

Association of Southeastern Research Libraries

MINUTES, SEPTEMBER 10-11, 1965

AMID the famous "Marshes of Glynn," the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries held its 1965 annual meeting at the Corsair Motel, Jekyll Island, Georgia, on September 10-11. Twenty librarians, representing as many libraries of universities in the region which offer the doctorate, as well as state libraries holding important research collections, attended the conference. This meeting marks the first time since ASERL was organized in 1956 that it has met independently of ALA or SELA conventions.

The two day conference was presided over by Guy R. Lyle (Emory University), currently serving as chairman of ASERL.

The first session was called to order at 9 o'clock, Friday morning, September 10. I. T. Littleton (North Carolina State University) made a statement on the work he had done in compiling the *Manual of Policy Statements*, previously distributed to members, indicating that three criteria had been used in selecting statements to be included: (1) representativeness, (2) completeness of statement, and (3) interest. There was general agreement that no effort should be made to keep the *Manual* up-to-date, although a revised edition might be desirable in ten or fifteen years. Appreciation was expressed to Mr. Littleton and to his secretary, Mrs. Janie Yarborough, for performing the task of preparing the *Manual*.

Jerrold Orne (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill) reported on his efforts to clarify membership requirements for librarians in the American Association of University Professors. He stated that he had had the assistance of A. F. Kuhlman and R. B. Downs in preparing a composite statement on the subject, which has been presented to Robert Van Waes, membership chairman of AAUP, who will present it to

Committee F of AAUP in mid-September. Dr. Orne stated his conviction that AAUP membership should be open to librarians solely as librarians, without restriction on the basis of academic, faculty, or other arbitrary classification.

The session then considered, under the leadership of Stanley West (University of Florida), substituting for Archie McNeal (University of Miami), common problems relating to public services. Xeroxing and other photocopying devices and services, charges for photocopying services, reference service during late evening and weekend hours, and library orientation classes, were among topics discussed informally. A report on interlibrary loan procedures, prepared by Mrs. Emeline Staples (Louisiana State University), and presented by Theodore McMullen was received as information. The first session adjourned at noon.

The second session of the conference convened at 8:30 Friday evening at which time David Kaser (Joint University Libraries) led the discussion on common problems relating to acquisitions. Procedures for checking and ordering from antiquarian bookdealers' catalogs, checking library holdings against standard bibliographies, choice of jobbers, standing orders for university press books, and selection of fiction were among topics dealt with. Two items of information from The United States Book Exchange: "What Is USBE," and "Current Periodical Distribution Service" were distributed and discussed. Members were asked to comment directly to Miss Ball (USBE) their interest in the Current Periodical Distribution Service. A written report from Olive Branch (University of Tennessee) on the Foreign Newspaper Project was received as information. On motion of Jerrold Orne, seconded by Porter Kellam (University of Georgia), the chairman of ASERL was instructed to investigate the possibility, by whatever means deemed appropriate, of

securing a grant under Title II of Senate Bill 600 (now in Conference Committee) for the purpose of acquiring cooperatively files of domestic and foreign materials unavailable in the region.

Benjamin Powell (Duke) led a discussion of common problems relating to personnel. Vacations, work week, recruiting, time for writing and research, and performance ratings were discussed. David Kaser moved, seconded by Stanley West, that the chairman appoint a committee to compile a manual of personnel policies to supplement I. T. Littleton's compilation of policy statements. Unanimously passed. The second session adjourned at 11:00 p.m., Friday.

The third session convened at 9:00 a.m. R. W. Greenwood (Tulane) distributed copies of a list of *Major Microform Holdings of ASERL Members, 1965*, a revision of the 1963 original list. Extra copies of this list are available and may be secured from Tulane University library.

Porter Kellam then presented a report on his compilation of *Statistics of the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries*, copies of which were distributed to members. Discussion followed on standardization of statistics. There was general agreement that U.S. Office of Education blanks could be used for reporting purposes. September 1-15 was the date agreed upon for the collection of statistical data, which Mr. Kellam agreed to edit again next year.

Ray Hummel, Jr. (Virginia state library) presented four proposals for bibliographical projects which might be undertaken by ASERL. The first of these proposals was to prepare a "Guide to Distinguished Collections" in the region. After lengthy discussion and debate, Jerrold Orne moved, seconded by David Kaser, that the chairman investigate this proposal further with the authority to approach a foundation, the implication being that with adequate funding and personnel, the ASERL would endorse such a proposal.

The second bibliographical project suggested was a "Survey of Series of Southeastern State Documents in Southeastern Libraries." The consensus seemed to be that the first step should be for ASERL to urge

appropriate committees in each of the states represented to make efforts to bring state documents under bibliographic control in states where this is not now accomplished. It was pointed out that Florida, Louisiana, and Virginia are now adequately covered bibliographically.

The third bibliographical project advanced was to prepare a "Union List of Serial Publications of Foreign Governments." Benjamin Powell stated that the Association of Research Libraries may undertake such a project on a national scale within the foreseeable future. Jerrold Orne moved, seconded by Frank Shirk (V.P.I.) that this proposal be kept as a live one in ASERL, but that action on it be delayed at present. Unanimously passed.

The final bibliographical proposal, enthusiastically received, was for the preparation of a *Checklist of Southern Broad-sides through 1876*. It was reported that Virginia state library, University of Georgia, Duke University, and University of North Carolina now have in various stages of preparation checklists of their own holdings of this material. On motion of Benjamin Powell, seconded by Stanley West, the project was approved. The chairman was directed to take such steps as are necessary to get the work underway.

Benjamin Powell reported that the Midwest Inter-Library Center was changing its function from a repository of little-used material to one of acquiring cooperatively research resources of interest to American scholarship nationally. He stated that the Association of Research Libraries has under consideration a proposal for expanding the cooperative acquisition function of MILC which might be supported by federal funds and contributions from research libraries throughout the country.

The fourth session convened at 9:00 p.m., Saturday. Steve Furth, in charge of all information retrieval activities for IBM in the United States, assisted by Paul M. Cousins, Jr. (Emory), presented a summary of recent developments in library application of data processing. The meeting adjourned at 10:30 p.m.—J. Mitchell Reames, University of South Carolina. ■ ■

51st Conference of Eastern College Librarians

SEVERAL HUNDRED academic librarians made their annual trek to Harkness auditorium in the Butler library at Columbia University at 10 A.M. on Saturday, November 27, for the fifty-first Conference of Eastern College Librarians. Program chairman for the day was Rice Estes, librarian of Pratt Institute.

The morning session, with Jack Dalton presiding, concerned "Current State-Wide Library Developments." Opening speaker was James E. Skipper, executive secretary of the Association of Research Libraries, who reviewed recent developments on "The National Scene." Most such developments have grown out of (1) rapid advances in science; (2) the acceptance of federal support of local libraries; and (3) the recognition of information as a national resource. These factors have precipitated important recent changes in the national information picture, such as new directions being proposed by COSATI, Intrex, and INTERCOM. The Higher Education Act of 1965, the Medical Library Assistance Act, and the State Technical Services Act are already enacted, and new legislation is expected soon in the field of international education, all of which have important meaning for any information network, whether on the local, state, regional, or national level.

The development of a state plan for Connecticut was described by Walter Brahm, director of the Connecticut state library. Efforts there date from a 1948 survey, primarily of public libraries. As a result of subsequent recommendations, two regional centers were established. Increased attention to state library problems during the 1960's have culminated during the past twelve months in several important items of library legislation, including laws which coordinate all state library efforts under a state library committee, and which develop a new basis for funding library activities. Energies are now being directed to consolidate and effect these important recent gains.

New York's achievements and prospects as regards a statewide library plan were presented by Morris Gelfand, librarian of Queens College. A major achievement has been the successful application of a systems concept to public library development in the state. The extension of this concept to academic and special libraries awaits legislation and funding, but when completed it will comprise a comprehensive system for all libraries and readers in the state. Dr. Gelfand enumerated the well-nigh incredible array of recent surveys, studies, proposals, and cooperative efforts, all of which have been helpful. Great shortages continue in reference and research libraries in the state, but they can be overcome through the application of state, regional, and national systems.

Norman Stevens, associate librarian of Rutgers University, presented current statewide library thinking in New Jersey. Based primarily upon a study made in 1962/63, a plan was adopted by the New Jersey Library Association in late 1964. The plan urges: (1) a statewide network, and (2) adequate funding. Total implementation will require some \$30 million, excluding amounts needed in academic libraries, but initial steps have already been taken toward putting the plan into effect. Current thinking is that the four largest libraries in the state will serve as a capstone to the system, with special requests being referred to them on some rational basis. Some questions concerning the involvement of academic libraries in the network remain to be answered.

Following a period of vigorous, interested questioning and answering, conferees repaired to various dining rooms in the neighborhood for lunch and for informal continuation of discussion in small *ad hoc* groups.

The afternoon session, chaired by Richard Logsdon, concerned "Books and Publishing." Mrs. Elizabeth Janeway departed

from her announced topic of "The Novelist Today" to discuss authors' thoughts concerning the proposed revision of the copyright law (HR4347). They like the proposition to extend the period of protection, and would prefer it to be the lifetime of the author plus fifty years. She felt that the major problem facing revisors of the law, however, is to effect some kind of author protection from technological advances in library photocopying. In effect, she pointed out, libraries are already acting as short-run supplemental publishers, and this is all to the good if authors benefit from this extension into new markets. She invited the library profession to lend its support to a licensing provision in the new law which would guarantee a financial return to authors for library copying of their works.

Peter Jennison, executive director of the National Book Committee, then spoke on "What's Wrong with Book Publishing Today." He called for constant scrutiny of the social function of the publishing industry to assure its continuing value to society. Although society has not chosen, for example, to make adult trade book publishing a profitable venture, no one would seriously question its right to continue. Many problems are arising from the rapidly increasing number of titles being published in this country annually. In part at least this in-

crease may be attributed to the likelihood that there are today more ways of subsidizing a writing career than there have been in times past. At any rate, today's major problem seems more to be a shortage of serious readers than of good writers. Problems continue in the areas of censorship, in book advertising, and in book distribution.

The closing speaker was M. M. Oberlander, president of The Faraday Press, Inc., who described "Trends in Soviet Scientific Publishing." The ignorance of Soviet scientific literature among American scientists, thinks Dr. Oberlander, is widespread and inexcusable. The reverse of this proposition, however, is not true, due to major and successful Soviet efforts to develop a network system around VINITI to get the world's scientific literature into the hands of Soviet scientists in some usable form. Not only are important breakthroughs taking place in Soviet science, but also Soviet abstracting techniques and practices are being constantly refined and improved more rapidly than American techniques are advancing.

Again a healthy question-answer period ensued, following which the delegates were adjourned to reconvene shortly thereafter in the school of library service for a reception sponsored by the school and the Columbia University libraries.—D. K. ■■

NOT TOO ACADEMIC

(Continued from page 39)

room by way of the several very long steel ladders that were the only way there, and asked the captain. "He hasn't been down there in fifteen years!" Then what good is he? "He gets good officers to serve under him and there is nothing he doesn't know about the engines and how to keep them going. He's invaluable." I don't recommend that librarians sit in their offices sipping Scotch (at least not all the time), but I think there is something to be said for the chief's methods.

The separation of duties is not, as I said earlier, an easy job. But it must be done. We must exercise the same care in recruiting good nonprofessionals (paying them decent salaries and according them the dignity due their work) and students as we do in recruiting professionals. We must institute adequate inservice training for them. And, finally, we must persuade the profession to abandon the comfortable prejudices of the past and, most of all, persuade our colleagues to learn to trust in the abilities of others to work under their professional tutelage and supervision. ■■

ACRL Grants Committee Awards

SIXTY-SIX colleges and universities were awarded funds by the ACRL Grants Committee at its meetings late in November. These total \$52,900. In addition twelve institutions received equipment grants from the Library Bureau of Remington Office Systems Division, Sperry Rand Corp., valued at \$8,000. No grants were made this year for research projects.

Principal support for the monetary grants came, as in previous years, from the United States Steel Foundation, Inc. Other contributors were: McGraw Hill, Inc.; the Olin Mathieson Charitable Trust; Pitney Bowes, Inc.; Time, Inc.; and the H. W. Wilson Foundation.

According to an agreement with the U.S. Steel Foundation, \$20,000 was used to help build the general book collections of southern colleges and universities which are below ALA standards. With additional U.S. Steel funds the committee is providing to certain of these institutions consultant assistance for the problem of book selection.

A great many applications were for non-Western materials, for which nine grants were made. Another frequently expressed need was for portions of the Library of Congress or National Union Catalog, for which there are five grants. Six awards were made for science, five for history, six for journal needs not limited to one field, and three for collections of recordings. The other grants are spread over a wide variety of subject fields.

The unsuccessful applicant may well ask why his grant for non-Western materials or the National Union Catalog was not supported as were similar requests from other institutions. The hard fact is that four out of five applications must be turned down for lack of funds. The process of selection is entirely on the vote of the majority of the committee members. The factors involved change slightly year by year with the composition of the committee and its collective experience, and are too complicated for analysis. However a brief summary of the operating procedure used last November may be of interest.

Each committee member had studied, prior to the meetings, all 373 applications coming from nearly every state in the

Union. This is no small task. Each application was graded individually from A to D, but no individual was to give more than thirty A's and thirty B's.

As each application came up for consideration a show of hands was requested for the A's, B's, etc. given to it. If there were four A's it was "in" at once, subject to discussion of amount and focus. But if it was unlucky enough to receive four D's, out it went, generally without discussion.

While this procedure resulted in some assignments and some eliminations, the major work came on the second go-round. As each institution came up, the chairman read off the grades assigned. An application that had a strongly favorable vote, perhaps two A's, four B's, two C's, would then get careful group evaluation. In some cases twenty minutes or more would be devoted to a single application. On the other hand the application that was heavy on the D end of the scale often was greeted with a curt motion "to scratch."

No attention was given to geographical spread, types of institutions receiving grants, etc. until the main work had been done. The committee then did some checking to make sure the chairman's home state was not overly rewarded, and that all the grants had not gone to Alaska or Nevada. Whatever spread there may be by type of institution, size, location, etc., came naturally.

As the committee dug into the applications various individual preferences and prejudices were freely aired and freely discussed. Funds for binding? How does binding forward undergraduate education? Normally this is considered an expense to be met by the regular operating budget. The announcement of the program in the September issue of *College and Research Libraries* had warned that grants were almost never made for salaries, for binding, or for equipment except that provided by Library Bureau.

Or take *Chemical Abstracts*. Here is a small, struggling institution with a set covering the past twenty years. With the annual indexes does it really need the decennial indexes, or could the money go for some better purpose? If this request for

a run of the National Union Catalog is supported, can the institution purchase another necessary portion? A request for early journal files in history or literature generally was favored over a similar request in technology or the physical sciences.

Some applications were by their very nature hopeless. For example, here is a request for a sum in excess of the total amount at the committee's disposal, and another so vague that no one present could decipher the exact purpose for which it was intended.

A few institutions suffered because it was known that their acquisition needs were then receiving strong special help from other foundations. Other applications received low votes by several committee members because they were for the support of new programs which had already been started with no apparent provision for the basic books and journals. This was considered improvidence.

A good many criteria had been discussed at preceding Midwinter and annual conference meetings of the committee, but no formal guidelines voted. Each committee member had these informal criteria before him as he studied his set of applications prior to the meeting. Then when the committee came together it spent some time discussing its ground rules. It decided that for this year research grants, if any, would be made only to ALA members. It voted to question seriously any application from a very small institution, tentatively set at an enrollment below four hundred. It expressed itself as generally not favoring grants to institutions which had already been helped by the program four times, and in the discussions a few applications which were teetering toward acceptance were rejected on the basis of "They've had three grants in the past five years," or something similar. In other words the committee sought to spread the grants. It also voted against grants to institutions with a record of poor library support.

The financial data supplied were often as extraordinary as a Loch Ness monster in the Chicago River. Here is an institution with a library salary expenditure of, say, \$20,000 and a book expenditure of, say, \$12,000 but a total library expenditure of \$25,000. In other cases institutions reportedly spent more on their libraries than the whole amount spent for all educational

and general purposes. The committee does not, of course, disapprove of such policy! In too many cases data supplied looked questionable. Perhaps this is the new mathematics; otherwise librarians should do better.

Inevitably each committee member was occasionally in the position of voting "A" on an application which was rated "D" by the majority, or vice versa. However in only isolated cases was any individual dissatisfied with the majority opinion after full discussion.

Many applications made commitments to match grants, if awarded, by gifts from outside the library budget. It is hoped that some of these institutions will still be able to get assistance from outside sources even though no grant is received.

The chairman was deeply involved in the negotiations which led to the setting up of the Grants Program in 1955, with \$30,000 provided by the United States Steel Foundation. He hopes and believes that the program has made important contributions to college libraries beyond the actual sum of over \$600,000 distributed in the past eleven years. The work of identifying need and its presentation to a college president must have a beneficial effect. The publicity given the grants draws public attention to this important aspect of higher education. While private donors have for centuries supported individual library collections, there had previously been no recognition of this general need by tax sources or foundations, except in the most isolated cases. Support went rather to administrations, which were entrusted with its use for general institutional needs. It is believed that the modest ACRL annual program was a factor in the development of federal recognition of library acquisition needs in the Higher Education Act.

The committee is already studying the direction that the program should take if the \$50,000,000, authorized but not yet appropriated by the national government, is made available for the building up of library collections. On one point it is emphatic, and that is that the need for philanthropic support of libraries will remain as great as ever.

Members of the ACRL Grants Committee for 1965/66 are: George M. Bailey, ACRL executive secretary (ex officio); Humphrey G. Bousfield, chief librarian,

Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, N.Y.; Helen M. Brown, librarian, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass. (ex officio); Miss Johnnie E. Givens, head librarian, Austin Peay State College, Clarksville, Tenn.; Mark M. Gormley, director of libraries, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wis.; Rev. Vincent R. Negerbon, librarian, St. Francis College, Loretto, Pa.; M. D. Sprague, librarian, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee Institute, Ala.; Arthur T. Hamlin, university librarian, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, chairman.

1965/66 ACRL GRANTS AWARDS

Anderson College, Anderson, Ind., \$800.
 Augustana College, Sioux Falls, S.D., \$850.
 Bennett College, Greensboro, N.C., \$1,000.
 Berry College, Mount Berry, Ga., \$1,000.
 Bethel College, McKenzie, Tenn., \$1,200.
 Bethune-Cookman College, Daytona Beach, Fla., \$750.
 Bishop College, Dallas, Tex., \$1,500.
 Bradley University, Peoria, Ill., \$500.
 Bridgewater College, Bridgewater, Va., \$900.
 California Lutheran College, Thousand Oaks, Calif., \$600.
 Claflin College, Orangeburg, S.C., \$1,000.
 Clarke College, Dubuque, Iowa, \$600.
 College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore, Md., \$500.
 College of Our Lady of the Elms, Chicopee, Mass., \$600.
 Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., \$1,000.
 Elmira College, Elmira, N.Y., \$1,000.
 Florida Memorial College, St. Augustine, Fla., \$1,000.
 Fontbonne College, St. Louis, Mo., \$350.
 Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa., \$750.
 Goddard College, Plainfield, Vt., \$500.
 Goshen College, Goshen, Ind., \$725.
 Graceland College, Lamoni, Iowa, \$500.
 Hamilton College, Clinton, N.Y., \$500.
 Hiram Scott College, Scottsbluff, Neb., \$750.
 Holy Family College, Torresdale, Philadelphia, Pa., \$500.
 Huston-Tillotson College, Austin, Tex., \$1,200.
 Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Ill., \$750.
 Iona College, New Rochelle, N.Y., \$500.
 John Brown University, Siloam Springs, Ark., \$1,000.
 Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, \$750.
 Keuka College, Keuka Park, N.Y., \$600.
 Knox College, Galesburg, Ill., \$500.
 Lambuth College, Jackson, Tenn., \$1,200.
 Lane College, Jackson, Tenn., \$1,400.
 Malone College, Canton, Ohio, \$1,000.
 Marycrest College, Davenport, Iowa, \$1,000.

McMurry College, Abilene, Tex., \$600.
 Midland Lutheran College, Fremont, Neb., \$1,000.
 Midwestern College, Denison, Iowa, \$500.
 Miles College, Birmingham, Ala., \$1,000.
 Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill., \$500.
 Mount Saint Mary College, Newburgh, N.Y., \$500.
 Norwich University, Northfield, Vt., \$1,000.
 Oakwood College, Huntsville, Ala., \$1,500.
 Pacific College of Fresno, Fresno, Calif., \$1,000.
 Paine College, Augusta, Ga., \$1,000.
 Park College, Parkville, Mo., \$1,000.
 Regis College, Denver, Colo., \$350.
 Rosary Hill College, Buffalo, N.Y., \$850.
 St. Andrews Presbyterian College, Laurinburg, N.C., \$1,000.
 St. Augustine's College, Raleigh, N.C., \$2,000.
 St. Benedict's College, Atchison, Kan., \$500.
 Salem College, Winston-Salem, N.C., \$275.
 Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N.Y., \$500.
 Seton Hill College, Greensburg, Pa., \$400.
 Shaw University, Raleigh, N.C., \$1,000.
 Simpson College, Indianola, Iowa, \$400.
 Southern Missionary College, Collegedale, Tenn., \$1,500.
 Southwestern College, Winfield, Kan., \$500.
 Stephens College, Columbia, Mo., \$500.
 Stetson University, DeLand, Fla., \$750.
 Stillman College, Tuscaloosa, Ala., \$1,500.
 Stonehill College, North Easton, Mass., \$500.
 Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, Miss., \$500.
 Trevecca Nazarene College, Nashville, Tenn., \$500.
 Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio, \$500.

1965/66 EQUIPMENT GRANTS

Aurora College, Aurora, Ill., glass door book-case.
 Cabrini College, Radner, Pa., card catalog.
 California Baptist College, Riverside, Calif., card catalog.
 Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City, Tenn., card catalog.
 Edgewood College of the Sacred Heart, Madison, Wis., book truck.
 Marylhurst College, Marylhurst, Ore., card catalog.
 Northwestern Christian College, Eugene, Ore., study carrels.
 Our Lady of Cincinnati College, Cincinnati, Ohio, CBI table.
 Saint Bernard College, Saint Bernard, Ala., periodical shelving.
 Spring Hill College, Mobile, Ala., study carrels.
 Wayland Baptist College, Plainview, Tex., card catalog.
 Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, Ohio, periodical shelving.