

The ACRL Grants Program: A Report of Its First Four Years

IN 1955 the United States Steel Foundation granted \$30,000 to ALA to be distributed to college libraries by ACRL. From these funds sub-grants went to eighty-nine colleges and to five research projects. The following year the Foundation renewed its grant; the New York Times made \$5,000 available for the purchase of microfilm copies of its back files; and the Remington Rand division of Sperry Rand, Inc., gave \$5,000 for sub-grants for library equipment. Later in the same academic year the Lilly Endowment, Inc., made a gift of \$26,000 to promote the more extensive and imaginative use of library resources by undergraduate students. In accordance with the donor's wishes public and private institutions offering four-year programs and located in Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Ohio, and Kentucky received awards from this sum. In the program's third year \$40,000 was available—\$30,000 from the United States Steel Foundation, \$5,000 from the New York Times, and \$5,000 from Remington Rand. During 1958-59 the United States Steel Foundation made its fourth grant of \$30,000 to the

Association and Remington Rand its third of \$5,000, while the C.B.S. Foundation, Inc., contributed \$1,000 for materials in the field of communication and Nationwide Insurance Co. \$500 for materials in business administration.

In the past four years ACRL has received funds totalling \$172,500 for its program to assist college libraries. In outlining its procedure for handling these funds the Association stated that it would make grants, in the name of the donor, for the following purposes: books and related materials, equipment, consultative service, staff investigation and study, and research. The Association reserved the right to use not more than 5 per cent of any grant toward the expenses of administering the program and has done so since the program's initial year. In the four years funds from the six organizations named provided for eight grants for research (amounting to \$8,500) and for 383 grants to college and university libraries (amounting to \$150,300).

ACRL has entrusted the administration of this program of assisting college libraries to a Committee on Foundation Grants. The original committee consisted of Robert Vosper, director of libraries, University of Kansas, and then president of the Association; Robert W. Orr, director of the library, Iowa State College; Flora B. Ludington, librarian, Mt. Holyoke College, and a former president of the American Library Association; Humphrey G. Bousfield, librarian, Brooklyn College; Theodore A. Distler, executive director, Association of American Colleges; Kevin Guinagh, professor, Eastern Illinois State College; Frank H. Sparks, director of the board of trustees and former president of Wabash College; Louis B. Wright, director, the Folger Shakespeare Library; and Arthur T. Hamlin, university librarian, University of Cincinnati, formerly ACRL executive secretary. Others who have served on

This is a condensation of a report prepared by Mr. Jackson for ACRL's Committee on Grants. Mr. Jackson is Associate Professor of Library Science at the University of Illinois. Students in his courses on Resources of American Libraries and on Advanced Bibliography aided in the preparation of this article by coding for punched-card tabulation the applications on which it is based and by making preliminary analyses of some of the resulting tabulations. They are Elizabeth A. Benbrook, Marjorie C. Bengston, Robert Bradley, Richard G. Burns, Dewey E. Carroll, Joyce Davis, Howard L. Dunlap, Charity H. Greene, Robert J. Haertle, Dorothy Joens, Jessie L. Matthews, Mildred C. Montgomery, Barbara J. Souter, and Paul H. Spence.

the committee are Eileen Thornton, librarian, Oberlin College; Benjamin B. Richards, librarian, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia; Dorothy M. Crosland, director of libraries, Georgia Institute of Technology; Luella R. Pollock, librarian, Reed College; Lewis C. Branscomb, director of libraries, Ohio State University; and Richard B. Harwell, executive secretary of ACRL.

NATURE AND METHODS OF THIS STUDY

Studies of the college library are few. In recent years such problems of major research libraries as growth and finance have received considerable attention, but the same cannot be said for the college library. In the course of four years the Committee on Foundation Grants received over fifteen hundred applications for assistance, each containing data on the institution submitting it and particularly on its library facilities, together with a description of the project for which funds were requested. Here is much—but by no means all—of the material which a survey of college libraries would have collected. This material presents a unique opportunity for a study of the present state of the American college library.

This report can be only partially complete. The Foundation Grants Program has had limitations, and the Committee administering it has necessarily adopted certain limiting policies in order to reflect the wishes of the donors. The program has not been restricted to certain types of institutions, but the Committee discouraged applications from the great universities, from colleges unusually well provided with endowment, and from tax-supported schools. Although non-accredited as well as accredited institutions have been free to present projects, the applicants constitute a relatively homogeneous group. Another important limitation is the number of schools represented. Many colleges submitted more than one application during the four years, so that this report bases its observations on 654 institutions. They represent one-third of those listed in the current directory issued by the Office of Education. Subject to the limitations just outlined, however, the institutions here studied constitute an excellent sample of non-tax-supported liberal arts colleges.

This study combines, then, several objectives. As a report on the Foundation Grants Program, it seeks (1) to summarize the Program's operations during the past four years and (2) to analyze the grants made in terms of their distribution, projects supported, and recipient institutions. As a study of college libraries, it attempts (1) to compile from the data available on the applications a picture of the finances, personnel, and resources of the college library today and (2) to comment on the implications of this picture. Since grants for research represent a type essentially different from those made for books, equipment, or other library projects, and since these studies were undertaken by individuals rather than by libraries, they are not considered further in this report.

There are 1676 usable applications which form the basis for this study. They are distributed by year as follows: 1955/56, 419; 1956/57, 481; 1957/58, 295; 1958/59, 481. In order to facilitate this investigation most of the information contained on the applications was transferred to IBM punched cards. A code was prepared which would provide access to thirty-six kinds of information, including the following: year of competition; whether the application was successful or not; the organization providing the funds; the amount received; the name and location of the institution; its accreditation status; its control; the composition of its student body; its enrollment; its classification by level of offering and type of program; whether or not it is an institutional member of ALA; financial data for the most recent year supplied on the application; information on staff; size of library; number of volumes added in the last year reported; the project for which the grant was requested; and whether or not any matching funds were pledged. Facts pertaining to the institution's accreditation, control, enrollment, and classification were taken from the current Office of Education directory; the remainder came from the applications themselves. Although every effort was made to code data accurately, it was impossible to recheck each application; errors that came to light in the process of tabulating were corrected, but a small number probably remain. It is believed, however, that these are not significant enough to affect the results of this study.

The five sections which follow deal with the geography of the Foundation Grants Programs, the projects submitted to the Committee, and the finance, the personnel, and the resources of the college library.

THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE PROGRAM

To examine the geographical distribution of various features of the Foundation Grants Program applications were coded not only for the states in which institutions are located, but also for the region to which the states belong. The divisions for the continental United States follow those used in several studies of library resources. Alaska and Hawaii are grouped together as states not belonging to any region. A final division includes the outlying parts of the United States (e.g., Puerto Rico). Table I shows the distribution of 1676 applications by state and region. As might be expected, larger numbers of applications came from the most populous states and from those with most institutions of higher education, although no state accounted for more than 8.7 per cent of the total. States with most applications are, in descending order, New York (146), Pennsylvania (128), Ohio (114), Illinois (111), California (94), Indiana (84), and Iowa (67). In other words, seven states supplied nearly half (44 per cent) of the applications, all of them but California in either the Northeast or the Midwest; most requests from states in the other three regions were received from Tennessee in the Southeast (24), Kansas in the Northwest (17), and Texas (26) in the Southwest. The Midwest supplied 31.1 per cent of the applications; the Northeast 27.5 per cent; the Southeast 20.9 per cent; the Far West 8.5 per cent; the Northwest 6.4 per cent; and the Southwest 5.0 per cent; in short, half of the requests came from two regions and four-fifths from three.

Many colleges applied for grants more than once during the four years. The Foundation Grants Committee received an average of 2.54 requests per school, which means that about half of the colleges applied in two of the four years and about half applied in three of the four years. Theoretically a given institution might have applied as many as six times. No count was made of the number of times each college asked for assistance,

but a random sample revealed at least ten instances of six applications. The spread of the 654 colleges and universities by region parallels very closely the distribution of the applications. The Northeast sent slightly fewer applications than its proportion of schools, while the reverse was true of the Midwest. One wonders whether the Lilly grants offered any special stimulus to five Midwestern states but, if so, it applied more to Illinois and Ohio than to Michigan.

The Foundation Grants Program has distributed \$150,300 to college libraries during its first four years. The annual amount has remained relatively constant, with the last three years showing a modest increase from the original \$24,000. The 383 awards went to institutions in all parts of the country, although eight states have received none. The largest sum (by a considerable margin) went to Indiana (\$17,400), with Ohio (\$14,250) and Illinois (\$12,550) following; this does not surprise one when he remembers that eight of the nine grants from the Lilly Endowment were directed by the wishes of the donor to colleges in these states; if these awards be excluded, the figures would be \$5,400, \$9,550, and \$8,050 respectively. Figures for each state represent, in all but a few cases, the amount received by more than one institution. Although there have been no restrictions on the grants, it has been understood that in order to achieve widespread distribution they were to be relatively modest in size. (The Lilly grants were larger in order to underwrite programs promoting the use of library resources.) Such a distribution has, in fact, taken place. More than half of the awards have fallen between \$300 and \$400, while the total range has been from \$100 to \$3,500 (including Lilly grants). The average grant has been \$392 including the Lilly awards or \$336 excluding them.

Two hundred and eighty-seven college and university libraries received the 383 grants. Two hundred and two received a single award; seventy-four received two; and eleven received three. The last group consisted of the following: Rose Polytechnic Institute, Muskingum College, College of Wooster, Western College for Women, Athens College, Atlanta University, Tougaloo Southern Christian College, Converse College, Abilene Christian College, Univer-

TABLE I
DISTRIBUTION OF APPLICATIONS BY REGION AND STATE

REGION AND STATE	NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS	PER CENT	REGION AND STATE	NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS	PER CENT
<i>Northeast</i>			<i>Northwest</i>		
Connecticut	22	1.3	Colorado	8	.5
Delaware	0	-	Idaho	7	.4
District of Columbia	12	.7	Kansas	33	2.0
Maine	10	.6	Montana	5	.3
Maryland	35	2.1	Nebraska	28	1.7
Massachusetts	38	2.3	North Dakota	3	.2
New Hampshire	7	.4	South Dakota	14	.8
New Jersey	16	1.0	Utah	6	.4
New York	146	8.7	Wyoming	2	.1
Pennsylvania	128	7.6			
Rhode Island	5	.3	Total	106	6.4
Vermont	20	1.2			
West Virginia	22	1.3	<i>Southwest</i>		
Total	461	27.5	Arizona	4	.2
			New Mexico	5	.3
<i>Midwest</i>			Oklahoma	15	1.0
Illinois	111	6.6	Texas	59	3.5
Indiana	84	5.0	Total	83	5.0
Iowa	67	4.0	<i>Far West</i>		
Michigan	33	2.0	California	84	5.0
Minnesota	46	2.7	Nevada	0	-
Missouri	29	1.7	Oregon	28	1.7
Ohio	114	6.8	Washington	31	1.8
Wisconsin	38	2.3	Total	143	8.5
Total	522	31.1	<i>Other States</i>		
			Alaska	2	.1
<i>Southeast</i>			Hawaii	0	-
Alabama	29	1.7	Total	2	.1
Arkansas	16	1.0	<i>Outlying Parts of U.S.</i>		
Florida	16	1.0	Canal Zone	0	-
Georgia	30	1.8	Guam	0	-
Kentucky	46	2.7	Puerto Rico	8	.5
Louisiana	14	.8	Total	8	.5
Mississippi	16	1.0			
North Carolina	44	2.6	GRAND TOTAL	1676	100.0
South Carolina	34	2.0			
Tennessee	56	3.3			
Virginia	50	3.0			
Total	351	20.9			

sity of Redlands, and Whitman College. It might be interesting to see whether examination of these libraries and the projects they proposed would reveal any unique characteristics.

THE PROJECTS SUBMITTED

Five categories comprise the types of proposals in the applications: library materials, equipment, personal services, program activities (library instruction, surveys, etc.), capital expenditures, and all other. Since re-

quests for materials in specific subject fields normally used the nomenclature of academic departments, the subject subdivisions follow them rather than the Decimal or Library of Congress Classification: the humanities; the natural sciences and mathematics; the social sciences; inter-departmental area studies; professional and pre-professional study in such fields as agriculture, engineering, law, and medicine; and also for general materials. Requests for specific titles enumerated such major works as *Dictionary of American Bi-*

TABLE II
DISTRIBUTION OF GRANTS BY REGION AND STATE

REGION AND STATE	AMOUNT RECEIVED	PER CENT	REGION AND STATE	AMOUNT RECEIVED	PER CENT
<i>Northeast</i>			<i>Northwest</i>		
Connecticut	\$ 2,450	1.6	Colorado	800	.6
Delaware	--	--	Idaho	500	.3
District of Columbia	700	.5	Kansas	1,850	1.2
Maine	1,300	.9	Montana	--	--
Maryland	4,350	2.9	Nebraska	1,850	1.2
Massachusetts	1,500	1.0	North Dakota	--	--
New Hampshire	--	--	South Dakota	700	.5
New Jersey	2,000	1.3	Utah	500	.3
New York	9,350	6.2	Wyoming	--	--
Pennsylvania	9,050	6.0			
Rhode Island	--	--	Total	6,200	4.1
Vermont	1,300	.9			
West Virginia	1,700	1.1	<i>Southwest</i>		
Total	33,700	22.4	Arizona	300	.2
			New Mexico	300	.2
<i>Midwest</i>			Oklahoma	1,300	.9
Illinois	12,550	8.3	Texas	2,750	1.8
Indiana	17,400	11.6	Total	4,650	3.1
Iowa	5,675	3.8			
Michigan	2,050	1.3	<i>Far West</i>		
Minnesota	4,650	3.1	California	5,675	3.8
Missouri	2,100	1.4	Nevada	--	--
Ohio	14,250	9.5	Oregon	1,950	1.3
Wisconsin	1,300	.9	Washington	2,400	1.6
Total	59,975	39.9	Total	10,025	6.7
			<i>Other States</i>		
<i>Southeast</i>			Alaska	600	.4
Alabama	2,900	1.9	Hawaii	--	--
Arkansas	2,000	1.3	Total	600	.4
Florida	950	.6			
Georgia	3,350	2.2	<i>Outlying Parts of U.S.</i>		
Kentucky	5,850	3.9	Canal Zone	--	--
Louisiana	950	.6	Guam	--	--
Mississippi	2,300	1.6	Puerto Rico	1,600	1.1
North Carolina	3,150	2.1	Total	1,600	1.1
South Carolina	2,400	1.6			
Tennessee	4,200	2.8	GRAND TOTAL	\$150,300	100.0
Virginia	5,500	3.7			
Total	33,550	22.3			

ography, *New York Times*, and *Encyclopaedia Britannica*.

Nearly two-thirds of the 1676 applications ask for some kind of library materials, while another quarter request library equipment. Knowledge of the *New York Times* grants for microfilm copies of its back files and of the Remington Rand grants for equipment have undoubtedly stimulated a number of requests in these areas; similarly the Committee's announcement that it felt unable to provide funds for meeting library build-

ing and personnel needs has probably discouraged applications in these categories. Finally there have been miscellaneous proposals which do not fit the above categories; among them are requests for binding of back files of certain periodicals (requested several times), establishing a collection of children's books (in connection with a program in elementary education), buying reproductions of paintings and other art works, and purchasing Library of Congress catalog cards for a special collection.

About two-thirds of the requests indicate a subject field (this classification does not apply to requests for equipment and to certain others). Table IV shows the distribution by broad subject areas. The large proportion of projects specifying only "general materials" corresponds not only to the projects of a vague and indefinite nature, but also to many requests for newspapers, classed as a subdivision of general materials. Of projects identifiable with academic departments, the highest number ask for material in education (49), business administration (42), music (33), chemistry (29), bibliographies (24),

library and for the current edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Single libraries have asked for such titles as *Dictionary of American Biography*, Sabin, the *World Book*, *Jewish Encyclopedia*, and publications of the Early English Text Society.

FINANCE

The application forms have varied slightly over the years but generally they have requested the following financial information: total institutional expenditures; library expenditures; the latter as a per cent of the former; total spent for books, binding, and

TABLE III
FIRST PROPOSALS BY TYPE OF PROJECT

TYPE OF PROPOSAL	UNSUCCESSFUL APPLICATIONS		SUCCESSFUL APPLICATIONS		TOTAL	
	NUMBER	PER CENT	NUMBER	PER CENT	NUMBER	PER CENT
Library Materials	768	59.4	298	77.8	1066	63.6
Equipment	387	29.9	61	15.9	448	26.7
Personal Services	46	3.5	10	2.6	56	3.3
Program Activities	45	3.5	9	2.4	54	3.2
Capital Expenditures	19	1.5	--	--	19	1.2
Other	28	2.2	5	1.3	33	2.0
Total	1293	100.0	383	100.0	1676	100.0

history (20), religion (17), library science (16), art (14), English literature (12), and American literature (10). Almost every other subject is represented, although by fewer than ten requests. In addition, there are sixty-nine proposals for material in general education, but a check of the applications would be necessary to determine whether these really reflect the needs of programs of general education in liberal arts colleges.

The final analysis of the project proposals consists of a tabulation by title. This list consists primarily of expensive reference works. The specific nature of the New York Times funds accounts for the high number of requests for the *Times* on microfilm (more than half of the total). Aside from this, the Library of Congress catalogs appear most frequently, followed by Beilstein's *Handbuch der organischen Chemie, Chemical Abstracts* and/or its index. There have been several requests for the Loeb Classical Li-

periodicals; and the income from endowment. Although the implications of such data for the present study are obvious, the figures pose several problems in analysis. The first is the fact that the Roman Catholic institutions followed varying practices in reporting their financial data. Since these figures are not fairly comparable with those of other schools, it seemed wise to exclude the Roman Catholic institutions completely in considering the financial picture. The remaining 1247 applications constitute the basis for the following discussion. Another problem stems from the fact that figures are available for five different years (1953/54 through 1957/58). Sorting by year revealed the following distribution: 24 applications have data from 1953/54; 325 from 1954/55; 306 from 1955/56; 222 from 1956/57; and 370 from 1957/58. The small size of the 1953/54 group makes it unlikely that it is a representative sample and it was therefore

not analyzed. The conclusions for other years are, in fact, based on slightly smaller numbers than those given above, because not every institution supplied all information.

What are the total expenditures of the colleges and universities that have applied for ACRL grants? The average total for each year can be ascertained, but this would not be an indicative figure because it would be distorted by the amounts reported by the few large institutions (e.g., Northwestern, Stanford, Syracuse, and Boston Universities). The median figure for each year seems more reliable. In 1954/55 it came to \$402,172; the next year, to \$440,274; in 1956/57, to \$509,808 and in the following year, to \$496,442. Approximately two-thirds of each year's applications came from institutions reporting expenditures under \$750,000, and about 80 per cent from those reporting expenditures under \$1,000,000.

In effect, the size of the total institutional budget restricts the potential library support, since, for instance, even the relatively high proportion of 5 per cent of a million-dollar budget makes available only \$50,000 to the library. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that as late as 1958 more than half of the colleges and universities reported they were spending less than \$50,000 on their libraries. A closer look at the data reveals a somewhat more encouraging picture, however. The ratio of schools spending less than \$25,000 has decreased from 68.5 per cent in 1954/55 to 55.7 per cent in 1957/58, while those spending between \$25,000 and \$49,999 has grown from 19.6 per cent in the earlier year to 29.5 per cent in the latter. This would seem to indicate that improvement is taking place and that libraries are receiving more support, although how much more they can buy for their dollars in the light of inflation, increasing costs of materials, and higher salaries, is debatable. The group of institutions spending above \$50,000 has also increased, but there are risks in drawing conclusions, because the sample is small and the inclusion of some institutions with major research collections distorts the picture of college libraries.

In each of the four years reviewed two-thirds or more of the colleges spent less than \$10,000 for library materials—surely a dis-

couraging picture—while in no year did the total of those spending between \$10,000 and \$24,999 reach even 30 per cent of the institutions reporting. In spite of a wide range (from several hundred dollars in a southern denominational college to over \$200,000 in a major midwestern private university), the effective range was much smaller: 90 per cent of the applicants spent over \$1,000 but under \$25,000 for books, periodicals, and binding. Twenty-five thousand

TABLE IV
FIRST PROPOSALS BY SUBJECT AREAS

AREA	PROPOSALS	% OF TOTAL
General Materials	503	47.0
Humanities	222	20.8
Natural Sciences and Mathematics	122	11.4
Social Sciences	114	10.7
Area Studies	28	2.6
Professional and Pre- professional Studies	80	7.5
Total	1069	100.0

dollars seems to be a kind of ceiling on the college library's book budget at the present time; neither the number nor the percentage of institutions spending more than this amount increased greatly in the four years.

One of the most useful indices of library support is the proportion of institutional expenditures devoted to libraries. Expressed as a percentage, this figure permits comparisons of support given by institutions of various types and control and the extent to which support is maintained at the same level. Although this figure was not requested every year on the application for the grants administered by ACRL, it was computed whenever possible for use in the present study.

Table VI shows the range of library expenditures, expressed as a percentage of total expenditures for four groups of libraries: Groups II and III in the annual compilation of college and university libraries published in *CRL* and the successful and unsuccessful applicants in the present study. It reveals very slight variation among the median figures for the four groups. Data available in the present study seem to indi-

cate that library support of less than 3 per cent or more than 6 per cent of an institution's total expenditures represents atypical cases. This means simply that a school appropriation more than 6 per cent or less than 3 per cent gives good or poor support to its library, judged only in relationship to what other institutions are doing. It may be that all schools ought to spend larger shares of their budgets on libraries; but we do not know what qualitative criterion should apply.

In the present study there are fifteen occasions of support above 10 per cent of an

stitutions generally viewed as making generous provision for libraries.

In connection with accreditation one wonders whether the need to meet the standards set by accrediting bodies channels a higher proportion of an institution's funds into its library. To analyze this all accredited, and all non-accredited schools in the present study were separated. The range, arithmetic average, and median for the two groups fell so close together as to make it appear that correlation between accreditation status and higher proportionate support of libraries does not exist. For example, in 1956/57, 20

TABLE V
EXPENDITURES FOR BOOKS, PERIODICALS, AND BINDING

YEAR	NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS	BELOW \$1,000	\$1,000-\$4,999	\$5,000-\$9,999	\$10,000-\$24,999	\$25,000-\$99,999	OVER \$100,000
1954/55	303	8	143	94	65	12	1
1955/56	305	5	98	120	69	8	5
1956/57	222	3	70	71	65	12	1
1957/58	370	4	116	129	100	18	3

institution's expenditures. These applications were reviewed to see whether they might shed any light on this factor. They came from eleven institutions, of which seven are located in the South and Southwest, one in the Northeast, one in the Midwest, and two in the Northwest. Five of them are non-accredited, six accredited. Five of the institutions have provided a high level of support for a number of years: Arkansas College ranged from 10 to 15.6 per cent; Abilene Christian College appropriated 10.6 per cent of its funds for the library in one year and 12.5 per cent in another; Baker University varied from 10.4 per cent to 13.8 per cent; Florida Normal and Industrial Memorial College has given unusually high support to its library, with a minimum of 15.9 per cent and a maximum of 22.5 per cent in the past five years; and Atlanta University provided 10.4 per cent for the library in all but one of the past six years (when the amount was still a high 8.8 per cent). These figures are not only the highest among those who applied for the foundation grants but compare favorably with the most recent ratios reported for in-

non-accredited schools had a median ratio of 4.3 per cent for library expenditures, while in 202 accredited schools it was exactly the same; the following year 54 non-accredited institutions had a median ratio of 4.7 per cent, 316 accredited institutions 4.6 per cent. A sorting of the institutions into the five categories established by the Office of Education suggests that institutions giving graduate work at the master's level are not spending a significantly higher proportion of funds on their libraries than those which offer only undergraduate instruction.

PERSONNEL

With practically no exceptions the reporting libraries had a minimum of one professional librarian, but very few had more than three. In each of the four years more than two-thirds reported that their professional staff ranged from one to three persons; about 10 per cent had four, while another 10 or 12 per cent (depending on the year) had from five to nine. Schools with more than ten professionals tended to be the few large colleges and universities which applied. Although it would be interesting to compare

the size of the staff with enrollment, it was not possible to analyze this in detail; a random sample showed some striking variations. For instance, colleges having one professional ranged in enrollment from as few as 109 to as many as 1,510. On the other hand, a school with 1,452 students reported a professional staff of eight and one with 1,188 had ten. Obviously the amount and caliber of library services available to the faculty and students in the library with the smaller staff differs greatly from that available in the one with the larger staff. It would seem to most observers of the college library that a one-man professional staff cannot give really adequate service, even in the small institution, yet this is exactly the type of service offered by about one-fourth of the present sample.

The picture of clerical staff is even more drab, if the present statistics are typical.

Although only partially complete data is available for 1955/56, it appears that in this and subsequent years about one-fifth of the libraries had not a single clerical assistant at the time of reporting! About half reported one or two persons, between 15 and 20 per cent three or four, leaving only 10 to 15 per cent of the entire group with clerical staffs of five or more. It is generally conceded that a desirable ratio of clerical to professional workers is 2:1. If college libraries are understaffed by professionals, they are even more understaffed by clerical help. College administrations have apparently not faced up to the fact that when librarians do clerical work (as they must when there is not enough clerical assistance), it is costly indeed. Have librarians not presented forcefully enough to their administrations the need for clerical help? Has it been such a struggle for college administrations with lim-

TABLE VI
LIBRARY EXPENDITURES IN RELATION TO TOTAL EDUCATIONAL
EXPENDITURES IN SELECTED GROUPS OF INSTITUTIONS

YEAR	GROUP	NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS	LIBRARY EXPENDITURES AS PER CENT OF TOTAL EXPENDITURES		
			HIGH	MEDIAN	LOW
1954/55	ACRL Group II	72	9.3	5.0	1.2
	ACRL Group III	107	11.0	4.1	1.6
	Successful Applicants	74	10.6	4.6	2.3
	Unsuccessful Applicants	247	11.5	3.7	1.3
1955/56	ACRL Group II	84	12.7	4.7	1.8
	ACRL Group III	106	12.0	4.3	1.4
	Successful Applicants	88	15.6	4.5	1.0
	Unsuccessful Applicants	216	18.5	4.4	1.4
1956/57	ACRL Group II	96	10.4	4.5	1.6
	ACRL Group III	104	9.2	4.2	1.3
	Successful Applicants	77	10.4	4.3	1.6
	Unsuccessful Applicants	145	11.2	4.3	1.4
1957/58	ACRL Group II	92	11.4	4.6	0.4
	ACRL Group III	121	9.6	4.2	1.9
	Successful Applicants	72	15.9	4.3	2.2
	Unsuccessful Applicants	298	24.5	4.6	1.8

Sources: For ACRL Groups II and III, "College and University Library Statistics," *CRL*, XVII (1956), 56-84; XVIII (1957), 48-79; XIX (1958), 49-83; XX (1959), 27-61.

ited funds to provide professional help that enough money does not remain for clerical staff? Do schools with larger enrollments have a better professional-clerical ratio? Do institutions spending a larger percentage of their budgets on libraries make more generous provision for clerical help? We presume the answers to these questions are yes, but the validity of these assumptions remains to be tested.

The application forms for the past two years also requested the approximate number of student assistant hours available annually to the library. Nearly 97 per cent of all applicants reported some student assistance available, but the hours reported ranged from none to 56,000 in 1956/57 and from none to 36,299 in 1957/58. The high figures should be discounted, since they tend to represent exceptions (major universities or large colleges). For instance, in the former year only 17 of 284 institutions (6.0 per cent) reported more than 10,000 hours, while in the latter year the figures were 20 out of 481 (4.2 per cent). Ten thousand hours of assistance works out to 277 per week for an academic year composed of 36 weeks. This is not generous provision for the jobs usually done by students.

Further analysis of the available data might attempt to correlate the size of library staffs with enrollment, with library budgets, and with the number of volumes held. However, it seems apparent that a valid assessment of the adequacy of a college library's staff (professional, clerical, and student) depends on factors which reflect institutional policy on such matters as hours of service per week, level of service, teaching function, and other concepts not covered by the factual information providing the basis for this study. The problem of staffing the college library needs thorough investigation and evaluation.

RESOURCES

On each application blank information was requested on the size of the library in volumes. Between 75 and 80 per cent held below 100,000 volumes at the time of reporting. This figure is approximately the number of volumes in Harvard's Lamont Library or in the new Undergraduate Library at the University of Michigan. This state-

ment, however implies a far better picture of college libraries' resources than is really the case. A much better idea of these libraries is obtained when one uses a classification that divides the institutions with less than 100,000 volumes into four categories: (1) less than 25,000 volumes; (2) 25,000-49,999 volumes; (3) 50,000-74,999 volumes; and (4) 75,000-99,999 volumes. Between 10 and 20 per cent of the libraries had less than 25,000 at the time of reporting; between 30 and 44 per cent had between 25,000 and 49,999; between 13 and 22 per cent had between 50,000 and 74,999; and only 6 to 15 per cent had between 75,000 and 99,999.

Still another measure of resources is the number of volumes added to a collection in a year's time. Fifty-five per cent of the reports are for 2,000 volumes or less, and 75 per cent for 3,000 volumes or less. In light of the facts that about 10,000 new books are published in the United States annually it is clear that college libraries have a highly selective, or highly inadequate, acquisition policy.

Determination of the quality of library resources in colleges poses problems in interpretation, because only inferences can be drawn from the data available. The fact that practically every academic discipline has been mentioned in the projects requesting funds for library materials suggests that no common pattern of weakness exists. (There is no need to belabor the recent concern for the sciences.) On the whole, a review of the applications leaves the impression that the quality of library resources placed at the disposal of students in liberal arts colleges leaves a great deal to be desired. Statistics of total holdings inevitably reflect older materials probably not needed in a program of instruction for undergraduates. The rising price of books has probably put the college library even further behind in its attempts to maintain a current and up-to-date collection.

One aspect of resources deserves special mention: reference materials. A sampling of applications shows a great need not only for acquiring specific titles but also for adding works in specific subject areas and for obtaining new publications and revisions of older ones in order to make reference collections more up-to-date. The librarians'

statements make it apparent that the development and maintenance of an adequate reference collection is impossible with the financial limitations under which many of them operate. The Committee has recognized this by a relatively high number of awards in this area, but the needs are far from filled.

RECOMMENDATIONS

After studying all the data which became available in the course of preparing this report, the writer recommends:

1. That the Foundation Grants Program not only be continued but that all possible means of expanding it be considered. The need for further assistance is clearly indicated by the fact that the total amount requested in the years reviewed came to an estimated minimum of \$755,000, or five times the total of grants made.

2. That the Committee on Foundation Grants give consideration to adopting the principle that recipient institutions match the grants made to them. A number of applicants already have indicated their willingness to do so; if such a principle were adopt-

ed not only would it increase the effectiveness of available funds, but it might also make the program more attractive to potential donors.

3. That ACRL encourage further research in the field of college libraries. There are numerous lacunae in our knowledge; for instance, it seems to the writer that the problem of staffing college libraries is crying for a thorough study, as is the nature of the resources available in these institutions. Further studies utilizing the present data might prove useful, especially if they could be supplemented by information now lacking. As a part of the Foundation Grants Program a continuing analysis of the information on the applications submitted might be undertaken.

CORRECTION—In the article by Martha S. Bell on "Special Women's Collections in United States Libraries," in the May issue of *CRL*, the Alice Meynell Collection was located at Boston University Library. Its correct location is Boston College Library.

Microcard Series Reaches Century Mark

ACRL's Microcard Series has reached the century mark. Number 100 in the series is a compilation of the abstracts for numbers 1 through 99 as they have appeared in *CRL*, plus an introduction by Mrs. Margaret K. Toth, editor of the series, and an author and subject index.

Twelve to fifteen additional titles are planned for the series during 1959-60. Seven of these are in the process of publication and five more have already been accepted by the series' editorial committee.

Number 100 of the series is being sent to all current subscribers of the series without charge. It introduces for the first time in the series the use of double-sided cards. These cards eliminate the undesirable curl of single-sided cards as well as doubling the capacity of each card.

The ACRL Microcard Series was initiated in 1953 with Lawrence S. Thompson as editor. Present members of the editorial board in addition to Mrs. Toth are E. Heyse Dummer, managing editor, Felix Reichmann, and E. J. Humeston, Jr. The editorial board is responsible for the selection of titles included in the series. The University of Rochester Press is responsible for their production and distribution. The series includes a few independent monographs but consists primarily of microcard editions of master's theses and term papers from library schools.