RAYMOND L. CARPENTER

Two-Year College Libraries: A Comparative Analysis in Terms of the ACRL *Standards*

The analysis of 1977 HEGIS data for two-year-college libraries in terms of the 1979 ACRL Standards *shows that a majority of these libraries do not meet the standards in respect to nearly all the variables available for study. HEGIS data do not include measures of some important factors such as space and equipment, and not all data are gathered in terms that match the* Standards' *definitions. Increased financial support is needed to bring the libraries of the nation's two-year schools up to standard.*

THE QUANTITATIVE STANDARDS for two-year college libraries completed in 1979 by the Junior College Libraries Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) constitute the current guidelines for planning and evaluating learning resource centers or libraries for those higher education institutions known variously as junior colleges, community colleges, and technical institutes.[1] This study presents a profile of the libraries of these institutions in terms of those variables included in the *Standards* for which there are measures available in the 1977 Higher Education General Information Surveys (HEGIS), the most recent data available at the time of this analysis. The HEGIS survey of libraries is supplemented with information from the surveys of enrollment, finance, and staff. All four sets of data were obtained in machine-readable form and analyzed with the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). Major financial support for computation services was provided by the Junior College Libraries Section of ACRL with additional assistance from the Computation Center and the School of Library Science of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

The maximum number of *usable* cases (institutions) in the HEGIS surveys is 1,146, only one fewer than the total listed in the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education's *Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*.[2] This nearly perfect coincidence of *total* numbers suggests that in the aggregate we have an excellent approximation of the universe of two-year institutions. However, some of the schools listed by the Carnegie Commission were no longer in existence or failed to report at the time of the 1977 HEGIS studies, and a few new institutions appeared between the time of the compilation and the HEGIS studies. Nonetheless, the institutions analyzed in this study clearly constitute over 95 percent of the total in the U.S. Thirty-six institutions counted as two-year schools by HEGIS did not report adequate or reliable data and were eliminated completely from the analysis. As the total *N*s in the various tables show, fewer than 1,146 schools provided responses for all questions in the surveys; rarely were there fewer than 1,100 us-

Raymond L. Carpenter is professor, School of Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

able responses. Responses were inspected and "cleaned" before being taped and analyzed by the author. In sum, the data are quite complete and valid.

The major limitation of this study lies in the fact that the HEGIS studies did not query institutions about all of the variables specified in the *Standards*. Missing are data about the physical plant (space) and equipment distribution. Moreover, the HEGIS query about recorded materials does not make a distinction, as does the *Standards* statement, between "motion pictures and videotapes" and "other recorded materials." Consequently, the specificity called for in the *Standards* can only be estimated from the HEGIS responses that reflect numbers for all types of recorded materials. An additional limitation on the accuracy of our assessment of recorded-materials holdings can be attributed to a special and fundamental problem in reporting this class of resources. Recorded or audiovisual materials are probably undercounted as they are sometimes controlled entirely or in part by an agency or department in the institution other than the library. Such holdings are in effect unreported if the institution fails to take account of such departments when polled by HEGIS. The extent to which this introduced undercounting is impossible to estimate.

The *Standards* do not differentiate between public- and private-controlled schools, but institutions vary considerably in respect to this type of control, as will be apparent in examination of the following tables. Many of the standards are expressed in terms of the size of full-time student enrollment (FTE). In order to understand how well the nation's two-year schools meet the *Standards*, table 1, showing the distribution of schools in terms of FTE size and type of control, is important. Private institutions are relatively smaller – only 2 percent have more than 3,000 FTE students as compared with 42 percent of the public institutions of this size.

These percentages vary a bit from table to table due to different rates of response to particular questions. Thus, the numbers in parentheses in each of the following tables identify the number of libraries reporting for the variable in the respective table.

As only five *privately* controlled schools have enrollments of 3,000 or more, private institutions larger than 3,000 FTE students are summarized collectively in each table by the footnote denoted by an asterisk. Few schools have enrollments over 11,000, and in order to compress the data for readability the tables with data expressed in terms of enrollment limit the upper level to 11,000 FTE. In those tables the row labeled $< 11{,}000$ represents institutions with FTE of $9{,}000 < 11{,}000$ FTE students.

One of the most salient features of the standards for two-year schools is the specification of "minimal" and "good" levels for each category of FTE for several variables. These levels are noted in the relevant tables by the letters *M* (minimal) and *G* (good) with the numerical value in parentheses called for at these levels by the *Standards*. For example, in the table on professional staff, the "M (2)" for the fewer than 1,000 FTE students category indicates the minimum number of professional staff required to meet standards in schools of this size. The table shows that 30 percent of private and 43 percent of public schools have at least two professional staff members, the "minimum" level requirement, while only 2 percent and 5 percent respectively, have four or more professionals, the "good" level requirement.

In tables 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 17, all columns do not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.

TABLE 1
STUDENT ENROLLMENT SIZE BY TYPE OF CONTROL

FTE Students	Total (1,146)	Private (235)	Public (911)
Less than 1,000	32%	82%	19%
1,000 < 3,000	34	16	39
3,000 < 5,000	11	2	14
5,000 < 7,000	7	2	9
7,000 < 9,000	5	2	6
9,000 or more	10	2	13

STAFF

The *Standards* document specifies different numbers for professional and support staff. Tables 2 and 3 show the distributions for each of these categories of staff at the minimal and good levels for each FTE student group.

Considering that nearly two-thirds of the schools have fewer than 3,000 FTE student

TABLE 2

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

FTE Students		Total (1,146)	Private (235)	Public (911)	< 1.0 Prof. Staff	1 < 2.0 Prof. Staff
< 1,000	M (2)	36%	30%	43%	13%	51%
	G (4)	3	2	5		
1,000 < 3,000	M (2.5)	49	16	52	5	23
	G (4)	21	3	23		
3,000 < 5,000	M (3.5)	56	*	56	1	8
	G (6)	9		9		
5,000 < 7,000	M (6)	25		23	1	0
	G (8)	7		6		
7,000 < 9,000	M (7)	34		33	0	2
	G (10)	12		10		
< 11,000	M (8)	48		48	0	0
	G (12)	25		25		
Median		2.5	1.0	3.0		
Mean		3.4	1.5	3.9		
90th percentile		6.5	3.0	7.3		
10th percentile		1.0	0.1	1.0		

*Of the 4 private schools with FTE 3,000 < 9,000, one is at M, two at G level.

TABLE 3

SUPPORT STAFF

FTE Students		Total (1,146)	Private (235)	Public (911)	< 1 Support Staff	1 < 4 Support Staff
< 1,000	M (4)	4%	2%	6%	43%	53%
	G (6)	< 1	0	1		
1,000 < 3,000	M (5)	15	0	17	12	60
	G (10)	1	0	1		
3,000 < 5,000	M (9)	15	*	15	3	30
	G (18)	1		1		
5,000 < 7,000	M (15)	5		4	1	17
	G (24)	2		2		
7,000 < 9,000	M (17)	15		16	0	7
	G (30)	0		0		
< 11,000	M (19)	29		29	0	2
	G (36)	4		4		
Median		3.0	0.5	3.5		
Mean		4.6	1.0	5.5		

*Of the 4 private schools with FTE 3,000 < 9,000, one is at M level.

enrollments, the majority do not meet the minimum professional staff criteria. However, public institutions fare consistently better than their privately controlled peers in respect to both minimum and good levels of professional staffing. The extent to which the minimum of two professionals for the smallest schools is not met is reflected in the two right-hand columns. There we find that 13 percent of the schools with fewer than 1,000 FTE students and 5 percent of schools with 1,000–3,000 students have fewer than *one* professional. Of the 1,000–3,000 FTE group (39 percent of public schools are of this size), 23 percent have between one and two professionals. A comparison of the medians and means for private and public institutions is further indication of their disparity in respect to this important variable.

The inadequacy of support staff is greater yet; neither private nor public institutions come up to mark to any significant degree. Even among the group of schools with 3,000–5,000 students, of which 56 percent met the minimum standard for *professional* staff, only 15 percent meet the support-staff standards. Moreover, 30 percent of this group have fewer than four support-staff members, less than half the number required for their minimum level. Comparing the data from tables 2 and 3 for all sizes of schools suggests widespread understaffing in general and a serious deficiency in developing professional-support-staff ratios. Consider the schools with fewer than 1,000 students: 36 percent have two or more professionals,

but 43 percent have less than one support-staff member.

Implied in the minimums for professional and support staff are ratios ranging from 1:2 to about 1:2.5 professional to support staff for the several enrollment groups. Table 4 provides a summary of professional:support ratios by type of control.

Table 4 amplifies the relationships implied in tables 2 and 3. The *Standards* for staff imply that there should be at least two support staff for each professional. Assuming that the minimum ratio of professional to support staff should be 1:2, calculations conclude that 79 percent of all schools fall short of this "standard" (92 percent of the private and 77 percent of the public schools). The means and medians point up the differences between the schools by type of control, public institutions being far more favored – although 31 percent of them have less than one support staff for each professional.

Student assistants constitute a special factor in support of library services. If 500 hours can be considered as a rough equivalent of twelve full-time weeks of work (forty hours per week), over one-third of the schools lack this level of support (table 5). The median hours for all institutions would produce one full-time "equivalent" staff member for forty weeks a year. While student assistants may perform many important tasks, the extent to which they can be counted on for continuous and skilled service is open to question in counting such employees as support staff.

TABLE 4

RATIO OF PROFESSIONAL TO SUPPORT STAFF

Ratio Prof.: Support	Total (1,111)	Private (214)	Public (897)
< 1:0.5	19%	49%	12%
< 1:1.0	19	20	19
< 1:1.5	27	16	29
< 1:2.0	14	7	16
< 1:3.0	14	7	15
1:3.0 or more	7	2	8
Median	1:1.04	1:0.50	1:1.24
Mean	1:1.30	1:0.64	1:1.46
Minimum	1:0.0	1:0.0	1:0.0
Maximum	1:20.0	1:3.5	1:20.0

TABLE 5

HOURS OF STUDENT ASSISTANCE, ANNUAL

No. of Hours	Total (1,051)	Private (186)	Public (865)
< 500	35%	36%	34%
< 2,000	19	31	17
< 6,000	28	28	28
< 10,000	10	3	11
10,000 or more	8	2	9
Median	1,600	1,150	1,830
Mean	3,360	1,860	3,690

COLLECTIONS

The *Standards* for collection size refer to written and recorded materials. The HEGIS inquiry and the *Standards* statement do not coincide precisely in terminology and definitions for the various kinds of materials. The distribution of periodical subscription *titles* as reported to HEGIS appears in table 6. "Other written materials" as called for in the *Standards* are represented in table 7 as the number of *volumes* held as reported by HEGIS. HEGIS does not distinguish as do the *Standards* between "motion pictures and videotapes" and "other recorded materials"; table 8 thus represents as "audiovisual" titles the best approximation of the *Standards*.

While a majority of neither public- nor private-controlled schools have the number of periodical titles called for in the *Standards*, public institutions greatly exceed the private institutions; at least twice as many meet the minimum as well as the good levels. Note that nearly a quarter of *all* schools have fewer than 100 titles.

The size of the book collection is also below standard in most institutions, but private schools, of which 82 percent have fewer than 1,000 FTE students, do somewhat better than the public schools, as nearly a quarter of them meet the "good" level. As in the case of periodical subscriptions, a quarter of all schools fall well below half the minimum for the lowest FTE group, holding fewer than 10,000 volumes.

In table 8 all "recorded materials" are represented by the HEGIS count of the number of audiovisual titles: "audio recordings, motion pictures, filmstrips, slides, overhead transparencies, videotapes, videodiscs, mixed media (multi-media), kits, etc; exclude microforms."[3] The HEGIS count is a close approximation of the *Standards'* intentions, but its count does not distinguish between "motion pictures and videotapes" and "other recorded materials" as does the *Standards* statement. Consequently, in order to maximize the effect of the *Standards*, the *M* and *G* levels in table 8 constitute some of the

TABLE 6
PERIODICAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

FTE Students		Total (1,146)	Private (235)	Public (911)	< 100 Titles	< 200 Titles
< 1,000	M (200)	37%	25%	50%	24%	38%
	G (300)	12	6	19		
1,000 < 3,000	M (300)	41	8	44	9	17
	G (500)	7	0	18		
3,000 < 5,000	M (500)	24	*	24	2	6
	G (700)	5		5		
5,000 < 7,000	M (700)	8		7	2	4
	G (800)	5		4		
7,000 < 9,000	M (710)	22		22	0	0
	G (860)	3		3		
< 11,000	M (720)	36		36	1	0
	G (920)	17		17		
Median		280	150	330		
Mean		350	150	410		
90th percentile		630	280	670		
10th percentile		90	20	150		

*Of the 4 private schools with FTE 3,000 < 9,000, none is at M level.

TABLE 7
BOOK COLLECTION SIZE (VOLUMES)

FTE Students		Total (1,146)	Private (235)	Public (911)	< 10,000 Volumes	< 20,000 Volumes
< 1,000	M (20,000)	43%	47%	39%	25%	32%
	G (30,000)	18	23	13		
< 3,000	M (30,000)	33	19	35	9	24
	G (50,000)	6	3	7		
< 5,000	M (50,000)	21	*	21	4	10
	G (70,000)	3		3		
< 7,000	M (70,000)	10		7	1	6
	G (85,000)	2		1		
< 9,000	M (82,000)	12		12	0	2
	G (109,000)	2		2		
< 11,000	M (94,000)	24		24	2	1
	G (133,000)	8		8		
< 10,000 vols.		12%	28%	8%		
< 20,000 vols.		20	25	19		
Median		27,300	18,900	30,000		
Mean		33,900	20,700	37,300		
90th percentile		64,600	41,400	69,700		
10th percentile		9,000	2,200	11,500		

*Of the 4 private schools with FTE 3,000 < 9,000, one is at M, one at G level.

TABLE 8
AUDIOVISUAL TITLES

FTE Students		Total (1,069)	Private (200)	Public (869)	< 100 Titles
< 1,000	M (365)	76%	68%	83%	9%
	G (1,475)	40	31	49	
1,000 < 3,000	M (1,475)	59	26	62	6
	G (3,550)	26	7	28	
3,000 < 5,000	M (3,550)	46	*	47	1
	G (6,050)	29		30	
5,000 < 7,000	M (6,050)	38		37	1
	G (9,750)	17		16	
7,000 < 9,000	M (6,096)	50		49	2
	G (10,860)	21		22	
< 11,000	M (6,142)	40		40	1
	G (11,970)	25		25	
Median		2,140	730	2,600	
Mean		4,660	1,530	5,370	
90th percentile		10,900	3,970	12,100	
10th percentile		253	39	400	

*Of the 4 private schools with FTE 3,000 < 9,000, two are at M, one at G level.

TABLE 9
MATERIALS OTHER THAN BOOKS, PERIODICALS, AND AUDIOVISUALS

Volumes	Total (1,078)	Private (186)	Public (892)
Median	1,560	264	2,080
Mean	7,090	2,890	7,970

"motion pictures and videotapes" and "other recorded materials" values called for in the *Standards*. For instance, schools with enrollments (FTE) of fewer than 1,000 are expected (in the *Standards*) to have 15 units of "motion pictures and videotapes" and 350 of "other recorded materials." Table 8 has combined these to indicate that 365 audiovisual units are required for the minimum level.

Although the data do not account for the degree of specificity accounted for in the *Standards*—distinguishing counts of motion pictures and videotapes from counts of other types of recorded materials—they do show that the holdings are much closer to standard than are either periodical subscriptions or books as reported in the previous two tables. Public institutions outrank private ones—nearly half of the public schools with the smallest enrollment attain the "good" level, and nearly two-thirds of public schools in the modal FTE group of 1,000–3,000 are at the minimum level. The difference between public and private schools reflected in their medians points up the magnitude by which each type exceeds the standards.

Because the reporting of other kinds of materials is less consistent in respect both to reliable enumeration and consensus about definition, table 9 reports simply the median and mean volumes held. As the *Standards* call for no more than 350 units for schools with FTE of 1,000–3,000 and 1,200 for the 3,000–5,000 FTE category, most of both private and public institutions presumably meet the minimum standards. Note, however, the extraordinary difference between the mean and the median for private schools. Holdings of this kind vary so greatly that one may question the reliability of reporting, perhaps largely due to lack of any reliable *inventory* in many schools.

The *Standards* call for annual acquisition of 5 percent of the existing *collection*. The best indicator available for this in the HEGIS database is the annual acquisition rate for the *book-stock* part of the collection. Consequently, table 10 tells us only about book-stock additions, not about the important collections of "recorded materials" (HEGIS does not inquire about this). On average (that is, comparing medians and means), private schools barely meet the standard. Public schools, in spite of 31 percent falling below the 5 percent mark are about 50 percent better off.

BUDGET

The *Standards* state that "a fully developed Learning Resource Program will usually require from 7 to 12 percent of the educational and general budget of the institution, whether these are separately identified as learning resources or diffused in a multiple number of accounts."[4] The extent to which learning resources programs are funded beyond the budgets reported to HEGIS is not

TABLE 10
PERCENT OF BOOK STOCK ADDED (STANDARD: 5% OF THE COLLECTION SHOULD BE ADDED YEARLY)

Percent Added	Total (1,146)	Private (235)	Public (911)
<4%	23%	43%	18%
<5%	14	17	13
cumulative % under 5%	(37)	(60)	(31)
<7%	22	15	24
<10%	19	12	21
10% or more	22	14	24
cumulative 5% or more	(63)	(41)	(69)
Median	6.1%	4.6%	6.5%
Mean	8.8	6.9	9.3

TABLE 11
LIBRARY EXPENDITURE AS A PERCENT OF INSTITUTIONAL EXPENDITURE (STANDARD: 7–12%)

Library's % of Institutional Budget	Total (1,107)	Private (217)	Public (890)
<3%	30%	35%	29%
<4%	22	20	23
<7%	37	32	39
cumulative less than 7%	(89)	(87)	(91)
7<13%	9	11	9
13% or more	1	3	1
cumulative 7% or more	(10)	(14)	(10)
Median	3.9%	3.7%	3.9%
Mean	4.5	4.8	4.4

known. Thus, table 11 relies on reports of those 1,107 institutions that had at least one identifiable resource agency—in nearly all instances a library or learning resource center. In other words, two-year institutions *may* be funding their learning resources programs at a higher level than the table indicates if there are sources of funding not reported because they were not polled. Nonetheless, given that less than 4 percent of the total number of institutions failed to report, we can probably assume that most institutions fall well below this budgetary standard. The difference between public and private schools is negligible. Collectively, 30 percent allocate less than 3 percent, and 52 percent allocate less than 4 percent of their institutional budgets to the library or learning resource center. Such budgets must be more than doubled to begin to meet the bottom level of this standard.

Tables 12, 13, and 14 provide further insight into the budgetary situation.

Library budgets are extremely modest, even in the smallest schools. That is, 82 percent of private-controlled schools have FTE student enrollments of fewer than 1,000, and table 12 shows that 5 percent of private schools have total operating budgets of less than $35,000. Public schools fare better, but with their larger enrollments this is to be expected; even among this group nearly a quarter have less than $75,000 a year.

The pattern of differences between private and public schools is demonstrated again in the findings about materials and personnel expenditures. While the much smaller budgets of private schools can be attributed to their smaller enrollments, the size of the differences shown in the percentage distributions and in the averages is very large. Given the very limited total budget it is not surprising to find that over half of the private schools spend less than $10,000 on materials, and about a fourth of public schools spend less than $20,000. Given the small number of staff, the salaries and wages budgets are unsurprising. Troubling, if not surprising, however, is the question as to how an institution of any enrollment size can provide services and materials with such limited funding.

Service

Although there is no position taken in the *Standards* regarding the amount of time the library should be accessible to users, the HEGIS data afford rudimentary but fundamental information on this subject. Table 15 shows that the average hours open per week is similar in public and private schools, although a quarter of the private schools provide access fewer than fifty hours a week as compared with 5 percent of public schools. If the 80 percent of schools open between fifty and seventy-five hours a week are on a seven-

TABLE 12

Total Library Operating Expenditures

Total Library Budget ($)	Total (1,146)	Private (235)	Public (911)
<35,000	15%	54%	5%
<75,000	22	37	18
<150,000	28	8	34
<250,000	16	1	20
250,000 or more	18	1	22
Median	$102,000	$34,000	$133,000
Mean	166,000	42,000	198,000

TABLE 13

Materials Budgets

Materials ($)	Total (1,146)	Private (235)	Public (911)
<10,000	16%	55%	6%
<20,000	22	34	18
<40,000	30	9	36
<75,000	22	2	27
75,000 or more	11	0	13
Median	$27,000	$ 9,000	$33,000
Mean	39,000	11,000	46,000

TABLE 14

Salaries and Wages Budgets

Salaries and Wages ($)	Total (1,146)	Private (235)	Public (911)
<20,000	16%	56%	6%
<40,000	23	34	19
<75,000	21	7	25
<100,000	11	1	13
100,000 or more	30	2	37
Median	$55,000	$18,000	$ 75,000
Mean	99,000	23,000	118,000

TABLE 15

Hours Open per Week

Number of Hours/Week	Total (1,145)	Private (235)	Public (910)
<50	10%	26%	5%
50<75	80	63	85
75 or more	10	12	10
Median	64	62	64
Mean	64	59	65
Minimum	10	10	13
Maximum	168	168	168

day schedule, they presumably are accessible approximately eight to ten hours a day. The extent to which these hours of access are in the evenings or on weekends and times that employed students may need to use the library cannot be determined with the data available.

The appendix to the *Standards* consists of nearly seventy users' services for which statistics might be collected. The HEGIS data furnish measures for estimates of two important factors in the list, reference services and circulation.

The figures in table 16 do not provide the kinds of distinctions called for in the *Standards*. For instance, they do not tell if the service consists of "extensive assistance" or if the service was to particular user groups such as the physically handicapped.[5] In order to interpret the table accurately, note that the percentage distributions are for the number of reference and directional transactions *per FTE student*. The HEGIS questionnaire does not inquire about the type of user, consequently such other users as faculty and staff are in effect not counted in the tabulation. If the number of the *total* population of users was known and used as the divisor, the number of transactions would be smaller than represented in the table. The means and medians of the public and private schools differ greatly—private schools provide on average about three and a half times as many transactions as the public ones.

As in the previous table, the total figures in table 17 (in this case, loans) are divided by the number of FTE students. Other users are not included; thus, the data are somewhat inflated. Again the private schools show, on average, higher usage than those under public control. Considering the *total* school population, the table shows that 55 percent of them lend fewer than eight items per year per student. This number would be lower if the number of faculty, staff, and other users was included in the divisor. In sum, the circulation data suggest a low rate of use.

TABLE 16

REFERENCE AND DIRECTIONAL TRANSACTIONS PER FTE STUDENT PER WEEK

Number of Transactions	Total (991)	Private (197)	Public (794)
<0.1	42%	17%	48%
<0.5	44	50	43
<1.0	9	18	6
1.0 or more	5	15	3
Median	.13	.30	.11
Mean	.36	.82	.25
10th percentile	.03	.06	.03
90th percentile	.64	1.7	.48
95th percentile	1.07	2.9	.73

TABLE 17

ANNUAL LOANS PER FTE STUDENT

Number of Loans	Total (1,130)	Private (224)	Public (906)
<4	24%	26%	24%
<8	31	12	36
<12	20	16	21
<20	14	18	13
20 or more	11	28	7
Median	7	10	7
Mean	14	36	9
10th percentile	2	1	2
90th percentile	21	53	17

SUMMARY

The analysis of the 1977 HEGIS data to determine how closely learning resource centers in two-year colleges meet the ACRL standards may be summarized briefly as follows:

1. *Staff*. A majority do not meet professional or support-staff standards. Public schools are more nearly up to standard for professionals than are private schools. Both fall far short of recommended support-staff levels.

2. *Collections*. Public institutions come closer to having the number of recommended periodicals than private ones, but a majority of both falls below the standard. About 25 percent have fewer than 100 periodical subscriptions.

While book collections are more nearly up to standard in private schools, a majority of both falls short of recommended levels. Collections generally are small: 57 percent have fewer than 20,000 volumes.

The standards for audiovisual titles are more nearly reached by both private and public schools than for other materials.

The standard referring to collection development, as measured by percent of book stock added, is unevenly met. Forty-three percent of private schools add less than 4 percent; 41 percent add 5 percent or more, the standard level. Only 18 percent of public schools add less than 4 percent, and 69 percent meet the 5 percent level, with nearly one-fourth adding 10 percent or more.

3. *Budget*. The recommendation that in-

stitutions allocate from 7 to 12 percent to learning resource centers is rarely satisfied. Only 14 percent of private and 10 percent of public schools' libraries receive 7 percent or more of their institutions' budgets.

Assuming that the *Standards* are, in general, useful measures for evaluating and developing library resources and services, and that the HEGIS data provide a reasonable approximation of the status quo, most libraries are below the standard for nearly all factors. Further, improvement in data gathering and analysis is necessary to afford a full and more precise measure of libraries in terms of the ACRL *Standards*. However, several of the most important factors in the *Standards* are measurable, as reflected in this study, and the shortcomings are fairly clear. Assuming that management policy and practice would be effective and efficient, the allocation of considerably more funds is probably the key factor in bringing these learning resource centers and libraries more nearly up to the levels specified in the *Standards*.

References

1. *"Draft: Statement on Quantitative Standards for Two-Year Learning Resources Programs," College & Research Library News* 40:69–73 (March 1979).
2. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education* (Berkeley, Calif.: The Commission, 1976).
3. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Education Division, "Higher Education General Information Survey and Library General Information Survey, College and University Libraries—Fall, 1977" (Questionnaire) (Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1977), p.2.
4. "Draft: Statement on Quantitative Standards," P.70.
5. Ibid., p.73.