

ACRL Board of Directors

ANNUAL CONFERENCE CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, 1972

MINUTES

Monday, June 26, 1972—10:00-11:30 A.M.

Present: President, Joseph H. Reason; Vice-President and President-Elect, Russell Shank; Past President, Anne C. Edmonds; Directors-at-Large, Mark M. Gormley, Norman E. Tanis, David C. Weber; Directors on ALA Council, Page Ackerman, Evan I. Farber, James F. Holly, Robert K. Johnson, Roscoe Rouse; Chairmen of Sections, Carl R. Cox, Hal C. Stone, Lee Ash, Wolfgang M. Freitag, Ralph H. Hopp; Vice-Chairmen and Chairmen-Elect of Sections, John R. Beard, William J. Hoffman, Howard L. Applegate, Alice D. Ball, LeMoyne W. Anderson; Professional Assistant, Jordan M. Scepanski; Administrative Assistant, Ilse F. Bridges.

Absent: Herbert A. Cahoon, James F. Govan, Warren J. Haas, Andrew Horn, Richard L. O'Keeffe.

Visitors: D. Joleen Bock, Richard M. Dougherty, Richard K. Gardner, H. Joanne Harrar, David W. Heron, B. J. Mitchell, Jasper G. Schad, Robert Van Waes, Sue Welch, and others.

The meeting was called to order by the presiding officer, President Joseph H. Reason. The first order of business was the approval of the minutes of the Midwinter Meeting sessions of the ACRL Board of Directors as published in the April 1972 issue of *CRL News*. Following this, Mr. Reason announced the ACRL election results and introduced Norman Tanis as the new vice-president/president-elect and Joanne Harrar, director-at-large for 1972 through 1976.

The chair then recognized Howard Applegate, who stated that difficulties had arisen concerning the site selected for the Rare Books and Manuscripts Preconference Institute in 1973. Los Angeles was now deemed to be a more convenient and advantageous location for the preconference. Mr. Applegate thus **MOVED**, and LeMoyne Anderson **SECONDED**, that the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section be authorized to change the location of the 1973 Preconference Institute from Denver to Los Angeles. After a short discussion the vote was **IN FAVOR** of the motion.

Mr. Reason next called upon John Beard, chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on an ACRL Membership Levy for an Academic Status Office, for his report on the recently con-

ducted membership poll concerning such a levy. The May 1972 issue of *CRL News* had carried a special insert which provided the membership an opportunity to express their opinion on the matter, asking whether they were in favor of the assessment or opposed to it believing the office should be funded from the ALA budget. Space was also provided on the card for other preferences or comments. Mr. Beard reported that the response to the poll had been very poor, with only 732 replies (6.7 percent), out of a total membership of 10,872. Of those responding, 149 voted in favor of the assessment, 424 were opposed to the assessment and believed the office should be funded from the ALA budget, 116 were opposed to the office and/or faculty status, 20 were in favor only if funding from ALA were not forthcoming, 4 were in favor of a smaller assessment, 1 took no position, and 21 indicated other opinions. Mr. Reason inquired if Mr. Beard intended to request some action from the membership and asked the committee's opinion of the results. Mr. Beard felt that the response had been too poor to draw any definite conclusion and Mr. Reason asked if anything should be done other than making an announcement of the official tally. A general discussion followed, with Roscoe Rouse stating that the report should be adopted as presented. William Hoffman asked if the strong negative responses were possibly a result of the way in which the questions were worded. Russell Shank commented on the matter of budgeting from ALA and reminded the Board that the requested associate executive secretary position had again not been funded. James Holly asked if the survey indicated the members did not want the position established and if their response supported the ALA position, but Mr. Hoffman stated that it appeared many people believed ALA should fund the office; most were opposed, however, to an additional dues levy. It was agreed that Mr. Beard should make his report at the membership meeting that afternoon.

Mr. Reason then introduced Robert Wedgeworth, executive director designate of ALA, who informed the Board of the search for a new executive secretary. He mentioned that he had delayed a selection in order to personally interview and carefully screen a number of individuals. His widening of the search had resulted in a number of excellent candidates. David Weber asked what inadequacies had been found among some of the earlier candidates for the position, and Mr. Wedgeworth replied that they either did not have enough experience or they lacked an understanding of the issues. He

assured the Board that he would recommend an appointment within a month.

The next item on the agenda concerned the Association of American Colleges/American Association of University Professors/ACRL *Joint Statement on the Faculty Status of Librarians* [see September 1972 *CRL News*] and Mr. Reason explained that the Executive Committee had invited Robert Van Waes, associate secretary of AAUP, to attend both the Board meeting and the afternoon's membership meeting. He introduced Mr. Van Waes who, he said, was available to answer any questions which might arise concerning the work of the joint committee.

Mr. Holly stated that he was interested in hearing a brief review of the negotiations leading up to the joint statement. Mr. Van Waes complied, touching on some of the problems involved and filling in some of the background regarding efforts of collective bargaining units. He concluded saying he thought the Joint Statement was a very good document and he hoped ACRL would approve it.

Page Ackerman inquired about the timing involved for approval of the document by the other two associations. Mr. Van Waes replied that the AAUP would submit the document to its Council and ask for approval to have it published. At the AAC, a commission will review the statement during its annual meeting in January. He indicated final approval from all three organizations could possibly be achieved within a year. At this point, Mr. Shank mentioned that he had a letter written by one of the Board's members, David Weber, to the ACRL executive secretary. He brought the matter up at this time because he believed it to be a point germane to the discussion. He then read Mr. Weber's letter, which raised the question of the Association's tax exempt status. If ACRL formally involves itself in arbitration and in the imposing of sanctions, it would come close to the position of a labor union, he said, and he expressed the belief that the AAUP may also be in this position. He asked if Mr. Van Waes could be contacted and queried about the tax position of the AAUP as a result of their efforts as a bargaining agent.

Mr. Van Waes made several comments in answer to Mr. Weber and indicated that in his opinion this was a question of whether or not a group was becoming political. An organization does what it must, he said, and if necessary the AAUP would give up its tax exempt status.

Mr. Beard asked if the AAUP would be prepared to fight for such a policy statement on the faculty status of librarians, if the question of enforcement arose. Mr. Van Waes replied in the affirmative. There being no further questions, Mr. Reason thanked Mr. Van Waes for

his participation and then called upon Mr. Shank for his report on the 1972/73 budget.

Mr. Shank explained that it was difficult to compare the 1971/72 budget with the 1972/73 proposed budget since the figures were presented somewhat differently this year. He told the Board that ACRL's funding had been reduced. He discussed the elimination of the half-time professional assistant position and the ramifications of other budget cuts, and he compared ACRL's budget with those of other ALA units. He stated that the association will have a difficult time in the coming year. Mr. Dougherty, editor of *CRL News*, indicated that *CRL News* was to be cut by an average of four pages per issue.

The chair then recognized Hal Stone, who spoke about the reorganization of the American Association of Junior Colleges/ACRL Joint Committee on Junior College Libraries. The Board had previously agreed to an expansion of the committee to include representation from the Association for Educational Communications and Technology. Mr. Stone said that the committee proposed to eliminate one committee member from the AAC and one from ACRL and add three from AECT. This structure has been agreed upon by the three organizations.

The next item on the agenda was the proposed changes in the ALA Bylaws concerning Committees of Council, and Mr. Reason asked Mr. Shank to conduct this discussion. The changes would require that a majority of the members of certain major ALA committees be drawn from the Council. Mr. Holly indicated that he voted for the proposal when it was brought before Council at the Midwinter Meeting and he intended to vote in favor of the bylaw amendments implementing the procedure. He said he strongly believed that Council members should be involved in the operation of committees and that under the present system too much time was wasted in Council meetings. A number of Board members opposed the suggested changes, however, and the argument that the proposal resulted in a smaller number of members participating in the affairs of the association was advanced.

In response to Mr. Reason's call for new business, Mr. Weber brought up the subject of committee and section reports. He thought that these were being somewhat neglected since chairmen were not asked, as they had been in the past, to make verbal reports. He considered these important even if listening to them all was a bit tedious at times. When Mr. Freitag mentioned the written reports included in the docket, Mr. Weber replied that, in his opinion, the key issues facing the various units should be brought to the attention of the Board rather than merely having written reports for information purposes.

The chair then recognized Anne Edmonds, past president of ACRL and chairman of the newly-formed American Association of School Librarians/ACRL/American Library Trustee Association Interdivisional Committee on Federation. Ms. Edmonds said she would appreciate suggestions and guidance from the committee and announced that there would be a meeting the following afternoon.

Mr. Rouse then asked to go back to the subject of the proposed changes in the *ALA Bylaws* concerning Committees of Council, as he wanted to specifically know the Board's view when he was called upon to vote on the matter in Council. Mr. Reason asked for a show of hands on the proposal. One person voted for the changes, nine favored the status quo, and the rest abstained. There being no further questions or comments on this subject and no additional new business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:30 A.M.

MINUTES

Thursday, June 29, 1972—2:00-6:00 P.M.

Present: President, Joseph H. Reason; Vice-President and President-Elect, Russell Shank; Past President, Anne C. Edmonds; Directors-at-Large, Mark M. Gormley, Norman E. Tanis, David C. Weber; Directors on ALA Council, Page Ackerman, Evan I. Farber, James F. Gowan, James F. Holly, Andrew Horn, Robert K. Johnson, Richard L. O'Keeffe, Roscoe Rouse; Chairmen of Sections, Carl R. Cox, Hal C. Stone, Wolfgang M. Freitag, Ralph H. Hopp; Vice-Chairmen and Chairmen-Elect of Sections, John R. Beard, William J. Hoffman, Howard L. Applegate, Alice D. Ball, LeMoyne W. Anderson; Professional Assistant, Jordan M. Scepanski; Administrative Assistant, Ilse F. Bridges.

Absent: Herbert A. Cahoon, Warren J. Haas, Lee Ash.

Visitors: Millicent D. Abell, Raymond Bohling, Thomas H. Cahalan, Brendan Connolly, Richard M. Dougherty, Elizabeth E. Ferguson, Richard K. Gardner, H. Joanne Harrar, Louis A. Jacob, Roy L. Kidman, Beverly Lynch, Frank C. MacDougall, Jasper G. Schad, Eldred Smith, Robert Pierson, Edward Weidlein, and others.

President Joseph H. Reason presided and called the meeting to order. He then introduced Raymond Bohling, newly elected Director-at-Large.

Mr. Reason next repeated the announcement made at the ALA Council meeting that morning concerning the settlement of the Peter Doiron case. Mr. Doiron accepted his termination

as editor of *CHOICE* and his salary would be discontinued at the end of the month. Richard Gardner would become the new editor. Mr. Gardner would serve on a part-time basis for the next three months and assume the duties of editor full-time as of October 1, 1972.

Mr. Reason then turned the floor over to Richard Dougherty, editor of *CRL News*, who proposed to the Board that the journal initiate an annual contest for the best paper written by a library school student. He stated that this matter had been discussed with the *CRL* Editorial Board, which had expressed its approval. The winner of the contest would be brought to the Annual Conference for one day.

During the ensuing discussion on the subject, Ira Farber wanted to know if the subject of the paper would have to relate to college and research libraries and Mr. Dougherty replied affirmatively. He further explained that a jury would be appointed to read the papers submitted and to rate them and stated that at present he had twelve readers who would volunteer to do so. The winning paper, and possibly others, would be published in the journal. Mr. Shank asked if there were anything else that could be done for the winner, such as the awarding of a stipend, for example. Mr. Dougherty pointed out that money available for such a contest was very limited and that transportation and one day's expense could be paid for from the editor's travel fund, which he was willing to use. Mr. Reason inquired whether Mr. Dougherty had consulted with the ALA Awards Committee as there might be some conflict. Mr. Dougherty answered that he did not think there was a similar award in existence but that he would contact the committee. Mr. Reason then asked if the prize could be paid for out of the ACRL budget, but Mr. Weber said that the cost could be quite high and that ACRL might be committing itself to a greater expense than anticipated. Mr. Dougherty replied that a limit could be established and indicated there was some precedence for such an award. The American Society for Information Science presently conducts a similar type of contest. Mr. Farber questioned the objective of the contest, asking what was to be gained by it, and Mr. Dougherty responded that it was primarily intended to encourage more students to write, and also submit, good papers. Mr. Shank then made the following motion.

MOVED that the ACRL Board approve in principle the concept of a student paper contest, with guidelines to be set up and reported back to the Board.

Mr. Hoffman SECONDED, and the substitute MOTION CARRIED.

As the next item of business, Mr. Reason called on Roy Kidman, chairman of the Committee on Academic Status for a report. Mr. Kidman referred to the *Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians*, which had been approved at the Dallas Conference [see September 1972 *CRL News*], and the provisions which had been made for negotiations with the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors. He summarized the negotiations carried on by the three organizations during the past year which had culminated in the *Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians*. This was the statement discussed at the meeting on Monday when Mr. Van Waes was present. He then read the motion which the Committee on Academic Status had recommended to the ACRL membership on June 26, a motion which was subsequently APPROVED.

MOVED that the ACRL *Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians*, as passed at the ACRL Membership Meeting of June 24, 1971 in Dallas, Texas, be reaffirmed and that the April 26, 1972 *Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians* of the Association of College and Research Libraries, the Association of American Colleges, and the American Association of University Professors be endorsed as an effective implementation of many of these standards.

Mr. Kidman asked that this motion be adopted by the Board. The vote taken was unanimously IN FAVOR of the motion.

Mr. Kidman then MOVED that ACRL recommend to the joint committee that an "s" be added to the word "paragraph" on line 26 of the document as an editorial clarification. After a short discussion, this motion also CARRIED unanimously.

Mr. Kidman pointed out that the other two organizations involved might make changes in the document and therefore the letter of transmittal by the ACRL president should perhaps include an indication that changes in the document would necessitate a referral back to the ACRL Committee on Academic Status for further review and recommendations. Mr. Reason wished to know if the Board agreed to this, and Mr. Beard questioned whether such a statement would be diplomatic. Mr. Shank said he did not think so and that he felt this to be unnecessary. Mr. Kidman said that some committee members thought there might be a problem with this. Mr. Shank suggested that rather than insert such a statement in the letter of transmittal the concern of the committee could be made known in some other way. He said he would consult

with ACRL headquarters and the new chairman of the Committee on Academic Status.

Ms. Ackerman then proposed a resolution of thanks to the present and past chairman of the Committee on Academic Status and all members thereof for their hard and dedicated work on this particular issue. She stated that the joint statement was a milestone for academic librarians and MOVED a formal resolution of thanks to all concerned. Mr. Beard SECONDED and the MOTION CARRIED by acclamation.

Mr. Reason indicated that the next item to be taken up was a memo from the Subject Specialists Section requesting Board action. Wolfgang Freitag, chairman of the section, stated that many members of the subsections were concerned about the relatively low status the subsections had within ACRL and said they did not believe they were properly represented on the ACRL Board. He pointed out that subsection officers had difficulty obtaining travel funds and time off to attend conferences due to their relatively low status in the association. In view of the important contributions subsections were making to ACRL, the Section now asked for the elimination of all subsections by granting them sectional status, thus permitting greater participation in the governance of the association. He then read the memorandum submitted to the Board.

The Executive Committee of the Subject Specialists Section of ACRL, after extensive discussion of all aspects of the present status of ACRL, the sections, and the subsections, now recommends that the ACRL Board assign sectional status to the seven present SSS subsections, thereby eliminating the present Subject Specialists Section as such.

Mr. Freitag put the recommendation in the form of a MOTION which was SECONDED by Mr. Anderson. The ensuing discussion centered around the procedural changes involved and whether the bylaws would have to be amended and approved by the membership; if so, this would mean at least one year before final action could be taken. Mr. Weber wanted to know if the matter had been discussed with the Planning Committee, and Mr. Shank replied it had, but stated that the committee did not have any recommendations as yet. Louis Jacob, newly elected vice-chairman of the Subject Specialists Section, pointed out that the subsections were growing in members at a time when the overall ALA membership was decreasing. The subsections definitely felt they should be better represented within the division. Ms. Ackerman inquired if there were any reason why the request should be denied. She asked if objections had been raised during the Planning Committee's discussions. Mr. Shank replied that there

had not been any, that the size of the Board had been the only concern. It was felt that the entire structure of ACRL should be studied before the size of the Board was changed, but otherwise there were no real objections to the request. Mr. Tanis pointed out that according to Section 5 of the Bylaws it was perfectly legal to make this change. Mr. Anderson mentioned that he had heard one subsection was considering leaving ACRL and affiliating with another organization. Messrs. Freitag and Jacob both stated that ACRL was in real danger of losing members unless they were given the recognition they wanted and deserved.

When it was pointed out that providing representation on the ACRL Board for all of these subject groups might result in a proliferation of sections with a corresponding increase in the size of the Board, Mr. Shank said that perhaps discussion groups could be formed rather than new sections, until such time as the Board was restructured. Mr. Tanis thought that a leveling of the Board and an encouraging of participation in Association decisions by more young people, who quite often were elected to subsection offices, had considerable merit. Mr. Weber stated that he did not think it appropriate to take action without a recommendation from the Planning Committee; he was in sympathy with the motion, but would like to have further study done. Mr. Jacob replied that he hoped the matter would not be deferred. The subsections, he said were doing meaningful work and were quite successful; yet, under the present structure they are in a subordinate position. Mr. Hoffman said that if the Board wanted to change the criteria for the establishment of new sections to prevent a continued increase in the number of Board members, it could, of course, do so, but this should certainly not interfere with a consideration of the present request. He suggested that the motion be approved and then a study made to change the Bylaws altering the number of members required to petition for establishment of a section. Mr. Applegate asked what the Planning Committee specifically had in mind concerning the restructuring of ACRL, and Mr. Shank responded that it had no specific ideas at this time, but nevertheless thought it should be undertaken. Mr. Holly stated that he thought the matter should be referred to the Planning Committee for a recommendation. Jordan Scepanski then pointed out that under the Bylaws the change could go into effect immediately, and Mr. Tanis agreed since the Board had the authority to create sections. Mr. Scepanski raised a question, however, concerning the Bylaws requirement of signatures for the establishment of sections, but Messrs. Shank and Reason both thought such signatures unnecessary since the petition was presented by the Executive Committee of the Subject

Specialists Section. In any case, the twenty-five signatures had already been gathered when the subsections were established. There being no objection to accepting the request from the SSS Executive Committee in lieu of the signatures, the matter was put to a vote. It PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Reason then turned the floor over to Mr. Shank for the report of the Planning Committee. Mr. Shank reminded the Board that certain recommendations made by the Committee at the Midwinter Meeting were still to be discussed, but that these would be considered after the new items had been acted upon. The Planning Committee met the previous evening and had three recommendations for Board action. Mr. Shank proceeded to read Item 2 of the Planning Committee report to the Board, dated June 29, 1972.

The Planning Committee wishes to express its concern about the reduction in the size of the Board. We tend to feel that the Board should be restored to its present size, but recommend that the entire organizational structure of ACRL be studied first. After changes in the structure are decided upon (if any changes are required) then the make-up of the Board of Directors to provide adequate representation of the membership and organizational units can be determined.

Mr. Shank **MOVED** that the expression of concern and request for study in Item 2 be approved. He mentioned that with the reorganization of the ALA Council eliminating divisional representation, the Board would decrease in number by nine. The recommendation was made before it was learned that the Subject Specialists Section would request the increase previously approved. Ms. Edmonds wanted to know if this were to be a separate organizational study apart from the ALA study. Mr. Shank replied that it was and that this seemed to be a Planning Committee function, but the Committee made no recommendation as to who should conduct the study. Ms. Edmonds commented that she felt it should be the Planning Committee and Mr. Shank therefore **AMENDED** his motion to read.

That the expression of concern and request for study in Item 2 be approved and be referred to the Planning Committee for action.

The motion PASSED without dissenting votes.

Mr. Shank next moved to Item 3 of the report.

The Chairman of the Committee on Library Surveys has recommended that the

THE INDISPENSABLE BASIC RESEARCH TOOL FOR...

historians

studying the first century of American expansion, the development of federal land policy, or local history

genealogists

seeking precisely to locate migrating persons west of the Appalachians, their East Coast origins and evidence of possible Revolutionary War military service

librarians

holding National Archives microfilms of General Land Office, U.S. Treasury, or Department of State records

archivists

of collections containing supplementary land records, surveys, bounty-land warrants, or early deeds

land-title searchers or county recorders of deeds

wishing to establish the first link (the land patent) in chain of title to specific land tracts

FEDERAL LAND SERIES

Clifford Neal Smith, *Editor*

The FEDERAL LAND SERIES makes available to librarians, historians and other scholars a systematic survey of archival materials on the land patents issued by the United States government from 1788 to 1810. Of special interest are a list of grants to refugees of the Revolutionary War from Canada and Nova Scotia, the names of Connecticut "Sufferers" who lost property to the British, and some military bounty-land warrants issued for service during the Revolution.

THREE-WAY INDEX ■ *Indexes every name encountered* ■ *Indexes all subject matter covered* ■ *Indexes all tract designations*

You will find the *Federal Land Series* an indispensable basic research tool.

ISBN 0 — 8389-0138-7 (1972) **\$20.00**



AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION

Chicago, Illinois 60611

Committee be abolished. The Planning Committee concurs, and refers this matter to the Board of Directors for consideration.

He **MOVED** that the Planning Committee recommendation that the Committee on Library Surveys be abolished be approved. After a short discussion the motion **CARRIED** by unanimous vote.

Mr. Shank referred to Item 1 of the report and stated that this particular item was related to a previous recommendation made at Midwinter.

The Planning Committee recommends that the ACRL Board express its opposition to the proposed dues structure, at least until a number of issues have been examined (as listed below). We further recommend that the ACRL advocate a dues structure that provides for the inclusion of dues for membership in at least one division as part of the basic membership dues.

The issues that we feel should be addressed before a decision is made are as follows:

(a) Should the dues structure be changed when the organizational structure of the American Library Association is under consideration?

(b) The potential adverse effect of the new dues structure on the size of membership of ACRL should be more carefully assessed.

(c) What portion of the proposed divisional membership dues money will come to the division? We recommend that divisions receive 100 percent of the divisional dues. What portion of the basic membership dues will be available to divisions for support?

(d) What would be the effect of the new dues structure on subscriptions to ACRL journals?

Mr. Shank **MOVED** that the Board accept the recommendation stated in Item 1 of the report. He explained that a new dues proposal might be brought before the ALA membership during the Las Vegas Conference and that it was important the questions raised by the Planning Committee be answered. The **MOTION CARRIED** unanimously.

The next point to be considered was Item 3 of the Planning Committee Annual Report, one of the recommendations not considered at the Midwinter Meeting.

It is recommended that ACRL establish an ad hoc Committee on Educational Requirements for Service in Academic and Research Libraries in aspects of work that

require different or additional education than is specified in the ACRL Standards for Academic Status.

Mr. Shank **MOVED** the establishment of the committee. Mr. Applegate mentioned that the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section had an ad hoc committee considering the same matter. Mr. Tanis questioned if the intended work could not perhaps be done by an already established committee; i.e., the Committee on Standards and Accreditation. Mr. Shank responded that since the incoming chairman of that committee, Jasper Schad, was present, it might be best to let him comment on the matter. Mr. Schad complied and mentioned specifically that the budget for his committee should be considered in any decision concerning new activities. The budgeted amount of \$3,000 was not adequate to carry on the work at hand, and at this time the committee's most important project, a revision of the *Standards for College Libraries*, was not yet underway. Mr. Shank indicated that he would withdraw his motion if someone could offer an acceptable alternative, and Mr. Applegate suggested that the Rare Books and Manuscripts Section committee proceed and a progress report be made to the Board at the Midwinter Meeting. The matter could then be considered at that time. In answer to Ms. Ackerman's request for more specific reasons for the recommendation, Mr. Shank pointed out that one aspect of this involved the *ACRL Standards for Faculty Status*. Under the Standards, individuals without an MLS degree might be excluded. Following this he **WITHDREW** the motion.

Mr. Shank now read Item 4 of the report.

It is recommended that the President of ACRL schedule an "Informational Meeting" of ALA Councilors who are members of ACRL (open, of course, to all members of ALA) before the first meeting of the Council at each conference of ALA at which time the concerns of the Board of Directors of ACRL can be made known to the Councilors.

He **MOVED** that the above recommendation be approved. Mr. Hoffman stated that he thought it very important that guidance of this type be made available, but Mr. Stone wondered if there might not be a problem of scheduling. Mr. Tanis asked if perhaps lobbying might be preferable to a meeting. Mr. Shank replied that that might also prove difficult. Mr. Weber asked if such meetings were really needed. If a particularly important issue came up, a caucus could be held to consider it. Mr. Applegate than **PROPOSED** that the president of ACRL be authorized to communicate with ALA Councilors who are members of ACRL as he sees fit and that he inform the Board of Directors of

his actions. Mr. Shank accepted this proposal as a SUBSTITUTE MOTION and it was UNANIMOUSLY approved.

Mr. Shank next read Item 8 of the committee's annual report.

It is recommended that the ACRL Ad Hoc Committee on Constitution and Bylaws be changed to the ACRL Committee on Constitution and Bylaws.

He MOVED the change which was APPROVED by unanimous vote.

Mr. Shank mentioned that, for the record, Item 7 of the report having to do with the dues structure no longer needed to be considered because of the action just taken concerning the ALA dues proposal, and that Item 2, a recommendation concerning the *ALA Standards for Accreditation* need not be discussed since the Standards had been approved. He therefore MOVED Item 1.

It is recommended that the ACRL Committee on Appointments and Nominations be composed of the Chairmen of the Section Appointments and/or Nominating Committees, and as many members-at-large as are required to reach the authorized number of members.

Mr. Hoffman questioned whether a number should be substituted. Mr. Tanis pointed out that the proposal involved a change in the Bylaws. Mr. Stone and Ms. Ackerman both suggested that the Board approve the idea and ask the president-elect to implement it. Mr. Shank then WITHDREW his MOTION. Mr. Reason said that this procedure could be suggested to the president-elect each year and he could decide upon his own course of action.

Following this discussion, Mr. Shank MOVED Item 6 of the report.

It is recommended that the ACRL appoint an Ad Hoc Committee to analyze the proceedings of the ALA Conference on Information Networks and Interlibrary Communications and recommend to the Planning Committee courses of action for ACRL that will facilitate the role of academic and research libraries in their involvement in library service according to national plans for networking and interlibrary cooperation.

Mr. Applegate wondered if there were no existing committee which could handle this matter and Mr. Weber asked if this entailed elimination of the ACRL representative to the Interdivisional Committee on Interlibrary Communications and Information Networks. When Mr. Shank replied in the affirmative, Mr. Weber suggested a change in the wording of the motion so that it would read as follows.

It is recommended that the ACRL appoint an Ad Hoc Committee on Information Networks and Interlibrary Communications to recommend to the Planning Committee courses of action for ACRL that will facilitate the role of academic and research libraries in their involvement in library service according to national plans for networking and interlibrary cooperation.

Mr. Shank agreed to this change in wording and the measure PASSED by unanimous vote.

Mr. Shank then moved on to Item 5 of the report.

X It is recommended that the President-elect of ACRL be authorized to change the size of ACRL committees as circumstances warrant with the normal maximum size of committees to be nine people. In no case should an ACRL committee be larger than twelve members except as the Board of Directors direct or approve.

After considerable discussion on this matter, it was generally agreed that the president already had this authority. Nevertheless the Board unanimously agreed to the proposal after Mr. Tanis indicated that such authority was in no way in conflict with the Constitution and Bylaws.

The next item on the agenda was the National University Extension Association/ACRL Joint Committee report and Frank MacDougall, chairman of the joint committee, was asked to take the floor. Mr. MacDougall gave a short summary of the committee's activities and referred to the resolution approved by the Board at Midwinter, authorizing the Joint Committee to develop Standards for University Extension Library Services. Mr. Tanis pointed out that the resolution should have been referred to the Committee on Standards and Accreditation for a recommendation, but that it was now too late for this since both ACRL and NUEA had approved it. Mr. Scepanski said that any standards developed by the joint committee would have to come before the Board for approval and these could then be referred to the Committee on Standards and Accreditation for review, if necessary. A discussion then followed on the matter of removing the University Libraries Section from the official name of the joint committee. The committee had originated in that section. It was decided that the matter should be taken up with the ALA Committee on Organization.

H. William Axford, chairman of the Committee on Standards and Accreditation, was unable to be present at the meeting and Mr. Reason therefore called upon Mr. Stone to report on the *Guidelines for Two-Year College Learning*

Resources Programs. Mr. Stone pointed out that the Board had approved these guidelines in principle at Midwinter and that they now had been edited and approved by the American Association of Junior Colleges/ACRL Joint Committee. The Board UNANIMOUSLY GRANTED its formal APPROVAL.

The next order of business concerned two resolutions submitted to ACRL by the Idaho Library Association.

RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED AT THE 1972 ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE ILA AT MCCALL, IDAHO, APRIL 29, 1972

WHEREAS, academic libraries must often defend their position regarding the establishment of departmental or branch libraries, in this period of limited finances for libraries, whose size does not require them, especially to professional accrediting agencies or bodies:

BE IT RESOLVED by the College, University and Special Libraries Division of the Idaho Library Association meeting in annual conference, April 27-29, 1972, at McCall, Idaho, that all professional accrediting bodies refrain from suggesting the establishment of departmental or branch libraries at a particular institution until and unless it has been established whether or not the size and resources of the institution dictate this (with the exception of Law and Medical libraries which must be separate to receive professional accreditation):

And, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be forwarded for support and approval to the Idaho Library Association in general session, the Pacific Northwest Library Association, the Association of College and Research Libraries and the American Library Association.

* * *

WHEREAS, an adequate library is essential to the educational process, and therefore it is the responsibility of any accrediting agency to examine critically the library of any educational institution being surveyed for accreditation purposes:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the College, University and Special Libraries Division of the Idaho Library Association meeting in annual conference, April 27-29, 1972 at McCall, Idaho, that all accrediting associations and professional accrediting agencies be urged to make every attempt to include a professional librarian or someone at least knowledgeable about libraries on accrediting teams visiting academic institutions;

And, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be forwarded for support and approval to the Idaho Library Association in general session, the Pacific Northwest Library Association,

the Association of College and Research Libraries, and the American Library Association.

These resolutions were adopted by the Idaho Library Association meeting in general session on April 20, 1972.

Mr. Scepanski explained that the resolutions could not be brought before the Committee on Standards and Accreditation since the committee lacked a quorum at its earlier meeting. Since the American Library Association as a whole had also been asked to approve these, they would come before the ALA Council on Friday. Mr. Scepanski further explained that David Clift, the ALA executive director, had asked for ACRL's recommendation and had also sought the opinion of the ALA Committee on Accreditation. Mark Gornley suggested a recommendation to the Council that the resolutions be tabled until further study. Mr. Hoffman thought the resolutions should be referred to the ACRL Committee on Standards and Accreditation and that it was inappropriate for the ALA Committee on Accreditation to be involved in the matter. Mr. Tanis said that, although the concerns expressed in the resolutions were serious and long standing, the matter should nevertheless be studied carefully. Mr. Shank stated that, in his opinion, ACRL should object to the involvement of the ALA Committee on Accreditation. Since this committee is concerned only with the accreditation of programs in library science, and not with the accreditation of academic institutions or their libraries, Mr. Clift should not have sought their guidance. ACRL speaks for ALA in matters involving academic libraries, he said. After further discussion Mr. Holly MOVED that Keith Doms, ALA president, be informed no action is recommended at this time, but that the resolution be referred to the ACRL Committee on Standards and Accreditation for recommendations. Mr. Shank SECONDED, and after additional discussion it was AGREED TO AMEND the motion to read as follows.

That Keith Doms be informed no action of the ALA Council is recommended at this time and that the resolutions be referred to the ACRL Committee on Standards and Accreditation for recommendations because of ACRL's primary responsibility in these matters.

Mr. Holly agreed to present the matter at Council and the motion was unanimously SUPPORTED.

Mr. Shank now asked to be permitted to bring up the subject of the search for an ACRL executive secretary. He said he was apprehensive about delays which might be encountered before the position was filled and also said that the Board had not had much opportunity to

Reprints

OF IMPORTANT JOURNALS IN

Hispanic Review. A Quarterly Journal Devoted to Research in the Hispanic Languages and Literatures

(Pennsylvania. University)

Vols. 1-37. Philadelphia

1933-1969

(Partly in the original edition)

Clothbound set \$750.00

Paperbound set 600.00

Published by the Modern Language Association, Spanish Section, this journal is devoted to research in the Hispanic languages and literatures.

"The book review section has substantial critical reviews of interest to scholars . . . [Recommended for] College, university and large, metropolitan public libraries."

—Katz, *Magazines for Libraries*

Modern Language Notes

Vols. 1-77. Baltimore 1886-1962

Clothbound set \$1,877.00

Paperbound set 1,625.00

"Publishes articles of literary criticism and discussions of problems in criticism of comparative literature. Each volume contains six issues devoted, in order of publication, to Italian, Spanish, German, French, again German, and comparative literature. All types and periods of the national literature are considered. Articles are generally original and critical."

—Katz, *Magazines for Libraries*

English Association. Year's Work in English Studies

Vols. 1-43. Oxford 1919/20-1962

(Vol. 42 in the original edition)

Clothbound set in

23 volumes \$671.50

Paperbound set 582.00

This annual is without doubt the most important publication of the English Association, providing a yearly survey of the progress of scholarship in the English language and its literatures throughout the world. It is of great value as a general reference work for students and scholars of English literature and an indispensable tool for philologists as well.

Prices of individual volumes of all journals are available upon request. Please direct all orders and inquiries to Paul Negri.

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

Modern Language Journal

(Federation of Modern Language Teachers' Associations; Associations of Modern Language Teachers of the Central West and South)
Vols. 1-47. New York 1916/17-1963 (Vols. 43-47 partly in the original edition)
Paperbound set \$1,150.00

"... devoted primarily to methods, pedagogical research, and to topics of professional interest to all language teachers from the elementary to the graduate levels. A basic journal for any school or academic library where foreign languages are a major concern of the curriculum."

—Katz, *Magazines for Libraries*

Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France

(Société d'histoire littéraire de la France)
Vols. 1-34. Paris 1894-1927
Clothbound set \$1,000.00
Paperbound set 895.00

"An important scholarly journal devoted to French literature. With four to ten articles in each issue, it covers all periods While of particular interest to larger academic libraries, the book reviews make it of some value to smaller and medium sized libraries."

—Katz, *Magazines for Libraries*

Word

(Linguistic Circle of New York)
Vols. 1-16. New York 1945-1960
Clothbound set \$200.00
Paperbound set 155.00

The emphasis of this journal is on exploring the structure of all language and examining its many functions and relations. Articles are in French and English and discuss all phases of structural analysis, descriptive linguistics, semantics, and mentalistic or formalistic linguistics.

Available

FROM JOHNSON REPRINT



CORPORATION

New York and London/111 Fifth Avenue/New York, N.Y. 10003

participate in the selection of the new executive secretary. The Board agreed that greater involvement on the part of at least the Executive Committee was very important and therefore Ms. Ackerman **MOVED** that the president of ACRL be authorized to take such action as he sees fit to insure effective ACRL participation in the selection of a new ACRL executive secretary. Alice Ball **SECONDED** the motion which **CARRIED** unanimously.

The next item brought up was a petition from New England members of ACRL requesting the establishment of a New England Chapter. Ms. Edmonds so **MOVED**, James Govan **SECONDED**, and the chapter was established.

Mr. Shank initiated a discussion on the advantages of having a parliamentarian present at all ACRL membership meetings. This was thought to be a good idea, and Mr. Scepanski remarked that perhaps a recommendation could be made that a parliamentarian be available for all ALA divisional membership meetings and be paid for out of conference funds. This was to be explored.

Mr. Shank then proposed a vote of gratitude to Mr. Reason for his splendid work as president of ACRL during a very difficult year. This was met with general applause. The meeting adjourned at 5:45 P.M. with Mr. Reason turning the chair over to Mr. Shank, the incoming president. ■ ■

CHOICE EDITOR APPOINTED

Richard K. Gardner has been named editor of *CHOICE*, a publication of the Association of College and Research Libraries, a division of the American Library Association that reviews and evaluates new books of importance in academic libraries. Gardner was the founding editor of *CHOICE* and held that office from 1963 to 1966. Since leaving that post he has served on the faculties of the Graduate Library Schools of Case Western Reserve University and the Université de Montreal, at which latter school he has been director since 1970. His previous experience was as assistant librarian, Case Institute of Technology from 1955 to 1957, as library advisor to the government of South Viet Nam, in 1957 and 1958, and as librarian at Marietta College from 1959 to 1963. Gardner holds degrees from Middlebury College (A.B.); Case Western Reserve University (M.S. in Library Science, and Ph.D.); and earned a graduate diploma in French literature at the Sorbonne.

COME TO COLUMBUS

SOCIETY OF AMERICAN ARCHIVISTS 36TH ANNUAL MEETING

October 31 to November 3, 1972

- first saa four-day meeting • workshops at the ohio historical center • sessions at ohio state university • open council meeting • discussion of report of the committee for the 1970's • four mixers • latest archival equipment and literature on display • outstanding facilities of new sheraton-columbus hotel • and more •

write david r. larson, saa local arrangements chairman,
ohio historical society, columbus, ohio 43211

