

A DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION OF THE PRESENT STATUS  
OF THE LIBRARIES IN THE PUBLIC JUNIOR AND  
COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF MICHIGAN

By

Martin Paul Wolf

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

College of Education

1971

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have  
indistinct print.

Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

## ABSTRACT

### A DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION OF THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE LIBRARIES IN THE PUBLIC JUNIOR AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF MICHIGAN

By

Martin Paul Wolf

The purposes of this study were: (1) to describe the present status of community and junior college libraries in Michigan; (2) to develop quantitative, comparative criteria for evaluation; (3) to identify strengths and weaknesses in library programs, and (4) to identify emerging library concepts and practices.

Ten descriptive questions were formulated and ten evaluative questions were posited relating quantitative library characteristics to other internal characteristics of the college. A survey instrument was developed in cooperation with the Michigan Community College Librarians Association and administered to all public community-junior colleges.

A panel of judges comprised of community college administrators and librarians selected six quantitative

criteria for the gross measurement of library quality. These included the relationship of: (1) staff size to enrollment; (2) library budget to institutional operational budget; (3) acquisitions expenditures to enrollment; (4) circulation to enrollment; (5) size of collection to number of credit course offerings, and (6) number of professionally supervised hours of operation per year.

Seven libraries were identified as comparatively superior on the basis of performance on the selected criteria. Normative data were developed on this performance which was then used to make quantitative recommendations for future library growth and development in the areas of financing, staffing, holdings, facilities, hours of operation, administrative relationships and circulation.

Twenty libraries were visited by the investigator and in-depth interviews were conducted with librarians, administrators and chief executive officers. Emerging library concepts and practices were identified in the following areas; (1) the library college concept; (2) new roles for the library and staff; (3) learning resources; (4) new library development; (5) facilities; (6) faculty and student relationships with the library; (7) applications of technology, and (8) inter-library cooperation. Qualitative recommendations are presented based on the previously identified emerging concepts and practices.



Martin Paul Wolf

Finally, several characteristics of apparently effective library operations were inferred from the relationships found between quantitative measures and the in-depth analysis of emerging library concepts and practices. These include the attitudes of the president toward the library's role, the extent of financial support, the emphasis placed on the collection, the relationships between the librarian and the president, and the attitude of the faculty toward the library's role.

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my wife, Edythe Carol Wolf who assisted with the bibliographic research and instilled in me an appreciation of the advantages of being married to a professional librarian. For her support and encouragement I am forever grateful.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to thank the many people who made this study possible. Special thanks must be given to Dr. James Nelson, Chairman of the Guidance Committee, and Dr. Richard Chapin, Director of the Michigan State University Library and member of the Committee. Both of these professors played a major role in directing this study. The assistance of Dr. Max Raines, a Committee member, whose advice and counsel expanded the scope of this study, is also appreciated.

The cooperation of President Donald Carlyon and the Board of Trustees of Delta College is gratefully acknowledged. The assistance of Dr. William Yankee whose recent dissertation provided direction for thesis format is acknowledged.

The writer is indebted to Dr. Robert Cahow and Dr. David Murphy, of the Michigan Community College Association, and Mr. James Platte, of Lansing Community College, who assisted in the development and administration of the survey.

Finally, the cooperation of librarians, administrators and chief executive officers of the Michigan

community colleges who took time from their busy schedules to be interviewed is acknowledged with gratitude.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION . . . . .	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES. . . . .	vii
 Chapter	
I. THE PROBLEM. . . . .	1
Need for the Study. . . . .	5
The Problem . . . . .	22
Delimitations . . . . .	27
Definitions . . . . .	27
Overview . . . . .	29
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RESEARCH . .	31
Introduction. . . . .	31
Early Developments. . . . .	32
Status Studies of Junior College Library Programs. . . . .	36
Standards for Junior College Libraries .	46
Evaluation by Accrediting Associations .	58
Other Recommendations for Evaluation. .	61
Analysis and Summary . . . . .	65
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	70
Instruments . . . . .	72
Design and Methodology . . . . .	77
Summary . . . . .	86
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA . . .	88
Introduction. . . . .	88
Descriptive Questions. . . . .	88
Evaluative Dimensions. . . . .	118
Rankings of Criteria . . . . .	136
Selection of Highest Ranked Libraries .	139
Characteristics of High-Ranked College Libraries . . . . .	141
Summary . . . . .	143

Chapter		Page
V.	A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF MICHIGAN'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE LIBRARIES . . . . .	148
	Introduction. . . . .	148
	Methodology . . . . .	149
	The Emerging Library College Concept. . . . .	151
	New Roles for the Library and Staff:	
	An Analysis . . . . .	161
	Learning Resources: Concepts and Practices . . . . .	164
	New Library Development . . . . .	169
	Facilities . . . . .	172
	Relationships with Faculty and Students. . . . .	176
	New Technological Applications in the Libraries . . . . .	183
	Cooperative Efforts with Other Libraries . . . . .	186
	Library Problems in the Community Colleges . . . . .	190
	Absence of Library Goals and Objectives. . . . .	196
	Relationship Between Quantitative and Qualitative Analyses . . . . .	197
	Summary . . . . .	203
VI.	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	207
	Recent Growth of the Community College Libraries . . . . .	207
	Qualitative Recommendations. . . . .	213
	The Library's Role in the Institution . . . . .	214
	The Librarian's Role . . . . .	216
	Library Relationships with Students . . . . .	218
	Facilities . . . . .	219
	Development of the Multi-Media Center Concept. . . . .	221
	Technological Applications . . . . .	223
	Cooperative Efforts with Other Libraries . . . . .	224
	Quantitative Recommendations . . . . .	225
	I--Financing of Community College Libraries . . . . .	226
	II--Staffing of Community College Libraries . . . . .	227
	III--Collections and Holdings of Community College Libraries . . . . .	229
	IV--Other Areas of Library Operations . . . . .	230
	Recommendations for Further Research. . . . .	231
	An After-Thought . . . . .	236
	BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	237
	APPENDICES . . . . .	252

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
2.1 Per Cent of Junior Colleges Falling Below Standards. . . . .	43
3.1 Michigan Public Community and Junior Colleges and Locations . . . . .	71
4.1 Hours of Operation . . . . .	90
4.2 Methods of Orientation . . . . .	93
4.3 Basic Collections. . . . .	95
4.4 Microform Holdings . . . . .	97
4.5 Periodical Depth . . . . .	98
4.6 Audio-Visual Software and Hardware Holdings .	100
4.7 Circulation Statistics . . . . .	101
4.8 Professional Staffs . . . . .	103
4.9 Employment of Technicians and Technical Assistants . . . . .	105
4.10 Secretarial/Clerical Staffs and Hourly Assistance . . . . .	107
4.11 Total Library Staffs. . . . .	108
4.12 Allocation of Staff Time to L.R.C. Functions.	110
4.13 Allocation of Library Staff Time by Function.	111
4.14 Allocation of A.V. Staff by Function . . .	113
4.15 Administrative Process . . . . .	114
4.16 Library Operational Budgets 1969-1970 . . .	115
4.17 Allocations of Library Expenditures. . . .	117
4.18 Criterion 1--Comparison of Basic Collection to Equated Enrollment. . . . .	119

Table		Page
4.19	Criterion 2--Comparison of Library Budget to College Budget . . . . .	121
4.20	Criterion 3--Comparison of Total Library Staff to Equated Enrollment. . . . .	122
4.21	Criterion 4--Comparison of Circulation to Equated Enrollment. . . . .	124
4.22	Criterion 5--Hours of Supervised Operations Yearly. . . . .	126
4.23	Criterion 6--Comparison of Credit Courses to Collection Size. . . . .	128
4.24	Criterion 7--Comparison of Credit Courses to Periodical Subscriptions. . . . .	130
4.25	Criterion 8--Comparison of Library Space to Enrollment . . . . .	132
4.26	Criterion 9--Comparison of Acquisitions Expenditures to Enrollment . . . . .	134
4.27	Summary of College Rankings on All Criteria .	135
4.28	Ranked Judgments of Criteria by Administra- tors and Librarians . . . . .	138
4.29	Seven Highest-Ranked Colleges and Their Rankings on the Evaluative Criteria . . .	140
4.30	Comparison of Normative Data of Highest- Ranked Libraries with Normative Data of All Community College Libraries in Michigan and the Remaining Lower-Ranked Community College Libraries . . . . .	142
5.1	Variables Affecting Success in Media Development . . . . .	167
5.2	Capital Outlay Appropriation for New Libraries. . . . .	170
6.1	Comparison of 1965 Nelson Report of Community College Library Collections with 1970 Data.	209
6.2	Comparison of 1965 Nelson Report of Community College Library Staffs with 1970 Data . .	211



## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM

During the past two decades the community college movement in Michigan has been one of growth and development with twenty new institutions having been established throughout the state. Further, student enrollments in these institutions have increased from slightly over twenty-seven thousand in 1960 to over one hundred fifteen thousand students at the end of the decade in 1970.<sup>1</sup>

The community colleges in Michigan, though differing in size, location and financial resources, are strikingly similar in their basic philosophies and purposes. All define themselves as open door institutions, admitting all applicants with a high school diploma or its equivalent. Many of the schools open the door even further by reducing these minimum requirements for applicants beyond the typical college age of eighteen to twenty-one.

The similarity of Michigan's community colleges is reflected in their commitment to the comprehensive,

---

<sup>1</sup>M.C.C.A. Research Series, Community College Enrollments 1969-1970 (Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Community College Association, June 1970), p. 9.

multipurpose role that has become an inherent part of the community college movement. All twenty-nine institutions subscribe to the following five functions characteristic of the comprehensive community college: (1) University parallel programs for transfer to senior institutions, (2) technical-vocational, occupational education, (3) student-personnel and counseling services, (4) adult and continuing education, and (5) community services and cultural affairs programming.

The major development of the community college movement has occurred in the two decades following the end of World War II, and a modest correlation can be found between the movement and three changes that have occurred in the American society during the same period of time. The first of these has been the increase in the population of the nation. This population explosion of the post World War II era has had a direct impact on the higher education enterprise. Part of the phenomenal growth of community colleges can be attributed to the large increase in sheer numbers of young people desiring education beyond high school.

A second great change that has occurred in the American society since the end of World War II has been referred to as the "knowledge explosion." The explosion has been occurring prior to World War II, but the full

impact of it has been felt by colleges and universities in the past two decades, and our society is employing its technology at accelerated speeds to find ways of managing this knowledge. Colleges and universities are beginning to move away from teacher-centered, traditional approaches of teaching facts and moving toward learner-centered methods geared toward helping students acquire skills in retrieving information and using it effectively.

Finally, there has developed in our society a new educational compulsion, born perhaps from the continuing, changing technology, the availability of more leisure time and the ready accessibility of community colleges and other types of higher education. It has also been called the continuing education explosion,<sup>2</sup> and in practice it is the recognition that education is a lifelong process. Literally millions of adults are going to college as part-time students, in order to pursue further education. The college libraries feel the full impact of these "explosions." As noted by Julio L. Bartolazzo, President of the College of San Mateo:

All of these movements, together with more effective communications, the new technology, and the resulting influence of the teacher-learning process, emphasize the ever increasing role of the library.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Julio L. Bartolazzo, Junior College Libraries, ed. by E. L. Moore, A.C.R.L. Monograph Number 30 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1969), p. 7.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

The impact of the several "explosions" and the other influences mentioned by Bartolazzo are obvious but probably immeasurable. In simplest terms the community college is a truly new institution, "uncommitted to traditional methods of education, attempting to respond to extraordinary societal pressures, and evolving a philosophy that necessitates innovation, a very diversified curriculum, experimentation and creativity."<sup>4</sup> What type of library should such a unique institution develop? The question becomes all-encompassing primarily because the library as a service unit of the college must serve an institution that is still an evolving entity.

The Talmud suggests that, "When one does not know where he is going, it does not matter which road he takes." It would be unfair to imply that the community college movement has not found direction yet, but it is still in its infancy as a new form of higher education. The development of the library for this type of a new and changing institution is a most prodigious task. It is difficult to disagree with John F. Harvey, Dean of the Graduate School of Library Science at Drexel Institute, who states:

Until the colleges (community) find themselves, attract respectable enrollments and good budgets, and are able to offer strong programs, the library's

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 8.

role in classroom instruction will not be realized, and only isolated examples will be available of superior programs.<sup>5</sup>

### Need For The Study

#### Condition of Junior College Libraries

From the earliest days of junior college development through the beginning years of the community college movement, to the present, concern for the quality of the junior college library and recognition of a continued lack of such quality has seriously challenged the academic acceptability of this new and evolving institution. At the 1930 organizational meeting of the Junior College Libraries Roundtable, made up of both librarians and administrators, the condition of the libraries was described in these terms, "Deficiency is one of the most serious counts against the junior college as it now exists."<sup>6</sup>

This early concern for and recognition of the inadequacies of the junior college libraries was complemented by a similar concern on the part of the Carnegie Corporation, which expressed its concern with a series

---

<sup>5</sup>John F. Harvey, "The Role of the Junior College Library in Classroom Instruction," Junior College Journal, Vol. 32 (April 1962), p. 447.

<sup>6</sup>American Library Association Junior College Libraries Roundtable, "A Junior College Measuring Stick," American Library Association Bulletin, Vol. 24 (1930), p. 296.

of grants to selected junior colleges in the mid-nineteen thirties. The purpose of these grants was the "stimulation of an informed, continuous and adequate support of their libraries by junior colleges."<sup>7</sup> The inadequacies of these libraries which the Carnegie Corporation was attempting to help rectify included five junior colleges in Michigan:<sup>8</sup>

<u>College</u>	<u>Grant</u>
Bay City Junior College	\$1500
Flint Junior College	6000
Highland Park Junior College	3000
Ironwood Junior College	1500
Jackson Junior College	3000

The criticism of the junior college libraries was extensive, and much of this criticism was originating within the junior college movement itself. Walter C. Eells, through pleased with the Carnegie grants, described the junior colleges as follows:

Some junior colleges that have full right to exist have no right to continue to offer their students the miserable excuses for libraries and library service which are now found.<sup>9</sup>

The assumption that the library is the heart of an educational institution has long pervaded the higher education enterprise in the United States. At the

---

<sup>7</sup>R. M. Lester, "Development of Junior College Libraries," Junior College Journal, Vol. 8 (October 1937), p. 3.

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 7.

<sup>9</sup>Walter C. Eells, "Significance of the Junior College Library," Junior College Journal, Vol. 8 (October 1937), p. 2.

beginning of the community college movement, some twenty years after the first Roundtable, Crawford B. Thayer diagnosed the ailing junior college library in these words, "If the library is indeed the heart of an educational institution, the careful observer can only conclude that junior colleges have a bad case of heart trouble."<sup>10</sup>

Much of what had been written in the preceding years regarding junior college libraries was exceedingly critical. The libraries were described as falling short of efficiency in service and holdings.<sup>11</sup> There was a recognition of the need for standards and research in the junior college library field.<sup>12</sup> Junior college administrators were criticized for not dealing adequately with library problems.<sup>13</sup> B. Lamar Johnson completed a study in the late 1940's which attempted to isolate the critical areas of library problems. He found some

---

<sup>10</sup>Crawford B. Thayer, "New Role of the Junior College Library," Junior College Journal, Vol. 19 (March 1949), p. 396.

<sup>11</sup>American Library Association Junior College Libraries Roundtable, op. cit., p. 47.

<sup>12</sup>Cecil D. Hardesty, "Planning the Junior College Library," American School and University (New York: American School Publishing Corp., 1940), pp. 308-309.

<sup>13</sup>F. B. Moe, "Significance of the Junior College Library in the Educational Program," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 4 (December 1942), p. 60.

agreement among both librarians and administrators in perceptions of the problems of junior college libraries (see Table 1.1).<sup>14</sup>

TABLE 1.1.--Identified Problems of Junior College Libraries.

Problem Area	Librarian Perceptions	Administrator Perceptions
A. Expenditures for Books	Rank 1	Rank 4-3
B. Teaching Library Use	Rank 2	Rank 2
C. Activities of Faculty to Encourage Effective Use	Rank 3	Rank 1
D. Library Plant and Facilities	Rank 4	Rank 4-3
E. Salaries of Librarians	Rank 5	Rank 5

There was recognition on the part of both professional librarians and administrators in the community college field that the need for improvement of junior college libraries was essential. A major thrust in the development of standards for junior college libraries occurred in the 1950's when the Committee on Standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries prepared a series of standards "designed to provide a guide for the evaluation of libraries in American two-year

---

<sup>14</sup>B. Lamar Johnson, "Junior College Library Problems," Junior College Journal, Vol. 18 (December 1947), pp. 177-180.



colleges."<sup>15</sup> At the time of the adoption of these standards by the Association of College and Research Libraries in January 1960, Felix E. Hirsch described the national picture of junior college libraries in these terms:

The nationwide picture of the junior college library field today is far from reassuring. The median figures for two hundred sixty-six junior colleges as published in College and Research Libraries, January 1960, indicate that staffs are too small, budgets too low, and book collections inadequate.<sup>16</sup>

The attempt to develop standards was a serious effort by professional librarians in the junior college field to come to some agreement of what junior colleges might be in the future. Fifteen years earlier the American Library Association had established a planning committee for the post-war era. The concern for inadequacy of college libraries was expressed in a forceful statement on the matter when the committee wrote:

. . . special concern and attention be devoted to those libraries, constituting the large majority of all higher educational libraries in the land, which clearly fall below accepted levels of support and that continued attention be given to developing standards and norms which will assist these libraries in improving their staffs, books, stock and service.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>Committee on Standards, Association of College and Research Libraries, "Standards for Junior College Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 21 (May 1960), p. 200.

<sup>16</sup>Felix E. Hirsch, "New Horizons for Junior College Libraries," Library Journal, Vol. 85 (June 1960), p. 2373.

<sup>17</sup>College and University Post-War Planning Committee, College and Universities Libraries and Librarianship (Chicago: American Library Association, 1946), p. 21.

The period of the 1960's does not show much evidence that the development of standards, per se, had much impact on improving the quality of junior college libraries. Several major writers in the library field studied the condition of junior college libraries and were extremely critical of the situation. Guy Lyle reported:

At present there are far too many junior college libraries housed in overcrowded and inadequate library quarters and too few full-time staff workers for the librarian to do a first-rate professional job.<sup>18</sup>

Jordan, in defending the A.C.R.L. standards for junior colleges as goals for the future, severely criticized the condition of junior college libraries by saying, "I would like to emphasize that conditions in the average junior college library today are deplorable, if not shocking."<sup>19</sup>

Community college administrators and librarians might take some relief if the above descriptions were of junior colleges in the 1930's and 1940's but Lyle and Jordan were describing the comprehensive community colleges of the 1960's. One must conclude that the growth of the entire community college movement has far surpassed the internal growth of their libraries. In the early 1960's

---

<sup>18</sup>Guy R. Lyle, The Administration of the College Library (3rd ed.; New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1961), p. 21.

<sup>19</sup>Robert T. Jordan, "Goals--Not Standards," American Library Association Bulletin, Vol. 55 (June 1961), p. 565.

John F. Harvey visited twenty-eight community college libraries and reported his findings:

It is reasonably apparent for most of the junior college libraries I saw that neither the faculty nor the administration understood how to use this tool. The libraries weren't operating anywhere near their potential, and no one seemed particularly unhappy about it.<sup>20</sup>

The condition of junior college libraries has not apparently improved in recent years. The hoped-for improvement that was to be generated by the adoption of junior college library standards by the American Library Association does not appear to have materialized. Alice B. Griffith studied the status of four hundred eighty-six junior college libraries by examining the statistics of the United States Office of Education. Her findings suggest that the great majority of libraries do not meet the minimum American Library Association standards. She found more than seventy-five per cent of these institutions failing to meet standards for minimum volumes and periodical subscriptions, more than eighty per cent with two or less professional librarians and two or less non-professional staff, and almost seventy-five per cent having operating budgets of less than \$30,000.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>Harvey, op. cit., p. 447.

<sup>21</sup>Alice B. Griffith, "Organization and Administration of the Junior College Library," Library Trends, Vol. 14 (October 1965), pp. 132-144.

John Gardner, the former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, severely criticized the condition of junior college libraries and referred to them as a "Fancy Gothic Fiction" as late as May 1967.<sup>22</sup>

Even if one recognizes the research demands placed on university libraries, the Analytic Report of the U.S. Office of Education: 1962 is almost embarrassing to the community college movement. It states:

Junior colleges enrolled just under 14% of all students, but owned only 4% of all volumes, employed 8% of all academic librarians and spent 6% of the total academic library expenditures.<sup>23</sup>

The condition of Michigan's junior colleges in the mid-nineteen sixties appeared to be similar to the national picture. In a report prepared by Nelson Associates, Incorporated for the Michigan State Library, it was reported that most of the junior college libraries in Michigan could be described as lacking books, lacking staff and lacking facilities.<sup>24</sup> Comparing these findings to Trinkner's three basic needs for effective service is a rather disappointing experience. He states:

---

<sup>22</sup>John W. Gardner, "A Fancy Gothic Fiction," Library Journal, Vol. 92 (May 15, 1967), pp. 1896-1897.

<sup>23</sup>Nelson Associates, Inc., Undergraduate and Junior College Libraries in the United States (New York: Nelson Associates, Inc., 1968), p. 6.

<sup>24</sup>Nelson Associates, Inc., A Program for the Rapid Improvement of Community College Libraries in Michigan (New York: Nelson Associates, Inc., 1965), p. 45.

The typical junior college library has three needs that are basic to the total structure of effective service, viz. a well-planned library building, adequate book-collection resources, and a professional staff.<sup>25</sup>

According to Trinkner's basic needs, Michigan's junior colleges were lacking in all three in the analysis of Nelson Associates.

The condition of junior college libraries was exceptionally poor when the Junior College Libraries Roundtable met in 1930. Almost forty years later in the full bloom of the community college movement, the writings and research in the field suggest inadequacy of junior college libraries. Robert Frost, the distinguished American poet, once indicated that he rated colleges by the libraries they had. It would appear that Frost would not have given junior colleges very high ratings.

#### Disregard of the Library by the Junior College Field

One measure of development of junior college libraries is the extent to which they have been researched and indications of that research appear in the literature. Evidence of this development should be readily available in the professional journals, doctoral level research and textbooks. When one searches for this evidence in the

---

<sup>25</sup>Charles L. Trinkner, "Junior College Libraries," Library Trends, Vol. 14 (October 1965), p. 119.

field of community-junior colleges, one finds a literal deluge of writings on the colleges, but little has been written about their libraries.

Three major textbooks currently used on the graduate level in many universities do not even mention the junior college library. The three are Ralph R. Fields', The Community College Movement, Leland L. Medsker's, Junior College: Progress and Prospect, and James W. Thornton's, Community Junior College, considered by many to be the most comprehensive text on the subject.

In 1957 Sister Carlos M. Miller surveyed the literature of the junior college library. She points out at the conclusion of her research:

The composite of the literature leans heavily toward the conclusion that the junior college library has not yet ferreted out its own distinct position nor squarely faced the general objectives toward which it is striving.<sup>26</sup>

Reporting in the Junior College Journal, Floyd Smith, Jr. evaluated the Journal's performance as a professional periodical in dealing with the junior college library. He found that in the fifteen-year period between 1940 and 1955 there was committed seventy pages of approximately nine thousand to the area of the library, less than one per cent. In the fifteen-year period only fourteen

---

<sup>26</sup>Sister Carlos M. Miller, "Survey of the Literature on the Junior College Library," Junior College Journal, Vol. 28 (November 1957), p. 146.

articles dealt with the library.<sup>27</sup> The Journal has been the major professional voice of the community college movement during the past four decades. That this voice was silent during those years suggests that the library of the junior college has been somewhat neglected.

During the two decades between 1940 and 1960 two hundred twenty-five dissertations were reported in the literature dealing with the general subject of the junior college.<sup>28</sup> Of these only one dealt with the junior college library, and this was concerned with administrative relationships.<sup>29</sup>

Duncan G. Morrison and S. V. Martorana compiled a list of studies and surveys in the junior college field for the U.S. Office of Education. Their purpose was to determine which areas within the two-year college field were receiving the most and least attention. They found that the library was the area most neglected.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup>Floyd Smith, Jr., "The Library in the Junior College Journal," Junior College Journal, Vol. 27 (September 1956), pp. 39-41.

<sup>28</sup>Franklin Parker, "The Community Junior College: A Bibliography of 225 Research Dissertations," Junior College Journal, Vol. 32 (December 1961), pp. 193-204.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., p. 203.

<sup>30</sup>Duncan G. Morrison and S. V. Martorana, The Two-Year Community College, An Annotated List of Studies and Surveys, Bulletin 1958, No. 14 (Washington, D.C.: U.S.O.E., 1958), p. 3.

Finally, Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., reporting to a joint conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries and the American Association of Junior Colleges, pointed out the serious deficiency of concern for the junior college library when he stated, "Of all aspects of junior college development, less attention has been given to the junior college library than to any other part of the instructional program."<sup>31</sup>

The dearth of research and writing on the subject is mute testimony of a general disregard of the library by academic professionals in the junior college field.

#### Difficulties in Appraisal

The task of evaluation of the junior college library is an extremely difficult one and has probably contributed significantly to the lack of research previously mentioned. The crux of the problem may be in the scarcity and paucity of basic information about junior college libraries. As Wallace points out:

We lack information upon which to base conclusions; as a result, each institution must project itself blindly into the unknown without knowledge of facts compiled by similar institutions, knowledge which might aid in redirecting the objectives of its library.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., "The Stake of the Junior College in Its Library," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 27 (July 1966), p. 266.

<sup>32</sup>James O. Wallace, "Junior College Libraries," Junior College Journal, Vol. 25 (April 1955), p. 486.



The problem of lack of information and the consequent lack of norms has plagued the junior college movement from its earliest years to the present. Eells stated:

We need definite statements of junior college norms as well as standards. These norms should be formulated not only for the junior college as a whole but for institutions of different types, sizes and methods of control.<sup>33</sup>

In stressing the need for information about the library Eells emphasized, "We need to know where we are (norms) before we can make intelligent progress toward where we should be (standards)."<sup>34</sup>

Beyond the problem of lack of information is the sheer complexity of the problem of evaluation of any library. As Patillo points out:

After some seven years of coping with the practical problems of examining institutions for accrediting purposes, I can testify that the library is one of the most difficult phases of an institution's program to evaluate adequately.<sup>35</sup>

Norman Burns, writing in behalf of the North Central Association, appears to be in sympathy with Patillo's point of view when he states, "We are not

---

<sup>33</sup>Walter C. Eells, "Needed Developments in Junior College Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 1 (September 1940), p. 347.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., p. 347.

<sup>35</sup>M. M. Patillo, "The Appraisal of Junior Colleges and College Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 17 (September 1956), p. 397.

wholly satisfied with our evaluative techniques in the area of the college library."<sup>36</sup>

Patillo summarizes the complexity of the problem by saying:

There seems to be serious problems in almost every method of appraising the effectiveness of a college library. Beyond certain very general propositions which would be widely accepted, there is a paucity of constructive thought as to how to proceed in the specific situation. Somehow we need to develop some very different ways of looking at the whole problem.<sup>37</sup>

A recognition of the need for and the value of basic status studies as the foundation for the evaluation of junior college libraries has developed slowly but steadily during the development of the community college movement. Eells, reporting on a major status study done by the U. S. Office of Education between 1938 and 1940, recognized the value of the basic information obtained by saying:

More significant however, is the derivation and presentation of a series of criteria by means of which any junior college librarian can easily determine how her library stands with reference to several hundred other junior college libraries in certain measurable factors of resources and service.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup>Norman Burns, "Accrediting Procedures with Special Reference to Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 10 (April 1949), p. 157.

<sup>37</sup>Patillo, op. cit., p. 397.

<sup>38</sup>Walter C. Eells, "Junior College Library Criteria," Junior College Journal, Vol. 15 (December 1944), p. 160.

The need for basic data on junior college libraries was recognized by the Carnegie Corporation preliminary to its grants program for junior colleges. As Bishop points out one of the purposes of the Carnegie Study:

. . . accumulation of rather detailed information about the junior college libraries and a careful study of this information as a basis for formulating standards.<sup>39</sup>

B. Lamar Johnson, discussing trends in junior college libraries, indicated the early recognition of the need for factual studies of junior college libraries when he stated, "A number of junior college libraries are recognizing the importance of factual studies as the basis for attacking library problems."<sup>40</sup>

#### Need for Criteria and Standards

Although the junior college movement is more than a half century old and its heir, the community college movement, has grown to over a thousand operating institutions, the problem of developing criteria and standards for libraries has not been resolved. In the early years the recognition of the need for such development was

---

<sup>39</sup> William W. Bishop, "Library Service in the Junior College," Junior College Journal, Vol. 5 (May 1935), p. 456.

<sup>40</sup> B. Lamar Johnson, "The Library in General Education," National Society for the Study of Education--Forty-Second Yearbook; Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943), p. 77.

readily apparent. Bishop's call for detailed information about junior college library operations was one of many such indicators that the need for study was paramount if evaluative criteria were to be developed.

The need for status studies as the preliminary effort in the development of evaluative criteria was also recognized by Eells who differentiated between status study data and standards. He points out, "They (status study results) tell what junior college libraries are, not what they should be."<sup>41</sup> The problem of evaluation thus becomes a two-fold complexity. The first phase is a need for reliable data concerning the status, i.e. the present condition of junior college libraries, and the second phase is the need to arrive at reasonable evaluative criteria based on present conditions but concerned with long-range objectives. The lack of standards based on sound criteria may produce catastrophic results in the opinion of Hirsch. He predicts:

If we do not agree on new standards soon, and make every effort to implement them, many college students in the nineteen-sixties will be served by disgruntled, completely overworked librarians in overcrowded buildings and will look in vain for that variety of good up-to-date reading materials without which no solid pages can be written nor any real learning accomplished.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup>Walter C. Eells, "Junior College Libraries," Junior College Journal, Vol. 6 (January 1936), p. 206.

<sup>42</sup>Felix E. Hirsch, "Facing the Future," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 19 (May 1958), p. 197.

Though many writers in the field would probably not be as pessimistic as Hirsch, many would agree on the need for evaluative criteria. Weber's statement of this need is fairly representative of many professionals in the field:

What college administrators are in need of are sound criteria for judging library adequacy. Through using such criteria, one would expect to determine the degree to which the library is supporting the instructional program of the college, the success with which the library staff and faculty work together toward an agreed-upon quality of education, and whether the library is in the same relative position of excellence and suitability as are other parts of the institution.<sup>43</sup>

The problem of assessment by use of qualitative criteria is, of course, an exceptionally difficult one to resolve, consequently, the more effective method appears to lie in the quantitative arena. As Tanis points out:

It is difficult to formulate specific qualitative criteria by which the adequacy of a public junior college can be measured. Not quite as difficult, however, is the measuring of quantitative supportive characteristics which form the basis for quality service.<sup>44</sup>

In summary, there appears to be a considerable need for both status studies and evaluative criteria in the field of junior college libraries. The general

---

<sup>43</sup>D. C. Webber, "Criteria for Evaluating a College Library," American Colleges Bulletin, Vol. 43 (December 1957), p. 629.

<sup>44</sup>Norman E. Tanis and M. Powers, "Profiles of Practice in the Public Junior College Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 28 (September 1967), p. 331.

rejection of the 1960 American Library Association Standards by junior college administrators, and the lack of implementation of these standards throughout the community college field suggest that the problem still exists. The joint committee of the American Library Association and the American Association of Junior Colleges has called for a new statement of criteria for achieving effective junior college libraries.<sup>45</sup> The need for research into both the descriptive and evaluative domains of the junior college library field is essential, and the response to this need is long overdue.

#### The Problem

There is a serious lack of both basic, comparative data on junior college libraries and methods of establishing evaluative criteria. Part of the solution is believed to be the acquisition and interpretation of accurate data on the present status of community college libraries. Again, part of the solution may lie in developing new methods of establishing quantitative criteria that would be accepted by both college administrators and professional librarians.

In Michigan, as in most other states with large community college systems, there is no collective

---

<sup>45</sup>"Ten Point Program Outline for Junior College Libraries," Library Journal, Vol. 91 (March 15, 1966), p. 1377.

information regarding many aspects of library operation. The present status of these libraries is unknown.

The problem is to establish knowledge of the existing situations and conditions of Michigan's community college libraries.

### Purposes

The purposes of this study are:

1. To describe the status of Michigan community and junior college libraries as they presently exist.
2. To develop quantitative criteria that may be used for the identification of comparatively superior community and junior college libraries in Michigan.
3. To explore in-depth with community college librarians and administrators their library programs and identify strengths and weaknesses of them.
4. To identify new and emerging concepts and practices in community and junior college libraries.

### Assumptions

The assumptions undergoing this study are:

1. That relevant data on operating practices in Michigan junior and community college libraries is available and obtainable.

2. That agreement on selected quantitative criteria may be reached among community college librarians and administrators.
3. That new and emerging concepts and practices in community college libraries are occurring and can be identified through on-site investigation.

### Descriptive Questions

1. To what extent are these libraries open, and to what extent are these hours of operation professionally supervised?
2. For what major service areas do the libraries have responsibility?
3. What methods of orientation are employed by the libraries to instruct students in library use?
4. What is included in the library's collection?  
What is the size of its basic collection?  
What are its holdings in periodicals, microform, audio-visual equipment and materials?
5. What are the circulation statistics and related data for the library?
6. What are the professional and auxiliary staffing patterns in these libraries?
7. How is the library staff time utilized?



8. What is the relationship between the head of the library and the administration of the college?
9. What is the relative size of the library operational budgets to institutional budgets? What is the relationship of the library budget to the enrollment of the college?
10. How is the library budget allocated to the various operations within the library?

#### Evaluative Dimensions

11. What is the relationship between the size of the library's collection and the enrollment of the college?
12. What is the relationship between the library's expenditures and the enrollment of the college?
13. What is the relationship between the size of the library staff and the enrollment of the college?
14. What is the relationship between the circulation data and the enrollment of the college?
15. How does the extent of the library's supervised hours of operation compare with other community college libraries?

16. What is the relationship between the number of credit course offerings and the size of its collection?
17. What is the relationship between the number of credit course offerings of each college and its periodical subscriptions?
18. What is the relationship of the space allocated for library purposes to the enrollment of the college?
19. What is the relationship of expenditures for books and periodicals to the enrollment of the college?
20. How do the individual colleges rank on all evaluative criteria and on those criteria selected by community college administrators and librarians?

#### Innovative Dimensions

21. What new concepts and library practices are currently being employed in Michigan community college libraries?
22. Which junior and community colleges are involved in these new concepts and practices?
23. What problems, if any, are occurring as the result of implementing new concepts and practices?

### Delimitations

This study is limited to:

1. Public community-junior colleges in the State of Michigan.
2. Data collected in the survey instruments and the on-site investigations.
3. Library-learning resource centers of the community colleges.

### Definitions

Circulation: Distribution and utilization of the library's collection and other holdings outside the confines of the physical structure of the library. Usually specific records are kept of the particular piece of material and the individual who has borrowed it. Each item so distributed is considered one circulation transaction.

Collection: The library's basic stock of printed materials including books, bound and microfilmed periodicals, reference books and other bound volumes of instructional material.

Hardware: The audio-visual equipment necessary to use non-print materials. Included are such items as tape recorders, projectors, microfilm readers and other similar equipment.

Library college ideal: A concept which reverses the traditional college pattern of mandatory classroom attendance, lectures, textbook assignments and voluntary additional reading in the library. Use of library materials becomes the basic element in the student's independent pursuit of knowledge. Teachers and librarians are perceived and used by students as additional learning resources. The major thrust is on independent study centered around the library as the integrating core of the college.

Library-learning resource center: A unit of an individual campus which integrates printed and non-print forms of communication resources and the necessary equipment and services to permit their utilization.

Library Staff: Personnel who operate the library-learning resource center. These people will have a variety of abilities and ranges of educational background. They include professional staff, technicians, assistants, clerks, secretaries and student assistants.

Professional Staff: Personnel who carry on responsibilities in the library almost always requiring professional training at the graduate level.

Technicians and Technical Assistants: Staff members who work under the supervision of a professional staff member in areas requiring special skills and abilities.

In almost all cases these staff members require specialized college training at a minimum of the associate degree level.

Holdings: The library's total collection of all printed and non-print materials including motion pictures, film strips, transparencies, slides, tapes, art reproductions, charts, maps, posters, programmed learning aids, books, journals, newspapers, pamphlets, government documents, microfiche, and other related items including the necessary equipment for their utilization.

#### Overview

A description and evaluation of the library programs of the community and junior colleges of Michigan is presented in the chapters which follow.

Chapter II: A review of the literature and research on junior-community college libraries is presented. Emphasis is placed on the relationship of status studies to the development of standards, contributions of regional accrediting agencies and evaluative techniques that have been attempted in the junior college library field.

Chapter III: The methods, procedures and treatment of the data collected are presented in the third chapter. Attention is given to the survey instruments developed for this study; the method for determining evaluative criteria for the identification of superior junior college

libraries is described; and the method for treatment of the comparative data on the twenty-eight colleges is explained.

Chapter IV: The data, organized and tabulated to describe each element, and comparisons among the colleges are presented in this chapter. An evaluation of the colleges is presented. The highest rated colleges based on the evaluative criteria are described. Minimum characteristics of quality library programs are determined as performance means of these identified institutions.

Chapter V: In this chapter a report of visitations to the junior-community college libraries in Michigan is presented. Emphasis of the report is placed on innovative and unique practices and concepts presently being employed in the colleges.

Chapter VI: A summary of the findings and conclusions is presented in the final chapter. A discussion of the findings, recommendations for future research and implications for the future of junior college libraries are presented.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

#### Introduction

An analysis of the literature and research of the junior college library reveals four major emphases. One of these is status studies designed to determine through the use of quantitative measures comparative data on large numbers of junior college libraries. The fact that status studies have been a continuous effort in the field for almost five decades indicates that the need for comparative data on junior college library operations has never been completely satisfied. The growth and changing role of the junior college has been a contributing factor in this continuing emphasis on status studies.

A second major emphasis is the focus upon development and implementation of standards. While there is considerable disagreement among library professionals and junior college administrators as to what standards are and how they should be used, there is, nevertheless, strong agreement upon the need for reasonably determined standards to improve the quality of junior college

libraries and the services which they perform. The emphasis on status studies and the norms that may be statistically extracted from such studies and the emphasis on standards appear to be related at first glance. Logically and empirically, the normative data from status studies should be the basis for the development of standards. Unfortunately, this relationship has not held completely in actual practice.

Two other emphases that appear in the literature of the junior college field deal with the problems of evaluation. Attempts at evaluation of libraries, though limited in comparison to instructional and administrative evaluation of the junior college, have been made. There has been some concern for improving junior college libraries through the use of evaluative techniques. Along with these efforts has been the more organized attack on the evaluation problem by the various regional accrediting agencies, especially, the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

#### Early Developments

The beginning of any organized concern for the junior college library by professionals in the field can be traced to the Junior Colleges Roundtable of the American Library Association which met for the first time in 1930 and, among other things, recognized the



lack of any type of standards for junior college libraries. As a result of the deliberations of this group of librarians, the first set of standards for junior colleges was developed. They were referred to as a "measuring stick" rather than as standards, and dealt with three major criteria.<sup>1</sup>

1. Size of book collection.
2. Budgets for books.
3. Personnel.

Minimum requirements in each of the three categories were suggested which varied with the size of the student body.

Eleanor M. Homer, in discussing the measuring stick, pointed out that several major criteria had been omitted. These included the quality of the library's holdings, the relationship of the holdings to curriculum and the use of the library.<sup>2</sup> Further criticism of the Roundtable recommendations was made by Raney, whose criticism was echoed by other professionals when he stated, "But something more significant must be done about books than to count them."<sup>3</sup> Although the original benchmarks of the Roundtable were limited in scope and not founded on adequate research, they did begin the long

---

<sup>1</sup>Eleanor M. Homer, "A Junior College Measuring Stick," A.L.A. Bulletin, Vol. 24 (August 1930), pp. 296-297.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 297.

<sup>3</sup>M. L. Raney, "Junior College and Its Books," Library Journal, Vol. 59 (February 15, 1934), p. 144.

process of development of standards for junior college libraries.

Little research or serious study of their libraries was accomplished by the junior college people through the 1930's as Ryan points out, "The years prior to 1936 might well be thought of as the 'dark ages' as far as junior college library history is concerned."<sup>4</sup> One exception to Ryan's statement is the work that was done in evaluation of libraries by the North Central Association. The 1928 standards of the Association listed some minimum quantitative criteria for its junior college membership:

The college shall have a live, well-distributed, professionally administered library of at least 8,000 volumes exclusive of public documents, bearing specifically upon the subjects taught and with a definite annual appropriation for the purchase of new books and current periodicals. It is urged that such appropriation be at least \$5.00 per student.<sup>5</sup>

The problem of evaluating the holdings of a library as opposed to merely counting books was dealt with by the use of standardized checklists as recommended by Raney, Mohrhardt, et al.<sup>6</sup> Using this approach, the North Central Association, in its 1930 Manual of

---

<sup>4</sup>Roberta M. Ryan, "Building A Junior College Library," Library Journal, Vol. 64 (May 15, 1939), p. 399.

<sup>5</sup>Manning M. Pattillo, "Appraisal of Junior College and College Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 17 (September 1956), p. 398.

<sup>6</sup>Raney, op. cit., p. 144.

Accreditation, listed seven criteria, the first two measured against such checklists:<sup>7</sup>

1. Reference book holdings.
2. Periodical holdings.
3. Ranking system of expenditures for books compared to junior college norms.
4. Staff salaries on a per student approach.
5. Student use.
6. Faculty use.
7. Relationship of curricula to library holdings.

These evaluative criteria were used by the North Central Association for more than fifteen years and, undoubtedly, affected the direction of growth of junior college libraries at least in the North Central region, if not nationally.

The early years of junior college development, and consequently its library development, must be viewed in light of the fact that these institutions were strongly influenced by the four-year colleges and were in fact true junior colleges, not community colleges. As Swanson pointed out, "Indeed up to now little freedom has been accorded the junior college in this and other respects."<sup>8</sup> The junior colleges were small, under-financed and very much under the shadow of the senior institutions. Their libraries were limited and very often only part of a high school library. This recognition of the lack of quality

---

<sup>7</sup>Pattillo, op. cit., pp. 398-402.

<sup>8</sup>A. M. Swanson, "Library and Junior College Aims," Junior College Journal, Vol. 9 (January 1939), p. 176.

of junior college library programs severely limited the evaluation process. Adams, in the preface to his book on the junior college library program, addressed this problem when he stated:

It (the book) does not pretend to be a scientific evaluation of library programs nor of their conformity to standards. Such a study would be difficult, for there are few programs ready for evaluation.<sup>9</sup>

The early years of junior college library evaluation was at a time when the North Central Association provided some leadership, and the junior college section of the American Library Association was attempting to develop minimum standards. The concern for junior college library evaluation had begun. It was during these same years that the earliest attempts at status studies were made.

#### Status Studies of Junior College Library Programs

The concern for the development of standards led various professional groups to attempt status studies during the developmental years of the junior college. The Committee on Standards of the Association of College and Research Libraries undertook a research survey in 1932. All junior colleges were surveyed but only one

---

<sup>9</sup>Harlen M. Adams, Junior College Library Program (Chicago: American Library Association, and Stanford University, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1940), p. 1.

hundred thirty-two, or thirty per cent, responded to the original instrument. The emphasis of this study was on four areas:<sup>10</sup>

1. Size of library collections.
2. Relationship between curricula and holdings.
3. Staff size.
4. Budget.

The focus of the study was primarily data collection as a preliminary effort toward standards development. During the same period of time a status study was completed by the North Central Association of its member junior colleges which were reporting library data as a regular procedure. Forty-six colleges were analyzed by Haggerty and Works. Six major areas of library operations were studied:<sup>11</sup>

1. Reference holdings.
2. Periodical subscriptions.
3. Expenditures for books.
4. Expenditures for salaries.
5. Student employment.
6. Circulation.

A comparison of these studies suggests a similarity of concern for measurable factors that has maintained itself within the field up to the very present time. The factors include: (1) measures of the quality of the collection,

---

<sup>10</sup>"Report of the Committee on Standards," A.L.A. Bulletin, Vol. 26 (1932), pp. 570-75.

<sup>11</sup>William J. Haggerty and George A. Works, "An Analysis of the Library Data of the Higher Institutions of the North Central Association for the Year, 1933-34," North Central Association Quarterly, Vol. 11 (October 1936), pp. 457-69.

(2) measures of the quality of the staff, both professional and non-professional, (3) measures of the financial support of the library, and (4) measures of utilization. If one examines the functions of the library, such as those suggested by Fay, the relationship between function and research is not very strong. Fay's functions include:<sup>12</sup>

1. Provide best possible collection of books, periodicals, and other printed data.
2. Scientific organization of the collection for use by faculty, students and administration.
3. Teaching methods of using books and libraries.

There is an assumption made by most researchers and evaluators of junior college libraries that if the library has a reasonably strong collection, an adequate and qualified staff, a good financial base, and circulation statistics that suggest it is being used, then the functions of the library are being accomplished. Waples, analyzing the same North Central Association data, suggested seven criteria for evaluation:<sup>13</sup>

1. How much is spent over a period of years for the purchase of books and periodicals?
2. What has been spent for salaries of library personnel?
3. What general reference books and what standard reference books in the different academic fields does the library contain?

---

<sup>12</sup>Lucy E. Fay, "The Library in the Junior College," American Association of Junior Colleges, Proceedings of Tenth Annual Meeting, Atlantic City, New Jersey, Nov. 19-20, 1929 (Nashville, Tenn.: George Peabody College, 1929), pp. 119-120.

<sup>13</sup>Douglas Waples, "Report on the Library," North Central Association Quarterly, Vol. 9 (October 1934), p. 208.

4. To what magazines and standard periodicals in the fields covered by the curriculum does the library subscribe and how complete are the files on such periodicals?
5. On what basis are annual additions to the general collection distributed among the various academic departments, and what contemporary publications are added over and above departmental requests?
6. To what extent do students of each sex, class and department borrow publications in each of the various departmental fields for free reading?
7. To what extent are such titles borrowed by instructors of each department?

Waples' criteria were designed for use by North Central examiners for individual institution evaluation. Ideally, cross-sectional research for comparative data, i.e., status studies, should gather the detailed type of data suggested by Waples, however, the practicality of such criteria for research is questionable.

W. W. Bishop, the librarian for the University of Michigan, visited the junior colleges of Michigan and reported the results of an on-site type of status study. His findings suggested a rather dismal situation in Michigan. He reported that library hours were too short, there was little opportunity for collateral reading, facilities were poor, collections were weak, and library instruction was seriously lacking.<sup>14</sup>

Mohrhardt's study of three hundred twenty-six junior college libraries could be considered the first

---

<sup>14</sup>George E. Butterfield, "Michigan Libraries," Junior College Journal, Vol. 5 (February 1935), pp. 320-21.

major, national status study. He found inadequate book collections, a wide range in the number of periodicals subscribed to, poor articulation with the faculty and lack of financial support for many junior college libraries.<sup>15</sup>

The Carnegie Corporation studied one hundred thirty junior colleges with a focus on purpose, organization, facilities, holdings, budget and administration. They further examined instructional use, recreational reading, academic relationships and student participation.<sup>16</sup> The findings of this study indicated lack of adequate staff, poor articulation with the academic sphere, and space problems.<sup>17</sup>

Few statewide studies of junior college libraries were conducted during the early years. An attempt was made by Settelmayer in Minnesota in 1940. Studying eight junior colleges, he reported that a lack of adequate statistics of national norms made the comparative study very difficult.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup>F. E. Mohrhardt, "Status of Junior College Libraries," A.L.A. Bulletin, Vol. 30 (August 1936), pp. 699-700.

<sup>16</sup>Harlen M. Adams, "Library Practices and Instructional Methods," Junior College Journal, Vol. 8 (February 1938), pp. 254-57.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 257.

<sup>18</sup>J. C. Settelmayer, "Glance at Junior College Libraries," Minnesota Librarian, Vol. 13 (December 1940), pp. 108-10.



The need for national norms was recognized by the U. S. Office of Education, which had been collecting basic library data for college and universities for several years. The Junior College Journal, in an effort to inform its members of the U.S.O.E. research, reported the results of a national status study for the years 1939-40.<sup>19</sup> Basic data categories included: holdings, circulation, staff and budget, the same four areas emphasized eight years earlier by the North Central Association and the Association of College and Research Libraries.

Eells, reporting the U.S.O.E. attempts, commented:

More significant, however, is the derivation and presentation of a series of criteria by means of which any junior college librarian can easily determine how her library stands with reference to several hundred other junior college libraries in certain measurable factors of resources and services.<sup>20</sup>

Eells takes a pragmatic view when he states, "They are measures that are available."<sup>21</sup> As a result of data obtained from the U.S.O.E. studies, Eells suggests eight major criteria for evaluation:<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>"Junior College Libraries," Junior College Journal, Vol. 15 (November 1944), p. 115.

<sup>20</sup>Walter C. Eells, "Junior College Library Criteria," Junior College Journal, Vol. 15 (December 1944), p. 160.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 160.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., pp. 161-165.

1. Total volumes held.
2. Volumes per student.
3. New volumes added per year.
4. Expenditures per student (total).
5. Expenditures per student for library staff.
6. Circulation.
7. Reserve circulation.
8. Hours per week of operation.

MacKenzie and Brumbaugh analyzed the data of the North Central Association in regard to junior college libraries. Again one finds the emphasis on collection, staff, expenditures and circulation.<sup>23</sup>

Little research in the form of status studies can be found during the war years and immediate post-war years. In 1955 Krenitsky studied junior college libraries in Texas but was concerned primarily with the book and periodical collections.<sup>24</sup> Mick studied Kansas junior colleges and was concerned with facilities, collection, staff and utilization.<sup>25</sup> Johnston surveyed one hundred twenty-five smaller junior colleges in 1958 and found that the major concerns of librarians were staff and facilities.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup>D. M. MacKenzie and A. J. Brumbaugh, "Analysis of the Library Data of the Higher Institutions of the North Central Association for the Year 1941-42," North Central Association Quarterly, Vol. 18 (April 1944), pp. 293-308.

<sup>24</sup>M. V. Krenitsky, "Studying of Junior College Libraries in Texas," Junior College Journal, Vol. 25 (February 1955), pp. 331-46.

<sup>25</sup>Sister M. J. Mick, "Library in Kansas Junior Colleges," Junior College Journal, Vol. 28 (March 1958), pp. 383-88.

<sup>26</sup>Walter T. Johnston, "Glance at Junior College Libraries," Junior College Journal, Vol. 29 (December 1958), pp. 195-201.

With the adoption of the Standards for Junior College Libraries by the American Library Association in 1960 the trend in status studies changed somewhat. The emphasis on collection, staff, utilization and finances (and in some cases, facilities) still existed but the quantitative standards of the A.L.A. now offered criteria which could be applied. Typically, the status studies of the last decade and up to the present compare large numbers of junior college libraries to these quantitative standards. Theodore Samore, using the U.S.O.E. data for the years 1959 through 1962, examined junior college libraries on a national basis.<sup>27</sup> Table 2.1 describes the percentage of junior college libraries falling below minimum standards of the American Library Association.

TABLE 2.1.--Per Cent of Junior Colleges Falling Below Standards.

	1959-60	1960-61	1961-62
Volumes	87%	86%	91%
Personnel	77%	75%	85%
Expenditures	61%	62%	57%

<sup>27</sup>Theodore Samore, "Current Condition of American Academic Libraries," Higher Education, Vol. 20 (December 1963), pp. 7-10.

A further discussion of standards will follow but it should be noted that the direction of status studies changed considerably after the adoption of the 1960 standards. It might well be described as a movement toward a "how do we fare against the standards?" approach and has continued to the present.

Wheeler studied a national sample of 103 community college libraries in 1964 using the standards approach.<sup>28</sup>

Among her findings were:

1. Seventy-four per cent of the libraries did not meet the size of collection standard.
2. Ninety-two per cent did not meet the seating standard.
3. Less than half the colleges met the standard for library budget.<sup>29</sup>

As some of the states have developed rather extensive community college systems, the recent trend in status studies has been toward studying library characteristics of institutions within the system. Typical of this approach is a 1967 study done by Anderson and Spencer in Illinois.<sup>30</sup> The focus of this study was on collection (volumes held),

---

<sup>28</sup>Helen R. Wheeler, The Community College Library: A Plan for Action (Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String Press, Inc., 1965), p. 153.

<sup>29</sup>Helen R. Wheeler, "Community College Library 1965," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 27 (September 1966), p. 397.

<sup>30</sup>E. F. Anderson and James S. Spencer, "Report of Selected Data and Characteristics--Illinois Public Junior Colleges," Standards and Criteria for the Evaluation and Recognition of Public Junior Colleges (Springfield, Illinois: Illinois Junior College Board, 1968), pp. 476-84.

space (floor space per full-time equated student), budget, staff and comparisons against criteria established by the Illinois Junior College Board.<sup>31</sup> It is noticeable that in recent years the quantitative standards established by the American Library Association have fallen into some disuse.

Similar statewide status studies have been done in recent years by Hale in Kentucky<sup>32</sup> and Yamada and Kaser in Tennessee.<sup>33</sup> Many of the states with community college systems attempt to collect data on their libraries using some type of an annual format. The Washington Community College Librarians Association reports basic data on collection, budget and personnel for twenty-two community college libraries.<sup>34</sup> In recent years there has been an awakening of serious research interest in acquiring and organizing library data on statewide, regional and national bases. Norms are slowly being established in the hope that these may eventually form the foundations for new, relevant and imaginative criteria for standards

---

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., pp. 16-17.

<sup>32</sup>C. E. Hale, "Survey: Kentucky's Junior College Libraries," Kentucky Library Association Bulletin, Vol. 34 (October 1970), pp. 13-21.

<sup>33</sup>Ken Yamada and David E. Kaser, "Junior College Libraries in Tennessee," Tennessee Librarian, Vol. 22 (Spring 1970), pp. 117-20.

<sup>34</sup>Washington Community College Librarians Association, "Community Colleges," Washington State Library News Bulletin, Vol. 37 (April 1970), pp. 116-117.

and evaluation. The assumption that certain levels of adequacy in measurable aspects of community college library operation are indicators that the library is meeting its purposes still persists and remains unchallenged. These measurable aspects include collection, staff, utilization, facilities and financial support.

### Standards for Junior College Libraries

During the years of self-study for the junior college library profession, there has been a continuing effort within the profession to develop standards for junior college library practices. Wilson and Tauber offer a description of what is generally meant by library standards:

The progress of a profession is usually marked by the accumulation of an increasing number of generally accepted practices. As these practices are commonly approved, they are recognized as norms or standards and are regularly followed until more satisfactory methods are discovered. A measure of standardization thus characterizes normal development.<sup>35</sup>

Thus, standards are commonly defined in terms of current practice. However, there is a counter view that suggests there is a differentiation between norms and standards. Lorenz suggests, "Standards should not reflect what is

---

<sup>35</sup> Louis R. Wilson and Maurice F. Tauber, The University Library--The Organization, Administration and Functions of Academic Libraries, Second Edition (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956), pp. 96-97.

but what should be."<sup>36</sup> The implication is clear that for some the standard is a higher level of performance than the norm or average performance. Exponents of this counter view would agree with Lorenz' statement that, "Standards should reflect the best achievements at present of the larger units of library service."<sup>37</sup>

Regardless of which view is taken, the source for standards should be based on adequate research of library operations. As Hurt points out:

Most college library standards are based on comparisons. Such standards arise from the collection and publication of annual library statistics and from special studies and surveys from which data are collected and made public.<sup>38</sup>

Often it appears that standards are a result of expert consensus, but in the final analysis the consensual agreement has its roots in accepted practices of the profession. Hurt states:

Even expert opinion is based largely upon comparative standards; which is to say that the expert will compare features of a given library with what his experience and special training tell him to be the standard for any similar library in the same situation.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup>John G. Lorenz, "What Is The Importance of Library Standards?" Canadian Library, Vol. 21 (September 1964), p. 97.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., p. 97.

<sup>38</sup>Peyton Hurt, "Principles and Standards for Surveying a College Library," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 2 (March 1941), p. 112.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., p. 112.

As early as 1932 standards for junior college libraries were being contemplated by California, Florida, New York, Oklahoma and Pennsylvania.<sup>40</sup> As a result of the survey conducted by the Association of College and Research Libraries, serious discussion of standards was begun. Five areas were included in these preliminary discussions:<sup>41</sup>

1. Library functions or minimal essentials.
2. Ratio of library budget to total budget.
3. Staff.
4. Records and library reports.
5. Access and articulation with other libraries.

Randall, in explaining the approach being taken by the Association, stated:

Educational standards are generally not standards in the sense that they are exact definitions. They are rather statements of minimums below which it is improbable that successful or satisfactory results may be expected.<sup>42</sup>

The "minimum levels" approach to standards, which at that time was typical of the North Central Association as well, was criticized by both Johnson and Kirkpatrick. Johnson disagreed with the assumption that if the standards on book stock, budget, staff, facilities and administration were met, then it could be assumed the functions of the library were being met. He stated,

---

<sup>40</sup>Committee on Standards, op. cit., p. 570.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 575.

<sup>42</sup>William M. Randall, "Junior College Library Standards," A.L.A. Bulletin, Vol. 27 (December 15, 1933), p. 717.



Not one of these standards relates directly to the objectives of the junior college library. The standards force attention not upon the objectives of the library, but on the standards.<sup>43</sup>

Kirkpatrick criticized the standardized book list approach and urged, "thoughtful men and women re-examine our fancy new standards and try to bring about their simplification."<sup>44</sup>

During the late 1930's, when the Carnegie Corporation developed an interest in assisting junior college libraries, an advisory committee of junior college librarians and administrators was established by the Corporation.<sup>45</sup> The committee recommended qualitative standards in six major areas:<sup>46</sup>

1. Housing.
2. Staff.
3. Book Collection.
4. Classification and cataloging.
5. Inter-library cooperation.
6. Training in use of the library.

Little action in the field resulted from these recommendations for standards, but the prestige of the Carnegie Corporation and the committee brought into national focus

---

<sup>43</sup>B. Lamar Johnson, "Junior College Library Standards," Library Journal, Vol. 61 (September 1, 1936), p. 627.

<sup>44</sup>L. H. Kirkpatrick, "Wanted--A Revision of Library Standards," School and Society, Vol. 52 (November 9, 1940), p. 466.

<sup>45</sup>R. M. Lester, "Development of Junior College Libraries," Junior College Journal, Vol. 8 (October 1937), p. 4.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., pp. 5-6.

the desirability and need for library standards. As an outgrowth of the Carnegie interest five Michigan junior colleges received grants for improving their libraries.<sup>47</sup>

The interest in standards during this early period of junior college development was rather limited. Gitler recommended four areas for standards in establishing a junior college library.<sup>48</sup> These included financial administration, book collection, facilities and staff. Just prior to the Second World War the American Library Association and the Association of College and Research Libraries established a committee to develop standards for junior college libraries.<sup>49</sup> This committee concerned itself with: (1) a method for self-computation of library service loads, (2) job analysis of staff needs, and (3) classification of positions. It was planned that a practical rating scale be developed for institutional self-measurement against the three standards.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup>Bay City Junior College, Flint Junior College, Highland Park Junior College, Ironwood Junior College and Jackson Junior College.

<sup>48</sup>Robert L. Gitler, "Standards for a Junior College Library," Junior College Journal, Vol. 9 (November 1938), pp. 68-71.

<sup>49</sup>H. B. Timmerman, "Revision of Standards for Libraries," School and Society, Vol. 53 (March 15, 1941), p. 341.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 341.

During the war years and early post-war years little attention was given to the development of standards by professionals in the field. The war itself and the problems associated with it as well as the changing role of the junior college were probably contributing factors to this situation. In 1953 the interest in junior college library standards was renewed with vigor at the American Library Association Conference in Los Angeles. A Committee on Standards for junior colleges was appointed with a two-fold assignment: (1) preparation of a statement of standards to eventually be adopted by the membership, and (2) collection of material for an A.C.R.L. monograph on junior college libraries.<sup>51</sup> The work of this committee, comprised of professional librarians primarily from junior colleges, was to last seven years until January of 1960 when the membership of the association adopted the standards.<sup>52</sup> The question of how the standards were to be viewed, that is, whether they were to be minimum levels of performance or goals to eventually be attained, was a difficult one to be answered. Shephard's statement

---

<sup>51</sup>"Preparation of the Standards for Junior College Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 21 (May 1960), p. 199.

<sup>52</sup>"Standards for Junior College Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 21 (May 1960), p. 200.

was the approach taken by the large majority of professional librarians:

These standards define concisely and pertinently, the purposes of the library, holdings, budget, personnel, housing and administration. They are helpful in measuring the extent and effectiveness of library service; they serve as goals to be attained.<sup>53</sup>

The intent of the standards was to be goals for junior college libraries and was not to be considered norms of average performance. The committee chairman, Felix E. Hirsch, in presenting the standards to the Association, explained the aim of the committee as, "to provide flexible standards based on firm principles."<sup>54</sup> He further stated:

How can we evaluate the quality of our service? This problem has vexed many a college librarian and his authorities because it involves so many intangible factors. The Standards for College Libraries attack it from several angles, by continuous analysis of statistical records, and by self-studies undertaken jointly with the faculty. But some questions will remain unanswered, even after every reasonable effort has been made.<sup>55</sup>

The standards' preface suggests that they were to be used as a guide for evaluation. The standards were grouped into eight major categories:<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup>Elizabeth J. Shephard, "Library Trends," North Carolina Libraries, Vol. 14 (June 1956), p. 135.

<sup>54</sup>Felix E. Hirsch, "New Standards to Strengthen College Libraries," A.L.A. Bulletin (September 1959), p. 679.

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., p. 682.

<sup>56</sup>"Standards for Junior College Libraries," op. cit., pp. 201-06.

1. Functions of the Junior College Library.
2. Structure and Government.
3. Budget.
4. Staff.
5. Library Collection.
6. Building.
7. Quality of the Service and Its Evaluation.
8. Interlibrary Cooperation.

Several of the standards were explicitly quantitative.

A minimum budget of five per cent of the total operational budget of the institution was recommended. A minimum of two professional librarians, a book stock of 20,000 volumes and provision for seating twenty-five per cent of the student body were also recommended as minimums.<sup>57</sup>

After the adoption of the standards by the Association, an effort by professional librarians was undertaken to have the standards adopted by the junior colleges. The major statement of the Association suggested six uses for the standards:<sup>58</sup>

1. Librarian selection.
2. Use by chief administrators as guidelines for library development.
3. Basic collection development.
4. Budgeting.
5. Staffing.
6. Construction and planning.

---

<sup>57</sup> Ibid., pp. 201-06.

<sup>58</sup> American Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries, Junior College Libraries Section, Standards and Criteria Committee, "Guidelines for Establishing Junior College Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 24 (November 1963), pp. 502-05.

Hirsch described the standards as a "blueprint for the 1960's,"<sup>59</sup> for junior college librarians to argue their case with chief administrators,<sup>60</sup> and a reasonable argument against the status quo of junior college libraries.<sup>61</sup> Norman Tanis, a community college librarian and a member of the committee, recognized the difficulties of implementing the standards when he stated:

Due to the complex nature of the American junior college, a relatively new and strictly 20th century phenomenon, many difficulties in effecting application of the Standards confront librarians. Most crucial among these are the building diversity of the junior colleges, their changing role in modern American society, and their rapid growth due to burgeoning enrollments with its concomitant problem of insufficient finances.<sup>62</sup>

The variety of institutions falling under the umbrella of "the community college" makes the problem of formulation of library standards extremely difficult according to B. Lamar Johnson.<sup>63</sup> In reviewing the standards critically, Johnson saw a variety of strengths but some weaknesses to

---

<sup>59</sup>Felix E. Hirsch, "Goals for the 1960's," Junior College Journal, Vol. 31 (November 1960), p. 139.

<sup>60</sup>Felix E. Hirsch, "Evaluation Trends," Library Trends, Vol. 14 (October 1965), pp. 191-202.

<sup>61</sup>Felix E. Hirsch, "How High Should We Aim?" A.L.A. Bulletin, Vol. 55 (February 1961), p. 162.

<sup>62</sup>Norman E. Tanis, "Implementing the Junior College Library Standards," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 22 (March 1961), p. 130.

<sup>63</sup>B. Lamar Johnson, "New Junior College Library Standards," A.L.A. Bulletin, Vol. 55 (February 1961), p. 155.

them. He felt that the emphasis placed on the need of interpreting standards in the light of the aims and needs of the particular institutions was a strength. He further saw strengths in the emphasis on quantitative criteria, evaluation, library budget, staff and funds for audio-visual services and the recognition of the multi-functional aspects and characteristics of the junior college library.<sup>64</sup>

There were, however, weaknesses of the standards, especially in the quantified items. Johnson voiced the opinions of many chief administrators when he challenged the 20,000 volume criterion, the two professional librarians criterion and the requirement for twenty-five per cent seating capacity.<sup>65</sup> All three were considerably higher than national norms of junior colleges. Arguing the case for the librarians, Tanis suggested use of the standards for self-study by institutions<sup>66</sup> and, in fact, employed them in such a self-study at Henry Ford Community College in Dearborn.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., p. 158.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., p. 160.

<sup>66</sup>Norman E. Tanis, "Junior College Libraries in the 1960's," Drexel Library Quarterly, Vol. 2 (July 1966), pp. 227-239.

<sup>67</sup>Norman E. Tanis and K. J. Jacobs, "Strengthening the College Library," Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. 12 (Spring 1964), pp. 87-90.

In 1964 the Washington Conference of the Council of Library Resources met to make recommendations on the development of new approaches to the evaluation of junior college libraries.<sup>68</sup> At that conference, criticisms of the Standards were made by a variety of community college presidents representing colleges throughout the country. The following twelve major criticisms were voiced by the college presidents:<sup>69</sup>

1. Standards should be called guidelines.
2. It was questionable whether the librarian should report to the chief administrator.
3. The word "volume" had an obscure meaning.
4. The number of volumes should be based on the breadth and depth of the curriculum, not on student population.
5. The word "volume" should be removed from the first sentence of the Standards.
6. Quality service did not require 20,000 volumes.
7. The 5% budget allocation was unrealistic.
8. Quantitative statements regarding collection size should be eliminated.
9. The concept of the library as a materials center should predominate.
10. The 25% seating demand was unrealistic.
11. Community libraries should be considered part of the college collection.
12. Qualitative standards with examples of well-run libraries were needed.

One of the significant results of the Conference was an almost total invalidation of the Standards; a second was the recommendation for the appointment of a joint Committee of American Library Association representatives and American

---

<sup>68</sup>Tanis, op. cit., pp. 227-239.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., pp. 230-39.



Association of Junior College representatives. This was accomplished in 1965 and was comprised of five librarians, five administrators, and two mutually appointed faculty members. This committee was assigned seven areas of concern:<sup>70</sup>

1. Role and functions of the library.
2. The planning and building of facilities.
3. Preparation, recruitment and selection of personnel.
4. Development of library materials.
5. Interaction with instructional program.
6. Finance and budgeting.
7. Encouragement of evaluation and research.

The criticisms of the Standards made by community college administrators were not directly a condemnation of standards, per se, but were primarily a recognition of the problem of relevancy and realism in an extraordinarily diversified community college field. The development of such standards is intrinsically the problem of ultimate evaluation. The two questions that eventually must be answered are, "What are the important criteria?" and "How may they be realistically measured?" The value of meaningful standards as a prerequisite for evaluation and as a set of guidelines for development cannot be overestimated. As President Laffin of the State University Agricultural and Technical College at Farmingdale, New York stresses:

---

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., pp. 238-239.

Practically all institutional reports state that the library is the college 'heart.' Yet, it is not enough for a college administrator to make this reference without having established provisions for keeping the heart beating. This can only be done by implementing excellent standards. . . .<sup>71</sup>

### Evaluation by Accrediting Associations

The contributions of the regional accrediting agencies have been considerable through the years in the evaluation of junior college libraries. As early as 1928 the North Central Association had developed library standards which were being used by their examiners as guidelines for evaluation.<sup>72</sup> In the North Central Association's Revised Manual of Accrediting their evaluative criteria for junior college libraries is clearly described:

In estimating the adequacy of the library attention will be given to the holdings of standard works of general and specific reference, to the holdings of magazines and periodicals and to the number and variety of books. The use of the library by students and faculty, library expenditures over a period of years, salaries of the library staff, qualifications of the staff, and the administrative practices relating to the library will all be considered in this connection.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup>Charles W. Laffin, Jr., "Library in the Two-Year College," Drexel Library Quarterly, Vol. 2 (July 1966), p. 224.

<sup>72</sup>Pattillo, op. cit., p. 398.

<sup>73</sup>North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Revised Manual of Accrediting (Chicago: North Central Association, 1941), p. 5.

An examination of the criteria used by the six regional accrediting agencies produces a very distinct commonality of concern.<sup>74</sup> Although there are some differences, the overlap among criteria is considerable. Those criteria that almost all agencies use include: collection adequacy, staff, facilities, financial support, utilization and expenditures. Additionally, some agencies are concerned about administration and recency of acquisitions.<sup>75</sup> In effect, the accrediting agencies over a considerable period of time have developed their own standards and used them as bases for evaluation. The standards, as such, developed by community college administrators and librarians, are in fact a general definition of values of what is important in library operations as perceived by community college people themselves.

The A.C.R.L. Standards were not rejected by the regional associations, nor were they welcomed with open arms. Lombardi, one of the most experienced of the North Central examiners, spoke for the Association by saying:

However, in accreditation, junior college administrators look askance at rigid quantitative criteria. Such criteria seem to go counter to the idea of

---

<sup>74</sup>American Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries, Standards Committee, College and University Library Accreditation Standards--1957, compiled by Eli M. Oboler, et al., ACRL Monograph, No. 20 (Chicago: American Library Association, 1958), p. 46.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., pp. 1-46.

uniqueness of each college. This in part accounts for the administrator's uneasiness and dissatisfaction with the A.L.A. standards.<sup>76</sup>

Jones, also speaking for the regional accrediting agencies, rejects any possibility of adoption of the 1960 Standards, but at the same time recognizes their value and offers cooperation with the American Library Association in publicizing them.<sup>77</sup> He states, "We are not prepared to recognize any single authority or to commit ourselves permanently to any one doctrine or document, including our own."<sup>78</sup>

The problem of developing standards and using them either as minimum evaluative criteria or goals to be attained has never been completely resolved. Both the accrediting agencies and the professional library organizations have, at their direction, provoked an evolution of quantitative and qualitative criteria which when applied to individual institutions allow for inferential evaluation of library service. Ideally, standards need to possess both quantitative and qualitative characteristics; moreover, if they are truly functional, they should be able to be used both for the process of evaluation and as goals for the future. As Wheeler emphasizes:

---

<sup>76</sup>John Lambardi, "Standards at the Grass Roots," A.L.A. Bulletin, Vol. 60 (April 1966), p. 378.

<sup>77</sup>F. Taylor Jones, "The Regional Accrediting Association and the Standards for College Libraries," College and Research Libraries (July 1961), p. 274.

<sup>78</sup>Ibid., p. 273.

Standards are frequently used in evaluating educational institutions and their programs and are often applied more to quantitative aspects than to qualitative results. At the other extreme is the vaguely stated generality which provides neither great assistance nor information for working purposes. Criteria for community college libraries should, therefore, provide qualitative-but-functional considerations which can be utilized in evaluation as well as for goals.<sup>79</sup>

#### Other Recommendations for Evaluation

The need for evaluation of junior college libraries has been apparent from the very beginnings of the development of the two-year colleges, but the methods by which evaluation is to be accomplished is yet to be agreed upon. The difficulty of the task is well-recognized as Pattillo states:

The library is one of the most difficult phases of an institution to evaluate adequately. There seems to be serious problems in almost every method of appraising the effectiveness of a college library.<sup>80</sup>

Although the early years of junior college development were considered bleak in terms of library growth and development as both Hester<sup>81</sup> and Haggard<sup>82</sup> pointed out, concern for evaluative measures for library service was

---

<sup>79</sup>Wheeler, op. cit., p. 8.

<sup>80</sup>Pattillo, op. cit., p. 397.

<sup>81</sup>Edna A. Hester, "Junior Colleges-Their Trends and Libraries," Junior College Journal, Vol. 6 (December 1935), p. 130.

<sup>82</sup>W. W. Haggard, "Shortcomings of the Junior College Library," Junior College Journal, Vol. 5 (February 1935), p. 225.

evident even then. Moe even suggested that if one could measure the quality of library service, the effectiveness of the entire junior college organization would be appraised.<sup>83</sup>

Waples suggested three criteria for measuring effectiveness: "Holdings of books and periodicals, the financial support of the library, and utilization of the library by students and instructors."<sup>84</sup>

Stone, who is credited with writing the first book on the junior college library, recommended four qualitative criteria even though she had been instrumental in developing the Roundtable's original benchmarks which were, of course, highly quantitative. The four were: utilization, how interesting the books were, how up-to-date the collection was and how well it was distributed among subject areas taught.<sup>85</sup> Coulter suggested three criteria as a result of the identification of serious weaknesses in junior college libraries. These were: professional staff, book holdings and facilities.<sup>86</sup> She predicted:

---

<sup>83</sup>Moe, op. cit., p. 60.

<sup>84</sup>Douglas Waples, The Evaluation of Higher Institutions, The Library (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), p. 2.

<sup>85</sup>Ermine Stone, "Quality of the Junior College Library," Junior College Journal, Vol. 5 (January 1935), p. 166.

<sup>86</sup>Edith M. Coulter, "Functions of the Junior College Library," Junior College Journal, Vol. 1 (1931), p. 485.

The junior college library of the future will be in charge of an adequate and highly qualified staff. It will possess a carefully selected and well-balanced collection of books; it will be housed in a spacious and dignified building. Given these conditions the library will assume the most important role in the education of the junior college student.<sup>87</sup>

Tunison recommended six factors that "cannot be neglected in estimating the adequacy of the library."<sup>88</sup>

These were:<sup>89</sup>

1. Book collection.
2. Satisfactory cataloguing and classification.
3. Adequate number of periodicals.
4. Definite annual appropriation.
5. Efficient administration.
6. Qualifications of the librarians.

Rush, in criticizing the current condition of junior college libraries, suggested that the collection of reference books, periodicals, bibliographical apparatus and recency of books was paramount as well as the relationship of holdings to curricula.<sup>90</sup> Mohrhardt, using the technique of identifying fifteen superior schools from the Carnegie status study, extracted seven criteria: (1) size of college budget based on a per student expenditure,

---

<sup>87</sup>Ibid., p. 486.

<sup>88</sup>Fay Tunison, "A Critical Study of Standards and Practices in Junior College Libraries" (unpublished Master's dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1935).

<sup>89</sup>Ibid.

<sup>90</sup>Charles E. Rush, "Opportunities in the Junior College Field," Junior College Journal, Vol. 6 (January 1936), pp. 178-79.

(2) library budget as a percentage of college budget,  
 (3) library salaries as a percentage of library budget,  
 (4) book budget, (5) basic collection, (6) regular additions to holdings, and (7) a minimum number of periodicals.<sup>91</sup>

Shores, working for a committee of the Association of the College and Research Libraries, canvassed library and educational opinion and arrived at six criteria areas:<sup>92</sup>

1. Budget.
2. Personnel.
3. Book stock.
4. Quarters and equipment.
5. Organization.
6. Educational participation.

McEwen, after an extensive North Central study of all of its two-year colleges, analyzed the data and recommended four areas of evaluation: (1) book collection quality as it relates to the academic program, (2) adequacy of periodicals, (3) expenditures, and (4) utilization.<sup>93</sup>

Finally, Carnovsky, recommending factors for library self-evaluation, suggested six: (1) books, (2) periodicals,

---

<sup>91</sup>F. E. Mohrhardt, "Junior College Library Budgets," Junior College Journal, Vol. 8 (January 1938), pp. 171-173.

<sup>92</sup>Louis Shores, "Evaluating Library Service to Higher Education," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 2 (July 1941), pp. 211-215.

<sup>93</sup>R. W. McEwen, "North Central Association 1943 Survey of College and University Libraries," College and Research Libraries, Vol. 4 (June 1943), pp. 253-256.



(3) staff, (4) physical structure, (5) finances and  
(6) library use.<sup>94</sup>

In more recent years, recommendations for evaluative criteria underscore the consistency over the years of the focus of attention on the same broad categories for criteria. For example, Trinkner suggests that the keys to effective service lie in facilities, book collection and staff.<sup>95</sup> Lyle suggests six criteria headings: administration, book collection, staff, finance, physical plant and library use.<sup>96</sup> Finally, the Association of College and University Libraries suggest that the "prime evidence" in judging library adequacy lies in collection, reading spaces and time, and staff.<sup>97</sup>

#### Analysis and Summary

A review of the literature of the junior college library field suggests that from the earliest years of

---

<sup>94</sup>L. Carnovsky, "Self-Evaluation or How Good is My Library?" College and Research Libraries, Vol. 3 (September 1942), pp. 304-10.

<sup>95</sup>Trinkner, op. cit., p. 119.

<sup>96</sup>G. R. Lyle, et al., "Evaluation of the College Library," Administration of the College Library (New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1961), p. 397.

<sup>97</sup>American Library Association, Association of College and University Libraries, "Guide to Methods of Library Evaluation," College and University Library News, No. 9 (October 1968), p. 293.

development of the two-year college there has been continuous effort by a variety of groups and individuals to measure the quality of the libraries and the services that they perform. Attention to the study of these libraries, development of standards and criteria for evaluation has been an on-going process for more than forty years.

The emphasis on status studies has reflected a continuing need within the field for basic data, data that could be used for the extraction of norms, for the bases by which standards could be developed and eventually for the evaluation that might be accomplished. Today several progressive states with large community college systems are developing systems of information retrieval for library data, and the United States Office of Education has a fully working annual system for the acquisition of library data on community colleges. These various systems of collection of library data are still in their infancy and there is an obvious void in the effective utilization of such data.

The development of standards for junior college libraries has been evolutionary with the American Library Association assuming a significant leadership role. Early attempts at standards development met with limited success, but by 1960, standards for junior college libraries, highly quantitative as they were, were adopted by the

major professional librarians' organization in the country. The failure of these standards in the past decade can be traced to several sources. Certainly, the lack of resolution of the question of whether they were to be viewed as long-range goals or minimum levels of performance hampered their implementation among community colleges. Additionally, the fact that they were developed primarily by professional librarians without participation by community college administrators produced a credibility gap and limited their usefulness.

Yet these standards and others that have been proposed have served a significant purpose in the evaluation of junior college libraries. Standards, whether they are implemented or not, serve to focus attention on evaluation and specific aspects of evaluation. They serve to remind community college administrators and librarians that library functions and services must be continually studied and evaluated. They remind the educational field that it is never enough to provide library service without raising the significant and often difficult-to-answer question, "What is the quality of that service?"

The literature on evaluation of the junior college library is more limited than that literature dealing with status studies and standards. Over the years the primary emphasis has been placed on a group of measurable

characteristics of junior college library operations. There has been an underlying assumption that there is a relationship between these measureable characteristics and the service functions of the library. This method of evaluation would imply that if a library rates high on these characteristics, it probably is providing the services it is designed to provide. The measures that appear with consistency throughout the literature include:

1. Basic collection, periodical and reference materials.
2. Professional staff and technical and supportive staff.
3. Facilities and space for faculty and students.
4. Financial resources and support.
5. Utilization by students and faculty.
6. Expenditures.

Although the inferential approach to library evaluation has been criticized by some writers, in general it is accepted within the field as a reasonable methodology for the evaluation of groups of libraries. On the individual institutional level more in-depth methodologies may be applied.

There are no known studies which combine the factual data obtained from a reliable information system with evaluative criteria agreed upon by both community

college administrators and professional librarians. By placing into juxtaposition these two elements with an evaluative technique, a study may be made that might contribute to the solution of the complex problem of library evaluation. The methods and procedures of such a study are described in Chapter III, which follows.

### CHAPTER III

#### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

##### Colleges Studied

Every public community and junior college in the State of Michigan, except Wayne County Community College, is included in the study. Wayne, which at the time of the study did not have a central campus nor an identifiable learning resource center, is not included in either the descriptive or evaluative sections of this study. Each public community college, along with its location, is presented in Table 3.1. Because data were available for each of the Oakland campus libraries and all three serve large student bodies, they are identified individually in the study.

During the Fall of 1969 the Michigan Community College Association, comprising the Presidents and Trustee members of Michigan's community and junior colleges, established the Information Retrieval Committee for the expressed purpose of developing systems for information retrieval of basic data on operations in the community colleges. The Committee consisted of four Presidents of community colleges, several Board of Trustee members,

TABLE 3.1.--Michigan Public Community and Junior Colleges and Locations.

College	Location
Alpena Community College	Alpena
Bay De Noc Community College	Escanaba
Delta College	University Center
Genesee Community Junior College	Flint
Glen Oaks Community College	Centerville
Gogebic Community College	Ironwood
Grand Rapids Junior College	Grand Rapids
Henry Ford Community College	Dearborn
Highland Park College	Highland Park
Jackson Community College	Jackson
Kalamazoo Valley Community College	Kalamazoo
Kellogg Community College	Battle Creek
Kirtland Community College	Roscommon
Lake Michigan College	Benton Harbor
Lansing Community College	Lansing
Macomb South Community College-- South Campus	Warren
Mid Michigan Community College	Harrison
Monroe County Community College	Monroe
Montcalm Community College	Sidney
Muskegon Community College	Muskegon
North Central Michigan College	Petoskey
Northwestern Michigan College	Traverse City
Oakland Community College	Auburn Hills
Oakland Community College	Highland Lakes
Oakland Community College	Orchard Hills
St. Clair Community College	Port Huron
Schoolcraft College	Livonia
Southwestern Michigan College	Dowagiac
Washtenaw Community College	Ann Arbor
West Shore Community College	Scottville

and four research and development officers from the colleges. The Committee, chaired by President Philip J. Gannon of Lansing Community College, met regularly during the 1969-70 school year, planning the systems and identifying major operational areas that would be studied. Among the areas so identified was community and junior college libraries. During the Spring of 1970 a cooperative effort was undertaken between several members of the Committee and representatives of the Michigan Community College Library Association to develop an instrument that would provide basic data on community college library operations, data that could then be used by both administrators and library personnel for a variety of purposes. Since no descriptive data on Michigan's community college libraries were available, the major emphasis of the Committee was to develop an instrument that was comprehensive. The instrument was finally adopted by the Information Retrieval Committee in late Spring 1970 and was administered to all twenty-nine community colleges during the Summer of 1970. Responses were received from every institution.

### Instruments

#### Survey Questionnaire

The Survey of Michigan Community College Libraries/Resource Centers, developed by the Michigan Community College Association and the Michigan Community College



Library Association, has been included in its entirety in Appendix A. The instrument was divided into four major categories:

Part I. General Information

Part II. Materials

Part III. Personnel

Part IV. Financial Resources

The elements of the questionnaire for each part are listed below:

Part I--General Information

1. Name and campus identification if multi-campus.
2. Number of credit courses listed in 1969-70 catalog.
3. Major areas of responsibility of library.
4. Hours of operation.
5. Weekly hours of operation.
6. Supervised hours of operation.
7. Weeks of operation per year.
8. Methods of orientation.
9. Operation of educational television, closed-circuit television and dial access systems.
10. Existence of functioning faculty committee for the library.

Part II--Materials

1. Number of volumes held.
2. Micro-film reels held.

3. Titles on micro-film.
4. Other microtext held.
5. Number of periodical titles being received.
6. Periodical titles in "runs" of five and ten years.
7. Physical units of catalogued or inventoried audio-visual software.
8. Physical units of catalogued or inventoried audio-visual hardware.
9. Circulation transactions for 1969-70 school year.

#### Part III--Personnel

1. Full-time and part-time professional staff, technical staff, secretarial and clerical staff.
2. Hours of student assistance.
3. Hours of other hourly assistance.
4. Percentage of staff time devoted to major library responsibilities.
5. Percentage of library staff time expended by function.
6. Percentage of audio-visual staff time expended by function.
7. Title of administrative officer to whom library head reports.

#### Part IV--Financial Resources

1. Total operational budget for 1970 fiscal year.
2. Percentage of total library budget allocated to major categories of expenditures.

#### Measures of Library Quality

A special instrument was developed by the author in consultation with selected professional librarians at both the university and community college levels, community college administrators and community college researchers. The instrument lists nine possible measures of library quality and respondents were asked to rank the measures in order of most to least important as a gross measure of library quality. Listed below are the nine criteria of the instrument.

1. Ratio of the college's enrollment to the size of the library collection.
2. Ratio of the library's operational budget to the college's operational budget.
3. Ratio of the library staff size to the enrollment of the college.
4. Ratio of circulation statistics to the enrollment of the college.
5. Total amount of professionally supervised hours of library operations per week.

6. Ratio of the number of the college's credit course offerings to the size of the library collection.
7. Ratio of the number of periodical subscriptions to the number of credit courses offered.
8. Ratio of space allocated for library purposes to enrollment.
9. Ratio of expenditures for books and periodicals to enrollment.

These criteria were derived from recommendations made by community college librarians, administrators, and researchers who had been asked to suggest quantitative measures of library quality that could be used to compare community college libraries.

#### Other Sources of Data Collection

For determination of physical facilities data the Inventory of Physical Facilities at Institutions of Higher Education in Michigan Fall 1969 was employed as a primary source. The Inventory was published by the Michigan Department of Education in October 1970 and quantitatively describes all community and junior college facilities.

For the determination of fiscal data on community colleges and their libraries the Bureau of the Budget Form 400 was employed. During the Summer and Fall of

1970 all public community and junior colleges submitted basic financial data on expenditures for the fiscal year 1969-70.

Full-time equated enrollment data were obtained from official reports submitted by the community colleges to the Michigan Department of Education, Bureau of Higher Education.

#### Data Verification

Both college catalogues and phone calls were used to clarify and verify data submitted by the colleges in the study. Information that appeared to be incomplete or inaccurate was checked by the use of telephone calls to the respondents.

#### Design and Methodology

The first part of this study is basically descriptive. The data are organized to provide a collective, quantified profile of the basic characteristics. The second part of the study is evaluative, and it draws upon aspects of the descriptive data and their corresponding components in the Measures of Library Quality instrument.

#### Preparation and Treatment of Descriptive Data

The descriptive data were prepared and treated using the following general approach. For each item a summary table was prepared which identified each community

college library and listed the pertinent data for that item. Three measures of central tendency were then presented in each table. These include the mean for all colleges, the standard deviation and a mid-range of scores calculated on the basis of plus and minus one-half of the standard deviation. At a glance the reader of the table can determine if any individual college's score falls within the middle third of all community college libraries on that particular item. Finally, for each descriptive item a discussion and interpretation of the data are presented.

#### Part I--General Information

Hours of Operation.--This listing provides data on the number of days which the library is open, the hours per week both supervised and non-supervised, the extent of weeks of service during the year and finally an overall measure of operations which indicates the supervised hours of service on a yearly basis.

Methods of Orientation.--A summary sheet was prepared listing all colleges and the methods of orientation being employed.

#### Part II--Materials

Basic Collections.--This listing provides data on the size of the basic collection, the number of periodical subscriptions and a measure of the relationship of the

collection to the enrollment of the college on a per full-time equated student basis.

Microform Holdings.--A summary sheet was prepared listing the colleges under study and their holdings of microfilm reels, microfilmed periodical titles held and other units of microtext.

Extent of Periodical Depth.--A listing is provided of the reporting colleges' periodical depth at five and ten year levels.

Audio-Visual Holdings.--A listing of the reporting colleges' holdings of audio-visual software and hardware units was prepared.

Circulation Statistics.--A listing is provided of all public community and junior colleges' circulation statistics for the school year 1969-70. Included is a uniform measure of these data relating circulation to the enrollment of college on a full-time equated student basis.

### Part III--Personnel

Professional Staffs.--For each college the number of full-time professional staff and part-time professional staff is provided as well as the total full-time equated professional staff. A measure of the size of the staff as a ratio of the enrollment of the college is provided.

Technicians and Technical Assistants.--A summary sheet was prepared listing all colleges indicating the employment of technicians or technical assistants. The listing provides data on the number of such technical people employed and the full-time equated number of such personnel.

Secretarial/Clerical Staffs and Hourly Assistance.--A listing was prepared for all colleges in the study. This listing provides data on the size of the clerical staff, the student hourly staff and other hourly staff.

Total Library Staff.--This listing provides composite data on total staff combining professional, technical, secretarial/clerical and hourly staff equated to full-time personnel on the basis of a forty-hour work week. Total staff is then related to the college enrollment and a ratio measure of staff to students is determined.

Utilization of Staff Time.--Three summary sheets were prepared listing all colleges in the study. The allocation of staff to learning resources functions on the basis of percentage of staff time is presented. Four basic categories are used: library, audio-visual, programmed learning, and other. Two additional summaries are presented indicating the allocation of library staff time to primary library functions: acquisitions, interpretation and circulation, production, distribution and maintenance.



Administration.--A summary of the administrative organization was prepared from the item in Part III of the questionnaire asking to whom the head of the library reported. The summary presents the totals for all responding colleges as a group and a discussion is presented.

#### Part IV--Financial Data

Library Operational Budgets.--A listing was prepared indicating the total college operating budget, the budget for library operations and the percentage of the library budget to the overall college budget. For each college the library expenditures were related to the enrollment and ratios of expenditures per F.T.E. student were determined.

Allocations of Library Expenditures.--A summary of library expenditure allocations based on eight categories identified in the questionnaire was prepared and included all colleges in the study.

#### Preparation and Treatment of Selected Evaluative Dimensions

Three phases may be identified in the preparation and treatment of the evaluative section of the study:

(1) Administration of the Measures of Library Quality instrument and the structuring of the responses for

criteria selection; (2) organization and treatment of the criteria data with the concomitant identification of the libraries' ranking to the criteria, and (3) identification of high-ranked colleges and derivation of criteria norms for those colleges so identified. Each of the three phases is described in the following sections:

1. Administration of the Measures of Library Quality. For the purpose of obtaining consensual agreement on the evaluative criteria, the second instrument, the Measures of Library Quality, was administered randomly to nine community college librarians and six community college administrators. A copy of the instrument may be found in Appendix B. Each respondent was asked to rank the nine criteria listed in terms of least important to most important "gross measure of library quality." All fifteen subjects responded to the questionnaire. A summary table was prepared listing the responses of the community college librarians and the community college presidents separately. A final consensus table was then prepared indicating the total ranking points for each criteria. An arbitrary cut-off was used and the six highest ranked criteria, i.e., those selected as the most important measures by the panel, were then selected for application for the evaluation of the community college libraries.

## 2. Organization and Treatment of the Criteria

Data. For each of the nine criteria a table was prepared listing the community and junior colleges and the pertinent data required for each criterion. Several sources of data were used. The descriptive data presented in the first part of Chapter IV was the primary source for most of the criteria. Additionally, the following sources were used to provide data for the evaluative criteria:

- A. The catalogs of the institutions were used as a primary source to verify the number of credit courses offered by the college.
- B. Full-time student enrollment data was obtained from official statistics provided by the Bureau of Higher Education of the Michigan Department of Education.
- C. Library space data was extracted from the Inventory of Physical Facilities at Institutions of Higher Education in Michigan Fall 1969.

The criteria are listed below in order of presentation in Chapter IV:

- Criterion 1: Size of the library collection compared to the enrollment of the college and expressed as a ratio.
- Criterion 2: Institutional budget for operations compared to the library's operational

budget and expressed in terms of expenditures per student.

Criterion 3: Total library staff compared to enrollment and expressed as a ratio.

Criterion 4: Circulation transactions compared to enrollment and expressed as a ratio.

Criterion 5: Supervised hours of operation annually compared to all other community college libraries.

Criterion 6: Size of the collection compared to the number of credit courses offered and expressed as a ratio.

Criterion 7: Number of periodical subscriptions compared to the number of credit courses and expressed as a ratio.

Criterion 8: Space assigned for library purposes compared to enrollment and expressed as a ratio.

Criterion 9: Expenditures for books and periodicals compared to enrollment and expressed as a ratio.

The data for all community colleges on each criterion were then statistically analyzed to determine standard scores for each college (Z--scores). Each college receiving a score within the range of  $-.5$  to  $+.5$  was given a ranking

of "average." Beyond  $+ .5$ , the college was ranked "high" and similarly, below  $- .5$  the college was ranked "low" on that particular criterion. Each college received nine individual rankings, one for each criterion. A summary table of the community colleges rankings on the evaluation criteria was prepared and an analysis is presented.

3. Identification of High-Ranked Colleges and Derivation of Criteria Norms. For the identification of the "highest ranked" colleges the rankings of each college were examined on the six criteria selected by the librarians-administrators panel as the "most important" measures of library quality. An arbitrary cut-off of the seven highest ranked colleges, the upper quartile of Michigan's community colleges, was used. The colleges' rankings were examined to determine first those colleges which ranked high on all six of the criteria, then those which ranked high on five of the six criteria and the process was continued until the seven colleges were thus identified. A summary table of the seven colleges and their rankings on the evaluative criteria was prepared and an analysis is presented.

After the identification of the seven highest ranked colleges, a re-examination of the criteria data on these colleges was performed. A comparison is presented between the norms of the selected seven colleges and the norms for all community colleges in the study. An analysis is presented of these comparisons.

Finally, a general analysis is made of all data available on the selected seven colleges to determine what special relationships, if any, exist among those colleges, their libraries and special characteristics of those libraries.

### Summary

Basic data for the study were obtained by the use of a survey instrument developed jointly by community college administrators, researchers in the community college field, and head librarians from Michigan community colleges. A second instrument describing nine possible measures of library quality was mailed to nine head librarians and six community college chief administrators who then ranked the criteria on the basis of their own judgments as to the importance of each criterion as a gross measure of quality of the library.

The methodology of the study involved two stages: (1) the organization, tabulation and analysis of the survey data to provide a collective profile and description of the characteristics of community and junior college libraries in Michigan, and (2) an evaluation of each library on the basis of their rankings on six criteria selected by the panel of administrators and librarians.

Seven community college libraries were identified in the upper quartile of all libraries, and the characteristics

of these colleges were used as the basis for the development of normative data on the six selected criteria.

Beyond those six criteria-based norms, other characteristics of the seven selected colleges were examined, including general characteristics of the institutions and their libraries.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

#### Introduction

In this chapter the descriptive data are presented and an interpretation of the data is provided. Similarly, the evaluative criteria are applied to all of the libraries under study and the identification of the high-ranked libraries is made. Finally, quantitative characteristics of the selected libraries are presented and compared to similar characteristics derived for all of Michigan's community college libraries. Discussion of the data is presented after each statistical presentation.

The analysis of the data is presented in the order in which the original questions, both descriptive and evaluative, were posed in Chapter I.

#### Descriptive Questions

The presentation and analysis of the descriptive data includes all twenty-eight colleges of the study. However, the data for four of the colleges must be viewed with some caution. These colleges include West Shore Community College, Kalamazoo Community College, Kirtland Community



College and Mid-Michigan Community College. All four of these colleges were established prior to 1968 but did not open until September 1968. Consequently, much of the descriptive data which are presented in terms of comparative ratios are somewhat misleading for these four colleges. For all four institutions serious efforts were made by their administrations to build quality library collections and staffs prior to and immediately following the openings of their institutions. Each college has allocated capital outlay monies for library development during these early years, consequently some of the descriptive data ratios and all of the evaluative dimension ratios cannot be compared to the other established libraries. The category, "special," is applied to these newer colleges in the presentation of the data. All four colleges are included in the discussion of new and emerging concepts which is presented in Chapter V of this study.

Question 1: To what extent are these libraries open, and to what extent are these hours of operation professionally supervised?

Data from the study as it pertains to this question are presented in Table 4.1. The data show that more than half of the colleges are open at least one of the two weekend days and five of the colleges are open throughout the week. Most colleges are open at least during the

TABLE 4.1.--Hours of Operation.

College	Days Open	Hours per Week	Supervised Hours	Weeks of Service	Supervised Hours per Year
Alpena	5	50	40	50	2000
Bay De Noc	5	61	40	50	2000
Delta	7	94	89	52	4628
Genesee	7	82.5	69	50	3450
Glen Oaks	5	65	60	52	3120
Gogebic	5	52.5	40	52	2080
Grand Rapids	6	70	70	52	3640
Henry Ford	7	90	90	52	4680
Highland Park	6	60	60	50	3000
Jackson	6	61	40	50	2000
Kalamazoo Valley	5	65	65	52	3380
Kellogg	6	52	49	45	2205
Kirtland	5	65	40	52	2080
Lake Michigan	5	65	65	52	3380
Lansing	6	70	65	46	2990
Macomb County	6	78	78	52	4056
Mid Michigan	6	65	48	52	2496
Monroe County	5	65	65	52	3380
Montcalm	7	69	61	52	3172
Muskegon	6	68.5	64.5	52	3354
North Central Michigan	6	60.5	40	52	2080
Northwestern Michigan	7	78	66	50	3300
Oakland (A.H.)	5	61	51	52	2652
Oakland (H.L.)	5	61	56.5	52	2938
Oakland (O.R.)	5	61	61	52	3172
St. Clair	6	63	63	52	3276
Schoolcraft	6	68.5	60.5	52	3146
Southwestern	6	65	N.R.	52	N.R.
Washtenaw	6	73	35	52	1820
West Shore	5	61	56	52	2912
M=5.8 M=66.7 M=58.2 M=49.4 M=3021					S.D.= 767
					Mid-Range=2637.5-3404.5

weekdays at night and the average for all colleges is slightly more than sixty-six hours, with fifty-eight of these hours under direct professional supervision. The concept of the community college library as a service to the community as well as to the college is empirically supported to some extent by the fact that most of the colleges are operating their libraries throughout the year, regardless of whether classes are in session or not. The view that the availability of a professional librarian is necessary for the effective utilization of the library by students is not supported by any real commitment on the part of the libraries. Only nine of the colleges studied provide professional service during all of the hours the library is open. For a few of the libraries with small staffs this may be a problem of logistics, but several of the large libraries with sufficient professional staffs are not evidencing much commitment to the "librarian as an instructor" concept.

Question 2: For what major service areas do the libraries have responsibility?

The survey instrument asked the colleges to indicate their major areas of responsibility. Almost all of the colleges (26) indicated that these responsibilities included the administration of audio-visual services for the entire college. Generally, the "learning resource center" concept in terms of responsibilities implies,

according to the data, the traditional library services and audio-visual services. Only eight colleges reported any additional responsibilities and these were in the area of programmed learning. Three colleges reported additional responsibilities, one for administration of the planetarium and two in the area of auto-tutorial instruction.

Question 3: What methods of orientation are employed by the libraries to instruct students in library use?

The data are presented in Table 4.2 and indicate the responses of the libraries. The two most often used methods are orientation sessions and guided tours, both of which may be described as traditional college library approaches. About three-fourths of the libraries have either developed their own handbook for students or make use of a general student handbook by including some information about the library. Some of the colleges use formalized classes usually as part of freshman English courses. Most of the libraries tend to use a combination of traditional methods, however, four colleges, Monroe, Macomb, Washtenaw, and Lansing report use of prepared audio-visual presentations. Additionally, three colleges, Grand Rapids, Muskegon, and Lansing report use of research-type exercises to be used by students to familiarize themselves with library procedures for research.

TABLE 4.2.--Methods of Orientation.

College	Orientation Sessions	Classes	Guided Tours	Hand- books
Alpena	X			X
Bay De Noc	X		X	X
Delta	X		X	X
Genesee	X	X	X	X
Glen Oaks	X	X	X	
Gogebic	X	X	X	
Grand Rapids	X	X		
Henry Ford			X	X
Highland Park	X	X	X	X
Jackson	X	X	X	X
Kalamazoo	X		X	
Kellogg	X		X	X
Kirtland	X		X	X
Lake Michigan			X	X
Lansing	X	X		X
Macomb County	X		X	X
Mid Michigan	X		X	
Monroe County	X		X	X
Montcalm	X		X	
Muskegon	X	X	X	X
North Central Michigan		X		
Northwestern Michigan				X
Oakland (A.H.)			X	X
Oakland (H.L.)	X	X	X	X
Oakland (O.R.)	X	X	X	X
St. Clair	X		X	X
Schoolcraft	X	X	X	X
Southwestern	X	X	X	
Washtenaw	X			X
West Shore	X	X	X	X

Question 4: What is the extent of the library's collection? What is the size of its basic collection? What are its holdings in periodicals, microform, audio-visual equipment and materials?

The data corresponding to these related questions on the holdings of the libraries under study are presented in Tables 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6. The basic collections are described in Table 4.3 and the data suggest a considerable range in size of the collections. The largest library in the state among community colleges is Genesee which shares its collection with a branch of the University of Michigan and receives financial assistance for acquisitions from the university. Excluding the four new colleges that are currently building their basic collections, the smallest collections exceed 13,000 volumes and the mean for all community college libraries is well above the A.L.A. standards for a basic collection. As one might expect, the schools with the larger enrollments tend to have larger library collections; however, the data on volumes per full-time equated student suggest that there is considerable variation from college to college. Some larger, older schools appear to have smaller libraries than one might expect for their enrollment size and several smaller, newer schools, such as Montcalm, Glen Oaks and Washtenaw, have developed sizeable collections in a rather short period of time.

TABLE 4.3.--Basic Collections

College	Volumes	Periodicals	F.T.E. Enrollment	Volumes per F.T.E.
Alpena	14,511	325	821	18
Bay De Noc	16,000	150	602	27
Delta	71,324	356	3,987	18
Genesee	95,435	507	4,370	22
Glen Oaks	14,357	305	571	25
Gogebic	15,975	172	517	31
Grand Rapids	33,000	229	4,040	8
Henry Ford	60,972	766	5,991	10
Highland Park	18,153	245	2,646	7
Jackson	18,259	223	2,159	9
Kalamazoo Valley	12,455	540	1,673	7*
Kellogg	25,702	304	1,915	13
Kirtland	20,000	300	252	79*
Lake Michigan	30,000	350	1,462	21
Lansing	41,500	433	3,975	10
Macomb County	70,000	642	8,939	8
Mid Michigan	10,073	183	371	27*
Monroe County	31,655	296	1,118	28
Montcalm	14,225	238	541	26
Muskegon	27,032	324	2,543	11
North Central Michigan	16,508	143	548	30
Northwestern Michigan	29,568	310	1,173	25
Oakland (A.H.)	24,354	539	8,870	10
Oakland (H.L.)	28,630	350	Oakland	Oakland
Oakland (O.R.)	32,058	684	Com- bined	Com- bined
St. Clair	24,339	412	1,904	13
Schoolcraft	41,103	572	3,395	12
Southwestern	13,365	203	685	20
Washtenaw	29,351	457	2,227	13
West Shore	3,400	234	221	15*
	M=29,443	M=360		M=17.3 S.D.= 7.7 Mid-Range=14.3-21.1

\* Special Category--See Discussion.

The use of microform as a means of collection development as well as a space saving device appears to be a method employed by many of the community college libraries in Michigan. Table 4.4 indicates that twenty-seven of the thirty libraries report some microform holdings, with twenty-five colleges having periodicals on microfilm. Ten of the colleges report in excess of one hundred periodical titles on microfilm.

Periodical depth described in Terms of five and ten-year "runs" is indicated in Table 4.5. It would appear that many of the colleges, including several of the newer colleges such as Washtenaw, Schoolcraft, and Glen Oaks which were established within the past ten years, have developed considerable depth to their periodical holdings. There seems to be exceptional depth for some of the larger community college libraries, including Genesee, Macomb, Delta, Grand Rapids, Oakland and Schoolcraft. Generally, the data suggest that the older, larger libraries are developing substantial depth to their periodical holdings, as one might expect, but the recent advent of microfilm and the availability of periodicals in this form makes it possible for smaller and newer libraries to develop sizeable periodical collections quickly and at reasonable cost. One can conclude that this is occurring in Michigan's community colleges.



TABLE 4.4.--Microform Holdings.

College	Microfilm Reels	Periodical Titles Held	Other Units of Microtext
Alpena	1533	--	--
Delta	4575	194	15
Genesee	3735	114	9355
Glen Oaks	1863	184	--
Grand Rapids	1000	41	--
Henry Ford	854	--	1750
Highland Park	1677	123	--
Jackson	2300	65	--
Kalamazoo Valley	1273	60	--
Kellogg	1263	104	23
Kirtland	655	33	--
Lansing	818	19	--
Macomb	2989	79	45
Mid Michigan	365	35	--
Monroe	1698	148	160
Montcalm	1587	27	--
Muskegon	1311	101	--
North Central Michigan	1383	18	--
Northwestern Michigan	5000	42	300
Oakland (A.H.)	4447	239	4
Oakland (H.L.)	2415	170	--
Oakland (O.R.)	2851	178	101
St. Clair	1783	22	--
Schoolcraft	2055	27	50
Southwestern	535	33	--
Washtenaw	1824	205	271
West Shore	210	14	--

TABLE 4.5.--Periodical Depth.

College	Five-Year Runs	Ten-Year Runs
Bay De Noc	10	--
Delta	64	166
Genesee	286	293
Glen Oaks	173	32
Gogebic	18	16
Grand Rapids	188	197
Highland Park	110	89
Jackson	70	40
Kalamazoo Valley	50	40
Kellogg	128	88
Kirtland	33	10
Lake Michigan	85	61
Lansing	175	73
Macomb	235	105
Mid Michigan	45	13
Monroe	140	7
Montcalm	23	8
Muskegon	121	10
North Central Michigan	82	32
Northwestern Michigan	128	78
Oakland (A.H.)	220	186
Oakland (H.L.)	155	115
Oakland (O.R.)	40	138
St. Clair	84	50
Schoolcraft	327	86
Washtenaw	185	117
West Shore	9	4

Since almost all of the libraries indicate responsibility for audio-visual services, it would be expected that these libraries would indicate considerable holdings of software (films, filmstrips, records, tapes, slides, transparencies and the like), and hardware (audio-visual equipment such as projectors, phonographs, tape recorders and the like). Table 4.6 describes the holdings of the various libraries. Although there is a wide range among the libraries in their audio-visual holdings, the data suggest that most of the colleges have made a considerable financial commitment to acquisitions of this type of media. Several of the larger libraries indicate extensive holdings, including Genesee, the Orchard Ridge campus of Oakland, Kalamazoo, Macomb, Kellogg, Lansing, and the other two campuses of Oakland. Some of the smaller college libraries, including Muskegon, West Shore, Montcalm, and Monroe, have developed sizeable software collections in the audio-visual field.

Question 5: What are the circulation statistics and related data for the library?

The extent to which a library is used may be measured in several ways. Since all of the libraries in the study maintain circulation data, the survey asked for the circulation of printed materials for each college. Table 4.7 summarizes the responses for each college and

TABLE 4.6.--Audio-Visual Software and Hardware Holdings.

College	Software Units	Hardware Units
Alpena	600	30
Delta	600	360
Genesee	22,750	258
Glen Oaks	3,760	92
Gogebic	175	63
Grand Rapids	655	185
Highland Park	2,592	*
Jackson	1,225	*
Kalamazoo Valley	11,000	200
Kellogg	4,738	111
Kirtland	400	20
Lake Michigan	160	106
Lansing	2,100	265
Macomb	2,538	725
Mid Michigan	673	47
Monroe	3,000	350
Montcalm	868	44
Muskegon	1,846	132
North Central Michigan	400	31
Northwestern Michigan	500	15
Oakland (A.H.)	7,641	172
Oakland (H.L.)	10,709	379
Oakland (O.R.)	31,538	900
St. Clair	2,259	166
Schoolcraft	8,307	193
Southwestern	350	80
Washtenaw	6,179	950
West Shore	1,657	94

\* Junior college uses school district audio-visual center.

TABLE 4.7.--Circulation Statistics.

College	Annual Circulation	Circulation per F.T.E.
Alpena	12,844	15.6
Bay De Noc	10,000	16.6
Delta	43,000	10.8
Genesee	82,221	18.8
Glen Oaks	14,498	25.4
Gogebic	9,617	18.6
Grand Rapids	12,843	3.2
Henry Ford	101,657	17.0
Highland Park	9,481	3.6
Jackson	28,600	13.2
Kalamazoo Valley	24,274	14.5
Kellogg	17,622	9.2
Kirtland	3,500	13.9
Lake Michigan	38,918	26.6
Lansing	48,007	12.1
Macomb	86,833	9.7
Mid Michigan	2,981	8.0
Monroe	16,866	15.1
Montcalm	7,482	13.8
Muskegon	27,786	10.9
North Central Michigan	3,500	6.4
Northwestern Michigan	10,900	9.3
Oakland	33,981	3.8
St. Clair	24,856	13.1
Schoolcraft	34,423	10.1
Southwestern	3,975	5.8
Washtenaw	12,024	5.4
West Shore	488	2.2
		M=11.9
		S.D.= 6.4
		Mid-Range=8.7-15.1

indicates a ratio between circulation and student enrollment. Again, excluding the four new colleges, the range of circulation per student is considerable among the twenty-four established libraries. Two colleges, Glen Oaks and Lake Michigan, exceed twenty-five volumes per student per year while three of the colleges circulate less than four volumes per student. There appears to be no relationship between the size of the student body or the size of the library's collection and its circulation. Other variables are obviously operating to enhance or depress circulation but are not within the realm of this study. One of the most important variables is obviously the extent to which faculty encourage library use by the teaching methods that they employ.

Question 6: What are the professional and auxiliary staffing patterns in these libraries?

Five tables have been prepared that present the data on staffing patterns. The first of these, Table 4.8, lists the professional staffs including part-time, full-time, and equated full-time. Six of the libraries have less than two professional librarians, and again a considerable range is indicated among the colleges in the sizes of their professional staffs. As might be expected, there appears to be a high correlation between the size of the college and the number of professional staff

TABLE 4.8.--Professional Staffs.

College	Full Time	Part Time	F.T.E.	Ratio: Staff to Students
Alpena	2	0	2	1:411
Bay De Noc	1	1	1.5	1:401
Delta	5	0	5	1:797
Genesee	9	1	9.5	1:460
Glen Oaks	1	2	2	1:286
Gogebic	1	0	1	1:517
Grand Rapids	4	0	4	1:1010
Henry Ford	6	5	8	1:749
Highland Park	2	1	2.5	1:1058
Jackson	3	0	3	1:720
Kalamazoo Valley	5	0	5	1:335
Kellogg	4	0	4	1:479
Kirtland	1	0	1	1:252
Lake Michigan	3	0	3	1:487
Lansing	6	1	6.5	1:612
Macomb County	8	1	8.5	1:1052
Mid Michigan	2	0	2	1:186
Monroe County	5	1	5.1	1:219
Montcalm	2	0	2	1:271
Muskegon	5	0	5	1:509
North Central Michigan	1	0	1	1:548
Northwestern Michigan	2	0	2	1:587
Oakland (A.H.)	5	0	5	1:771
Oakland (H.L.)	3	0	3	Oakland Combined
Oakland (O.R.)	3	1	3.5	
St. Clair	4	2	4.5	1:423
Schoolcraft	6	0	6	1:566
Southwestern	1	0	1	1:685
Wahstenaw	4	0	4	1:557
West Shore	2	0	2	1:111
				M=1:591
				S.D.= 225
				Mid-Range=478.5-703.5

employed. If one accepts the thesis that the professional is a primary resource to the students, then it would follow that the more students that are using the library, the greater the need for professional librarians. Across all community college libraries studied, the mean ratio of professional staff to students is approximately one to six hundred full-time equated students. However, several libraries exceed one thousand students per professional librarian. All three of these libraries are older, established schools with medium to large enrollments. A question may be raised regarding the size of a professional staff that is needed when a community college's enrollment growth and library development reaches a certain level. Does the professional staffing tend to "level off" after a college enrollment begins to exceed several thousand students because of a general attitude that "we have enough librarians" or because the size of the total library staff (including support personnel) reaches a level where library instructional services to students can be maintained regardless of the size of the enrollment? In general, Table 4.8 suggests that as the colleges become larger the ratio of professional staff to students tends to decrease.

The employment of library technicians is described in Table 4.9. Fourteen colleges employ technicians in



TABLE 4.9.--Employment of Technicians and Technical Assistants.\*

College	Number Employed	F.T.E.
Alpena	1	1
Delta	3	3
Henry Ford	1	1
Kalamazoo Valley	2	2
Lake Michigan	4	2
Lansing	12	11.75
Macomb County	2	1.5
Monroe County	3	1.5
Muskegon	1	.5
Oakland (A.H.)	3	3
Oakland (H.L.)	2	2
Oakland (O.R.)	6	6
Southwestern	1	1
Washtenaw	3	3

\* Only colleges reporting the use of technicians are listed.

their libraries with the Orchard Ridge campus of Oakland and Lansing Community College employing slightly less than half of these technicians. Since there are only a few two-year library technician programs in the State and very few graduates, the fact that there are forty-three technicians employed is somewhat impressive. Over a period of time a study of the development of such programs and their effect on community college staffing patterns might be extremely valuable.

The employment of other support personnel is described in Table 4.10. As might be expected, the large libraries tend to employ considerable numbers of both clerical staff and student hourly assistance. These schools include: Delta, Genesee, Macomb, Oakland, St. Clair, and Washtenaw, all of which are medium to large-sized schools. Table 4.11 describes the total library staffs for each college with hourly assistance equated on the basis of a forty-hour week. Fifteen of the libraries, slightly more than half, employ at least two support personnel for every professional librarian. Six of these exceed three support personnel and two, Delta and Washtenaw, exceed a ratio of four support personnel for each professional. If one accepts a minimum ratio of two support persons for each professional, a rock-bottom minimum standard in the library field, then almost half the community college

TABLE 4.10.--Secretarial/Clerical Staffs and Hourly Assistance.

College	Secretarial/ Clerical	Student Hourly	Other Hourly
Alpena	--	4,596	603
Bay De Noc	1	3,600	--
Delta	5	25,720	--
Genesee	14	16,364	3,521
Glen Oaks	2	4,694	--
Gogebic	2.2	2,470	150
Grand Rapids	1.6	5,000	--
Henry Ford	--	7,607	2,636
Highland Park	3	3,750	--
Jackson	1	2,800	--
Kalamazoo Valley	5	6,240	--
Kellogg	1	10,131	--
Kirtland	1.5	270	--
Lake Michigan	1	13,038	--
Lansing	2	15,160	--
Macomb	14	15,805	--
Mid Michigan	1	4,200	--
Monroe	5	9,591	2,080
Montcalm	1	4,276	400
Muskegon	7	10,209	--
North Central Michigan	1	450	--
Northwestern Michigan	2	2,080	2,525
Oakland (A.H.)	2	9,025	--
Oakland (H.L.)	4	7,220	--
Oakland (O.R.)	8	9,486	--
St. Clair	4	11,271	--
Schoolcraft	4.5	10,000	--
Southwestern	--	4,588	128
Washtenaw	9.75	10,274	--
West Shore	1	2,252	--

TABLE 4.11.--Total Library Staffs.

College	Equated Professional	Equated Technical	Equated Clerical	Equated Hourly	Ratio: Total Staff to Students
Alpena	2	1		2.6	1-147
Bay De Noc	1.5		1	1.8	1-140
Delta	5	3	5	12.4	1-157
Genesee	9.5		14	9.9	1-131
Glen Oaks	2		2	2.3	1- 91
Gogebic	1		2.2	1.3	1-115
Grand Rapids	4		1.6	2.4	1-505
Henry Ford	8	1		4.9	1-431
Highland Park	2.5		3	1.9	1-358
Jackson	3		1	1.4	1-400
Kalamazoo Valley	5	2	5	3.0	1-111
Kellogg	4		1	5.6	1-181
Kirtland	1		1.5	.1	1- 97
Lake Michigan	3	2	1	6.3	1-119
Lansing	6.5	11.75	2	8.2	1-139
Macomb County	8.5	1.5	14	7.6	1-283
Mid Michigan	2		1	2.0	1- 74
Monroe County	5.1	1.5	5	5.6	1- 65
Montcalm	2		1	2.2	1-104
Muskegon	5	.5	7	4.9	1-146
North Central Michigan	1		1	.2	1-249
Northwestern Michigan	2		2	2.3	1-186
Oakland	11.5	11	14	12.4	1-181
St. Clair	4.5		4	5.4	1-140
Schoolcraft	6		4.5	4.8	1-222
Southwestern	1	1		2.3	1-159
Washtenaw	4	3	9.75	4.9	1-103
West Shore	2		1	1.1	1- 54

M=1:192

S.D.=1:115

Mid-Range=134.5-249.5

libraries in Michigan are over-staffed professionally or at the very least, professionals are being used for technical or lower level services. It should be noted that the number of professionals in most colleges includes an audio-visual specialist and the "two support persons" criteria should be examined in light of that fact.

Question 7: How is the library staff time utilized?

It was previously found that almost all libraries indicate responsibility for the administration of audio-visual services. Table 4.12 describes the estimates made by the responding libraries of the allocation of total library staff time to the various services of the library. The means for all colleges indicate that although the concept of the learning resource center is expanding in the community college field, the large majority of staff time is still devoted primarily to administration of the traditional library. Approximately one-fourth of staff time is allocated to audio-visual services and very little time is allocated to other functions. Eleven colleges exceed twenty per cent of their staff time allocated to audio-visual services. Regardless of what the learning resource center is called, it would appear that for the most part it is still a library.

Tables 4.13 and 4.14 indicate the allocations of staff time to library services and audio-visual services.

TABLE 4.12.--Allocation of Staff Time to L.R.C. Functions.

College	Library	A.V.	Programmed Learning	Other
Alpena	75%	25%	0%	0%
Bay De Noc	80	20	0	0
Delta	80	20	0	0
Genesee	93	7	0	0
Glen Oaks	85	15	0	0
Gogebic	85	15	0	0
Grand Rapids	95	5	0	0
Henry Ford	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
Highland Park	95	4	0	1
Jackson	90	10	0	0
Kalamazoo Valley	65	35	0	0
Kellogg	65	35	0	0
Kirtland	75	25	0	0
Lake Michigan	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
Lansing	51	21	24	4
Macomb	33 1/3	33 1/3	33 1/3	0
Mid Michigan	75	20	5	0
Monroe	60	40	0	0
Montcalm	75	25	0	0
Muskegon	80	20	0	0
North Central Michigan	98	2	0	0
Northwestern Michigan	96	2	0	0
Oakland (A.H.)	70	25	5	0
Oakland (H.L.)	57	42	1	0
Oakland (O.R.)	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
St. Clair	80	20	0	0
Schoolcraft	80	20	0	0
Southwestern	35	65	0	0
Washtenaw	68	32	0	0
West Shore	65	35	0	0
Totals	M=74%	M=23%	M=2.5%	M=.5%

TABLE 4.13.--Allocation of Library Staff Time by Function.

College	Acqui- sitions	Interpre- tation	Circu- lation
Alpena	50%	25%	25%
Bay De Noc	45	20	35
Delta	10	90	0
Genesee	43	40	17
Glen Oaks	50	35	15
Gogebic	70	20	10
Grand Rapids	70	15	15
Henry Ford	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
Highland Park	50	35	15
Jackson	35	25	40
Kalamazoo Valley	40	25	35
Kellogg	50	15	35
Kirtland	50	25	25
Lake Michigan	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
Lansing	43	17	40
Macomb	33 1/3	33 1/3	33 1/3
Mid Michigan	50	40	10
Monroe	15	60	25
Montcalm	30	40	30
Muskegon	58	33	9
North Central Michigan	60	20	20
Northwestern Michigan	75	20	5
Oakland (A.H.)	35	60	5
Oakland (H.L.)	56	24	20
Oakland (O.R.)	50	30	20
St. Clair	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
Schoolcraft	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
Southwestern	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
Washtenaw	72	8	20
West Shore	40	50	10
Totals	M=47%	M=32%	M=21%

Approximately half of the total library staff time is devoted to acquisitions, another third is devoted to interpretation and the balance to circulation. There are some wide variations when one examines the individual colleges, however. Three colleges, Delta, Monroe and Montcalm, appear to emphasize interpretation and allocate minimum staff time to acquisitions. This is also true of one of the campuses of Oakland Community College, Auburn Hills.

The allocations of audio-visual staff time as described in Table 4.14 suggest that no one function dominates the allocation. Acquisitions, production and distribution each receive about one-fourth of the staff time allocations. Ironically, interpretation receives only fifteen per cent, and one of the areas of audio-visual services for instruction that has been highlighted in the literature is the problem of teaching teachers how to effectively use audio-visual and multi-media approaches. The data suggest a minimum amount of time is being allocated by most of the libraries to deal with this problem. Only Glen Oaks Community College appears to be allocating substantial staff time to interpretation.

Question 8: What is the relationship between the head of the library and the administration of the college?



TABLE 4.14.--Allocation of A.V. Staff by Function.\*

College	Acqui- sitions	Inter- pretation	Pro- duction	Distri- bution	Mainte- nance
Alpena	75%	10%	5%	10%	0%
Bay De Noc	25	30	5	10	30
Delta	0	5	65	30	0
Genesee	15	15	25	25	20
Glen Oaks	30	50	8	10	2
Gogebic	70	10	10	8	2
Grand Rapids	10	10	10	50	10
Highland Park	75	5	5	10	5
Jackson	65	25	0	8	2
Kalamazoo Valley	40	10	20	20	20
Kellogg	15	10	40	30	5
Kirtland	30	10	10	30	20
Lansing	7	5	50	28	10
Macomb	20	20	20	20	20
Monroe	5	5	65	15	10
Montcalm	5	10	0	55	30
Muskegon	25	25	10	35	5
Northwestern Michigan	0	0	50	50	0
Oakland (A.H.)	0	10	60	20	10
Oakland (H.L.)	30	11	18	28	13
Oakland (O.R.)	10	20	40	20	10
St. Clair	20	5	20	50	5
Southwestern	10	20	20	10	5
Wahstenaw	15	5	50	25	5
West Shore	35	25	15	25	0
Totals	M=25%	M=15%	M=25%	M=25%	M=10%

\* Only colleges reporting are listed.

The head librarians were asked to indicate the title of the administrator to whom they reported. Table 4.15 summarizes the responses.

TABLE 4.15. Administrative Process.

Reports to	Number of Respondents
President	12
Chief Administrator of a Campus	4
Academic Dean	12
Administrative Assistant to President	1

More than half of the head librarians report directly to the chief administrator of the college or the chief administrator of the campus in a multi-campus operation. The analysis of the individual responses indicates with very few exceptions that in the larger schools the head of the library reports directly to the chief academic officer and in the smaller schools he reports directly to the president.

Question 9: What is the relative size of the library operational budgets to institutional budgets? What is the relationship of the library budget to the enrollment of the college?

The data pertaining to these two related questions are presented in Table 4.16, and were extracted from Bureau 11

TABLE 4.16.--Library Operational Budgets 1969-1970.

College	College Budget	Library Budget	Per Cent	Expenditures per F.T.E.
Alpena	\$1,313,516	\$42,752	3.3%	\$52.07
Bay De Noc	763,000	39,000	5.1	64.78
Delta	5,772,700	208,900	3.6	52.40
Genesee	6,465,247	218,702	3.4	50.05
Glen Oaks	927,000	36,000	3.9	63.05
Gogebic	629,000	29,897	4.8	57.83
Grand Rapids	4,031,571	115,505	2.9	28.59
Henry Ford	6,732,763	244,399	3.6	40.79
Highland Park	3,475,000	75,948	2.2	28.70
Jackson	2,817,677	93,853	3.3	43.47
Kalamazoo Valley	2,205,989	164,342	7.4	98.23*
Kellogg	2,382,098	111,941	4.7	58.45
Kirtland	388,700	23,200	6.0	92.06*
Lake Michigan	1,855,405	86,317	4.7	59.04
Lansing	4,504,857	177,840	3.9	44.74
Macomb County	10,912,803	322,468	3.0	36.08
Mid Michigan	623,696	94,369	15.1	254.36*
Monroe County	1,838,000	125,000	6.8	111.80
Montcalm	853,402	46,794	5.5	86.50
Muskegon	3,082,272	136,509	4.4	53.68
North Central Michigan	675,489	31,436	4.7	57.36
Northwestern Michigan	1,452,820	67,930	4.7	57.91
Oakland	13,080,392	613,194	4.7	69.13
St. Clair	2,784,940	93,317	3.4	49.01
Schoolcraft	4,759,755	187,217	3.9	55.14
Southwestern	959,947	24,184	2.5	35.31
Washtenaw	4,356,595	218,703	5.0	98.21
West Shore	568,000	42,000	7.4	190.05*
		\$3,671,717	M=4.8%	M=\$56.42
				S.D.= 19.47
				Mid-Range=46.68-66.16

of the Budget reports submitted by the individual colleges during the fiscal year 1970. Excluding the four newer colleges which have been allocating capital outlay and other special monies for development of their libraries, the average of institutional operational budgets allocated for library operations falls just slightly short of five per cent for all colleges studied. The recommended standards of the American Library Association is a five per cent minimum which was rejected by many community college administrators on the basis that it was unrealistically high. Yet in Michigan, on the basis of the 1969-70 data presented in Table 4.16, the community colleges are allocating relatively substantial financial resources to their library operations, in excess of three and one-half million dollars in fiscal year 1970. However, it should be noted that the 4.8 per cent average for the State includes audio-visual operations which is not included in the A.L.A. standard. The range is considerable, however, with three colleges allocating less than three per cent and four schools exceeding five per cent. All four of the newer colleges are making efforts to develop their libraries according to the financial data. Expenditures on the basis of full-time equated students indicates that Michigan's community colleges expend on the average of \$56.42 per student yearly, with a range of \$28.70 for the

lowest school to \$98.21 for the highest. If one accepts the A.L.A. standard as a general guideline, then it must be concluded that there is a strong financial commitment to libraries among most community college governing boards and administrators.

Question 10: How is the library budget allocated to the various operations within the library?

The data pertaining to this question are presented below in Table 4.17 and is a summary of the responses of the twenty-four established community college libraries.

TABLE 4.17.--Allocations of Library Expenditures.

Category	Per Cent of Library Budget
1. Salaries	52.9%
2. Books	22.1
3. Hourly Wages	8.2
4. Periodicals	3.6
5. Audio-Visual Software	3.1
6. Audio-Visual Hardware	2.3
7. Audio-Visual Rentals	.7
8. Other Supplies and Materials	6.1

The major library expense, as one might expect, is in the area of salaries with slightly more than half the operational budget allocated to salaries for the library

staff. If hourly wages are included, total salaries account for more than sixty per cent of the average budget. For acquisitions of books and periodicals, approximately one-fourth of the operational budget is allocated. Audio-visual acquisitions account for slightly more than six per cent as does the category, other supplies and materials. (It should be noted that Lansing Community College has a separate budget for audio-visual acquisitions and staff.) In general, the major operational costs for most of the community college libraries is in the areas of salaries and acquisitions of books and periodicals; these two categories account for eighty-seven per cent of all operational expenditures.

#### Evaluative Dimensions

Question 11: What is the relationship between the size of the library's collection and the enrollment of the college?

The data pertaining to this question are presented in Table 4.18. The statistical comparison is made on the basis of volumes held per full-time equated student. Excluding the four special schools, the mean for all colleges is 17.3 volumes per student. Except for Genesee Community College, which has an exceptionally large collection because of its relationship with the University of Michigan, the highest ranked are small to medium-sized

TABLE 4.18.--Criterion 1--Comparison of Basic Collection to Equated Enrollment.

College	Volumes	Equated Enrollment	Volumes per F.T.E.	Z Score	Rank
Alpena	14,511	821	18	.09	Average
Bay De Noc	16,000	602	27	1.25	High
Delta	71,324	3,987	18	.09	Average
Genesee	95,435	4,370	22	.61	High
Glen Oaks	14,357	571	25	1.00	High
Gogebic	15,975	517	31	1.78	High
Grand Rapids	33,000	4,040	8	-1.21	Low
Henry Ford	60,972	5,991	10	-.95	Low
Highland Park	18,153	2,646	7	-1.34	Low
Jackson	18,259	2,159	9	-1.08	Low
Kalamazoo Valley	12,455	1,673	7	Special	--
Kellogg	25,702	1,915	13	-.56	Low
Kirtland	20,000	252	79	Special	--
Lake Michigan	30,000	1,462	21	.48	Average
Lansing	41,500	3,975	10	-.95	Low
Macomb County	70,000	8,939	8	-1.21	Low
Mid Michigan	10,073	371	27	Special	--
Monroe County	31,655	1,118	28	1.39	High
Montcalm	14,225	541	26	1.13	High
Muskegon	27,032	2,543	11	-.82	Low
North Central Michigan	16,508	548	30	1.65	High
Northwestern Michigan	29,568	1,173	25	1.00	High
Oakland	85,042	8,870	10	-.95	Low
St. Clair	24,339	1,904	13	-.56	Low
Schoolcraft	41,103	3,395	12	-.69	Low
Southwestern	13,365	685	20	.35	Average
Washtenaw	29,351	2,227	13	-.56	Low
West Shore	3,400	221	15	Special	--

M=17.3

S.D.= 7.7

Mid-Range=13.9-20.7

colleges. High-ranked libraries include both upper peninsula colleges, Gogebic and Bay De Noc, as well as Glen Oaks, Monroe, Montcalm and Northwestern Michigan. If the A.L.A. standard of 20,000 volumes is used as a guideline, sixteen of the Michigan community colleges exceed the minimum.

Question 12: What is the relationship between the library's expenditures and the enrollment of the college?

The data pertaining to this question are presented in Table 4.19. The statistical comparison is made on the basis of yearly expenditures per full-time equated student. The data reveal a considerable range among the colleges with Monroe spending more than \$110 per student on the high end and Grand Rapids Junior College spending less than \$30 per student. Other high ranked colleges include: Washtenaw at \$98.21 per student, and Montcalm at \$86.50 per student. There appears to be no relationship between either the size or age of the college and its expenditures on a per student basis.

Question 13: What is the relationship between the size of the library staff and the enrollment of the college?

The data pertaining to this question are presented in Table 4.20. The statistical comparison is made on the basis of the number of full-time equated students to total



TABLE 4.19.--Criterion 2--Comparison of Library Budget to College Budget.

College	Library Budget	Per Cent of College Budget	Expenditures per F.T.E.	Z Score	Rank
Alpena	\$42,752	3.3%	\$52.07	- .22	Average
Bay De Noc	39,000	5.1	64.78	.43	Average
Delta	208,900	3.6	52.40	- .21	Average
Genesee	218,702	3.4	50.05	- .32	Average
Glen Oaks	36,000	3.9	63.05	.34	Average
Gogebic	29,897	4.8	57.83	.07	Average
Grand Rapids	115,505	2.9	28.59	-1.43	Low
Henry Ford	244,399	3.6	40.79	- .80	Low
Highland Park	75,948	2.2	28.70	-1.42	Low
Jackson	93,853	3.3	43.47	- .67	Low
Kalamazoo Valley	164,342	7.4	98.23	Special	--
Kellogg	111,941	4.7	58.45	.10	Average
Kirtland	23,200	6.0	92.06	Special	--
Lake Michigan	86,317	4.7	59.04	.13	Average
Lansing	177,840	3.9	44.74	- .60	Low
Macomb County	322,468	3.0	36.08	-1.04	Low
Mid Michigan	94,369	15.1	254.36	Special	--
Monroe County	125,000	6.8	111.80	2.84	High
Montcalm	46,794	5.5	86.50	1.54	High
Muskegon	136,509	4.4	53.68	- .14	Average
North Central Michigan	31,436	4.7	57.36	.05	Average
Northwestern Michigan	67,930	4.7	57.91	.08	Average
Oakland	613,194	4.7	69.13	.65	High
St. Clair	93,317	3.4	49.01	- .38	Average
Schoolcraft	187,217	3.9	55.14	- .07	Average
Southwestern	24,184	2.5	35.31	-1.08	Low
Washtenaw	218,703	5.0	98.21	2.15	High
West Shore	42,000	7.4	190.05	Special	--
M=4.8%                      M=56.42 S.D.=19.47 Mid-Range=46.68-66.16					

TABLE 4.20.--Criterion 3--Comparison of Total Library Staff to Equated Enrollment.

College	Library Staff	Equated Enrollment	Ratio	Z Score	Rank
Alpena	5.6	821	1:147	- .39	Average
Bay De Noc	4.3	602	1:140	- .45	Average
Delta	25.4	3,987	1:157	- .30	Average
Genesee	33.4	4,370	1:131	- .53	High
Glen Oaks	6.3	571	1:91	- .88	High
Gogebic	4.5	517	1:115	- .67	High
Grand Rapids	8.0	4,040	1:505	2.73	Low
Henry Ford	13.9	5,991	1:431	2.08	Low
Highland Park	7.4	2,646	1:358	1.45	Low
Jackson	5.4	2,159	1:400	1.81	Low
Kalamazoo Valley	15.0	1,673	1:111	Special	--
Kellogg	10.6	1,915	1:181	.10	Average
Kirtland	2.6	252	1:97	Special	--
Lake Michigan	12.3	1,462	1:119	- .63	High
Lansing	28.5	3,975	1:139	- .46	Average
Macomb County	31.6	8,939	1:283	.79	Low
Mid Michigan	5.0	371	1:74	Special	--
Monroe County	17.2	1,118	1:65	-1.11	High
Montcalm	5.2	541	1:104	- .77	High
Muskegon	17.4	2,543	1:146	- .40	Average
North Central Michigan	2.2	548	1:249	.49	Average
Northwestern Michigan	6.3	1,173	1:186	- .05	Average
Oakland	48.9	8,870	1:181	- .10	Average
St. Clair	13.9	1,904	1:140	- .45	Average
Schoolcraft	15.3	3,395	1:122	- .61	High
Southwestern	4.3	685	1:159	- .29	Average
Washtenaw	21.7	2,227	1:103	- .78	High
West Shore	4.1	221	1:54	Special	

M=1:192

S.D.= 114

Mid-Range= 135-249

library staff expressed as a ratio. As was previously discussed, the make-up of the library staff for each college in terms of professional and support staff varies considerably among the colleges. However, the statistical measure used for this criterion, total equated staff, assumes that all library staff are service personnel working in some organized team approach to provide library service to students and faculty primarily and community secondarily. On this basis the data suggest that the mean for all colleges is approximately one full-time staff person for every two hundred students. Most of the colleges fall within the mid-range of 135 to 249 or close to it. Some of the more exceptional colleges in terms of staff include: Glen Oaks, Monroe, Washtenaw, Montcalm, Lake Michigan, and Gogebic, which have one staff member for one hundred twenty students or less.

Question 14: What is the relationship between the circulation data and the enrollment of the college?

The data pertaining to this question are presented in Table 4.21. The statistical comparison is made between the annual circulation statistics for each college and the enrollment expressed in terms of circulation per full-time equated student. It is recognized that the basic circulation data include faculty and community use of the college library; however, this criterion assumes that the vast

TABLE 4.21.--Criterion 4--Comparison of Circulation to Equated Enrollment.

College	Annual Circulation	Equated Enrollment	Circulation per Student	Z Score	Rank
Alpena	12,844	821	15.6	.59	High
Bay De Noc	10,000	602	16.6	.75	High
Delta	43,000	3,987	10.8	-.16	Average
Genesee	82,221	4,370	18.8	1.09	High
Glen Oaks	14,498	571	25.4	2.13	High
Gogebic	9,617	517	18.6	1.06	High
Grand Rapids	12,843	4,040	3.2	-1.36	Low
Henry Ford	101,657	5,991	17.0	.81	High
Highland Park	9,481	2,646	3.6	-1.30	Low
Jackson	28,600	2,159	13.2	.21	Average
Kalamazoo Valley	24,274	1,673	14.5	Special	--
Kellogg	17,622	1,915	9.2	-.41	Average
Kirtland	3,500	252	13.9	Special	--
Lake Michigan	38,918	1,462	26.6	2.32	High
Lansing	48,007	3,975	12.1	.04	Average
Macomb County	86,833	8,939	9.7	-.34	Average
Mid Michigan	2,981	371	8.0	Special	--
Monroe County	16,866	1,118	15.1	.51	High
Montcalm	7,482	541	13.8	.31	Average
Muskegon	27,786	2,543	10.9	.15	Average
North Central Michigan	3,500	548	6.4	-.86	Low
Northwestern Michigan	10,900	1,173	9.3	-.40	Average
Oakland	33,981	8,870	3.8	-1.27	Low
St. Clair	24,856	1,904	13.1	.20	Average
Schoolcraft	34,423	3,395	10.1	-.28	Average
Southwestern	3,975	685	5.8	-.95	Low
Washtenaw	12,024	2,227	5.4	-1.01	Low
West Shore	488	221	2.2	Special	--

M=11.85

S.D.= 6.35

Mid-Range=8.68-15.02

majority of circulation transactions are made by students and that circulation, per se, is one reasonably valid measure of library utilization. The data in Table 4.21 indicate an extraordinarily wide range in the extent of circulation among the community college libraries. Six colleges fall below six volumes per student per year while there are six colleges that exceed sixteen volumes per student per year. Both Glen Oaks and Lake Michigan Community Colleges exceed twenty-five volumes per year. There are numerous variables that affect the circulation of a library's holdings that are beyond the realm of this study, but there appears to be no question that some of these variables are operating to a great degree in some of the colleges. There appears to be no relationship between the size of the collection or the size of the student body and the circulation of the library.

Question 15: How does the extent of the library's supervised hours of operation compare with other community college libraries?

The data pertaining to this question are presented in Table 4.22. The mean for all colleges is fifty-eight hours per week or slightly more than three thousand hours per year. On this criterion there is a direct relationship between the hours of supervised operation and the size of the college. All five of the high-ranked colleges are

TABLE 4.22.--Criterion 5--Hours of Supervised Operations  
Yearly.

College	Hours of Operation	Z Score	Rank
Alpena	2,000	-1.33	Low
Bay De Noc	2,000	-1.33	Low
Delta	4,628	2.10	High
Genesee	3,450	.56	High
Glen Oaks	3,120	.13	Average
Gogebic	2,080	-1.23	Low
Grand Rapids	3,640	.80	High
Henry Ford	4,680	2.16	High
Highland Park	3,000	- .03	Average
Jackson	2,000	-1.33	Low
Kalamazoo Valley	3,380	.47	Average
Kellogg	2,205	-1.06	Low
Kirtland	2,080	-1.23	Low
Lake Michigan	3,380	.47	Average
Lansing	2,990	- .04	Average
Macomb County	4,056	1.35	High
Mid Michigan	2,496	- .68	Low
Monroe County	3,380	.47	Average
Montcalm	3,172	.20	Average
Muskegon	3,354	.43	Average
North Central Michigan	2,080	-1.23	Low
Northwestern Michigan	3,300	.36	Average
Oakland (A.H.)	2,652	- .48	Average
Oakland (H.L.)	2,938	- .11	Average
Oakland (O.R.)	3,172	.20	Average
St. Clair	3,276	.33	Average
Schoolcraft	3,146	.16	Average
Southwestern	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
Washtenaw	1,820	-1.57	Low
West Shore	2,912	- .14	Average
M=3,021			
S.D.= 766			
Mid-Range=2,638-3,404			

larger community colleges. No smaller schools are in the upper third of the rankings. It might be assumed that smaller schools with smaller library staffs would have difficulty providing professional supervision for the weekly hours the library is open for operations. Yet Table 4.11 indicates many of the smaller libraries have two, three or more professionals available on a full-time basis. It would appear that the major thrust of many of the smaller college libraries is aimed primarily at the typical forty-hour week, Monday through Friday during the day. All community colleges in Michigan offer an academic program that runs from early morning to late in the evening, yet most professional supervision is aimed at the day programs.

Question 16: What is the relationship between the number of credit course offerings of the college and the size of its collection?

The data pertaining to this question are presented in Table 4.23. The statistical comparison is made between the number of credit courses offered and the size of the collection, and is expressed as a ratio of volumes per credit course. This criterion assumes a gross relationship between the academic program and the size of the library's collection. The mean for all colleges is slightly more than one hundred volumes per credit course with the middle third of the group ranging from eighty

TABLE 4.23.--Criterion 6--Comparison of Credit Courses to Collection Size.

College	Credit Courses	Size of Collection	Ratio	Z Score	Rank
Alpena	331	14,511	1:44	-1.22	Low
Bay De Noc	149	16,000	1:107	.02	Average
Delta	487	71,324	1:146	.79	High
Genesee	304	95,435	1:314	4.09	High
Glen Oaks	228	14,357	1:64	- .82	Low
Gogebic	173	15,975	1:92	- .28	Average
Grand Rapids	400	33,000	1:83	- .45	Average
Henry Ford	600	60,972	1:102	- .09	Average
Highland Park	248	18,153	1:73	- .65	Low
Jackson	279	18,259	1:66	- .79	Low
Kalamazoo Valley	277	12,455	1:45	Special	--
Kellogg	341	25,702	1:76	- .59	Low
Kirtland	177	20,000	1:113	Special	--
Lake Michigan	336	30,000	1:90	- .31	Average
Lansing	532	41,500	1:78	- .55	Low
Macomb County	374	70,000	1:187	1.59	High
Mid Michigan	217	10,073	1:47	Special	--
Monroe County	234	31,655	1:135	.57	High
Montcalm	127	14,225	1:113	.14	Average
Muskegon	346	27,032	1:78	- .55	Low
North Central Michigan	135	16,508	1:122	.31	Average
Northwestern Michigan	221	29,568	1:135	.57	High
Oakland (A.H.)	302	24,354	1:81	- .49	Average
Oakland (H.L.)	300	28,630	1:96	- .20	Average
Oakland (O.R.)	303	32,058	1:106	.00	Average
St. Clair	299	24,339	1:82	- .47	Average
Schoolcraft	401	41,103	1:103	- .06	Average
Southwestern	135	13,365	1:100	- .12	Average
Washtenaw	364	29,351	1:81	- .49	Average
West Shore	194	3,400	1:18	Special	
M=360      M=29,443      M=1:106 S.D.=51 Mid-Range=80.5-131.5					



volumes to one hundred thirty. Of the five high-ranked colleges on this criterion three, Genesee, Delta and Macomb, are larger schools, and two, Monroe and Northwestern, are comparatively smaller schools.

Question 17: What is the relationship between the number of credit course offerings and the college's periodical subscriptions?

The data pertaining to this question are presented in Table 4.24. The statistical comparison is made between the number of credit courses offered and the number of periodicals to which the college subscribes and is expressed as a ratio of periodicals per credit course. This criterion assumes a gross relationship between the academic program and the number of periodical subscriptions. The mean for all colleges is 1.24 subscriptions for each credit course offered with the middle third of the group ranging from 1.04 subscriptions to 1.44. There appears to be no relationship between size of the college and its rank on this criterion. Of the seven high-ranked colleges, several have large and some have quite small enrollments. Only two colleges, Genesee and Macomb, rank high on both criteria, volumes and periodical subscriptions. Again there does not appear to be much relationship between the size of the collection and the number of periodical subscriptions that a library has. There does, however,

TABLE 4.24.--Criterion 7--Comparison of Credit Courses to Periodical Subscriptions.

College	Credit Courses	Periodicals	Ratio	Z Score	Rank
Alpena	331	325	1:98	- .66	Low
Bay De Noc	149	150	1:1.01	- .59	Low
Delta	487	356	1:.73	-1.31	Low
Genesee	304	507	1:1.67	1.10	High
Glen Oaks	228	305	1:1.34	.26	Average
Gogebic	173	172	1:1.00	- .61	Low
Grand Rapids	400	229	1:.58	-1.69	Low
Henry Ford	600	766	1:1.28	.10	Average
Highland Park	248	245	1:.99	- .64	Low
Jackson	279	223	1:.80	-1.13	Low
Kalamazoo Valley	277	540	1:1.95	1.82	High
Kellogg	341	304	1:.90	- .87	Low
Kirtland	177	300	1:1.70	1.18	High
Lake Michigan	336	350	1:1.05	- .49	Average
Lansing	532	433	1:.82	-1.08	Low
Macomb County	374	642	1:1.72	1.23	High
Mid Michigan	217	183	1:.85	-1.00	Low
Monroe County	234	296	1:1.27	.08	Average
Montcalm	127	238	1:1.88	1.64	High
Muskegon	346	324	1:.94	- .77	Low
North Central Michigan	135	143	1:1.07	- .44	Average
Northwestern Michigan	221	310	1:1.41	.44	Average
Oakland (A.H.)	302	539	1:1.79	1.41	High
Oakland (H.L.)	300	350	1:1.17	- .18	Average
Oakland (O.R.)	303	684	1:2.26	2.61	High
St. Clair	299	412	1:1.39	.38	Average
Schoolcraft	401	572	1:1.43	.49	Average
Southwestern	135	203	1:1.51	.69	High
Washtenaw	364	457	1:1.26	.05	Average
West Shore	194	234	1:1.21	.08	Average

M=1:1.24

S.D.= .40

Mid-Range=1.04-1.44

appear to be a considerable correlation between the number of credit courses offered and the number of periodical subscriptions. Generally, the larger the academic program is, the more periodicals the library subscribes to.

Question 18: What is the relationship of the space allocated for library purposes to the enrollment of the college?

The data pertaining to this question are presented in Table 4.25 and are extracted from a study conducted by the Michigan Department of Education. The statistical comparison is made between the total space allocated for library purposes and the full-time equated enrollment of the college. The mean for all colleges is slightly more than seven and one-half square feet per student with a considerable range among the colleges studied. At one extreme is Grand Rapids Junior College which provides less than two square feet per student, and at the other extreme are Glen Oaks and Montcalm which provide more than twenty square feet per student. Of the eight high-ranked libraries all were built in the past decade and could be considered newer facilities, yet some of the other newer schools rank low on library space provided. The conclusion must be drawn that there is great variability among the community colleges on this criterion.

TABLE 4.25.--Criterion 8--Comparison of Library Space to Enrollment.

College	Total Library Space	Equated Enrollment	Ratio	Z Score	Rank
Alpena	5,494sq.ft.	821	6.7:1	- .18	Average
Bay De Noc	4,586	602	7.6:1	- .02	Average
Delta	23,071	3,987	5.8:1	- .34	Average
Genesee	52,679	4,370	12.1:1	.80	High
Glen Oaks	12,400	571	21.7:1	2.53	High
Gogebic	1,617	517	3.1:1	- .83	Low
Grand Rapids	7,373	4,040	1.8:1	-1.07	Low
Henry Ford	35,351	5,991	5.9:1	- .32	Low
Highland Park	4,088	2,646	1.5:1	-1.12	Low
Jackson	6,235	2,159	2.9:1	- .87	Low
Kalamazoo Valley	4,200	1,673	2.5:1	- .94	Low
Kellogg	8,073	1,915	4.2:1	- .63	Low
Kirtland	2,880	252	11.4:1	.67	High
Lake Michigan	26,214	1,462	17.9:1	1.85	High
Lansing	25,256	3,975	6.4:1	- .23	Average
Macomb County	22,786	8,939	2.5:1	- .94	Low
Mid Michigan	5,462	371	14.7:1	1.27	High
Monroe County	13,247	1,118	11.8:1	.74	High
Montcalm	11,577	541	21.4:1	2.48	High
Muskegon	18,282	2,543	7.2:1	- .09	Average
North Central Michigan	4,631	548	8.5:1	.15	Average
Northwestern Michigan	13,047	1,173	11.1:1	.62	High
Oakland	31,226	8,870	3.5:1	- .76	Low
St. Clair	14,755	1,904	7.7:1	.00	Average
Schoolcraft	19,022	3,395	5.6:1	- .38	Average
Southwestern	5,967	685	8.7:1	.18	Average
Washtenaw	7,547	2,227	3.4:1	- .77	Low
West Shore	735	221	3.3:1	- .79	Low

M=7.69:1

S.D.=5.53

Mid-Range=4.93-10.45

Question 19: What is the relationship of expenditures for books and periodicals to the enrollment of the college?

The data pertaining to this question are presented in Table 4.26. The statistical comparison between acquisition expenditures and the enrollment of the college is expressed in terms of dollars spent per full-time equated student. Except for Washtenaw Community College with an enrollment of over two thousand students, most of the high-ranked libraries service student bodies that are relatively small. It would appear that on this criterion a well-established library with a large collection is somewhat penalized by the ranking system employed because of that collection. The amount of money necessary to maintain the adequacy of its collection is reduced to some extent and on a per student basis the expenditures per year are apt to be lower.

Question 20: How do the individual colleges rank on all evaluative criteria and on those criteria selected by community college administrators and librarians?

The data pertaining to the initial part of this question are presented in Table 4.27, Summary of College Rankings on All Criteria. All colleges of the study are listed and the rankings, average, high or low, are presented for each criterion. The most obvious conclusion

TABLE 4.26.--Criterion 9--Comparison of Acquisitions Expenditures to Enrollment.

College	Book & Periodi- cal Expenditures	Equated Enrollment	Ratio	Z Score	Rank
Alpena	N.R.	821	N.R.	N.R.	N.R.
Bay De Noc	\$12,402	602	\$20.60	.81	High
Delta	46,500	3,987	11.66	- .37	Average
Genesee	68,000	4,370	15.56	.14	Average
Glen Oaks	15,732	571	27.55	1.72	High
Gogebic	14,230	517	27.52	1.72	High
Grand Rapids	16,170	4,040	4.00	-1.38	Low
Henry Ford	47,657	5,991	7.95	- .86	Low
Highland Park	18,227	2,646	6.89	-1.00	Low
Jackson	20,648	2,159	9.56	- .65	Low
Kalamazoo Valley	65,736	1,673	39.29	Special	--
Kellogg	22,388	1,915	11.69	- .37	Average
Kirtland	15,000	252	59.52	Special	--
Lake Michigan	13,566	1,462	9.28	- .68	Low
Lansing	23,652	3,975	5.95	-1.21	Low
Macomb County	54,497	8,939	6.10	-1.26	Low
Mid Michigan	38,000	371	102.42	Special	--
Monroe County	22,000	1,118	19.68	.68	High
Montcalm	13,102	541	24.22	1.28	High
Muskegon	35,492	2,543	13.96	- .07	Average
North Central Michigan	15,089	548	27.53	1.72	High
Northwestern Michigan	23,775	1,173	20.27	.76	High
Oakland	55,370	8,870	6.24	-1.08	Low
St. Clair	30,141	1,904	15.83	.18	Average
Schoolcraft	37,443	3,395	11.03	- .45	Average
Southwestern	7,980	685	11.65	- .37	Average
Washtenaw	54,019	2,227	24.26	1.29	High
West Shore	16,800	221	76.02	Special	

M=\$14.48

S.D.= 7.60

Mid-Range=10.68-18.28

TABLE 4.27.--Summary of College Rankings on All Criteria.

College	Criterion								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Alpena	A	A	A	H	L	L	L	A	N.R.
Bay De Noc	H	A	A	H	L	A	L	A	H
Delta	A	A	A	A	H	H	L	A	A
Genesee	H	A	H	H	H	H	H	H	A
Glen Oaks	H	A	H	H	A	L	A	H	H
Gogebic	H	A	H	H	L	A	L	L	H
Grand Rapids	L	L	L	L	H	A	L	L	L
Henry Ford	L	L	L	H	H	A	A	L	L
Highland Park	L	L	L	L	A	L	L	L	L
Jackson	L	L	L	A	L	L	L	L	L
Kalamazoo Valley	SP.	SP.	SP.	SP.	A	SP.	H	L	SP.
Kellogg	L	A	A	A	L	L	L	L	A
Kirtland	SP.	SP.	SP.	SP.	L	SP.	H	H	SP.
Lake Michigan	A	A	H	H	A	A	A	H	L
Lansing	L	L	A	A	A	L	L	A	L
Macomb County	L	L	L	A	H	H	H	L	L
Mid Michigan	SP.	SP.	SP.	SP.	L	SP.	L	H	SP.
Monroe County	H	H	H	H	A	H	A	H	H
Montcalm	H	H	H	A	A	A	H	H	H
Muskegon	L	A	A	A	A	L	L	A	A
North Central Michigan	H	A	A	L	L	A	A	A	H
Northwestern Michigan	H	A	A	A	A	H	A	H	H
Oakland (A.H.)	L	H	A	L	A	A	H	L	L
Oakland (H.L.)	L	H	A	L	A	A	A	L	L
Oakland (O.R.)	L	H	A	L	A	A	H	L	L
St. Clair	L	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
Schoolcraft	L	A	H	A	A	A	A	A	A
Southwestern	A	L	A	L	N.R.	A	H	A	A
Washtenaw	L	H	H	L	L	A	A	L	H
West Shore	SP.	SP.	SP.	SP.	A	SP.	A	L	SP.

Interpretation--L=Low Ranked  
 A=Average Ranked  
 H=High Ranked

SP.=Special Situation  
 N.R.=Not Reported

that may be drawn from the data presented in this table is that with few exceptions most of the individual libraries in the study vary considerably in their strengths and weaknesses as defined by the evaluative criteria. Most colleges in terms of their rankings tend not to be either consistently high or consistently low, but rank high on some criteria, low on others, and average on still others. There are, of course, some noticeable exceptions. Four colleges, Monroe, Montcalm, Genesee and Glen Oaks, appear to rank rather consistently high on most criteria. Conversely, Highland Park, Jackson, Kellogg and Lansing score low on a relatively large number of criteria. There is one common characteristic that binds three of these colleges together: they are administered as part of the public school system, the older junior college type of structure. Lansing, up until recent years, was also closely connected to the public school system of the City of Lansing and, in fact, began its operations in public school facilities. There could conceivably be a relationship between this commonality and the fact that these libraries tend to rank low on the evaluative criteria.

#### Rankings of Criteria

Of the fifteen judges, six community college chief administrators and nine head librarians, who were asked to make judgments as to the relative importance of the nine



criteria as gross measures of library quality, all fifteen responded to the instrument. Table 4.28 indicates the individual judgments of all members of the panel. There appears to be a relatively high consistency among most of the members of the panel regardless of whether they are administrators or librarians. There is a consistency among both groups on the three highest ranked criteria: library budget, supervised hours of operation, and staff size. Moreover, in terms of total points based on the judgments, these three criteria are separated numerically from the remaining six criteria. There appears to be agreement between both groups of judges on the two lowest ranked criteria: periodicals and collection as it relates to enrollment. Both of these criteria are deemed the least important as a gross measure of library quality. Of the remaining four criteria, three of which were selected on the basis of total points resulting from judged rankings, the agreement is not quite as strong. The criterion of library space is considered quite high in relative importance by the administrators and second to lowest by the librarians.

One possible explanation for the disagreement on this criterion may be a conviction on the part of many librarians that although a library's space may be limited, a quality library may still be administered. A second

TABLE 4.28.--Ranked Judgments of Criteria by Administrators and Librarians.

Criterion	Administrator Rankings								Librarian Rankings										Combined Total
	Judges						Total	Judges								Total	(All Judges)		
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6		#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8			#9	
1. Enrollment to Collec- tion.	6	9	5	7	5	9	41	7	6	6	6	8	4	3	6	6	52	93	
2. Library Budget to Oper- ational Budget, Expendi- tures per F.T.E.	4	2	6	6	1	5	24	4	7	3	2	2	1	1	1	2	23	47*	
3. Staff Size to Enroll- ment.	3	3	4	5	7	3	25	5	1	2	1	1	5	2	3	1	21	46*	
4. Circulation to Enrollment.	5	4	9	1	9	1	29	1	4	5	9	5	3	9	5	7	48	77*	
5. Professionally Super- vised Hours of Operation.	1	1	1	4	6	4	17	2	2	1	4	3	6	4	7	3	32	49*	
6. Credit Course Offerings to Library Collection.	2	8	8	2	3	8	31	6	3	8	8	6	8	5	2	4	50	81*	
7. Credit Course Offerings to Periodicals.	9	5	7	9	8	7	45	9	9	9	7	7	7	8	8	9	73	118	
8. Library Space to Enrollment.	8	6	2	3	4	2	25	3	8	7	5	9	9	7	9	8	65	90	
9. Acquisitions Expendi- tures to Enrollment.	7	7	3	8	2	6	33	8	5	4	3	4	2	6	4	5	41	74*	

\* Selected as Evaluative Criteria.

possible explanation may be that administrators have a greater concern for library utilization.

The final six criteria selected by the panel of judges in order of their total rankings are presented below:

1. Staff size to enrollment.
2. Library budget.
3. Professionally supervised hours of operation.
4. Acquisitions expenditures.
5. Circulation.
6. Collection related to credit course offerings.

#### Selection of Highest Ranked Libraries

The seven highest ranked community college libraries are presented with their rankings in Table 4.29. The highest ranked library in the study serves the students, faculty and community of Monroe County. It ranks high on five of the six selected criteria and above average on the sixth. Of the seven colleges, two, Delta and Genesee, are large schools with enrollments in excess of four thousand full-time equated students. Two colleges can be classified as medium sized, Northwestern and Monroe, with student bodies in excess of one thousand students; the remaining three are smaller schools. Two of the schools, Gogebic and Flint, developed from older junior colleges; the remaining five were established in more recent years as community colleges.

TABLE 4.29.--Seven Highest-Ranked Colleges and Their Rankings on the Evaluative Criteria.

College	Criterion and Ranking					
	#2 Expenditures per F.T.E.	#3 Library Staff to Enrollment	#4 Circulation to Enrollment	#5 Supervised Hours of Operation	#6 Credit Courses to Collection	#9 Expenditures for Acquisitions
1. Monroe	High	High	High	Average	High	High
2. Genesee	Average	High	High	High	High	Average
3. Montcalm	High	High	Average	Average	Average	High
4. Delta	Average	Average	Average	High	High	Average
5. Northwestern	Average	Average	Average	Average	High	High
6. Glen Oaks	Average	High	High	Average	Low	High
7. Gogebic	Average	High	High	Low	Average	High

Characteristics of High-Ranked  
College Libraries

Table 4.30 compares normative data on seven colleges with comparable data for all the community college libraries in Michigan. An analysis of the data reveals considerable differences between the selected colleges and the statewide averages. The most significant difference is on the staffing criterion; the selected colleges tend to have larger staffs in proportion to their students. For all community colleges the ratio is one staff person for almost two hundred students, while for the selected libraries the ratio is one staff person for every one hundred twenty-one students.

Large variations are also found in the circulation criterion and size of collection criterion. The stronger libraries tend to have a significantly greater circulation per student, thirty-four per cent greater, and a larger collection compared to the size of the academic program. In essence, the stronger libraries tend to have a substantially larger collection (thirty-four per cent), and it is more widely circulated among the students.

Logically, one would expect to find greater expenditures for acquisitions on the part of these stronger libraries, and on the basis of expenditures per full-time equated students, this apparently is the case. The selected colleges spend on the average \$19.37 per student

TABLE 4.30.--Comparison of Normative Data of Highest-Ranked Libraries with Normative Data of All Community College Libraries in Michigan and the Remaining Lower-Ranked Community College Libraries.

Criterion		Seven Highest-Ranked Libraries	Remaining Lower-Ranked Libraries	All Community College Libraries
1. Library Expenditures per F.T.E.	Mean	\$68.51 per student	\$51.44 per student	\$56.42 per student
	Standard Deviation	20.89	16.45	19.47
	Mid-Range	58.06-\$78.96	43.22-\$59.66	46.68-\$66.16
2. Ratio of Staff to Enrollment	Mean	1:121 students	1:223 students	1:192 students
	Standard Deviation	1:37	1:121	1:114
	Mid-Range	102.5-139.5	162.5-283.5	135-249
3. Ratio of Circulation to Enrollment	Mean	16.0 books per stu.	10.72 books per stu.	11.85 books per stu.
	Standard Deviation	5.08	5.91	6.35
	Mid-Range	13.44-18.54	7.77-13.67	8.68-15.2
4. Supervised Hours of Operations Yearly	Mean	3304 hrs. per year	2910 hrs. per year	3021 hrs. per year
	Standard Deviation	609	747	766
	Mid-Range	2959-3649	2536.5-3283.5	2638-3404
5. Ratio of Credit Courses to Size of Collection	Mean	142 vols. per course	92 vols. per course	106 vols. per course
	Standard Deviation	74	28	51
	Mid-Range	105-179	78-106	80.5-131.5
6. Expenditures for Acquisitions per F.T.E.	Mean	\$19.37 per student	\$12.05 per student	\$14.48 per student
	Standard Deviation	8.02	6.70	7.60
	Mid-Range	15.36-\$23.38	8.70-\$15.40	10.68-\$18.28

per year compared to \$14.48 for all community college libraries in the study, a difference of thirty-four per cent.

Considering the fact that the stronger colleges spend proportionately more for acquisitions and for staffing than the other libraries, it would follow that these colleges tend to allocate more of their institutional resources for their library operations. Table 4.30 indicates that they do spend an average of \$12.00 more per student, a difference of twenty-one per cent.

Finally, there appears to be a slight difference in the amount of supervised hours of operation between the two groups. The stronger college libraries tend to be open more hours per year under direct supervision of a professional librarian. The difference between the two groups is eight and one-half per cent, which accounts for an additional five and one-half hours per week.

#### Summary

1. Community college libraries are rapidly moving toward six, and in some cases seven day-a-week operations. Moreover, they are tending to be year-round operations which are open whether classes are in session or not.

2. Community college libraries are assuming the responsibility for audio-visual services and are moving toward a learning resources concept.

3. The colleges use a combination of traditional orientation methods to instruct students in library use. A few libraries are also using prepared audio-visual presentations and research-type exercises.

4. The sizes of the individual collections vary considerably among the colleges with the higher enrollment colleges tending to have larger collections. However, there are some newer schools that have developed collections approaching 20,000 volumes in rather short periods of time.

5. The libraries report extensive use of microform in developing their collections. Almost all colleges have acquired some periodical depth by the use of microfilm.

6. There appears to be financial commitment on the part of colleges in the acquisition of audio-visual equipment and materials. Some of the libraries have developed sizeable audio-visual software collections.

7. Circulation data for the libraries indicates differences among colleges ranging from over twenty-five volumes per student in some libraries to less than four per student in others. On a statewide basis the mean for all libraries is twelve volumes per student.

8. Almost all of the libraries have a minimum of two professionals on their staffs; however, there are five libraries that do not reach this minimum. On a



statewide basis the community college libraries have one professional librarian for every six hundred students.

9. Fourteen colleges employ forty-three library technicians, but two of these employ almost half of the total number.

10. All libraries use students as part of their staffs and most have full-time clerical personnel. Only half of the libraries provide at least two full-time equated support personnel for each professional and only six libraries exceed three support persons for each professional.

11. On the average seventy-five per cent of library staff time is allocated to traditional library functions with about one-fourth of the time devoted to audio-visual and multi-media functions.

12. Library staff time within the typical library functions is devoted toward acquisitions, less so to interpretative services and considerably less to circulation.

13. Audio-visual staff time is devoted equally to acquisitions, production and distribution with a small amount of time devoted to interpretation.

14. Library directors generally report to either the President of the college or the chief academic officer. Usually in the smaller schools he reports to the President and in the larger schools to the academic administrator.

15. On a statewide basis the community colleges allocate approximately five per cent of their institutional budgets to library operations, but there are differences among the colleges. In general, the smaller, newer colleges tend to allocate a higher percentage than the older, more established libraries.

16. The largest proportion of the library budgets are expended for salaries accounting for more than sixty per cent on a statewide basis. Acquisitions of books and periodicals account for about twenty-five per cent.

17. On a per student basis the libraries' collections consist of approximately seventeen volumes per student with wide variations among the colleges. Sixteen of the colleges exceed the A.L.A. minimum standard of 20,000 volumes.

18. The colleges spend an average of \$56.42 per student for yearly operations but among all the schools there is a range from close to \$100 per student on one end of the continuum to less than \$30 on the other end.

19. Provision for library space varies among the community college libraries. The average space available per full-time equated student is slightly more than seven and one-half square feet; however, several college libraries have in excess of twenty square feet per student and several have less than two square feet.

20. By use of a quantitative ranking system, seven colleges were identified as being in the upper quartile of community college libraries in the state. They include: Monroe, Genesee, Montcalm, Delta, Northwestern, Glen Oaks and Gogebic.

## CHAPTER V

### A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF MICHIGAN'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE LIBRARIES

#### Introduction

More than a century ago a president of an established eastern university described a university as "a library surrounded by students." Today the higher educational enterprise in the United States is seriously engaged in efforts to make the library the educational center of the campus. Within that enterprise the community college, because of its experimental nature, lack of tradition and uniqueness as an institution of higher learning, has an opportunity to develop new library concepts and practices that can make the library the very heart of the instructional program.

If one accepts the concept that a library can be a vital, dynamic force in an institution of learning, then logically it can be examined as a functioning, living entity, not merely as an abstract of statistical data. The field of psychology attempts to understand human behavior by quantitative measurement of the individual combined with qualitative analysis of behavior. Libraries

can be measured quantitatively and qualitatively. They can be perceived as dynamic organisms that must be sustained physically and can be observed behaviorally.

In this chapter a sample of Michigan's community college libraries are examined in terms of new and emerging concepts and practices. Within the time limits of this study an attempt was made to visit as many of the libraries as possible. Criteria used to determine colleges to be visited included: (1) new colleges established during the previous three years, (2) the highest ranked colleges (six of the seven were visited), (3) colleges recommended by the Michigan Community College Librarians Association, and (4) libraries recommended by other librarians and administrators during the visitations.

Twenty colleges were visited. The author met with librarians, administrators, teachers and students in an effort to identify and understand the ways in which these libraries are attempting to assume new and expanding roles, and to become more relevant and useful to the people they serve.

### Methodology

A semi-structured interview technique was employed. At each institution visited the author met first with the person directly responsible for the operation of the library. An appointment by telephone had been scheduled

with each library director prior to the visit. As an initiating point for discussion, the author informed the library director of the general purposes of the visit and indicated four major areas of interest that might be used as a basis of discussion. These areas included:

(1) the ways in which this particular library is attempting to become more relevant and useful to the faculty and student, (2) the new and changing roles of the library and the staff, (3) the ways in which the library is expanding its holdings and its services and, (4) problems and concerns that are hindering development of the library. In every case these general areas of interest became "stepping off" points for intensive discussion.

Whenever possible the interviewer met with the President of the college, other administrators and in some cases with faculty and students. Appendix C lists the colleges visited and the persons interviewed. In several institutions the interviewer met with the entire library staff for a short, informal discussion about the library and some of the objectives that the staff was trying to accomplish. During the interviews with the library directors a tour of library facilities was made. In many of the libraries an audio-visual specialist was part of the staff and, in these instances, an informal and unstructured interview was conducted with this staff member. Without exception the persons interviewed were

enthusiastic and responsive to the interviews and demonstrated a willingness to discuss their library's strengths and weaknesses.

### Presentation of the Data

The presentation of the data has been organized into the following major categories:

1. The Emerging Library College Concept.
2. New Roles for the Library and Staff.
3. Learning Resources: Concepts and Practices.
4. New Library Development.
5. Facilities.
6. Relationships with Faculty and Students.
7. New Technological Applications in the Libraries.
8. Cooperative Efforts with Other Libraries.
9. Library Problems in the Community Colleges.

To avoid embarrassment to individuals, some direct quotations will not be identified. However, whenever appropriate colleges and statements will be identified because it is felt that such identification will increase the reader's insight into community college libraries.

### The Emerging Library College Concept

Most library directors view the library college as an ideal that is worthy as a goal but not attainable in the immediate future in their institutions. All

librarians were familiar with the writings of Louis Shores, Robert T. Jordan, B. Lamar Johnson, and others, and they agreed with the basic tenets of these writings. Librarians tend to agree that the librarian should be a teacher, that the library should be the center of learning activity and that traditional separation of learning resources from the instructional program is self-defeating. Further, librarians recognize that this separation is a more serious problem in the community college where instructional goals are highly diversified than it is in the four-year colleges and universities.

At several institutions it was pointed out that the keys to a successful library program were the attitudes of the director of the library and the library staff. A change in attitude from the traditional services concept to one of instruction was critical. In effect, one must ask, "Do the librarians function as instructors? Do they actively engage in instruction? How do they engage in instruction?"

Several of the libraries are actively involved in the instructional processes beyond the "services" level of support. This involvement usually takes the form of a librarian-teacher team approach and is directly related to academic course objectives. At Lansing Community College an introductory business course is taught in



the library and is correlated with freshman English Composition. The team in this case consists of an English teacher, a Business teacher, and a librarian. The teachers are physically located in the library for part of their teaching load assignment, where the physical necessities, such as desks, files and the like, are provided. There is a strong emphasis on bibliographic development and use with all three team members assisting students during class time and at other times during the day. Integration of two academic courses with the library as the center for learning has been accomplished.

At Macomb Community College's Center Campus a similar approach emphasizing programmed instruction is in full operation. Full-time faculty members are hired by and report to the director of the library. Teachers have offices in the library and some classrooms are located in the library as well as in the programmed learning laboratories. A close working relationship exists between the librarians and the teachers and part of this relationship is due to the proximity of the two types of professionals to each other and the shared goals implicit in the programmed learning approach. Students use the laboratories and the resource team on a voluntary basis. During the first six months of operation five thousand individual students, approximately one-third of the student body, used the laboratories.

The teacher-librarian team approach is used in several other colleges including Kirtland, where Political Science classes meet in the library with the team, and at West Shore, where second-term English classes similarly meet in the library. In both cases the teacher-librarian team has jointly developed bibliographies related to the specific objectives of the classes and the research assignments of the students. It should be noted that both of these colleges are new colleges. In discussions with librarians at all four colleges emphasizing this library college concept of instruction, it was felt that younger, less experienced faculty members were more interested in experimenting with this type of instruction. Two obvious reasons for this phenomenon were suggested. First, the younger teachers tend to be less tradition-bound in their approaches to instruction; and, secondly, they are more recent products of graduate schools where the universities may be emphasizing library-centered approaches to teaching.

The apparent success of library-centered teaching reflects several variables. The attitude of the library staff is critical in viewing their role as instructional, not merely supportive. Further, administrative support of the library college concept is necessary, both financially and philosophically. At Macomb, for example,

several hundred thousand dollars have been invested in equipment, teacher offices and staffing. On an annual basis six teacher salaries and additional librarian salaries have become a regular operational expenditure. Finally, an awareness by faculty members of the possibilities for library instruction and a motivation and willingness to use the library as an intrinsic part of their instructional approach becomes a crucial variable. In most cases the motivation and encouragement of faculty members to experiment is partly the responsibility of the academic administrators. In smaller colleges, the president himself may serve as a motivator. In each of the colleges mentioned, discussions with the administration suggested that this responsibility was being met actively and enthusiastically. All four presidents were knowledgeable about the programs and involved in their planning.

#### Other New Library Approaches to Instruction

The change in the responsibilities of the library from the more traditional books and periodicals center to the multi-media center is exemplified in the recent tendency to name these facilities, Learning Resource Centers. The question that should be raised is, "Are these Learning Resource Centers more than libraries with some other types of media as part of the collection?" If they are, in fact,

something new, what is their relationship to instruction? It must be reported that, for the most part, the learning resource centers with their multi-media holdings are still traditional libraries with service rather than instructional orientation. However, there are some examples of learning resource centers in which instruction is operationally defined in actual library practice. These newer types of instruction that are either library-centered or heavily library-related include systems approaches such as auto-tutorial instruction and programmed instruction.

An implemented systems approach is in operation at Lansing Community College where media specialists and librarians have worked with faculty members in the development of a variety of audio-visual materials that are used by students in a multi-media, self-instructional approach. The media include audio-tapes, slides, film strips and the like. Academic areas include business, science, social science, language arts, health and industrial technologies. The success of this approach appears to be related to administrative support demonstrated in two distinct ways. First, there has been infusion of capital outlay and operational funds for both equipment and materials, as well as for learning resources staff personnel to assist faculty in the technical aspects of systems development. Secondly, as part of their

contracts, faculty members have been given release time for systems development and it appears to have been effectively utilized. The successful implementation of the program has been the result of a combination of administrative encouragement and faculty motivation.

The auto-tutorial approach to instruction involves, as the name implies, a student-centered, individualized approach to learning which depends primarily on prepared materials being manipulated by the student at his own rate. Several community college libraries are actively involved in auto-tutorial programs. At Monroe Community College faculty-prepared audio-visual teaching "packages" are used in the teaching of auto technology and data processing. At Washtenaw a similar approach is used in the teaching of economics. At Delta College an auto-tutorial approach, using slides, audio-tapes and single concept films, is being utilized in the teaching of nursing fundamentals.

A variety of roles are played by the libraries in their relationships with auto-tutorial instruction. At Kalamazoo Valley Community College the auto-tutorial laboratories are located in the academic areas, but the learning resource center has duplicates of the instructional materials and equipment. The library assumes a role of secondary laboratory for all other academic areas of the college offering auto-tutorial instruction. Students

may check out materials and equipment and replicate laboratory learning activity in the library and in some cases at home.

Delta College's library provides the auto-tutorial laboratory staff for the nursing program. The staff, called "laboratory technicians," are graduate nurses who have been trained by the library to assist nursing students in auto-tutorial learning situations.

Library involvement in auto-tutorial instruction is unique at Monroe, where English composition instructors correct and grade students' work using audio-taping facilities in the library. Students then check out the individualized tapes and playback equipment from the library and return them at a later date.

The roles of the library in this type of instruction are multiple. In almost all cases the role of technical assistance to faculty in the development of materials is a major one on the part of the learning resources staff. Further, instructional assistance to students, bibliographic and circulation assistance, specialized staffing and duplication of laboratory materials made available in the library are other roles being assumed by the libraries. The effectiveness of this type of instruction has not yet been adequately measured in most instances, but the involvement of the libraries is apparent and, at least on the surface, quite effective.

Programmed learning laboratories in which printed materials are presented in a structured, individualized learning situation exist in many libraries. Usually, the material is prepared by faculty members or purchased commercially, and a laboratory is located in the learning resource center. The library's role is one of technical assistance to students who are using the materials and equipment. Secondary roles include duplication and storage of materials, circulation and cataloging.

More than half of the libraries visited were actively involved in programmed instruction. The total commitment of Macomb was not evident in other libraries, but programmed instruction appeared to be part of a growing role for many libraries.

Kalamazoo Valley is providing programmed instruction in nursing, natural science and business. Schoolcraft uses it in music and mathematics. St. Clair has a programmed reading laboratory and a full-time specialist. Perhaps the most unique programmed learning provisions are located at Auburn Hills campus of Oakland where several Individualized Programmed Learning Laboratories (I.P.L.L.'s) are located throughout the campus and are staffed by full-time faculty. The library provides miniature reference and materials centers at the I.P.L.L. and technical assistants for the laboratories. Most of the materials

used have been developed by the faculty and cover a broad range of academic areas including reading, English, mathematics, science, accounting, technologies and engineering.

In some cases administrative responsibility for programmed learning rests with the academic sphere. In others it rests with the library. In all cases, however, there appears to be good articulation between faculty and library staff, and librarians are becoming more actively involved in the instructional processes.

### Summary

These new approaches to instruction which involve a multi-media, systematic and individualized methodology have expanded the role and responsibilities of the library and its staff. Librarians are becoming a more intrinsic part of the instructional process. Because of these new approaches, the usual distinctions between the role of the librarian and that of the teaching faculty are slowly disappearing. A new emphasis is emerging in which behavioral objectives are being stressed, and an expanding role for the librarian is being accepted by both the faculty, library staff and students.



New Roles for the Library and Staff:  
An Analysis

As has been pointed out, the role of the library in the community college is an emerging and expanding one. As the community college itself continues to re-define its purposes and assumes new and evolving instructional responsibilities, so too will the library need to adjust its systems and methods. Some changes are occurring in the field which suggest that professional librarians in community colleges are developing techniques to make the library more flexible and responsive to the needs of the institution.

Within the institutions the librarian appears to be more actively involved in instructional affairs than ever before. In most colleges he is being invited to actively participate in curriculum and academic councils and, even in the largest institutions, the library director is usually appointed to the administrative council of the president. Most librarians report that they take their council responsibilities seriously and through participation in long-range planning of instruction and curriculum planning they are able to anticipate learning resource needs of the institution.

At the division and departmental levels some of the college libraries have made academic specialists of their librarians. At Genesee and Auburn Hills, for example,

each librarian has developed "specialties" in academic areas usually through a combination of academic background and additional training on the job. These librarians attend departmental and division meetings regularly and become familiar with that aspect of the college's academic program and that faculty. Over a period of time the faculty begins to perceive the specialist librarian as part of their division. The librarian is able to actively encourage participation of these teaching faculty in selection of books, periodicals and other media in their areas for the library.

In small colleges with limited library staff, several directors indicated the importance of increasing their communication with faculty. A variety of methods are used by library directors to accomplish this on a personal level. The emphasis is on leaving the library and meeting with the faculty. Some of these methods include coffee, lunch, golf, chats in their offices, and attending departmental meetings whenever possible. Most librarians indicate that salesmanship is a critical skill in the smaller libraries, and that "going out to the faculty wherever they are" is one key to making the library responsive to instructional needs. Again, many librarians indicate that the emerging role of the community college librarian is one with increased emphasis on

communication with the faculty and other members of the instructional program.

Another change in the role of the librarian involves the re-distribution of total library staff duties. Some colleges are beginning to emphasize the interpretive or reference aspects of the librarian's job and de-emphasizing the technical processes aspects. Delta College is an outstanding example of this change, although there are several libraries that are moving in this direction. At Delta all technical processes, including cataloging, circulation, book ordering and purchasing, are done by trained clerks and students. Librarians do not have offices, but desks, files and office equipment are located in the center of the library. As a basic policy of the library and the academic administration, the librarian's role is defined as primarily reference with faculty and students, and instructional support services to faculty. Book, periodical and other media selection is a joint responsibility of the librarians and faculty, but ordering, purchasing and cataloging is delegated to clerical levels as much as possible. Librarians do assist the clerks with clerical problems and cataloging difficulties.

Several other colleges use commercial cataloging firms which absorb much of the clerical work in purchasing and cataloging, releasing the professional librarians for

more time with faculty and students. At Muskegon two reference desks in the center of the library are manned by both professionals and second-year college students who have been trained in reference work. It was pointed out by several librarians that students can be quite effective as reference assistants, and that student users find it easier, on occasion, to ask another student a "stupid" question about the library than to ask a librarian.

In general there appears to be a trend in many of the community colleges to place greater emphasis on the human relations aspects of professional library work and to find other means of handling the necessary but often time-consuming technical and clerical needs of the library.

#### Learning Resources: Concepts and Practices

The concept of the learning resources center as it is conceived and perceived by community college administrators and librarians is a multi-media expansion of the library. It is typically viewed as involving expansion of the library staff to include media technicians, professionals trained in instructional media development and a variety of support personnel. The learning resources center becomes a part of the instructional program rather than only supportive of it.

Most colleges have an audio-visual specialist as part of the library staff. This person usually has the minimum of a bachelor's degree in audio-visual education and, in some cases, the master's degree. Of the twenty colleges visited, seventeen had an audio-visual specialist; several of these possessed the Master of Library Science Degree with a major in audio-visual. In the larger colleges audio-visual technical support personnel included electronics technicians, graphic artists, photographers, television technicians, and general audio-visual technicians.

At Macomb South Campus and at Lansing considerable financial support and space is devoted to the multi-media concept. At Lansing the audio-visual budget exceeds \$100,000 and is almost as much as the library budget. While it is a separated budget at Lansing, most colleges budget under learning resources, per se, and do not administratively separate the two.

In a variety of ways the colleges are attempting to integrate the audio-visual media with the books and periodicals collections. Several colleges have developed integrated catalogs which include audio-visual materials available in the learning resources center. These materials include audio-tapes, phonograph records, slides, films, filmstrips, and programmed learning

materials. Kellogg uses a color card system; St. Clair has modified their Library of Congress catalog system to include A-V materials. At Lansing a totally integrated catalog has been developed along with special bibliographies of audio-visual software in academic fields. Almost every college indicated planning was underway to develop an integrated catalog.

A trend is developing in several of the colleges toward eventual circulation of all media. At Auburn Hills this is already the case; students may check out a variety of materials and the equipment necessary to use these materials. In other colleges the problems of financing and control have not been solved, but many are attempting to increase the check-out availability of media and the equipment to which it is linked.

#### Media Development

The success of the learning resources approach rests squarely with the ability of the college to develop resource materials directly reflecting course objectives. For the most part this can only be done by involvement of the faculty teaching those courses. In discussions with media specialists at some of the more successful colleges in this field, including Kalamazoo Valley, Lansing, Delta and Macomb, several variables appeared

to be related to the success of these programs. Table 5.1 lists the variables that were agreed upon by media specialists, faculty members and administrators in the colleges actively involved in media development.

TABLE 5.1.--Variables Affecting Success in Media Development.

- 
1. Faculty Awareness of Media Potential in the Instructional Process
  2. Presence of Faculty Innovators
  3. Presence of an Audio-Visual Specialist Trained to Work with Faculty
  4. Learning Resources Technical Support Staff
  5. Administrative Support for Media Development both Academic and Financial
  6. Released Time or Other Remuneration
- 

All of these variables were felt to be important. Faculty awareness is dealt with in a variety of ways at the colleges. At Lansing a full-time specialist is assigned to work with and encourage faculty. At Kalamazoo Valley a special orientation for faculty emphasizes multi-media and television, as well as the library. At Kellogg the audio-visual specialist feels that their success is primarily due to working with the faculty on a one-to-one basis. Awareness of faculty is developed in a variety of ways, but one important element appears to be the availability and willingness of an audio-visual specialist trained to work with faculty.

Many colleges report a multiplier effect when they are fortunate enough to have a few faculty members willing to experiment with multi-media approaches. It appears that success with these approaches by a few faculty members has a strong and positive influence in encouraging other faculty members to experiment and try multi-media methods.

The need for adequate technical support staff is felt by all of the colleges which are attempting to develop the learning resources concept. Even in those which have large staffs the need for additional staff to assist faculty is apparent. At first glance this appears to be an example of Parkinson's Law, but in discussions with library directors it became evident that the parameters of staff requirements for a functioning learning resources approach have yet to be determined. The interim determination in practice is the degree to which the administration has been willing to commit financial resources.

If one of the variables could be singled out as the most decisive, it would be the willingness of the administration to support media development through released time for the faculty, especially in the summer months. Delta, Lansing, and Auburn Hills have used this approach with some success. Directors indicate that it is almost impossible to develop a learning resources



center without faculty participation through released time, although some faculty members in each college are so highly motivated that they develop materials and systems on their "own time." There appears to be a high relationship between multi-media development in some of the colleges mentioned above and the released time concept. In the final analysis the development of such learning resource centers is a direct result of administrative commitment expressed in faculty released time or other types of remuneration.

#### New Library Development

Four colleges were identified in Chapter IV as having been established in the past three years and three others, Monroe, Glen Oaks and Montcalm, are also relatively new. In visitations to these colleges the author attempted to identify the methods by which these colleges were able to develop rather extensive collections, to build excellent facilities and achieve comparatively high rank on the evaluation criteria (three of these colleges are ranked in the upper quartile in Chapter IV).

Several common characteristics were found during the visitations. All seven newer colleges were granted extensive capital outlay appropriations to build their collections before the colleges began operating. Table 5.2 lists the colleges and the appropriations made by their Boards of Trustees.

TABLE 5.2.--Capital Outlay Appropriation for New Libraries.

College	Appropriation
Glen Oaks	\$100,000
Kalamazoo Valley	195,000*
Kirtland	107,000
Montcalm	120,000
Mid-Michigan	50,000
Monroe	200,000
West Shore	Open-Ended (no limit)

\* Additional \$76,000 appropriated second year.

In each new college the commitment to establish a quality library collection was made by the Board upon the recommendation of the President. At five of the colleges the writer was able to meet personally with the President. All of them indicated that one of the first people they hired for their administration was a professional librarian. Each President expressed a strong commitment to building a collection quickly and, further, building a learning resources facility as quickly as possible. In each college the learning resources center was one of the first two buildings in the campus master plan. The rapid and apparently successful development of these new libraries may be attributed to a great extent to the recognition

by community college administrators of the value of a learning resources center as the heart of the instructional program.

Similarly, the professional skills of the librarians in developing their collections rapidly also contributed to the developmental success of these libraries. They reported the use of three major publications in building the initial collections. These included Books for Junior Colleges, published by the American Library Association; The Choice Opening Day Collection and Books for Occupational Education, published by Bowker. These books are heavily used by most of the community college libraries for up-dating their collections. Most of these librarians used limited facilities and in some cases extraordinarily poor facilities in their early work in developing the collections before the school began operating. As an example, two were housed in barns, one in a converted supermarket, and one in an old farm house.

If one were to isolate the factors that contributed to the rapid and successful development of these new community college libraries, three major factors appear to have operated in concert to accomplish the task. First, was the exceptional leadership and direction provided by the presidents; second, the strong financial commitments of the governing boards; and, finally, the dedication and

skill of the librarians who built the collections and, in several cases, assisted in the planning of the facilities.

### Facilities

Although the panel librarians in Chapter IV indicated that library space, per se, was not a relatively important evaluative criterion, most librarians and administrators would probably agree that quality facilities are instrumental in helping achieve the goals of the library or learning resource center. During campus visitations the writer was astounded by the quality and scope of the community college library facilities. Not only were the larger, high tax-based schools exceptional in their library facilities, but the smaller, new schools evidenced strong financial commitment to quality facilities. Of the larger schools, Macomb South Campus must be regarded as having one of the largest, well-equipped and aesthetically desirable community college libraries in Michigan. At Muskegon, Henry Ford, Northwestern, Genesee and Oakland Orchard Ridge exceptionally fine library facilities exist.

More extraordinary, however, are the smaller community college libraries with limited financial resources. Among these are Kirtland, Monroe, West Shore (presently being built), Mid-Michigan and Montcalm, with well-equipped, relatively spacious facilities. The interest

of the writer, however, was primarily in the area of how these facilities contributed to the library's efforts to become more relevant, more utilized and more involved in the instructional programs of the college. In several instances it appeared from the discussions that inferior facilities could have served as well, for there was little use of the library at the college and minimum involvement with the instructional program. These instances, however, were in the minority.

The newer facilities contained specialized areas specifically designed to encourage faculty and student use. These libraries were built with faculty offices and in some cases student counseling offices. In discussions with several presidents, it was pointed out by them that these were purposely built into the libraries rather than in other instructional buildings. As President John Eaton of West Shore Community College pointed out, "It was not by necessity, but by design." The underlying philosophy of locating faculty offices in the library was expressed succinctly by another president, who stated, "That's where the action is going to be at our college." In discussions with librarians at colleges with faculty offices in the library, it became evident that the very proximity of the teachers increased instructional activity in the library, and further, increased communication between librarians and the faculty members.

Other specialized areas within the libraries designed to increase faculty participation and involvement in the library include the following:

1. Faculty study and discussion rooms to accommodate one to ten people.
2. Faculty lounges for coffee, reading and general relaxation.
3. Faculty study areas with professional journals and collections.

Many of the newer libraries have built their facilities with these types of special areas purposely included; in other cases modification of existing facilities has been accomplished. An outstanding example of modification is at Macomb Center Campus, where a faculty study area was set aside by merely relocating some shelving. Most librarians report these "extras" in the facility enhance the faculty-librarian relationship and promote a proprietary attitude on the part of the faculty toward the library.

Newer facilities have designed specialized areas to attract students. The most obvious, and by far the most successful, approach is the provision for small, group conference rooms found in almost all of the newer libraries. In many instances these were built to reflect new instructional approaches that encourage group discussion, group preparation of assignments and group study. Librarians

report that these rooms are widely used by students and by students and faculty together outside the regular classroom hours.

Other specialized areas for students include free typing rooms with equipment supplied by the library, audio laboratories and equipment for listening and recording, smoking lounges, drafting tables, and at Delta, desk calculators located in carrels.

At Macomb Center Campus a dial-access facility has been developed, using a combination of closed-circuit television, slides and filmstrips synchronized with teacher-prepared audio-tapes. At the South Campus a completely equipped science laboratory is located in the library for student use. Kalamazoo Valley has a classroom for its Radio-Television curriculum located in the learning resource center. In a variety of ways many libraries are designing and equipping their facilities to encourage utilization by the students. Many librarians have become pragmatists and take the attitude, "What works is good." Those specialized facilities that encourage faculty and students to use the library and to feel comfortable in the library in the final analysis are not accouterments but keys to achieving the library college ideal.

It should be carefully noted, however, that limited facilities do not necessarily limit the productiveness or

utilization of a library or, conversely, that excellent facilities guarantee a utilized library. One of the most ill-equipped, space-limited libraries in Michigan is at Auburn Hills Campus of Oakland, which is located presently in a mobile classroom. In discussions with the library staff and with students, and during several hours of observing the activities of the library, it became apparent to the writer that this library was one of the most dynamic, student-oriented libraries in Michigan. Several months earlier the Board of Trustees at Oakland had recommended a large reduction in the operating budget of the library. Students on their own, representing several hundred signatures of other students, successfully petitioned the Board to reinstate a large portion of the reduced budget. The library is referred to as the "Friendly L.R.C." and is perceived that way by students and library staff alike. There is no question that quality facilities are extremely valuable in achieving the objectives of a library, but the attitudes and behavior of the librarians and staff appear to be the essential ingredients in a successful library operation.

#### Relationships with Faculty and Students

The non-administrative status of the librarian appears to be critical to the instructional role of the library and the success it has in becoming a learning



resources center and moving toward the library college ideal. As the Director of Learning Resources at Macomb, Mrs. Louise Giles, points out, "The librarian is like the circus rider on two horses. One horse is the administration, and the other is the faculty. The librarian's sympathy must be with the faculty." How the librarian is perceived by the faculty becomes crucial both for the attitudes the faculty will have toward the library and the extent to which they will use it and encourage its use.

In most cases the librarian is part of the administrative staff of the college, however, several master contracts place the librarian in the faculty structure and in some colleges the librarian is defined and perceived as a division chairman with the library staff as an academic division of the college. In Michigan, where faculty salaries are relatively high in the community colleges, the salary disadvantage of not being classified as an administrator is considerably reduced and some advantages accrue to the library. One head librarian reported that she was recently "demoted" from administrative status to faculty status as a division chairman and found over a short period of time that both her personal relationship with the faculty and the library staff's ability to work with the faculty had become enhanced. She attributed much of this change to her "demotion." Several

librarians hold the title of Associate Dean, but do not encourage its use among their staff.

In several libraries during the early years the librarian reported directly to the president, and as the college grew, administrative reorganization placed the librarian in a direct reporting position to the instructional dean. Several librarians report that they preferred reporting to the dean and being perceived as part of the instructional administration of the college. Only one librarian indicated the change of reporting to the instructional dean did not help. He stated, "It really made no difference, neither of them listened to me anyway."

On the whole, most of the librarians reported a variety of activities they engaged in to increase identification with the faculty. Many make it a point to eat and have coffee with faculty and, in some instances, socialize with faculty in preference to administration.

Perhaps the librarian's perception of himself and his role is the determining factor in how well he will relate to the faculty. Most librarians indicate they feel continuously the precarious balance between administration and faculty, but most say they are forced by the very nature of their work to "lean toward the faculty" if they are going to have an instructionally-centered library.

This leaning toward the faculty can be facilitated in many ways, and community college librarians have developed effective techniques to complement their psychological posture of being faculty, student and instructionally oriented. As the librarian of Northwestern Michigan pointed out, "The key is a library-conscious faculty." He suggests that the "consciousness" is a direct result of the ways in which the librarian deals with that faculty.

At Northwestern a portion of the book budget is spent on materials directly connected to the scholarly avocational interests of the faculty. The teachers are encouraged to recommend for purchase books and periodicals in their interest fields as well as in their academic teaching fields. Over a period of some fifteen years the faculty has developed a proprietary interest in the library. As one history faculty member emphasized, "It is our library; it belongs to the faculty."

This vested interest in the library is exemplified by the fact that a memorial fund for the library has regularly received donations by the Northwestern faculty. It was pointed out that this attitude about the library results in encouragement of students by faculty to use the library. The encouragement, of course, takes many forms but in the final analysis, the library is perceived and used as an instructional resource.

A variety of other methods are employed by librarians to develop "library consciousness" on the part of faculty and students. In many colleges, such as Delta, Northwestern and Auburn Hills, there are no departmental book budgets. All faculty and administration (and students in many cases) are encouraged to recommend books and periodicals.

Encouragement takes several forms. For example, in many colleges Choice cards, describing new books by teaching fields, are sent to departments; several colleges photocopy pages of Books for Junior Colleges, and send to departments by subject areas taught. Muskegon, among others, photocopies the table of contents of current periodicals and sends them to faculty in their subject areas. In a number of ways the libraries attempt to encourage ordering and maintain liaison with the faculty.

At Macomb Center Campus the library has purchased the Learning Directory of the Westinghouse Corporation, which lists multi-media materials and is subject indexed. The library reports wide faculty use of the document. At Northwestern a regular newsletter of library activities is sent to the faculty. Many colleges are developing newsletter approaches for communicating with faculty.

Although most librarians indicate that the essential ingredient for student utilization is the

attitude and behavior of the faculty in regard to the library, there are some current library practices that appear to be effective in encouraging student use. In general, the practices come from an underlying philosophy expressed by the Associate Dean for Learning Resources at Muskegon when she said, "What can I do to undo what traditional libraries do to frustrate students' use of the library?"

Several libraries have eliminated fines. Some colleges have developed an indefinite renewal policy for students and notify the student if the book has been called for by another student. At Auburn Hills books are circulated on a semester basis unless a request is made for the book while it is in circulation.

At Genesee special attention has been given to the card catalog which is a three-phase catalog: subject, author and title. The librarians at Genesee report that students find it easier to use. Along with the catalog are a series of attractively printed pamphlets called Mott-Inklings, which describe in detail how to use various parts of the library. Finally, at Genesee a reference catalog is being developed in subject areas about which students repeatedly request information. At Auburn Hills and the other campuses of Oakland the computer-based book catalog is distributed freely around the campus for student and faculty use.

Montcalm Community College Library purchases annually two reference works, Facts on File and Editorials on File, which makes it easier for students to do research on current affairs and problems. Both are subject indexed and give students direct access to information not available in serial form in their smaller library. Similar types of materials are found at Macomb Center Campus which subscribes to Newsbank, a comprehensive microfiche library of one hundred fifty newspapers.

In a multiplicity of ways the community college libraries are attempting to become more student-oriented. The emphasis appears to be one of making the library easier to use and more comfortable to use by both students and faculty. Library consciousness is an attitude and eventually a methodology shared by faculty, students and librarians. It is in fact a shared understanding of the library's role and commitment to the instructional process. At two smaller colleges the writer's interviews were interrupted by the librarians who left to assist students who appeared to be having difficulty using the library. In each case it was a reminder to the writer that in these libraries he was a guest and the student was receiving expected help from his librarian in his library.

New Technological Applications in  
the Libraries

With the new technologies permeating the instructional programs of many of the colleges, one might expect considerable technological changes in the operating of community college libraries which are rapidly becoming instructionally oriented. As a result of the visitations to most of Michigan's community colleges, this writer must conclude that for the most part the new technologies, such as data processing, electronic information storage and retrieval, television, rapid communications and the like, have not been readily adopted by the libraries nor is there much of an awakening interest in technological applications to community college libraries.

In recent years there have been exploratory discussions by many librarians of computer applications for technical processes in the libraries. These discussions have been provoked by the membership of the Michigan Community College Librarians Association, but there has been no progress beyond the discussion stage. During the interviews many librarians indicated only a passive interest in computer applications for their libraries. There appeared to be wide disagreements among the librarians as a group and even among librarians within individual colleges in some cases. There are computer applications presently being used in a few of the larger libraries.

Several have computer-controlled circulation. At Oakland the computer is used to print and up-date the card catalog in book form. At Henry Ford a computer provides a regional periodical listing connecting the Dearborn Campus of the University of Michigan, the Dearborn Public Schools, and Henry Ford Community College libraries. Many of the larger community colleges have computers and electronic data processing, but there appears to be little relationship between the availability of such equipment and possible applications to library processes. The few librarians that expressed an interest in computer applications are thinking in terms of regional library systems in which computers could assist in centralized cataloging, purchasing, circulation and information retrieval; all, however, consider these as possibilities in the distant future.

In the area of library technical processes there is little interest or application of the new technology. An exception is Washtenaw Community College, where an IBM magnetic tape system is used to produce the cards for the catalog. In this system a clerk types on a magnetic tape the basic catalog data from the National Union Catalog with the entry listings. After it is checked by the librarian, the cards are produced automatically with each entry. Cataloging then becomes a rapid and



accurate process with the help of a rather simple technological application. At Macomb Center Campus a microfilm system allows for immediate reproduction of catalog cards. The microfilm collection of Library of Congress cards, indexed for immediate retrieval, is purchased commercially and expedites the cataloging of materials. These are the limits of technological applications found for the most part. In general, technology has not been adopted by the community college libraries. Most libraries still order the Library of Congress cards, still circulate their collections by hand, and, generally, have not sought new ways to reduce the time-consuming technical processes that are inherent in a functioning library.

The new, multi-media approaches to teaching in the instructional fields have not been adopted by the community college libraries in the teaching of library use. There is one isolated example at Washtenaw where a staff member has developed an auto-tutorial package using audio-tape and slides to orient students in library use. Generally, the librarians exhibit little interest in applying technology to their own work in running the libraries. There appears to be an enigma in which the libraries are adapting to new modes of instruction which require intricate technological applications, while at the same time they are not seriously concerned with

applying this technology to their own operations, especially in their clerical and retrieval responsibilities.

#### Cooperative Efforts with Other Libraries

For many of the community college libraries with limited funds and small collections the advantages of inter-library cooperation are so great that interest in the potential for such cooperation is quite strong among most of the librarians. Several techniques designed to enhance and encourage cooperation already exist. Among these is the "hot-line" which connects all the community college libraries with the State Library in Lansing. This library calls each of the community colleges on a regular weekly basis and takes requests for materials which are then duplicated and sent by mail to the requesting institution. Every librarian who was interviewed indicated it was a valuable service to the colleges and was used with regularity at his institution.

A second cooperative system is the Southwestern Educational Library Project (SWELP) which connects Western Michigan University's libraries with public, college and special libraries in eight southwestern Michigan counties. Funded under a federal grant, it services five of the public community colleges with direct access to most of its collection on a loan basis. Of the five libraries using the service, four communicate by telephone while

Kalamazoo Valley is connected by teletype. The community college librarians report a one-day delivery time in most cases. In effect, each of these five community college libraries have vastly expanded their collections and services to students and faculty through use of the SWELP system. At Muskegon the librarian reported that two faculty members were able to complete doctoral dissertations because of the research material supplied through the system.

Colleges located near university campuses report excellent cooperation on the part of the four-year schools. Such is the case at Genesee with the University of Michigan, at Lansing with Michigan State University, at Henry Ford with the Dearborn Campus of Michigan, and at Washtenaw with the University of Michigan. The librarians report that requests to the universities for research materials not available at their own community colleges are responded to quickly and enthusiastically by the universities.

The libraries are beginning to look toward the universities, their sister community colleges and public libraries in their districts for ways to increase the availability of learning materials for their students. There appears to be both activity and thinking toward regional library networks and the foundations are being laid with the increased emphasis on university-community college cooperation. The librarians believe that the

universities want to be of assistance to the two-year colleges and up to the present time the performance of the universities in trying to accommodate requests from the community colleges has been encouraging. Almost all of the librarians interviewed expressed this opinion.

On the local district level the library cooperation has been minimal. There are some cases of cooperative purchasing of audio-visual materials and equipment. This cooperation is usually between the college and the intermediate district as in the four-county district in which Mid-Michigan College is located. The community colleges appear to have built their library collections with little regard to existing public libraries and cooperation is almost non-existent. The librarians argue the case that the libraries' purposes and their clientele are so different, that there is little need or opportunity for cooperative planning in collection development. Three librarians did admit, however, that they individually could be doing more to cooperate with local public libraries.

As this writer visited the community college libraries, on several occasions he visited the local county library. This was the case at Monroe County, where the public library was located one mile from the community college library. Both libraries are well-stocked, apparently adequate libraries for their purposes. One

could not help wondering if there weren't a better way of providing library services to Monroe County's citizens and its students than to have two fine, growing libraries literally looking at each other across the road. Similar situations existed in many of the community college districts.

The success of further cooperative efforts among the community college libraries, the university libraries and the public libraries appears to depend on two related variables. The first is the attitudes of those people in charge of these libraries. What is needed is a willingness to cooperate, combined with a recognition that there are fiscal and space limitations for the community college library collections, a recognition on the part of the community college, the university and public librarians and administrators. As a result of the interviews, the writer is convinced that these attitudes do exist and that inter-library cooperation is functioning at an extremely high level.

The second variable is the application of new technological methods of high-speed communication systems that allow for instantaneous contact, retrieval and response between libraries. There is a potential for the application of computer technology, microwave and cable television and microfilm technology applied to

inter-library communication. Positive attitudes producing a spirit of cooperation is obviously not enough. It must be complemented by a search for new methodologies. At the community college level in Michigan in 1970-71 this search has apparently not begun.

### Library Problems in The Community Colleges

When the librarians being interviewed were asked, "What kinds of major problems is your library now facing?" three areas of concern were mentioned with exceptional consistency across all of the libraries in the study. These areas included: (1) financing, (2) utilization of resources, and (3) measurement of effectiveness. By far the over-riding concern was the area of financial condition of the libraries. Of the six evaluative criteria selected by the administrator-librarian panel, five of the six are directly related to adequate financing. President John Dimitry of Macomb felt that the essential element in a successful library is financing when he stated, "The key to success of these libraries is their financial condition." Certainly, it becomes obvious that with maximized financial support any library could be evaluated high on almost all of the evaluative criteria discussed in Chapter IV.

The analysis of the present financial condition of the community college libraries in Michigan suggests serious budgetary problems in every one of the libraries.

Again, without exception every library director reported that up to the present year the financial support of the library had been exceptionally good at his college. With the advent of the educational financing problems in the State of Michigan in 1970, the librarians report that the effect on the community college libraries has been almost catastrophic. As budgetary pressures have been exerted on the individual community colleges, the library has felt the full impact of these pressures.

Part of the problem was explained by one president who stated, "When budgets are squeezed, it is possible to cut library acquisitions, unfortunately." Most of the community college's budget is allocated for salaries of tenured faculty and, in some cases, administrators. A considerable portion of the budget, then, is fixed and cannot be manipulated or reduced. The library is in the unfortunately unique position of having a budget which can be manipulated. In most colleges the effect of the fiscal squeeze has been in the reduction of the acquisitions budget which in many colleges is in the tens of thousands of dollars, and, in some cases of larger colleges, exceeds the hundred thousand dollar level. Almost all of the librarians report reductions in their acquisitions budgets. The Auburn Hills budget, as an example, was reduced from \$38,000 to \$4,000 last year until pressures from the

student body caused the governing board and administration to raise this allocation to \$18,000, still a reduction of more than fifty per cent. Eleven libraries reported cuts in their acquisitions budgets.

Several librarians have reported that additional budgetary cuts have been accomplished in the community college libraries by the method of not replacing library staff personnel when they leave. Seven of the twenty colleges visited reported a reduction in staff size since the survey was conducted in 1970. Three others indicated that within the next year staff reduction might occur at their colleges if personnel left as was being anticipated.

It appears that while financial commitment to the libraries has been reasonably strong in the past, at the present time budgetary pressures on the community colleges are negatively affecting that commitment on the part of governing boards and chief administrators. It is, of course, much easier to support the libraries during "good times," but some questions must be raised as to the validity of such commitments to the library in times of financial stress. In Chapter VI which follows, a summary analysis of the growth of community college libraries will be presented. Much of this growth during the years from 1965 to 1970 has been in collection development and staffing. If the present trend of reducing library



budgets continues, it is doubtful if that growth can be maintained.

A second major problem identified in the interviews is in the area of utilization. Although most of the librarians recognize some value to the circulation criterion used in the evaluative phase of this study, most indicate that there is a lack of effective means to study library utilization. At Macomb, which has made the largest financial commitment to the library of any community college in Michigan, the President indicates that to some extent he is "on the spot," having recommended the massive infusion of capital outlay and operating funds for the learning resource center. He stated, "These facilities must be used or they cannot be justified." The problems for most librarians is discovering more effective methods of determining utilization. Circulation is recognized as one indicator of use, but only limited interpretation can be made of circulation statistics.

Most of the community college libraries make regular headcount studies during the school year. Some record closed-reserve transactions; others keep reshelving records by academic areas. Many of the librarians report that they have yet to solve the problem of measurement of library use. There is a general dissatisfaction with present methods. Some questions of use that still require

new and as yet undetermined methods include: "Who are the students who use the library? How are they different from those who do not use the library? How do students use the library?"

The problem of utilization measurement is really a research problem, and perhaps this is one reason it has not been effectively dealt with as yet. Professional librarians are not usually trained in research methodology. The colleges may very well need to supply research support services to the library if these types of questions are to be answered adequately.

Several colleges, including Delta, Macomb and Lansing, among others, are beginning to take this approach. Research and development administrators in these colleges are developing research models addressed to these critical utilization questions. The fact that librarians identify utilization research as a major problem is in itself an indicator of the concern within the library profession. In this sense both community college administrators and librarians have a shared goal that they may reach in the not-too-distant future.

The third major library problem identified in this qualitative phase of the study is directly related to the problem of utilization. It, too, is a measurement problem. To what extent are the libraries effective?

One director of a large community college library suggested that the critical question that must be asked is, "How have we (the library staff) affected the user?" The problem is one of evaluation. Just as the instructional program must measure the student in terms of behavioral outcomes, so too, must the library concern itself with behavioral objectives for the library user. It is obviously not enough to assume that if a library is adequately financed and staffed and is open, then, in fact, the students or users are changing as a result of their library experiences.

If the library is to become the instructional heart of the college's academic program, then it must define in behavioral terms the end product of its instruction. The problem is two-fold: identification of objectives and measurement of these objectives. Again it must be reported that librarian concern for this problem is beginning to appear in many of the colleges, but unfortunately the solution to this problem seems distant. The need for research support services for the library seems readily apparent. It is doubtful that these research-oriented problems will be solved until the colleges apply support to their libraries in the form of research personnel, money and time. Both the problem of utilization and the problem of library effectiveness are, in fact, institution-wide problems that require institution-wide resources for solution.

### Absence of Library Goals and Objectives

The existence of the related problems of student library utilization and library effectiveness underscore a weakness of the libraries that was found during the visitations. The libraries have not addressed themselves to the task of defining their own goals and objectives in terms of behavioral outcomes of their users. Few of the libraries visited had clearly stated goals. The few that did had goals so broadly stated that they could not be measured quantitatively regardless of research support services that might be made available by the institution.

Most of the libraries visited did not have any written objectives that could be used for evaluation of library effectiveness. There appeared to be an assumption that "everybody knows what a library's objectives are." Further, those libraries which did have a written statement of goals did not have specific written and agreed-upon measurable objectives.

The problem of measurement of library effectiveness will not be solved until the professional librarians with the assistance and cooperation of community college administrators address themselves to the pre-empting problem of development of library objectives. Relationships will have to be determined between the objectives of the college, the instructional program and the library-learning resources center. This, too, is an institution-wide

problem and requires institution-wide resources for solution. Some of the leadership will need to come from the professional librarian. At the present time this leadership has not appeared.

#### Relationship Between Quantitative and Qualitative Analyses

Ideally, the quantitative analysis of the libraries described in the previous chapter and the qualitative, in-depth analysis presented in this chapter should be related. The evaluative methodology presented in this thesis identified colleges that on the basis of the statistical data appeared to rank high on the selected criteria in comparison to other community college libraries. An examination of the colleges so identified may reveal the extent to which the evaluative methodology is, in fact, an accurate indicator of the dynamic nature of the library and its effectiveness as a learning resources center.

Monroe Community College ranked highest among all colleges in the study. In every criterion except supervised hours of operation it received a "high" score and was above average on that criterion. The in-depth, qualitative analysis of Monroe brought to the surface some special characteristics of this institution that separates it from most other community colleges. The most outstanding characteristic is the President of the college.

Dr. Campbell gave leadership to his governing board to the extent of obtaining solid financial commitments for collection development. Further, the learning resources center was given highest priority in the campus master plan and was built immediately. Facility-wise it is one of the best equipped, spacious and aesthetically attractive facilities in the state and is located in the physical center of the campus.

The library has a competent, well-trained staff including a media specialist who works closely with faculty. Special training sessions in multi-media instructional approaches are provided to the faculty on a regular basis. Emphasis is placed on librarian-faculty relationships, and a professional library for faculty is located in the learning resource center.

The attitudes of the President of the college are transmitted to the entire library staff and faculty, and are best exemplified in a response he made to the writer to the question, "What makes a library innovative?" He stated, "Perhaps the truly innovative library is one which actually does what we say it is supposed to do." Obviously, one of the characteristics of a successful library operation is the attitude the chief administrator has toward the role of the library and the extent to which he translates his attitude into active and dynamic leadership at his institution.

The second highest-ranked community college library, based on the evaluative criteria, is Genesee Community College, which shares its facilities with the Flint Campus of the University of Michigan. The library ranked high on staff, circulation, hours of operation and size of collection. Both staffing and collection size can be partially explained by the uniqueness of the Mott Library which receives financial support from two institutions, the college and the university. Because of this unique source of funding the library is able to maintain a comparatively large staff and has been able to develop a sizeable collection.

Effective utilization of staff appears to be one of the major strengths of Genesee. It is one of the few colleges that has made academic specialists of its librarians who have become identified with divisions and departments in the instructional program. Heavy emphasis has been placed on making the library easier to use by students and faculty. It is one of the few colleges that has a three-phase catalog; it has developed the Mott Inklings, which explain in detail how to use various parts of the library. It has spent considerable time and money on researching circulation data, book and periodical use in the library, and up-dating the collection. It was the only college reporting activity in culling out deadwood from its collection. The fact that it ranked

high on circulation can be attributed in part to this emphasis on making the library easier to use and fortifying and modifying the collection. Two additional characteristics to successful library operation are found at Genesee: one, of course, is strong financial support; the other, an emphasis on a quality, up-to-date collection, the use and circulation of which is encouraged by an emphasis on making the library more accessible and easier to use by students.

Montcalm Community College is one of the more recently established libraries in Michigan. The evaluation system ranked it high on three criteria: staff, expenditures and acquisitions, all financial-based criteria. Again, the in-depth analysis pointed to two strengths of the college. The first was a commitment of capital outlay funds for library development. The second was a strong library commitment on the part of the President, Dr. Donald Fink, who had come to Montcalm with more than a dozen years of community college experience. He was able to transmit his commitment for a quality library to both his board and his librarian. The librarian reported in the interview that his president was "approachable." Another characteristic of successful library operation appears to be the relationship of the chief administrative officer with his library director.



Delta College ranked high on two of the criteria, hours of operation and size of collection. The qualitative analysis of Delta points to one over-riding strength--the emphasis placed on the library as a support mechanism for the instructional processes of the institution. It is at Delta where the librarians do not have offices, and their desks are located in the center of the library. Again, it is at this institution where the largest per cent of the professional staff time is devoted to interpretation with faculty and students. The library director, as one might expect, is an Associate Dean in the Academic Affairs department of the college. As in the discussion of the three previous colleges, the relationship between high rankings on some of the evaluative criteria and the actual practice in the institution becomes apparent. The evaluative criteria do become indicators and clues to the dynamics of the libraries. In a college like Delta with heavy emphasis on instructional support, it is not unexpected that their hours of operation and the size of the collection would be high-ranked criteria reflecting an instructional services philosophy.

Northwestern Michigan College ranks high on two criteria, collection and expenditures for acquisitions. It is at this institution that the major emphasis is on "library consciousness" of faculty. Northwestern is the

college that emphasizes faculty involvement in the selection of books and periodicals and the faculty is encouraged to select books and other reading materials in their scholarly avocational fields. It is at Northwestern where the strong, proprietary interest in the library is evidenced by the attitude of the faculty. The strengths indicated by the evaluative criteria are directly related to the philosophical underpinnings of this library and its practices. A fourth characteristic of successful library operation appears to be the attitudes of the faculty toward the library, attitudes that can be directed positively by the relationship of the librarian with the faculty.

The last of the selected colleges visited was Glen Oaks Community College, one of the newer and smaller institutions in Michigan. The college ranks high on circulation, staff and expenditures for acquisitions. The qualitative analysis indicates that one of its major strengths is the administrative status of the librarian who is defined in the master contract as a division chairman and has exceptionally strong communication with the faculty. She meets regularly with the division chairman and sits on the curriculum committee. As a result she has been able to achieve involvement of the faculty in selection of books and periodicals. The effect of this faculty involvement is exemplified in both the college's

high ranking in the acquisitions criterion and in the circulation criterion. It is reasonable to assume that a faculty actively involved in building the collection will encourage its use in their classes. A fifth characteristic of successful library operation appears to be the ability of the librarian to involve the faculty in the development of the library and instill a proprietary interest in it. Both Northwestern and Glen Oaks have been able to promote this vested interest by the faculty.

The evaluative criteria, based on statistical data, permit the investigator to identify superior community college libraries, but further the evaluation rankings become clues to strengths of the libraries. They do not indicate the dynamics of the library but provide direction to where those dynamics may be found. Statistical analysis of library data is necessarily self-limiting. It cannot alone describe the vitality of a library. In-depth, on-site interviews and observations permit the investigator to understand and evaluate the library as a functioning, dynamic entity. The two approaches, quantitative and qualitative analysis, complement each other.

#### Summary

1. Although many of the community college libraries are not totally committed to the library college concept,

they are becoming actively involved in the instructional programs of the colleges. Involvement has taken the form of teacher-librarian teams which develop instructional methodologies, work with students in the learning resources environment and provide continuous resource support to students.

2. Library-centered teaching appears to be most successful in those colleges where the library staff perceives their role as instructional, where administrative support for experimentation is strong, and where the faculty is motivated and willing to experiment.

3. Community colleges have developed learning resource centers where the library has become a center for new instructional techniques, including auto-tutorial instruction, programmed learning and systems approaches to teaching.

4. Libraries have acquired a multiplicity of new roles to complement newer instructional strategies. As multi-media approaches have become part of the fabric of instruction, the libraries have assumed new responsibilities for technical assistance, staffing and training of faculty and students.

5. Librarians are becoming more actively involved in instructional planning and are participating in administrative and curricula councils and are identifying with academic divisions and departments.

6. Increased emphasis is being placed on librarian articulation with faculty and students. The interpretive aspects of the professional librarian's skills are becoming more accentuated, and technical process is slowly being relegated to para-professional and clerical levels.

7. New community college libraries have developed rapidly and effectively during the past five years in Michigan. The rapid and successful development of these libraries can be attributed to financial support by governing boards, strong leadership and commitment to libraries by community college chief administrators, and dedication and ability of library directors.

8. Quality library facilities abound in Michigan with many of the more recently built libraries providing a variety of specialized areas and facilities specifically designed to attract faculty and students, and increase the utilization of the library.

9. Librarians are developing new methods to increase the quality and extent of their relationships with faculty and students. A variety of approaches are being used by librarians to develop "library-conscious" faculties and proprietary attitudes among users.

10. Libraries are heavily involved in new technological applications in instruction but few of the new technologies are being applied to library operations,

per se. There appears to be minimum use of computers and data processing for library operations, few applications of multi-media techniques for teaching library use and a general lack of interest by librarians in experimenting with technological applications for library operations.

11. Inter-library cooperation, especially between community colleges and universities in Michigan, is expanding at a rapid rate. Systems such as the South-western Michigan Educational Library Project and the State Library "Hot-Line" are making it possible for community college libraries to expand their services and increase their potential as libraries offering research support services.

12. Several major problems are now faced by Michigan's community colleges. The educational financing problems of the State have directly affected the community college libraries which have experienced cutbacks in acquisitions budgets and some decrease in staff during the past two fiscal years. The evaluative problems of measurement of library utilization and measurement of library effectiveness have not been solved. The need for research assistance has become apparent, and community colleges will need to provide institutional resources above and beyond those available within the library, if these evaluative problems are to be dealt with effectively.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In this chapter the study is summarized. The present status of Michigan community college libraries is compared to their status of five years ago. Recommendations for their future development are presented. The qualitative recommendations are based on the results of the visitations made by the writer. The quantitative recommendations are based primarily on the normative data of the high-ranked libraries described in Chapter IV.

#### Recent Growth of the Community College Libraries

In June of 1965 a study was completed by Nelson Associates, Incorporated. The study, A Program for the Rapid Improvement of Community College Libraries in Michigan,<sup>98</sup> was commissioned by the Michigan State Library and examined the adequacy of the libraries on the basis of collection, staff and budget, using the 1960 standards of the American Library Association. This is the only major study of Michigan's community college libraries prior to the present

---

<sup>98</sup>Nelson Associates, op. cit.

study. Though not comprehensive, the Nelson study provides the opportunity to make some quantitative comparisons of the libraries during a period of time when the general growth rate of community colleges in Michigan was at its peak.

The first of the three A.L.A. standards that was applied in the study involved the size of the basic collection. The standard requires a basic core collection of 20,000 volumes which is to be enlarged by 5,000 volumes for every 500 students beyond 1,000. Table 6.1 compares the Nelson report of 1965 to similar data for the same eighteen colleges in 1970. It should be noted that, as was pointed out in Chapter II, the standards of the A.L.A. was not accepted by a considerable number of administrators and librarians; however, it is felt that the data presented in the standards form by Nelson Associates provides a reasonable baseline for a comparison of data.

Table 6.1 indicates the size of the collections of the existing community college libraries in 1965, the A.L.A. standard based on the enrollment of the college at that time, and the percentage of the standard met by the size of the collection. The same data are presented for 1970 and have been extracted from the descriptive phase of this present study. Summary data for all eighteen colleges, as a group, are also provided.



TABLE 6.1.--Comparison of 1965 Nelson Report of Community College Library Collections with 1970 Data.

College	1965 Holdings	A.L.A. Standard	% of Standard	1970 Holdings	A.L.A. Standard	% of Standard	% of Increase
Alpena	10,115	20,000	51	14,511	20,000	73	+22
Bay De Noc	10,000	20,000	50	16,000	20,000	80	+30
Delta	50,000	31,060	161	71,324	49,870	143	-18
Genesee	84,639	49,670	170	95,435	53,700	177	+ 7
Gogebic	12,822	20,000	64	15,975	20,000	80	+16
Grand Rapids	18,873	39,680	48	33,000	50,400	65	+17
Henry Ford	30,000	56,210	53	60,972	69,910	87	+34
Highland Park	22,500	30,270	74	18,153	36,460	50	-24
Jackson	18,000	24,760	53	18,259	31,590	58	+ 5
Kellogg	14,000	25,580	55	25,702	29,150	88	+33
Lake Michigan	15,000	21,490	70	30,000	24,620	122	+52
Lansing	22,669	29,610	77	41,500	49,750	83	+ 6
Macomb	20,000	41,860	48	87,590	99,390	88	+40
Muskegon	10,500	27,540	38	27,032	35,430	76	+38
North Central	11,000	20,000	55	16,508	20,000	83	+28
Northwestern	18,500	20,000	93	29,568	21,730	136	+43
St. Clair	9,486	28,210	34	24,339	29,040	84	+50
Schoolcraft	18,500	23,460	78	41,103	43,950	94	+16
Totals	391,604	529,400	74%	666,971	704,990	95%	+21%

Of the eighteen colleges studied, sixteen libraries increased the size of their collections. One of the remaining two, Delta, experienced a proportional decrease but still exceeded the minimum standard. It should be noted that as the colleges' enrollments grew, the standard for the size of their collection increased proportionately. On a summary basis, the eighteen colleges, as a group, increased their collections by 275,367 volumes during the five years and increased their percentage of the standard from seventy-four per cent to ninety-five per cent. During this period of time the colleges' enrollments increased from 32,144 full-time equated students to 50,587, an increase of fifty-seven per cent. Their collections, however, increased by over seventy per cent. It can be concluded that during the past five years the community college libraries have made progress in developing their collections. As the colleges have grown in size, library collections have grown at an even more accelerated rate. It may be further concluded that attention has been paid by librarians, administrators and governing boards to developing adequate book stocks in the libraries.

The second of the three A.L.A. standards which was applied in 1965 was in the area of staffing. The minimum staffing requirement calls for two professional librarians and at least one non-professional staff member. Table 6.2 compares the staffs of the eighteen colleges in 1965 and

TABLE 6.2.--Comparison of 1965 Nelson Report of Community College Library Staffs with 1970 Data.

College	Library Staffs			
	1965		1970	
	Profes- sionals	Non- Professionals	Profes- sionals	Non- Professionals
Genesee	9	12	9.5	14
Delta	4	6	5	8
Henry Ford	4	2	8	1
Schoolcraft	3	2	6	4.5
Grand Rapids	3	1	4	1.6
Jackson	3	1	3	1
Macomb	2	5	8.5	15.5
Northwestern	2	2	2	2
<u>A.L.A. Standard</u>				
	<u>Two</u>	<u>One</u>		
Alpena	2	0	2	1
Highland Park	1	2	2.5	3
Lansing	1	2	6.5	13.5
Muskegon	1	2	5	7.5
St. Clair	1	1	4.5	4
Kellogg	1	1	4	1
Lake Michigan	1	0	3	3
<u>A.L.A. Standard</u>				
	<u>Two</u>	<u>One</u>		
Gogebic	1	1	1	2.2
North Central	1	0	1	1
Bay De Noc	1	0	1.5	1

the same college staffs in 1970. In 1965 eight of the colleges met the minimum staffing requirement. Of the remaining ten, nine had only one professional librarian and the tenth library lacked a non-professional staff member. The comparison with the 1970 data indicates that fifteen of the colleges now meet the minimum staff requirements set forth by the standard, an increase of thirty-nine per cent. Of the eighteen colleges, sixteen have increased the size of their library staffs. It seems reasonable to conclude that there has been some progress in library staff development in Michigan's community colleges during the past five years.

The third A.L.A. standard applied was in the area of operational budgets. The standard requires that the library budget be at least five per cent of the institution's operating budget. Nelson Associates did not directly request financial data from the community colleges, but did survey the librarians through use of a questionnaire which asked for a judgment of the adequacy of the budget for printed materials. They reported nine of seventeen librarians felt that the budget was not adequate. During the visitation interviews conducted for the qualitative phase of this study, eighteen library directors were asked to judge the adequacy of their acquisitions budget. Without exception the librarians indicated

that prior to the present year, the financial support for library acquisitions was at the very least satisfactory. Twelve of the librarians described their budgets as good or excellent. Not one librarian described his budget as inadequate in the area of acquisitions.

Some comparison of the library budget data for Michigan can be made with data accumulated by the National Center of Education Statistics of Health, Education and Welfare. For all reporting two-year, public institutions in the United States, library expenditures account for three and two-tenths per cent of the institutional operating budgets, while in Michigan for the same year, 1969-70, the figure reported in Chapter IV is four and eight-tenths. It can be concluded that Michigan's community college libraries are receiving a comparatively higher level of financing than community college libraries nationally, and further, in the five years between 1965 and 1970 there has been a positive change in the attitudes of librarians toward the adequacy of their budgets.

### Qualitative Recommendations

#### Introduction

This study has presented a qualitative description and evaluation of Michigan's community college libraries and a quantitative analysis which has attempted to identify concepts and practices that appear to have been effective

for the libraries in expanding their roles, in becoming more instructionally relevant and in developing some of the aspects of the library-centered college. These recommendations presented are an attempt to bring into sharp focus some of these concepts and practices that have been found in the study. As has already been emphasized in Chapter V, many of the individual colleges have strengths unique to that institution. When these concepts or practices appeared to be generally feasible and applicable to many community college libraries, they are included. These qualitative recommendations are a synthesis of effective practices found in the study combined with the researcher's interpretation and intuitive judgments of sound educational methods that the study has uncovered. They are perceived as an ideal that may be achieved and are presented as guidelines that may be used for further development of community college libraries.

#### The Library's Role in the Institution

The library's role will be determined primarily on the basis of how it is perceived by the administration and faculty of the institution. These perceptions will be influenced by the attitudes and commitment of the chief administrative officer. If he views the library as the instructional heart of the college, if he sees the library

as an inherent part of the instructional process rather than only as a support service, if he perceives instruction as the ultimate objective with teaching as the major role of his library, he will establish a learning environment in which administrators and faculty will view the library as a true center for learning. In a variety of ways the president will transmit to his administration and faculty the over-riding precept that the objectives emanating from the instructional program are primary and that faculty, librarians and library facilities are resources to be used for the benefit of the students.

The fine differentiations that are usually made in traditional higher education between what professional teachers do and what professional librarians do will be replaced with an approach that asks what can the professional teacher do and what can the professional librarian do to help reach agreed-upon instructional objectives. It is at the presidential and instructional dean's level of college administration in community colleges that the atmosphere is established which allows for a perception of the library as the center of instructional activity.

When the library's role is that of an instructional or learning resources center, it will accommodate a variety of media, including but not limited to traditional printed materials. It will also provide technical support staff

and services which have become part of the library as a result of its perceived role.

### The Librarian's Role

There is a close interrelationship between the library's role and the librarian's role. As the president and instructional dean help establish the environment through which the library's role may be perceived, the librarian establishes the methodology for the role. The librarian translates perception into activity, instructional needs into services, and attitude into involvement. He will spend some of his time becoming aware and making his staff aware of the existing instructional program and long-range curricula and academic planning. He will do this by becoming a functioning member of the academic council, the curriculum council and other internal mechanisms of the college and by actively participating in their work.

The librarian will hire, develop and train his staff to a technical level of expertise that complements the multi-media roles of the library. He will place major emphasis on the interpretive roles of the professional librarians and audio-visual specialists. He will accomplish this in several related ways. At the first level he will develop and transmit to his professionals



the idea that direct contact with faculty and students, in the forms of reference work, bibliographic development and other types of instructional assistance, is the major role of the professional. At a secondary level he will delegate clerical requirements of library operations to clerical staff, students and machines. In developing a library staff he will emphasize in his budgeting the need for adequate, non-professional support staff for his librarians.

In his relationship with the faculty, the librarian will develop in the teaching staff of the college a vested interest in the library. He will encourage maximum faculty participation in the selection of books, periodicals and audio-visual media. He will actively solicit from the faculty involvement in all aspects of library operations, including budgeting, acquisitions, long-range planning of facilities and equipment and general operations of the library. He will assume a role of a coordinator of instructional resources, both human and physical, designed to complement and support the instructional objectives of the institution. He will seek out instructional problems of the faculty that may be solved through the expansion or modification of existing learning resources. He will emphasize continuous articulation between the library staff and the teaching faculty and will recognize the

value of meeting with the faculty in their offices, departmental meetings, classrooms and lounge areas. The librarian will acquire expertise in articulation and communications and will use this expertise to sell the library as an instructional tool.

### Library Relationships with Students

The community college library staff will seek new ways of accommodating student learning needs. They will assume that its primary purpose is to serve students and will translate this assumption into activities designed to make the library easier to use and more effective and responsive to student needs. It will explore new methods of circulation of both printed materials and other media. It will examine circulation possibilities that allow for increased use of the collection inside and outside the library with minimum penalties for overdue materials. The library will continuously search for new types of reference materials that facilitate student use especially materials designed for use in the community colleges. Use of professionals and trained technicians for reference work with students will be encouraged.

As far as it is feasible, the library will encourage student participation in book, periodical and media selection. It will open up lines of communication with student groups that will encourage student participation in all aspects of

library planning and operations. The library will regularly review student attitudes and dissatisfactions with the library by a variety of means, including student liaison committees, research surveys and other methods of feedback.

Orientation of students for library use will be perceived as an on-going and continuous process that involves the entire library staff and the faculty. Librarians will move into the classrooms and classes will meet in the library with faculty and librarians working as a team to help relate the learning resources of the institution to the instructional goals of the academic program.

The catalog of the library will be a comprehensive index of all learning materials and students will perceive the collection as a multi-media resource that is available for their use on the campus, in the library and at home. Both the staff of the library and its holdings will be perceived by students as resources readily made available to them to assist in accomplishing their learning objectives.

#### Facilities

The planning and development of library and learning resource facilities will actively involve librarians and multi-media specialists. Educational specifications will

be developed with the help of the library staff and faculty and will be related to specific behavioral outcomes derived from the academic programs of the college. The expected role of the learning resources center will be a primary determinant of facilities planning.

The governing board of the college with direction and leadership from the President, the instructional dean and the librarian, will adopt a master plan that provides for sufficient appropriations to meet both the required education specifications of the facility and an adequate multi-media collection. In the campus master planning, attention will be given to providing long-term financial assistance for collection development which will allow the librarian to develop a multi-year acquisitions plan for the library.

The community college library will provide specialized facilities designed to encourage faculty and student use with emphasis placed on comfort, spaciousness and aesthetic desirability. The library will be located centrally and as close as possible to the other instructional areas of the campus. The facility will include classrooms, faculty and counseling offices, and small group conference rooms for use of students, faculty and community groups.

Provision of space for typing rooms, programmed learning laboratories, other specialized equipment

laboratories, will be considered as they relate to the predetermined instructional outcomes. Space will also be considered for a professional library and lounge, smoking and lounge areas for students, and general lounge areas for other users of the library. The facilities will be planned so that the library will be perceived by users as a place for study and research, for intellectual interaction by both faculty and students, and for general relaxation.

#### Development of the Multi-Media Center Concept

The community college library, with its expanded responsibilities for multi-media resources, will have as part of its staff an audio-visual specialist with particular expertise in working with faculty in materials development. Under his direct supervision will be technical assistants with competencies in graphics and design, photography, television, electronics, and other technical areas which support media development. The audio-visual specialist will devote much of his time working with individual faculty members and departments in exploring new methods of incorporating multi-media applications to the instructional process. He will become increasingly aware of the objectives of the various academic programs and courses. He will encourage faculty members to experiment with new

media providing them with direction, technical expertise, and technical support services through his staff. The audio-visual specialist will join with the academic administrative unit to recommend budgetary considerations for released time for faculty members to develop media materials. He will develop and transmit to his staff a firm conviction that a multi-media center is dependent upon faculty participation in materials development. This conviction will be translated into staff activities that support and encourage faculty involvement.

The library will have adequate space provisions for storage and maintenance of equipment, offices for technical personnel and specialized facilities for faculty members to develop materials. These facilities could include recording studios, audio listening laboratories, closed-circuit television taping studios, graphics preparation rooms, darkrooms and other types of media preparation rooms.

The library budget will be planned to include multimedia development. Budgeting will provide for staff assistance, materials and equipment for media development by faculty. As the library staff works with students in a continuous orientation program designed to encourage library use, similarly the audio-visual technical staff will spend much of its time with faculty in a continuous

program of orientation in multi-media usage and potential applications to the instructional process. Finally, the audio-visual staff will take full advantage of the fact that most colleges have some faculty innovators who need only to be encouraged. The staff will actively seek to identify such innovators on their campus and will encourage experimental and demonstration-type projects in the multi-media field.

#### Technological Applications

In the community college library there will be a major emphasis placed on seeking new applications of recent advances in electronic technology. Within the fiscal limits of the institutional budget and the library budget, studies will be made of possible computer applications to the technical processes of library operations. Electronic data processing will be considered for circulation, purchasing, cataloging, and information retrieval.

The library will examine the potential of multi-media approaches to library orientation for students and faculty. Audio-visual techniques will be considered for teaching the various aspects of library usage. The library will develop an on-going research program designed to assess the potential applications of newer technological forms to library processes. This research program will be

budgeted for and will include some monies for travel of library staff to other libraries where applications have been made. A part of the underlying philosophy of the library will be the concept of continuously seeking new ways to reduce the professional's time in clerical and sub-professional activities and increase the professional librarian's interpretive activities with faculty and students. The application of new technological forms will be one major approach to implementing this concept.

#### Cooperative Efforts with Other Libraries

The model community college library will stress inter-library cooperation as a means of expanding both the collection and services of the library. The universities and other community colleges will be perceived and used as supplemental resources to the library. Whenever possible, the library will attempt to operate as both a receiver and supplier to other libraries. Articulation with the nearby university libraries will be emphasized, as well as with libraries in the immediate district of the college. Whenever possible, attempts will be made to reduce unnecessary duplication of materials and services with local libraries. As the community college library attempts to utilize the vast resources of the universities to expand its services, it will look toward playing a supportive role with local high school libraries and small



community libraries in its district. It will cooperate at all library levels to increase its potential as a learning resource for both the immediate academic community it serves and the broader community of its district.

### Quantitative Recommendations

#### Introduction

Both the quantitative and qualitative phases of this study indicate that in recent years there has been considerable growth and development of the community college libraries in Michigan. These recommendations are suggested as minimum levels of performance below which continued development in the 1970's would be doubtful. For the most part they are derived directly from the study and are based on several related aspects of the study: (1) the normative data of the seven highest-ranked colleges based on the evaluative criteria, (2) concepts and practices identified during visitations to the twenty colleges, (3) recommendations and suggestions offered by community college presidents, academic administrators and library directors, and (4) earlier attempts at development of standards for community college libraries.

Application of these guidelines and continued re-evaluation of them over a long period of time could

provide the basis for the development of new standards for Michigan community college libraries. At the present time, however, they should not be considered standards. They are presented primarily to assist librarians and administrators in long-range planning of community college library services.

#### I--Financing of Community College Libraries

Five of the six evaluative criteria selected by the panel of administrators and librarians are contingent upon adequate library financing. Much of the success of a library operation is dependent upon a realistic budget that is related to the institutional budget. Since a sizeable proportion of the community college budget is directly supportive of instruction and the library is an inherent part of the instructional process, a percentage of that budget should be allocated to library services.

#### Recommendation 1

It is recommended that a minimum of four per cent of the institution's operational budget be allocated for library operations. In colleges having libraries that have assumed the audio-visual function, an additional one per cent of the budget should be allocated for operations and acquisitions in the multi-media field.

Recommendation 2

For recently established community colleges capital outlay appropriations should be provided for both facilities and collection development at the earliest possible time. Appropriations should allow for multiple-year planning by the librarian for collection development.

Recommendation 3

Acquisition of books and periodicals should not fall below twenty-five per cent of the library's operational budget and should be higher during the early years of collection development.

II--Staffing of Community  
College Libraries

The effectiveness of the library as an instructional center for the institution will be dependent upon adequate professional and non-professional staff. Meaningful relationships with faculty and staff will be possible only when enough professional librarians are available, when clerical and sub-professional duties are assumed by non-professional staff members, and when emphasis is placed on the interpretive and instructional skills of the professional librarian.

Recommendation 4

It is recommended that the A.L.A. standard of a minimum of two professional librarians be accepted. It

is further recommended that the A.L.A. standard of one additional librarian for every five hundred full-time equated students beyond one thousand be accepted for minimum staffing requirements.

#### Recommendation 5

It is recommended that for each librarian there should be the full-time equivalent of two non-professional staff members assigned for clerical and related supportive duties. Student hourly assistance should be included as part of the non-professional equivalent.

#### Recommendation 6

It is recommended that the ratio of total library staff size to full-time equated enrollment should not exceed one hundred twenty-five equated students per staff member.

#### Recommendation 7

It is recommended that the library staff should include a specialist in multi-media approaches to instruction. Usually the competencies required for this position require an advanced degree in the field. His primary responsibilities should be dedicated to consultative work with faculty. It is recommended that careful attention be paid to provision for technical support staff in libraries that have assumed the multi-media role.

### III--Collections and Holdings of Community College Libraries

The extent and quality of the library's holdings will play a major role in the effectiveness of the library as an instructional tool. With adequate financing it may be expected that the library's holdings will be sufficient in quantity and quality.

#### Recommendation 8

It is recommended that the A.L.A. minimum standard of a basic collection of 20,000 volumes be accepted. Further, it is recommended that the A.L.A. standard for increasing the size of the collection at the rate of ten volumes per full-time equated student beyond one thousand students be accepted.

#### Recommendation 9

Beyond the minimum size of collection described in the above recommendation, it is further recommended that the library have a minimum of one hundred forty volumes per credit course offered in the instructional program. With strong faculty involvement in acquisitions selection, there can be some assurance of a correlation between collection development and the course offerings of the instructional program.

IV--Other Areas of Library OperationsRecommendation 10

Space.--It is recommended that total space for all library operations exceed twelve square feet per full-time equated student. As the individual college's enrollment reaches two thousand students, a range of ten to twelve square feet should be considered a minimum for total library operations.

Recommendation 11

Hours of operation.--It is recommended that community college libraries be open for supervised operations at least during all campus class hours. Further, weekend operations for the library should be considered when there is minimal evidence that weekend availability of the library is justified. A library should be considered open for operations only when there is at least one professional librarian available for supervision and reference service for users.

Recommendation 12

Administration relationships.--It is recommended that as far as possible the library director be identified with the instructional administration of the college. To that end, it is recommended that the director report to the instructional dean; however, during the early years

of the institution's development it is recommended that the library director report directly to the president until such time as the library has reached a level of maturity in its collection, staff and functional role.

### Recommendation 13

Circulation of collection.--It is recommended that a yardstick of twelve volumes per student per year be used as a measure of reasonable circulation. It is further recommended that established community college libraries whose circulation rates do not reach this minimum actively engage in research to determine possible causes for their lower circulation rates. It is assumed that circulation is one measure of library utilization by students.

### Recommendations for Further Research

This study has attempted to demonstrate the feasibility of measuring quantitative characteristics of community college libraries and then utilizing the data for evaluation on the basis of predetermined criteria. Further, it attempted to demonstrate the viability of on-site investigation as a method for identification of emerging concepts and practices that may facilitate the library's efforts to become more instructionally related and student centered. However, the design of this study has precluded the answering of two related evaluative questions which,

in the final analysis, must be answered if the library-college ideal is ever to be fully realized.

The question of accountability in education has received considerable attention in recent years. If the library is, in fact, becoming an essential part of the instructional process in the community college, it must address itself to the problem of accountability, as must the various other instructional programs of the college. The question that must be raised and answered deals with the end product of the library experience. In simplest form what must be asked is, "What changes in the behavior of the student have occurred as a result of his library experiences?"

Some of the libraries listed a group of very general objectives, while others failed to even define their objectives. Not one of the libraries studied had addressed itself to developing objectives in terms of behavioral outcomes. The problem of measuring the effectiveness of an individual library is dependent upon such development of objectives. It cannot be assumed that a library, adequately financed and staffed, with a strong collection, and with adequate space and facilities, is effective. Having these characteristics can enhance the possibilities of the library's effectiveness, but the measurement of its impact must by necessity be related to behavioral change in the individual.



This present study focused on the evaluation of library resources. Further research into library evaluation should consider two related avenues. First, there is the need for identification of measurable behavioral outcomes of library users that are directly related to agreed-upon community college library activities. It is reasonable to assume that the similarity in the nature and purposes of public community colleges would permit agreement of some library objectives. Secondly, further research should be conducted in the measurement of these behavioral outcomes. This research should include efforts to identify causative factors that contribute to the successful accomplishment of such outcomes and efforts to identify variables that appear to hinder success. Until libraries are able to empirically substantiate their effect on student behavior, they will be unable to respond to these ultimate questions of accountability.

This study did not attempt to evaluate utilization of libraries except to the extent of using circulation data as one measure of utilization and as one of the selected six criteria. The problem of library effectiveness that has been discussed may very well be dependent for solution upon the problem of measurement of library utilization. There has been little research dealing with the utilization of libraries. A series of related

questions need to be answered in this area before the problem of library effectiveness can be dealt with adequately.

Research is needed which will answer the following questions:

What motivates students to use the library?

What characteristics are possessed by students who use the library?

Are they different from students who tend not to use the library?

If they are different, what appear to be the discriminating variables?

What effect does the individual teacher have on library usage by his students?

How do students use the library?

Are their reasons for using the library related to the purposes which justify the library's very existence?

This study has dealt primarily with characteristics of libraries, but it would appear that considerable research is needed in the characteristics of library users. An analogy could be made with the industrial process and may very well be justified in the light of recent public emphasis on accountability. The American industrial enterprise, much more than the educational enterprise, has been held accountable for its products in the past. In effect, this study has dealt with an examination of the machinery by which the product can be made. The questions just raised deal primarily with the reasons the consumer buys the product and uses it.

In the area of library use considerable research is needed as to why libraries are used or not used and how they are used by students. To complete the analogy the problem of library effectiveness is one of measuring the quality of the end product. For the library, the end product is a student who hopefully has been positively affected by his library experience.

One final area for further research is somewhat unique to Michigan's community colleges, but at the same time may have applications in other states. It is the question of the effect of recent financial problems in education that have plagued the state. As has been pointed out in this research, during the past year or two, the community college librarians in Michigan report that they have been forced to operate on rather restricted budgets and that many of the libraries have felt the full brunt of these restrictions. As a result there has been some inhibiting of both staff growth and collection development. The effect these changes will have on the long-term development of the community college libraries needs to be studied. Recommendations from such research could be invaluable in limiting the long-term effects of the possible stunting of the growth that the libraries have experienced during the past decade. Research designed to measure the immediate and long-term effects of financial pressures

could be of value to other community college systems which may in the future experience similar financial problems.

An After-Thought

At the turn of this century William Rainey Harper, regarded as the founder of the junior college movement, observed:

That factor of our college and university work, the library, fifty years ago almost unknown, today already the center of the institutional intellectual activity, half a century hence, with its sister the laboratory . . . will, by absorbing all else, have become the institution itself.

President Harper's prediction is yet to be fully realized, but its validity need no longer be questioned. In Michigan, with one of the most comprehensive community college systems in the country, the libraries are slowly becoming the hearts of their institutions. As true resource centers for learning, they are being staffed by highly qualified and competent people and they are being housed in spacious and dignified facilities. The eventual success of the community college movement in the United States will in no small way be due to the growth and effectiveness of its libraries and learning resource centers.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Harlen M. The Junior College Library Program: A Study of Library Services in Relation to Instructional Procedures. Chicago: American Library Association, and Stanford University, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1940.
- American Library Association. College and University Libraries and Librarianship: An Examination of Their Present Status and Some Proposals for Their Development. Planning for Libraries, No. 6. Chicago: American Library Association, 1946.
- American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. Junior College Library Section. Selected Bibliography on Library Development and Management for Junior College Libraries and Administrators. Chicago: American Library Association, 1968.
- American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. Standards Committee. College and University Library Accreditation Standards-1956. Compiled by Eli M. Oboler, et al. ACRL Monograph, No. 20. Chicago: American Library Association, 1958.
- Conference on Junior College Libraries, 1967, University of California, Los Angeles. Junior College Libraries: Development, Needs and Perspectives. Edited by Everett L. Moore. ACRL Monograph, No. 30. Chicago: American Library Association, 1969.
- Fay, Lucy E. "The Library in the Junior College." American Association of Junior Colleges. Proceedings of Tenth Annual Meeting, Atlantic City, New Jersey, Nov. 19-20, 1929. Nashville, Tenn.: George Peabody College, 1929.
- Johnson, Byron Lamar. "Library Service at the Junior College Level." The Library in General Education. Forty-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1943.

- Lyle, Guy R., et al. Administration of the College Library. 3rd edition. New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1961.
- Michigan Department of Education. An Inventory of Physical Facilities at Institutions of Higher Education in Michigan Fall 1969. Statistical Bulletin 4060. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Department of Education.
- Morrison, Duncan G., and Martorana, S. V. The Two-Year Community College: An Annotated List of Studies and Surveys. U. S. Office of Education Bulletin 1958, No. 14. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1958.
- Nelson Associates, Inc. A Program for the Rapid Improvement of Community College Libraries in Michigan: Report of a Survey Undertaken for the Michigan State Library. New York: Nelson Associates, Inc., 1965.
- Nelson Associates, Inc. Undergraduate and Junior College Libraries in the U. S.: A Report Prepared for the National Advisory Commission on Libraries. New York: Nelson Associates, Inc., 1968.
- North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Revised Manual of Accrediting. Chicago: North Central Association, 1941.
- Stone, Ermine. The Junior College Library. Chicago: American Library Association, 1932.
- U. S. National Center for Educational Statistics. Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities: Analytic Report, Fall 1968. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1970.
- Waples, Douglas, et al. The Evaluation of Higher Institutions. Vol. IV: The Library. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936.
- Wheeler, Helen R. The Community College Library: A Plan for Action. Hamden, Connecticut: Shoe String Press, 1965.
- Wilson, Louis R., and Tauber, Maurice F. The University Library: The Organization, Administration, and Functions of Academic Libraries. 2nd edition. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956.

### Journals

- Adams, Harlen M. "Library Practices and Instructional Methods." Junior College Journal, 8 (February 1938), 254-57.
- Almy, Patty. "Background and Development of the Junior Library." Library Trends, 14 (October 1965), 123-31.
- American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. Committee on Liaison with Accrediting Agencies. "Guide to Methods of Library Evaluation, July 7, 1968." College and Research Libraries News, No. 9 (October 1968), 293-94.
- American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. Junior College Libraries Section. Standards and Criteria Committee. "Guidelines for Establishing Junior College Libraries." College and Research Libraries, 24 (November 1963), 501-05.
- American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. Junior College Libraries Subsection. "Proceedings at the American Library Association Conferences, 1938-1939." American Library Association Bulletin, 32 (October 15, 1938), 824-30; 33 (October 15, 1939), 83-84.
- American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. Standards Committee. "Standards for College Libraries." College and Research Libraries, 20 (July 1959), 274-80.
- American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. Standards Committee. "Standards for Junior College Libraries." College and Research Libraries, 21 (May 1960), 200-06.
- American Library Association. Junior College Libraries Roundtable. "A Junior College 'Measuring Stick.'" American Library Association Bulletin, 24 (1930), 296-97.
- American Library Association. Junior College Libraries Roundtable. "Report of the Committee on Standards." American Library Association Bulletin, 26 (1932), 570-75.



- Ardern, L. L. "Circular 322: Libraries in Technical Colleges." Librarian and Book World, 46 (May 1957), 85-86.
- Bailey, George M. "Junior College Libraries Nationwide, A Report." Illinois Libraries, 49 (November 1967), 162-65.
- Bartlett, Robert. "Projection of Guidelines for the Multi-Media Center." North Central Association Quarterly, 43 (Fall 1968), 224-28.
- Bishop, William W. "Junior College Libraries." Junior College Journal, 5 (December 1934), 111-12.
- Bishop, William W. "Library Service in the Junior College." Junior College Journal, 5 (May 1935), 456-61.
- Burns, Norman. "Accrediting Procedures with Special Reference to Libraries." College and Research Libraries, 10 (April 1949), 155-58.
- Butterfield, George E. "Michigan Libraries." Junior College Journal, 5 (February 1935), 320-21.
- Carnovsky, Leon. "Self-Evaluation; or, How Good is My Library?" College and Research Libraries, 3 (September 1942), 304-10.
- Christensen, Ruth. "Junior College Libraries: Development, Needs, and Perspectives." American Library Association Bulletin, 61 (July 1967), 830-31.
- Clapp, Verner W., and Jordan, Robert T. "Quantitative Criteria for Adequacy of Academic Library Collections." College and Research Libraries, 26 (September 1965), 371-80.
- Clay, Mary H. "Balancing Junior College Instruction with Library Support." College and Research Libraries, 10 (January 1949), 32-36.
- "College and University Library Statistics, 1958-1959: Junior Colleges Group VII." College and Research Libraries, 21 (January 1960), 78-87.
- Coulter, Edith M. "Functions of the Junior College Library." Junior College Journal, 1 (1931), 481-86.

- Councill, Mildred S. "Suggestions for Establishing a Small Junior College Library." Junior College Journal, 29 (November 1958), 146-49.
- Eells, Walter C. "Carnegie Study of Junior College Libraries." Junior College Journal, 7 (January 1937), 176-79.
- Eells, Walter C. "Junior College Libraries." Junior College Journal, 6 (January 1936), 202-06.
- Eells, Walter C. "Junior College Library Criteria." Junior College Journal, 15 (December 1944), 160-65.
- Eells, Walter C. "Needed Developments in Junior College Libraries." College and Research Libraries, 1 (September 1940), 347-56.
- Eells, Walter C. "Significance of the Junior College Library." Junior College Journal, 8 (October 1937), 1-2.
- Elstein, Herman, and Hartz, Frederic R. "Standards, Selection, and the Media Center: Where Are We Now?" Audiovisual Instruction, 15 (December 1970), 35-39.
- Fourth Annual Conference on Junior College Libraries, Southern Illinois University, March 27-29, 1969. Illinois Libraries, 51 (June 1969), 498-510.
- Fusaro, Janiece F. "Toward Library-College Media Centers: A Proposal for the Nation's Community Colleges." Junior College Journal, 40 (April 1970), 40-44.
- Gardner, John W. "A Fancy Gothic Fiction: The Centrality of the Library." Library Journal, 92 (May 15, 1967), 1896-97.
- Gitler, Robert L. "Standards for a Junior College Library." Junior College Journal, 9 (November 1938), 68-71.
- Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. "The Stake of the Junior College in Its Library." College and Research Libraries, 27 (July 1966), 263-66.
- Gore, Daniel. "Mismanagement of College Libraries: A View from the Inside." American Association of University Professors Bulletin, 52 (March 1966), 46-51.

- Griffith, Alice G. "Organization and Administration of the Junior College Library." Library Trends, 14 (October 1965), 132-44.
- Haggard, W. W. "Shortcomings of the Junior College Library." Junior College Journal, 5 (February 1935), 225-26.
- Haggerty, William J., and Works, George A. "An Analysis of the Library Data of the Higher Institutions of the North Central Association for the Year 1933-34." North Central Association Quarterly, 11 (October 1936), 457-69.
- Hale, Charles E. "Survey: Kentucky's Junior/Community College Libraries." Kentucky Library Association Bulletin, 34 (October 1970), 13-21.
- Harvey, John F. "The Role of the Junior College Library." College and Research Libraries, 27 (May 1966), 227-32.
- Harvey, John F. "The Role of the Junior College Library in Classroom Instruction." Junior College Journal, 32 (April 1962), 441-47.
- Hemphill, Mabel H. "Does Accreditation Make for Adequacy?" Louisiana Library Association Bulletin, 31 (Fall 1968), 95-98.
- Hester, Edna. "Junior Colleges: Their Trends and Libraries." Junior College Journal, 6 (December 1935), 130-34.
- Hicks, Warren B. "Center of the Campus: Chabot College Library." Junior College Journal, 37 (November 1966), 38-40.
- Hirsch, Felix E. "Evaluation Trends." Library Trends, 14 (October 1956), 191-202.
- Hirsch, Felix E. "Facing the Future: On the Way to New College Library Standards." College and Research Libraries, 19 (May 1958), 197-200.
- Hirsch, Felix E. "Goals for the Nineteen-Sixties: The Significance of the New American Library Association Standards for Junior College Libraries." Junior College Journal, 31 (November 1960), 135-39.

- Hirsch, Felix E. "How Can We Implement the American Library Association Standards for College Libraries?" College and Research Libraries, 22 (March 1961), 125-29.
- Hirsch, Felix E. "How High Should We Aim?" American Library Association Bulletin, 55 (February 1961), 160-62.
- Hirsch, Felix E. "New Horizons for Junior College Libraries." Library Journal, 85 (June 15, 1960), 2372-75.
- Hirsch, Felix E. "New Standards to Strengthen College Libraries." American Library Association Bulletin, 53 (September 1959), 679-82.
- Homer, Eleanor M. "A Junior College Measuring Stick." American Library Association Bulletin, 24 (August 1930), 296-97.
- Hurt, Peyton. "Principles and Standards for Surveying a College Library." College and Research Libraries, 2 (March 1941), 110-16.
- Johnson, Byron Lamar. "Junior College Library Problems." Junior College Journal, 18 (December 1947), 177-80.
- Johnson, Byron Lamar. "Junior College Library Standards." Library Journal, 61 (September 1, 1936), 627-29.
- Johnson, Byron Lamar. "Needed: Experimental Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, 36 (October 1965), 17-21.
- Johnson, Byron Lamar. "New Junior College Library Standards." American Library Association Bulletin, 55 (February 1961), 155-60.
- Johnston, Walter T. "Glance at Junior College Libraries." Junior College Journal, 29 (December 1958), 195-201.
- Jones, F. Taylor. "Regional Accrediting Associations and The Standards of College Libraries." College and Research Libraries, 22 (July 1961), 271-74.
- Jones, Robert C. "Multicampus Instructional Resources Services: Three New Campuses in St. Louis." Junior College Journal, 36 (March 1966), 11-13.

- Jordan, Robert T. "Goals--Not Standards." American Library Association Bulletin, 55 (June 1961), 565-67.
- "Junior College Libraries." Junior College Journal, 15 (November 1944), 115.
- "Junior College Library Standards." Higher Education, 4 (October 15, 1947), 46.
- Kast, Gloria E. "Unique Junior College Library." Library Journal, 83 (December 1, 1958), 3371-72.
- Kirkpatrick, Leonard H. "Accreditation of Libraries and Library Schools." College and Research Libraries, 12 (October 1951), 346-48.
- Kirkpatrick, Leonard H. "Wanted--A Revision of Library Standards." School and Society, 52 (November 9, 1940), 464-66.
- Krenitsky, Michael V. "Study of Junior College Libraries in Texas." Junior College Journal, 25 (February 1955), 331-46.
- Laffin, Charles W. "Library in the Two-Year College." Drexel Library Quarterly, 2 (July 1966), 224-26.
- Lang, Jovian. "Evaluating a College Library." Catholic Library World, 31 (November 1959), 91-95.
- Legge, Christopher A. "Policies and Programs of a Small College Library." Junior College Journal, 29 (March 1959), 412-13.
- Lester, Robert M. "Development of Junior College Libraries." Junior College Journal, 8 (October 1937), 3-9.
- Lombardi, John. "Standards at The Grass Roots." American Library Association Bulletin, 60 (April 1966), 377-80.
- Lorenz, John G. "What is The Importance of Library Standards?" Canadian Library, 21 (September 1964), 96-97.
- McDiarmid, Evrett W. "Suggestions to Junior College Librarians." Junior College Journal, 8 (November 1937), 62-65.

- McEwen, Robert W. "North Central Association's Survey of College and University Libraries." College and Research Libraries, 4 (June 1943), 253-56.
- Mackenzie, D. M., and Brumbaugh, Aaron J. "Analysis of the Library Data of the Higher Institutions of the North Central Association for the Year 1941-42." North Central Association Quarterly, 18 (April 1944), 293-308.
- Mapp, Edward. "Library in a Community College." College and Research Libraries, 19 (May 1958), 194-96.
- Metcalf, Keyes D. "Why We Need to be Investigated." College and Research Libraries, 15 (October 1954), 383-87.
- Mick, Sister Mary Juliana. "Library in Kansas Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, 28 (March 1958), 383-88.
- Miller, Sister Carlos Maria. "Survey of the Literature on the Junior College Library." Junior College Journal, 28 (November 1957), 139-46.
- Moe, Floyd B. "Significance of the Junior College Library in the Educational Program." College and Research Libraries, 4 (December 1942), 60-63.
- Mohrhardt, Foster E., Comp. "Junior College Library Budgets." Junior College Journal, 8 (January 1938), 171-73.
- Mohrhardt, Foster E. "Status of Junior College Libraries." American Library Association Bulletin, 30 (August 1936), 699-701.
- "Newly Established National Committee for Improving Libraries in Two Year Colleges." Library of Congress Information Bulletin, 25 (March 10, 1966), 136-37.
- Parker, Franklin. "The Community Junior College: A Bibliography of 225 Research Dissertations." Junior College Journal, 32 (December 1961), 193-204.
- Pattillo, Manning M. "The Appraisal of Junior College and College Libraries." College and Research Libraries, 17 (September 1956), 397-402.

- Peele, David A. "Community College Libraries: Problems and Prospects." Library Journal, 92 (September 1, 1967), 2898-2901.
- "Preparation of the Standards for Junior College Libraries." College and Research Libraries, 21 (May 1960), 199-206.
- "Proposed Community College Library Program." Michigan Librarian, 31 (December 1956), 3.
- Randall, William M. "Junior College Library Standards." American Library Association Bulletin, 27 (December 15, 1933), 716-19.
- Raney, McKendree L. "Junior College and Its Books." Library Journal, 59 (February 15, 1934), 141-44.
- Rink, Bernard C. "Community College Library, Cultural Solar Plexus." College and Research Libraries, 23 (September 1962), 389-92.
- Rush, Charles E. "Opportunities in the Junior College Field." Junior College Journal, 6 (January 1936), 176-79.
- Ryan, Roberta M. "Building a Junior College Library." Library Journal, 64 (May 15, 1939), 399-401.
- Samore, Theodore. "Current Condition of American Academic Libraries." Higher Education, 20 (December 1963), 7-10.
- Scott, W. Wiley. "Library's Place in the Junior College." Library Trends, 14 (October 1965), 183-90.
- Settelmayer, John C. "Glance at Junior College Libraries." Minnesota Libraries, 13 (December 1940), 108-10.
- Sewell, Philip H. "Evaluation of Library Services in Depth." UNESCO Bulletin for Libraries, 22 (November 1968), 274-80.
- Shepard, Elizabeth. "Junior College Library Trends." North Carolina Libraries, 14 (June 1956), 134-36.
- Shores, Louis. "Evaluating Library Service to Higher Education." College and Research Libraries, 2 (June 1941), 211-15.

- Shores, Louis. "The Library-Centered Junior College." North Carolina Libraries, 23 (Fall 1964), 8-13.
- Shores, Louis. "The Library College Idea: The Inevitable Culmination of the Independent Study Movement." Library Journal, 91 (September 1, 1966), 3871-75.
- Shores, Louis. "The Library Junior College." Junior College Journal, 36 (March 1966), 6-9.
- Smith, Floyd, Jr. "The Library in the Junior College Journal: An Evaluation." Junior College Journal, 27 (September 1956), 39-41.
- "Standards for Junior College Libraries in Texas." Texas Library Journal, 40 (Spring 1964), 24-29.
- Stone, Clarence W. "The Library Function Redefined." Library Trends, 16 (October 1967), 181-96.
- Stone, Ermine. "Quality of the Junior College Library." Junior College Journal, 5 (January 1935), 165-69.
- Stone, H. C. "Relevance is the Name of the Game: Community College Libraries in the Seventies." California Librarian, 31 (January 1970), 29-31.
- Sullivan, Peggy A. "Junior College Libraries as Seen in Student Handbooks: Footnote on Current Practice." Pacific Northwest Library Association Quarterly, 34 (October 1969), 8-13.
- Swanson, Arthur M. "Library and Junior College Aims." Junior College Journal, 9 (January 1939), 175-78.
- Tanis, Norman E. "Act Now: Implementing the New Junior College Library Standards." Wilson Library Bulletin, 35 (September 1960), 60-61.
- Tanis, Norman E. "Implementing the Junior College Library Standards." College and Research Libraries, 22 (March 1961), 130-33.
- Tanis, Norman E. "Junior College Libraries in the Nineteen-Sixties: Implementing the American Library Association Standards." Drexel Library Quarterly, 2 (July 1966), 227-39.
- Tanis, Norman E., and Powers, Milton. "Profiles of Practice in the Public Junior College Library." College and Research Libraries, 28 (September 1967), 331-36.



- Tanis, Norman E., and Jacobs, Karl J. "Strengthening the College Library." Improving College and University Teaching, 12 (Spring 1964), 87-90.
- Taylor, Robert S. "Toward the Design of a College Library for the Seventies." Wilson Library Bulletin, 43 (September 1968), 44-51.
- "Ten-Point Program Outlined for Junior College Libraries." Library Journal, 91 (March 15, 1966), 1377-79.
- Thayer, Crawford B. "New Role of the Junior College Library." Junior College Journal, 19 (May 1949), 396-98.
- Third Annual Conference on Junior College Libraries, Northern Illinois University, March 29-30, 1968. Illinois Libraries, 51 (June 1969), 455-97.
- Thornton, James W., Jr. "Library in the Junior College." Florida Libraries, 9 (June 1958), 8-9.
- Timmerman, Hazel B. "Revision of Standards for Libraries." School and Society, 53 (March 15, 1941), 340-41.
- Tirrell, John E. "Total Independent Study at Oakland." Junior College Journal, 36 (April 1966), 21-23.
- Trinkner, Charles L., ed. "Junior College Libraries." Library Trends, 14 (October 1965), 119-20.
- Trinkner, Charles L. "Library Trends in Florida's Junior Colleges." Junior College Journal, 30 (March 1960), 376-80.
- Wallace, James O. "Junior College Libraries." Junior College Journal, 25 (April 1955), 486-87.
- Waples, Douglas. "Report on the Library." North Central Association Quarterly, 9 (October 1934), 208.
- Washington Community College Libraries Association. "Community Colleges." Library News Bulletin (Washington State Library), 37 (April 1970), 116-17.
- Wattenberger, James L. "Junior College Libraries (Florida): An Increased Responsibility." Florida Libraries, 15 (March 1964), 10-14.

- Weber, David C. "Criteria for Evaluating a College Library." Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 43 (December 1957), 629-33.
- Wheeler, Helen R. "Community College Library 1965." College and Research Libraries, 27 (September 1966), 395-97.
- Yamada, Ken, and Kaser, David E. "Junior College Libraries in Tennessee." Tennessee Librarian, 22 (Spring 1970), 117-21.

#### Unpublished Materials

- Allen, Kenneth W. "An Investigation of Student and Faculty Attitudes and Their Utilization of the Community College Library in Three Selected Colleges in Illinois." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1970.
- American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. Ad Hoc Committee on Revision of the Junior College Library Standards. "Guidelines for Junior and Community College Library Learning Resources Centers." 1970. (Mimeographed committee draft.)
- Brubeck, Katherine M. "The Influence on the Standards for Junior College Libraries of the Junior College Libraries Section of the Association of College and Reference Libraries of the American Library Association." Unpublished Masters thesis, Florida State University, 1954.
- Chapin, Richard E. "A Public Information Corporation: An Alternative for the Communication Technology of the 1970's." Paper presented at the Conference on Interlibrary Communications and Information Networks, Warrington, Virginia., September 28-October 2, 1970.
- Illinois Library Association. Library Survey Committee. "A Multi-media Survey of the Community College Libraries of the State of Illinois." A report prepared for the Legislative Library Development Committee of the Illinois Library Association. Chicago Heights, Illinois, 1970.

- Krenitsky, Michael V. "Study of Junior College Libraries in Texas." Unpublished Masters thesis, Southern Methodist University, 1954.
- Meyer, Donald P. "An Investigation of Perceptions Regarding the Instructional Function of the Library Among Faculty Members and Librarians at Public Community Colleges in Michigan." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.
- Miller, Sister Carlos Maria. "An Evaluative Survey of the Literature on the Junior College Library, 1925-1950." Unpublished Masters thesis, Catholic University of America, 1956.
- Tunison, Fay. "A Critical Study of Standards and Practices in Junior College Libraries." Unpublished Masters thesis, University of South Carolina, 1935.

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SURVEY OF MICHIGAN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

LIBRARIES/RESOURCE CENTERS

JULY 1, 1969 TO

JUNE 30, 1970

Survey of Michigan Community College  
Libraries/Resource Centers  
July 1, 1969 to  
June 30, 1970

PART I--CAPACITY TO SERVE: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Name of College: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Campus, if multi-campus institution: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Number of credit courses listed in 1969-70 catalog: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Major areas of learning resources in the college:  
(check those applicable)
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_ Library
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_ Audio-Visual
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_ Programmed Learning; i.e., A-T, A-V-T
  - d. \_\_\_\_\_ Other; i.e., Planetarium, Museum (please specify)
5. Hours of operation, library/resource center:  
(check those applicable)

	M	T	W	Th	F	Sa	Su
AM	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
PM	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
EVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Total hours of operation per week: \_\_\_\_\_
7. Of the total hours listed in item 6, how many are under professional supervision? \_\_\_\_\_
8. Number of weeks open for service per year: \_\_\_\_\_
9. Methods of orientation to library/research/learning resources: (check those applicable)
  - a. \_\_\_\_\_ Orientation sessions for faculty
  - b. \_\_\_\_\_ Formally structured classes
  - c. \_\_\_\_\_ Guided tours
  - d. \_\_\_\_\_ Handbooks
  - e. \_\_\_\_\_ Special bibliographic assistance
  - f. \_\_\_\_\_ Other (please specify)

10. Do you have an operational ETV system? ☐ Yes ☐ No
11. Do you have an operational CCTV system? ☐ Yes ☐ No
12. Do you have an operational dial access system?  
☐ Yes ☐ No

PART II--CAPACITY TO SERVE: MATERIALS

14. Number of volumes held at end of year: \_\_\_\_\_
15. Number of reels of microfilm held at end of year: \_\_\_\_\_
16. Number of titles (i.e., New York Times) on microfilm at end of year: \_\_\_\_\_
17. Number of physical units of other forms of microtext held at end of year: \_\_\_\_\_
18. Number of periodical titles, excluding duplicates, being received at end of year: \_\_\_\_\_
19. Number of periodical titles in "runs" beyond five years: \_\_\_\_\_
20. Number of periodical titles in "runs" beyond ten years, inclusive of those listed in item 19: \_\_\_\_\_
21. Number of other non-periodical serial titles, excluding duplicates, being received at end of year: \_\_\_\_\_
22. Number of physical units of other catalogued and/or inventoried software (i.e., films, transparencies, tapes, disks) held at end of year: \_\_\_\_\_
23. Number of physical units of other catalogued and/or inventoried hardware (i.e., projectors, recorders, cameras, receivers) held at end of year: \_\_\_\_\_
24. Number of recorded circulation transactions from the library/resource center during the year ending June 30, 1970:

\_\_\_\_\_ Printed materials (re items 14-21 above)

\_\_\_\_\_ Software (re item 22)

\_\_\_\_\_ Hardware (re item 23)

## PART III--CAPACITY TO SERVE: PERSONNEL

Contractural and Salaried  
Library/Resource Center  
Staff

Number of Staff		FTE of	FTE of
FT	PT	PT staff	total staff

25. Chief Administrative  
officer or director:26. Assistant Administrative  
Officers:27. Other professional  
librarians:28. Professional staff in  
A-V:29. Professional staff in  
other functions:30. Technicians and techni-  
cal assistants:31. Secretarial/clerical  
staff:

32. Number of hours of student assistance during year: \_\_\_\_\_

33. Number of hours of other hourly assistance during year: \_\_\_\_\_

34. Percentage of total staff time devoted to the major  
areas of learning resources in the college: (should  
total 100%)

\_\_\_\_\_ Library

\_\_\_\_\_ Audio-Visual

\_\_\_\_\_ Programmed Learning; i.e., A-T, A-V-T

\_\_\_\_\_ Other; i.e., Planetarium, Museum

35. Percentage of library staff time expended by function:  
(should total 100%)\_\_\_\_\_ Acquisition of collection (selection,  
processing, and production)\_\_\_\_\_ Interpretation of collection (reference,  
orientation, bibliographic assistance)

\_\_\_\_\_ Circulation of collection



36. Percentage of audio-visual staff time expended by functions: (should total 100%)

☐ Acquisition of materials (selection and processing)  
☐ Interpretation of services (in-service training)  
☐ Production of materials  
☐ Distribution of equipment and materials  
☐ Maintenance of equipment and materials

37. To whom is the chief administrative officer or director of the library/resource center directly responsible in the administrative structure? \_\_\_\_\_

Title

#### PART IV--CAPACITY TO SERVE: FINANCIAL RESOURCES

38. Total library-resource center operational budget for all purposes, July 1, 1969 to June 30, 1970: \_\_\_\_\_

39. Percentage of total budget (re item 38) allocated to major categories: (should total 100%)

☐ Salaries, to regular contractural and salaried staff  
☐ Wages to students and other hourly assistants  
☐ Books  
☐ Periodicals  
☐ Audio-visual software (re item 22)  
☐ Audio-visual hardware (re item 23)  
☐ Audio-visual rental  
☐ Other supplies and materials

Responding Official (s)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Title)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Title)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Title)

## APPENDIX B

### MEASURES OF LIBRARY QUALITY

April 9, 1971

Dear

As you know, the M.C.C.A. Information Retrieval Committee is completing a study of the Michigan community college libraries. As part of the study, we would like your opinion on some gross measures of library quality. The attached sheet is self-explanatory and should take only a few minutes of your time.

We are looking for some agreement among the community college administrators as to what they think are indicators of library quality. No individuals will be identified in the report.

Thanks for your help.

Martin P. Wolf  
Chairman, Research Sub-Committee

MPW:rd  
Attachments: 2

## Possible Measures of Library Quality

## Instructions:

The MCCA Information Retrieval Committee is doing a major study of community college libraries. As part of that study we are attempting to obtain some agreement among chief administrators, academic administrators and librarians for some gross measures of library quality. Below is a list of nine possible measures of library quality. Would you please rank these in order of most important to least important with the most important ranked with the number 1 and the least important ranked number 9. Your opinion based on your own experience is being solicited. Thank you.

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Criterion</u>
_____	Ratio of the college's enrollment to the size of the library collection.
_____	Ratio of the library's operational budget to the college's operational budget.
_____	Ratio of the library staff size to the enrollment of the college.
_____	Ratio of the circulation statistics to the enrollment of the college.
_____	Total amount of professionally supervised hours of library operation per week.
_____	Ratio of the number of the college's credit course offerings to the size of the library collection.
_____	Ratio of the number of periodical subscriptions to the number of credit courses offered.
_____	Ratio of space allocated for library purposes to enrollment.
_____	Ratio of expenditures for books and periodicals to enrollment.

Check One:

\_\_\_\_\_ Chief Administrator  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Academic Administrator  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Librarian

APPENDIX C

A LIST OF INDIVIDUALS INTERVIEWED  
INCLUDING THEIR POSITION, THE  
COLLEGE AND DATE

A List of Individuals Interviewed Including  
Their Position, The College and Date

<u>Individual and Position</u>	<u>College</u>	<u>Date</u>
Mr. James Platte, Director of Learning Resources	Lansing	6/29/71
Dr. Ronald Campbell, President	Monroe	7/6/71
Mr. Ewell, Director of Audio-Visual	Monroe	7/6/71
Mrs. O'Connor, Librarian	Monroe	7/6/71
Mr. Rosenthal, Librarian	Henry Ford	7/6/71
Mr. Pat Butler, Librarian	Schoolcraft	7/7/71
Mrs. Louise Giles Dean of Learning Resources	Macomb	7/7/71
Dr. John Dimitry, President	Macomb	7/7/71
Mr. Donald Pelkey, Librarian	Genesee	7/8/71
Mr. Curt Bohling, Director, Learning Resources	St. Clair	7/8/71
Dr. Richard Norris, President	St. Clair	7/8/71
Mr. Gene Larson, Associate Dean	Oakland, Auburn Hills	7/9/71
Mr. Rene Amaya, Librarian	Oakland, Orchard Ridge	7/9/71
Mr. Douglas Anderson, Associate Dean for Learning Resources	Delta	7/12/71
Dr. John Erskine, Dean for Instructional Services	Macomb Center Campus	7/13/71
Mrs. Lee, Librarian	Macomb Center Campus	7/13/71
Mr. John Carlson, Director, Learning Resources	Montcalm	7/14/71

<u>Individual and Position</u>	<u>College</u>	<u>Date</u>
Mr. John Lotz, Director, Learning Resources	Kalamazoo Valley	7/14/71
Mr. Alfred Sagar, Director of Library Services	Kalamazoo Valley	7/14/71
Mrs. Marilyn Gosling, Librarian	Glen Oaks	7/15/71
Mr. Donald Vinkemulder, Librarian	Kellogg	7/15/71
Mr. David Young, Dean, Instructional Resources	Mid-Michigan	7/19/71
Dr. Eugene Gillaspy, President	Mid-Michigan	7/19/71
Mr. Stuart Lawrence, Director of Library	Kirtland	7/19/71
Dr. Robert Stenger, President	Kirtland	7/19/71
Mr. Bernard Rink, Librarian	Northwestern	7/20/71
Mr. Walt Beardslee, Faculty Library Committee	Northwestern	7/20/71
Mr. Gerald Hopper, Director, Instructional Media Center	West Shore	7/21/71
Dr. John Eaton, President	West Shore	7/21/71
Miss Barbara Wilson, Associate Dean	Muskegon	7/21/71

In addition to the above-named administrators and librarians, short interviews were held with faculty members, students and library staff members at most of the colleges visited.