



The Higher Education Act, Title II-A: Its Impact On The Academic Library

ALAN CARTER SMITH

THE YEAR 1965 marked a high point in the history of federal legislation for libraries. Acting in response to demands for more social legislation, and with the strength of his sweeping victory at the polls behind him, President Lyndon Johnson, in a special message on education delivered January 12, 1965, urged the Congress to "push ahead with the No. 1 business of the American people—the education of our youth."¹ He remarked: "Every child must be encouraged to get as much education as he has the ability to take. We want this not only for his sake—but for the Nation's sake. Nothing matters more to the future of our country; not our military preparedness—for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace; not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant."²

The legislators—subsequently dubbed by Eileen Cooke of the ALA Washington Office as the second "Education Congress"—responded by promptly enacting several pieces of legislation designed to improve education and library service at all levels. The Higher Education Act (HEA) has proven most valuable in its provision of materials and encouragement of training and research in academic libraries. Previous legislation had provided library buildings, but as Johnson remarked in his speech: "To construct a library building is meaningless unless there are books to bring life to the library."³

Hearings on the proposed Higher Education Act of 1965 before the House Special Subcommittee on Education reflected the broad sense of mission and historical perspective then prevalent. For example,

Alan Carter Smith is Lecturer, School of Library Science, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, stated:

In 1963 and 1964 history was made, through the efforts of this committee and its capable chairman [the Committee on Education and Labor] and the 88th Congress, named by President Johnson as "the Education Congress." The continuing commitment of America to equality of educational opportunity for all youth was significantly upheld.

Landmark measures were passed to provide classrooms, libraries, and laboratories for undergraduate institutions; facilities for new graduate schools; grants for community colleges; more loans and graduate fellowships for students enrolled in higher education; and enlarged and improved training for physicians, dentists, and nurses. . . .

There is still much to be done. "Higher education is no longer a luxury, but a necessity," as President Johnson stated.⁴

Senate hearings also reflected this sense of purpose and historical significance. Senator Wayne Morse, chairman of that body's subcommittee on education, stated his hopes for fulfilling the President's proposed legislation and anticipated the degree of gratitude future generations of Americans would owe these and similar efforts.⁵

Signed into law on November 8, 1965, the Higher Education Act addressed itself to a spectrum of problems in higher education: university extension and continuing education, strengthening developing institutions, and student assistance. Specifically, Title II-A of the act mapped out a program for community college, college, and university library assistance; Title II-B provided for library training and research; and Title II-C authorized a centralized acquisitions and cataloging program under the direction of the Library of Congress. This article will consider the legislative history, objectives, provisions, effects and proposed expansion and modification under future legislation of Title II-A.

HISTORY AND EFFECTS OF LEGISLATION

Title II-A was designed to provide funds for acquisition of books, periodicals, documents and other media, and "necessary binding" at each type of academic library, whether at a university, a college, or a community college. Secretary Celebrezze, speaking for enactment, had

HEA II-A

quoted the nineteenth-century words of Thomas Carlyle, emphasizing the usefulness of books as an aid to teaching and research excellence both for teacher and learner, and underlining more extensive needs in the twentieth century, the era of education's self-paced learner: "The true university of these days is a collection of books."⁶

At the time of HEA's passage, an estimated 4.8 million students were enrolled in 2,100 institutions of higher education in the United States. Approximately one-half of the libraries of four-year institutions failed to meet minimum standards; 82 percent of two-year institutions were inadequate in library resources. At least fifteen universities offering the Ph.D. degree did not have 150,000 volumes in their libraries, which would be adequate for a small liberal arts college. Additionally, research needs, particularly in the university library, were thought to be growing more extensive; expansion resulting both from attempts to serve the areas of interest of more students and from response to the "twigging of knowledge" (the rapid emergence of new fields of inquiry and the recombinations of old ones) had weakened library budgets. Additional books were required to meet the research needs of an anticipated increase in the number of professionals whose careers would depend upon superior library resources. Inflation, too, was a factor to be considered; book costs had increased approximately one-third over their 1960 level.

Johnson saw the HEA working at three levels: to help the less-developed and smaller institutions improve their libraries; to enrich the resources of the college and university libraries; and to allow the resources of the great universities to assist in solving such national problems as poverty and community development.⁷

The law specified three types of grant: basic, supplemental, and special purpose. Eighty-five percent of each year's appropriation under Title II-A was to be directed to basic and supplemental grants; the remainder was to be divided among special purpose grants.⁸

Up to \$5,000 was allotted as a basic grant to an institution of higher education and to combinations of such institutions; the amount specified appears to have been an arbitrary figure. This sum was to be allowed by the Commissioner of Education upon written application from the institution, provided that a matching sum was allotted by the institution and that the level of expenditure for library resources for the year of appropriation equaled the average figure for the preceding two years. The sum was also to be expended during the fiscal year for which the grant was requested.

Supplemental grants were authorized by the law in an amount not to

exceed \$10 per each full-time student. These grants were to be awarded by the commissioner, who was to take into consideration such factors as the size and age of the library collection, student enrollment, and endowments and other financial resources of the institution. Matching requirements were waived in this section.

The remaining 15 percent of appropriations under Title II-A was allocated to special purpose grants. Again, the commissioner was empowered to release the sums, considering such factors as the special needs of some institutions for additional library resources (Type A grants), the contributions some libraries make to special national or regional needs (Type B grants), and efforts of some institutions to promote joint-use facilities (Type C grants). Special purpose grants required matching at the rate of 1:3 from outside sources; also, expenditures for other library purposes were to be maintained at the average annual rate of the two years preceding June 30, 1965.

To provide guidance and criteria in the distribution of supplemental and special grants, the law required the Commissioner of Education to establish an Advisory Council on College Library Resources in the Office of Education. The committee was to consist of the commissioner (as chairman) and eight members appointed by him, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.⁹

On May 13, 1965, President Johnson signed the supplemental appropriations bill providing limited funds for Title II—\$10 million were appropriated for Title II-A out of an authorization of \$50 million. This sum provided 1,830 basic grants for fiscal year (FY) 1966; no special purpose or supplemental grants were awarded that year. Within two weeks, the Office of Education sent out and processed applications from more than 2,000 institutions and mailed checks.¹⁰

These initial grants appeared to please and satisfy the academic community. At a 1966 symposium on HEA-1965, Helen Welch, then acquisitions librarian at the University of Illinois, noted that \$5,000 was a particularly significant addition to the small college's budget; for large and well-endowed institutions, the sum was welcome.¹¹ In both instances, the possibility for future supplemental and special purpose grants existed, and Welch believed library opportunities realizable through these grants to be significant.

Title II-A grants continued to be made during fiscal years 1967 and 1968 under authorization of the 1965 law and at the \$25 million level. Total funds were distributed among the three types of academic libraries as follows: approximately 20 percent to junior college libraries, 40-45 percent to college libraries, and 35 percent to university

HEA II-A

libraries. In FY 1967, basic grants were made to 1,989 libraries; in 1968, to 2,111. Supplemental awards were first made available in 1967, providing assistance to 1,266 libraries that year; in 1968, 1,524 institutions received aid. These appropriations were awarded to approximately 75 percent of those applying.

Special purpose awards also began to be made in 1967. Type A funds were perhaps the biggest disappointment to the many unsuccessful applicants; these funds were allocated for institutions of higher education which exhibited a need to augment their library resources and which could demonstrate that the quality of their educational resources would be substantially enhanced by such an increase in resources. In 1967 only 54 out of 120 applications were funded; in 1968, just 19 out of 495; amounts ranged from \$3,000 to \$100,000.¹² Perhaps the reason for this low level of funding was that the criteria used to score the applications were not very different from those for the supplemental grants. Katherine Stokes, then College and University Library Specialist in the Office of Education, summed up the problem: "Both types fitted an almost universal description of the situation of a higher education institution's library in the late '60's. Growing enrollments, rising book prices, and expanding programs at every level from undergraduate courses to the Ph.D. were characteristic reasons given for needing Federal grant money in practically every application for a supplemental or a Special Purpose Type A grant."¹³

Back runs and missing issues of periodicals appear to have been the most frequent types of purchase made under these grants.¹⁴ Often the material was supplied in microform, perhaps because the title was available only in that format, but also because sudden additions in this form to the library's stock did not require much space in the already crowded library stacks. Moreover, a few long runs of periodicals would not overload the catalogers, who presumably could not have processed in one year a number of monographs equal to the number of multiple volumes for one periodical title.

Other purchases indicated a rising interest in audiovisual materials; in non-Western, black, and other minority group studies; and in reprint materials to fill in lacking volumes, such as those listed in *Books for College Libraries*. Several institutions used funds to improve their collections to meet ALA standards for size of collection, or to meet North Central, Middle States, or Southern Association accreditation standards. In 1968, purchases belied a new emphasis on materials about urban problems, such as air and water pollution.

Special Type B grants were designed to help institutions of higher education provide adequate library and information science resources to satisfy special national or regional needs. This purpose of funding implied the willingness of the library to make purchased collections available for research beyond its own campus. Money was available if an institution maintained a "comprehensive library collection in a specialized subject field, either independently or cooperatively with other institutions of higher education, which is required for advanced scholarship or research, and makes such resources available to the national or regional scholarly community," as the policies and procedures manual accompanying the application forms stated.¹⁵

Members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) were particularly well prepared to apply for this type of grant, for they had been shouldering similar responsibilities for years. In 1948 they had initiated the Farmington Plan (discontinued in 1972) for comprehensive purchase of important titles published anywhere in the world, dividing the collective burden individually by country, subject area, and library interest. LACAP (the Latin American Cooperative Acquisitions Project, discontinued in 1973, and a part of the Farmington Plan) and the PL-480 plan also had quickened expertise in the administration of area study funds. The majority of special Type B grants during 1967-68 went to ARL libraries.

As might be expected, much of the acquisitions money went to strengthen resources for Near Eastern, East Asian, Latin American, and African Studies collections.¹⁶ Nevertheless, one ARL member library was able to purchase a substantial music research collection totaling 2,838 volumes, with music scores and original manuscripts. In 1967 a \$15,000 Type B award went to Ohio University, Athens (a non-ARL library), to strengthen its collections in fine arts, the volumes to be made more widely available through the computer facilities of the Ohio College Library Center. In 1968, Sam Houston State College in Texas (also a non-ARL library) found it possible to purchase education and criminology resources, collection areas later to be strengthened by a Type A grant in 1969.

Type C awards aroused perhaps the most controversy of any special purpose grants, especially among grants officials. These grants were for the benefit of combinations of institutions of higher education requiring aid in the establishment and strengthening of joint-use facilities. Criticism was presented of consortia of libraries being hastily established to take advantage of government grants, stressing shared

HEA II-A

resources on paper, yet being virtually nothing more than interlibrary loan agreements.

"Yet," as Katherine Stokes pointed out, "it is this sharing of resources in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of expensive or seldom used materials that was an underlying purpose when the HEA Title II-A College Library Resources program was created."¹⁷ Moreover, it must be agreed that interlibrary loan is a valuable tool in providing expensive or little-used material, particularly for research. In 1967, Type C grants totaled \$1,575,050 to 71 applicants; in 1968, \$1,996,003 went to 209 libraries.¹⁸ In 1968, individual grants ranged from \$20,000 to a group of seven libraries in Pennsylvania, to \$286,000 for an 18-member combination of libraries in Kansas.

Periodicals on microfilm again appear as a frequent investment under Type C grants to save space, cataloging time, and expensive binding costs. The New England Library Information Network received a special grant for acquisition of resources in 1968, which was complemented by a Title II-B research grant for the development of union catalog capabilities.

Opportunity for increased graduate study and research was a positive result of these and similar grants. However, the administrator of a West Coast grant summed up perhaps even more important results:

Transcending the highly significant immediate benefits has been the effect exerted by the successful administration of the grant on the member institutions. . . . Participation in this successful cooperative venture has sparked a series of inter-institutional projects and has united the librarians into a well functioning organization having established lines of communications and a scheduled program of meetings and workshops. . . . Last but by no means least among the benefits is the spark of enthusiasm which the successful accomplishment of this cooperative endeavor infused into the association at a time when financial problems seemed to become overwhelming and are creating an atmosphere of pessimism in the private institutions.¹⁹

A total of 5,930 basic grants amounting to \$29,307,574 were awarded during FY 1966-68; 2,790 supplemental grants amounting to \$22,081,316 were made during that same period; and \$7,007,026 for 192 projects were distributed in special purpose funds.²⁰ In total, a sum approaching \$60 million was expended under Title II-A in that period.

During the Congressional hearings in consideration of the HEA Amendments of 1968, interested educators and librarians commented about the effectiveness of Title II-A. In a written statement submitted February 28, 1968, Stephen A. McCarthy, executive secretary of ARL, perhaps best summed up the impact of the legislation on the library community: "Despite the fact that Title II-A has never been funded at more than fifty percent of the authorization, it has nevertheless enabled many smaller institutions to augment their library resources in a substantial manner. Under the supplemental and special grants programs of Title II-A, selected larger libraries have been assisted in developing special library resources in support of programs of instruction and research which otherwise would have been of far poorer quality."²¹

Most of the hearings time for the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 was not directed to the Higher Education Act of 1965. Instead, the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 and especially the National Defense Education Act of 1958 elicited much controversy and testimony. When Title II of the HEA was considered, most of the discussion was directed toward Title II-B or II-C. Perhaps this paucity of evidence on Title II-A resulted from the successful lobbying efforts of ALA and also the general approbation toward the title felt by Congressmen.

President Johnson signed PL 90-575 on October 16, 1968, providing a three-year extension to the Higher Education Act of 1965.²² The law authorized expenditure of \$25 million for Title II for FY 1969; \$75 million for 1970; and \$90 million for 1971. Additionally, in response to testimony presented at Congressional hearings, particularly Edmon Low's testimony in the Senate for ALA, certain amendments were introduced to liberalize and equalize distribution of sums under various types of grants. For example, new institutions were permitted to apply for basic grants in the fiscal year preceding the first year in which students were to be enrolled; branches of institutions were made eligible for supplemental and special purpose grants. Also, the maintenance of effort requirement for special purpose grants was modified to allow annual expenditures to continue at the average annual rate spent in 1963-65, or at the average annual rate during the two years preceding application for the grant, whichever was less; this provision would insure that libraries hit with financial cutbacks would not suffer.

Awards for FY 1969 occurred at approximately the same level and with the same distribution as during the previous two years: basic

HEA II-A

grants to 2,224 institutions went out; 1,747 supplemental grants totaled \$10,318,415, and \$1,474,000 was awarded for special purpose funding through 77 grants.²³ The rising number of applicants in both the basic and supplemental grant categories, coupled with the static \$25 million appropriation level, resulted in a decrease in supplementary funds in 1968 and 1969.²⁴ Characteristically, too, it was possible for the largest institutions with huge enrollments and many Ph.D. programs to receive the greatest awards. The main campus library at the University of Minnesota (enrolling 44,815 students and with 27 doctoral fields of study) received \$128,680; of this, \$40,000 was a special purpose Type B grant to help develop its Asian library, the only such resource for scholars between Chicago and the West Coast.²⁵

In 1969, special purpose Type A funds were used mostly for periodical backfiles, many in microform, again with some effort to meet ALA or other accrediting association standards, and also with an eye to providing support for new advanced degree programs.²⁶ More interest in urban problems was evidenced, as were efforts to make particular campus resources more widely available to the general community. In one southwestern institution, audiovisual materials were bought for use in conjunction with the state education service center located in the community. An Eastern institution with a strong emphasis in engineering reported that grant funds had improved resources demonstrably, and had created an awareness among the engineering students of the value of using library materials for the solution of interdisciplinary technological problems.

Type B awards went once again in significant quantity to area studies programs, especially those dealing with East Asia, Africa, and the Middle East.²⁷ One Type B special purpose award of \$40,000 was used to add to a midwestern ARL member library's volumes in the following areas: eighteenth-century British political, economic, and social history; medieval and Renaissance civilization; modern European literature; natural history, especially ornithology and botany; historical cartography; and the French Revolution. This university is responsible for 72 percent of the doctoral programs offered within its state; also, information from unique library materials, constituting a national resource, have been supplied to scholars in, among other places, Athens, Brisbane, Capetown, Dublin, Florence, Rome, London, and Utrecht, as well as to researchers in other parts of the United States. Three non-ARL libraries received special purpose Type B awards in 1969: the Georgia Institute of Technology, the Northrop Institute of Technology in California, and Oberlin College in Ohio. Much of the

\$30,000 granted to the Georgia Institute of Technology was used to obtain materials previously distributed free by federal agencies.

Type C grants were awarded in the amount of \$2,276,000 to 22 combinations of libraries; one-half of these grants went to consortia which had been recipients in one of two previous years, and they most frequently bought periodicals on microfilm with the money. One report indicated that: "The sole emphasis of purchases made . . . was for material indexed in the H.W. Wilson Co. indexes, namely, the Social Sciences and Humanities (International) Index, Education Index, Essay and General Literature Index, Business Periodicals Index, and in addition, Poole's Index to Periodical Literature. This material was mainly microfilm in a ratio of about 4-1 over the book, and most purchases were of serial titles."²⁸

Despite an auspicious beginning for FY 1970, including an authorization of \$75 million under PL 90-575 for Title II-A, the first year of the new decade marked the beginning of a decline in federal support of education which has still not been reversed. President Johnson had submitted a budget for FY 1970, including \$3,591.3 million for Office of Education Programs, prior to the inauguration of President Richard Nixon on January 20, 1969. In March, the new administration revised this budget downward to \$3,180.3 million; ultimately, due to public support and pressure groups, the appropriation for Title II-A passed at \$9.816 million.²⁹

Perhaps this reduction was proposed in light of the mounting costs of the war in Vietnam as well as various urban problems besetting the country, both urging economy in the nation's expenditures. Clearly, as the 1970s progressed, a new attitude toward education and libraries emerged on the part of the administration, manifesting itself in, for example, zero budget requests by the President, impoundment of education funds, and increasing insistence upon local support of educational programs. Despite this apparent lack of concern for libraries, in 1970 the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science was authorized by Congress and received the approval of the President.

Reduced appropriations in 1970 meant a different approach to the distribution of funds from the methods of former years. Basic grants were made to 2,201 institutions, but were limited to a maximum of \$2,500 rather than the authorized \$5,000 figure. Although reaction from the field might have been expected, there appears to have been none, due largely to the plethora of small supplemental grants. These

HEA II-A

grants, authorized at the \$10 per student level, actually were awarded at a rate of about \$4.75 per student; \$4,331,024 were distributed on the basis of enrollment, programs and demonstrated need to 1,783 institutions. Because of the scarcity of funds, no special purpose awards were made in 1970. Frank Stevens, then chief of the Training and Resources Branch of the U.S.O.E. Division of Library Programs remarked: "In view of the reduction in the appropriation, it was determined that while special purpose grants are highly desirable and contribute to the achievement of high program standards and interlibrary cooperation, the basic needs of each institution be on an equitable basis."³⁰

In 1971, due once again to a shortage of funds, an innovative approach to distribution of funds was tried—a method that drew much criticism from the library community. The Office of Education originated a more concentrated approach to fund distribution: awards were to be made to those institutions in greatest need, such as community and junior colleges, new institutions, vocational institutions, and developing institutions with large numbers of disadvantaged students.³¹ Basic grants went only to institutions which also qualified, under this rubric, for a supplemental grant. Correspondingly, supplemental grants under such terms could be made at the \$10 per student level, and special purpose awards might thereby be resumed, priority going to those institutions involved in the Model Cities projects, and having a high distribution of economically disadvantaged students, special program needs, and an ability to share resources with needy institutions.

Basic grants went to 548 institutions and totaled \$2,698,383; \$5,574,703 in supplemental funds went to 531 institutions; and 115 special purpose grants were awarded. Significantly, of special purpose Type A funds, the majority went to junior and community colleges in urban areas with large enrollments of the socially and economically deprived; the largest Type C award, \$125,000, went to the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago, a cooperative effort of national importance making research library materials readily available through loan to approximately 100 members and associate members.³²

Criticism of this method of distribution was immediate. The setting of priorities appears to have been made arbitrarily by the Office of Management and Budget without the recommendation of or consultation with the Advisory Council (which by 1970 was reduced to three members because no new nominations had been made to fill

vacancies). As chairman of the Advisory Council, Edward Holley protested the movement away from Title II-A's basic goal of helping all weaker and inadequate college libraries:

The argument used in the Office of Education has been that \$5,000 didn't do any college much good. This argument is specious and could only be made by persons totally unfamiliar with the many junior colleges and church-related senior colleges across the country. For them the \$5,000, with its wise matching provision, meant the difference between aiming for adequacy and being content with library mediocrity. I cannot believe that this was the original congressional intent nor do I believe our congressmen intended to leave out these struggling, but deserving institutions. Having visited many of these college libraries on survey and accreditation teams, I can vouch for the tremendous boost the \$5,000 grants gave their college library programs. If these grants had been continued at the same level of appropriations as in 1969, some \$25,000,000, within ten years we could have been proud of the improvement in the instructional programs of those colleges. Let me add that it does seem strange to promote a "Right to Read" program and at the same time to reduce expenditures for college library resources from \$25,000,000 to \$5,000,000.³³

Moreover, Holley and Donald Hendricks had previously published *Resources of Texas Libraries* (1968), documenting the impact and usefulness of the Title II-A program in that state.

The year 1971 also marked reconsideration by Congress of the higher education bills. During the 91st Congress, from December 16, 1969, to July 16, 1970, the Committee on Education and Labor held thirty-four days of testimony related to amendment of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, the International Education Act of 1966, and related bills.³⁴ Based on testimony and other evidence submitted, a new education bill was introduced in the 92nd Congress on April 6, 1971.

Testimony revealed that the higher education community was facing extraordinary change, accentuated by acute financial distress. Since World War II, enrollments had significantly increased; institutions of education had modified and innovated changes and modes of instruction to prepare students for life in a society rapidly shifting its values; inflation and rising costs had produced endemic deficit financing.³⁵ The bill attempted to meet those needs by extending and

HEA II-A

amending programs of categorical aid, as well as indicating new federal roles in support of higher education.

Edmon Low spoke before the Special House Subcommittee on Education on behalf of the ALA on March 24, 1971, indicating the impact of Title II-A:

[With the advent of this college library resources] program for a basic grant of \$5,000, which was matched by a like amount of local funds and with a requirement of a maintenance of effort, libraries were permitted to move ahead as never before; it has, in truth, been a real renaissance movement in a large majority of college libraries in this country.

Not only have books been bought in significant quantities but also, greater interest has been generated in, and attention been given to, the library by the administration of these schools, resulting not only in upgrading of staff but also in erection of new buildings to provide better library services overall.

These grants now assume a greater influence than ever before because of the increasingly difficult financial plight of institutions of higher education in general.

There is hardly an institution anywhere these days from the smallest college to the largest university which is not caught between the hammer of rising costs, increased demand for faculty salaries, and need for additional facilities, and the anvil of stationary or decreasing revenues from State sources or from private donors.³⁶

Low's remark were buttressed by pertinent comments about the successful use and importance of Title II-A funds received from academic libraries.

Indications were received that \$9.5 million, the amount released in 1971, was totally inadequate as a yearly appropriation; two to three times that amount could effectively be used. The 1971 bill did not pass out of the Senate, due largely to last-minute extensive revisions.

HEA-1968 was in effect only through June 30, 1971, so the 1972 HEA programs were funded under a one-year contingency authority under PL 91-230, Title IV. Only 494 combined basic and supplemental grants were made in 1972, despite the fact that 1,550 institutions applied.³⁷ Grants totaling approximately \$11 million were awarded in the same fashion as the previous year, eligibility for a supplemental grant determining receipt of a basic grant. Monies went to predominantly black universities and colleges, and to those libraries with serious deficiencies in their library holdings.³⁸

Signed into law on June 23, the Education Amendments of 1972 (PL 92-318) required that all basic grants up to \$5,000 be satisfied before supplemental or special purpose grants could be made.³⁹ Supplemental grants were permitted at the \$20 per student level, an increase of 100 percent. Public and private nonprofit library institutions became eligible for basic and special purpose grants, providing their primary responsibility was the provision of library and information services to the higher education community. Maintenance of effort requirements were liberalized.

Monies awarded during 1973 were the first to be distributed under the HEA-1972. The total amount appropriated in 1973 was \$12.5 million, out of an authorization of \$52.5 million; \$10,031,128 in basic grants went to 2,044 institutions.⁴⁰ An additional \$74,318 in basic grants went to seventeen public and nonprofit library institutions, the new category of agency eligible to receive grants under the amendments. No supplemental grants were awarded; however, 65 special purpose grants benefited 307 colleges and universities. Type A grants were awarded to libraries in urban areas with large enrollments of the economically disadvantaged; Type B grants of \$170,000 were awarded to institutions having library collections meeting the needs of other institutions in economically and socially deprived communities; Type C grants of \$1,030,000 went to strengthen joint-use facilities.

During FY 1974, \$9,960,200 in basic grants (with a maximum of \$4,235 for individual grants) went to 2,377 eligible recipients.⁴¹ No supplemental or special purpose grants could be awarded. Total authorization for Title II-A in 1974 was \$59.5 million. For FY 1975, the authorization stands at \$70 million; as of this writing, \$9,750,000 has been appropriated, although announcement of distribution has not yet been made.

ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assessment of the impact of Title II-A in the period 1966-74 might take place on several levels. Cumulative obligations amount to \$135.9 million; more than 23,660 awards have been made in the three grant categories; about 10.6 million library volumes have been purchased.⁴² More than 2,200 institutions participate annually in the receipt of funds. Through 1973, 470 special purpose awards helped to support the needs of special or institutional research centers and interlibrary programs.

The awards have allowed many academic libraries to keep up

HEA II-A

purchases from year to year in a time of galloping inflation. For example, a 1974 survey in *Library Journal* states that from 1967 to 1973, the cost of hardcover books rose about 50 percent, periodical prices doubled, and serial services increased in price more than 50 percent.⁴³ Approximately \$11,000-\$12,000 would be needed today to equal the purchasing power of a 1966 grant of \$5,000. This inflationary spiral has taken place against a backdrop of increased student demands, an information explosion, and an increasing reluctance and inability of state and other appropriating officials to increase educational, and thus library, support. Additionally, endowment and foundation investments typically yielded less and less return during this period as the stock market plummeted. For example, grants from the Council on Library Resources (made with funding from the Ford Foundation) may soon come to an end; in the past these monies have been extremely useful in sponsoring research and development in interlibrary and cooperative ventures.⁴⁴

An additional benefit, as mentioned before, has been to give the library greater visibility to the academic community. Funds for library materials, coupled with funds for new buildings and for upgrading the training of librarians, have all helped to make the library and the librarian more respected and essential to the community than ever before.

The HEA-1965 and its extensions have stressed cooperative efforts. On an informal level, this emphasis has tended to bring together librarians from several institutions for planning with defined lines of communication and scheduled meetings; on a more formal basis, consortia have been formed with established and well-defined responsibilities. However, with a new depression in higher education, cooperation in 1975 has a different meaning than it had in the prosperous 1960s. Today, cooperation implies the life-line which institutions must grasp if they are to weather the stormy assaults of inflation, an information explosion, and increased patron demands.

James E. Allen, Jr., appointed Commissioner of Education in 1969, had remarked in 1965 on the need for integrating the academic library into a total, nationwide library fabric:

We must press our efforts to ensure that all types of libraries are brought into a total service structure which can make real the potential inherent in the separate parts. The time is indeed past when we can think compartmentally of a "public library program," a "school library program," a "college library program," or even the

programs of a highly specialized private library. We need to acknowledge the interrelation of these resources and services; we need to plan from the vantage point of a library user, who cares little about the "type" of library, but a great deal about the ability of that library or that library system to supply his needs.⁴⁵

The spirit of Allen's remarks finds manifestation in current recommendations of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) for collective action to overcome existing problems in larger academic libraries as steps toward the national resolution of library services, by:

- (1) introducing new means for extending access to recorded information
- (2) ensuring a national capacity for continuing development of distinctive collections and resources
- (3) initiating research and development activities of common concern
- (4) creating a national bibliographical data base in machine-readable form
- (5) developing a national program for the preservation of research materials.⁴⁶

The commission remarks that college and junior college libraries continue for the most part understaffed and poorly stocked, and are inadequate.⁴⁷ Such efforts as NCLIS proposes would inevitably benefit the smaller institutions as well as the nationwide network of all types of libraries. Such action requires massive aid, part of which must come from federal funds. In light of this need for cooperative effort, it seems especially unfortunate that grants under the special purpose category have had to be made at minimal levels for the past several years if, indeed, they have been made at all.

The use of interlibrary loan increases access to media and is based on the premise that books are somehow the property of the intellectual community as a whole. However, recent studies have indicated that the larger institutions bear the brunt of the burden in staff time and costs in supplying the needs of smaller libraries' patrons. David Kaser estimated in 1972 that the average cost of a single interlibrary loan to a research library was about \$8, a cost not directly related to its own programs.⁴⁸ Reimbursement by the federal government, the state, or the patron is a possible solution, and not only in a time of financial stringency. NCLIS recommends central bibliographic services that might serve as the basis for such loans; although total subsidization of

HEA II-A

collections by the government is not advocated, the commission does propose the nourishment of "certain repositories of information" as resources for interlibrary loan, thereby easing the burden of some large institutions.⁴⁹ Perhaps the maintenance of lending libraries patterned after the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago and similar to the lending division of the British Library is a solution; unfortunately, there is not a national library in the United States to tie them to.⁵⁰

Much of the problem of interlibrary loan consists of bibliographic identification of the item requested. Current work indicates that one-third to one-half of the cost of a single transaction results from efforts to verify the item.⁵¹ Truncated, abbreviated search by author and title via such a computerized operation as that of the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) could help pare this cost considerably; an additional merit of the OCLC tapes is their use as union catalogs, allowing holdings in neighboring libraries (and not necessarily the largest libraries) to be identified quickly. Unfortunately, hook-up with consortia affiliated with OCLC involves a considerable investment of money; during the early years of affiliation with a consortium, a library requires large sums at unpredictable times—this money must come from the current budget, unless otherwise available.⁵²

Under such a system as OCLC there is also the need for an extended retrospective bibliographic data base. At present, pre-MARC tape cataloging is input by member libraries on a hit-or-miss basis. In light of the high cost of conversion, priorities of conversion might be established based upon possible efforts toward interlibrary sharing via a tape union catalog.

Collections of national, even international, importance need to be recognized and their value underlined by at least partial federal support. With even apparently well-endowed institutions forced to cut back in book and periodical orders (sometimes at the half-year point, bringing an end to all monographic purchases), indications are that even those institutions considered well heeled are in financial distress, a situation apparently not the case in 1965. Collections of unique and special material will become more and more difficult to maintain, as those responsible for collection development struggle to cover even basic curricular needs in English.

Clearly what is needed in future legislation is funding once again at the \$25 million level (considering inflation, hopefully \$70 million) of the 1960s. Current monies, though welcome, are minimal; basic grants at the \$10,000 level would be significant even to the large research

library. Awarding of funds might take place on the basis of service performed by a single library to other libraries and services performed for its own patrons, as well as on the basis of rendering the inadequate small library acceptable in size.

NCLIS recommendations should be used in establishing priorities in the awarding of funds under 1976 legislation. The White House Conference on Library and Information Services and its supporting state conferences could aid in specifying how NCLIS recommendations should be interpreted on the state and regional levels.

This is a time for long, hard looks at education and the library's part in the process. Planning for libraries should begin anew, not especially on the basis of past recommendations and priorities, but on assessed current needs and possibilities. On one side of the theoretical construction is the under-supported, inadequately stocked community college or college library struggling to fulfill day-to-day curricular needs; on the other side is the university library, equally involved in its quest for a unique but possibly little-used item. Perhaps curricular needs will be judged of less priority than research needs, or the reverse. Maybe an institution surviving at a minimal level with little chance of upgrading its resources and continuing to build on them could do most for the educational community by closing its doors and stopping a wasteful drain on limited resources; perhaps the university library with no especially singular resources could do best by abrogating its perceived role of annually buying a substantial, yet little-used, portion of the world's book output.

What is the relationship of the government to each institution? What is the relationship of the academic library to the public, the school, or the special library? Perhaps provision of library book resources is not as important as their interpretation via public services.

Certainly, the problems faced by academic libraries cannot be solved by individual institutions acting alone. Instead, libraries must rely on increased private, local, state, but especially federal funding, an investment that should be made on a long-term, continuing basis.

APPENDIX

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS UNDER TITLE II-A

FY	Authorization	Cumulative Authorization	Appropriation	Obligations	Number of grants:		
					Basic	Supplemental	Special
1966	\$50,000,000	\$ 50,000,000	\$10,000,000	\$ 8,400,000	1,830	0	0
1967	50,000,000	100,000,000	25,000,000	24,500,000	1,989	1,266	132
1968	50,000,000	150,000,000	25,000,000	24,900,000	2,111	1,524	60
1969	25,000,000	175,000,000	25,000,000	24,900,000	2,224	1,747	77
1970	75,000,000	250,000,000	12,500,000	9,816,000	2,201	1,783	0
1971	90,000,000	340,000,000	9,900,000	9,900,000	548	531	115
1972	18,000,000	358,000,000	11,000,000	10,993,000	504	494	21
1973	52,500,000	410,500,000	12,500,000	12,500,000	2,061	0	65
1974	59,500,000	470,000,000	9,985,000	9,960,200	2,377	0	0
1975	70,000,000	540,000,000	9,750,000	—	—	—	—
Totals			\$150,635,000	\$135,869,200	15,845	7,345	470

Source: Figures on appropriations, obligations, and numbers of grants from: Stevens, Frank A., and Carl, Herbert A. "Higher Education Act, Title II A." In *The Bowker Annual*. . . 1975. New York, R. R. Bowker, 1975, p. 139, "Table 2, Number of Grants Issued."

References

1. U.S. Senate. *Congressional Record*. 89 Cong., 1 Sess. (1965), CXI, Pt. 1, p. 500. For a full account of the political and social milieu in which the HEA was passed, see Low, Edmon. "Two Decisive Decades: Federal Consciousness and Libraries," *American Libraries*, 3:717-24, July/Aug. 1972.
2. U.S. Senate, *ibid.*
3. *Ibid.*, p. 510.
4. U.S. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Special Subcommittee on Education and Labor. *Higher Education Act of 1965* (Hearings on H.R. 3220). 89 Cong., 1 Sess. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1965, p. 26.
5. U.S. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Subcommittee on Education. *Higher Education Act of 1965* (Hearings on S. 600). 89 Cong., 1 Sess. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1965, p. 2.
6. U.S. House, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
7. U.S. Senate. *Congressional Record*. 89 Cong., 1 Sess. (1965), CXI, Pt. 1, p. 510.
8. For text of Title II-A, see U.S. Code. *Congressional and Administrative News*. 89 Cong., 1 Sess. (1965), Pt. 1, pp. 1236-40; for the Title's legislative history, see *Ibid.*, Pt. 2, pp. 4040-48.
9. Authorization for this council was ended July 1, 1972 by mandate of the Commissioner of Education under authority of the General Education Provisions Act, sec. 448(b), 20 U.S. Code 1233g.
10. Krettek, Germaine. "The Higher Education Act of 1965: Background, Provisions, Administration," *College & Research Libraries*, 27:335, Sept. 1966.
11. Welch, Helen. "Implications for Resources and Technical Services," *College & Research Libraries*, 27:340-45, Sept. 1966.
12. Stokes, Katherine M. "Summary of Special Purpose Type A Grants in the College Library Resources Program 1967, 1968, 1969." Jan. 28, 1971. (Unpublished)
13. *Ibid.*
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*
17. ————. "Interlibrary Loans: A Basic Consortia Activity." March 6, 1970. (Unpublished)
18. ————. "Type C [1967-69]." (Unpublished)
19. *Ibid.*
20. Jones, Othello. "Distributional Analysis by Level of Higher Education of Grants Made for Title II-A of HEA, Fiscal Years 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, & 1971." (Mimeographed); and Stevens, Frank A., and Carl, Herbert A. "Higher Education Act, Title II-A." In Madeleine Miele and Sarah Prakken, eds. *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1975, pp. 136-39.
21. U.S. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Special Subcommittee on Education. *Higher Education Amendments of 1968* (Hearings on H.R. 15067). 90 Cong., 2 Sess. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1968, p. 403.
22. For text of amendments to Title II, see U.S. Code. *Congressional and Administrative News*. 90 Cong., 2 Sess. (1968), Pt. 1, pp. 1196-99; for the legislative history see *Ibid.*, Pt. 3, pp. 4042-45.

HEA II-A

23. Jones, *op. cit.*, and Stevens and Carl, *op. cit.*
24. Stokes, Katherine M. "Summary of Title II-A Grants, Higher Education Act." In Carole Collins, ed. *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1970, p. 99.
25. *Ibid.*
26. ————. "Summary of Special Purpose Type A Grants . . .," *op. cit.*
27. ————. "Summary of Special Purpose Type B Title II-A Grants . . .," *op. cit.*
28. ————. "Type C," *op. cit.*
29. Frase, Robert W. "Five Years of Struggle for Federal Funds." In Madeleine Miele, ed. *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1974, pp. 156, 159.
30. Stevens, Frank A. "Summary of Title II-A Grants for Academic Libraries Under the Higher Education Act of 1965." In Janice Johnson, ed. *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1971, p. 139.
31. For a fuller discussion of the 1971 method of distribution, see ————. "Summary of Title II-A Grants for Academic Library Resources Under the Higher Education Act of 1965." In Janice Johnson, ed. *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1972, pp. 225-27.
32. *Ibid.*, p. 227.
33. Holley, Edward G. Personal communication to S. P. Marland, Jr., U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dec. 2, 1971. Included as Attachment B to: Edward G. Holley. "Statement before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, July 25, 1973." (Mimeographed)
34. U.S. Code. *Congressional and Administrative News*. 92 Cong., Sess. (1972), Pt. 2, p. 2463.
35. *Ibid.*
36. U.S. House. Committee on Education and Labor. Special Subcommittee on Education. *Higher Education Amendments of 1971* (Hearings on H.R. 32, H.R. 5191, H.R. 5192, H.R. 5193, and H.R. 7248). 92 Cong., 1 Sess. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1971, pp. 389-90.
37. Stokes, Katherine M. "From Inside the DLP," *North Carolina Libraries*, 32:21, Spring 1973.
38. Carl, Herbert A. "Title II-A, College Library Resources, of the Higher Education Act of 1965." In Jeanne J. Henderson, ed. *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1973, pp. 371-73.
39. For text of amendments to Title II-A, see U.S. Code. *Congressional and Administrative News*. 92 Cong., 2 Sess. (1972), Pt. 1, pp. 280-85; for the legislative history see *Ibid.*, Pt. 2, pp. 2462-75.
40. Stevens, Frank A., and Carl, Herbert A. "Higher Education Act, Title II-A, College Library Resources," In Madeleine Miele, ed. *The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information*. New York, R.R. Bowker, 1974, p. 144.
41. Stevens and Carl (1975), *op. cit.*, pp. 136-39.
42. *Ibid.*, p. 139.
43. Brown, Norman B. "Price Indexes for 1974," *Library Journal*, 99:1775, July 1974.

ALAN CARTER SMITH

44. "New CLR Grants Assist in AACR Revision, Stanford Bibliographic Automation, and U. Chicago Data Management," *American Libraries*, 6:341, June 1975.
45. Quoted in Stokes, Katherine M. "U.S. Office of Education's Long-Range Plans for College and University Library Development." In Caroline Wire, ed. *Library Lectures: Numbers Nine through Sixteen*. Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Library, 1971, p. 66.
46. National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. *A National Program for Library and Information Services* (2d draft, rev.). Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., Sept. 15, 1974, p. 30.
47. *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33.
48. See Kaser, David. "Whither Interlibrary Loan?" *College & Research Libraries*, 33:398-402, Sept. 1972; and Stevens, Rolland E. *A Feasibility Study of Centralized and Regionalized Interlibrary Loan Centers*. Washington, D.C., Association of Research Libraries, 1973.
49. National Commission . . . , *op. cit.*, p. 32.
50. Wagman, Frederick (Director of the University of Michigan Library). Personal communication, June 2, 1975.
51. Casey, Genevieve. Personal communication, June 3, 1975.
52. Wagman, *op. cit.*