicals. However, within the selected areas, there is wide variation. The 1962 indexes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average Price</th>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>$91.81</td>
<td>144.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>40.92</td>
<td>243.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>35.64</td>
<td>259.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Documents</td>
<td>16.41</td>
<td>264.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Total</td>
<td>55.35</td>
<td>153.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

William Huff and Norman Brown, who established and keep up-to-date the serial services indexes, have not yet established an index for translation services. This is a new and growing area and an expensive one. Huff and Brown point out that in 1949 there was a single Russian translating service available at a subscription price of $95.00; in 1959 there were 60 such services at a total cost of $2,512.75. For the library budget the serial services are necessary, expensive, and distressing.

Since the base period for all the library materials indexes is 1947-49, they can be compared with the Consumer Price Index. To include book cost indexes in the comparison, one must return to the 1961 figures, which are as follows: books, 162.0; periodicals, 155.5; serial services, 146.7; consumer prices, 127.4. As these figures show, library materials have far outdistanced consumer prices as a whole.

Trends in library binding costs are less easily measured, since bind-
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ing practices vary in different institutions. Some have binding contracts with commercial firms, others have their own binderies where some costs are hidden, and others deal in the open market. One thing is certain: the cost is going up. William Dix reported in 1954 that the average cost per volume at Princeton, where binding was done by another division of the University on a nonprofit basis, had increased 110 per cent from 1931-32 to 1952-53, a 21-year period. Binding at the University of Illinois Library is done under contract with a commercial firm. For Class A binding there was an average increase of 25.8 per cent for all sizes of books for the 10-year period from 1949-50 to 1959-60.

Cost indexes would be welcome for antiquarian books, foreign books, recordings, and microfilms, and the Cost of Library Materials Index Committee is turning its attention to these areas. Information on book prices is available in the trade literature of a number of foreign countries, and the Committee plans to collect such information and make it available through library periodicals. The Bookseller gives annual British book production figures. A comparison of the average price of the 16,509 titles listed in 1951 (13 shillings) with the average price of the 23,248 titles listed in 1961 (21 shillings, 6 pence) shows an increase of 65.3 per cent. (These figures omit government publications.) This is slightly higher than the U.S. index figure of 162.0 for 1961, based upon the 1947-49 price. However, the average prices for 1961 are not comparable in terms of cost to U.S. libraries. The U.S. average price for 1961 is $5.81; the U.S. equivalent of the British average price is $3.01. This same phenomenon of the results of devaluation of a national currency appears in William Kurth's article on Mexican book prices. Comparing average prices for Mexican books in 1950 and 1954, Mr. Kurth found that in pesos the Mexican purchaser found an 81.7 per cent increase in price, while in dollars the American purchaser found only a 42.5 per cent increase in the same period.

A practically uncharted area of price concern is that of secondhand and antiquarian books. Demand, scarcity, and such peripheral considerations as the increased cost of catalog listing of antiquarian books have increased prices far more sharply than those for new publications. For the large research library this is a crucial area, and some standard measurements are needed if administrative boards are to be convinced of the urgency of budget increases.

When one is considering the specific needs of public libraries, it is interesting to note the changes in the unit costs used by the Ameri-
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can Library Association in building budgets to illustrate minimal standards collections. The figures used in the 1956 and 1959 budgets, based upon costs in selected libraries and allowing for library discounts, are as follows: 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1956</th>
<th>1959</th>
<th>Percentage of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current books, per volume</td>
<td>$2.45</td>
<td>$2.80</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals, per annual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subscription</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longplaying records</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers, per annual</td>
<td>$18.00</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subscription</td>
<td>$4.75</td>
<td>$4.50</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since some budget support has been drained off the materials item to cover the urgent salary needs, it is interesting to compare the increases in cost of the two items. Using the Strout figures for the salaries of beginning librarians 19 (although this can raise some arguments), one finds that there is an increase of 70.3 per cent in the 1961 average over the 1951 average. Since no average figure is available for 1951 books, comparisons must be limited to periodicals and services. Periodicals show a 40 per cent increase in 1961 over 1951, and serial services show a 39.8 per cent increase for the same period. Evidently the salary emergency has been more urgent, although it must be admitted that salaries as a whole lag behind the increase in beginning salaries during periods of personnel scarcity.

Not only are publications becoming more expensive, but there are also more of them available for purchase. Between 1951 and 1961, new titles published annually in the United States, including new books and new editions, increased from 11,255 to 18,060, an increase of 60 per cent.20 For the same period British publication figures, which include reprints, rose from 18,066 to 24,893, an increase of 38 per cent.21 An approximation of world book production was estimated by UNESCO as 323,000 in 1958, the figure rising to 340,000 in 1960, an increase of about 5 per cent in the two-year period.22 World periodical production, omitting general interest newspapers, appears in the same source as 72,189 in the 1959 volume and 83,220 in the 1961 volume, an increase for the two-year period of 15.3 per cent.23 Increased publication, particularly in science and technology, has prompted the
growth of a large number of abstracting, indexing, bibliographical, and translation publications. As mentioned above, these are expensive publications and much in demand by library patrons. If the world itself remains in a healthy condition, there is no foreseeable let-up in the increased amount of publication. Expected increases in population, number of college graduates, job opportunities for scientists and technicians, and amount of leisure time all point to an expanding market which will encourage publication of more and more titles.

Library budgets have not yet felt the full impact of the cost of the newer media—films, phonorecords, photoreproductions, talking books, tapes, and wires. Much approval has been given to the possibilities of these new means of communication, but perhaps because of budget problems, most libraries have not been able to build substantial collections. In 1955 Fleming Bennett reported on results of a survey undertaken in 1952 by the Association of College and Research Libraries Committee on Audio-visual Work. The purpose of the survey was to ascertain the extent to which services with educational films, film-strips, recordings, slides, maps, and pictures had been developed in U.S. colleges and universities. Responses from 575 libraries revealed that there had not yet been any extensive development of audio-visual services in these libraries, but there were indications that the rate of development would be accelerated in the coming years. In 1960 Chester Davis reported a Library Journal survey of record collections in selected libraries of various types and sizes. From 260 replies received, Davis found somewhat the same situation. He reported that with notable exceptions budgets for records were meagre and insignificant.

Public library statistics gathered by the U.S. Office of Education indicate some awakening interest in the new media, as the following table indicates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of Total Operating Expenditures Used for Library Materials</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books and Periodicals</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-Visual Materials</td>
<td>no report</td>
<td>no report</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A similar picture is shown by the two most recent reports available from the Office of Education for institutions of higher education. The percentages of library operating expenditures which are used for materials are shown in the following table: 28

TABLE II

| Percentage of Library Operating Expenditures for Materials in Institutions of Higher Education |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Category                                      | 1946-47 | 1951-52 |
| Books and Periodicals                         | 30.8    | 27.5    |
| Binding                                       | 3.7     | 3.9     |
| Audio-Visual Materials                        | .4      | .4      |
| Totals                                        | 34.9    | 31.8    |

The number of library patrons is increasing. Public libraries are expanding through the growth of urban areas, the extension of library service to rural populations, and the overall population increases. Academic libraries are faced with growing enrollments, which bring an increased number of faculty to be served, more graduate courses, more advanced degrees to support, increased production of books, and increased and expanded areas of research and scholarship. Both academic and public libraries are feeling an increased need for foreign publications brought on by more foreign language training, more foreign travel, more foreign visitors to all parts of the United States, and most of all, more concern about what is happening in other countries. Other strains on budgets are the commitments which continue and which grow, such as periodical subscriptions and binding, Farmington Plan commitments for university libraries, and for public libraries the specialized serial tools required to give service to business. New services once begun tend to increase rather than diminish.

The serious problem posed by a diminishing share of library operating funds for the purchase of library materials, the increasing costs of such materials, and the increasing numbers of materials needed should be attacked directly by stating the facts of the situation to the authorities who can make some adjustments. The problem can also be attacked by effecting small savings in various ways in the expenditure of available funds.

In spending library funds the librarian should exercise care to obtain the best discounts compatible with service, take advantage of the infrequent foreign currency devaluations before prices have leveled off,
HELEN M. WELCH

avoid paying customs brokers' fees by careful instructions to foreign agents, reduce duplication of titles, take advantage of long-term periodical subscriptions, follow efficient binding practices, avoid emergency buying, and enlist the aid of persons going abroad to obtain antiquarian items directly from shop shelves, where they can be purchased without an added markup for catalog listing.

Substantial savings can be made by the cooperative building of library resources, both in the mechanics of procurement and preparations and in the division of collecting responsibility. Total library costs—book funds, salaries, and building costs—should be considered in acquisition decisions. Processing package deals, such as those offered by commercial firms which supply books already cataloged and prepared for the shelves and the Public Law 480 program, under which procurement and cataloging are carried out cooperatively, should be considered with an eye to total savings for the library. Photocopies can sometimes save binding costs as well as long-term storage costs. In employing exchanges to obtain materials which could as well be purchased, the librarian should not fail to consider the hidden costs. The limited literature on the cost of exchanging duplicates suggests that general exchanges are not economical, but that the exchange of materials in limited subject areas and with a limited number of participants is. Rather more than ordinary duplication seems to be unavoidable in obtaining materials from the newly developing countries of the world and from the socialist countries of Europe. Academic libraries which are collecting intensively from such countries would find it advantageous to develop inexpensive ways of exchanging publications among a few heavily engaged institutions. New sources of funds can often be found: individual donors, academic departmental funds, and government and foundation grants. The enterprising librarian would do well to study the modus operandi of the king of the librarian-beggars, Lawrence Thompson, as set forth in his "Of Bibliological Mendicancy." 29
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Someone, obviously not a librarian, once said that a college library was complete if it had a good collection of books and a janitor to sweep up at night. Penurious library administrators may sometimes wish that life were so simple when they see more than 60 per cent of their budgets being doled out in salaries and wages. But aware that the building of library collections cannot be left to publishers and book jobbers, the organization of materials to elves who come in the night, and the finding of obscure information to the unsophisticated reader, the administrator knows that money for personnel is well spent in the effort to provide superior library service.

Granting that librarians are worth their hire, one may ask how well they have fared in a period of increased library activity buttressed by growing fiscal support. This paper attempts to answer that question, as well as available data permit, and it explores also the effect of the difficulty of filling professional positions on salaries and the utilization of library manpower.

Despite a seeming wealth of statistical information about academic and public libraries, lack of usable data from many institutions and discontinuity in reporting confound serious attempts to make an objective examination of changes in salaries over a long period. Therefore, the following analyses are necessarily impressionistic and must be used with caution. However, since the public library systems and the university libraries represented in the tables have large staffs, the numbers of positions under consideration give the findings relevance if not statistical validity.

Table I shows changes in salaries for specified positions in 10 large public library systems between 1955 and 1961. Because public library salaries are reported in terms of scheduled ranges, separate calculations were made for the differences in the bottom salaries for each job as well as in the top salaries. The table shows that, in general, the bottom
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salaries did not increase so much as did the top salaries. Indeed, in several instances, the bottom salary for a given position was actually lower in 1961 than in 1955. The highest professional salary quoted in 1955 was $16,000; the lowest, $1,920. By 1961 the highest salary was $20,600; the lowest, $4,040. The highest nonprofessional salary in 1955 was $11,904; the lowest, $1,352. In 1961 the highest salary was $13,511; the lowest, $2,040.

### TABLE I

Per Cent Change in Salaries Paid by Ten Large Public Library Systems, 1955–1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Change in Top Salary of Range</th>
<th>Change in Bottom Salary of Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>+71.4</td>
<td>+28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>+75.5</td>
<td>+27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td>+80.5</td>
<td>+33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Head</td>
<td>+73.6</td>
<td>+36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch Head</td>
<td>+72.1</td>
<td>+41.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>+73.6</td>
<td>+32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Librarian</td>
<td>+56.8</td>
<td>+39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Librarian</td>
<td>+52.4</td>
<td>+37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofessional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Head</td>
<td>+129.1</td>
<td>+47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>+66.0</td>
<td>+56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Clerk</td>
<td>+45.0</td>
<td>+22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Clerk</td>
<td>+71.0</td>
<td>+24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>+91.9</td>
<td>+23.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based upon data from “Salary Statistics for Large Public Libraries,” published by Enoch Pratt Free Library.
2 Excludes four libraries that did not report on this position in one or both years.
3 Excludes one library.
4 Excludes two libraries.
5 Excludes three libraries.

A word about the high nonprofessional salaries may be in order. Public libraries with multimillion-dollar budgets have found increasing need for persons trained in fiscal management so that several business
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managers listed in the 1961 Enoch Pratt statistics received more than $10,000 a year and, in one case, the range of the business manager's salary equalled that of the assistant director. Another nonprofessional position of growing importance is that of building manager. In far-flung library systems with a large plant investment, the salaries for this position also have pushed over the $10,000 mark.

In an evaluation of the significance of these salary changes, it is important to keep in mind that the consumer price index rose 11.6 per cent between 1955 and 1961. Although the index is only a rough guide in this context, it does confirm that part of the increase in salaries served merely to offset the rise in the cost of living and that, in fact, the real value of some salaries declined even though the dollar payments were increased.

**TABLE II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Change in Top Salary of Range</th>
<th>Change in Bottom Salary of Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>+92.6</td>
<td>+52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director 2</td>
<td>+114.5</td>
<td>+79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td>+121.1</td>
<td>+65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heads of school, college, and department libraries 3</td>
<td>+180.0</td>
<td>+95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other professional</td>
<td>+86.8</td>
<td>+61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All non-professional</td>
<td>+212.5</td>
<td>+51.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2 Excludes four libraries that did not report on this position in one or both years.

3 Excludes one library.

Table II shows changes in actual salaries for specified positions in 10 large university libraries between 1952 and 1961. The figures cannot be compared directly with those given in Table I because they cover a longer period and so reflect proportionately greater changes. The highest professional salary quoted in 1952 was $12,600; the lowest, $2,400. By 1961 the highest was $20,318; the lowest, $4,200. Among the salaries for nonprofessional staff, the highest in 1952 was $5,628; the
lowest, $1,200. By 1961 the highest was $8,520; the lowest, $2,268. The increases should be considered in the light of the fact that the consumer price index rose 12.6 per cent in the same period.

Table III shows changes in salaries paid by 10 smaller college libraries between 1952 and 1961. The libraries in this group showed more marked salary changes because, during this period, some of the colleges showed signs of developing into major institutions with a consequent upgrading of the library. The highest professional salary given in 1952 was $7,008; the lowest, $2,200. As of 1961, the highest was $12,200; the lowest, $2,850. The highest salary for a nonprofessional staff member in 1952 was $3,372; the lowest, $1,200. In 1961 the highest was $5,496; the lowest, $2,100.

TABLE III
Percentage Change in Salaries Paid by Ten Smaller College Libraries, 1952–1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Change in Top Salary of Range</th>
<th>Change in Bottom Salary of Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>+106.5</td>
<td>+69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>+120.4</td>
<td>+68.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Heads</td>
<td>+155.6</td>
<td>+57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other professional</td>
<td>+112.0</td>
<td>+54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All non-professional</td>
<td>+103.6</td>
<td>+74.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2 Excludes six libraries that did not report on this position in one or both years.

3 Excludes three libraries.

4 Excludes four libraries.

The data on beginning salaries in the libraries in these three groups are so sketchy (or even nonexistent) that the changes cannot be charted for the 10-year period. The well known Strout figures must, therefore, be used in spite of their limitations for the purposes of the present examination. The average salary reported in 1952 for placements in all types of libraries was $3,375. In 1961, it was $5,365, an increase of 58.9 per cent. The 1961 figure is undoubtedly too high for public and academic libraries. Among the 10 public library systems represented in Table I, the highest starting salary in 1961 was $5,090;
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the lowest, $3,900; and the median, $4,600. The 1960 public library
statistics compiled by the U.S. Office of Education seem to confirm
these figures by reporting median salaries that range from $4,675 to
$4,200 for public libraries of various sizes. Among the 10 universities
represented in Table II, the highest beginning salary was $5,400; the
lowest, $4,440; and the median, $4,990. In the 10 smaller college li-
braries, the highest starting salary was $6,300; the lowest, $3,000; and
the median, $4,800.

The striking feature about these beginning salaries is their compar-
ability and the apparent lessening of the importance of the psychic
income that induces some library school graduates to work for less than
the going rate in certain well known libraries.

The question of the proper proportion of professional staff members
to nonprofessional staff has often been raised, but like many other
persistent issues in librarianship, it has not been clearly resolved. In
principle, librarians agree that the nonprofessional aspects of their
work should be delegated to subprofessional and clerical workers, but
in practice the change-over has not occurred.

The recommended ratio for academic libraries is two nonprofes-
sional staff members for each professional librarian. Yet even in the
large university libraries represented in Table II, the ratio was only
three to two; while in the small college libraries, it was less than
one to one. To be sure, these figures do not include the hours of
student assistance equated to full-time equivalents, but anyone who
has worked with this kind of help realizes its severe limitations. Part-
time nonprofessional help does not insure effective use of professional
staff because it exacts its own toll in time spent for training and
supervision.

The recommended ratio for public libraries is at least two non-
professionals for each librarian, and one writer has suggested three
to one. Again the facts reveal a different picture, for the actual ratio is
three to two, excluding maintenance staff and persons paid on an
hourly basis.

All this seems paradoxical in the face of complaints about the
shortage of professionally trained librarians and rising personnel costs.
One explanation is that the decentralization of library units and the
long hours of service virtually compel libraries to maintain a lower
ratio. There is another explanation, less complimentary to librarians:
their status fears warp their judgment. A case in point is the discon-
tinuance of the Library Technology Program set up by the Orange
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County Community College in Middletown, New York.\textsuperscript{9} In principle, the idea of training subprofessional library workers seemed to be a good one, but after four years it came to nothing. "At the core of this failure," writes the college president, "is the inability or unwillingness of librarians to define the difference between the professional and the nonprofessional in library management, and this I believe to be closely linked to the fear that the status and responsibilities of professional librarians will be infringed upon."\textsuperscript{10}

The need for more professional librarians is real enough not to require bolstering by uninformed estimates or the "facts" presented in imperfectly designed surveys. Finding good candidates for existing vacancies is enough of a problem without worrying about pie-in-the-sky estimates of the number of librarians needed to meet particular "goals." The problem is serious enough for library administrators to consider whether, in Orne's phrase,\textsuperscript{11} they are confronted by a shortage or waste.

It is regrettably true that many library operations (especially in smaller libraries) are inherently inefficient. Even so, few librarians have been notably resourceful or even diligent in seeking ways to make optimum use of professional staff. As long as librarians were paid little more than clerks, this neglect was not particularly costly. With professional salaries spiraling upward, however, the responsible administrator must face the problem squarely. Only then can he be sure that the lion's share of his budget is really well spent.
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Budgeting and Budget Control in Public Libraries

PAXTON P. PRICE

The great majority of public libraries in the United States are supported by appropriations. While appropriations are supplemented with state and federal aid, fees and fines, and other receipts, all funds are generally combined for budgeting purposes. Special trust and endowment income is excluded, of course. The appropriation process requires library budgeting of one type or another.

The yield from special library taxes, which is ordinarily a predictable amount, is the second most frequent source of library revenue. In spite of the fixity of this kind of income, libraries supported in this manner are being required more and more by law to prepare annual budgets. Theoretically, in order to prepare an annual budget the source of library income has no effect upon the library's obligation for proper financial management.

Early literature implied that the library administrator was supposed to have the most direct hand in the preparation of the annual budget. This implication was verified a decade later by the McDiarmids, who made a survey of library management for their book on administration. They found that size of library reflected the pattern as to which persons prepared the budget. In libraries having fewer than 75 staff members, the librarian was often assisted in the budget-making activity by members or a committee from the board of trustees. Whenever staff reached beyond 75 members and up to 300, board participation was almost nonexistent and the librarian was assisted in budgeting and financial control by an assistant librarian or administrative specialist. For staffs of over 300 the librarian and the financial assistant had exclusive control of this activity.

A current survey of municipalities of over 10,000 population that operate libraries shows, among 710 cities reporting, the following
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distribution of budget preparation procedure while not identifying specific individuals most directly involved:

Library board recommends library budget to chief administrator of city 235
Librarian recommends library budget to chief administrator of city 132
Library board adopts budget and city council approves tax monies only 104
Library board sends library budget to city council through chief administrator of city 102
Library board sends library budget directly to city council 96
Other procedures 41

In a great majority of these cities the library board of trustees is clearly an administrative board having fixed authority for financial management procedures. To the knowledge of this writer, there has never been such a nationwide survey analysis of the financial procedures followed in public libraries operated by other political subdivisions.

While effective revenue and expenditure control have ever remained the objective of budgeting, the procedure has changed in recent times. The name for the new procedure is "performance budgeting," and it came from the Hoover Commission’s recommendations to the federal government published in 1949. The new procedure has been called "an approach toward budget formulation, presentation and control rather than a distinctive budgeting system" by the Municipal Finance Officers Association. A performance budget is expressed in terms of programs of work to be performed rather than a listing of what is to be bought.

Prior to the 1940’s the preparation of a budget by the majority of governmental agencies required first an estimate of the revenues expected to be received. Libraries practiced this same procedure based upon the budget making approach defined by Sherman in 1933 as “the preparation of an estimate based on past history and future prospects of revenue and proposed expenditures for a given period, usually a year.”

With the end of the depression and as governmental management grew sophisticated with more skills and professionalization, the old estimate approach gave way to data gathering and justification. Kaiser, the West Coast librarian with a reputation for winning budget increases, gave the advice that budget requests should be based only upon what could be justified before the appropriating body.
In 1941, Miles and Martin discussed the financial management of the library from the viewpoint that the librarian is a public administrator and, therefore, must undertake his duties in financial management with knowledge of current thought and practices in that special field. The definition of budgeting shifted from the previous "estimate" to "a plan of development." And Miles and Martin also note, for the first time, that the annual budget is one step in a multi-year plan, which is a common feature of present-day budgeting.

While the type of budget prepared by libraries will follow the general lines required by local appropriating or approving authorities, and many have budgeting manuals specifying forms to be used, the trend today is clearly toward the performance budget. This kind of budgeting is a change from the old type that consisted of a plan to spend estimated income upon things or services: "In its simplest terms the goal of performance budgeting is to prepare, analyze, and interpret the financial plan in terms of services and activity programs, rather than limiting the budget to a detailing of objects of disbursement such as personal services, supplies, and equipment, and so on." The result of appropriations being based upon programs of service and activities listed in the performance budget will yield the sum of public funds needed which will, in turn, determine how much money must be collected by taxation or other means. Budgeting authorities hail this new justification method of budgeting as a means of applying sound judgment on public expenditures and the taxes required for their financing.

This is not to say that at present the majority of libraries are preparing the performance type of budget. Replies to a brief questionnaire sent to state libraries by the author indicate that performance budgets are prepared by only a small percentage of libraries. In promoting the use of performance budgeting, authorities in public finance are claiming that it is a financial plan that is understandable to the taxpaying public through their representatives on the appropriating body. The second advantage they claim for it is the efficacy with which that plan is useful in evaluating results achieved. Their object is to develop techniques of increased efficiency in the achievement of objectives in government programs. The performance budget lends itself to improved methods of systematic evaluation and the consequent improvement of performance. Their dictum is that government programs must be executed as efficiently as possible to achieve maximum program results for their costs.
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If the performance budget is characterized as a shift from the past practice of outlining the means of attaining objectives to the formulation of programs that represent the objectives themselves, then determination of these objectives is the first step in the preparation of such a budget. These determinations are made by the agency preparing the budget. Policy objectives will represent the library's management decisions on the quality and quantity of service to be offered. These decisions then become the framework upon which are based subsequent steps in budget preparation.

Planning the attainment of these policy objectives is the second step in the preparation. This consists of composing alternative possible plans of execution. It is at this point that the policy objective pertaining to quality of library service is translated into workable plans. Moreover, this procedure offers the opportunity to take into account unconventional as well as customary methods.

Programming is the third step and consists of choosing the plan to use from the alternatives considered in the planning phase. Here it is that all factors relative to the possibility and degree of success promised by each alternative plan must be weighed. Decision-making at the management and planning levels is sharpened in the process, and those that share in it can have faith in the plan adopted for the very reason of having participated in this analysis.

The fourth step is the formulation of the budget which is a program of activities or services in dollar terms of how the plan will be executed. This procedure starts with the broad functions or services for which the library exists. These are then divided into subprograms or functions. Finally, they are carried out further into activities and subactivities to the point necessary for the identification of commonly recognized work units. The purpose of this procedure is to show the "equitable relationship between the volume of work performed and manpower utilized." Peterson lists four major programs in his Washington, D.C. Public Library budget: (1) administration, (2) processing, (3) public service, and (4) buildings and grounds. Price is currently using four different programs for a state library budget: (1) administration, (2) loan service, (3) advisory and consultant services, and (4) regional demonstration service.

Performance budgeting depends upon work measurement which ideally is built upon cost accounting data and work unit measurements. But because the majority of libraries, and municipalities, have not established cost-accounting systems, and until such data are available

[405]
in the future, reliance upon budgetary analysis is acceptable for initial performance budgeting.\textsuperscript{15} Certain facts and data can be collected roughly, but accuracy is expected to be improved with each new budget experience and time. The difficulties are (1) determination of units of output measurement and (2) application of standards to measure results. Confidence grows in work units used from their stability over several periods of time. Peterson\textsuperscript{14} recommends the use of man-hours as the work unit for libraries, but acknowledges the difficulty of applying them to all aspects of library service. He is supported by Catherine Maybury,\textsuperscript{16} who again brings up the necessity of having to determine the work units by which to measure the total cost of program services. She claims that, however difficult measurement is for all library services, measurement can be accomplished. The Los Angeles Public Library,\textsuperscript{17} upon close analysis, found that it needed to use a different work unit from that commonly used in the profession in measuring more accurately its work load. One example of work units devised and used in the measurement process is the initial group employed in Milwaukee\textsuperscript{15} for a budget analysis study. An item is the work unit for acquisitions, a book is the work unit for book maintenance, a single unit is the work unit for circulation, square feet is the work unit for building maintenance, etc. The great problem facing the library field in this regard is the establishment of standardized work units which can then be used for comparison purposes. Charles A. Beard\textsuperscript{18} predicted that determination of units of costs and units of performance were the determinants of successful public administration.

Justification of a budget request changes somewhat from the old object-of-expenditure type of budget to the program-of-services kind. Some of the earlier budget documents may have included the elements considered essential now for the performance budget, but in the main, justification consisted of arguments as to why requests took the form they did. But the new performance budget is built upon factual data that serve as partial justification.

The performance budget is conceived and designed to furnish appropriating authorities with all the information needed to make policy decisions as to amounts of public expenditures. Therefore, the first requirement is to present work load data for each of the budget’s proposed programs and activities. This listing includes a brief description of the program or subactivity and statistical or tabular data showing the volume of work to be handled by each. The predicted workloads are justified by showing trends in development. The work-
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load is explained in terms of units of work to be accomplished. Comparative facts and statistics are included to show how management computes its request.

Justification for purchases must be precise. Thus, personal service costs show existing and new positions, effects of salary plan revisions, salary increases, and staffing schedules. Costs of books would show the application of appropriate computations along with the reasons for the amount needed to continue present programs and to start new ones. Equipment cost requirements show the obsolescence factors applied in requests for replacements and bid prices for new equipment.

A prepared budget must go through a process that ends with its being authorized by law. Its fortune in passing with its initial form changed or unchanged through this process will depend upon many known and unknown forces, plus the quality and sufficiency of its preparation and presentation.

The appropriation process for libraries varies widely according to different laws and customs. However, evidence in the literature points to the following course of events. After the librarian prepares the budget, it may be reviewed and revised by a committee from the board of trustees. Or the budget may be presented directly to the entire board for explanation, justification, and amendment. In any event, adjustments made in the budget at this point are made in cooperation with the administrative librarian. The budget then has unified support from all parties concerned.

The literature is clear and consistent in assigning to the board of trustees the responsibility for securing adequate support for the library as one of their primary obligations. Exemplary board performance at this point in the procedure is characterized as their having strong enough convictions about the level of support needed that they will not shirk their active support of the budget, even in the face of public disfavor. However, in the majority of cases, it is the librarian and not the board who argues the budget before the appropriating body. But presentation of the budget before the appropriating authorities for eventual ratification must take place. Depending upon local practice, the budget may be accompanied by a covering message which is a general recital of the social purposes served by the library, its accomplishments, outstanding needs, and special problems or conditions faced, all specified in terms of service evaluation. In arguing the library's budget request before the legislative branch of government,
the librarian is entering the arena of dynamic political action and competing with many other public services with like demands for sharing public tax funds. In effect, this aspect of library administration requires participation in the processes of government, public administration and public finance. The librarian who so participates must be familiar with current developments in these fields and become a sophisticated user of the methods involved.

The city council sitting as an appropriating body is described in general terms by Shirley as a conservative group thinking primarily in terms of basic economy and with too little time to review budget requests and make decisions upon them. The goal becomes then the presentation of a carefully prepared, logically justified, planned program of public services accompanied by necessary quality information useful in making good decisions. Effectiveness in this presentation spells the difference between adequate or disappointing results.

Some preparation can be made for this appropriation experience and can thereby increase possibilities for effectiveness. Both experienced librarians and public administration authorities stipulate that a program of personal public relations with city managers and council members at times other than budget sessions, coupled with furnishing the city manager with factual, concise, and illuminating reports on progress with library service programs, increases government’s disposition to favor the library cause. Librarians are warned to thread much more practicality into their usual idealistic outlook, which is a veiled prediction that they will ever be victims in the legislative process as long as they use unrealistic methods.

Program execution is step five in the performance budgeting process. The constant problem faced by management in executing the budget’s programs is to determine the relationship between the effectiveness of expenditure decisions and the program or policy objectives which they are intended to serve. The librarian at the same time must be on constant guard to insure that expenditure decisions likewise achieve efficiency and economy. Decisions affecting these two ideals should be made at the lowest possible operating level and shaped by the policy on quality and quantity of service to be rendered. Economy is effected by administrators’ use of controls, sanctions, and incentives throughout the organization.

While unforeseen conditions occur that require some adjustment within programs during the course of expending the budget, executives and spending authorities must be committed to the principle of staying
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within the limits of the budget. Use of periodic fund-release allotments serves as a control to this effect. On the other hand, the administration's failure to spend all or the majority of the appropriation is open to criticism for poor budgeting or bad administration. In instances of these latter types of failures, the library is likely to suffer at the next budgeting session.

It appears that accounting records have been and still are a problem for the library from the administrative and management viewpoint. This difficulty is probably due to an unclear conception on the part of the library board of the usefulness of such records, and a lack of appreciation by city administration and legislative officials for their differing classification from those commonly used for the remainder of city services. Many library authors support the differing positions taken by both city officials and library administrators.

There is no disputing the claim of Shultz and Harriss that one of the key instruments for helping to achieve economical and good government is modern accounting. Cunningham specifies that accounting is one of the essential elements in financial control. Accounting records should be kept primarily for the information and use of those who are responsible for an activity. Those responsible, directly or indirectly, are the city council, city officials, the librarian, and the board. Each of these has a different reason for interest in these records and a different use for the information they contain. Wight has produced the most exhaustive treatment on the subject of library accounting, although his work was published prior to the advent of performance budgeting and the consequent changes in accounting.

The nature of a budget should determine the basic system of accounts maintained. Practices over the country vary considerably on library financial record keeping. Many variations are due to the nature of laws under which libraries operate. One of the most frequently argued points in relation to library accounting is the duplication of record keeping that exists between the library and the city's central finance office. All authors plead for elimination or reduction of the duplication in the name of economy. Efforts to comply with the city management's desire for uniformity are applauded because of the recognition that ultimate governmental power rests there.

The classification of library accounts also varies a great deal from library to library, but all authorities agree that it should conform with the organization of the budget. But wherever they are free to do so, most libraries have adopted the classification used by the U.S. Office
of Education and endorsed by the American Library Association. It was originally proposed by ALA. Indeed, the Municipal Finance Officers Association has not fixed a standard classification for library accounts, although it has done so for nearly all other city services, recognizing as acceptable that recommended by ALA and USOE.29 However, the Library Services Branch of the USOE has recently revised its form.

There appears to be general agreement by finance authorities that library financial accounts should be kept on an accrual basis—one that shows the status of funds after taking into account obligations yet unpaid. As stated earlier, cost accounting is not widely practiced in public libraries or in general municipal finance. There are exceptions, of course, and some cities have finance staffs of a size that permits them to rotate among the various city services doing budget and expenditure analyses. It has been thought that libraries, differing from industry, are unadaptable to cost accounting because "production" in the commercial sense is not the objective of public service. Nonetheless, the modern interpretation of cost accounting by accounting experts includes "processes" and "departments" as the object for measuring and assigning costs as well as production, together with the concomitant objective of developing standards to control costs.

Cost accounting has a number of important uses for library management, and a number of studies of its application in libraries have been made. Wight30 has developed the topic more fully than has anyone else recently, and he has summarized the findings of the previous studies. An ALA committee reported in the mid-thirties that cost accounting had limited importance for library administration.

Accounting records classification for a performance budget would be different from the usual library kind illustrated by the ALA recommended headings. If the nature of the budget dictates the system of accounts kept,31 then under the performance budget the accounts would show financial activities by program. The old system of classification by objects of expenditure would be eliminated or subordinated. This change makes it possible to supplement appropriation control with expenditure control. Under the performance budget, accounts will be classified in a manner common to the budget, accounting, and reporting. Expenses are treated on a use basis and charged to the program that consumes the results of the expense. Finally, accounting records maintained for a performance budget should also show the
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volume of work produced or services rendered, the basis upon which
the budget was built.

It is appropriate to repeat here that use of a performance budget
does not depend upon use of cost accounting. Statistical facts about
costs and units of work produced will be sufficient for practical appli-
cation.

If library boards control expenditures of library funds that are sup-
plied by the public in the form of taxes, both parties are due periodic
and final reports on the financial condition of the library. The third
party needing the information furnished by the financial report is the
librarian. His need might be considered even more immediately
urgent than that of the others because of his delegated responsibility
for financial management. The chief librarian needs this information
for managerial control of his entire organization and its services. Also,
his is under the obligation of presenting evidence to his board on the
status of his trust.

The financial report is a summary of budget transactions: receipts,
expenditures, encumbrances, and balances all prepared in such a man-
er that it can be compared with the budget. The financial report
should be rendered regularly, which generally is monthly. Legal re-
quirements, board participation, and size of library affects the form
and frequency of financial reports. When one works under a perform-
ance budget, the prime requirement of financial reporting is prompt-
ness and timeliness. These factors influence management control of
effectiveness in reaching service goals of programs. The financial re-
port rendered under a performance budget also needs to show units
of work produced and an evaluation of the quality of that work.

Varying also from library to library is the publication of an annual
financial report. The most common practice is the issuance for general
distribution to the public of a leaflet containing brief facts on services
rendered, income and expenditure summaries, and assorted other pub-
lic relations information. Certainly essential is an annual financial re-
port summarizing all income and expenditures in terms of the budget
for presentation to the board of trustees and perhaps to appropriate
city officials. At least once a year after the completion of the legal
fiscal period, an audit by outside experts should be made of the library
accounts. Such procedure is necessary to protect both the public and
all library personnel handling public funds.

The sixth step in budgeting and financial control with a performance
budget is budget review, and like all the previous five steps, it is a point at which decision-making takes place. Auditing to determine legality, propriety of expenditures, and necessary balancing of accounts serves the first purpose of budget reviewing. The other two purposes, managerial in character, are (1) to aid in the process of determining policy objectives for the succeeding budget formulation and (2) to review actual performance under programs budgeted in comparison with established objectives for each. It is at this point that judgments can be made upon efficiency, quality, and related costs.

According to the literature, the extent of the coordination of purchasing by the library with that by the city purchasing agent is obscure. Libraries claim the need for freedom because of the distinctive nature of the items which they purchase. This claim holds true for their main service ingredients, which they are trained to select and purchase. There are, however, many costly supplies and even some standard equipment and furniture used in the library that can be purchased through the city, oft times at less cost through quantity purchase contracts or a bidding process that is time-consuming for library officials. A recent survey of the facts on this issue made by the city managers' national organization reveals that the majority of city libraries do some purchasing through the city.

In summary, evidence strongly shows that desired interest in and support for the library budget request can be expected when the library achieves results in terms of its service goals and objectives, operates efficiently with modern methods, and earns the respect, understanding, and rapport of the appropriating and administrative officials of government.
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Academic Budgets and Their Administration—1962

JAMES H. RICHARDS, JR.

To judge by the amount of library literature in the last 10 years dealing with the doctrine of budgeting for college and university libraries, the subject would seem to have been thoroughly, and one might almost say definitively, covered in the years prior to 1950. Indeed, it would be difficult to come by a more comprehensive statement of doctrine or practice than Lyle's, even before it was superbly updated in his 1961 third edition. No attempt will be made here to restate it in detail; the book is close to nearly every college librarian's hand and heart. The principles enunciated, and echoed in some respects elsewhere, are these: The budget is the most important element in the college library financial picture. It is an estimate, which must be related to the problems peculiar to each institution, its size, type, teaching methods, plant, and concepts of education and library uses. It is of paramount importance that the librarian be invited by the president or chief budgetary officer to submit the library budget. It should be submitted and approved in time for the selection and recruitment of new personnel before the next academic year begins. Sufficient funds should be requested to support a sound program of development. It should represent planning in terms of educational goals rather than "crisis" operation, and it should be reasonably flexible in its execution while permitting ease of periodic checking to determine balances.

It is not irrelevant to relate to the foregoing principles the frequently stated or implied doctrine regarding the status of the chief librarian in the administrative hierarchy, for this factor would seem to be budgetarily important. It is said at times that the librarian should rank with the deans, enjoying the twofold advantage of more direct access
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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.” 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. 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.
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. 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.
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. 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. 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-
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
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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 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
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 percent of the publicly supported institution libraries in the Midwest can carry over encumbered book funds at year's end. 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-
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ment in the college library financial picture” and its administration a fascinating occupation.
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New Developments in Insurance and Protection of Library Contents

CHARLES W. MIXER

When the editors of this issue of Library Trends were planning the inclusion of an article about insurance for libraries, the intent was in part, at least, to have a review of developments during the past 10 years. With one exception, however, the major news in this area came in 1962, as will be mentioned later in this article.

The earlier principal change came in the 1950's. At that time the standard combination of (a) fire and extended coverage for nonrarities and (b) a fine arts policy for rarities was supplemented by a markedly increased use of an alternative possibility: the utilization of a valuable papers policy—a type of insurance which had originally been developed for business and archival purposes—not only for items of high value, but for the remainder of a library's collections as well. Although the premium was 50 per cent higher per $100 of coverage, this combination opened up the possibility of bringing the bulk of a library's holdings under virtually all-risk coverage. Furthermore, it was found that libraries could reduce the higher cost of this type of insurance by having for the nonrarities one or more policies based upon the maximum probable loss in a building or a group of buildings, as determined by an experienced loss adjuster. Of course, this plan involved a calculated risk, which some boards of trustees have been willing to accept in order to secure the benefits of broader coverage while holding down the cost. Up until the early 1960's, however, there was no policy which had been specifically tailored to the needs of libraries.

Within the insurance field there have been some developments during the past decade which should be mentioned. Due to the pas-
sage of multiple line legislation in most of the states and to increased competition among insurance companies, the earlier demarcations between the principal divisions of insurance—fire, inland marine, and casualty—began to give way and “package policies” were offered, which included coverage from two or more of these divisions, instead of a separate policy for each type. Along with this in point of time and partly as a result of the above trend, there was a broadening of the scope of coverage in both the named-peril and in the all-risk coverages. The package policies help to reduce selling costs and when the insurance companies have had additional loss experience under the broadened coverages, lower rates should result for the classes of property which can qualify. Insurance companies have been giving more attention to specific groups which have common characteristics, and are accumulating loss-experience data pertaining to them.

Along with a dramatic broadening of coverage during the past few years in group hospital and surgical insurance for individuals, and indications that more flexible and broadened coverage might be in the offering for the insurance of library contents, these developments made the early 1960's seem a propitious time to undertake a thorough study of insurance protection for libraries. The goals: broadened coverage and lower rates. These goals have now been attained, on an initial basis at least, as a result of a grant which was made by the Council on Library Resources to the American Library Association Library Technology Project. This aspect of the project will be described in greater detail later in this article.

From the standpoint of the protection of library resources, there has been no comprehensive compilation of information specifically related to the types of physical losses as far as libraries were concerned, the possible methods for preventing such losses, the defensive measures which libraries might take against fire, the various types of fire protection equipment, or of basic factors to be considered in furthering fire protection when a library building is planned. This fact will now be changed in the forthcoming publication of a manual on insurance and protection of library resources which contains the results of an investigation carried on by Gage-Babcock and Associates, Inc., of Kansas City, Missouri, under a contract with the Library Technology Project. The company carried on its investigation during 1961, submitting its findings in a series of chapters written in draft form which were turned in to the Library Technology Project. These were reviewed by the following Advisory Committee, which had been
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appointed by the Council on Library Resources: Walter W. Curley, who was then Business Manager of the Providence (Rhode Island) Public Library and Chairman of the Library Administration Division Insurance for Libraries Committee; Stephen A. McCarthy, Director of Libraries at Cornell University; Keyes D. Metcalf, Librarian Emeritus of the Harvard University Library; Charles W. Mixer, Assistant Director of Libraries at Columbia University; Frazer G. Poole, Director of the Library Technology Project (Chairman); and Melville J. Ruggles, Vice President of the Council on Library Resources, Inc. Publication of the volume by the Library Technology Project is expected in July 1963.

The manual will constitute a genuine contribution to the profession. The range of information covered can be indicated by a summary of the headings and subheadings of the principal chapters. Chapter 2, on the types of physical losses, discusses the extent of loss by fire, the causes of building fires, fires of suspicious origin, the principal sources of damage to library materials (smoke, water, insects, theft, vandalism, and mutilation). Chapter 3 is concerned with means for the prevention of such losses. Chapter 4 discusses fire defense measures, including inspection, operations, preparation for emergencies, an inspection form for control of hazards, fire-drill regulation, and an evacuation plan. Chapter 5 deals with fire protection equipment, including detection devices, such as thermostatic, optical, pneumatic, ionized particle, and smoke-actuated types. It also discusses types of fire extinguishers—portable, hose lines, and fixed systems (sprinkler, carbon dioxide, and dry chemical). Chapter 6 treats fire protection in relation to library planning, with sections on local codes and regulations, the location and use of the building, the types of building construction, interior arrangements and finishes, vertical draft openings, exit facilities, and pertinent information with regard to furniture, equipment, and machinery. Chapter 7 discusses the principles of library insurance, and Chapter 8 reprints, with explanatory notes, the new model insurance policy for libraries. In an appendix will be found sections dealing with fire tests, salvage and restoration of damaged materials, earthquake probabilities, evaluation and insurance of rarities, chronology of library fires, etc.

The range of information brought together may be indicated by further reference to some selected examples. There has previously been no comprehensive compilation of studies relating to library fires as such nor an analysis of the causes of such losses. Largely because
of the lack of such specific data, insurance companies have grouped libraries as a type with other public buildings, with generally higher premiums than may be the case in the future, now that the groundwork is being laid for a statistical basis of comparison.

As part of its contractual investigation for the Library Technology Project, Gage-Babcock and Associates, Inc., set out to make a compilation of all known library fires. The sources of the data were (a) the records of the National Fire Protection Association, (b) the literature of fire insurance, fire prevention, and other printed records which were suggested as potentially useful, and (c) a questionnaire which the company mailed to over 2,000 libraries and from which it received over 1,000 replies. Section F of the questionnaire called for data on various types of loss experience, including fire. From these three sources, a worldwide chronology of library fires was assembled, of which the earliest recorded one occurred in 612 B.C., and the most recent on February 20, 1962. Although no claim could be made, of course, that the listing was complete, it is of interest to observe that there was a total of 242 listings of fires, of which 107 were before 1900 and 135 after that period, exclusive of a very small listing of the vast destruction to libraries during World War II.

Taking a closer look at the more recent period, Gage-Babcock reports that the records of the National Fire Protection Association show the following average annual loss figures for the years 1954 through 1958 in the United States (libraries are included in the Public Buildings figures):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Occupancy</th>
<th>Number of Losses</th>
<th>Dollar Loss</th>
<th>Incidence of Fires (Per Cent)</th>
<th>Dollar Losses (Per Cent)</th>
<th>Dollar Losses (Average Per Fire)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Buildings</td>
<td>16,380</td>
<td>$68,438,000</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>$4,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>566,920</td>
<td>307,351,000</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercantile</td>
<td>73,300</td>
<td>190,166,000</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>2,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>38,720</td>
<td>191,708,000</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>4,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>129,940</td>
<td>234,873,000</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>1,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>824,660</td>
<td>$992,036,000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I
Average Figures for Annual Fire Losses in the United States, 1954-1958
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With regard to fires in the various categories of public buildings in the United States (with libraries chiefly in the first three categories), the figures are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Occupancy</th>
<th>Number of Losses</th>
<th>Dollar Loss</th>
<th>Incidence of Fires (Per Cent)</th>
<th>Dollar Losses (Per Cent)</th>
<th>Dollar Losses (Average Per Fire)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government Buildings</td>
<td>1,720</td>
<td>$3,168,000</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>$1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals, Institutions</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>$3,039,000</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools, Colleges</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>$26,691,000</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Churches</td>
<td>3,660</td>
<td>$18,228,000</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theaters</td>
<td>1,360</td>
<td>$4,370,000</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amusement Halls</td>
<td>3,560</td>
<td>$12,942,000</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>3,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16,380</td>
<td>$68,438,000</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>$4,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of particular concern is the fact that the data with regard to annual fire losses in the United States for the period from 1941 through 1958 showed a definite up-swing in both the number of losses and in the dollar amount of those losses. The tabulation is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Number of Fires (Annual Average)</th>
<th>Dollar Loss</th>
<th>Public Building Category Number of Fires</th>
<th>Category Dollar Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1941-45</td>
<td>650,800</td>
<td>$396,800,000</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>$35,460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947-51</td>
<td>582,600</td>
<td>705,890,000</td>
<td>12,400</td>
<td>40,194,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954-58</td>
<td>824,660</td>
<td>992,216,000</td>
<td>16,380</td>
<td>68,438,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the point of origin of building fires gave the following locations and percentages of the total which originated in each: basements, 36 per cent; trash containers, 14 per cent; bookstack areas,
12 per cent; offices and restrooms, 12 per cent; with each of the other areas being 6 per cent or less.

An analysis of the causes of building fire losses revealed the following principal ones: smoking and matches, 16 per cent; electrical (fixed service); fires due to misuse or faulty wiring and equipment, 9.3 per cent; defective or overheated heating equipment, 8.2 per cent; rubbish, 5.3 per cent; chimneys, flues: defective or overheated, 5 per cent; with each of the remaining known causes being less than 5 per cent.

Seventy-one per cent of library fires occur between 9 p.m. and 9 a.m. This fact, coupled with the high incidence of smoking as a cause of fire, indicates the advisability of a careful check of library premises at the hour of closing and of having periodic tours by a night watchman.

A few comments selected from the data about protective features in library buildings are worthy of note. A point is made as to the desirability of having smoke-actuated or heat-actuated mechanisms in the ventilating and air conditioning ducts which will automatically shut down the operation of the machinery to avoid the spreading of smoke caused by a fire. (The author of this article observed how, when this feature is not present, even a modern multi-tier stack with each tier separated by concrete flooring can become uninhabitable in a relatively short time, although a fire is of only moderate proportions and is in a distant part of the stack.) The Gage-Babcock study points out that smoke and toxic gases cause most of the deaths which are associated with fires. (The air conditioning ducts themselves may contribute to the spreading of a fire if the insulating filler, which separates the two sheets of metal on the side of the ducts, is flammable. A major university library found this to be a direct contributory factor in the spreading of a fire from one stack level to another, although the levels were otherwise separated from each other by concrete floors and enclosed stairwells.)

Among the hazards to which the study draws attention is the fact that in many installations, particularly earlier ones, acoustical ceiling tile is of a flammable type, that this type has contributed to the rapid spread of fire across ceiling areas, and that, when heated, the adhesive which fastens the tiles to the ceiling will melt and thus allow the burning tiles to drop. An added hazard arises if fluorescent fixtures are in proximity to such flammable ceiling materials, since the ballasts in the fixtures may develop a short circuit, which will generate a high degree of heat without causing the main circuit fuse to melt. The
danger occasioned by continuance of such intense heat can be avoided by having each ballast individually fused.

The chapter of the Gage-Babcock report on planning the new library covers a variety of helpful topics, including statements as to the areas of jurisdiction of the various local codes. Touching upon a point which might be overlooked, it discusses flame spread of interior finishes, with index figures for some types of materials which are quoted from the National Fire Protection Association's Fire Protection Handbook. From this, it is surprising to learn that veneered wood, although highly attractive, has an index figure of 515. (The codes place a limitation upon the use of materials which have a flame spread index figure higher than 100.)

In the chapter on fire defense measures, emphasis is given, as it has been by fire chiefs for years, to notifying the fire department first, before trying to take direct action to extinguish a blaze. There is also information about the desirable weight and height of wall-placement of fire extinguishers from the standpoint of women or of nonrobust persons who might need to use them at the outbreak of a fire, with mention of a newer type containing water under pressure which is less damaging to library materials than the older soda and acid type. Varieties of fire detection systems are described, with a full, objective discussion of the advantages and limitations of sprinklers. New to most librarians will be information about a new type of nozzle for fire hoses which will help to limit the amount of water damage in fire fighting: this type has a mechanism which will provide water-fog as well as a clear stream and has a shut-off device.

At the inception of the grant made by the Council on Library Resources to the Library Technology Project, it was stated that one of the objectives would be the development of a model insurance contract covering library contents. (Buildings are insured under the standard fire policy, to which is attached a building form which conforms to the rulings of the local rating organization.) Gage-Babcock and Associates, Inc., and the Library Technology Project have successfully developed such a model insurance contract, which is now available for use. It is virtually "all risk," covering fire and extended coverage, water damage from any source, vandalism, theft, explosion, collapse of building or of bookstacks, collision of carrying vehicles, etc. All perils are covered unless specifically excluded, the latter being a few standard uninsurable ones such as war or rebellion or confiscation by governmental body. There are no geographical limitations except for Iron Curtain
countries. Otherwise, library materials are covered wherever the property may be—in the library, on loan, at the bindery or repair shops, in transit (by land or sea), by public or private carriers including mail or express, etc. Also covered is the property of others which may be in the custody of the library. Not only books are covered, but also all movable property which is owned by the library, such as fixtures, furniture, supplies, etc., as well as bookstacks, if they are brought in after completion of the building. Multi-tier stacks which extend through several stack tiers or those which are also supporting members for floors would be insurable under the building form, which normally has a lower rate.

In an effort to keep the premium low by avoiding expensive numerous small claims, the plan features a deductible requirement from each adjusted claim. The library may select as part of its insurance policy the desired deductible from various specified figures: $250, $500, $1,000, etc. Once each year for the first three years on the anniversary date of the policy, the library will report the total value of all insured property. One major advantage of this feature is that it makes unnecessary the usual co-insurance clause. At the end of that three-year period, the premium will be adjusted, because the library pays only for the insurance that it actually uses. This means that if the average value of the property for the three-year period has declined, the insured library will be given a premium refund; if the value has increased, the library will pay the additional premium.

Under the "Agreed Valued Clause," the insurance company pays the amount per item for total loss of items specifically valued—books in the general collection, special collections materials, etc.: on furnishings, furniture, and supplies, the actual cost of repairing or replacing. There is no deduction for depreciation. Contrary to some policies, there is no deduction in the amount of insurance by reason of any losses paid. Under the "Debris Removal and Salvage Clause," the possibility of further loss resulting from delay in salvage while the staff are awaiting inspection by a loss adjuster is obviated. The library can proceed at once, knowing that costs of debris removal and salvage will be paid.

The library makes its own evaluation of the property covered. In one section will be the items of high value which will be specifically valued. In the remaining section covering other materials, the valuations are made by category with agreed-upon average values per unit for each category. The determination of a final rate for a specific library is complicated, since it involves credits for certain physical
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features and risk-loading charges. However, the actuarial data provided by the Gage-Babcock study have led the investigators to estimate that rates can be set for the model policy “which will be 17% to 40% lower than any insurance of comparable coverage now available.”

Several insurance companies have agreed to provide insurance under the terms of the new policy. The names of these companies can be obtained from the Library Technology Project. This policy and the forthcoming manual on the Library Insurance and Protection of Library Resources constitute a real achievement. Both are landmarks in this area of library administration and great credit is due to the Council on Library Resources, to the Library Technology Project, and to Gage-Babcock and Associates, Inc., who carried out the basic investigation and compilation of data.
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Performance Standards and Specifications in the Library Economy

FRAZER G. POOLE

Because the terminology of standards work is extensive, sometimes overlapping, and occasionally confusing, some definition of the terms to be used in this discussion will be helpful.

A standard, according to Webster’s New World Dictionary, is “something established for use as a rule or basis of comparison in measuring or judging capacity, quantity, content, extent, value, quality, etc.” The term has been more precisely defined for the varied contexts in which it is used in the standardization activities of business, industry, and science. For the present purpose, the following definition will serve: “Standards are documents which are formulated by agreement, authority, or custom of sponsors, to define a product, material, process, or procedure, quality, construction, operating characteristics, performance, nomenclature, and other like facts.”¹

This definition recognizes two special attributes of a standard: (1) it is a written statement, and (2) it must be established by some recognized authority. In many cases a standard is an attempt to solve a recurring problem. In many cases, too, a standard is based upon a specification. This is not to say that standards and specifications are the same, although the close relationship between them gives rise to the fact that the two terms are often used interchangeably.

A “specification” is frequently defined as “a concise statement of the requirements for a material, process, method, procedure, or service including, whenever possible, the exact procedure by which it can be determined that the conditions are not within the tolerances specified in the statement.”² Two principal types of specifications are recognized in standards work: (1) “objective specifications,” which specify the requirements of an objective, and (2) “means specifications,” which indicate the means or methods by which the objective may be attained.
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Within these two groups are included design specifications, manufacturing specifications, quality control specifications, and others.

Although existing specifications often provide a basis upon which standards can be developed, such development is not an automatic process, as later discussion will show. On the other hand, there are situations in which the development of standards precedes the development of specifications. In such instances, standards are usually statements of desired performance, which serve to guide producers in formulating manufacturing specifications. "Performance standards," which originate as performance (objective) specifications, describe the results to be achieved rather than the means of accomplishment. Standards of this type are of great importance to the consumer because he is primarily interested in how well a product performs rather than in how it is made. The librarian who purchases a photocopier, for example, is interested in how effectively the machine copies books and other materials, in how economical it is to operate, and in how long it will last. He is not concerned about how the machine is fabricated.

Standards expressed in terms of performance are not new to the general field of standardization. Indeed, standards, which in some way indicated the quality to be expected of a given product, may be traced back to ancient times. Thus, Tyrian purple and Damascus steel were associated in the user's mind with the highest quality. In our own age, standards of quality (performance) for food and drugs have become familiar to everyone.

Largely because of their complexity, standards for other types of consumer products have been given less attention than standards for food and drugs. This same complexity makes it difficult for the consumer to determine, before he purchases a product, what its characteristics are, how well it will serve the purpose for which he needs it, and how long it will fulfill its expected function before it wears out and needs replacing. The more complex the product, the more unlikely it is that the consumer will have sufficient knowledge to evaluate its probable performance. As a result, consumer losses traceable to inefficient and wasteful buying have been estimated to range from 10 to 25 per cent. The true amount of such losses is probably not important, but it is important to recognize that carefully developed performance standards would do much to help the consumer make better, more economical purchases.

Because librarians are consumers, the problem of performance standards has important implications for the library economy. Recog-
nition of the need for standards, as a means of supplying better in-
formation about library equipment and supplies, provided in part the
justification for the Library Technology Project. In his report to the
American Library Association on the feasibility of the Project, John
Ottemiller stated: "There can be no doubt that librarians will welcome
a standards program. There is sufficient evidence of indiscriminate and
faulty buying to support this opinion." The Council on Library Re-
sources emphasized the importance of standards, in the title of the
grant: "Library Technology—a Program for Testing and Standardiza-
tion of Library Equipment, Supplies, and Systems." As a result, the
Project came into existence with the responsibility for undertaking the
development of standards and specifications useful to the library pro-
fession.

Heretofore, librarians' interest in standards and specifications has
been directed chiefly to standards for service, although there have been
occasional efforts to develop standards for library equipment and
supplies. Melvil Dewey, for example, undertook to standardize the
dimensions of the catalog card at 12.5 \times 7.5 \text{ cms.} as early as 1877.
Since that date, specifications have been developed for other aspects
of a catalog card, but these have never been established as standards.

In June 1934, the "Minimum Specifications for Class A Library
Binding," prepared jointly by the Bookbinding Committee of ALA
and the Employing Bookbinders Section of the Book Manufacturers'
Institute, were approved by the Council of the American Library
Association. Although ALA approved several revisions of the Class A
specifications they were not formally designated as a standard until
1958, when they were issued as the *Library Binding Institute Standard
for Library Binding*.\(^5\)

Attempts to standardize library equipment and supplies have been
limited, however, and it was not until 1940, when the American Stan-
ards Association Sectional Committee Z39, on Library Work and Docu-
mentation, was sponsored by ALA, that any formal recognition was
given to the importance of developing standards for library consumer
goods. In 1960, twenty years later, ASA Sectional Committee Z85, was
formed under the sponsorship of ALA's Library Technology Project,
and arrangements were made for the new committee to assume re-
 sponsibility for developing standards for library equipment and sup-
plies.

Standards and specifications are not self-generating. In fact, a con-
siderable investment of money, the cooperation and effort of many
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people, and much patience are needed to produce an effective standard. Usually a standardization program includes three stages: (1) developing the standard, (2) establishing the standard, and (3) putting the standard to use.7

No standard should be developed except in response to a definite need. The need may be obvious. If not, the identification of those characteristics with which the consumer is most concerned will usually help in determining the extent of the need. Such characteristics may or may not be evident. For example, the importance of the durability of the finish on library furniture, the rigidity of the legs on library tables, the stability of steel bookstacks, and the degree of resolution of the lens of a microfilm reader is obvious to everyone. On the other hand, as in the case of a book pocket, the performance characteristics desired by the library consumer may be less evident.

After the characteristics of the product have been determined and the need for the standard confirmed, the factors to be used in measuring performance must be known. To illustrate, in LTP’s work in establishing standards for catalog cards, high initial strength was recognized as an important element in the performance of a good card stock before the factors of folding endurance and tear resistance, which best measure such strength, were identified.

The identification of the factors to be used in determining performance is useless, however, unless these factors are measurable. Such measurements may be relatively simple, as in the case of measuring the temperature and humidity that determine the efficiency of the air conditioning system in a rare book vault. Measuring the durability of a bookbinding, on the other hand, presents such an unusually difficult problem that the W. J. Barrow Research Laboratory was obliged to design and build completely new testing equipment as the first step in the current ALA–SLA program to develop performance standards for library binding. This problem alone required an expenditure of nearly $25,000 and eight months of work.

Whether suitable equipment for measuring the characteristics of a product exists or must be designed and built, economical, practical test methods must be available in order to determine whether or not a given product actually meets the standard. Testing procedures so complex that they require costly apparatus and highly trained technicians can make it difficult or even impossible to obtain acceptance and use of a standard, no matter how much it may be needed.

Although the tests used to measure the performance of consumer
goods should be as objective as possible, subjective evaluations are sometimes necessary. At present, for example, there is no acceptable laboratory test for measuring the erasibility of a catalog card. Hence, the evaluation of this factor depends upon the subjective opinions of the technical director in the paper mill, the purchasing agent for the supplier, and finally the library user.

In some cases, measurements of the characteristics of consumer goods require tests that will indicate quickly the performance to be expected over a long period. Thus, in an evaluation of the performance of paper, it is not enough to determine the initial strength of the sheet; it is also important to determine how long the paper will retain this initial strength. Tests which provide this information are usually called "accelerated aging" tests. Such tests are considered reliable for many practical purposes, including the evaluation of permanence in certain types of book paper. In other instances, as with the polyvinyl acetate adhesives used in adhesive-bound books, research results have not been conclusive enough to make accelerated aging tests acceptable.

When the need for a given standard has been confirmed, the specifications carefully prepared, and the test results checked and rechecked, the development of a performance standard moves out of the laboratory and into the conference room. Here, based upon the technical data developed in the laboratory, the actual standard is worked out.

By definition, standards are documents formulated by agreement, authority, or custom. Those standards established by general consent result from the voluntary agreement of the parties concerned. To make such standards truly representative, the American Standards Association requires that committee membership be properly balanced between producer and consumer interests. Thus, ASA Sectional Committee Z85 consists of an equal number of representatives from the manufacturers of library equipment and from the several library associations.

When standards are established by general consent, an agreement acceptable to all concerned may be difficult to obtain and compromises become necessary. The consumer usually believes that such compromises lower the quality of the standard, while the manufacturer defends compromises on the grounds that they are needed to make production economically feasible. More than one proposed standard has not received approval because the interested parties could not reach an acceptable compromise.

The term "authority," used in reference to establishing a standard,
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sometimes refers to the legal power invested in municipal, state, or federal governments. In a more general sense, the term "authority" refers to the power invested in any national body such as a trade or professional association, technical society, or manufacturer. The American Library Association, for example, can develop, establish, and promulgate its own standards for library equipment and supplies, whenever such a course of action appears desirable.

On the other hand, ALA can adopt the general-consent method to promote the development of standards for library consumer goods by sponsoring a sectional committee of the American Standards Association, an organization established solely for the purpose of providing a framework within which those concerned with the development of a given standard can operate most efficiently. This was the course chosen by ALA when, in 1960, it established ASA Sectional Committee Z85.

Because standards established by custom usually develop gradually through a process of survival and as a result of trade practices related to measurements of quantities or to grades or terms used in the trade, they are often indefinite or inaccurate. Such standards are usually of little significance in describing consumer goods and need not be considered further here.

Whether a consumer standard is established by general consent or by authority, several basic problems, including scope, level of quality, tolerances, and flexibility must be considered. In establishing the scope of a performance standard for the finish on library furniture, for example, investigators may discover that the color of the finish is a characteristic about which the consumer will want to make his own decision. Further, color per se does not involve performance. Hence, it can probably be decided that this characteristic is outside the scope of the proposed standard. The level of quality specified by the proposed standard must also be considered. Standards must be rigorous enough to force inferior goods off the market, but should not be so rigorous that the cost of producing goods to meet them is out of proportion to the improvement that can be expected in the quality of the product. In some instances, standards are desirable for more than one level of quality.

Tolerance refers to the permissible variation from the proposed standard. For example, the specifications for catalog cards include, in addition to the exact size, the degree of variation from that size
which is acceptable. Such tolerances usually reflect limitations imposed by the method of manufacture of the product or by the measurement of the characteristic concerned.

Some degree of flexibility in a standard is often necessary to correct errors which may be made when the standard appears in written form and to adjust the standard to changes in technology. However, flexibility is usually less important in the case of a standard in which performance is specified. In this case, if new materials and methods are developed, it is necessary only to insure that these will perform as required by the standard, before they are incorporated into manufacturing specifications.

The development of a good performance standard may require months or years of work and involve the expenditure of large sums of money. If the standard is not used, these expenditures have been wasted. More important, of course, is the continuing loss of money—and of quality—by those purchasers who do not take advantage of the standard after it becomes available.

The widespread use of the *Minimum Specifications for Class A Library Binding* seems to indicate that librarians generally are familiar with the advantages of good specifications. On the other hand, there is some evidence that the *Minimum Specifications for Binding Lesser Used Materials* (LUMSPECS) are not as well known and accepted as they deserve to be. This failure to take advantage of good specifications may result from a lack of understanding on the part of librarians of the characteristics of this type of binding and of the materials for which it can be used, as well as from a lack of knowledge about the end uses of certain library materials. In addition, it may result from the apparent reluctance on the part of some library binders to make this type of binding available. Whatever the reasons, there is little doubt that if librarians used these specifications more effectively, they could save money and also eliminate many questionable binding and mending practices which result in damage to the materials in their collections.

It should be recognized that the Class A specifications (now *Library Binding Institute Standard for Library Binding*) and the LUMSPECS are manufacturing specifications rather than performance specifications, and as a result they tend to limit the use of newer materials and methods. Thus, the Class A specifications have not been changed in any important particular for over 20 years.

The present ALA-SLA program to develop performance standards
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for library binding is partly a result of this situation. By contrast, the new standards will be based upon the performance to be expected from given types of bindings rather than upon manufacturing specifications. Moreover, the new standards will include performance criteria for several types of bindings, and librarians will thus be in a position to specify the type required by the end uses of the materials in their collections. Because the new standards should also make possible a more competitive purchasing situation, some reduction in binding costs may be expected.

Although specifications for library binding first received the attention of the profession more than 25 years ago, no action had been taken to develop specifications or standards for library furniture prior to the establishment of the Library Technology Project in 1959. As a result, librarians have been forced to rely upon specifications prepared by the several manufacturers of library furniture. These, of course, are intended to describe only the products of the manufacturer concerned. Although some of these specifications define furniture of a high quality, such a condition defeats the principal purpose of competitive bidding. Then, too, the lack of suitable performance standards for library furniture has made it necessary to resort to a number of somewhat artificial devices to eliminate the obviously unqualified bidder. Despite this situation, there have been numerous instances in which the lack of an accepted standard in a competitive bidding situation has made it necessary for the librarian to accept furniture of poor quality. It is obvious, therefore, that the profession requires library furniture specifications that (1) will promote more realistic bidding and (2) will give the librarian a knowledge of the essential performance characteristics of the furniture he purchases.

In response to this need, one of the first programs of the Library Technology Project was aimed at the development of performance standards for library furniture. This work was placed in the hands of a subcommittee of ASA Sectional Committee Z85. The program made some initial progress, but was delayed considerably by the death of the subcommittee chairman. At that time, a qualified consultant was attached directly to the LTP office and given the task of developing performance specifications for library furniture. This work is now in progress. Following the development of these new specifications, Sectional Committee Z85 will consider them for approval as ASA standards.

These examples illustrate the type of performance standards needed
for certain kinds of library consumer goods. However, unless standards and specifications are understood, accepted, and effectively used, their potential benefits for the library economy will remain largely unrealized.

It should be emphasized that there are often two related but distinct advantages to be gained by using performance standards. One is the savings made when properly developed standards result in healthy and effective competition. The other is the improvement in quality, without increase in price, which often results. In both instances librarians gain.
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