HARRISON BRYAN

Australian Academic Libraries:
The Incomplete Revolution

Over the last twenty years academic libraries in Australia have been trans-formed in terms of accommodation, staffing, resources, and services. This was brought about as federal funding became available, in succession, to the libraries of universities, colleges of advanced education (CAEs), and in-stitutions of technical and further education (TAFE). University libraries have become the nation's largest bibliographical resource and can now lay some claim to providing resources for research. CAE libraries are within sight of beginning adequacy for undergraduate teaching. TAFE libraries, though transformed, still fall far short of adequacy. Economic constraints have slowed development in recent years, but the future cannot be said to be wholly bleak.

HISTORY

The first universities were established in Australia during what has been termed the era of colonial pride.[1] The initial moves to recognize what were originally, with one exception, penal colonies as self-respecting outposts of European civilization, came in the 1840s and 1850s; and it is no accident that Australia's oldest universities, Sydney (1851) and Melbourne (1853), were founded almost immediately on the establishment of responsible government in the colonies of New South Wales and Victoria respectively. There followed a period, which extended beyond the federation of the six colonies into the Commonwealth of Australia in 1901, during which each colony or state es-tablished "its own" university. Thus we have Adelaide, 1874; Tasmania, 1890; Queensland, 1909; and Western Australia, 1912.

It is important for the non-Australian reader to appreciate that Australian federalism has a strong "state-rights" strand to it. Residual power, including that relating to education, lies with the states not the commonwealth, and it has been asserted,

with what degree of facetiousness one can but conjecture, that the only force which unifies Sydney and Melbourne, the two big Australian cities, is their common distrust of Canberra, the national capital.

Partly due to this, at least potentially, disruptive force, and partly to the problems of distance and demography in a country the size of the United States but with perhaps 10 percent of its population, there has been an irrepressible urge toward com-plete self-sufficiency on the part of the first six "state" universities. This has made for a degree of sameness among them. It has also led in some cases to a dangerously early overextending of their resources.

Since 1913 a further thirteen universities have been established. Three trends are traceable in this development: an urge to diversify; a need to multiply to meet popu-lation growth; and a repeated stirring of conscience toward decentralization, in a country whose population seems re-morselessly to be concentrating in a handful of cities, most of them on the southeast littoral.

Diversity and Multiplicity

In response to the first urge, the Austra-lian National University (ANU) was founded in 1948, virtually coincident with the pro-

Harrison Bryan is librarian, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia.

duction of "Australia's own" motor car—actually by a subsidiary of General Motors—and for the same reasons of national self-assertion. ANU was to be a simon-pure research institution; but, as noted below, it acquired in 1960 an undergraduate operation, which has seemed to water down in part its claims to difference from other universities, some of which have considerably larger postgraduate enrollments.

Almost coincidentally, the New South Wales University of Technology was established as a fairly strong reaction to what was seen, perhaps unfairly, as an unduly "ivory tower" preoccupation on the part of the University of Sydney. Originally eschewing the humanities and dedicated to a new academic and administrative structure, the University of New South Wales, as it is now called, seems rather less clearly distinguishable today from other universities. The accent on applied science and technology has remained, but much of the "new look" structure has gone and the university has a well-developed faculty of arts.

The drive to multiply produced further metropolitan universities in five of the six state capitals; another in Sydney (Macquarie, 1964) making, with the University of New South Wales, three altogether in that city; two more in Melbourne (Monash, 1958, and La Trobe, 1964), and one each in Adelaide (Flinders, 1966), Brisbane (Griffith, 1970), and Perth (Murdoch, 1970).

Decentralization

Decentralization preceded both multiplication and diversification. Canberra University College was established as an offshoot of Melbourne in the new federal capital in 1927. It was married to the Australian National University, not without a degree of mutual misgiving, in 1960. The University College of New England, established at Armidale in northern New South Wales as a branch of Sydney in 1938, became the independent University of New England in 1954. James Cook University of North Queensland began in 1961 as Townsville University College, an offshoot of Queensland, and became independent in 1970. Newcastle University College, founded in 1951, and Wollongong University College,

founded 1957, both originally associated with the University of New South Wales, secured their independence in 1965 and 1975 respectively.

Deakin, established in 1974, is either a multiplication or a decentralization, being located fifty miles from Melbourne, or perhaps even a diversification, since it was founded on the basis of two colleges of advanced education and with a specific commitment to external teaching, which it shares with Queensland and New England.

Federal Intervention

In 1957 the Australian university system was rescued from chaos and near immolation by the commonwealth's entry into university financing, following the report of the Murray Committee.[2]

In 1965, the Martin Committee recommended a binary system of tertiary education, which resulted in the identification, ultimately, of a total of eighty-three, now reduced to sixty-seven, colleges of advanced education (CAEs), of a status described as "equal but different" in relation to universities.[3]

The colleges comprise a range of institutions from several large central institutions of technology with at least a family resemblance to MIT, through a large number of former teachers colleges, many of which have become multidisciplinary to a group of monodisciplinary colleges such as agricultural colleges and conservatories of music.

A Grinding Halt?

In common with other Western nations, Australia seems to have developed, in recent times, some community disenchantment with tertiary education and especially with universities. In association with the country's recent economic problems, a process of "stabilization" has been applied to federal funding of universities and a "no growth" situation has developed. It might be noted that the CAEs have also had the brake applied, though not quite as drastically. The only growth area in the postsecondary field has been in technical education, the so-called TAFE (technical and further education) sector, which began to receive federal aid following the Kangan report of 1974.[4]

Most recently a committee appointed by the commonwealth government to advise on the future of education and training, the Williams Committee, suggested the likely continuation of this trend, with most of the increase in aspirants to postsecondary education (resulting from population and economic growth) going to TAFE institutions. At the same time, the Williams Committee recommended that the boundaries between the sectors be clarified and urged in particular that universities tighten up on their selection and admission procedures and give increased emphasis to research.[5]

Funding Mechanisms

It is rather ironic to note that, despite the constitutional reservation of education as a state power, none of the universities, though each was established under a state statute, could survive without commonwealth funding. The constitutional problem has been solved by a sleight of hand called special grants to the states. The same device has been employed not only in the other two tertiary sectors but also in both primary and secondary education.

Funds for tertiary education are disbursed by the commonwealth on the advice of a Tertiary Education Commission (TEC), which has three advisory councils, one for each sector. In the case of the TAFE sector, there is a further stage of consultation with state boards variously entitled boards of advanced education or boards of higher education.

One interesting aspect of federal funding was the decision of the Whitlam government in 1972 to increase university grants, provided the institutions concerned abolished tuition fees. Thus, theoretically, tertiary education is not only open to all but also free.

Library Reviews

A final historical note covers published sources for the development of academic libraries themselves. University libraries were surveyed in 1934 as part of an overview of Australian libraries by Ralph Munn of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, in association with Ernest R. Pitt, an Australian librarian.[6] They were looked at again by Lionel McColvin, city librarian of Westminster, in 1947, again as part of a general survey.[7] In 1961 Maurice F. Tauber completed the only in-depth survey of Australian library resources ever undertaken.[8] In 1978 Robert B. Downs looked specifically at academic and research library resources in Australia.[9]

Neither college nor TAFE libraries have been the subject of published surveys, but the former were reviewed with some care over several years by a library subcommittee set up by the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Colleges of Advanced Education and were mentioned in the reports of that committee and its successors.[10] TAFE libraries were surveyed specifically by E. H. Flowers and A. J. Brown as part of the Kangan Committee's investigations in 1974.

A very good statistical record of university library development is to be found from 1961 to date, originally in the text and later in the annual supplements to *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* and its predecessor, the *Newssheet* of the University and College Libraries Section of the Library Association of Australia.[11] Since 1969 the same source includes college libraries. There are no easily available sources of collated TAFE statistics.

BOOKSTOCK

The main feature of the bookstock of Australian academic libraries has been its mushroom growth in recent years. In 1934 the six Australian university libraries were able to account for a total stock of fewer than 425,000 volumes, and of this some 55 percent was held in one library, that of the University of Sydney. By the end of 1978 the total bookstock had risen to 12,519,000 volumes. By far the greater portion of this growth had followed the availability of federal funding from 1958 onward.

There has also been a similar growth of the libraries' potential reader population (academic staff—full and part-time—and students—undergraduate and graduate, full and part-time, including external students, on a simple head count). By 1977 the nineteen university libraries served a potential direct population of 169,846.

Although statistics are not so readily available for the libraries in the colleges of advanced education, there has also been

like growth. Bookstock has increased from some 287,000 volumes in 1969 to more than 5,000,000 in 1977, with potential readers numbering 184,000 in 1977.

For both university and CAE libraries the pattern is clearly the same: a massive increase in stock and a parallel increase in reader responsibilities. In terms of a crude measure of books available per reader, the improvement rate has been higher in the colleges than in the universities, but the relative levels of provision in the two sectors tell a different story.

No comparable measurement can be made of TAFE bookstock. It appears, however, that, once again, the "shot in the arm" of federal funds has had a tremendous effect. Total bookstock rose from approximately 677,000 volumes to 1,100,000 between 1974 and 1977. Unfortunately, the starting point was pathetically low, and the number of students at TAFE institutions, on a head count, is formidable indeed. Even allowing for the high proportion of part-time enrollments, it comprises a service load far beyond those handled by either the university or the college libraries.

Quantitative Evaluations

In an attempt to assess collection adequacy more accurately, the Clapp-Jordan formula and its later refinements by Blanchard have been applied to university and college collections.[12] The limitations of using such a fourteen-year-old yardstick must be appreciated.

Bearing in mind the tendency noted earlier for Australian universities to attempt self-sufficiency, it may come as no surprise that only one library, that of the University of Sydney meets Clapp-Jordan and indeed Blanchard standards, and that it has only recently achieved this position. As table 1 shows, Sydney has far and away the largest bookstock and the largest accession rate.

A more common pattern is demonstrated by Macquarie, a much more recently established library, where the Clapp-Jordan deficiency stood at 1,247,000 volumes in 1978, though it should be noted that this was a reduction of some 440,000 volumes over a decade.[13]

If we attempt a rather less ambitious excercise, it is possible, again by using the Clapp-Jordan formula in each case, to establish that, in 1978, eighteen of the nineteen university libraries at least had some resources beyond those needed for undergraduate study and teaching and that the national total of this "surplus" amounted to some 7,468,000 volumes. The point is made simply to contrast the present situation with

TABLE 1

AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES LIBRARIES IN 1978

Order of Size	Name of Institution	Size of Collection*	Accessions*	Order of Accessions	Number of Reader Places	Order of Reader Places	Total Expenditure†	Order of Total Expenditure
1	Sydney	2,522	251	1	4,444	1	5,228	1
2	Queensland	1,146	61	3	3,138	5	4,637	2
3	Melbourne	998	66	2	3,503	3	4,230	6
4	Adelaide	977	52	6	2,333	8	3,020	7
5	Aust. Nat. Univ.	954	57	4	1,800	9	4,421	4
6	Monash	939	50	7	3,818	2	4,280	5
7	New South Wales	924	55	5	3,430	4	4,544	3
8	West. Aust.	747	45	8	2,711	6	2,677	8
9	Macquarie	563	37	10	2,500	7	2,389	9
10	New England	432	21	17	308	19	1,401	15
11	Flinders	419	33	11	1,071	11	1,500	14
12	Newcastle	385	26	14	832	13	1,607	11
13	Tasmania	374	16	19	1,030	12	1,593	13
14	La Trobe	370	31	13	1,463	10	2,348	10
15	James Cook	185	20	18	460	17	1,139	18
16	Wollongong	156	22	16	530	14	1,194	16
17	Deakin	151	32	12	515	15	1,605	12
18	Murdoch	142.	25	15	487	16	1,146	17
19	Griffith	134	41	9	438	18	986	19

SOURCE: *Australian Academic and Research Libraries*. Library Statistics, 1978.
*Size of collection figures are × 000 bound volumes (including microform equivalents).
†All figures are × A$000.

that at the time of the Munn-Pitt report, when only three libraries had any holdings in excess of the Clapp-Jordan minima for undergraduate instruction and the national surplus totaled only 142,000 volumes.

In 1978, with six libraries in addition to Sydney at, or within early sight of the one-million-volume mark, it does seem possible to claim some potential for higher education and research in Australian university libraries.

As a group, and indeed library for library, Australian university libraries are beginning to measure up quite well to British university libraries, though very few would qualify for an Association of Research Libraries listing.[14]

It may be even more appropriate to apply this second calculation to CAE libraries since, though there are blurred edges between the two sectors, the colleges are asserted to be less concerned with higher education and research than are the universities.

Table 2 sets out the basic statistics for the larger CAE libraries. If we measure the Clapp-Jordan undergraduate teaching minimum for that institution against the bookstock of each, we come up with a result that is rather less depressing than the table suggests.

In short, although only eleven of the sixty-seven CAE libraries would have had any "surplus" in 1978, given current accession rates, a total of twenty-nine should be equipped for undergraduate teaching by the time this paper is published, and a decade of growth at the present rate would see the vast majority equally well placed. There would remain a handful of institutions, principally monodisciplinary colleges, with no real hope of ever achieving that modest pinnacle of success.

One feature that distinguishes many CAE libraries is their relatively heavy reliance on audiovisual material. With some notable exceptions, of which the best example is Macquarie, Australian university libraries have been slow to develop in the nonbook area.

The imagination boggles at applying Clapp-Jordan to TAFE libraries, and it might be argued that it would be unrealistic

TABLE 2

LARGER AUSTRALIAN COLLEGES OF ADVANCED EDUCATION LIBRARIES IN 1977

Order of Size	Name of Institution*		Size of Collection†	Accessions†	Order of Accessions	Number of Reader Places	Order of Reader Places	Total Expenditure‡	Order of Total Expenditure
1	West. Aust. I.T.	(A)	401	48	1	1,081	1	1,807	1
2	State Coll. Melbourne	(C)	275	20	4	345	10	1,178	4
3	Canberra CAE	(A)	248	18	5	680	2	950	5
4	Royal Melbourne I.T.	(A)	212	26	2	666	3	1,552	2
5	Sydney Tea. Coll.	(C)	202	11	1	287	12	446	11
6	Swinburne Coll. Tech.	(A)	138	12	11	660	4	934	6
7	New South Wales I.T.	(A)	132	21	3	275	13	1,243	3
8	South Aust. I.T.	(A)	125	13	9	461	7	881	7
9	Tasmanian CAE	(A)	118	6	16	192	17	417	13
10	Mitchell CAE	(B)	109	18	5	320	11	373	14
11	Torrens CAE	(C)	95	8	12	120	18	324	16
12	Ballarat CAE	(B)	94	4	17	375	8	296	17
13	Darling Downs I.A.E.	(B)	93	17	8	512	6	705	8
14	Caulfield I.T.	(A)	92	7	14	636	5	643	9
15	Kelvin Grove CAE	(C)	91	8	12	206	15	350	15
16	Adelaide CAE	(C)	91	7	14	194	16	239	18
17	Riverina CAE	(B)	90	13	9	240	14	548	10
18	Bendigo CAE	(B)	90	4	17	351	9	429	12

SOURCE: *Australian Academic and Research Libraries.* Library Statistics, 1977.
*Suffixed capital letters indicate the group of colleges to which the institution belongs: (A) Central Institutes of Technology (a group of eleven colleges); (B) Other "first generation" colleges (a group of fourteen colleges); (C) Former Teachers Colleges (a group of thirty-eight colleges);
†Size of collection figures are × 000 bound volumes (including microform equivalents).
‡All figures are × A$000.

to undertake such an exercise. However, it must be stated that the leeway resulting from decades of neglect is so substantial that only a handful of TAFE libraries can hope to meet, in the foreseeable future, even the modest interim standard set by Brown and Flowers in the Kangan report.

ACCOMMODATION

This article appears at just the right time, in that it is still possible to say that a feature of the commonwealth's intervention in tertiary education has been the great fillip given to academic library building.[15]

Since 1959 every Australian university library has been either housed or rehoused in a custom-built building of high quality, excepting only two: the University of Adelaide Library, whose parent institution's restricted site has required a series of increasingly ingenious extensions to the library, and Deakin, the most recent foundation.

College libraries, too, have benefited from the availability of capital funds, and there are several new buildings of international quality. Unfortunately, there are still many ill-housed libraries, including several of the larger ones.

Very few TAFE institutions have either new or adequate library premises, but there may be hope in the continuation of a real increase in support in this sector.

A somewhat unsatisfactory measure of accommodation is the percentage of the full-time student population that can be seated at any one time.

In 1977 the median for Australian university libraries in this respect was 33.95 percent, with a high range of 46.6 percent and low of 9.7 percent. For the CAE libraries treated in table 2, the median was 19.6 percent and the range from 33 to 9.9 percent.

Unfortunately, the recent shutdown in fund increases has been felt first in the accommodation area; and, particularly in the university field, there are a growing number of institutions facing the grim reality of a rapidly filling building with no prospect of relief. In this respect, the Australian reception of the Atkinson Committee's report in the United Kingdom is interesting.[16] To date no serious suggestion has been made at an official level in support of the concept of the "self-renewing" library, or, worse still, the "steady state" library.

It remains to be seen whether, when the crunch comes, sufficient priority will be given to library buildings within drastically limited funding. Already the University of Queensland, twice the recipient of funds for substantial building, is at the point of retiring annually—it hopes only temporarily—the equivalent of its intake, before its on-campus stock has reached a satisfactory size.

Accommodation problems of this kind do not assume the same immediate prominence in the other tertiary sectors, largely because stock expansion has not proceeded at the same rate.

STAFF AND ORGANIZATION

Table 3 demonstrates quite clearly the very considerable improvement over the years in staffing university libraries in relation either to bookstock or to readers served, though the later figures in columns 2 and 3 reflect the results of the recent staff "freeze." Perhaps more significantly, even allowing for the crudeness in the measures used, it indicates quite clearly the notable shift of emphasis from technical services to reader services.

While technical services staff, by and large, has been increased at a rate commensurate with the growth in accessions, reader services staff has grown considerably more rapidly than the number of readers to be served.

This second trend is not as clear in CAE libraries. Compared with the unit load of 1:149 for reader services staff in university libraries in 1977, the average for the larger CAE libraries was only 1:253, with a high range of 1:637. On the other hand, the median work load for technical services staff in the larger CAE libraries was only 1:841 as compared with the university median of 1:960. The low range in the CAEs was actually 1:438. Even bearing in mind the grossness of the calculations, there seems to be some room for redeployment here. This would be wise, since all advice to date has been that, given modest bookstock, there is additional need to develop reader services.[17]

It is far too early to distinguish trends in TAFE libraries, since they are only now emerging from their Dark Ages.

TABLE 3

STAFF WORK LOADS 1934–77 AT ALL AUSTRALIAN UNIVERSITIES DURING 1934–77

Year	Total Staff	Books × 10³ Divided by Staff	Readers Divided by Staff	Technical Services Staff	Acc. Divided by Technical Services Staff	Reader Services Staff	Readers Divided by Reader Services Staff
1934	36	11.8	217	23	944	18	556
1949	135	6.9	231	69	509	52	510
1952	188	6.1	159	96	640	73	396
1955	212	6.4	141	109	733	82	370
1957	269	5.8	132	132	786	100	353
1959	365	5.4	126	187	1,137	141	326
1962	591	4.5	104	304	876	228	271
1968	1,330	3.9	88	577	773	626	165
1971	1,680	4.3	76	695	734	814	158
1972	1,861	4.3	71	754	757	896	147
1973	1,924	4.4	69	778	838	953	140
1974	2,066	4.4	77	849	852	968	163
1975	2,160	4.6	73	866	897	1,070	147
1976	2,226	4.9	74	853	914	1,103	150
1977	2,260	5.1	75	828	960	1,141	149

Organization

The staffing structures of Australian academic libraries present, on the whole, a fairly conventional picture. The traditional organization by departments is still common but, since the mid-1960s, a substantial number of university libraries have moved to a functional divisional structure.

The current excitement in the U.K. concerning subject specialization has not aroused a notable response in the antipodes. Monash and New South Wales are examples of university libraries essaying a subject-divisional organization, and Adelaide has moved farthest toward a staff structure based on subject specialists. Inevitably, there is a degree of "subject streaming" in both technical and reader services routines in many libraries.

Participation in management has been the center of considerable discussion in recent years, and the recorded experience of the oldest and largest of the group of libraries, highlighting both the value and the practical limits associated with participation, will sound very familiar to American ears.[18]

Two current problems of staff qualification and organization have their roots in the slow emergence of a three-tier structure at least in university libraries. The professional cadre has always been distinguished by the requirement that applicants hold a university degree and a library qualification. Leaving aside qualifications secured through the LAA's examination system since this system is now being phased out, professional qualifications from library schools have been secured following the first degrees, the normal award being a graduate diploma. Some colleges of advanced education are now offering bachelor degrees in librarianship, in the form of integrated three- or four-year courses, and a problem area is the acceptability of these for professional posts in academic libraries.

The second difficulty is the distinguishing qualification for middle-grade or paraprofessional staff. Here again, academic libraries have yet to espouse openly the library technician qualifications offered by some TAFE institutions and beginning to be recognized by the LAA.

READER SERVICES

To emphasize a point made in the previous section, there has been more than just a swing of the pendulum toward emphasizing reader services in academic libraries—and especially university libraries—in Australia.[19]

Indeed, the last fifteen years or so have seen a considerable movement of outreach to the reader, typified by the standing reader assistance unit at the University of New South Wales and the sophisticated, integrated reader education packages developed at Macquarie.

In recent years computerized literature searching has developed very rapidly. AUSINET, an Australian data base consortium, has existed since 1977. AUSINET mounts, in effect, the relatively recent files of major overseas data bases, but it also accommodates, increasingly, local data bases such as the *Australian National Bibliography* (ANB), the *Australian Public Affairs Information Service* (APAIS), both mounted by the National Library of Australia, and *Bibliographic Information on South East Asia* (BISA) put up by the University of Sydney.

In addition, many university libraries regularly access DIALOG and ORBIT; and. MEDLINE has been available in Canberra through a network funded partly by university libraries since 1975 and, in batch mode, since 1972.

AUTOMATION

Mention of computerized searching leads to a general consideration of library automation. In this area it could be suggested that Australian university libraries—with which can be included some larger CAE libraries—present a fairly familiar pattern to North American eyes. In several institutions, particularly the older or better endowed, there are in-house treatments of various aspects of library routine. There is little use of turnkey systems, and there is too little interinstitutional cooperation. Overall there is, it must be confessed, an unimpressive degree of concern for the systems approach to a library's totality of activities.

An IBM punched card circulation system installed in the University of Sydney Library in 1964 prefigured a decade of fairly rapid movement into automation. Special purpose listings have been widely developed. Half a dozen university libraries have batch-mode cataloging operations, and there are significant data banks of machine-readable cataloging, for example at New South Wales and Sydney, each with some 300,000 or so records in this form. Increasing use is made of AMRS, the National Library of Australia's Australian MARC Record Service.

Several circulation systems have been developed in-house, of which the most sophisticated is probably CIRCUS, Sydney's on-line operation. Several of the larger CAEs have acquisition and/or cataloging modules operational, for example, the New South Wales Institute of Technology, the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, and the Western Australian Institute of Technology.

COOPERATION

Interlibrary cooperation has been a feature of Australian library development, and, as noted below, academic libraries, particularly university libraries, have played an increasingly important part in resource sharing on a national scale.

Within the academic libraries themselves there are long-standing mechanisms for cooperation, and there are interesting new forms emerging.

The Committee of Australian University Librarians (CAUL) dates back, intermittently and under various titles, to 1928. Though meeting only annually, CAUL members maintain continued contact with one another by the device of multiaddressing inquiries or information of general interest.

CAUL's relationship with the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee (AVCC), the group of executive heads of universities, has been rather delicate at times, the latter body being somewhat reluctant to be lectured or pressured. In recent times, however, the AVCC has not discouraged submissions from CAUL and has, in effect, accepted CAUL's advice in some of its dealings with the Universities Council of the Tertiary Education Commission. The commission has itself developed informal contacts with CAUL.

ALCAE, the Association of Librarians in Colleges of Advanced Education, was actually encouraged into existence by the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Colleges of Advanced Education. It functions in an analogous way to CAUL.

There is no really effective mechanism yet for communication among TAFE librarians.

Libraries of all three sectors of tertiary education are represented on AACOBS (the Australian Advisory Committee on Bibliographical Services), a body that has some of the characteristics of the Association of Research Libraries in the U.S. and of the

Standing Conference of National and University Libraries in the U.K. All universities are represented directly on AACOBS by their librarians, but the other two sectors have only group representation on it.

AACOBS operates in part through regional committees, one in each of the seven capital cities, which provide an opportunity, and sometimes a focus, for continuing cooperation at the local level.

Networks

Of considerable interest is the emergence of more formalized devices for resource sharing on a regional or type of library basis. In Victoria CAVAL (Cooperative Action by Victorian Academic Libraries) brings together, as a registered company, all university libraries in the state, the state library, and certain of the CAE libraries. CAVAL's first target is a shared cataloging operation.

CLANN (College Libraries Activities Network in New South Wales) is more advanced than CAVAL. It associates in a shared cataloging network a number of CAE libraries spread throughout the state.

Finally, a feasibility study is currently in progress into the establishment of a permanent office of library cooperation, the members of which will be five of the six university libraries in New South Wales, the New South Wales Institute of Technology, and the state library. Once again a high priority is a shared cataloging operation.

All these developments, prompted by the need for more effective resource sharing at a time of shrinking finances, are being planned, hopefully, to be compatible and with the conscious intent that they be integrated into the national network toward which the National Library has been directing its efforts for some years.

THE NATIONAL ROLE

An important aspect of academic, particularly university, library operations in Australia is the significant national role that these libraries play.

Traditionally, the nation's bibliographical resources were to be found overwhelmingly in the independent "national" libraries set up, prefederation, by the six colonies and that are now all named state libraries. The rapid growth of the National Library, established originally as the library of the Commonwealth Parliament, added a new dimension after World War II, and the library network of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization (CSIRO) had seemed, until recently, to be developing as a national science collection.

The flow of federal funds to university libraries in the 1960s completely changed that picture. Within two decades university libraries have become, overwhelmingly, in volume count, the largest element in the nation's bibliographic resource.

This situation is reflected in the statistics of interlibrary loans in Australia, in the active involvement of academic libraries in all cooperative ventures, either nationally or at the regional or local level, and in the substantial direct use made of university library resources and services by the community at large.

In contrast to what was for long the stance of university librarians in the U.K., academic librarians in Australia have been closely involved in the affairs of the professional association, the Library Association of Australia, and the LAA's qualifications have been both accepted and promoted by academic libraries.

CONCLUSION

The subtitle of this article suggests the rapid and substantial changes that have come over academic libraries in Australia in the past twenty years. It also draws attention to the distance yet to be traveled to achieve an adequate standard of service to the academic community and to the nation.

In fact, there have been three successive revolutions in Australian academic libraries, each resulting from the entry of the federal government into funding postsecondary education.

The first and most nearly complete revolution has been in university libraries. In twenty short years they have changed out of sight, both in degree and in kind, to the point where they have altered the face of Australian academe and the pattern and quality of the nation's library resources.

The second revolution has been in CAE libraries, where twelve years or so of commonwealth funding have transformed an

area of deep depression into one of optimism and a negligible level of library provision and service into one which is in sight of minimum adequacy.

The third revolution is occurring in TAFE libraries. Here the improvement in stock and services, while it has been remarkable enough, is dwarfed still by the magnitude of the task yet to be achieved. The real change, however, has been in attitudes toward the library and its staff, and here a mere five years of federal support has brought real hope and enthusiasm where before there were only apathy and despair.

It is the more distressing, accordingly, that Australia's economic situation and changing government attitudes have so slowed the tempo of all three revolutions as to put their ultimate success in some jeopardy.

Some twelve years ago an editor subtitled an article by the present writer on Australian university libraries: "A Gloomy Conclusion?"[20] Another decade's experience really does make the use of such a term inappropriate. The achievements of the unfinished revolution have been such, in the writer's view, as permanently to preclude the possibility of slipping back to the parlous and quite insignificant position that academic libraries occupied in Australia at the time of the Munn-Pitt report. There will be delay and disappointment; there should no longer be disaster.

REFERENCES

1. Harrison Bryan, "The Development of Academic and Research Libraries in Australia, "in Harrison Bryan and Gordon Greenwood, eds., *Design for Diversity: Library Services for Higher Education and Research in Australia* (Brisbane: Univ. of Queensland Pr., 1977), p.1–46.
2. Australia. Committee on Australian Universities, *Report* (Canberra, 1957).
3. Australia. Committee on the Future of Tertiary Education in Australia, *Report* (Canberra, 1964–65).
4. Australia. Committee on Technical and Further Education, *Report* (Canberra, 1974).
5. Australia. Committee on Enquiry into Education and Training, *Report* (Canberra, 1979).
6. Ralph Munn and Ernest R. Pitt, *Australian Libraries* (Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research, 1935).
7. Lionel R. McColvin, *Public Libraries in Australia* (Melbourne: Australian Council for Educational Research, 1947).
8. Maurice F. Tauber, *Resources of Australian Libraries* (Canberra: Australian Advisory Council on Bibliographical Services, 1963).
9. Robert B. Downs, *Australian and New Zealand Library Resources* (London: Mansell, 1979).
10. Australia. Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Colleges of Advanced Education, *1st & 2nd Reports* (Canberra, 1966, 1969). Australian Commission on Advanced Education, *3rd Report* (Canberra, 1972).
11. *Australian Academic and Research Libraries* (Melbourne: University and College Libraries Section, Library Association of Australia, 1970–   ) and its supplement, *Library Statistics, 1972–   Library Association of Australia. University and College Libraries Section, Newssheet*, V.3–10 (1962–69).
12. Verner W. Clapp and Robert T. Jordan, "Quantitative Criteria for Adequacy of Academic Library Collections," *College & Research Libraries* 26:371–80 (Sept. 1965). J. R. Blanchard, "Planning the Conversion of a College to a University Library," *College & Research Libraries* 29:297–302 (July 1968).
13. Harrison Bryan, "Australian University Libraries in 1968," in Library Association of Australia, *Proceedings of the 15th Biennial Conference, Adelaide, 1969* (Sydney, 1971), p.91–110.
14. Harrison Bryan, *University Libraries in Britain: A New Look* (London: Bingley, 1976).
15. Harrison Bryan, "A Decade and a Half of Library Building (1959–73)," in Bryan and Greenwood, eds., *Design for Diversity*, p.413–52.
16. *Capital Provision for University Libraries: Report of a Working Party* (London: H.M.S.O., 1976).
17. Harrison Bryan and Evelyn L. Hean, *The Function of the Library in a College of Advanced Education* (Sydney: the authors, 1970).
18. Harrison Bryan, *WOPSO: An Exercise in Consultation* (Sydney: Kuring-gai College of Advanced Education, 1978).
19. Jean P. Whyte, "Direct Services to Readers," in Bryan and Greenwood, eds., *Design for Diversity*, p.271–312.
20. Harrison Bryan, "Australian University Libraries: A Gloomy Conclusion?" *Library Journal* 92:4113–16 (Nov. 15, 1967).