
Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_l_61

Recommended Citation
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_l_61/8

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (1989-1990) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.
FACT SHEET ON ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

(A) University Library Funding:

The 120 or so largest North American libraries purchased 100,000 fewer monographs in 1992 than they did a year earlier. (Source: Association of Research Libraries).

54% of 84 largest U.S. libraries could not afford to purchase all new academic monographs in 1992, up from 5% in 1977. (Sources: comparing data from Blackwell North America, Association of Research Libraries)

Total funding for college and university library collections in the U.S. fell from 0.97% of current fund expenditures in 1970 to 0.78% twenty years later: a loss of over $220 million. (Source: U.S. Department of Education)

65 of 90 U.S. large libraries reported receiving declining shares of their universities' budgets 1981/82-1989/90. (Source: Publishing Research Quarterly)

Between 1979 and 1990, Rutgers cut its library's share of educational and general expenditures by 41%, Northwestern by 37%, Florida by 34%, Princeton by 30%, Virginia by 27%, Washington U. by 23%, Stanford and Washington State by 22%, Iowa by 21%, U.C. Berkeley by 20%, Chicago by 19%, Boston and North Carolina by 17%, Yale by 14%, Cornell by 12%, Columbia by 9%. Hundreds of other institutions were not covered by this report. (Source: University Libraries and Scholarly Communication. 1992)

Title II-A of the Higher Education Act, which once provided millions of dollars for purchase of library books and periodicals, was deleted because American Library Association and Association of Research Libraries representatives asked Congress to replace it with funding for library technology. No learned society addressed this issue.

20% of all library uses were for off-campus users in a study done at Georgia Institute of Technology. Consideration of possible fees did not include recovery of the cost of collection development. (Source: Science & Technology Libraries)

No regulation assures that library expenditures for science books and journals equal the hundreds of millions of dollars "reimbursed" to 100 research institutions for library expenditures as a part of federal science research grants. (Source: Office of Management and Budget)

U.S. academic libraries now invest about $1 billion on all library materials, which is less than 1% of the total higher education expenditure of $164 billion, less than 1% of the total R&D expenditure of $152 billion, less than 10% of all academic R&D expenditures of $17 billion. (Sources: U.S. Department of Education, National Science Board)

(B) The Work Product of Scholarship and Science

The output of research, measured by the number of articles published in technical journals, has increased every year since 1665, doubling every 15 years -- or an average annual growth of 5%. The technical population grows at approximately the same rate. (Source: Science since Babylon, by Derek de Solla Price, Yale Univ. Press. 1961)

The number of papers covered annually by Chemical Abstracts, Biosis Previews, and Physics Abstracts 1981-1987 indicates a continued growth rate exceeding 5% and no sign of slowing. (Sources: American Chemical Society, Biosis, Physics Abstracts)

Learned monographs and articles are generated by academics. Total faculty in the U.S. increased from 450,000 in 1970 to 824,220 in 1990. (Source: U.S. Department of Education)

16,271 new academic monographs were published in 1972; 32,455 in 1992. (Source: Against the Grain)

Over 60% of science and engineering journal articles' authors are located outside of the United States. (Source: National Science Board)

(C) The Trusteeship of Scholarship and Science Research.

An international panel indicated that "lack of involvement by the science community in library funding and management" was the primary reason for the library crisis. (Source: Publishing Research Quarterly)

There was no discussion of libraries anywhere in the 64-page 1992 report of the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology. (Source: Renewing the Promise: Research-Intensive Universities and the Nation)

Major American college library collections doubled in size every 16 to 22 years between 1831 and 1938, continuing a trend started in colonial times. (The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library, by Fremont Rider. 1944)

Seven of the ten larger college libraries observed by Rider (above) failed to continue their growth rate since 1938, five of them are more than 50% behind projections based on Rider's 5% annual growth factor. (Source: Association of Research Libraries)

Administrative expenditures, excluding libraries, have been rising more rapidly than most other types of college expenditures. (Source: U.S. Department of Education)

(D) Poor Substitutes for Printed Books and Journals in Libraries.

The average cost of investing in the purchase of a monograph is $100 (and the library keeps it for years); Interlibrary loan expenses average $29.55 (and the library gives it away immediately). (Source: Chronicle of Higher Education)

Academic and research libraries generated 2 million online requests for photocopies or interlibrary loans in 1988/89, up 500% in ten years. (Source: Online Computer Library Center)

Electronic publisher Eugene Garfield warned scientists and librarians "don't hold your breath" waiting for the 'paperless' journal. (Source: The Scientist)

Copyright 1993 by Albert Henderson
PETITION
TO REQUIRE PURCHASE OF RESEARCH BOOKS AND JOURNALS
BY LIBRARIES IN UNIVERSITIES RECEIVING FEDERAL RESEARCH FUNDS

We, the undersigned scientists, believe that the ability of researchers to develop original studies and to disseminate their results is hampered by outmoded methods of government funding. We urge the government to adopt new procedures to enable major science libraries to maintain their collections. Without these changes, U.S. leadership in science, technology, medicine and agriculture will deteriorate.

Whereas: All science research begins with a thorough review and understanding of the published results of prior research;

Whereas: The results of science research must be reviewed, recognized and shared with present and future researchers through a system of peer-review and publication in a research journal;

Whereas: Research journals are available to the greatest numbers of researchers in the archival collections of major academic libraries where the purchase of a book or journal is an investment with a useful life of many years;

Whereas: Because major science research libraries exist within university libraries, they are subjected to the priorities of the education community rather than the needs of the research and development community. The indirect funding of research grants that was negotiated and justified as reimbursement for library services has often been used for unrelated expenses;

Whereas: Financial crises at major research universities have resulted in the cancellation of thousands of subscriptions to science journals, diminishing the capacity of these institutions to provide future researchers with adequate information services;

Whereas: The Office of Technology Assessment, the National Science Foundation, the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Commerce, and other agencies that fund science research have neither policies nor programs to assure the quality of science research libraries;

Whereas: Ninety per cent of research and development expenditures, which are made outside of university campuses, depend on academic libraries to maintain comprehensive collections of science journals. Industry pays little or nothing toward collection development and maintenance. Many university libraries are prevented by law or regulation from charging fees to these off-campus users. Yet the essential interests of off-campus researchers are not represented in the management or funding of these libraries;

Whereas: The first obligation of universities is education, rather than research, and it is unfair to ask universities to be the sole bearers of the costs of collection development and maintenance of research collections used by the entire R&D community.
Whereas: Photocopy, fax, and electronic media have eliminated the need for direct funding of authors’ reprints produced at the time of publication and distributed by individual authors;

Whereas: While some interesting ideas for new ways of handling information are based on new electronic technology, various experiments have yielded little in the way of archival quality research and review journals. The marketplace demands proven solutions to questions of new investment, capacity, cost recovery, standardization, copyright, and trademark before it will consider print on paper obsolete.

Whereas: The direct funding of page charges provided for by Federal science research grants affects a very limited number of published papers, authors, and publishers; page charges are not required to assure publication in an appropriate journal and no longer serve the interests of the greater research and development community;

Therefore: We call for an Executive Order or an Act of Congress to address the crisis in science libraries by changing the indirect and direct funding of Federal science research grants and libraries, specifically,

(A) to require grantee institutions to purchase technical journals and books with the “indirect” amounts negotiated for reimbursement of library use; and,

(B) to eliminate payment of page charges with government grants and to redirect an equal amount of funds to these institutions’ libraries for purchase of technical books and journals; and,

(C) to appoint a Permanent Office for Scientific and Technical Information to represent the interest of the entire research and development community and to assure that the ongoing quality of comprehensive science information resources is maintained; and,

(D) to provide additional funding direct to 100 selected major science libraries for the purpose of collection development and service to the off-campus users of university library collections.
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