

E. J. JOSEY, Moderator

Community Use of Academic Libraries: A Symposium

THE GENESIS OF the idea for this symposium came from an article in *Library Journal* in the spring of 1964,¹ in which H. Vail Deale discussed some of the perplexing problems facing academic libraries attempting to serve the general public. The response to Mr. Deale's article was overwhelming, for he had put into print some of the thoughts, ideas, and frustrations faced by fellow academic librarians around the country. Two years earlier,² I had published an article on the subject which took an opposite point of view. Although these two articles were not in agreement, they were not in total disagreement. Subsequently, Mr. Deale, serving as chairman of ACRL's College Library Section, invited me to chair an *Ad Hoc* Committee on Community Use of Academic Libraries. Since pluralism in belief is the hallmark of American society, a committee of academic librarians with a diversity of views was invited to tackle this responsibility.

In the Fall of 1964, the chairman, in a memorandum to the members of the committee, raised several questions and requested from the committee possible proposals for studying and solving this

problem. At the Midwinter Meeting in Washington in 1965, it was decided that a questionnaire would be circulated to college and university libraries for the purpose of ascertaining to what extent the problem of community use of libraries was grievous, and, at the same time, to gather ideas on the subject from academic librarians in the field. After a working committee session at Detroit in 1965 and a working session at the Midwinter Meeting of 1966, coupled with reams of correspondence, we are now able to present the findings of the survey.

At this point, I would like to express thanks publicly to the officers of ACRL, the College Section officers, and especially the members of the committee, for their splendid cooperation. A special word of thanks must be given to George Bailey, the executive secretary, for his advice, and to his secretary for handling the typing and mailing of the questionnaires. Without the unselfish help of these persons, it would not have been possible to have undertaken the survey.

Turning from background and coming to grips with the survey, a questionnaire containing thirteen questions which consisted of several parts were circulated to eleven hundred college and university libraries throughout the United States. The libraries represented institutions of various sizes and types, e.g., large public universities, large privately-endowed universities, state colleges, liberal arts colleges, teachers colleges, as well as prestigious and less known institutions.

The questionnaire was mailed on Oc-

¹ H. Vail Deale, "Campus vs. Community," *Library Journal*, LXXXIX (April 15, 1964), 1695-7.

² E. J. Josey, "The College Library and the Community," *Savannah State College Faculty Research Bulletin*, December 1962.

Mr. Josey is Associate Librarian, Academic and Research Library Bureau, New York State Library, Albany. Presented at the ACRL College Libraries Section meeting at the 85th Annual Conference of the American Library Association, Queens College, July 12, 1966.

tober 6, 1965, and librarians were requested to return the document by November 6. By mid-December, the executive secretary's office had forwarded to me seven hundred seventy returned questionnaires. Because the questionnaires continued to come in gradually, a new cut-off date of March 1 was established. Of the eleven hundred libraries canvassed, 783 or 71.2 per cent responded. In view of the high percentage of the returns, we view the findings as being significant.

Fifty-one college and university administrators, which included academic deans, presidents, and deans of students, requested copies of the findings, when they read of our efforts in the November 29, 1965, issue of "Reports on Questionnaires," published by the American Council on Education. Hence academicians, in general, join librarians in their concern for guidelines on community use of academic libraries.

Members of the committee here present an analysis of the findings. Richard C. Quick, director of library services, Northern Arizona University, will discuss questions one through four. John E. Scott, librarian, West Virginia State College, reviews questions five through seven. Edward Heintz, librarian, Kenyon College, is responsible for questions eight through ten. Considering questions twelve and thirteen is the responsibility of George C. Elser, librarian, Chaffey College, California. This will be followed by Barbara LaMont, the librarian of Douglass College of Rutgers, who presents suggestions from college and university librarians regarding adequate safeguards as revealed in the answers to question eleven. Edward Howard, director of the Evansville public library, then discusses the work of public libraries in this area. In concluding, I will attempt to present the implications for academic libraries.

COMMUNITY USE—DEALERS CHOICE

RICHARD C. QUICK

QUESTIONS ONE through four were designed to determine to what extent responding college and university libraries permit both in-building use and use outside the library building of library materials by persons not enrolled in these institutions, whether these privileges are extended to all persons in the community or only to select groups, and the reason or reasons for declining to extend library privileges. Responses to these questions show on the whole, a rather liberal attitude on the part of a large majority of libraries, with flexible regulations permitting neither blanket inclusion nor blanket exclusion of potential users.

Questions one through three required only a "Yes" or "No" answer. Question

four also required a "Yes" or "No" answer, but included subparts *a* through *e* requiring check-marks. Among the latter, respondents included considerable unsolicited—but very welcome—commentary. For this reason it has been felt desirable to go beyond simple machine tabulating and to make a more extensive evaluation of the shades of procedure or opinion shown.

Specifically then question one asked: "Do you permit in-building use of library materials by persons not enrolled in the college?" Of the 783 responses, 742 said "Yes," 10 said "no," and there was no response from 31 libraries.

Question two asked: "Do you circulate materials to persons not enrolled in the college?" Of the 755 institutions responding, 649, or 85 per cent indicated that the circulation privilege is extended

to those outsiders permitted use of the library. Those responding "No" totaled 106, and there were 28 who did not respond.

Question three asked: "If the answer to question number two is "No" what is the reason for this decision?" There followed subparts *a* through *e*, including the following suggestions, requiring "Yes" or "No" answers:

- a) Insufficient library materials for other than college personnel?
- b) Inadequate staff to administer extra service?
- c) Basic belief that materials should be used only by college personnel, even though the college program would not suffer through circulation to others?
- d) Firm belief that service to the general public would be a disservice to the community in view of the fact that public library development may be curtailed?
- e) Other?

To subpart *a* of question three, 150 of those libraries responding felt that they possessed insufficient materials for use by other than college personnel; 626 libraries did not respond, and 7 indicated that this was not among their reasons for not circulating materials.

To subpart *b* of question three, 89 of the responding libraries felt that they had insufficient staff to administer extra service, 676 libraries did not respond, and 18 indicated that this was not among their reasons for not circulating materials.

To subpart *c* of question three, 12 libraries of those responding felt a basic belief that materials should be used only by college personnel; 712 libraries did not respond, and 59 indicated that this was not among their reasons for not circulating materials.

To subpart *d* of question three, 32 libraries among those responding felt that their service to the general community might curtail public library develop-

ment; 701 libraries did not respond to subpart *d*, and 50 libraries indicated that this statement was not among their reasons for not circulating materials.

Question four was a multipart question asking: "Do you extend the library privilege to all persons?," and requiring a "yes" or "no" response before asking: "or only to select groups," which was followed by specific suggested groups, including:

- a) High school students
- b) Students from other colleges
- c) Teachers and clergy
- d) Other professional people
- e) Others

Machine tabulation for the general question in number four "Do you extend the library privilege to all persons?" shows 336 affirmative, 340 negative, and 107, no response. Hand tabulation of subparts *a* through *e* indicates a variety of practices and gradations of service, as reflected in the commentary volunteered by many respondents, especially in extension of question four proper, and of subparts *a* and *b*, these latter concerning privileges accorded to high school students and students from other colleges. For purposes of this discussion, question four and its subparts *a* and *b* have been hand tabulated to reflect commentary in terms of what I have called the unqualified "yes," the qualified "yes," and the qualified and unqualified "no."

Those responding with an unqualified "yes" to the general question "Do you extend the library privilege to all persons?" number 283, while 125 gave a qualified "yes," usually indicating that all of those willing to pay an annual fee or a short term fee were permitted the library privilege. Others specified in-building use only.

Seventeen libraries indicated with a flat, or unqualified "no" that *all* are not permitted to use the library, and 351 respondents indicated a qualified "no," most frequently indicating through the subparts of question number four those

groups to which the library privilege is not customarily extended.

To subpart *a*, concerning library use by high school students, 258 libraries responded with a flat—and sometimes emphatic—“no,” 189 responded with an unqualified “yes,” and 172 responded with a qualified “yes.” Those libraries responding with a qualified or conditional “yes” most often specified use by high school upperclassmen, honors students only, or those enrolled in “special” programs. Some of these respondents indicated that the library privilege is “limited to ten students per month,” to “Saturdays and summers only,” “to two dozen enrolled in some special programs,” at “specified hours—when only one book may be taken out.”

Among those libraries permitting some degree of use by high school students, it was most often reported that they must have a letter of introduction from a teacher or other school authority. In the great majority of instances, in-building use only is permitted, although a number of libraries reported an interlibrary loan arrangement between the college and high school libraries.

To subpart *b* of question four, concerning use by students of other colleges, 129 of those responding gave a flat “no,” 307 submitted an unqualified “yes,” and 186 gave a qualified or conditional “yes.”

In the case of the qualified “yes,” most permitted in-library use only, or made library use subject to fee or purchased “courtesy” card. Others cited interlibrary loan as their principal means of service to students from other colleges in the area.

The group response to subpart *c* concerning library privileges extended to teachers and clergy reflects an almost universal vote of confidence in persons of these callings as responsible people with a real need for research materials beyond those ordinarily acquired by public libraries.

The great majority of respondents also

indicated that other professional persons are usually accorded access to college and university library collections, although where there is a fee charged for use by outsiders these are not necessarily exempted.

Two hundred and forty-four libraries responded to question four's subpart *e*, where the question “Other?” and an inviting blank response area drew much diverse commentary. Blanket extension of services, often on a political or geographic basis is reflected in such comments as, “all who request,” “all residents,” “townspeople in need of materials,” “anyone,” “residents within fifty mile radius,” “any doing scholarly research,” “any resident of the state,” “metropolitan area residents,” “all citizens of Wichita,” “any adult who is a permanent resident of Topeka,” “borrowers at least fifteen years old,” “all citizens of the state of Maine,” “townspeople”; such blanket statements, however, are sometimes tempered by the phrase “except high school students.” Respondents in other cases indicated a maturity clause, offering the library privileges to “adults according to demonstrated needs,” “persons over twenty-one years of age,” “non-student adult residents,” “high school age or over,” etc. In other and fewer instances, the privilege is extended to adults paying fees.

The University of New Hampshire library reported service to the town of Durham as *the* official Durham public library. Under contract dating from 1907 the university provides the building and staff, while the town must appropriate not less than \$25.00 per year. “The present appropriation is \$1,500. . . .” Delta State College in Cleveland, Mississippi, discontinued service to the community in 1954 at the request of the public library board because it was considered that this service curtailed public library development.

The community group that appears closest to being genuinely unwelcome in

American college and university libraries is the high school student segment. Barely restrained emotions on the part of

many respondents to our question on high school students indicate a substantial distaste for service to this group.

FEES AND MODIFIED PRIVILEGES FOR OUTSIDE BORROWERS?

JOHN E. SCOTT

THIS COMMITTEE asked the following question as its fifth query on its questionnaire: "Do you charge a fee to outsiders for using materials in the library? Yes or no. Or for borrowing privileges for outsiders? Yes or no. Indicate fee."

Only 20 of the respondents said they charge a fee to outsiders for using materials in the library; an overwhelming majority of the libraries (722) stated that they do not charge a fee to outsiders for using materials in the library; 40 did not respond. Seventy libraries answered in the affirmative to the second part of the question, stating that they do charge a fee for borrowing privileges for outsiders; 499 replied they do not charge a fee; 112 gave no response.

It is obvious, from these figures, that the vast majority of academic libraries do not charge fees to outsiders for either using materials in the library or for borrowing library materials.

Since many college and university libraries charge fees, we asked them to indicate the fee charged. The amount varied from 50 cents per year, as reported by one college library, to \$50 per year as reported by three large universities (Columbia, MIT, and Harvard). Between these two extremes, the fee quoted most often was \$10 per year, followed by the next popular fees of \$5 and \$3 in that order. Princeton University, Yale University, and Manhattan College of the Sacred Heart stated that they charge a fee of \$25, although Manhattan

College indicates theirs as an annual membership fee.

Many libraries reported that they require a deposit, which is refundable, rather than a fee, if all materials are returned properly. This deposit fee varies from \$1 for three years at one college library (Northwest Christian College, Eugene, Oregon) to "Price of each book as deposit" at another college (College of St. Joseph, Albuquerque, New Mexico). The two deposit fees mentioned most often by various libraries were \$5 and \$10.

Question six asked: "What modification, if any, is placed upon borrowing privileges extended to qualified outsiders? (a) None? (b) Cannot check out reserve materials? (c) High school students must have a slip from their school librarian each time they wish to check out materials? (d) Shorter loan period? (e) No renewal? (f) Cannot check out journals? (g) Others?"

In response to question six, 163 respondents said that no modification is placed upon borrowing privileges extended to qualified outsiders, while 419 libraries said they cannot check out reserve materials.

One hundred and one college libraries said that high school students must have a slip from their school librarian each time they wish to check out materials. Some college libraries said that high school students must borrow through their school libraries or on interlibrary loan basis. Several libraries said they do not lend to high school students.

Only fifty-one college libraries said that they provide a shorter loan period to outside borrowers. Two examples of these are Denison University (Ohio) which states "Two week loan instead of one month" and Saint Peters College (New Jersey) which said "One month instead of one semester." Seventy-two college libraries said they do not grant renewals to outsiders, and 312 libraries replied that outside borrowers could not check out journals. Most libraries, however, were quick to add that neither could their own students check out journals. Many college libraries offer some kind of copying service which tends to minimize this problem.

The last part of question six was concerned with what other modifications are placed upon borrowing privileges extended to qualified outsiders than those already mentioned. One hundred thirty-one college libraries said that they do have other modifications. One college said, "One item at a time. We then circulate other items only when the first is returned." Another library said, "High school students may use the library only during specified times, and they do not have borrowing privileges." Still another college library replied, "Popular materials, ordinarily available at the public library, are not circulated to noncollege

personnel." Several libraries said, "Subject to recall if needed by academic community," and quite a few other libraries said that they limit the number of books at one borrowing—this number usually ranged between two and five items. Some college libraries allow high school students to use the library only during specified times. For instance, Wichita State University said, "High school hours are Saturday 9-5 and daily 4-6. Limit of two books checked out at these hours."

"Do you require qualified outsiders to complete an application form upon which are printed the regulations by which they are expected to abide?" was question seven. Two hundred twenty-eight respondents said, "Yes," while more than twice this number, 493, said, "No." Many libraries reported that outside borrowers are required to fill out forms, but no regulations are listed on the forms. For example, Alabama A. & M. College said, "A standard registration location card is completed. Lending rules are stated in Student's Guide—which is presented to new patrons." Some colleges simply said, "An oral explanation is given." Whether written or oral, many college library regulations still appear to limit or discourage the use of academic libraries by community borrowers.

ALUMNI, OVERDUE BOOKS, AND INTERLIBRARY LOANS

EDWARD C HEINTZ

I SUPPOSE it is a common experience as one studies the results of a questionnaire to wish that one or more questions had been phrased somewhat differently in order to arrive more readily at a knowledge of what one would like to have known. In this instance, I wish that this question had been: Are alumni given any privileges not granted to nonalumni? If so, what privileges? As it was, in order

to put the replies in perspective I referred back to question four: Do you extend the library privilege to all persons, yes or no, or only to select groups? Since these two questions (and replies) were not on the same sheet, and because of the large number of replies, I resorted in part to sampling in order to complete my portion of the study in the time I could devote to it.

I approached this question with the preconceived notion that alumni would

universally constitute a special privilege group. This stemmed from my own present situation and the one immediately preceding it of being in the library of a small privately owned institution in a small community and based on the knowledge that private colleges depend to some degree upon annual alumni contributions. If I had given any thought to the matter I might have realized that alumni cannot always be a privileged class, and that is what the questionnaire reveals.

In the sampling I made in comparing answers to questions four and eight, of the returns from eighty-five libraries in five states, only one answered "Yes" to the question, "Do you extend the library privilege to all persons?" and "No" to "Do you permit alumni who reside in the community to borrow materials?" This would make alumni a deprived or penalized group and so I assumed that in this instance the questionnaire was answered in haste and did not reflect the facts of the situation. In this sampling of eighty-five, I found only two other returns which appeared to contain contradictions, and so from this point on I ignored question four for my purposes.

Of the entire number of 785 returns, seventy-one indicated in some way that alumni are not given any privileges—they are treated in the same way as everyone else. This is about 9 per cent. By far the greater proportion of these are publicly supported institutions or are in populous areas, or both. They include Harvard, MIT, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, and the University of Pennsylvania. I believe if this question had been phrased "Are alumni as a group given special privileges?" the proportion of negatives would have been considerably higher.

Our efforts in question nine were centered around attempting to discover

what means are used to recover overdue books from outside borrowers: phone call; messenger; legal action; letter; other? Not a great deal was revealed by this question. As was to be expected, telephone and letters were checked by almost every respondent. We did not include postcards in the question, and many wrote in the word "postcards" after other, but I suspect that most checked "letters" as including any use of the mail. About 15 per cent also checked messenger. The University of California was the only one to indicate legal action. They resort to the services of a collection agency which evidently resorts to the small claims court as a last resort. As for "other," few wrote in anything here, but of those who did it was almost always "referral to school authorities" or words to that effect. Letters canceling borrowing privileges of delinquents or having a bill issued by the institution's accounting office were mentioned also. Chaminade College, Honolulu, must rank first in the nation as having the most saintly clientele, for our respondent wrote, "In ten years it has never been necessary to have recourse to any of these measures," no telephone calls, postcards, letters, messengers, legal action, or any other.

"Do you check out materials indirectly through interlibrary loan to public libraries in your area (instead of directly to an outside borrower)?" was question ten. A sampling of 321 libraries, all of the returns from twenty states representative of various areas in the country, tallied as follows: 120 (50 per cent) said yes; 117 (36 per cent) said no. Of the remainder, twenty-two wrote "both"; nine said this matter had not come up, six answers were conditional, and seven gave no answer.

Answers to these queries improve our understanding of academic libraries' services beyond their immediate clienteles.

SAFEGUARDS

BARBARA LAMONT

OUR QUESTION concerning safeguarding library collections was: "What general suggestions would you offer, that are not covered in the foregoing questions, which would provide adequate safeguards for lending books to community borrowers?"

Responses implied differences in the interpretation of the question. It was not always possible to tell whether suggestions referred to present or possible practice. Further, some librarians are obviously more concerned with loss of property, others with disservice to the college community. And of course, safeguards vary in accordance with the type of borrowers who cause problems. In some situations the cause of concern is the patrons of the public library and especially high school students. In others it is students from other colleges.

A few librarians insist that there is no solution. "I know no answer; letters and phone calls are easily ignored; legal action is bad for public relations." And, "There is none. That's way we don't lend to outsiders." And, "I disagree with the implication that there is any way to safeguard the interests of our own students when our resources and staff are insufficient to their needs."

At the opposite pole, a much larger group of librarians feels that there is no problem. Most add that this is a result of being in a small community. A few go even further:

"We rely on the innate honesty of those who make use of the library. Up to now we have had no reason to regret this policy."

"We extend courteous service and expect borrowers to appreciate service and abide by the regulations. They seldom disappoint us."

"Asking cooperation has brought results. But withdrawal of the courtesy card is very effective."

"So how can you refuse anyone who wants to read a book?"

A closely related view is that good general public relations have eliminated the problem in some libraries.

"Two colleges and two public libraries work together to give all our borrowers the best service we can. We find that works better than rules."

"We encourage community use and believe that the positive rather than the protective pays off."

The variety and vociferousness of a large number of the 241 responses to this question, however, indicate that for many librarians, provision of adequate safeguards is a matter of real concern. Solutions vary from the simplest of steps to the most intricate systems of shared responsibility. No doubt it is true that there are no adequate safeguards, but every abuse avoided is that much to the good, and a combination of safeguards may well be almost adequate. There ought, in other words, to be something for everyone in the specifics elicited by this question. Let's take a look at them.

1. Many librarians depend wholly upon the discretion of the library staff, relying upon the common sense of the circulation staff or an interview with the librarian to establish the reason for the application and make a judgment of the responsibility of the borrower. One librarian recommends that one staff member handle all new requests for borrowing privileges; another that only members of the adult staff, not student assistants, charge books to outsiders.

2. Many librarians have relied with good success upon requiring *identifica-*

tion such as drivers' licenses. Some prefer a public library card as identification. Nearly every answer of this kind contained the suggestion that address and telephone number should be verifiable.

3. Some librarians recommend carrying the I.D. principle one step further by the issuance of *courtesy cards*. These may be either temporary (presumably for the duration of a short term project, or subject to annual renewal, or for longer duration but revokable. There was mention also of reciprocal cards, statewide or regional. One librarian dreams of a universal library card with a central clearing house to keep the record straight, and suggests that funds for developing a prototype operation on a federal scale could come from the Higher Education Act of 1965? (Would you believe a man from Mars?)

4. These, I think you will agree are all mild requirements, but for areas where experience has been bitter, there is a more stringent solution, *i.e.*, a *deposit*. The sum usually mentioned \$5, sometimes \$10 and in one case \$15. A few libraries require a deposit plus a fee, *e.g.*, a sum of \$15 of which \$10 is refunded when the library card is surrendered. In one college the deposit also is forfeited if books are kept beyond the date due. In a few cases a deposit of from \$2 to \$5 is demanded for each book borrowed, and one librarian reports requiring a sum equal to the cost of the book plus the cost of processing.

5. A quite different approach is that of applying *limitations* where abuses have existed. Some librarians have found that by this means they can continue to lend to many outsiders without disservice to the college community. One can limit the number of books borrowed at one time and limit borrowers to those living within telephone range for quick recall. The term of the loan may be limited. As one librarian said, "To protect the interests of our own students our policy

is short-term loans for adults and students of other colleges, still shorter for high school and junior high school students." College students from other institutions are often required to use inter-library loan only. An apparent victim of school children limits hours for outsiders to time when the entire staff is present "to assist and control." Another does not lend to high school pupils at all. Others lend only to honors students or extend privileges only for a short time and to those with a specific need.

One college has worked out a careful plan by which the library is designed to provide limited service for high school students only when other libraries cannot. According to this plan each high school in the area must have on file in the library the name of a teacher or administrator who will act as library coordinator. "Application for use" forms must be filled out and signed by the coordinator for each pupil who has need for the college library. Forms must not be submitted until it has been determined that the material to be used is not available in the school, town, or state library. This library's report is that the system works very well in that it limits this extension of service to those students who are prepared to make use of it.

Another kind of limitation has to do with the material lent: borrowers are refused books in sparsely covered areas, or books likely to be needed by students. One response suggests that books which circulate as often as once a month should not be lent to outsiders. Material may also be limited to books not in the public or school library, and referral slips from these libraries may be required.

6. *Interlibrary cooperation* has in part solved the problem for some libraries. A modification of the usual interlibrary loan procedures has the patron take the book to the public library, charging it from there. The public library returns

the book. Delivery service with cooperative recovery of overdues is also practiced. One librarian suggests that the library association on the local level might work out safeguards best suited to the local situation. And of course the by now familiar, carefully articulated state systems are cited as aids to this whole problem.

The usefulness of cooperation has been widely acknowledged in the responses, but there was one warning which I should like to quote in full:

"The mechanics of cooperative use of library resources should be given more attention. Librarians are determined cooperators, but an institution's first responsibility is to its constituents. There is probably a way out of our dilemma, but we librarians have not found it because our thinking about cooperation is still fuzzy and subjective. Library resources are a national asset. Irresponsible use can destroy this asset. We shall have to move at some combination of common sense and good will that will permit us to serve the need without destroying the resources."

7. Another sort of control has been achieved by asking other agencies and institutions to share responsibility for their constituents. A high school principal is required to be responsible for students borrowing under his auspices; or a high school teacher for books which he requires his students to read. Some libraries require appropriate references; in the case of faculty of another institution, a letter of introduction from his library, department chairman, or a faculty member of the institution whose library he wishes to use. A college student must have a letter from his academic dean, and industrial research personnel

is required to present a letter signed by the appropriate authority.

These, then, are the safeguards that you—or, at any rate, 241 of you—are using or are considering for future use. In situations where loss of books is of most concern (that is, where outside borrowing is not yet so extensive that it interferes with service to our own constituents), we can choose among a variety of safeguards in an ascending order of stringency, from a librarian's judgment of the prospective borrower to requirements of identification, courtesy cards, or deposits with or without fees. Or we may require that the borrower be introduced by another agency or institution willing to share responsibility for the borrower's use of the material. I have in mind not libraries, but school and college administrations, alumni societies, or the firm by which the borrower is employed.

If, on the other hand, disservice to our own constituents is the problem, we can follow or improvise on the patterns created by librarians who have tailored various systems of limitations to fit their situations, thus serving a part of the outside community while avoiding or minimizing abuses.

And finally, ancillary to safeguards against both kinds of difficulty are the various forms of cooperative use of resources. Nearly every library, I suppose, makes some use of interlibrary loan, and many are parties to regional or state systems of cooperation. Beyond the formal systems we have again the opportunity to improvise special local procedures which if applied with common sense in the spirit of generosity can go far to extend the service of academic libraries without lessening their academic usefulness.

EXIT CONTROLS AND THE STATEWIDE CARD

GEORGE C. ELSER

OF THE 783 LIBRARIES answering the questionnaire 318, or nearly half, indicated that they had no "control" at the exits of their libraries. Many of these libraries report that in new buildings being planned or under construction, some form of control is to be instituted—either guards or turnstiles, or both, and in several cases, the electronic device known as "Sentronic" will be used. The comments of respondents indicate that control or lack of it is a serious problem at many institutions. Typical of their replies are these statements: "Our building makes 'control' impossible—there are eight outside doors!" "Our losses are staggering"; "We have no controls, but they are needed—too many of our books walk out."

By far the most common form of control seems to be a guard. Whether or not the term guard really means a uniformed guard in all cases seems doubtful since many replies had added qualifying notes indicating that the guard was a "student," a "checker," or a "monitor."

The second form of control most often mentioned was the turnstile. Approximately one out of every eight libraries replying used this device for controlling exits. Since the questionnaire did not specify whether the turnstile was of the locking type, we do not know how many of these installations are of the kind which merely slows a person down as he exits or whether he must actually stop and then exit as the turnstile is unlocked. Many respondents checked both "guard" and turnstile, so we may assume that in some cases it is the guard who checks patrons as they pass through the turnstile.

The device most frequently referred to by the 86 respondents checking "other means of control" was the location of

their charging desk. The fact that the loan desk was physically placed so that all patrons have to pass it in leaving the building seemed to be an adequate control for many of the libraries replying. In some cases, all books, briefcases, and similar materials are checked by a student assistant, a library clerk, or attendant as patrons exit past the desk. In other cases, only a cursory examination seems to take place—or spot checking is done at different hours each day. Whether large libraries with many patrons constantly entering and leaving the building would find this solution satisfactory is doubtful. Having the charging and checking functions taking place at the same point could cause traffic jams at particularly busy periods of the day.

The small college with a collection of limited size and whose patrons are not too numerous, usually does not find it necessary to resort to controlled exits. The librarians of these institutions frequently expressed the hope that they would never be forced to take this step. As institutions grow, the increased size of their collections and the number of patrons making use of their facilities, tend to make it necessary to install some form of exit controls in order more effectively to protect their collections and make them available for the student and faculty members of the parent institution.

Would you approve of a statewide library card? (Applicable to all types of libraries) was the subject of question thirteen.

A resounding 66 per cent of the librarians answering this question want no part of a statewide library card. The reasons given for this negative response were many and varied. In looking over the replies to the questionnaire, no apparent pattern seems to exist as to type or kind of library which favored or did

not favor a statewide library card; however, there were certainly more "yeas" from the small libraries than from the large ones. Some small college libraries approved such a card because it would make available greatly expanded resources for their students and faculty. There were also those who feared that their small collections and staff could not adequately support the increased use which would come with the privilege of using such a card.

In general, the larger college libraries saw more problems in adopting a statewide card. The greatest number of "no" replies came from the large, private, or independent colleges. Some of the state universities and colleges felt that since they were tax-supported institutions, they did owe some service to citizens of their state. A sizeable number of private institutions felt that unless there were some kind of financial support from the state, they would be unwilling to go along with a statewide library card.

Representative of the librarians who think there is no merit to such a card were these comments: "Just *think* of the chaos that would result from such a step!!!" "Would these cards be distributed indiscriminately?" "No! I can't think of anything worse!!!" "Just another bit of red tape to be avoided."

Even the minority who saw great advantages to the statewide library had many reservations in their minds. There were many "ifs," "depending upon," and "provided that" restrictions among the 224 who said "yes." Typical replies were: "If the proper financial backing were available"; "If there were any way of controlling"; "Provided that the costs of increased service would be shared"; "Depending upon the issuing agency and precautions taken to restrict such cards to those persons having a genuine need for extensive borrowing"; "Provided that all limitations agreed upon by libraries concerned are made a part of the total

plan"; "Depending upon the conditions set-up"; "If a workable system could be devised"; "If such a card had some restrictions, but I'm not sure what restrictions, yet"; "Perhaps, but libraries would still have to have their own rules applicable to their own situation"; "Provided some method of control were devised to hold the amount of loss to a reasonable percentage"; "If a satisfactory card could be developed to work in all charging systems"; "Provided that it did not give automatic rights of any kind"; and "If there were some method of enforcing return of material or of having an outside agency assume costs for material not returned."

Many said, "I approve in theory, but such a card is not practicable for us at this time." Some said it is a good idea for public libraries, but not for academic libraries. We should continue to use interlibrary loan for such transactions.

A doubt expressed by some large university libraries concerned the ability of outsiders to use their collections wisely. They did not feel that they would have the time or the staff to instruct them properly in the use of their facilities—hence, they could be most useful as a resource for very specialized materials which could be adequately handled through existing interlibrary loan procedures.

A few librarians said that they had not thought about the subject "yet"—so had no opinions. There were a few who had thought about it a great deal and felt that we were limiting ourselves too much—that we should be thinking about areawide or regional library cards for the "midwest," "the south," "the far west," etc.; there was one individual who said that we should be thinking about a worldwide card.

One attempt at setting up procedures for such a card was mentioned in several replies. A feasibility study is being conducted among the public libraries of

New Hampshire. No details were given, but several references to the New Hampshire study were made by respondents.

In the June issue of the *Wilson Library Bulletin* the "Area Colleges Cooperative Program" was mentioned. In this plan, a program for sharing library resources has been initiated by nine south-central Pennsylvania colleges. Member libraries will exchange information on holdings, keep location records of significant holdings, prepare pertinent union lists, and develop areas of special concentration. Materials will be available to member libraries through interlibrary loan and copying services. Permit cards will be issued for work in any member library. The nine participating colleges are Dickinson, Elizabethtown, Franklin, and Marshall, Gettysburg, Juniata, Messiah, Millersville State, Shippensburg State, and Wilson College.

A different approach to the problem is envisioned in the "Interlibrary Loan by Publisher Plan" which has been orga-

nized in Southern California under the leadership of John Perkins of the Inglewood public library. In this plan, a member library agrees to take the total output of a selected publisher or a publisher's series or imprint. The library agrees to maintain its collection of books issued by the publisher it selects and to make these books available to any other member library by interlibrary loan. New members must select at least one publisher, series, or imprint new to the index. The plan went into effect July 1, with twenty-six libraries (public, junior college, college, and university) representing forty-five publishers or publishers' imprints or series!

It would appear that a majority of the librarians feel that the diversity of resources in our academic libraries, public and private, large and small, make it most difficult to envision a workable plan for a statewide library card at this time without well planned safeguards and some form of public subsidy.

THE WORK OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY SUPPLEMENTING THE RESOURCES OF THE COLLEGE LIBRARY

EDWARD A. HOWARD

As ALA PAST-PRESIDENT James E. Bryan so eloquently put it "... student use of libraries is increasing, not just because there are more students but also because, on the average, each student's use of the library is increased—not just of so-called reference tools but also in both the range and depth of materials used. Our libraries are not just crowded with students, they are overcrowded with students seeking and demanding library services, which some are getting and some are not."¹

Mr. Bryan's study of his own library situation revealed the fact that the student does not recognize the artificial

boundaries we librarians hold so sacred. He goes where the books are.²

For better or worse this habit forces the college and public librarian into a kind of alliance which we refer to as supplementing each other.

Trouble begins when one of the two libraries does a better job of "supplementing" than the other. If this happens, it is not long before the resentment engendered by insistent students among harassed public librarians results in restrictive rules designed to curb the voracious appetite of these students. At the other end of the line, in order to meet the same demands from the same students, the college librarians are busy concocting rules with which to shut out the local high school students.

¹ James Edmund Bryan, "Student-Library Crisis," *Library Occurrent*, XXI (June 1964), 133.

² *Ibid.*

In Evansville, at least, the question of what library is supposed to provide which materials to whom, is rapidly becoming academic. Now the question is how can all local libraries, college, school, and public, possibly acquire materials in sufficient quantities to meet the growing demands of a growing student body—of all ages. For the student now may, often as not, be a middle-aged man or woman, who has returned to the campus for anyone of a variety of reasons.

Fortunately for our local residents, the fifty-year history of cooperation between the public library and Evansville College library is replete with examples of selfless acts of generosity. The local public library was well established by 1919 when the college moved from Moores Hill, Indiana, to Evansville. At that point, the college librarian, George B. Franklin, sought the assistance of Ethel F. McCollough, head librarian at the Evansville public library, in reorganizing the college collection. During the academic year 1919-1920, the college library was housed in public library facilities and administered by a member of the public library staff. Because of this arrangement, the college library was able to open its doors in October 1919, one month after the beginning of classes. By the summer of 1920 the college library could operate on its own, and the arrangement with the public library was terminated.

Yet even after the termination of the formal contract between the two institutions, Evansville College continued to benefit from the generosity of the public library. For many years the latter loaned to the college library large numbers of books needed for college courses. These loans were made for long periods of time and the books were kept on reserve at the college library. In time, as the college library grew, this practice was discontinued also.

Now, forty-six years later, the public

library is once again called upon to assist a fledging institution of higher learning. The extension campus of Indiana State University was opened in Evansville in the fall of 1965. The student body and faculty is still virtually without a library in the college facility. Anticipating the needs of the new student body and faculty, the staff of the public library extended a welcome hand by setting up a reserve collection at central library and by assisting the newly appointed college librarian in his selection and processing of books. This arrangement, like the one with Evansville College, will be terminated when the new college gets on its feet. Yet we at the public library realize that even then, the college student from both Indiana State University and Evansville College will continue to draw heavily on our resources for many years to come.

But the relationship between the college library and the public library is by no means a one-way street. Users of the public library have profited by cooperative action among most of the local libraries. One of these benefits is the annual publication of the *Union List of Periodicals in Evansville Libraries* which includes magazine holdings at Evansville College, Evansville public library, Evansville State Hospital, the public schools office, and Willard library which is a semiprivate library. The cost of publishing the list in large quantities is prorated among the cooperating libraries. Next year will mark the tenth annual issue of this widely used union list of periodicals.

In 1956 an effort to provide a union list of books resulted in the development of a union catalog of nonfiction at the central agency of the public library. Main entries for new books added to the college library and to Willard library are interfiled with subject, author, and title entries of the public library. Color coding, as well as location symbols, quickly tell the user in which branch of the public library the book is located as well

as whether or not the book may be found in the college library or at Willard library. This simple device has encouraged public librarians to do what their patrons have been doing for years, namely, to go beyond their immediate resources to get the desired book.

But our efforts are not limited to these few steps to serve better the college student. Good over-all library service starts much farther down the line. To encourage the rapid growth of elementary school libraries occasioned by the sudden availability of federal assistance under Public Law 89-10, a member of the public library staff prepared the basic buying list as a point of departure for the recently appointed school li-

brary supervisor. Other members of our staff have provided technical advice in setting up a central book processing center in the public schools office. A Joint Committee for Library Service, composed of public school officials and public librarians meet semimonthly to iron out mutual problems relating to library service to elementary and secondary school students. The action of this committee has become increasingly important to us through the years.

We have yet to answer the basic question: what library should provide which materials to whom? Perhaps it is too late. Perhaps it should be as irrelevant to us as it is to the "pushy" students.

IMPLICATIONS FOR COLLEGE LIBRARIES

E. J. JOSEY

I AM SURE that you will agree that the findings are varied, revealing, and challenging.

From an examination of Mr. Quick's excellent analysis of the responses to questions one through four, it is conclusive that the greatest number of libraries, 742, or 94 per cent of the 783 libraries, permit to a degree some in-building use of library materials by persons who are unaffiliated with the institutions. Eighty-five per cent of the 755 institutions said that they extend circulation privileges.

When he reached question four, regarding the granting of library service to all persons, however, the community-use policy of these academic libraries is not as liberal as it appears on the surface, for the affirmative and negative answers are about evenly distributed (336 affirmative and 340 negative), and there were many reservations.

High school students, by and large, are denied service in the majority of libraries reporting, while they are given service in others. High school students

seem to bring (to borrow from Shakespeare) a sea of troubles to college and university libraries. One of the primary reasons for critical pressure against the rule of library privileges is the abuse of the privilege by the high school students themselves. It seems that referral forms or passes to be used by those high school youngsters who must use the academic library would eradicate the problem.¹ College students from other institutions are welcomed by most of the responding libraries, and clergy and teachers find very little difficulty in obtaining service.

The upshot of these findings indicates that some community users have access to some academic libraries around the country. In many instances, if a citizen is not associated with the institution, he is denied access to the collection of the academic library. This denial is based upon the theory that the college or university library exists primarily to serve

¹ See Hardin Craig, Jr., and Richard H. Perrine's "Problems of Urban Universities: Library Service for the High School Student," *Library Trends*, X (April 1962), 469-81; Evan Farber and Philip Shore, "High School Students and the College Library," *Library Occurrent*, XXI (September 1964), 164-66.

the students and faculty of the institution. It is quite evident that, by and large, college and university librarians believe in community use, for 742 of the 783 respondents indicated this fact; but, only limited community use.

Being associated with a small college library, I readily understand some of the reasons for these attitudes; they often stem from small budgets that do not meet minimal needs of service for campus clientele, that do not permit adequate staffs, and that do not allow space to accommodate "outsiders." Admittedly, we cannot scoff at these reasons. On the other hand, do college and university librarians really believe in cooperation? Some librarians talk about cooperation until there is a confrontation with the problems of cooperation. Certainly, community use is an aspect of the whole spectrum of library cooperation. The truth of the matter is that it may be wise for all academic librarians to ponder this crucial question: In view of the conference-within-a-conference at the ALA 1963 annual conference which dealt with meeting students' needs, and increased cooperation among libraries, should not all libraries be moving to a pattern of shared responsibility for library service, to all students, as well as community people who need library materials? Unfortunately, library affairs are still conducted as though no one had ever heard of the recommendations of the 1963 conference-within-a-conference.

Should the academic library be reimbursed for the service which it provides the general public? From this survey, we would join Mr. Scott, by saying "no," for 722 of the respondents declared that they do not charge a fee to community users. Since fees are merely a token charge and do not really pay for library service, they are indefensible. We academic librarians may have to question the legality of fees in view of the federal funds that we are now receiving. This

point is well taken by Walter Brahm, the state librarian of Connecticut, in his commentary on fees for nonresidents who use public libraries. His remarks seem germane to academic libraries. He writes "as librarians today, we place ourselves in a most untenable position if we withhold the fruits of our taxpayers' bounty while at the same time seeking a greater share in federal and state funds. If there were a taxpayer's suit, we have some doubt that, where a library accepts state aid, the courts would uphold the legality of the fee."²

The responses to question six show that some modification should be placed on qualified outsiders. We should not question the usefulness of some form of modification, in view of the academic library's primary responsibility to students, faculty, and staff, who need some assurance that reserve materials will be available for class assignments and that scholarly journals will be on the shelves for study and research purposes. The most astonishing fact is that in spite of the numerous restrictions that nonacademic patrons face in a large number of academic libraries, for the most part, they are not required to fill out a borrower's application form.

We usually think of the alumni as being sacrosanct, but Mr. Heintz reminds us that at least 9 per cent of the 783 returns revealed that alumni are not extended privileges unless they are also available to other persons. By and large, academic institutions are mindful of the importance of the alumni. To determine whether or not alumni have great affection for the libraries of their Alma Mater for library service rendered, it would be necessary to undertake another survey.

An examination of the methods used to retrieve materials from community borrowers reveals the fact that the telephone and the letter are the most fre-

² Walter T. Brahm, "On the Grindstone," *Library Journal*, XC (November 1, 1965), 4726.

quently used forms of communication. Obviously, community borrowers appreciate their library privileges, for only one academic institution indicated that it was necessary to use legal action in order to recover overdue books. Perhaps the fact that no great problems are encountered in the recovery of materials from community borrowers underlines the validity of library service to outsiders.

As regards the checking out of materials indirectly to public libraries, many libraries follow this procedure, thereby eliminating traffic to the college or university library. I share Mr. Heintz's feeling that what we found here will not help us to revamp our total vision of the interlibrary loan code.

Miss LaMont, in a novel fashion, began her report by reminding us how excessive one can become in safeguarding library collections. Her compression of the hundreds of suggestions for adequate safeguards was a feat of no small magnitude. There were almost as many different suggestions as there were librarians responding. The suggestions range from a few librarians who insist that there is no solution, to those who are extremely conscious of their community public relations. We are forced to recognize that because of so many positive suggestions and, at the same time, too many (to use Miss LaMont's description) vociferous suggestive commentaries, it becomes crystal clear that college and university librarians will demand that adequate safeguards of the academic library's resources must advance hand in hand with community use of college and university libraries.

The problem of control discourages some libraries from extending service to community users. George M. Bailey contends that "unless there is a control at the front door, for persons entering the building, the outsider has free access to the catalogs and the entire reference collection of the college or university li-

brary and, in the larger library, to a number of subject materials in special reading rooms."³ The evolution of rigid controls of entrances and exits in academic libraries is more or less a gradual process of response to the need for security, for George Elser reported that only half of the 783 respondents, *i.e.*, 318, had controls. On small campuses which are isolated from town, controls may not be necessary, but in a large urban center where it is difficult to distinguish between town and gown, some controls are advisable.

It appears that academic librarians are a little distrustful of a statewide library card, for 66 per cent of those responding rejected the idea! There seemed not to have been a consensus, even among the small libraries, for Mr. Elser stated that one faction felt that its small collections and staffs could not survive, and one group that felt that new vistas of resources would open up for their faculty and students.

There were also some who decided for their public library colleagues by agreeing that "it's a good idea for public libraries." This decision for the public libraries leads me to the colloquium on "The Metropolitan Public Library," which appears in the June issue of the *Wilson Library Bulletin*. Regarding the need for a realignment of service, Emerson Greenaway stated, "the legal entanglements that would be involved in any realignment of services are tremendous, and realignment would also create a need for new attitudes. For a long time, academic and research libraries have looked down their noses at the public library, not realizing the true extent of its resources and the fact that students come flocking to the public library because of its longer hours."⁴ I am sure

³ George M. Bailey, "Demands on College and University Library Facilities in Metropolitan Centers," *Illinois Libraries*, XLIII (November 1961), 672.

⁴ "The Metropolitan Public Library," *Wilson Library Bulletin*, LX (June 1966), 919.

that all of us agree that before a large preponderance of academic librarians would agree on a statewide library card, there will be the need to accept Mr. Greenaway's admonition of creating new attitudes. As a matter of fact, the creation of new attitudes is paramount, when we consider the fact that Lewis C. Naylor, another participant in the Metropolitan Public Library colloquium, stated that "all of us recognize that most librarians are provincial in their concepts of service."

If academic librarians would relinquish their traditional way of thinking and accept with adequate safeguards a regional or state-wide library card that could be used in their libraries, what a resource of incredible dimensions would be created for the citizens of the twenty-first century! We must be intellectually honest enough to discard obsolete practices that have traditionally persisted.

Mr. Howard's paper, "The Work of the Public Library in Supplementing the Resources of the College Library," serves as a catalyst, for it is a jolting reminder of the work of many public libraries in the country that has been of tremendous assistance to college libraries. We do not have around the country many utopias of shared library responsibility such as exist in Evansville, but the mere recital of this splendid cooperation between a college library and a public library illustrates and accentuates the fact that a realignment of service among all libraries can be accomplished. Moreover, if academic libraries accept their role in a pattern of shared library responsibility, community use of academic libraries would become an opportunity, not a problem. As we mull over Mr. Howard's presentation, the question then becomes: Are we justified when we permit the public library to service our clientele, and at the same time, deny service to the clientele of the public library?

As we rush head-on into the 1970's

with growing student enrollments, more of our students will be knocking on the doors of their public libraries. Concurrently, as we turn out more college graduates, most of these same graduates who will not be affiliated with institutions of learning will desire to use the libraries of neighboring colleges and universities, as well as the collections of their public libraries.

The myth of local self-sufficiency of academic libraries has been long refuted by libraries that participate in many co-operative projects. More recently, academic libraries are accepting federal assistance, not only for building construction, but also for books, materials, and equipment. The question of whether or not to deny a taxpayer the right to use his tax dollar in a given academic library may no longer be moot. In an editorial on access to libraries, Eric Moon wrote "Could not nonresidents argue that they had a right of free access to libraries receiving generous support from state and federal funds to which their taxes had contributed?"⁵ Could we not rephrase Mr. Moon's question to read: Could not residents of the community argue that they had a right of free access to college and university libraries receiving generous support from state and federal funds to which their taxes had contributed?

It has become unmistakably clear from an abundance of evidence that legislators on the state and national levels are thinking in terms of academic libraries opening their doors to community users. Although Donald Coney, director of libraries at the University of California, Berkeley, has reservations about outside use unless "suitable policies and budgeting be provided," he quoted, in a recent letter, from the report of the Legislative Analyst to the Joint Legislative Committee of the California Legislature in its

⁵ Eric Moon, "Access and the Supreme Court," *Library Journal* XCI (April 1, 1966), 1788.

current session. Commenting on the Governor's bill, the California Legislative Analyst contends that "the University Library System exists not only to serve the educational needs of students but also is the major resource center in the state for research not only by resident faculty plus faculties from other higher educational institutions, but also for industry and other community users."⁶

On the national scene, it has been reported that when representatives of ALA testified before the Congress on Title II of the Higher Education Act, there were many queries regarding the opening of academic collections to the general public, if federal funds were granted. In the light of these realities, the time may not be too distant, when funds will not be

⁶Letter from Donald Coney, director of libraries, University of California at Berkeley, May 4, 1966.

given to college and university libraries which do not believe in sharing their resources with the community.

There is in my opinion no one problem. Neither is there one solution. So let us begin with the assumption that, through cooperation with all libraries in a geographical area, academic libraries would be a part of the answer of extending library resources when they grant service to the community. The question now is not whether there should be community use of academic libraries. The question is, how is it possible to create the conditions under which there can be an accepted practice of community use of academic libraries. Despite the thorny problems we face, I am optimistic that reasonable answers regarding community use of academic libraries can be found. ■ ■

