

The next chapter has six case studies of widely differing community college libraries. The last chapter is a recipe for an ideal community college library. The appendixes are the usual reproduction of the questionnaire, data drawn from it, and bibliography. I would assume community college librarians will read this and it will appear on reading lists for college library administration courses.

I would have much preferred the author writing something which might be read by a wider audience than this. If the librarians are right that all of this is mostly the fault of administrators and "other faculty" they should stop talking to just each other. I hope the author will get far enough away from the machinery of her Ed.D. dissertation to write a five-page article on what is wrong with the community college library that administrators and other faculty might read. I would also hope that she will realize that what she is given to deliver as gospel will not be accepted as such. She will want to emphasize, in ways understandable to non-librarians, why the library is important and to de-emphasize the minutia of operating such a library.—*Kenneth J. LaBudde, University of Kansas City.*

Library Planning for Automation. Ed. by Allen Kent. Washington: Spartan Books, 1965. 195p. n.p. (65-17307).

This volume is the proceedings of a conference held at the University of Pittsburgh, June 2-3, 1964, that was invoked to discuss a proposal for a National Science Library System conceived by Dr. Stafford Warren, special assistant to the President for mental retardation, and promulgated by him to solve the chaos, duplication, and waste in our current handling of the increasing volume of scientific literature.

In order to scrutinize the Warren proposal a group of panelists was presented with three working papers: (1) the proposal itself which, in a nutshell, recommended that a National Library of Science System be established to "provide a pool of all the published scientific literature." This system would consist of a network of seven regional centers, each holding the contents of the published scientific journals on tape or microform and employing com-

puter technology to analyze, store, search, and distribute these materials; (2) a paper by Samuel B. Freeman, former president, Micro-Photo Division, Bell and Howell Company, on microphotography of the source documents for the proposed system. The author examined various microforms as the storage medium and recommended microfiche as the most appropriate; (3) a paper by Andrew Osborne, of the graduate school of library and information sciences, University of Pittsburgh, entitled "The Influence of Automation on the Design of a University Library," the findings of which were that information retrieval would not radically change the basic design and size of main university library buildings, although substantial changes could be expected in the departmental libraries for science and technology.

The panels consisted of twelve library planners (eight librarians, three educators, one architect) and three periodical publishers. The library planners represented: (a) libraries recently involved in library construction programs; (b) libraries actively planning or in the midst of construction; (c) libraries contemplating construction within the next five years.

By and large the panelists endorsed the Warren proposal as a necessary and feasible step in solving one of the thorny problems in the control of scientific literature. Their questions and reservations centered on such issues as:

1. restrictions of the information bank to the literature published in the scientific and professional journals. Several participants pointed out that both bibliographical and textual control of such literature are already superior to that for the control of the report literature;
2. the plan's failure to take cognizance of the potential role of the Library of Congress in promoting such a national service;
3. lack of knowledge about the information needs of scientists and engineers;
4. whether regional centers were either economical or necessary;
5. lack of data about the utility of existing storage and retrieval systems.

The publishers on the panel worried about the economic effects of the proposal

on conventional scientific publishing. John Markus of McGraw-Hill offered in some detail a photocopying royalty plan that might prove an equitable solution to the problems of copyright and photocopying.

One cannot judge the substance and worth of a conference by its printed proceedings, and the participants in the conclave may have gained considerable insight into the implications of the Warren proposal for library planning. If so, such insights have eluded the editor. Competent university librarians evidently found their assignment of relating the Warren proposal to library planning a bit sticky for they frequently retreated to discussing tangential matters such as the quality of microfilm readers and local applications of computers to library operations. The Osborne paper on automation and library design was too general to generate dialogue among the panelists.

To stir librarians, Dr. Warren circulated his memorandum in a "white paper" to

members of the Association of Research Libraries. The official comment of the Association (Appendix G, Minutes of the Sixty-Fifth Meeting, January 24, 1965, Washington, D.C.) stated that the Association concurred in the objectives but that there were proposals and assumptions in the report that seemed impractical, unnecessarily costly, and inefficient. The statement in these minutes should be measured against the general and somewhat superficial reactions of the conference which failed to produce a sophisticated and critical analysis of the proposal and its relationships to comparable plans for information control. The bits and pieces offered on various facets of automation and library planning contribute little or nothing to that subject. Entitling these proceedings *Library Planning for Automation* seriously misleads librarians who seek aid in planning for the new technology.—Robert T. Grazier, Wayne State University.

ALUMNI . . .

(Continued from page 226)

one (62 per cent) were in the lower third of their Drexel graduating classes, and seven (14 per cent) were among the bottom five individuals graduating that year.

Undergraduate education. Only 36 per cent (half as many as of Group S) attended institutions in the "prestige" group.

Graduate degrees. There was one individual in Group U with an advanced degree (2 per cent).

Undergraduate majors. Group U as Group S showed their major fields of concentration to be in the liberal arts area, many of them English majors.

Pre-Drexel and pre-job library experience. Of the persons making up Group U, 30 per cent had never worked in a library, and 33 per cent had been employed in such capacities as student assistants, typists, or menders of books.

College language training. In Group U 10 per cent had no foreign language training whatsoever; however, 12 per

cent had studied four or more languages.

CONCLUSIONS

This limited sampling seems to indicate that there were several evident characteristics of the successful graduate of the Drexel library school: (1) these graduates were somewhat younger than their less successful fellows, many having enrolled shortly after completion of an undergraduate degree; (2) they enjoyed better general health; (3) the Drexel faculty evaluations of them during their days as graduate students quite consistently forecast professional success; (4) their scholastic success was a good indicator of their future professional success; (5) the quality of their undergraduate college often indicated the quality of the individual; (6) they were somewhat better prepared by having undertaken graduate work in other areas as well; (7) a high per cent of this group had previous library job experience, many bearing considerable responsibility; (8) this group showed somewhat stronger language background. Perhaps it should be pointed out that only one

of the initial nine factors analyzed seemed to have no particular relevance to success. That was the consideration of the undergraduate major.

Of course, other factors no doubt had effects upon the success or non-success of these two groups. New or unexpected responsibilities in the home or on the job, family illness, and financial embarrassment took their toll in both groups. ■■

ACRL Membership

President, Helen M. Brown; College Libraries Section Chairman, Martha L. Biggs; Junior College Libraries Section Chairman, Harriett Genung; Rare Books Section Chairman, Marcus A. McCorison; Subject Specialists Section Chairman, James Humphry, III; University Libraries Section Chairman, Everett T. Moore. ACRL Executive Secretary, George M. Bailey, 50 East Huron St., Chicago 60611.

substitute for continuing professional development or the performance of professional obligations. To use the number of hours worked, irrespective of the nature of the work, as a criterion for evaluating a professional's performance is to deny the validity of the concept that he is rewarded for his service, not his time. Where the performance of overtime, voluntary or required, would detract from such development, it should not be required if at all possible; at the least it should not be encouraged. Where the performance of overtime cannot be avoided, compensatory time should be allowed, not on an hour-for-hour basis but in such a way as to permit the librarian concerned to continue his professional development.

In an era of continuing shortages of professional personnel, overtime is obviously a necessary evil. But it should not be allowed to perpetuate itself through a refusal to admit that the evil exists. ■■

OVERTIME . . .

(Continued from page 200)

"professional involvement," may have decidedly less pleasant implications. Shaffer cites a case of a staff worker who used the fact that she did not take her authorized breaks to "prove" that she actually worked longer than other staff members.²⁰ Nigel Walker, in a study of morale in the British Civil Service, notes that among the higher level of office workers (career personnel), the act of working for longer hours than most of their colleagues was a means of acquiring merit, and even some sort of moral advantage over them.²¹

In conclusion, it is felt that overtime, while its performance when necessary should be recognized and rewarded, is not and should not be considered as a

ACRL Membership May 10, 1966 . . .	9662
Section memberships, March 31, 1966	
College	2943
Junior College	946
Rare Books	1138
Subject Specialists	1947
University	3655
Institutional memberships, March 31, 1966	1656

²⁰ Shaffer, *op. cit.*, p. 74-78.

²¹ Nigel Walker, *Morale in the Civil Service* (Edinburgh: At the University Press, 1961), p. 167. Walker also observes that, "To be more hard working in this or other ways confers similar advantages, particularly if—like justice—it is not only done but seen to be done." p. 231.