

ACRL Board of Directors

MIDWINTER CONFERENCE CHICAGO 1970

BRIEF OF MINUTES

January 20, 1970—4:30 P.M.

Present: President, Philip J. McNiff; Vice-President and President-Elect, Anne C. Edmonds; Directors-at-Large, Norman E. Tanis, David C. Weber; Directors on ALA Council, Robert H. Blackburn, Andrew J. Eaton, James F. Holly, Andrew Horn, Robert K. Johnson, Sarah D. Jones, James O. Wallace; Chairmen of Sections, Robert J. Adelsperger, Ruthe Erickson, Marcia J. Miller, Roscoe Rouse, John E. Scott; Vice-Chairmen and Chairmen-Elect of Sections, Julius P. Barclay, Mrs. Joleen Bock, David W. Heron, Carl H. Sachtleben; Executive Secretary, J. Donald Thomas; Secretary, Sheri Pudlo.

Not present: Eleanor Buist, Herbert A. Cahoon, Mark Gormley, David Kaser.

President Philip McNiff presided.

Mr. McNiff reporting on the Core Collection stated that it was decided at the Middletown Meeting of December 8, 1969, that the editorship of the Core Collection would be under the general supervision of the editor of *CHOICE*. Guidelines to assist the editor were drawn up. It was also decided at the same meeting that the editor of *CHOICE* would be given the option of having as his first responsibility the editorship of the Core Collection or of *CHOICE*. Mr. Doiron decided that he would retain as primary responsibility the editorship of *CHOICE* and supervise the work of an editor for the Core Collection. This decision was agreed upon by the Advisory Committee and the Council.

Miss Anne Edmonds reported on the Planning and Action Committee meeting. She stated that the Planning and Action Committee had held its first meeting. The main topic of discussion was the role of the committee and the entire division. Miss Edmonds stated that she would present a lengthy report at the meeting on January 23.

In order to improve communication between the two associations, Mr. Stephen McCarthy summarized the activities of the Association of Research Libraries. Mr. McCarthy reporting on the National Serials pilot project stated that the policy and direction of the project remained in the hands of a National Task Force. He also reported that the first job in September of the new project directors would be a systems study, as the end product will be a machine manipulatable file. He further stated that the project at the present is financed through September. The final report of the initial phase will be ready in six weeks. The

Microforms study will continue for another year with a plan for a foreign newspaper Microform project being studied. Mr. McCarthy also mentioned that work on a Slavic program had begun.

Mr. H. Vail Deale reporting on the Grants Committee stated that since the initiation of the Grants Program fifteen years ago, the financial situation among academic libraries had changed drastically. The committee had, therefore, felt that a study should be made of its objectives. The U.S. Steel Foundation, agreeing with this proposal, had employed the American Academy of Educational Development to carry out the study. Mr. Deale continued that as the Board has seen this study, the committee was recommending that the Board give its approval. Mr. Deale pointed out that the committee felt the cost of the new program would run about \$50,000-\$60,000.

Mr. Eaton pointed out that if the Board approved this project the money would have to be raised from outside sources. Mr. Eaton also asked if the Executive Secretary would have time for such a program. Mr. Thomas indicated that the proposed program would require less time from the Executive Secretary than the former Grants Program.

Mr. Johnson MOVED to approve the Grants Report. Mr. Tanis SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Smith reported on the Academic Status Committee. He stated that the committee had held its first meeting and that members had been asked to prepare papers on their concept of academic status. He also reported that the members of the committee hoped to hold a one- or two-day meeting prior to Detroit. Mr. Smith then read two resolutions passed by the committee:

RECOMMEND TO ACRL THAT IT DO EVERYTHING IN ITS POWER TO SUPPORT THE CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARIANS IN THEIR EFFORTS TO ACHIEVE ACADEMIC STATUS, AND TO CONVEY THIS STATEMENT OF SUPPORT TO THE CHANCELLOR AND TRUSTEES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE SYSTEM.

WE COMMEND ACRL AND ALA FOR THE ACTION TAKEN WHICH RESULTS IN THEIR INVESTIGATION OF THE SITUATION AND URGE THAT FURTHER STEPS BE TAKEN BY ACRL AND ALA TO SUPPORT CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE LIBRARIANS IN THEIR QUEST FOR ACADEMIC STATUS.

Mr. Smith MOVED that our Board accept these two resolutions. Mr. Tanis SECONDED the recommendation. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Pullen stated that the Constitution and Bylaws Committee had no report, but it would appreciate any suggestions made by the Board

concerning revision of the existing Constitution.

Mr. Eaton reported on the Library Services Committee. He stated that the Chairman, Mrs. Elizabeth Swint, had not been able to attend the meeting, and he had been asked to report that at Atlantic City the committee decided that its major activity was to be in the field of networks. He asked the Board if this was appropriate. Mr. Thomas stated that the Executive Committee would have to look into the original charge of the committee and make this decision.

Mr. Norman Tanis reporting for the Standards and Accreditation Committee stated that the draft of the revised Junior College Standards will be submitted to the AAJC for their reaction, and that the College Library Standards will be revised within four or five months, with a final draft before Detroit.

Mr. Edmon Low reported on the AAJC/ACRL Committee on Junior College Libraries and pointed out that the chairman of the committee, the Executive Secretary, and the Associate Executive Director of AAJC had met and another meeting was planned for February. The main topic of the discussions was the program for the AAJC Hawaiian Conference.

Mr. Joe Treyz reporting on *CHOICE* stated that *CHOICE* had a cash balance of \$150,000, and that it had been felt that the final Council on Library Resources grant had not been needed, as *CHOICE* is now on a firm financial basis. He also reported that Subscriptions were up \$8,000, Review-On-Cards—\$8,000, Profit—\$36,000. On items relating to editorial matters, it was reported that the revised edition of "The Opening Day Collection" is ready to be published. *CHOICE* also plans to extend its reviews to government documents and books published by foreign publishers. He further stated that the staff of *CHOICE* has worked hard to expand its coverage, and members of the *CHOICE* Editorial Board are very concerned about the replacement of Peter Doiron as editor of *CHOICE*. It was reported that *CHOICE* was set up in the Middletown location to help achieve its goals. Mr. Treyz stated that one of the problems of the editor seems to be the fact that he has too many bosses: i.e., Executive Director of ALA, Deputy Executive Director of ALA, *CHOICE* Editorial Board, ACRL Board of Directors, Executive Secretary of ACRL, etc. The dismissal of the editor has seriously alarmed *CHOICE* personnel and threatens the magazine. The *CHOICE* Editorial Board asked for a meeting with the ACRL Board of Directors.

Mr. Heron stated that he found the report somewhat shocking. He also stated that he hoped the ACRL Board of Directors would be kept informed.

Mr. McNiff stated that the Executive Committee had met twice to discuss this matter. He further pointed out that the present problems were not new but that they extended back to considerations of the last three Presidents of ACRL. He pointed out that the Council on Library Resources are very concerned about this situation and that there could be implications for the future development of projects affecting the welfare of academic institutions. He pointed out that while the initial grant to establish *CHOICE* had been made to ALA with the understanding that the project was to be under the general jurisdiction of ACRL, the grant for the new Core Collection project had been made to ALA and that ACRL administration was only achieved after lengthy negotiation. Mr. McNiff further stated that he had hoped that the lines of responsibilities of the *CHOICE* editor and Editorial Board had been clarified at a meeting held in Boston in October, but there apparently were frictions which had been developed over a period of years due to misunderstandings. Mr. McNiff further stated that *CHOICE* should be brought into conformity with ALA policies, and that there should be an additional meeting of the ACRL Executive Committee and the *CHOICE* Editorial Board before making a final decision on this matter. Mr. Treyz replied that he was very hopeful that this matter could be worked out.

Mr. Richard M. Dougherty reported on *College & Research Libraries*. He stated that the ACRL Publishing Committee, the Executive Secretary, and the Central Production Unit are trying to establish operational guidelines for *CRL* in terms of production and management. An editorial board has been selected to help advise on features, and changes in the format of the journal have been worked out. Further, Mr. Dougherty stated that in the future the report of *College & Research Libraries* would be made directly to the ACRL Publishing Committee, rather than to the Board.

Mr. John Scott reported for the College Library Section which held its meeting on January 19. He stated that this year's conference program would be centered on the disadvantaged, and be entitled "Critical Issues Facing Librarians in Working with Disadvantaged Students." The program will include a panel discussion with reactors.

Mr. Robert Adelsperger reporting for the Rare Book Section stated that the Advisory Group of the Rare Book Section met on January 20 to establish an Executive Committee for the section, as none had existed previously. Mr. Adelsperger reported that in Atlantic City the Manuscripts Subcommittee decided to prepare drafts of chapters for the proposed man-

uscripts manual. However, the committee has now decided that this is not a feasible plan, and has also decided that an outside editor should be sought. Mr. Adelsperger then distributed a proposal for funding such a project and asked that the Board study the proposal and present its opinion during the meeting of January 23.

Miss Marcia Miller reporting for the Subject Specialist Section stated that the committee met on Monday morning and had decided on a program for Dallas: "The Placement of Subject Specialists in Libraries."

Mr. Roscoe Rouse reporting for the Universities Library Section stated that a survey of library protection and security had been discussed and that the Extension Library Service Committee was working on refining a survey questionnaire relating to extension service in universities. The survey should go to press in the spring. The ULS Summer Conference in Detroit will be under the direction of the undergraduate librarians. Mr. Rouse also pointed out that *Library Trends* is interested in publishing an issue on Urban University Libraries.

The meeting adjourned at 6:10 P.M.

BRIEF OF MINUTES

January 23, 1970—2:00 P.M.

Present: President, Philip J. McNiff; Vice-President and President-Elect, Anne C. Edmonds; Directors-at-Large, Mark Gormley, David C. Weber; Directors on ALA Council, James F. Holly, Andrew Horn, Robert K. Johnson; Chairmen of Sections, Robert J. Adelsperger, Ruthe Erickson, Marcia J. Miller, Roscoe Rouse, John E. Scott; Vice-Chairmen and Chairmen-Elect of Sections, Mrs. Joleen Bock, Carl H. Sachtleben; Executive Secretary, J. Donald Thomas; Secretary, Sheri Pudlo.

Not present: Julius P. Barclay, Robert H. Blackburn, Eleanor Buist, Herbert A. Cahoon, Andrew J. Eaton, David W. Heron, Sarah D. Jones, David Kaser, Norman E. Tanis, James O. Wallace.

Meeting convened at 2:10 P.M. in the Crystal Room.

President Philip McNiff presided.

The Chairman opened the meeting by calling for the Committee on Program Evaluation and Support (COPES) report and a summary of budget requests. Miss Edmonds, ACRL representative to COPES, reported that the budget requests were due from all sections and committees by March 1. The budget requests should now be received by the Board of Directors for all Dallas pre-conferences. All budget requests will go to COPES for approval, and a final report will be made to the Board of Directors at the Detroit meeting. The ACRL office suggested that budget requests in future

The Scripto Wordpicker.

The Mark Over Pen That Never Marks Out.



The Scripto Wordpicker helps you **pin point the things you want to remember. It underlines** in text books, and journals, **marks over** important facts in a letter, **highlights** interesting quotes in a speech, **picks out** facts and figures for fast referral.

Any book becomes a reference book, too.

No more misquotes, wrong dates or omissions. Select whatever you want to remember as you go along and let the Wordpicker go to work for you.

The Scripto Wordpicker —**the marking pen that underlines, never obliterates.**

For 49¢. In two unforgettable colors—Bright transparent yellow, Bright transparent pink.

Scripto

years should be received by December 1. This is necessary in order to allow the Board time to study requests and to assign priorities to requested funds before the budget is submitted in March to the ALA budgeting officer.

Mr. Wallace **MOVED** that December 1 be the accepted due date for future budget requests. Mrs. Bock **SECONDED**. **MOTION CARRIED**.

Mr. Thomas stated that budgeting instructions will be forwarded to new officers each August. Miss Edmonds stated that COPEs will meet in April and the decisions reached at that time will be sent out to our Board two weeks prior to Detroit. She further stated that COPEs is going to consider its obligation to return to endowment those funds used to meet emergencies of the past few years.

The Chairman called for a report on the Planning and Action Committee. Miss Edmonds reported that several items had been discussed by the committee, the first being the request from the Committee on Extension Library Services of the University Library Section to form a joint committee with NUEA. Miss Edmonds **MOVED** that the Board approve the committee. Miss Edmonds further stated that she has asked Mr. MacDougall to provide a formal statement from NUEA indicating their willingness to form a joint committee. The Board should keep in mind that no such document now exists and the vote will indicate the willingness of ACRL to form the committee when Mr. MacDougall provides the necessary document. Mr. McNiff stated that since the **MOTION** came from the Planning and Action Committee, there was no need for a second. **MOTION CARRIED**.

The second item discussed by the Planning and Action Committee was the structure of the division. The committee agreed that parallel with an analysis of the division we should have an analysis of ACRL's role as a division of ALA and the reorganization of ALA as a whole. Miss Edmonds further stated that she had asked the committee, prior to the Detroit meeting, to let her know their feelings concerning (a) the present structure of ALA and (b) the reports which have so far been generated by the Committee on Reorganization. Miss Edmonds pointed out that the Planning and Action Committee felt that of the proposals made so far by the Committee on Reorganization, federation seemed the most acceptable. The Planning and Action Committee felt the division should aim toward an extremely active role in intellectual freedom, status and welfare of librarians, library standards and their application, education of librarians, legislation, and resource development. The division should carry out an active policy of affiliations and association with other

learned bodies. In terms of divisional reorganization, a proposal had been made that committees which are not concerned with ongoing tasks should be abolished and a series of task forces, with terminal dates, be established. The committee also felt that the Office of the Executive Secretary, in order to carry out present duties and to undertake new programs, needed additional help and should, at the same time, take greater responsibility for the activities of the division. Miss Edmonds proposed to circulate the minutes of the Planning and Action Committee to all committee members and to all Board members. Miss Edmonds stated she would appreciate reaction from the Board to the deliberations of the committee. Mr. McNiff stated that the action taken on these matters will affect ACRL for many years ahead and that the Board should give serious thought to these matters. He pointed out that the federation plan would allow ACRL to better speak for academic librarians. He also pointed out that within the present structure ACRL does not have enough freedom of action or responsibility to do the work it should be doing, and that ACRL should be prepared to submit a statement to this effect to the Committee on Reorganization at its next meeting. Mr. Johnson supported these statements. Mr. Weber stated that he had been concerned for some time that the Board meetings had not been of great consequence. He felt that what Miss Edmonds had said was of great importance and that the Board should not be requested to react but should be instructed to react. He also suggested that it might be well for the Planning and Action Committee to request the Board to sit in joint session to gain greater representation. Mr. Weber further suggested that meetings of the Planning Committee be opened to all ACRL members. Mr. McNiff replied that the meeting was generally open to all who requested attendance, and that indeed the committee had actually requested noncommittee members to sit in on the meetings in order to have a broader representation. Mr. McNiff continued that he felt a joint meeting with the Board would not be of any particular significance. Miss Edmonds then **MOVED** that the word "Action" be stricken from the name of the Planning and Action Committee as the Committee's function was limited to planning and had no authority or machinery to act. **MOTION CARRIED**.

Mr. McNiff stated that he had received a **MOTION** from the Publication Committee that Mr. Howard Winger be designated the official historian to write the history of ACRL. Mark Gormley **SECONDED**. **MOTION CARRIED**.

The Chairman then pointed out that in order

to resolve the differences concerning the editor of *CHOICE*, the Executive Committee at its meeting on Saturday, January 17, 1970, decided that a clarification of the relationship between the *CHOICE* Editorial Board, the *CHOICE* editor, and the ALA staff was necessary to eliminate the types of difficulties which have arisen in the past. The committee had voted the following items to serve as a guide in the development of a new statement of purpose and responsibility:

1. The editor of *CHOICE* is a member of the ALA staff and is responsible to the ACRL Executive Secretary.
2. The *CHOICE* Editorial Board is responsible for advising the editor on editorial policy in conformity with the ACRL established practice.

Mr. McNiff confirmed that the Editorial Board of *CHOICE* at its meeting on Thursday, January 22, 1970, agreed to these two points and to the need for a revision of the statement of purpose and responsibilities with the understanding that the new statement of purpose would not be in conflict with these two principles. The Executive Director of ALA had agreed to continue the services of Mr. Doiron on the condition that these principles be accepted and implemented. A draft of a revised statement of purpose, prepared by the *CHOICE* Editorial Board on Thursday evening, January 22, 1970, was reviewed later that same evening at a meeting of the Chairman of the *CHOICE* Editorial Board, the Executive Secretary of ACRL, and the President and President-Elect of ACRL. It was decided, at that time, that further revision was required, and the ACRL Executive Committee has requested that the Executive Secretary prepare a draft of a new statement of purpose to serve as the agenda for a joint meeting of the Executive Committee of ACRL, the *CHOICE* Editorial Board, and the representatives of ALA staff, to be held at ALA Headquarters prior to the Detroit Conference. Mr. McNiff then asked Mr. Treyz if he did not feel that the *CHOICE* statement of purpose should be revised, and that there was a need to expand *CHOICE* along several lines, the most urgent, however, being, at the moment, the compilation of the *CORE* Collection. Mr. Treyz agreed.

Mr. McNiff then called for expressions from the Board.

Mr. Horn stated that it seemed to him that approval was indicated. Mr. Holly stated that he felt it difficult to argue with success and he felt *CHOICE* had been a success. He further stated that he hoped the proposed changes would not in any way impair *CHOICE*'s past record. Mr. McNiff pointed out that there was general feeling that editorially a good job had

been done by *CHOICE*, but there were problems of production and lines of responsibility which had to be worked out. He felt a new statement of purpose would do much to correct these problems. Mr. Treyz stated that he felt it was time to bring *CHOICE* into line with other ACRL publications, although he felt some qualms about moving the publishing department, and he would like to give the editor a certain amount of freedom. Mr. McNiff stated that in his mind there was no question of editorial freedom, but that the real problem was in establishing a sound basis on which to move ahead. Mr. Cahoon *MOVED* that the Executive Committee be authorized to continue its negotiations with the endorsement of the Board. Mr. Horn *SECONDED*. *MOTION CARRIED*.

The Chairman called for new business.

Mr. Thomas asked for an expression of opinion from the Board members concerning the scheduling of Board meetings; that is, should the meetings be scheduled on consecutive days or should they be spaced? Mrs. Bock felt a separation of dates is a good idea. Mr. Gormley stated that he felt there should be no more than a two- to three-day separation.

Mrs. Erickson requested a name change of the ACRL/JCLS Special Projects Committee to Communications Committee. Mr. Weber asked how long the committee had been in existence and what was the substance of the issue? Mr. Wallace stated that the committee had been in existence since 1961 and had formed a network across the country to secure and distribute junior college library information at the grass roots level. He pointed out that the committee had been very productive. As the *MOTION* originated from a section, no second was required. *MOTION CARRIED*.

Mr. Adelsperger asked the Board for an opinion on the proposal for a manuscript curators guide which had been distributed at the January 20 meeting. Mr. Weber stated that he felt somewhat ambivalent about the proposal for the following reasons:

1. The proposal seems too vague in its scope.
2. There is no consideration indicated with regard to technical processing.
3. The difficulty of securing an editor would be enormous.
4. Should this publication become an ACRL Monograph, what would be the chances of recouping the initial cost of the guide.

Mr. Adelsperger replied that he was not in total disagreement with any of these points. However, a similar project had been discussed with related associations and there was a general feeling that this type of document was needed, and interest by various funding agencies had been expressed. Mr. Adelsperger con-

tinued that various names for editor had been submitted and that there had been an indication of interest in the position. Mr. McNiff MOVED the question. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Adelsperger then informed the Board that the Advisory Committee of the Rare Book Section was now recommending the establishment of an Executive Committee to determine policy and direction for the section. The proposed committee would include the chairman, chairman-elect, past chairman, three members-at-large, and a secretary. The committee was to be organized and members elected in the spring of 1971. At that time, three members-at-large would be elected for one, two, and three year periods, respectively, and in each succeeding year one member-at-large would be elected for a three-year period. The secretary would serve for a two-year term. Mr. Adelsperger asked the Board if it were proper to request the approval from the membership of the Rare Book Section and then present his proposal to the Board.

Mr. Scott raised the question of the role of ACRL in work with the disadvantaged. He pointed out that the College Section was planning its Detroit Program on this theme, but that he was unaware of other activities within the division. Mr. Weber stated that too frequently ACRL concerned itself with program meetings when it seemed to him we should be concerned with the development of librarians. He questioned the possibility of establishing a program which would help librarians from disadvantaged groups to hold internships in various colleges and universities about the country.

Mr. McNiff felt that we needed to determine what is presently being done along these lines so that we could act with more assurance. Miss Edmonds pointed out that Mrs. Jessie Carnie Smith of Fisk University had been active in placing black interns. Miss Edmonds asked that Mr. Thomas secure information on Mrs. Smith's activities in this matter and distribute the information to Board members.

Mrs. Erickson reported that the JCLS planned to survey present and possible areas of work with the disadvantaged in junior colleges. Mr. McNiff suggested that the problem should be reviewed by the Planning Committee.

Mr. McNiff requested Mr. Thomas to discuss the problem of preconferences. Mr. Thomas asked that Exhibit I of Session II be read into the minutes.

PRECONFERENCE GUIDELINES

Preconference institutes may be held prior to the regular annual conference. Such institutes should be limited to projects which re-

quire more time or a different setting because of the nature of the subject to be covered.

As it requires at least eighteen months to prepare and budget for a preconference, the President-Elect or a Chairman-Elect of a section or subsection wishing to hold a preconference during the year he is president or chairman, must submit to the ACRL office no later than December 1 of the year he had been elected, a general statement setting forth the subject and the purpose of the preconference. These plans must also include a tentative budget.

The ACRL office will duplicate and distribute this statement to the officers and Board of Directors of the association at the following Midwinter Meeting for divisional approval or disapproval of the basic proposal. If the proposal is approved, the budget for the preconference will then be submitted to COPES and to the ALA Conference Planning Committee for final approval at the following Annual Conference in June.

All preconference plans must include a preplanning session at which the executive secretary of the association will be present. This session must be held no later than the November preceding the preconference date, and a complete report of the plans, including speakers, timing, etc., presented to the ACRL office for the ALA Conference Planning Committee by the following Midwinter.

All expenditures for the preconference will be coordinated through the office of the executive secretary. A final accounting of funds will be prepared by the preconference committee chairman and the executive secretary of the association.

Mr. Thomas pointed out that all preconferences must be self-supporting, and that presently the office of the executive secretary has the responsibility for preconference finances, although the office has no control of the expenditures. He asked that the statement be accepted as ACRL policy. Mr. Weber asked if insertion in the fourth paragraph of "a suitable substitute" after "All preconference plans must include a preplanning session . . ." would be acceptable? Mr. Thomas answered affirmatively.

Mrs. Erickson MOVED that the statement with Mr. Weber's recommended change be accepted. Mr. Wallace SECONDED. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Adelsperger raised the question of a Rare Book Preconference for the Dallas Conference. Mr. McNiff stated that he would like to refer all questions concerning preconferences for Dallas to the Executive Committee. Mr. Gornley stated that the idea of the first Rare Book Preconference was good. However,

he now questioned whether such work should not be done during the regular conference week. Mr. Weber stated that he was concerned that the Rare Book Preconferences were not held in the conference city. He pointed out that this precluded attendance by many mem-

bers who had a professional interest in Rare Books. Mr. McNiff informed the Board that the time had expired, and that the question of Rare Book Preconferences would be referred to the Executive Committee.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 P.M. ■■

From Inside the DLP

By DR. KATHARINE M. STOKES

College and University Library Specialist, Library Planning and Development Branch, Division of Library Programs, Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

The initials for our Division did not change on February 10 when we became a part of the BLET instead of the BAVLP, but those of you who are familiar with government structure will realize that this is an important change. The new Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology to which we now belong has been created as a sister bureau to the one for Educational Personnel Development (BEPD), and the two bureaus will be headed by the Deputy Commissioner for Instructional Resources, who has not yet been appointed. The BEPD is headed by Associate Commissioner Don Davies, who will be acting head of the BLET also until an appointment is made. The two other agencies with us in the new Bureau are the Educational Broadcasting Facilities Program headed by Raymond Stanley, and the Educational Media Program. The programs administered by the Library and Information Research Branch, now headed by Lawrence Papier are being transferred from the Office of Information Dissemination to the BLET.

Our Division personnel remains the same, headed by Director Ray Fry and his administrative staff, with four branch chiefs, as follows:

1. Mrs. Elizabeth A. Hughey (Library Program and Facilities)
2. Frank A. Stevens (Library Training and Resources)
3. R. Kathleen Molz (Library Planning and Development)
4. Paul C. Janaske (Library and Information Science)

The first branch is concerned with Library Services and Construction Act grants administered through the State Library agencies. The second dispenses Higher Education Act, Title II-A awards for college library resources and Title II-B awards for institutes and fellowships for library education. The third and fourth are planning branches, one devoted to library ed-

ucation and the other to all types of libraries and their activities. This third branch includes specialists on public, school, special, and academic libraries and one on public library services for children and young adults.

All this is preamble to my thanks to all of you who answer requests for copies of your annual reports. Planning is a very vague sounding activity, but any projection into the future has to be based on very definite information about past experience.

Your reports give us some insight into academic libraries—the changes in your budgets, for better or worse; the changes in your staffing as library technicians become available for non-professional tasks and automatic data processing necessitates the employment of systems experts and computer programmers; the development of resources for graduate work as your institutions offer new programs; the expansion of your services as you acquire more space in new buildings; the sharing of your resources with your neighbor libraries to offset rising costs as interest on endowment funds shrinks and government grants grow smaller.

We look forward to reading about the progress you are making, e.g., at Northern Illinois University where a Special Purpose Type A grant in 1967 under the Higher Education Act, Title II-A has been helping in building resources for an expanding graduate program; at the University of North Carolina where a Small Library Services and Construction Act, Title III, grant has helped to boost the local and regional tradition of cooperation to a new level of statewide usefulness among all types of libraries; at Indiana University where Higher Education Facilities Act grants helped to finance a new building that not only fosters excellent services for the academic community, but also provides a fine setting for an accredited library school. ■■

ACRL Membership

March 31, 1970	9,892
March 31, 1969	11,776
March 31, 1968	11,464
