

Report of the Committee on the Referral of Reference Inquiries

Reference Librarians Section, ACRL, July 2, 1952

IN THE SPRING of this year a committee was appointed to continue the work of last year's committee, headed by Dr. Burton W. Adkinson, that submitted a Tentative Code for the Handling of Reference Inquiries Received by Mail. The earlier committee reported that although it did not have time to attack the issue of charging fees for reference service, it hoped that the new committee would face this important problem and prepare a set of procedures for study and action.

The committee this year has also concentrated on the code for the handling of reference inquiries received by mail. At one meeting in Baltimore, attended by four of the six members of the committee, and through extensive correspondence, the tentative code of 1951 was reworked and subjected to intensive criticism. In April a new draft was sent to more than one hundred libraries and individuals to get the reactions of many librarians to the idea of such a code and to this draft in particular. In order to get the criticism of those who would most often be on the receiving end in any system of referral of reference inquiries as well as those who might have the most occasion to refer inquiries they receive, the draft was sent to the 45 libraries which are members of the Association of Research Libraries, to 46 state library agencies, to 6 large public libraries not members of the ARL, and to a dozen other individuals whose opinions were thought to be valuable. The response was most impressive and the committee wishes to go on record as showing its appreciation to all those who responded. Ninety-two individual replies, most of which represented the thinking of more than one person, were received. A summary of the opinions and criticisms would be too extensive to incorporate in this report. It was clear, however, that most of the ideas in the code represented practices already in very general use and that the code would make a substantial contribution to reference service. Numerous specific criticisms have contributed to the code in its present form. A statement on the purpose of the code has been incorporated as an

introductory section and becomes an integral part of it.

The committee recommends that the code be adopted by the section and that it be publicized widely through *College and Research Libraries* and other publications that will reach all types of libraries.

The problem of charging fees for reference service was not investigated for two reasons: 1) the entire time and energy of the committee was needed to complete the code for the Handling of Reference Inquiries Received by Mail, and 2) the majority of the members of the present committee was not sympathetic to the idea of fees for reference service. The committee recommends, therefore, that a special committee be established to make this specific study and that representatives of the Detroit Public Library, the John Crerar Library, the library of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the Library of Congress be invited to serve on it. The John Crerar Library is the only library known to the committee to be offering such a service at the present time. These other libraries have shown an active interest in it.

This report and the code for the Handling of Reference Inquiries Received by Mail, herewith, are respectfully submitted by

Miss Mary N. Barton
Miss Gladys F. Blakely
Mrs. Grace H. Fuller
Miss Beulah Mumm
Mr. Walter W. Wright
Miss Lucile M. Morsch, Chairman.

Code for the Handling of Reference Inquiries
Received by Mail

Submitted to the Reference Librarians Section,
Association of College and Research Libraries,
July 2, 1952.

Purpose. This code has been prepared as a guide for the libraries that receive reference inquiries by mail which for one reason or another they cannot satisfy. The most frequent reasons are either that the library receiving the inquiry does not have the necessary resources (either materials or personnel) or that the inquiry is

from a type of correspondent that the receiving library does not attempt to serve. For example, the Library of Congress and other large libraries receive many inquiries from correspondents who might be as well, and in many cases better, served by the public libraries in the home towns of the correspondents. The code is not intended to discourage any library from giving any reference service that it can give. At its discretion, of course, a library may suggest sources to the inquirer instead of referring the inquiry directly. The code provides, however, for the direct referral of inquiries that cannot be satisfied by the receiving library to a logical source of the information requested.

The benefits resulting from the use of the code should be three-fold: the patron will be better served, the library that has failed to make its services known to all the people it is designed to serve will gain new patrons, and the responsibility of the referring library will be met by the proper routing of the inquiry.

I. A library may refer to another library:

- a. Requests from correspondents who apparently have not used their own library resources when there is reason to believe that such resources are adequate to answer the inquiry; e.g., requests from local residents sent to a university library when there is a public library in the town, or requests sent to the Library of Congress from a city or town having a public library or state agency facilities.
- b. Requests from its own patrons (*i.e.*, the people it is designed to serve) when its own facilities are inadequate and it is known that another library has special facilities or competence in the field.

II. A library may refer to a state agency (*i.e.*, state library commission, state extension division, etc.):

- a. Requests from correspondents in that state when they cannot be referred to a specific library and there is reason to believe that the inquiry can be answered or properly referred by the state library agency.
- b. Requests from correspondents in other states when there is reason to believe that unique resources within that state are needed, and the referring library does not know which specific library is equipped to handle it.

III. A library may refer to a government agency or other organization, society or institution:

- a. Requests for information or data in a particular field that cannot be referred to another library or a state library agency (see I and II above) when the

organization to which the inquiry is being referred has special facilities or competence.

- b. Requests that can be satisfied by a publication of the organization that the referring library believes to be available for free distribution.

IV. A library does not refer to another library:

- a. Requests from its own patrons (*i.e.*, the people it is designed to serve) unless its own facilities are inadequate.
- b. Requests that it is uniquely, or best, able to answer to the extent that its own policy permits.
- c. Requests from libraries, unless its own resources are inadequate and another library is known to have better facilities or greater competence in the field of the inquiry.
- d. Requests for information that the inquirer probably ought to obtain through his own efforts (*e.g.*, information for theses and student papers, book reviews, answers to contest questions, etc.) In most instances the inquirer would be advised to utilize the resources of his own local libraries.
- e. Requests for services which libraries generally do not give, such as medical or legal advice, etc.
- f. Requests that cannot be deciphered or are so vague that it would be impossible to answer them without clarification.

V. A library suggests as other sources, without referring the original inquiry:

- a. An individual (his name and address) who is likely to be the best or only source of information needed to answer a serious research question. In exceptional cases, when the individual has agreed to accept such requests the inquiry may be referred directly to him.
- b. An outside research worker (including a library employee working on his own time) or commercial agency, when no fee service is available within the library, and the question would involve an excessive amount of work or special competence not available in the Library (*e.g.*, newspaper searching, genealogical research, preparation of bibliographies, translating, appraising collections of books and art objects, etc.)

VI. When a library refers an inquiry, it notifies the correspondent of the disposition of his request and sends the original inquiry with an explanatory statement to the library or other organization to which the inquiry is being referred.

Brief of Minutes

The ACRL Board of Directors

Meeting June 30, 1952, in New York

Present were officers and directors, section and committee chairmen, ACRL representatives on ALA Council, and several invited guests. President Ellsworth presided. All present had been furnished brief mimeographed reports on the work of most ACRL committees and a detailed report on finances. (These are available on request to ACRL members from the headquarters office.)

Committee on Administrative Procedures. Since the chairman was absent, Mr. Hamlin stated the problem of policy in getting better support for very weak college libraries. It appeared clear that ACRL should not attempt to accredit. It might exert a constructive influence by working with and through existing accrediting organizations.

Committee on Audio-Visual Work. Fleming Bennett reported one-third returns on a questionnaire sent to nearly 2000 institutions regarding their facilities, organization, and programs. Reasons for the delay in returns were discussed.

Committee on Interlibrary Loans. Mrs. Margaret Uridge reported for the chairman that SLA had accepted the new code in principle, as had the American Theological Library Association. The National Association of State Libraries did not vote on the code, and action by the Catholic Library Association was not known. Mr. Ellsworth said that the Association of Research Libraries had accepted the principle of the code but did not pass on the code as a group. (Note: the ACRL Board of Directors had approved the code, which is printed elsewhere in this issue, by a mail vote in May. The code was likewise approved a few days after the meeting by the ALA Council.) As recommended in the committee's report the Board voted to dissolve the Committee on Interlibrary Loans as of August 31, 1952. It was the sense of the meeting that a standing committee on this subject might become moribund, and that other interlibrary loan problems could be handled by another ad hoc committee, to be established when needed.

Buildings Committee. Chairman Robert

Muller reported that the highly successful Library Building Plans Institute held in Columbus had turned in \$226.27 instead of the \$22.27 reported in the document. He requested budget provision (\$500.00) to pay expenses of a few people who had no personal reason for attending the next institute. Mr. Ellsworth thought the members of the former Cooperative Committee had stayed away from Columbus out of courtesy. Experts were stated to grow like weeds, and a new crop was always coming along. *College and Research Libraries* for January 1953 will be largely a buildings issue.

Committee on Constitution and By-Laws. Mr. Kelley reported the revisions in the constitution which were later approved at the ACRL Membership Meeting (see minutes of the membership meeting). The committee felt that separation of the ALA and ACRL fiscal years was not good, or should be studied further.

Committee on Duplicates Exchange Union. Since no committee member was present, Mr. Hamlin said that the Union appeared to be performing a useful function to a group of smaller libraries.

Committee on Financing COLLEGE AND RESEARCH LIBRARIES. Miss Herrick stressed the need for advertising revenue if membership distribution is to be continued. She felt a great deal more could be done in the library equipment field, and requested people to speak up for advertising in *College and Research Libraries* when placing orders with nonadvertisers. Mr. Tauber said the advertisements were coming in so well that the executive secretary thought the October issue should have 16 extra pages. He knew that more ads could be obtained from publishers. The question of a business manager was to be discussed by the editor, incoming president, and secretary. Mr. Hamlin briefly described some inconclusive communications with the Canadian Library Association concerning bulk distribution of *College and Research Libraries* to its members on a cost basis.

Committee to Study Materials for Instruc-

tion in the Use of the Library. The request of the chairman that the committee be dismissed was accepted by the Board. Its full report (available on loan only from ACRL Headquarters) showed that different methods of teaching library use required divergent and original materials.

Committee on Membership. No report was presented because this committee terminates its activity in July, by a previous vote of the Board. Mr. Severance spoke briefly on progress with the new ACRL state representatives. He was seeking the right person to direct this work. As a Southerner he was particularly aware of the need for ACRL to operate on the state and local level. As rapidly as possible key people are being selected as state representatives.

Committee on Publications. Mr. Hamlin noted the remarkable progress made with the *ACRL Monographs* series under the leadership of David Maxfield.

Committee on Recruiting. The need for the committee was questioned since the subject was covered by the Joint Committee on Library Work as a Career, but no action taken. The possible usefulness of fraternities in recruiting was discussed. Mr. Lyle described the large national meeting of Alpha Beta Alpha in the spring and praised its founder, Eugene Watson.

Research Planning Committee. Chairman Kaplan reported that the application for funds for a research planning conference had been turned down. No one had been found to do a study of the relative desirability of full-time or part-time faculty in library schools. Mr. Naeseth might undertake the study of thesis topics in cataloging (with regard to current cataloging problems). Some interest had been aroused in a proposed series of manuals in various subject fields studied from the point of view of cataloging, reference, classification, etc. *College and Research Libraries* would publish a list of research in progress on college and reference topics (see elsewhere in this issue). Mr. Kaplan was much interested in problems brought to the committee by ACRL Headquarters and the outgoing chairman. The committee was helping in efforts to secure foundation funds for a series of experimental projects. It had persuaded Mr. Jesse to do a study of the influence on library planning of the defunct Cooperative Committee on Library Building

Plans. The committee was to consider three research projects presented by Columbia University Library staff members (*Use of Microprint in Relation to the Storage Library* by Miles O. Price; *Catalog Use: Theory and Fact* by Carlyle J. Frarey; and *Federal Documents: Cost of Processing Copies Received on Deposit* by Fleming Bennett with Anne S. Sauter and Raissa Silverman). Mr. Kaplan felt the presentation of problems such as these was a long step toward finding the people to make the studies.

Committee on Statistics. Chairman G. Flint Purdy commented on the usefulness of January publication of the statistics. Earlier publication was a marked improvement although accuracy and analysis both suffer. Compilations had included only a small number of Catholic institutions because their financial statistics were considered not comparable. Mr. Purdy now withdrew from that position and planned to include more Catholic institutions. In the past statistical forms had been sent to many libraries not included in the published lists, in order to build up a file for research at headquarters. Since the file had been used very little, he suggested the list might be restricted and this objective eliminated. Mr. Lyle spoke out strongly against withholding information as confidential, particularly salary data. In most cases the librarian is responsible, and he sometimes classes as confidential data that is public information in state documents. Discussion centered on this evil and methods of combating it. Mr. Hamlin mentioned the increased activity of state associations in collecting statistics on all colleges. These groups looked to ACRL for leadership and for statistical blanks. Mr. Purdy felt that his committee could handle this additional work. Several present expressed high praise of the statistics.

Brief reports were made by ACRL representatives on various joint committees. In response to questions, Mr. Wright commented on the progress being made by the Council of National Library Associations on (1) standardization of transliteration of the Cyrillic alphabet, (2) library education as it relates to special libraries, (3) protection of cultural and scientific resources, and (4) promoting the acceptance of standing orders by the Superintendent of Documents.

In response to questions about his work, Mr. Hamlin reported periods of occasional

discouragement. Progress of ACRL outside the home office was slow, and recognition at ALA Headquarters of ACRL or other divisional programs seemed slight. It was perhaps natural but regrettable that ALA staff should be interested in and support central ALA activities at the expense of divisional programs, which are just as much warp and woof of the ALA program.

In spite of the heavy deficit budgeted the previous year, ACRL would probably end the year safely in the black (see Brief of Minutes of the Membership Meeting). Membership losses from increased ALA dues were less than expected, probably because of membership distribution of *College and Research Libraries*. In February the divisions were given to understand that any increased revenue from memberships would be shared by ALA at the time of the July Conference, but action had been postponed until October. The Board discussed the problem of budget for the year ahead when the basis of support for both the past and future years remained uncertain. Doubt was expressed of the wisdom of having the ACRL Executive Secretary located at ALA Headquarters instead of on a university campus. (Adjourned.)

Meeting July 3, 1952 in New York

Present were officers and directors and several guests. In the absence of Treasurer Shaw, Mr. Ellsworth, who presided, and Mr. Hamlin had jointly prepared a tentative budget, copies of which were distributed (reproduced here as amended and adopted).

Initial query was why the proposed budget didn't balance. Mr. Hamlin said that income was conservatively estimated and included no provision for funds other than membership. Over \$2000 was coming to ACRL from other sources in 1951/52. There is every indication that ACRL will receive a good deal more than \$18,000.00 for the current year. Membership distribution of the journal should increase receipts from dues a good deal in the next twelve months. Mr. Hamlin explained the T.I.A.A. income figure as the sum he paid to ACRL for his retirement. This was matched by the ACRL, of course, and paid out to T.I.A.A. It was not true income, but the treasurer thought the matter best handled in this way.

Under expenditures, Mr. Hamlin explained that the separate budget for *College and Re-*

search Libraries had not yet been drawn up. \$3,750.00 was a maximum figure and would probably be reduced considerably. Careful estimates would be presented to the directors at Midwinter.

As the sums allotted the sections and committees were read off, it was noted that some of these groups might not need any funds and that a sizeable sum always reverts at the end of the year. The large sum of \$700.00 for the Publications Committee will finance further issues of the *ACRL Monographs* and is in a sense a loan as the group is budgeting an expected \$700.00 of income from the same committee. As an economy, Mr. Maxfield planned to bill only once a year for standing orders. Initial expenses of the *Monographs* might seem large, but the series was paying its way and providing a great service.

President Ellsworth explained the \$850.00 allotted to General Administrative Expense as partly for the president's travel on ACRL business, for the treasurer's travel if needed, for speakers at the ACRL general session, and, of course, for unforeseen eventualities. Mr. McAnally commented on the importance of having the president and executive secretary travel, and felt it was not sufficiently known that they had funds for the purpose.

Mr. Hamlin stated that the salary figure was determined by the ALA classification and pay plan (staff of two plus part-time clerical help). Discussion was critical of the classifications. It was voted that the incoming president negotiate with Mr. Clift on the matter of increasing the salaries of Mrs. Shepherd and Mr. Hamlin. It was also suggested he consult with the Public Libraries Division regarding the salaries of ACRL personnel.

Mr. Hamlin requested direction regarding attendance at P.N.L.A. at Victoria in September, an expensive trip. He was told to go there as well as to Southeastern in Atlanta.

The budget was formally adopted as discussed and amended (see printed version).

President Ellsworth sought advice on the method to be followed in preparing future budgets, but none was forthcoming.

Mr. Hamlin questioned the wisdom of keeping a balance of nearly \$10,000.00 in a checking account. He felt a part of this ought to be in a readily available investment, perhaps a savings account, where it would earn interest. With care ACRL might get

3% safely. The new treasurer and the executive secretary were requested to negotiate the matter.

Mr. Hamlin requested direction about the annual report. Last year he had prepared a full ACRL report, which included something from each section and committee chairman. The product of more than a score of people, the document was long and dull. It was therefore mimeographed, sent to officers and chairmen, and made available to the membership only on request. If the report had not made such dreary reading, he would have published it in the official journal. Comment was unanimous that the report should be in *College and Research Libraries*. Mr. Hamlin was directed to synthesize and summarize the reports of other officers in an attempt to get uniform style and reader interest. Full reports from chairmen should be loaned on request.

Discussion turned to ACRL chapters. The status of the New Jersey Library Association's College and University Section as a chapter of ACRL was in doubt. The Board solved any question by a formal vote that it be established as an ACRL chapter. The first chapter, in the Philadelphia area, had been voted in the previous fall. South-eastern's college section was weighing the pros and cons of affiliation. ACRL did not require or want elaborate chapter organization. It was a device to bring the national organization closer to individual members. A chapter ought to be able to call on national committees and national officers for cooperation, just as they in turn might get cooperation from the chapters. The usefulness of SLA chapters was cited by Mr. McAnally as a lesson for ACRL.

The research projects under development through the headquarters office which required foundation support were briefly reviewed. A group of librarians had met in Chicago for the better part of a day to discuss the selective bibliography proposal sponsored by Mr. Pargellis. The Board appropriated \$500.00 (if needed) to match the \$500.00 appropriated by the American Council of Learned Societies for continuing study of the proposal of a selective catalog upon which Mr. Hamlin, Mr. Pargellis, and others have been working.

Finally, the Board members turned again to the problem of divisional financial support by ALA. President Ellsworth stated that nothing more would be known about the new dues scale and allotments until after the ALA fiscal year had closed. Another year of waiting seemed to be the only practical course. Mr. Hamlin was queried on the possibility of accepting associates in ACRL who would help support the division, but who would not be members. This was a possible and admittedly radical proposal to equalize the present situation whereby ALA accepts membership dues of which no portion goes to the divisions. It seemed only fair that the divisions should likewise be free to accept support from individuals who are interested only in them. Misunderstanding or error was primarily responsible for the large number of cases of college people who belonged to ALA and to no division. Any time put in on checking these memberships, particularly institutional memberships, to see whether or not allotment to ACRL had been made, was unproductive labor. The Board felt that the revenue involved was important and voted that the executive secretary is instructed by the Board of Directors to make a study of ALA membership records to determine what colleges and universities with institutional memberships in ALA are not ACRL members, so these institutions may be reminded to allot to ACRL.

It was agreed that Mr. Ellsworth as the about-to-be past president should recommend names for inclusion in *Who's Who in America*, and Board members were invited to give him their personal recommendations.

ALA's new attitude against programs at the Midwinter Meeting was criticized and policy for ACRL considered. What would Midwinter be without any programs at all? The policy was unfair to the rank and file, many of whom could attend Midwinter but not a distant annual conference. ACRL officers would inevitably be criticized because the new ALA policy has not been given much publicity. There was general expression of opinion in favor of some ACRL program meetings at Midwinter in 1953. Mr. Severance and Mr. Hamlin promised to write section chairmen about programs. (Adjourned.)

—Arthur T. Hamlin, Executive Secretary.

ACRL Budget as Discussed, Amended, and Adopted—1952-53

INCOME

ALA allotments to ACRL from dues	\$.18,000.00
Executive Secretary, TIAA premium dues	360.00
ACRL Monographs	700.00
Total	\$.19,060.00

EXPENDITURES

<i>College and Research Libraries</i> subvention	\$ 3,750.00
Annual conference expenses	250.00
Council of Natl. Library Assocs. dues	10.00
CNLA American Standards Committee Z39	5.00
Joint Committee on Library Work as a Career	50.00
Cooperative Committee Bldgs. Study Expenses	200.00
ACRL Monographs	700.00

Section Expenses:

College	75.00
Junior College	100.00
Pure and Applied Science	100.00
Reference	100.00
Teacher Training	75.00
University	75.00

Committee Expenses:

Administrative Procedures	\$ 25.00
Audio-Visual	50.00
Buildings	525.00
Constitution and By-Laws	25.00
Duplicates Exchange	25.00
Financing <i>College and Research Libraries</i>	50.00
Prep. and Qual. for Librarianship	25.00
Publications (See <i>ACRL Monographs</i>)	
Committee on Selective Bibliography (Pargellis Proposal)	500.00
Statistics	150.00

Officers' Expenses:

President	25.00
Treasurer	50.00
General Adm. Exp. including Travel	850.00
Executive Secretary TIAA	720.00

Executive Office Expenses:

Salaries (2½), social security, etc.	12,350.00
Travel Expenses of Executive Secretary	1,000.00
Addressograph Plates	125.00
New Office Equipment	100.00
Communications, Supplies, etc.	500.00

Total\$22,585.00

Adopted July 3, 1952.

Preprint of the Annual Statistics

The annual college and university library statistics will appear in the January 1953 issue of *C&RL*. Pre-prints will also be sold at fifty cents each as a convenience to any librarian who needs the figures early for budget or other purposes. The pre-prints will be in galley proof form. It is hoped that they can be mailed before December 31, but that date is not guaranteed. Any who wish these galley proof pre-prints should send a note to that effect to the ACRL headquarters, The American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago 11, Illinois, and enclose with the order fifty cents in stamps, coin or check.

ACRL Committee on Audio-Visual Work

The ACRL Committee on Audio-Visual Work undertook a census of audio-visual services last spring. Its questionnaire was mailed to the librarians of institutions of higher education all over the United States. In many cases librarians undoubtedly had to forward the questionnaire to the heads of other departments where audio-visual materials were handled.

It is hoped that any who were overlooked in the mailing will notify the chairman, who will be glad to supply a copy of the questionnaire. He, in turn, hopes that all those who have not yet returned the completed questionnaire will do so at once so that the Committee can make its findings and proceed with other constructive work. Questionnaires and correspondence should be addressed to: Fleming Bennett, chairman, University of Arizona Library, Tucson.

ACRL Business Meeting

Brief of the Minutes

July 2, 1952, New York

The annual business meeting followed the general session, which was addressed by Dr. Judah Goldin and President Ralph E. Ellsworth. In the absence of Treasurer Shaw, Mr. Hamlin spoke briefly on the financial situation of ACRL. The latest figures available on the ALA books were only for March 31. Not included were many items of expense incurred before that date. He had prepared careful estimates, however, which indicated that the budgeted deficit for the year (more than \$5,000.00) was turning into a modest credit balance. Income for the year (\$16,300.00 on budget estimates) would be well above \$20,000.00. Expenditures (\$21,300.00 on initial budget; more added during the year) would not be greatly in excess of \$19,000.00. These balances were caused by the development of income sources other than membership dues (nearly 15% of the total for 1951-52), and by frugality on the part of all in the use of authorized funds.

Membership distribution of *College and Research Libraries* could be reported as more successful than anticipated even though it was to begin only then with the July issue. The Association had weathered a year of operation without benefit of the usual subscription funds, which are paid in advance. It had good advertising support, and the new policy was undoubtedly building up ACRL membership and membership receipts.

The *ACRL Monographs* have sold very well. In a year or two they will probably represent an important accomplishment. The system of state representatives for ACRL, which begins this fall, may do a great deal

to bring the national Association closer to the individual member and to make it more useful to the individual. Two ACRL chapters are now in existence, the Philadelphia chapter and the New Jersey state chapter. Finally, members should feel very free to write to their ACRL office in Chicago which has a genuine interest in and concern for any professional problems, large and small, of the membership.

President Ellsworth announced the election returns (see page facing Cover II for names of the newly elected officers).

Mr. Kelley of the Committee on Constitution and By-Laws presented an item of business which had originated at the previous annual meeting and proposed a constitutional amendment. It was felt that present provisions gave too much authority to the committee. In this the Board of Directors and the committee concurred and recommended that certain deletions be made in the Constitution to remedy the fault.

On the motion of Mr. Kelley it was unanimously voted that the phrase "upon a written recommendation of the Committee on Constitution and By-Laws appointed by the President" be deleted from Article IX and from Article X of the ACRL Constitution. (Note: To become effective the amendment must be published in *College and Research Libraries* prior to the next annual meeting and again approved by a two-thirds majority of members then present.) The meeting adjourned.

Arthur T. Hamlin, Executive Secretary.

Library Building Plans Institute

Tentative plans for the Second Library Building Plans Institute sponsored by the ACRL Library Buildings Committee are being made. If sufficient interest is expressed, the Institute will be held on February 1 and 2 at the Edgewater Beach Hotel in Chicago as a preconference activity of the 1953 Midwinter Meeting of the American Library Association.

Librarians interested in presenting their plans for criticism or in attending the Institute are asked to write immediately to Howard Rovelstad, Member, ACRL Buildings Committee, University of Maryland Library, College Park, Maryland.