

5-15-1969

May 1969 Senate Bill: Increased University Support of Library Expansion and Improvement

University of Rhode Island Faculty Senate

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

Recommended Citation

University of Rhode Island Faculty Senate, "May 1969 Senate Bill: Increased University Support of Library Expansion and Improvement" (1969). *Faculty Senate Bills*. Paper 275.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/facsen_bills/275

This Legislation is brought to you by the University of Rhode Island. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Bills by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu. For permission to reuse copyrighted content, contact the author directly.

Serial Number #252

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

FACULTY SENATE

BILL

Adopted by the Faculty Senate

RECEIVED
UNIVERSITY OF R. I.
MAY 19 1969
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

TO: President Werner A. Baum

FROM: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

- 1. The Attached BILL, titled May 1969 Senate Bill: Increased University Support of Library Expansion and Improvement

is forwarded for your consideration.

- 2. The original and two copies for your use are included.
- 3. This BILL was adopted by vote of the Faculty Senate on May 15, 1969 (date).
- 4. After considering this bill, will you please indicate your approval or disapproval. Return the original or forward it to the Board of Trustees, completing the appropriate endorsement below.
- 5. In accordance with Section 8, paragraph 2 of the Senate's By-Laws, this bill will become effective on June 5, 1969 (date), three weeks after Senate approval, unless: (1) specific dates for implementation are written into the bill; (2) you return it disapproved; (3) you forward it to the Board of Trustees for their approval; or (4) the University Faculty petitions for a referendum. If the bill is forwarded to the Board of Trustees, it will not become effective until approved by the Board.

May 19, 1969
(date)

[Signature]
Chairman of the Faculty Senate

ENDORSEMENT 1.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

FROM: President of the University

- 1. Returned.
- 2. Approved ✓ Disapproved _____.
- 3. (If approved) In my opinion, transmittal to the Board of Trustees is not necessary.

5/20/69
(date)

[Signature]
President

ALTERNATE ENDORSEMENT 1.

TO: Chairman of the Board of Trustees.

FROM: The University President

1. Forwarded.
2. Approved.

_____/s/
(date) President

ENDORSEMENT 2.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

FROM: Chairman of the Board of Trustees, via the University President.

1. Forwarded.

_____/s/
(date) _____
(Office)

ENDORSEMENT 3.

TO: Chairman of the Faculty Senate

FROM: The University President

1. Forwarded from the Chairman of the Board of Trustees.

_____/s/
(date) President

Original received and forwarded to the Secretary of the Senate and Registrar for filing in the Archives of the University.

_____/s/
(date) Chairman of the Faculty Senate

REPORT OF THE LIBRARY COMMITTEE TO THE FACULTY SENATE FOR THE YEAR 1968-1969.

The committee recommends:

1. That the University continue to increase its financial support of the Library.
2. That the Library undertake a substantial expansion and reorganization of its technical processing services.
3. That the Library budget for urgently-needed personnel be substantially increased as soon as possible.
4. That a building addition for the Library be started at the earliest possible date.
5. That members of the Library staff be invited to serve on appropriate University committees and to attend faculty meetings that are pertinent to the Library.

Statements in support of the committee's recommendations are offered below, followed by committee statements for the information of the Senate.

1. Increased financial support for the library.

The need is evidenced by statistical measures comparing the University Library with accepted standards and similar institutions, and by indications of deficiencies perceived by faculty members and students.

1. Statistical measures:

A. The Board of Directors of the Association of College and Research Libraries has approved a set of standards officially recognized by the American Library Association.

For "a college of university granting Bachelors' or Bachelors' and Masters' degrees", they state that "the program of library service . . . will normally require a minimum of 5% of the total educational and general budget." The ratio for URI has not, in recent years, exceeded 2.6%.

Reference: "Standards for College Libraries," American Library and Book Trade Annual, 1961 edition, New York: R. R. Bowker Co.

B. In library expenditure as a percent of total educational expenditure URI was reported in 1965-66 as being low in comparison with Brown University and the other five New England State Universities:

Connecticut	6.3
Brown	6.0
Massachusetts	4.9
New Hampshire	4.3
Vermont	4.1
Maine	3.2
Rhode Island	2.5

Reference: American Library Association: Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities, 1965-66. Chicago, 1967.

C. An unofficial but respected set of criteria for measuring the adequacy of academic libraries was published in 1965 by two professional librarians. Applied to the University collection in 1965-1966 by Mr. Abner Gaines of the library staff, it indicated:

Adequate collection per formula	667,425 volumes
URI collection	274,956 volumes
Indicated deficiency	392,469 volumes

Reference: "Quantitative Criteria for Adequacy of Academic Library Collections," by Verner W. Clapp and Robert T. Jordan, College and Research Libraries, September 1965, 371-380. Worksheet for URI library in Committee files.

D. Expenditure per full-time equivalent student: University of Rhode Island compared with three Eastern state universities:

	<u>1966-67</u>	<u>1967-68</u>
University of Delaware	\$83	85
University of Maryland	72	162 (main campus) 82 (State College)
University of Maine	65	108
University of Rhode Island	63	56

Reference: U.S. National center for Educational Statistics: Library Statistics, 1966-67, preliminary report on academic libraries and Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities: Data for individual institutions, Fall 1968.

1. Local Assessments of Library adequacy:

A. In 1966, a report prepared by Dr. Robert Harrison on the occasion of a visit by representative of the office of evaluation, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, compiled the results of a survey of faculty estimates of library holdings.

Holdings in support of then-existing Ph.D. program were estimated to be good for Bacteriology, Biophysics, Botany, Zoology and Oceanography, fair for Chemistry and Physics.

For Masters programs, holdings were estimated to be excellent for Chemistry, Biochemistry, Botany, Zoology, Bacteriology, Oceanography, Physics and Psychology; good for economics, education and sociology, fair for English and Geology; poor for Mathematics, Political Science, Geography and History.

Holdings on the Undergraduate level were deemed inadequate in Art, Music, Speech and Theatre.

B. The Graduate Students Association, during 1968-1969, conducted a survey of graduate students and compiled responses to a questionnaire which included questions on the library. Holdings were considered inadequate or highly inadequate by the following percentages of respondents:

Books	56
Periodicals, Current	52
Periodicals, back volumes	74

II. Expansion of technical processing services. The University library has in the recent past been spending about one half its budget on books and periodicals. The budget request for 1969-70 calls for almost 60% for purchases. Professional opinion is unanimous that this implies a serious inadequacy in the support of library services and personnel. The ACRL standards referred to above hold that "experience shows that a good college library usually spends twice as much (or more) for salaries as it does for books." (op. cit. p. 118).

The immediate technical problem will be in finding, ordering and cataloging the large expected additions to the library's collection. As growth continues, there will be needs for new and expanded services of diverse sorts. The committee foresees, therefore, that it will be necessary to increase the personal services and operating items in the library budget at a more rapid rate than the purchases.

III. Immediate increase in funds for personnel.

Currently the library staff is fully occupied in keeping up with the irreducible minimum of necessary work. The budget request for the current year asks for over \$400,000 for purchases, and less than \$300,000 for personal services. Unless this discrepancy is recertified, there is a real prospect that essential library work will simply not get done during the coming year. A proposed \$200,000 addition would bring personal services to just over one-half the total library budget, still a scanty provision.

IV. The need for a library building addition.

On 16 February 1969 the committee reported its finding that a building addition would be needed in the early 1970's, and that a \$7,000,000 building would accommodate growth until about 1978. The basic data have not changed, and the committee's recommendation is reiterated.

V. Librarian's participation in faculty committees and meetings.

Cooperation between the teaching and research faculty and the professional library staff offers great potential returns in effective scholarship and administration. Three important areas of cooperation seem to exist in (a) the planning of new instructional programs, (b) experimentation with curriculum and teaching innovations and (c) the closing up of existing gaps in subject areas. Professional librarians can contribute to educational planning in these fields, and teaching and research scholars can usefully discuss their needs and interests with librarians.

VI. Committee activities and plans

A. The professional staff of the library.

The committee is preparing a recommendation that professionally qualified librarians, with Masters' degrees and suitable professional qualifications, be given the status of faculty members. A subcommittee will continue discussions with members of the library staff, and initiate them with Mr. Parks, to develop

criteria for eligibility and procedures for promotion and tenure appointment, and will submit a specific recommendation at an early date. The committee has accepted the principle that professional librarians of a level of scholarly attainment and competence comparable to that required of the faculty should have faculty status.

B. Retirement and replacement of the Librarian.

Francis Pitcher Allen has been a member of the University faculty since 1936 and Librarian, Professor of Bibliography and University Archivist since 1939. He will retire on 1 August 1969. The committee records in this report its thanks to him, both for his services to the committee as consultant and for his and his staff's long and distinguished record of devotion to the University and its Library.

George Richard Parks will become Librarian on Professor Allen's retirement. The committee anticipates a fruitful relationship with him, and anticipates a fruitful continuation of close consultative relationships with the library staff.

Committee Members: Albert E. Griffith; William Haller, Jr.; Julia Lepper; John Mallett, III; Jules P. Seigel; Theodore J. Smayda; Lewis J. Hutton, Chairman.