

The Higher Education Act of 1965: A Symposium

At ACRL's membership meeting in New York on July 13, three speakers—each from his own vantage point—discussed the meaning of the Higher Education Act to the nation's academic libraries. Germaine Krettek, director of the ALA Washington office, began with a report on the background and status of the Act. Charles F. Gosnell, director of libraries, New York University; Everett T. Moore, assistant librarian, University of California, Los Angeles; and Helen M.

Welch, acquisitions librarian, University of Illinois, spoke respectively on implications for library administration, reference service, and resources and technical services. Maurice Tauber, Columbia University school of library service, summarized the speakers comments, and spoke on guidelines for preparation of grant requests, and implications for library education, and recommended future ALA division activities.

THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965: BACKGROUND, PROVISIONS, ADMINISTRATION

BY GERMAINE KRETTEK

AT THIS possible three-quarters point in the second session of the eighty-ninth Congress, Senate committees are still considering several measures relating to the Higher Education Act of 1965. The status of the proposed amendments and the appropriations is this:

On May 13, six months after the Higher Education Act of 1965 became law, President Johnson signed the Supplemental Appropriations bill which provided limited funds to implement P.L. 89-329 for the fiscal year which ended June 30, for TITLE II—COLLEGE LIBRARY ASSISTANCE and LIBRARY TRAINING AND RESEARCH. Ten million dollars was appropriated for Part A—college library resources; \$1 million for training of librarians; and \$300,000 for the Library of Congress program of acquisition and cataloging of research materials. No appropriation was made for library research.

Facing a deadline of June 30, the Library Services Division of the U.S. Office of Education did a remarkable job in

getting the guidelines and regulations approved, necessary forms and information out to the approximately twenty-one hundred institutions, over nineteen hundred applications processed, and the checks totaling over \$8 million mailed within the brief period of two weeks (sent out May 20-21; back by June 4). It was an almost round-the-clock operation.

On the other side of the coin, colleges and universities did an equally fine job of getting their applications mailed in record time and we trust the eighteen hundred and ten institutions who received grants got their funds obligated by the end of June.

On July 1, the new 1967 fiscal year began but appropriations are not yet available. This year, however, the President's budget included recommended amounts for all titles of HEA and for all parts of Title II. The Administration asked a total of \$35.3 million for Title II. Of this amount it is expected \$25 million will be allocated for resources, \$3.75 million for training, \$3.55 million for research, and \$3 million for the Library of

Congress acquisition program. The American Library Association testified at both House and Senate hearings on the HEW Appropriations bill (H.R. 14745) and strongly urged the appropriation of the amounts authorized—\$71,315,000 rather than \$35.3 million.

The House of Representatives, however, has approved the budget recommendations. The Senate Appropriations Committee has completed hearings but has not yet issued its report.

According to Sec. 205 (a) of the law, an Advisory Council on College Library Resources is to be established in the U.S. Office of Education, consisting of the Commissioner as chairman, and eight members appointed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of HEW. It is anticipated that President Johnson shortly will announce the establishment of this council to advise the Commissioner with respect to establishing criteria for making supplemental and special purpose grants.

After the council is established, new guidelines and regulations will be drafted and promulgated.

The Commissioner is also authorized to appoint a special advisory committee of no more than nine members to advise him on matters of general policy concerning research and demonstration projects relating to the importance of libraries and the importance of training in librarianship.

In connection with PART B of TITLE II—Library Training and Research, it should be kept in mind that this section provides for the training of all types of librarians. In relation to the training of school librarians, there is specific provision for the continuation of the School Library Institutes, which are included in Title XI of the NDEA, through the next fiscal period but thereafter will be funded under Title II, B.

At this very hour, Carolyn Whitenack, associate professor of library science and audio-visual education, Purdue Univer-

sity, and president-elect of AASL, is in Washington testifying before the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on those aspects of the Higher Education Amendments of 1966 which are of particular concern to libraries and librarians. Some of the provisions of S. 3047 and H.R. 14644 that ALA is supporting relate to facilities, the extension of Title III of HEA—Strengthening Developing Institutions, and a technical amendment to Title II, Part A, to correct certain inequities in the maintenance-of-effort provisions in the program for college library resources. A statement concerning the importance of the School Library Institute program is also being stressed in her testimony.

Two other titles of the Higher Education Act of 1965 have important implications for libraries which have been overlooked by some college librarians because of the emphasis on Title II.

Title V, Part C, provides fellowships for recent college graduates and other college graduates who plan a career in elementary and secondary education. Fifteen hundred and thirty of these prospective teacher fellowships have been awarded for study beginning in the 1966-67 academic year; seventy of these fellowships are in librarianship.

A separate program exists for experienced teachers.

Another title with specific implications for college libraries is VI—Financial Assistance for the Improvement of Undergraduate Instruction. Audio-visual equipment for the college library is specified and in Part B—Faculty Development Programs, provision is included for the training of librarians in the use of educational media equipment.

These are the highlights of the major portions of the Higher Education Act of 1965. It is a landmark measure, and should do much to improve college and university libraries if full advantage is taken of all titles.

THE PROMISE FOR REFERENCE LIBRARIANS

BY EVERETT T. MOORE

No words could please reference librarians more than those which appear in the Higher Education Act of 1965 under the matter-of-fact heading of "Strengthening College and Research Library Resources." Granted, this endeavor is not ordinarily considered to be the principal concern of reference librarians, if their responsibility continues to be that of assisting readers in using the resources that have been amassed and organized by many hands. But as we read the text of the Act under this heading we find that appropriations are authorized therein to enable the Commissioner of Education to "transfer funds to the Librarian of Congress for the purpose of (1) acquiring, so far as possible, all library materials currently published throughout the world which are of value to scholarship; and (2) providing catalog information for these materials promptly after receipt, and distributing bibliographic information by printed cards and by other means, and enabling the Library of Congress to use for exchange and other purposes such of these materials as are not needed for its own collections."

To reference librarians, this statement of intent in our federal statutes is full of promise. To acquire (so far as possible) "all library materials currently published throughout the world which are of value to scholarship" is an amazing objective in this age of exploding knowledge. We have, in these post-World-War-II years, been adjusting ourselves to the fact that no single library, no matter what its resources and skills, can attempt a real measure of completeness in all the fields in which it professes interest. How far toward such a goal the provision of federal funds might be able to carry the Library of Congress—acting in the interests

of all the research libraries of the nation—has not been calculated, for this is an incalculable matter. But the aim and purpose are noble, and all librarians would have to applaud the intent of the Act.

Awareness of this broad and comprehensive program of acquisitions by the national library should give reference librarians throughout the nation a new sense of confidence in the ability of our libraries jointly to meet the requirements of scholarship in every field.

Even more practical and concrete is the promise of the next subsection of the Act, in which it is specified that the Library of Congress shall be enabled to provide catalog information for these materials—"promptly after receipt"—and to "distribute bibliographic information" by printing catalog cards and other means, so that every library in the nation may thereby share in the benefits of this grandly conceived program of acquisitions.

It is a fact well known to us all that at present the university libraries of the country can obtain Library of Congress catalog cards for only a little more than half of the books they acquire each year. Increasingly they have had to resort to methods of organizing and recording many of their important acquisitions—including many vital foreign imprints—in economical but bibliographically inadequate fashion, in order to make them available for use. Such minimal bibliographical control as the systems of single-entry listing in card catalogs which a number of libraries have adopted have had to be employed in lieu of the fuller cataloging we still believe in but must often forego, even for many of the books which need it most.

Promise, therefore, of a greatly extended program of centralized cataloging, to bring these essential materials of

research under bibliographical control to an extent we had almost ceased to hope for, is important news indeed.

This promise relates directly to the world of today. There is nothing complex about it, and every reference librarian can recognize the proposed measures as being simple extensions of present systems. Greater efficiency in acquiring the materials of research and providing bibliographic information about them to all the research libraries in the nation are logical, natural steps toward a better utilization of our resources.

Not so direct and simple, but more far-reaching in their implications, are the provisions in that other section of the Higher Education Act entitled "Research and Demonstrations Relating to Libraries and the Training of Library Personnel." Here it is specified that the Commissioner of Education is authorized to make grants "for research and demonstration projects relating to the improvement of libraries or the improvement of training in librarianship, including the development of new techniques, systems, and equipment for processing, storing, and distributing information, and for the dissemination of information derived from such research and demonstrations. . . ."

This part of the Act looks to research to help us develop new methods and techniques, new systems and equipment for better organizing information and making it available for use. "Information," I judge, refers not only to the substance and content of scientific and technological knowledge, but to the body of bibliographical information which is the key to all literature and learning.

The potentialities of the library applications of the new technology have been finely described by William Dix in a recent article in *University: A Princeton Quarterly*. "At the national or regional level," he writes, "there will emerge networks which will bring the book resources of the nation under much great-

er control, providing much greater depth of indexing and subject analysis, available locally through computer-produced book catalogs or through machine-readable tapes or discs. More rapid and efficient dissemination of the product of the basic intellectual operation of cataloging, performed centrally, may come fairly soon. The actual storage of the intellectual content of books in computers and remote facsimile transmission of texts, while of course actually possible now on a small scale, seem to be fairly remote as regular library operations because of their costs."¹

The promise of the *research and demonstrations* section of the Act is one, therefore, of helping to bring such potentialities closer to realization.

Reference librarians look with anticipation to the development of library catalogs in machine-readable form, stored in memory devices, and capable of printing out selected portions on demand. To achieve such capability, libraries will of course have to work toward the standardization of bibliographical entries, so that information may be adapted to machine uses. Hence the importance of the plan for greater centralization of cataloging in the Library of Congress.

To serve the bedazzling variety of needs that are being created by interdisciplinary programs and area study centers, institutes for special studies, and joint research enterprises that are such important programs in many colleges and universities today, librarians may in many cases need to organize their services according to new patterns. The general reference librarian may give way in some situations to bibliographers or library specialists in a number of fields of interest: specialists who can work closely with scholars in providing information about library resources and in

¹ William S. Dix, "New Challenges to University Libraries," *University: A Princeton Quarterly*, No. 26 (Fall 1965), 14.

developing collections for research and study. To perform such services will require more complete, more detailed bibliographic information about every kind of material for research: ephemeral materials not in book form, magnetic tapes, technical reports, official and non-official documents. Hence, again, the importance of greater, not less, attention to thorough and detailed cataloging and organization of materials.

Most of the new institutes and centers, as Frederick Wagman has observed, are "based on the premise that existing curricular and department organization, like library subject classification, has virtue and should not be abandoned, yet is inadequate to meet current research and instructional needs."²

The area studies, Mr. Wagman points out, "have a new orientation, demanding not only a high rate of current acquisition but significant retrospective resources in which the major libraries of the country have always been deficient."³ And, when the university organizes itself to cope with the problem of acquiring, organizing, and giving service on publications from an area of Africa, or of Asiatic or near Eastern or East European countries, the staff member initially engaged is likely to be "charged with responsibility for selection, acquisition, cataloging, and reference—the last only if students and faculty can find his desk in either the cataloging or acquisitions departments. When additional professional staff can be provided, the functions of book selection and cataloging may be separated, and eventually a staff specialized in reference work may be employed."⁴

To meet the multifarious language needs for dealing with the publications which come in from all the less-familiar

areas of the world we can only turn reasonably to programs of centralized acquisitions and cataloging. Federal aid which will make this possible seems our only salvation.

Douglas Bryant has noted that: "As research more and more frequently crosses traditional lines and as scholars work more in groups and become peripatetic both physically and intellectually, libraries must inevitably alter in significant ways if they are to continue to provide the means for teaching and research. The lawyer and the mathematician in a School of Education, the psychiatrist in a Divinity School, and the oceanographer recently become Director of a Center of Population Studies are going to approach their research in ways quite different from those of their colleagues who continue to work within the traditional framework of their subject fields. And their library requirements will be quite different."⁵

In the Higher Education Act's provision for research and demonstration there is promise even in the vexing matter of interlibrary loans, for here are prospects for better bibliographic organization on a truly national basis. Systems for facsimile transmission of material from one library to another, as they are ultimately developed, will need to utilize the best organized and standardized media for published bibliographic information that can be devised, so that both location of material and transmitting it for use by the scholar who needs it can be provided. Our present chaotic procedures for locating and borrowing materials can only be relieved in this day of burgeoning research activity by utilizing new techniques and systems as they become available to us.

Certainly no functions or services of academic libraries will be more thoroughly affected by the fulfillment

² Frederick H. Wagman, "The General Research Library and the Area-Studies Programs," *Library Quarterly*, XXXV (October 1965), 345.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 345.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 348.

⁵ Douglas W. Bryant, "University Libraries and the Future," *Library Association Record*, LXVIII (January 1966), 7.

of the Higher Education Act's provisions than will those of the reference librarian. We have already glimpsed enough of the bibliographical world of the future

to be impressed by the necessity of taking every advantage of the kind of investigation and planning that this Act will make possible. ■■

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESOURCES AND TECHNICAL SERVICES

BY HELEN M. WELCH

It's GREAT to be a librarian in 1966, even a technical services librarian! It's respectable, now that libraries are costing the federal government so much. Education—including libraries—and welfare, they tell us, will be second only to national defense in the federal budget during fiscal year 1967.¹

If you want to be profession-proud, browse in the four volumes which make up the Senate and House committee hearings preceding the passage of Public Law 89-329. The set should be a best-seller for academic librarians. Note the easy acceptance by the Congressmen of the importance of libraries to this country, and consider that this is the result of a steady building process since the first major library bill in 1956. Note the implied and sometimes explicit request to librarians for guidance on what is needed. Note the gratitude expressed by both Chairman Morse and Chairman Green for the introduction by librarian-witnesses of the completely new proposal which became Part C of Title II. And note Senator Morse's appreciative statements on Edmon Low and Germaine Krettek. It's all in the record.

For technical service librarians, Title II, Part C is much the most important part of the Higher Education Act. It has several aspects that lift the heart. First of all, it's so short. Only seventeen lovely lines out of a document of fifty-two pages! Secondly, it establishes centralized cataloging—the thing we've wanted so much that we've even talked of pay-

ing for it ourselves! Thirdly, it was inserted in the bill by members of our own profession and was welcomed by the congressional subcommittees working on the bill. It's pleasant to ask for something you need very much, to be granted that thing, and then to be thanked for asking for it.

According to John Cronin, the proposal had its beginnings in a meeting of the RTSD Subcommittee on the National Union Catalog, held at LC in 1963. The committee's request that LC prepare alternative proposals for a centralized cataloging program led eventually to ARL's creative use of the hearings on the Higher Education Act to insert Part C into Title II. The whole process can give us pride in our profession: the subcommittee's request; LC's response to it; the ARL insertion into the hearings; the careful watching of the legislative process, and guidance through it by the ALA Washington office; and LC's masterly planning to implement the Act.

Those of us who work in day-to-day operations, acquiring books and giving them bibliographic addresses in our collections, sometimes feel that the great powerhouse of research libraries which the Association of Research Libraries represents is pretty far removed from our operations, that the head of a large library doesn't recognize the desperate flailing of the arms as we try to keep from going under for the last time in the flood of materials which come to us in ever increasing waves. But it was ARL which set up a Committee on Shared Cataloging and in 1964 voted unanimously to give its highest priority to

¹"News," *Library Journal*, XCI (March 1, 1966), 1184.

"developing a program for decreasing the amount of original cataloging." And it was Chairman William Dix of the committee who with great skill inserted centralized cataloging into the Act. At the hearings, Chairman Green of the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor called the proposal "perhaps more significant than any part covered in the bill."² Chairman Dix was abetted by other heads of libraries and by Executive Secretary Jim Skipper, whose library career from acquisitions to technical service head to university librarian had familiarized him with the problem and made him see it as a basic one which would have to be solved if libraries were to meet their increasing responsibilities, and who was *determined* that the problem would be solved. (We're not fools. Last Midwinter RTSD made the ARL Executive Secretary an *ex officio* permanent member of its Planning Committee.)

Librarians must see that centralized cataloging is continued beyond the original five years authorized by the Act. First, we must do all we can to make it work and to show better services and savings as a result of it. Second, we must be ready when the ALA Washington office warns us to speak and write to those who will decide its future. Lack of full initial funding for fiscal year 1966 has already reduced the proving period to four years.

LC IMPLEMENTATION PLANS

Let me remind you now of the Library of Congress plans to implement centralized cataloging and the acquiring, so far as possible, of "all library materials currently published throughout the world which are of value to scholar-

ship."³ The main emphasis of the program at the outset is on foreign publications, omitting periodicals and nonbook materials. With these exceptions, LC is attempting to secure all significant titles published with imprint date 1966 and later and all titles listed in 1966 issues of current foreign national bibliographies regardless of imprint date.

Close working arrangements with the publishers of national bibliographies provide early acquisition of new titles, which are delivered by air mail. Acceptance of the bibliographic descriptions in the national bibliographies for descriptive cataloging copy provides swift cataloging of each title. In countries where the book trade is not well organized and there are no national bibliographies, LC is expanding its already existing purchase arrangements, sometimes adding an agent in the field. To insure against loopholes in its acquisition arrangements, LC duplicates orders made by libraries in this country, such as: 1) blanket orders of several libraries with foreign book dealers; 2) Farmington Plan receipts; and 3) all series on continuation order in reporting libraries.

Coordinated acquisition controls, consisting of a depository file of LC catalog cards for current imprints, are sent to cooperating libraries, *i.e.*, all ARL members and other interested libraries, and offer both early distribution of cataloging copy and a means of notifying libraries which titles have already been cataloged. Titles ordered by cooperating libraries and not found in the control file are reported to LC, so that early acquisition and cataloging can be arranged.

IMPLICATIONS OF TITLE II-C

What are the implications of these LC arrangements for technical services? In cooperating libraries all orders for 1966 and later imprints must be searched in

² U.S. Congress, House Special Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, *Higher Education Act, Hearings*, 88 Cong., 1st Sess. (Washington, GPO, 1965), p. 368.

³ U.S. Congress, *Higher Education Act of 1965*, Public Law 89-329, November 8, 1965, p. 10.

the control file and procedures must include some satisfactory way of reporting to LC those titles not found. The chance of finding most monographs proposed for order—whether foreign or domestic imprints—are excellent, and the bibliographic information on the catalog card is complete, including price and bibliographic citation. Noncooperating libraries can gain the same information in the published *National Union Catalog*. The increasing completeness of this prompt record should greatly reduce the amount of time now spent in bibliographic verification during the order process.

Title II-C benefits all libraries, but, like a tax cut, it benefits the large operation more than the small. Earlier and more inclusive supplying of cataloging copy is, of course, its prime objective, and it is hoped that, in place of the approximately 50 per cent availability of needed catalog copy reported under various studies made last year, eventually more than 90 per cent will be available under the new procedures. The LC cards provided for the depository control file can be used either for card reproduction or for ordering LC cards by number. Although initially this LC catalog copy comes in card form, it may be provided in machine-readable copy later.

Both major cooperative acquisitions projects—the Farmington Plan and the PL 480 Program—will probably be affected by the new program. Farmington Plan participants will continue to receive publications under their assignments but will no longer be responsible for cataloging them. This change will keep the better part and drop the worse, since as the Plan worked out, it sometimes seemed to insure late cataloging of those titles received under it. Participants in the PL 480 Program may be able to reduce their substantial annual contributions for the cooperative cataloging of PL 480 receipts.

With the gradual reduction of cataloging duplication in libraries across the country and the concentration of standard cataloging in the Library of Congress, we can expect a high quality of cataloging, both in relation to materials which present difficulties because of format or language and in relation to fullness of description and added entries.

STANDARDIZATION

Those who now modify LC catalog cards will have greater need to justify such activity when centralized cataloging is fully implemented. A greater number of hours will be going into this activity than before, and savings for such libraries will be less than for those libraries which accept all elements on the card. When LC cataloging copy is delivered in machine form, even more ingenuity will be required to justify a tailoring of the copy, since it is more costly to change the machine record than to make a modification manually.

Both centralized cataloging and automation, then, are forcing libraries toward standardization. In time the modification of catalog copy to fit local conditions may come to seem as impractical and unwarranted as it would be to tailor subject headings in periodical indexes to bring them closer to local needs. Subject headings used in periodical indexes are accepted as they are received—and gratefully. The prospect of a foreseeable future in which LC will supply machine-readable cataloging copy almost as soon as a title is published makes the locally tailored catalog seem an indefensible luxury, particularly when, in the far distant future, the great collections at the Library of Congress are open to inspection through on-line computer access, and the advantage is apparent of being able to approach both the home collection and the LC collection through the same avenues.

ACQUISITION-CATALOGING BALANCE

The new LC acquisition-cataloging program under Title II-C invites those libraries which have not achieved a balanced acquisition-cataloging program, *i.e.*, one in which each year's acquisitions are processed for use during the year of receipt, to make again the effort to put the year's program on balance and to move toward reducing arrearages. The goal is to subdue bibliographically all the publications which the library needs and can afford to acquire. In general, those libraries which have solved the problem have done so by being content with modest collections. Those which have not solved the problem have generally tried to build substantial collections and have created cataloging backlogs. The latter practice of taking collections while they are available and hoping to catch up one day might be said to have been reduced to an absurdity by one university library which last year spent close to four million dollars on its acquisition program, of which less than 1 per cent went for binding, compared to the average 10 per cent binding expenditure in the libraries listed in the ARL "Academic Library Statistics." The same library spent 20 per cent of its total operating budget for staff salaries and wages compared to an average 57 per cent for all libraries reporting.

With centralized cataloging opening up the possibility of processing so many more titles, a balanced operation with a respectable acquisition program begins to seem possible. More extensive use of standing orders for current publications offers dividends in decreased processing costs. Blanket order titles arriving in the library with no records yet made can be matched with the catalog card in the control file, cards can be reproduced within the library, and volumes marked for the shelves with none of the intermediate records which add to processing

expenses but which in the end produce nothing of permanent value for the collection.

SERIALS

The forgotten people in all of this, as in the past, are the serials librarians, particularly the serials catalogers. The Library of Congress does not catalog new periodical titles until the first volume is complete. In addition, LC has considerable arrearages among its serials awaiting cataloging. The decision to omit periodical titles from the initial stages of centralized cataloging was a practical one, but it seems to put the serials librarians and users even further from the Promised Land. Whether a proposed proofsheets service, including all titles listed in *New Serial Titles* with LC classification numbers provided, can give serials operations some relief is yet to be seen.

RESOURCES

Part A of Title II, directed toward increasing college library resources, is commendably broad in its interpretation of "library materials." For small college libraries, the basic grant of \$5,000 may represent a significant increase in book budget, and supplemental grants to fill demonstrated special needs for additional library resources may be even more significant. For libraries already large and well supported, the \$5,000 basic grant and supplemental grants are most welcome, and the assistance to smaller libraries might also be thought of as aiding large libraries by reducing requests for interlibrary loans and photographic reproductions. Actually, I suspect that the more resources a small collection offers, the more titles scholars can identify to request.

The special purpose grants of Title II and funds provided in Title III to strengthen developing institutions both point toward interinstitutional projects,

either the consortium to develop common programs, or the partnership of an established and a developing institution, to offer a helping hand. In the area of resources, such cooperative programs not only stretch library funds, but also stretch the dwindling supply of older books in the open market.

Perhaps the greatest boost in resources growing out of the Higher Education Act will be the aid to libraries in catching up with their cataloging backlogs and thus making bibliographically available those resources which are presently hidden.

DEMONSTRATIONS

Part B of Title II offers the possibility of providing demonstrations of well-planned technical services departments employing the best available tooling, a project which RTSD Executive Secretary Elizabeth Rodell has been advocating for some time. For the host library of such a project, able to create a model operation with adequate financial resources, how exciting an opportunity! For the questioning technical service librarian, how useful to be able to see in operation well-designed and well-equipped procedures! Some libraries have been asked to assume a large portion of the burden of entertaining visitors with no regular outside support.

STAFF SHORTAGES

In the matter of available staff to process our collections, the Act offers several vectors pulling in different directions. We can hope they will add up to a state of equilibrium. Title II-B aids in training more librarians; Title II-C, by offering centralized cataloging, reduces the number of catalogers needed across the country; Title II-A, with its funds to increase library purchasing power, implies increased needs for processing personnel; and the Act as a whole, with its splendid infusion of energy into higher education, suggests more bodies moving

busily among the book trucks, the bibliographies, the catalogs, and/or the magnetic tapes.

INTERNATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The Library of Congress, in its excellent plans to carry out the intent of Title II-C, has pointed out the bridge it offers to greater international cooperation in cataloging. LC proposes, you will remember, to use for cataloging purposes the descriptions offered by the national bibliographies of practically all European countries. Only the form and choice of main and secondary entries are adjusted.

Too often U.S. foreign programs start with the assumption that our way is best, and cooperation means that the foreign country changes to conform to our way. The LC report, following its close scrutiny of the national bibliographies, showed that the title description used in national bibliographies is equivalent to or fuller than the present LC standard as established in the *LC Rules for Descriptive Cataloging*. Recognition of the good bibliographic standards of other countries and acceptance of the work produced under those standards offers a long stride toward international cooperation in cataloging.

Thus the suggestion of an anonymous Englishman, made in 1876, even before Ralph Ellsworth's efforts in the forties to centralize cataloging, may now be taken up. Edward Holley reports in his forthcoming book on the organizational meeting of the American Library Association in 1876 that an ex-librarian writing anonymously in *The Academy* (London) on March 18, 1876, observed:

When I was a librarian myself, I always wondered at the extraordinary waste of power in cataloguing new books. While I was writing my slip, according to the rules followed in most English libraries, I felt that there were probably a hundred people doing exactly the same work which I was doing, not only in England, but in every civilised country of the world. Yet what would be easier than to have

my slip printed, and any number of copies sent round by book-post to every library in Europe. With a little arrangement, every English book might be catalogued at the British Museum, every French book at the Bibliothèque Nationale, every German book at the Royal Library at Berlin, every Russian book at St. Petersburg, &c. At a trifling expense these printed slips might be sent to every small or large library, and each of them might have three or four kinds of catalogues—an alphabetical catalogue of the authors, a chronological catalogue, a local catalogue, a catalogue classified according to subjects, &c. Even when a

library is too poor to buy a book, the slip might be useful in its catalogue. The saving that might thus be effected would be very considerable. The staff of librarians might be greatly reduced, and the enormous expense now incurred for catalogues, and mostly imperfect catalogues, would dwindle down to a mere nothing.

Perhaps one hundred years later, in 1976, the anonymous ex-librarian's rational suggestion may well be a reality. ■■

FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF LIBRARY ADMINISTRATION

BY CHARLES F. GOSNELL

ALTHOUGH I have not been asked to be brief, my remarks will be. Anything that brings in new and usable money—to an administrator—is certainly good.

The implication of my assignment, given months ago, was that there were or would be many problems to which we should give deep thought and attention. My paper was to be submitted many months ago, so that day after tomorrow, you might read again what you hear here today. I objected to that time schedule for two reasons. One was that things might happen between the deadline for the paper and today. I did not want to be in the position of throwing overboard what had been written months ago, and what would be published next week, for something really worthwhile today. As you all know we did get the money like lightning, just two weeks ago.

The administrator is supposed to be a problem solver. Last March, as far as I was concerned, the only problem was that we did not have any problems. There was a law, but there was no money, no rules and regulations, no blanks to fill out. I felt like an MS student at Columbia library school of years ago, trying to get a thesis subject approved. The problem was to find a good

problem. My only problem was to explain to my President why we were not doing anything—no money.

It is characteristic nowadays for the federal government to take off with grandiose plans, to pass ambitious enabling legislation—to please everybody—and then fail to provide any money. What problem we had was a political one. It was handled admirably by our ALA Washington office and by our college and university presidents.

By now you may suspect that I had some skepticism about this program. I did. I still do, but not as much. It got off to a good start in the best bureaucratic fashion, there were regional meetings to explain everything to everybody. Of course the real details could not be explained, because there were none. And nobody knew when, if ever, there would be any money.

When it began to look as though we might get the five thousand dollar basic grant, I ventured the opinion that it might take some \$5,000 in administrative time and effort to gather data, fill out forms, etc., to get the \$5,000. That often happens, particularly in a large and efficient organization. But I was wrong.

We studied the provisions of the law, and tried to guess what we would have to do. Fortunately, we did not work too hard at it.

On May 13 the President signed the supplemental appropriation bill. Within two weeks we had the application forms. Miraculously these forms were unusually simple.

A few names and addresses were asked for, a few boxes to be checked, and eight simple financial figures which any well administered library should have on hand anyway. The form was quickly filled in (seven copies, to be sure) and within another two weeks the approval came. What could be simpler?

Paxton Price and his associates deserve a hearty, "Well done!"

I objected to an assignment which implied that I should indulge in prophecy and pontification, rather than comment on real facts and definite situations, but now I shall proceed to do the armchair bit. I am in the position of the fellow who began by saying, "Before I begin my speech I have something important to say." I have said it, and now I shall take off into the wild blue yonder.

Getting money from the federal government has become a profession in itself. Washington is full of experts, who, for a fat fee, will help you get federal money. The federal bureaucracy has created conditions where these experts can flourish. The basic fallacy is that the government tries to treat everybody exactly alike. There is almost infinite accountability. But no two people or institutions are exactly alike. The professionals are the people who can take unlikes and make them look like the very model which the legislators had in mind. They take rugged individuals and dress them in plausible uniforms to qualify for the handouts.

Soon after the Higher Education Act of 1965 was passed and the regional meetings were held, New York University took formal administrative action and designated its director of libraries to be coordinator of the university by program for Title II. Other coordinators were appointed for other sections cor-

responding to their respective official concerns. This only demonstrates that NYU is an old hand at getting federal money, and has an effective operating procedure. On December 15 the director of libraries made a report to the Administrative Council of the university outlining the legislation, its background, and its purpose.

Being an administrator he immediately began to try to figure out how much money would be available and when. Under maximum terms NYU might hope to get as much as a quarter-million dollars; so far, we have received ten thousand.

We do not have a library school and I cannot presume to speak on that aspect.

Spending the basic grant, for a large institution, even in a hurry, is no problem. Spending the quarter million will take a little more effort—and we will have to wait for the appropriation and the guidelines.

For the very small institutions the basic grant may be a relatively large sum, and may even involve difficulty in matching. But with a little planning ahead, this should not be a serious problem.

For large and small alike any help to the Library of Congress for centralized cataloging should be no problem, but a great benefit.

On its face, section 203, "Supplemental Grants" does not look too difficult, especially if the guidelines follow the path marked in May 1966.

Section 204, "Special Purpose Grants" looks more tricky, and I hesitate to let my imagination run wild to conjure up the flights of fancy that might be proposed as eligible for "Special Purpose Grants."

Section 205 provides for an advisory council to advise the commission on supplemental and special purpose grants. This seems to be a very good idea. At this time there has been no appropria-

tion for these purposes, and I have no information that the committee has been appointed.

Section 206 provides for nonaccredited institutions on a provisional basis. This is in line with what seems to be the underlying philosophy of the Act, "a little something for everybody."

Section 207 bars use of grants to buy material for religious purposes.

Section 208 represents a passing nod to the agencies responsible for

higher education in the several states.

This administrator concludes that so far, at least, the Act has posed no serious problems. Some of the later sections will necessarily be a little more difficult to handle, and may contain "sleepers." More generous appropriations are needed to make the Act really effective. A continuation of the present policy of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare will certainly be welcome. ■■

GUIDELINES FOR THE PREPARATION OF GRANT REQUESTS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR LIBRARY EDUCATION AND ALA DIVISIONS

BY MAURICE F. TAUBER

WHEN Miss Brown wrote to me some time ago, she told me that my responsibility was to summarize the other papers that would be presented by Miss Krettek, Dr. Gosnell, Mr. Moore, and Miss Welch. I was to single out those areas of concern that our membership should be aware of, if the greatest advantages are to be made of the sections of the Higher Education Act (Public Law 89-329), affecting libraries. This did not seem to be an impossible assignment, unless the participants failed to write papers. I did not think there would be any trouble from this angle. I was wrong in at least one instance, and in another I received the paper Monday afternoon. Dr. Gosnell has indicated the reason why he delayed writing his paper. I think he thought if he waited long enough he might not have to write it at all.

My assignment, however, when the first supplement of *College and Research Libraries* appeared in May listing the program, had been enlarged to the following: "Guidelines for the Preparation of Grant Requests, Including a Summary of the Working Papers (those presented to you), Implications for Library Education, and Recommendations for

Future ALA Divisional Activities." Thus, I have a wide range of targets, and if I miss any or all of them it is not because I have not been given the chance to shoot. Within the framework of some facts, and also some fancy or speculation, I will try to summarize the points made in the papers, suggest guidelines, so far as I can, for the preparation of grant requests, discuss library education and research, and to indicate general implications for ACRL and other ALA divisions.

BACKGROUND AND ADMINISTRATION

The points made by Miss Krettek, as always, are to be the heart of the matter. The Act has been described, and the extent of the potential aid to libraries analyzed. Miss Krettek and Mr. Low, too, must be praised again and again for the wording of the statements regarding the library assistance, because it is quite obvious that librarians have been given every opportunity to utilize the available funds in direct relation to their problems. Both of them, I understand, had much to do with the eventual wording. The various librarians who have gone to Washington to support the legislation should also be thanked for their aid.

The actual relationship of the sections of the Act to administration, reference services, and the technical services, as well as to personnel and training, has been spelled out in the several comments of the preceding speakers. Points may be made on some of these comments.

Dr. Gosnell has directed his attention to the fact that the library (and library school, too) will need to have considerable organization of talent familiar with governmental procedure if the institution is to obtain the funds desired for a particular project. Know-how and ability to follow through are implicit, and anyone familiar with a government contract realizes that the operations may be tedious in some situations. Dr. Gosnell has indicated that in this case, however, there has been an effort to make applications for funds simple, and it is hoped that this simplicity will speed up decisions by review groups so that the funds will be quickly forthcoming and applied to the projects outlined. As a matter of fact, our Office of Education has done a remarkable job in their speed, and has caught some libraries and library schools unprepared. At New York University the administration decided that the library would be the coordinator of the matters relating to the Act. This is a satisfactory pattern in an institution which has had a decentralized policy in regard to such requests. In some institutions, it may be somewhat more complex, particularly if there is a centralized control. Whatever the pattern is, however, it is quite clear that there is an essential series of steps, related to many forms that are to be filled out, and records kept, for any funds provided for programs under the Act.

Mr. Moore, as a reference librarian, has singled out those aspects of the Act which may have implications for the reference services of libraries. He has called attention to the development of

resources, and the introduction of procedures to make these resources bibliographically available on a wider scale than most of us dared hope for in recent years. Those of you who attended the University Libraries Section of ACRL-RTSD joint meeting Monday evening will recall the observations made by the various speakers on the potential for developing collections at the Library of Congress and for cataloging them quickly for library use. Mr. Skipper particularly pointed out that there appeared to be no limit to the opportunity, if the personnel were available for the task. This was also supported by Mr. Cronin in his remarks. Mr. Moore could not avoid emphasizing the need for sufficient and qualified personnel, as it is obvious that funds available could not be properly expanded unless staff could handle the obligations that the funds bring. Shortage of personnel, of course, is coupled naturally with inadequacies in operations, equipment, and technology. The need for research in technique, systems analysis, and national outlook are therefore cited. An important point, to which I will refer later, made by Mr. Moore is to the promise of research and demonstration.

Miss Welch, of course, had a wide opportunity in regard to the implications for technical services. The Act is quite broad in respect to this field of librarianship, and her comments on centralized cataloging, the Library of Congress potential, cooperative acquisitional programs, standardization, automation, serials, resources, personnel shortages, demonstrations, and international implications do not need to be repeated here. It may be said that they interweave with the comments by Mr. Moore, and give strength to the observation that the reference services are supported by effective technical services.

It is important to recognize a most significant ingredient in the acquisi-

tions aspect of the Higher Education Act. Resources in libraries have been developed by librarians but only in concert with bookdealers and other individuals concerned with the production of books such as publishers of all kinds and now, especially, reprint publishers. The markets for books are expanding rapidly, and stocks of older works are diminishing. Bookdealers and publishers all over the world will be put upon not only by the Act in terms of both acquisitions and cataloging but also by the greater demands which new or embryonic libraries will place upon them. The importance of streamlining acquisitions operations to help bookdealers is obvious. The effectiveness, energy, and interest of bookdealers in carrying out the implications of the Act are obviously of paramount importance. Fortunately, American bookdealers as a group have been friends of American libraries, and I feel certain that they will accept (they are even already in the middle of it, including wholesalers and general trade book sellers) the pressures that are involved in helping libraries develop their collections wisely. I understand that the Library of Congress, in its activities under the Act, is to use Stevens and Brown in London, Stechert-Hafner in Paris, and Harrassowitz in Wiesbaden. Dealers in Scandinavia, Spain, and Latin-America will also be used for this purpose. The Library of Congress has recognized the need for strong personnel in the various parts of the world from which it will seek its literature, and it is obvious that these people will be given full financial and other support to make the job as efficient as possible. In Latin-America the Library of Congress will establish lines of supply similar to those in Europe, and work on the success of the Latin-American Cooperative Acquisition Program (LACAP, as it is called) in its acquisitions program. Publishers similarly will be called upon to reprint many

titles which have not been available to small and growing libraries.

GUIDELINES FOR PREPARING PROJECT REQUESTS

At New York University, if Dr. Gosnell made his point, the procedures for requesting funds are well established. Undoubtedly, this is a pattern in other institutions. At Columbia University, for example, the Office of Contracts and Grants takes an intensive part in the preparing of request applications, and making certain that all elements involved in the request are included. Requests for funds for resources and construction are relatively simple. Requests for research require somewhat more detail. These requests follow a form of presentation, and contain not only a clear-cut delineation of the proposal but also a well-worked-out design, a precise statement of methodology, discussion of any possible built-in evaluative approaches, related studies (if a research project is intended), personnel descriptions, and an extended budget to show how the funds are to be used. Time schedules are always included, and should be marked out as carefully as possible, as many studies have been underestimated in terms of months or years needed. Overhead, of course, is always included, and may be as high as 20 per cent, and if on personnel basis only, as high as 30 per cent.

Indeed, the directions for filling out forms are rather direct and specific. Despite the clarity, however, as has been noted by Miss Krettek and others concerned, the institutions that have no special office for contracts and grants may be at a disadvantage in competition with the larger institutions which specialize in obtaining government funds. One can only say that every institution that is interested in obtaining such help should have staff members trained in developing such requests; if not, they should acquire such personnel by train-

ing individuals to do this work. The various agencies, such as the American Council on Education, for example, have issued bulletins to help institutions, and the April issue of *Special Report on Federal Programs*, of the American Council on Education, is entitled, "The College Equipment Grant Program," which discussed Title VI of the Higher Education Act, which is "to improve the quality of the classroom."

Although we have in library service Miss Krettek's excellent reporting on what is going on in Washington, and how to take advantage of developments in legislation that affect libraries, it may be said that in education there appears to be a more direct assembling of related activities in this publication. Perhaps this is something that may be done by ALA for the smaller libraries, or the individual librarian who may not be aware of the developments and procedures. Indeed, it may not be too late to issue as quickly as possible a handbook for preparing project requests for government awards and contracts. Titles I, IV, VI mentioned by Miss Krettek are examples of an area that might be included.

Individual institutional requests for awards relating to building construction, teaching awards, or demonstrations of various kinds follow a pattern that has been related to forms and instructions for filling them out. As a reviewer for the Office of Education, and as a consultant in research proposals, I have seen many of these as they come in for examination and decision. The ones that receive high priority follow the stipulations set forth, and make sure that no single element in the series of requirements is omitted.

At this point, it may be worthwhile to refer to the general program of research and demonstration that the Office of Education is concerned with in Title II of the Higher Education Act. At a meeting of various individuals (librarians, library school educators, and representatives of

library associations) in Washington in March 1966, which I was given the privilege to attend, there was a discussion of (1) Title II with emphasis on library research, (2) the provisions of Title II, Part B, and plans for program administration, (3) considerations that are required for implementation of the program, (4) policy decisions that are related to making the program most effective, (5) considerations of writing of the guidelines for library research programs, and (6) developments of priorities in research, and specification of research criteria.

At this meeting, which was directed by Lee Burchinal, who is acting director of the division for research training and dissemination of the Office of Education, it may be said that the effort has been so to structure the program as to make it easy to submit proposals. The review of Title II, Part B, particularly Section 223, dealing with grants for training in librarianship, and Section 224, concerned with research and demonstrations relating to libraries and the training of library personnel, and specification of review criteria was particularly useful to all members present.

The following comments may be made about this meeting that are relevant to the progress of the relation of libraries and library schools to the Higher Education Act. It was pointed out that there would be \$103 million for research for education generally, and that part of the total allotted to library service could be applied on every level from elementary education to post-graduate training.

The character of the program in research is worth special comment, as some of you may not be familiar with the types of programs that are available. They are as follows:

1. *Small grant program.* This program includes studies with a grant of from \$7,500 (minimum usually) to \$9,000, which would be primarily on an eighteen-month basis, and which may

be more useful even on a shorter period. These grants would be of the kind that might be particularly applicable to doctoral students in library schools.

2. *Regular projects.* These are those projects that may be carried on over a period of two to three years, and would go up to several more thousands of dollars over the small grant projects, if such funds are necessary.
3. *Program support.* This concept is directed to the support of an individual who has demonstrated capacity and has issued reports that relate directly to proposals. On the basis of past achievement, grants are given to such individuals for exploration of given areas. There is no set limit for funds, although there is tendency to limit grants to the periods involved.
4. *Research and development program.* This type of program involves the establishment of nine centers throughout the country, and would require interested institutions to match funds and make a substantial investment in carrying out the project. Large scale library projects are possible here.
5. *Regional laboratory program.* This is the largest effort applied to educational research, and is supported up to the needs of the project, and within the framework of the funds available to the Office of Education. It is not likely that libraries will be involved but it also is not impossible in terms of a major cooperative project.

At our meeting, the process for reviewing proposals was discussed in some detail. It was indicated that in the past some time would elapse between the submission of a proposal, and the decision on it. It was estimated at that time that it would be about three months. It was hoped that this would be reduced to eight weeks. This period would depend on the cooperation of consultants and readers in the field.

The group made an effort to list areas

of present concern, and to indicate the relationship of the U.S. Office of Education projects being received to those being considered by ALA (Library Technology Program with its Office of Research and Development), National Science Foundation, Air Force Office of Research and Development, National Institutes of Health and various other separate agencies of the government including major national libraries (Library of Congress, National Library of Medicine, National Library of Agriculture), and the new committee on Science and Technology located at the National Academy of Science (F. J. Weyle, executive director); this was an outgrowth of the work of Committee on Science and Technical Information (COSATI). It was also pointed out that ERIC (Educational Information Research Center), established at the Office of Education, with related centers distributed at other institutions, would be in a position to coordinate research activities, and to eliminate overlapping or duplicate research.

It was apparent that any research program in librarianship would need to examine priorities in the field. After various plans or analysis of the field, the following rubrics appeared to represent a consensus of the group:

1. Values of librarianship, including studies of users, uses, goals of services, and social utility.
2. Intellectual problems, involving bibliographic control, cataloging, classification, indexing, abstracting, and data processing and retrieval.
3. Systems analysis and planning, including allocation of resources, national responsibilities, and placement of men and machines.
4. Operations, involving mechanization, accounting, access to materials, and utilization of manpower.
5. Social and professional issues, including education of librarians, librarianship as a profession, and the pro-

gressive development of various types of libraries.

6. Resources and preservation, including the building of collections on a national basis, and caring for them in ways that we have not done in the past.

These areas are not new; they have been discussed in the literature of library service generally, as well as in library education. Verner Clapp includes them in his "Problems for Research" in *The Future of the Research Library*, issued last year by the University of Illinois.

IMPLICATIONS FOR LIBRARY EDUCATION

The preceding comments are directed at the problem of education for librarianship. I need not dwell on shortages in various areas of library service (and especially the serious gap in providing cataloging personnel, and personnel with some knowledge of automation). The development of new library schools in all parts of the country has raised the additional problem of staffing with teaching personnel. The Higher Education Act is concerned with developing personnel in these areas.

The need to inform all library schools of the implications of the Act is the basis for this meeting this morning, if any needed such information. The issuance of reports and papers on the Act, however, might be supplanted by the brochure suggested earlier, which would also include an explanation to all those in library education, of opportunities under various parts of the Act and related Acts. Miss Krettek has been trying to do this, and has done a remarkable piece of work, but the issuance of such an analytical bulletin, with instructions for procedure, might be of especial help to those libraries or institutions where there is not a mighty contracts and grants office.

In all library schools of any size, there should be an interest in obtaining funds available for improvement of the teach-

ing personnel in the profession; announcements of advanced and doctoral study were made in May 1966. A large number of schools have been awarded grants for either advanced study or doctoral programs, with the expectation that many of these people (and it is going to be rough to recruit suitable personnel) will go into teaching.

The \$3,550,000 available for research should be the basis for needed studies in the field as outlined earlier. There is a wide range of projects possible, as outlined in Section 225 of the Act, involving all levels of library service, and in all areas, including demonstrations, which would involve libraries themselves. This means that libraries, apart from individuals or library schools, can submit proposals separately, or in conjunction with library schools. The pattern of applications is quite flexible.

It is also quite clear, particularly after attending the meeting here of the Association of Hospital and Institutional Libraries division on Monday morning, that Section 223 (which is administered by another unit of the Office of Education, the Research Training Branch) should be coordinated with the Medical Library Assistance Act (which is supported by the Public Health Service) in terms of recruiting and training of personnel. The existence of this latter activity may be well known to medical librarians, but is not generally known to librarians as a group.

The implications for library education for individual schools of library service are quite clear. If library schools have not made proposals for obtaining funds for specific projects, they should do so. The various committees in library schools concerned with recruiting of students, and fellowships for advanced study, doctoral programs and research, or other relevant activities, should be involved in such proposals. Any projects of course imply that the schools are in a position, on the basis of personnel, facilities, and

equipment to perform on a high level if grants are awarded. All of us have a responsibility of not asking for funds if they cannot be used effectively. I am told that some of the nonaccredited schools or educational agencies are concerned about grants that have been given only to accredited schools. I am sure that eligible nonaccredited institutions are in a position to obtain grants and do effective work in the areas outlined. The law provides for criteria for selection and it is expected that some schools not now accredited will thereby improve their status and become eligible for accreditation. Title VI of the Higher Education Act (Public Law 89-329) established a new program of federal grants to institutions of higher education for the acquisition of laboratory and other special teaching equipment, or audiovisual materials. Miss Krettek has pointed out that this Act included libraries among the areas that might be assisted. The Act in general is intended to help those institutions that are making an effort to improve themselves.

OTHER DIVISIONS OF ALA

My assignment was to point out the implications for the various divisions of ALA. Mr. Moore and Miss Welch have done a complete job in describing relevant implications for the reference services and technical services respectively. In its various sections, the Higher Education Act cuts across all divisions of the association, and it would seem that

each unit of the ALA should be concerned about obtaining as much assistance as it can in the months ahead, to further its specific program. This does mean that there probably should be committees or groups representing the individual divisions of ALA. They probably should be coordinated at some point, so that overlap and duplicative projects would be minimal or non-existent. The Reference Services Division, the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Resources and Technical Services Division, the Library Administration Division, the Public Library Association, the Library Education Division, and the various other divisions—the Children's Services Division, the American Association of School Libraries, the Adult Services Division, and any other division of the ALA concerned with training of personnel (and all of them are), facilities, and services—are apparently able to qualify for participation in one or more of the several sections of the Act. We need to read the Act carefully, so that implications or possibilities are not overlooked. The Act, as I indicated earlier, has been written so that libraries can be helped to the utmost, if they take advantage of the opportunity. In addition to Miss Krettek, who has worked so tremendously at getting the act through, one might not overlook our legislative general, who has come through the wars with great success—our moderator, Edmon Low. ■■

