



Institutional Libraries: Federal Perspectives*

HENRY T. DRENNAN

ANY STATEMENT OF library services to the institutionalized is a statement of need, unfilled need, impending need. The problems of the institutionalized are national. All levels of government are concerned. This paper sketches a federal concern. Librarians and media specialists are in the ranks of those who deal with the disabled constituency of care and custody. Helping agencies of all kinds participate.

THE INSTITUTIONALIZED: A NATIONAL CONSTITUENCY

In 1970, the national census reported 2,160,280 persons residing in institutions.¹ One in every 100 Americans counted was in an institution. They are young. Some 1800 infants under the age of one were reported to be "inmates"; 10,000 institutionalized people were reported under the age of ten. Their numbers grow; 165,000 were teenagers. They are also very old. One-half million of them were older than eighty. Their common median age was 60.2 in 1970. Many are incarcerated; some are blind; some are deaf; many are confused; some are silent. To confront the institutionalized is to confront the human condition.

In 1970, 58 percent of all white women in homes for the aged were over the age of eighty. These aged white women were 33 percent of all institutionalized women. Typical residents of institutions are older white women and young black prisoners. Black men and black women have disproportionately high rates of incarceration in terms of their proportion in

Henry T. Drennan is Senior Program Officer for Research, Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, U.S. Office of Education.

* The opinions expressed in this article are the author's own. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official USOE position or policy.

the general population. Four percent of all institutionalized black women are jailed, as are 32 percent of institutionalized black men.²

Butler estimates that there are "a million persons over 65 years of age in institutions, primarily nursing homes, and well over 50 percent of these have evidence of some psychiatric symptomology and mental impairment."³ The aged and the mentally impaired constitute the largest portion of the institutionalized. The 1970 U.S. Census counted 635,882 persons with mental impairments in mental institutions. Combined, these two groups may account for 78 percent of the institutionalized.

The constituency of the institutionalized is considered in this paper as a federal concern for the support of library and information services. At times, the provision of or assistance to library services through the federal government is questioned as prudent public policy. Such questioning may overlook stated public policy as expressed in Section 2 of P.L. 91-345.⁴ That section holds that library and information services adequate to meet the needs of the people are essential to achieve national goals and to use educational resources more effectively. The law commits the federal government to cooperate with other levels of government.⁵

Federal activity in the development, support and operation of library services occurs through:

1. public policy formation and oversight by the U.S. Congress;
2. the counsel and advocacy of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science;
3. the operation of libraries (including institutional libraries) by federal departments;
4. the conduct of a program of special materials for the impaired by the Library of Congress; and
5. the administration of legislated programs for libraries, principally by the U.S. Office of Education (USOE).

PUBLIC POLICY FORMATION

That P.L. 91-345 does not discriminate among persons to receive educational benefits from improved library service, with federal assistance, is plain-faced. Generally, social consciousness has resulted in implicit consideration of the law, if in fact it was thought of at all as something that might help public libraries. The law applies, as well, to a more critical constituency: the impaired. Now, the most forceful advocacy comes from the impaired and their families. The professions are responding, and librarians are acting. The State Department of Education of South Dakota is an example. Its Division of Elementary and Secondary Education plans

Federal Perspectives

to train library media specialists to work with the handicapped. In its application to the Research and Demonstration Program of the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources (USOE), it emphasizes the need.⁶ In an 8-state region of the midwest (including South Dakota), there are an estimated 710,000 impaired educable children. A content analysis of testimony given before congressional committees legislating library programs, however, presents a minimum of evidence of need in the important area of library services to the institutionalized/impaired. The American Library Association (ALA) legislative office, which coordinates testimony, has in recent hearings cited exemplary institutional library models, yet put negligible emphasis on the needs of the institutionalized.

A second gatekeeping group, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS), presents testimony in its advisory role on national library needs. NCLIS has a strong record of developing well-researched essays and studies on the state of libraries. Both NCLIS and ALA have stressed continued system building and financial need, particularly of larger urban public libraries. The absence of substantial testimony by these advocates on the needs of the institutionalized is puzzling.

NCLIS has developed at least two statements that briefly but comprehensively set forth the needs of the institutionalized. In the proceedings of the Denver conference, McClaskey said:

Too often, agencies have tended to behave as if they believed that the institutionalized need or should have those services that happen to be offered by libraries rather than that libraries should modify and create services in response to the needs of the institutionalized.⁷

Smith reported at the same conference:

Of 132 State institutions for the mentally retarded, 45 have no libraries. The Wisconsin State Department of Public Instruction conducted a nationwide questionnaire survey . . . [stating that] there are 167,963 mentally retarded . . . in the various States, in which 139 library staff were employed, including clerks. Nationwide, the ratio is less than 1 library worker for every 1,900 residents.⁸

The "folding-in" of institutional services (and services to the handicapped) into LSCA Title I in the early 1970s may have deprived these programs of extensive review and oversight in the process of public policy formation. The needs of the vulnerable constituency of the impaired, however, are too critical to remain unstated, particularly when library advocacy and legislative responsiveness has been so effective on Capitol Hill.

THE FEDERAL SECTOR: INSTITUTIONAL LIBRARIES

Institutional libraries operated by the federal government are an important part of a worldwide system of federal departmental libraries. The institutional libraries of the federal system (excluding penal libraries) are mainly components of the Department of Defense and the Veterans Administration. In 1972, 189 institutional libraries were federally operated. These institutional libraries were part of the federal library system of 1550 libraries, of which 1386 submitted substantial operating data in 1972. This section of the paper is primarily based upon those data.⁹

THE FEDERAL INSTITUTIONAL CONSTITUENCY

A numerical estimate of the federal institutional population is difficult to determine. There were 42,953 patients counted in federal mental hospitals in 1970.¹⁰ In the same year, there were 2012 patients in federal tuberculosis hospitals. The writer estimates there were 37,084 persons residing in federal homes for the aged and dependent. The total federal institutional population (exclusive of penal) can be estimated at something more than 100,000 persons.

The majority of federal institutional residents are military veterans. Thus the institutional constituency is overwhelmingly male; only an estimated 3 percent are female. The age curve of the institutional residents reflects America's wars; principally World War I and World War II. In 1970, a majority (51 percent) of the federal institutionalized were between the ages of 40 and 54, which placed them in the military service range during the 1940s. Another demographic cluster occurs in the age range of 70-84 years. Men at that age in 1970 were of military service age during World War I. Thirty-two percent of the federal institutionalized were in the military service age range in 1917-18. Altogether, 83 percent of the federal institutionalized males were subject to military service by age. In testimony to the Senate in 1976, the administrator of the Veterans Administration reported:

In our long-term care programs, the number of veterans on a typical day were: 6,933 in VA nursing homes; 6,571 in community contract nursing homes; 9,222 in VA domiciliaries; 1,062 in State hospitals (VA supported); 4,268 in State nursing homes (VA supported); and 5,754 in State domiciliaries (VA supported)... Of all VA inpatients under care on October 1, 1975, approximately 33 percent (36,700) were 65 years of age or older. Compared to the census day

Federal Perspectives

in 1970, this represents a 7.2 percent increase in the proportion of older patients receiving health care.¹¹

Table I estimates the age of the federally institutionalized.

<i>Age Range</i>	<i>Federal Institutional Residents by Percent</i>
14-24	2.4
25-34	5.0
35-44	15.5
45-64	40.1
65-85	37.0

Table 1. Ages of the federally institutionalized (1970)

There are 158 institutional libraries operated by the Veterans Administration. Fifteen are operated by the Navy and fourteen by the Army. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare operates one.

FEDERAL INSTITUTIONAL LIBRARY MANPOWER

In 1972, 240 persons served in federal institutional libraries, out of a total of 11,000 federal library employees. Institutional libraries accounted for \$3.7 million of all federal library operational expenditures of \$89.9 million. Expenditures were 4 percent of total outlays; institutional manpower assignments accounted for 2 percent of total federal library employment. Twenty-nine percent of federal library employees are classified as librarians (1410 series). In their proportion of professional classification to all library positions, federal institutional librarians have the highest proportion of professional positions (58 percent) to all staff members. These institutional librarians constitute 6 percent (193 persons) of all federal professional library assignments.

LEVELS OF RESPONSIBILITY OF FEDERAL INSTITUTIONAL LIBRARIANS

In 1972, the median position for civil service grade of all federal librarians was at the GS-9 level; however, federal librarians in total have 19 percent of their ranks in the more favorable GS-12 rating and above. Considered as a separate category, federal institutional librarians place only 3 percent at the GS-12 level, with none rated above that status. Eight percent of other federal librarians exceed the GS-12 level (1972), with eight positions beyond that, at the GS-16 level and above.

SEXUAL SELECTION

Grade level 13 is the dividing point in federal libraries in assignment by sex. Men hold 52 percent of the GS-13 librarian positions. Table 2 illustrates significant disparities by sex in the assignment of federal institutional librarians and all federal librarians.

<i>Type</i>	<i>Percent Female by Grade</i>							
	<i>7-8</i>	<i>9</i>	<i>10-11</i>	<i>12</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>15</i>	<i>16</i>
All federal librarians	80	86	74	64	48	40	25	0
Federal institutional librarians	83	85	80	73	0	0	0	0

Table 2. Federal librarians by grade and sex, 1972

Male ascendancy increases to 60 percent at the GS-14 level, and to 75 percent at GS-15; no female librarians appear at GS-16, the supergrades or above. Female institutional librarians' grade assignments are compressed into GS-12 and below. Female institutional librarians are overrepresented at lower grade levels. They are 3 percent over at GS-7 and GS-8; a slight decline of 1 percent at GS-9; 6 percent over at GS-10; and 9 percent overrepresented at GS-12, the actual terminus of their opportunity. Thus, in 1972, no female federal institutional librarian, nor indeed male federal institutional librarian, held rank above GS-12. At the Veterans Administration, principal employer of federal institutional librarians, 99 percent of library employees (which includes other than institutional librarians) were classified below the GS-12 level. Nearly one-half (48 percent) were at the GS-8 level or below.

SALARIES

The federal government expended \$2,967,961 for institutional library salaries and wages in 1972. Available data presentations do not permit an analysis of distribution of funds by classification, i.e. by professional versus support staff. The mean annual salary for federal library employees in 1972 (6329 employees reported) was \$9443. For institutional library employees, the mean annual salary is estimated to be \$12,366. This estimate significantly exceeds the general estimated mean above, which contains a much higher proportion of nonprofessional positions. For all federal library purposes, 66 percent of the total expenditures of \$89.9 million, i.e. \$60 million, went for personnel services.

Federal Perspectives

THE CHARACTERISTIC FEDERAL INSTITUTIONAL LIBRARY

Federal institutional libraries expended an estimated \$5.12 per resident in 1972. These institutional libraries have the highest proportion of professional staff assignments: 58 percent. This reflects more of an imbalance than an advantage. The median number of all positions on institutional staffs is one. The institutional library is small, and its staff consists of one person.

The median or most characteristic institutional library had a collection of 4334 volumes, administered by one staff member. The library, in 1972, conducted a minimum interlibrary loan activity, only finding it necessary to borrow ten volumes annually. Compared with other types of libraries, however, its circulation activity is high. For all federal libraries in 1972, the ratio of volumes held to volumes circulated was 1:1.28. Each volume considered circulated on the average about one and one-quarter times. Institutional libraries, however, established a higher circulation ratio of 1:2.13. Considered statistically, each volume held would have circulated annually somewhat more than twice.

Collection turnover for institutional libraries, i.e. the period of time in which all books in the collection would be read at least once, was the shortest span. Turnover time for all federal institutional libraries was once every six months. The mean turnover time for all federal libraries was, in 1972, more than fifteen months (see Table 3). Federal libraries may serve 10 percent or more of the institutionalized persons in the United States. The relative wealth of data available through the federal library survey permits the comparison of activities — with caution. As a type to be studied, they offer the opportunity to examine what is actually three large institutional library systems at a time when systemic operations are advocated for economy, efficiency and other benefits.

A SPECIAL MATERIALS PROGRAM: THE DIVISION FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

The Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped of the Library of Congress has conducted a special materials program for the impaired since its inception through the Pratt-Smoot Act of 1931. In 1970, there were 22,739 persons receiving care in homes and schools for the physically handicapped. Many others, lodged in all types of institutions, receive aid from the division. Seventy-two percent were in public homes and schools, with 6448 in private institutions.

The most recent institutional count of the division reported services to institutions with 170,380 active readers. Institutional readership ac-

HENRY T. DRENNAN

<i>Type of Library</i>	<i>Collection Turnover Rate in Months</i>
Institutional	5.90
School	6.84
Health and Medicine	13.90
Academic or Instructional	20.80
Engineering & Science	24.70
Mean Rate for All	15.40

Table 3. Collection turnover rate

counts for 40 percent of the estimated 429,613 readers served in fiscal year (FY) 1977.

The number of institutional readers in the 6-month period October 1, 1976–March 31, 1977 had increased a substantial 14.2 percent over a similar 6-month period in FY 1976. Readership for all categories of readers served by the division grew by 10 percent. Statistical notes from the Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped reported overall trends, including:

1. Two new regional and subregional libraries added during the year;
2. An increase in readership of 15 percent;
3. An expected decrease in open reel circulation; and
4. An expected increase of 43 percent in closed reel circulation and readership.

Table 4 presents the use of media by type for institutional readers.

<i>Media</i>	<i>Use</i>	<i>Change</i>
Total	227,540	16.3%
Talking books	143,550	10.2
Braille	5,570	9.0
Cassette tapes	51,080	43.0
Open reel tape	890	-24.6
Large type	26,450	13.1

Table 4. Institutional use of materials furnished by the Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, FY 1976-77

Working together with the Library Services and Construction Act (the principal federal program for public and institutional library services), the Division for the Blind and Physically Handicapped and hun-

Federal Perspectives

dreds of librarians and staff members of the nation have created, through the designation of regional and subregional distribution nodes, a de facto national service network that strongly supports the knowledge needs of impaired people. In testimony before Congress on activities of LSCA, this national cooperation was summarized:

Both the LSCA and the Library of Congress programs for the physically handicapped include large numbers of older handicapped persons: they account for a major portion of readers of talking books, braille and other special reading materials available on loan through a network of 52 regional and sub-regional libraries for the blind and physically handicapped throughout the country.¹²

THE LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT, A FEDERAL GRANT PROGRAM

Institutional library service assisted financially by the federal government is described in most detail in the evaluation of LSCA conducted in 1972.¹³ Here, the principal emphasis will be on the fiscal aspects of the program, for it is a formula grant program with policy, planning and implementation activities delegated to state government. Some, but lesser, attention will be paid to operating characteristics and estimates of achievement and need.

The state library agencies exercise their policy-making choices within a set of national priorities. Those priorities are satisfied in allocating federal funds for various activities. The choice of activities to be initiated depends on the state agency's perception of critical urgencies and on the local, state and federal funds available.

The surveyors of 1972 identified 1521 projects in files up to 1971 that concerned the betterment of services for target groups (disadvantaged persons). A separate analysis for 1972 identified 915 projects with LSCA support. State agencies estimated in that year that they would expend \$35,064,926 from all sources for targeted projects. Of that amount, LSCA contributed 43 percent; other federal sources, 5.4 percent; state support, 30 percent; and local support, 21 percent. Twenty-two percent of the total number of projects identified were conducted for the institutionalized. On the basis of an average monthly count of use, the projected annual use of targeted projects involved 333,420 visits (27,785 monthly).

THE FUNDING OF LSCA INSTITUTIONAL PROJECTS

In FY 1975, a compilation of state library agency reports aggregating expenditures under Title I of LSCA for institutional services (including

correctional) amounted to \$2,700,933. Of that amount, the states had allocated \$1,200,283 to correctional institutions. Other institutions, the subject of this paper, received allocations of \$1,500,600 in federal aid.

No series of annual federal fiscal expenditures for solely institutional libraries is available nationally. The data in this section are assembled from various sources, estimated and projected to approximate what a full accounting could provide. From working with the 1972 data developed by the Systems Development Corporation (SDC), this writer is convinced that institutional library expenditures are underreported. However, working principally from the SDC survey (supplemented with other information), the following analysis and reconstructed estimates describe a substantial portion of fiscal assistance to state government for institutional library services up to 1973. Until that year, a total of \$138 million from all sources is estimated to have been expended on target groups, including service to the institutionalized (data based on 1521 projects). Table 5 depicts the distribution of funds.

Nearly 58 percent of funds for target group services were derived from nonfederal sources. However, the state share (34.4 percent) and the federal (42.6 percent) combined accounted for 80 percent of target group services funding. This proportion is far above the traditional allocation of state and federal participation in general library development. That traditional contribution seldom rises, as a mean, above 26 percent (state and federal combined). Two factors are illustrated here: (1) the state's response to national priorities, and (2) the dependence in the early 1970s of target group services on nonlocal support. Table 6 illustrates the national effect of state library agency distribution of funds by individual target groups.

When the distribution of funding by source to institutionalized library services is examined, one could expect that state funds would be strongly involved in supporting services that have been operated by state departments. Despite this expectation, when sources of funds for institutionalized service are compared with other target group services in 1972, the shift to state sources is not strongly developed. There is an offsetting factor in a substantial increase in federal sources other than Title I of LSCA. For example, all target groups received 2.9 percent federal funding other than LSCA (see Table 7). The institutional services sector considered alone, however, nearly doubled that share, with 5.75 percent from other federal sources.

State allocations of federal LSCA funds up to 1973 came close to a total of \$8 million. For FY 1972, the states allocated an estimated

Federal Perspectives

	<i>LSCA</i>	<i>Other Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Other</i>	<i>Total</i>
Amount	\$58.7	\$4.0	\$47.4	\$27.3	\$0.5	\$138
Percentage	42.6	2.9	34.4	19.8	0.3	100

Table 5. Allocation of fiscal assistance to target group library services by all sources to 1973 (in millions of dollars)

<i>Target Groups</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Disadvantaged	\$42.7	73.0
Institutional	7.7	13.0
Handicapped	8.3	14.0
All	58.7	100.0

Table 6. Distribution by states of LSCA funds to target groups to 1973 (in millions of dollars)

	<i>LSCA</i>	<i>Other Federal</i>	<i>State</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Other</i>
All target groups	42.6%	02.9%	34.4%	19.8%	00.3%
Institutionalized	40.4	05.8	20.4	22.5	07.4

Table 7. Funding sources compared for all target groups versus sources solely for library services for the institutionalized for operational projects in 1972 (by percentage)

\$1,874,763 of LSCA funds to services for the institutionalized. The writer believes that the 1975 figure of \$1.56 million is understated because of a reporting system that does not allow for more categories.

FUNDING BY STATE

Through the resident population count of the institutionalized and the array of LSCA expenditures for 1975 by state, it is possible to present the distribution of funds by amount (see Table 8). There is a strong supposition (with the usual exceptions) that states with small institutional populations correlate with high per capita resident expenditure. Large states may choose to spend less on institutional residents from their LSCA funds, and employ their federal assistance for other priority purposes. A controlling variable for all states is the total LSCA allocation available to

HENRY T. DRENNAN

<i>Amount</i>	\$-.49	\$.50-.99	\$1.00-1.49	\$1.50-1.99	\$2.00-2.49	\$2.50-2.99	\$3.00-3.99	\$4.00+
Percentage	17	24	9.5	16.6	9.5	2.4	9.5	11.9
Cumulative	17	41	50.5	67.1	76.6	79.0	88.5	100.0

Table 8. Estimated distribution of LSCA funds per institutional resident by 42 states reporting for 1975

them in any fiscal year. The national average of per institutional-resident expenditure, estimated to be \$1.95 in 1975 from LSCA funds, is a slender resource for library and information services to the critical, vulnerable constituency of institutional library users.

The costs of institutional library services are better illustrated by constructing per resident expenditures based on actual project costs, as opposed to estimated annual per resident cost (\$1.95). That figure would indicate what the distribution to each resident would be if the total amount were to be divided equally—but that is obviously not the case. It is not known how many inmates are without any service.

Information is not available for 1975 costs per resident in the LSCA project. Table 9 shows the share of LSCA funds expended per resident at an earlier date. The median LSCA allocation per resident was \$2.85; that was joined by a median from all other sources of \$2.31. When all sources of funds are combined for targeted projects, the median is \$4.44. That figure is similar to the mean expenditure of \$5.12 per resident for federal institutional libraries. The similarity can at best be considered interesting, because the magnitude of contributed services (if any) for either federal or nonfederal institutional libraries is unknown.

In 1972 the mean allocation by the states for all target group projects from LSCA funds was \$16,472. The mean allocation based on all revenue sources for target group projects was \$35,403. The LSCA mean allocation was 47 percent of the combined mean. However, institutional libraries which received LSCA funds in 1972 exhibited considerable variance from the mean expenditure for all target groups (handicapped, disadvantaged, etc.). Institutional library projects under LSCA in 1972 operated with a mean expenditure of \$20,950, well below (40 percent) the mean expenditure of \$35,043 for target group projects for the disadvantaged.

The mean allocation of LSCA funds for institutional library purposes was \$13,704. This figure is 17 percent below the mean allocation of \$16,472 of such funds for all targeted groups in 1972. Table 10 presents

Federal Perspectives

<i>Project category</i>	<i>LSCA</i>	<i>All others</i>
Hospitalized	\$1.68	\$3.30
Nursing Homes	2.13	4.17
Physically Handicapped	8.67	7.23
Aged	3.93	5.84
Disadvantaged	3.56	2.31
Hospitals and Nursing Homes	4.39	.30
Disadvantaged & Institutionalized	1.74	2.01
Institutionalized & Handicapped	1.82	1.86
Other Institutional combinations	0	1.60

Table 9. Estimated per-resident expenditures comparing LSCA and all other sources for current projects in 1972 that provided institutional library services

<i>Project category</i>	<i>All sources</i>	<i>LSCA</i>
Hospitalized	\$15,180	\$ 5,014
Nursing Homes	8,450	2,854
Physically Handicapped	30,114	16,563
Aged	15,411	6,199
Disadvantaged	30,335	18,407
Hospitals and Nursing Homes	14,778	13,892
Disadvantaged & Institutionalized	40,863	19,018
Other Institutionalized	39,956	23,250

Table 10. Targeted institutional project library expenditures from all sources compared with LSCA allocation (mean), 1972

the average project expenditure from federal LSCA funds and all other funds, by type of project.

STANDARD PROJECT OPERATING DATA

Institutional library projects tended to be small in 1972, and the median expenditure (from the array above) was \$30,114 annually from all sources. Table 11 provides a sense of the magnitude of characteristic institutional project materials holdings contrasted with all other types of targeted projects. Institutional libraries, because of their residential nature, are likely to have a higher volume of circulation of materials. Furthermore, because of their restricted constituency, their operating figures are apt to be more valid. The median circulation of volumes, with 455 agencies reporting, is slightly more than 5000 volumes monthly. Table 12 below gives the distribution of agencies by circulation. Forty-six percent of target

HENRY T. DRENNAN

<i>Media</i>	<i>Mean number of items</i>	
	<i>Institutional</i>	<i>All others</i>
Books	9,779	43,593
Periodicals	251	184
Pamphlets	339	483
Film/Slides	776	430
Records	33	1,039
Tapes	73	196
Large Print	102	100
Other Nonprint	1	63
Ethnic Materials	36	98
Non-English Material	18	168

Table 11. Institutional project materials holdings compared to those of other targeted projects, 1972

	<i>0-999</i>	<i>1000-1999</i>	<i>2000-2999</i>	<i>3000-3999</i>	<i>4000-4999</i>	<i>5000+</i>
Agencies	47	128	56	64	0	260
Percentage	10.3	6.1	12.3	14.0	0	57.3
Cumulative	10.3	16.4	28.7	42.7	42.7	100.0

Table 12. Distribution of agencies by volumes circulated monthly

group projects conducted special events in or through their libraries. Somewhat surprisingly, a significantly smaller proportion of institutional libraries (41 percent) conducted programs for their residents.

SELF-EVALUATION: FACILITIES

Institutional libraries funded by LSCA rated somewhat low in adequacy of facilities by their project directors. Twenty-five percent of the directors rated facilities better than expected; 7 percent did not rate them as well as expected. Deirdre Donohue, conducting an experimental library project for elderly institutionalized mentally ill in Rhode Island, spoke of the difficulty of facilities for program operations:

It became obvious that building visits would have to be made. . . . The "outreach" effort to the building involves tremendous lugging and hauling of projection equipment. . . . The 16mm projector which weighs about fifty pounds is even heavy for a man to carry. . . . The buildings are back from the parking area and the film program may be presented at the far end of the building.¹⁴

Federal Perspectives

SELF-EVALUATION: FUNDING

It is not unremarkable for librarians to complain of insufficient funds, particularly for materials. In the 1972 survey of LSCA target group projects, it was related staff members who considered that the institutional libraries were operating with insufficient funds. In the four broad categories of agencies studied in the survey, institutional libraries were considered the most deficient in funds. A related criticism from staff was that of inadequate materials. Thirty-one percent thought the library's materials to be insufficient.

SELF-EVALUATION: THE PATRON

To institutionalized persons the library is a haven. Donohue describes this in the report of her investigation:

Beatrice appears to be about 62 years old and she visits the library with Theresa, a 28-year-old chronic mentally ill woman from her building. . . . They are apparently from a closed ward and visit the library while on parole from their ward. Beatrice enjoys listening to music, helps pass out punch, and will look at books with pictures. She will also make simple puzzles with encouragement. . . . Beatrice appears to be a very lonely person and the library seems to offer her a place to go and see people and a place to be busy.¹⁵

In user responses to the national SDC survey, 50 percent of the institutionalized reported the library's function as a reading area to be its highest use. In addition, 50 percent of the respondents visit to obtain the librarian's assistance in obtaining information.

CHANGE IN INSTITUTIONAL LIBRARIES

Change has been the one dominant theme in American society since its foundation — and even prior to it. Whatever the phenomenon we are examining, we seem compelled to attribute change to it. We accept change as beneficial, but change may be difficult to describe. While the status of institutional libraries may be perceived as a continuous alteration for the better, there are difficulties. As record, it is difficult to establish a continuity of change, because the data are discrete and discontinuous.

When one studies the late years of the 1960s and the first half of this decade, the impression arises of inventory-building and inventory-taking. There is a tremendous concern with furnishing libraries with all the things they should have. Many of the standards appeared as lists. As the 1970s progressed, however, more attention was paid to institutional

clientele. Barbara Allen covered the years 1969-1975 in her succinct compendium of LSCA and services to the institutionalized. In her section on the New Mexico State Hospital, she reports:

LSCA has enabled outreach services from the library to wards, and programs such as bibliotherapy and film production which combine therapy and enjoyment. "It has allowed us a freedom in planning programs, since without LSCA we would be totally dependent on regular hospital budgeting which does not normally allow for expanded programming."¹⁶

At the New Mexico State Hospital Library, the agency spent \$22 for books in 1970; \$23 in 1971; nothing in 1972; \$115 in 1973; \$6 in 1974; and \$150 in 1975. In the same 6-year period, the agency spent \$34,439 on salaries and wages — an annual average of \$5740. The state library allocated \$8207 in LSCA funds for supporting planned programs in the period, which is an annual average of \$1368. The hospital's resident population averaged 411 persons. In the period 1969-75, per resident expenditure was \$8.80 annually. Of that amount, LSCA (there were no other federal funds) contributed \$3.33 per resident annually.

At the Villa Solano in New Mexico, the administrator reported that, before LSCA, "We didn't own enough books to warrant setting up a library room." The agency works to educate and train from eighty to ninety moderately retarded school-age boys. Villa Solano has received \$2801 in LSCA funds; it has also received \$5537 in state and other federal program funds.¹⁷

A series of surveys of state library agencies and of institutional libraries was conducted in the early 1970s with the assistance of the Library Services and Construction Act. In tenor they were item surveys. Some notable surveys were conducted by Marion Vedder from her experiences in New York state. The evaluation of the Pilot Library Program of the Louisiana State Library is an example of one of Vedder's comprehensive institutional library evaluations. The Pilot Library Program of Louisiana had, by 1974, implemented a cooperative program between the state library and the individual institution for eleven of the thirty-three eligible institutions.¹⁸

While Vedder constructed a searching enumeration of the libraries' facilities and materials, in the final analysis she showed insight into administrative relationships:

The cooperation of State Library staff and agency administrators was unable to secure and allocate well located and adequate facili-

Federal Perspectives

ties. Nor had they been able to arrive at successful library budgets to insure continuation of library resources and services at the level recommended by national standards and desired by Louisiana residents of institutions. Librarians are too timid or uncertain to prepare an adequate budget. This problem becomes more urgent as institutional libraries go off "Pilot."¹⁹

By 1972, two years prior to the Vedder survey in Louisiana, LSCA had participated in 335 projects assisting institutional libraries. In 1970 there were 34,000 operating institutions. LSCA had managed to touch the equivalent of 1 percent of them with severely limited funds.

CHANGES OF THE PAST, CHANGES OF THE FUTURE

Impending change made the efforts of the 1960s and early 1970s an achievement for a future that did not arrive. So swiftly has impending change occurred, that the *raison d'être* of both the institutional library and the institutional agency is placed on the public policy agenda. The major change of individualization, of moving the impaired into the human circle, of habilitating them as a civic responsibility through education, questions the conventional role of the institutional library. The deinstitutionalization which accompanies this approach promises (or threatens) to secularize the institutionalized and substantially to achieve the devolution of the agencies.

Readers of the institutional surveys and evaluations of the late 1960s and of more recent date are perhaps puzzled over the absence of one word generally missing in the documents: *education*. Its absence has not gone unnoticed; Vinton Smith in his essay called for it:

No consideration is given to integrating the library services with education, habilitation, training, and recreation programs. There are almost no adequate facilities for effective use by mentally or physically handicapped. . . . Only a few institutional libraries for the handicapped are used directly in support of school programs or incorporated into specific training activities.²⁰

Smith's statement should be contrasted with this section of the Education of the Handicapped Act: "It is the purpose of this Act to assure that all handicapped children have available to them . . . a free appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services."²¹

There are 123,000 institutional residents who have had no education. The median educational achievement is 8.7 years; 56 percent did not complete the eighth grade. More than 123,000 persons are unlettered, and

814,589 are functionally illiterate. Any institutional library interested in supporting literacy will know that there is a strong chance that 56 percent of its clientele will have difficulty reading or be unable to read at all.

The institutional population needing schooling is large. There are 635,882 mentally impaired persons in institutions. Of these, 201,992 were persons receiving care in homes and schools for the mentally handicapped. In 1973, 45 of 132 state institutions for the mentally retarded had no libraries. There are 138,931 young persons of conventional school attendance age in custody for mental impairment. Another 22,739 persons are in homes for the physically handicapped, the largest group being the deaf (8911). Of these physically impaired, 5000 are children under the age of ten. Residents of institutions between the ages of 5 and 34 amounted to 629,360 persons. Slightly more than 75 percent (474,000) were not enrolled in any school program. Institutional libraries must provide opportunity for these people.

Barbara Donahue, working in the Shawnee Regional Library Program (Illinois) at the A.L. Bowen Children's Center, reported that in the early fall of 1973, the children could be classified as shown in Table 13. Thirty-three percent of the children were girls; 67 percent were boys. Two-thirds of the children were between fourteen and twenty-one years old.

In 1963 the federal government initiated a new approach to improve the care and treatment of the mentally retarded and the mentally ill. The new approach involved initiatives in supporting an array of community services as an alternative to institutional care. The General Accounting Office of the Congress reported on the program in 1976: "A 1975 State inter-agency committee study of 18 mentally retarded persons in four nursing homes showed that the formal individualized programs for the retarded did not exist. The committee's report indicated that this lack of programming was typical of the nursing homes."²²

In 1969 there was an average of 427,779 persons housed in state mental hospitals on any given day. In 1974, only 237,692 remained. The average daily population had been reduced 44 percent in five years. In the same 5-year period, there had been a 56 percent decrease in the number of older Americans in state institutions on any one day.²³ Nursing homes manage mental patients poorly, largely because of the generally limited number of personnel in nursing homes. There are 5.3 nursing home employees for every 10 patients. The great majority are aides or orderlies who have had no special training, and their turnover rate is 75 percent annually. There are comparatively few registered nurses in nursing homes:

Federal Perspectives

<i>Description</i>	<i>IQ Range</i>	<i>Percentage of Population</i>
Retarded		
Profound	under 20	12.21
Severe	21 to 35	19.25
Moderate "Trainable"	36 to 51	31.92
Mild "Educable"	52 to 67	20.66
Borderline "Educable"	68 to 83	12.21
Emotionally disturbed	over 84	3.76

Table 13. Intelligence rating of children at A.L. Bowen Children's Center
Source: Donahue, Barbara. "The Mentally Retarded Enjoy Libraries Too," *Illinois Libraries* 56:209, March 1974.

about 65,000 for 23,000 homes. The nurses have a 71 percent turnover rate per year.

The impact of deinstitutionalization will place severe strains on institutions of care and their components. The shift to individualization through education will place strong new requirements on institutional libraries and the competencies of their staffing. This paper does not propose recommendations; there are good suggestions now available. One impression is inescapable, however. Probably because of the fragmented nature of institutional library life, there is a need for nodes, i.e. for integrating mechanisms that can strongly, informedly express the needs of the institutionalized in a library professional context. Other voices are crying out the needs of the handicapped; here there is only stillness.

References

1. In this paper, national figures on the institutionalized are principally drawn from U.S. Bureau of the Census. *Census of Population, 1970; Subject Reports: Persons in Institutions and Other Group Quarters*. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1973.
2. For a study of library services to the incarcerated, see: LeDonne, Marjorie. *Survey of Library and Information Problems in Correctional Institutions* (Final Report, Project No. 2-0847, Grant No. OEG-0-72-2531). 4 vols. Berkeley, Institute of Library Research, University of California, Jan. 1974.
3. Butler, Robert N. *Why Survive? Being Old in America*. New York, Harper & Row, 1975, p. 227.
4. Public Law 91-345. "National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act." July 20, 1970. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1971.
5. Smith, F. Vinton, et al. "Library and Information Needs of the Mentally and Physically Handicapped." In National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. *Library and Information Service Needs of the Nation*. Washington, D.C., NCLIS, 1974, p. 211.

6. South Dakota State Department of Education. Division of Elementary and Secondary Education. *Training Library Media Specialists to Serve the Handicapped Student*. Pierre, S.D., State of South Dakota, 1977.
7. McClaskey, Harris C. "Library and Information Needs of the Institutionalized Person." In National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, op. cit., p. 202.
8. Smith, op. cit., p. 214.
9. National Center for Education Statistics. *Survey of Federal Libraries, 1972*. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1972, p. 29.
10. U.S. Bureau of the Census, op. cit., pp. 95-172, Table 35.
11. U.S. Senate. Special Committee on Aging. *Part 2 — Appendixes; Developments in Aging: 1975 and January-May 1976*. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1976, p. 207.
12. U.S. Senate, op. cit., p. 93.
13. System Development Corporation. *Evaluation of LSCA Services to Special Target Groups: Final Report*. D.V. Black, et al., eds. Santa Monica, Calif., SDC, 1973.
14. Donohue, Deirdre A. *An Investigation of Library Services for the Elderly, Institutionalized Mentally Ill to Arrive at an Optimum Program Through the Establishment of a Library for 1,000 Residents With No Present Service. Final Report*. Providence, Rhode Island Department of State Library Services, 1973. (ED087 484)
15. Ibid., p. 11.
16. Allen, Barbara. *LSCA and the Development of Library Services to the Institutionalized in New Mexico, 1969-1975*. Santa Fe, New Mexico State Library, 1976.
17. Ibid., pp. 49-51.
18. Vedder, Marion H. *Louisiana State Library Institutional Library Pilot Program: An Evaluation, November 5-27, 1974*. Schenectady, N.Y., 1975.
19. Ibid.
20. Smith, op. cit., p. 215.
21. Public Law 94-142. "Education for all Handicapped Children Act of 1975." Nov. 29, 1975. Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1977.
22. Comptroller General of the United States. General Accounting Office. *Returning the Mentally Disabled to the Community: Government Needs to do More; Report to the Congress*. Washington, D.C., Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1977, p. 15.
23. U.S. Senate. *Nursing Home Care in the United States: Failure in Public Policy*. 94 Cong., 2 sess., March 1976, p. 718.