
College and university library expenditures in the U.S., 1981-82

By Betsy Faupel

*U.S. Department of Education
National Center for Education Statistics*

What we spent per student four years ago.

Colleges and universities spent \$1.9 billion in total library operating expenditures in 1981-82. This amounts to \$215.63 per full-time equivalent (FTE) student.

The total amount spent by college and university libraries in different states varies considerably, ranging from a high of \$248 million in California to a low of \$4 million in Wyoming (see Table 1).

The average library operating expenditures per full-time equivalent (FTE) student are highest in Alaska at \$623.27, the District of Columbia at \$451.42, and Connecticut at \$306.24. They are shown on the map on the cover of this issue as the darkest areas. By contrast, college and university libraries in states spending an average of less than \$175 per FTE student are shown as white areas.

On the average, private institutions spent more liberally on their libraries than public institutions. Nationally, private institutions spent about one and one-half times as much (153.4%) per full-time equivalent student as public ones. Only in about one-third of the states did the library expenditures of public institutions per full-time equivalent student exceed those of private institutions in the state.

Some of the differences among the states and between public and private institutions can be attributed to the different mixes of the different types of institutions. For example, there are more doctoral-level institutions in some states than in other states, and 2-year institutions are much more prevalent in

the public than in the private sector of higher education.

Only a small part of the expenditures was covered by Federal contribution. Receipts from Federal government grants for college and university libraries amounted to 1% of the expenditures of college and university libraries in 1981-82. Private institutions received 31% of the Federal grant money with 69% going to public institutions. The total amounts private institutions received from Federal government grants exceeded the amounts received by public institutions only in 14 states (not shown in the tables).

However, in terms of Federal grants received per FTE student the receipts were higher in private colleges and universities in 34 states. Nationally, private institutions received about one and one-third times as much (137.8%) in federal government grants for libraries per full-time equivalent student as public ones (see Table 2).

Since 1979 the National Center for Educational Statistics has decreased the frequency of its surveys of college and university libraries and conducted them in 3-year intervals. The statistics presented here were produced through a merger of previously unpublished expenditure data collected by NCES through the Survey of College and University Libraries in 1982 and the enrollment data collected through the annual Fall Enrollment Survey. All of the 3,104 institutions of higher education recognized by the United States Department of Educa-

TABLE 1

Total library operating expenditures in institutions of higher education, and total library operating expenditure per full-time equivalent (FTE) student, by control of institution: United States, 1981-82

State	Total library operating expenditures (thousands of dollars)	Library expenditures per FTE student		
		All institutions	Public institutions	Private institutions
United States	\$ 1,943,769.8	\$ 215.63	\$ 190.43	\$ 292.14
Alabama	24,295.9	170.81	171.93	163.72
Alaska	7,306.0	623.27	653.37	0
Arizona	25,346.6	195.89	205.19	64.77
Arkansas	11,666.7	184.61	189.63	159.76
California	248,487.8	217.06	192.06	371.89
Colorado	25,290.1	199.43	190.43	261.70
Connecticut	34,299.4	306.24	145.71	540.01
Delaware	5,761.5	225.92	238.30	109.25
District of Columbia	29,127.5	451.42	301.42	471.52
Florida	56,980.0	190.63	193.20	181.94
Georgia	38,294.3	241.67	234.11	263.22
Hawaii	10,174.0	277.45	284.59	167.84
Idaho	6,888.6	205.18	217.66	161.53
Illinois	103,495.0	232.90	197.19	327.20
Indiana	39,586.5	200.55	196.50	212.18
Iowa	25,129.8	205.84	205.96	205.57
Kansas	21,892.9	215.99	219.96	187.48
Kentucky	23,414.2	204.41	208.59	189.10
Louisiana	28,577.3	202.57	187.92	289.63
Maine	7,459.9	213.63	165.00	331.79
Maryland	33,106.7	219.04	191.03	371.02
Massachusetts	87,794.1	272.88	128.04	367.80
Michigan	62,513.2	169.78	168.16	178.88
Minnesota	32,759.5	195.42	176.60	251.62
Mississippi	14,712.2	162.17	159.05	189.27
Missouri	34,611.4	187.14	155.81	257.98
Montana	5,925.6	196.05	200.69	154.71
Nebraska	14,005.2	198.86	194.23	216.34
Nevada	5,938.0	276.55	277.75	98.18
New Hampshire	10,958.6	274.73	193.44	366.58
New Jersey	45,860.8	208.97	161.09	356.51
New Mexico	10,412.9	230.82	235.87	139.37
New York	184,033.3	237.65	186.62	300.08
North Carolina	60,641.1	251.69	229.07	326.36
North Dakota	5,644.1	179.50	180.64	165.17
Ohio	69,054.3	177.38	168.33	202.31
Oklahoma	22,120.6	187.76	165.50	307.21
Oregon	23,876.1	215.24	199.19	314.52
Pennsylvania	93,960.4	227.51	205.76	254.73
Rhode Island	11,375.2	218.17	157.35	274.42
South Carolina	19,545.6	179.54	173.38	204.64
South Dakota	5,165.9	176.41	179.36	167.86
Tennessee	31,388.1	196.32	165.46	277.50
Texas	117,188.1	218.36	202.82	309.31
Utah	16,752.5	215.36	188.07	257.54
Vermont	6,684.3	265.52	263.39	268.26
Virginia	46,404.9	220.43	205.81	303.20
Washington	36,972.2	202.35	202.74	199.81
West Virginia	9,176.9	150.24	153.27	133.05
Wisconsin	40,055.9	192.02	180.56	261.64
Wyoming	4,077.3	262.80	263.24	N/A
U.S. Service Schools	7,580.7	140.45	140.45	N/A

Note: Because of rounding, details may not add to totals.

Sources: Expenditures from U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, special tabulation derived from Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS)—College and University Libraries, Fall 1982. FTE student enrollment from unpublished data, survey of "Fall Enrollment in Higher Education."

TABLE 2

Receipts from Federal Government Grants per Full-time Equivalent (FTE) Student in Institutions of Higher Education: United States, 1981-82

State	Receipts per FTE student		
	All Institutions	Public Institutions	Private Institutions
United States	\$ 2.15	\$ 1.96	\$ 2.70
Alabama	1.24	1.21	1.40
Alaska	1.16	1.22	0
Arizona	2.67	2.82	0.62
Arkansas	0.59	0.53	0.87
California	3.29	2.95	5.41
Colorado	0.74	0.72	0.90
Connecticut	7.55	0.77	17.41
Delaware	0.41	0.31	1.32
District of Columbia	2.59	0.47	2.88
Florida	4.50	5.37	1.54
Georgia	5.16	4.77	6.26
Hawaii	10.19	10.67	2.82
Idaho	1.25	1.41	0.68
Illinois	2.44	2.88	1.30
Indiana	1.55	1.56	1.53
Iowa	1.96	2.07	1.70
Kansas	3.26	3.38	2.43
Kentucky	2.33	2.17	2.90
Louisiana	0.35	0.18	1.31
Maine	2.56	2.97	1.56
Maryland	0.58	0.50	1.04
Massachusetts	2.35	2.24	2.43
Michigan	2.75	3.12	0.71
Minnesota	1.04	1.20	0.56
Mississippi	0.78	0.73	1.29
Missouri	0.38	0.25	0.68
Montana	2.16	0.50	16.93
Nebraska	3.87	3.73	4.42
Nevada	0.32	0.27	8.33
New Hampshire	7.98	5.15	11.16
New Jersey	1.19	0.15	4.38
New Mexico	0.72	0.64	2.16
New York	1.65	1.50	1.83
North Carolina	2.00	1.98	2.07
North Dakota	1.05	0.52	7.61
Ohio	1.45	1.46	1.43
Oklahoma	1.00	0.30	4.76
Oregon	2.39	1.60	7.27
Pennsylvania	0.70	0.50	0.95
Rhode Island	3.52	0.24	6.55
South Carolina	2.47	2.85	0.93
South Dakota	1.54	1.00	3.12
Tennessee	2.17	1.81	3.12
Texas	0.98	0.93	1.22
Utah	0.65	1.06	0
Vermont	3.05	2.74	3.45
Virginia	1.30	0.72	4.57
Washington	2.51	2.00	5.76
West Virginia	1.44	1.01	3.91
Wisconsin	1.49	1.51	1.35
Wyoming	10.24	10.25	N/A
U.S. Service Schools	0.07	0.07	N/A

Sources: Receipts from U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, special tabulation derived from Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS)—College and University Libraries, Fall 1982. FTE Student enrollment from unpublished data, survey of "Fall Enrollment in Higher Education."

tion as colleges or universities that had libraries were included.

The Survey of College and University Libraries achieved a response rate of 91%. The data for a non-responding institution were imputed by using

data of a peer institution of similar characteristics, based on control and level, enrollment size, NCES classification, level of offering, and state of the geographic location. ■ ■

Mentoring in the academic library

Deanna L. Roberts

*Social Sciences Bibliographer
University of Georgia*

Professional development through observation and consultation.

Mentoring to accelerate an individual's professional development is not a novel concept in either business or academia. This master-apprentice or teacher-student relationship occurs informally in many organizations, and formalized mentoring programs have been successful both in the federal government as well as the private sector. Linda Phillips-Jones, in her article on establishing mentoring programs, states that "...among the most successful in the federal government include those in the Internal Revenue Service, the Federal Executive Development Program, and the Presidential Management Intern Program. In the private sector, programs have been established in such corporations as Jewel Companies, American Telephone and Telegraph's Bell Laboratories, and Merrill Lynch."¹ In academic libraries, the Council on Library Resources Internship Program was implemented in 1974 to provide a first-hand leadership perspective to experienced professionals in order to enhance their knowledge and understanding of the

complexities of research libraries. It is time to take a new look at the idea of mentoring programs in the academic library as a means of staff development for the junior professional or recent library school graduate.

While the definitions of a mentor are many and varied—coach, model, guide, teacher, sponsor, or advisor—the purpose is the same. This relationship allows new people to observe departmental activities, divisional functions and goals, in addition to the policies and procedures of the organization, through consultation with the experienced professional. Elizabeth Bolton, a specialist in public affairs education, advises that "the most important element in this type of relationship is the willingness to share accumulated knowledge with another individual in the novice stage of development whether on the same occupational level or from a higher position."²

¹Linda Phillips-Jones, "Establishing a Formalized Mentoring Program," *Training and Development Journal* 37 (February 1983):38.

²Elizabeth B. Bolton, "A Conceptual Analysis of the Mentor Relationship in the Career Development of Women," *Adult Education* 30 (Summer 1980):205.