ARTHUR M. McANALLY and ROBERT B. DOWNS

The Changing Role of Directors of University Libraries

The role of the university library director has changed markedly in the last decade. The position of library director has become a difficult role to serve. Directors have been subjected to pressures from different quarters. Five sources are identified by the authors, including pressures from the president's office, library staff, faculty, and students. These difficulties coupled with a declining ability to meet user needs, the lack of cohesive library planning, and an institutional inability to accommodate change have all contributed to the declining status of the library director. Recommendations as to ways to ameliorate the problem are offered. Among the suggestions included are better planning, improved budgeting techniques, and the introduction of new organizational patterns.

Editor's Note—Shortly after the completion of the manuscript, Arthur McAnally died unexpectedly. His death was both a professional and personal loss. Arthur was particularly generous to young librarians who aspired to become library administrators. I was one of those who was fortunate in receiving his friendship and counsel. His last manuscript represents, in my opinion, an important contribution to our professional literature. It is a privilege to be able to publish it.

T RADITIONALLY THE DIRECTORSHIP of a major university library has been a lifetime post. Once a librarian achieved such a position of honor and leadership in the profession, he usually stayed until he reached retirement age. In the 1960s, however, an increasing number of incidents occurred which indicated that

Robert Downs is dean of library administration, emeritus, university librarian, University of Illinois at Urbana, Champaign. Arthur McAnally was director of libraries, University of Oklahoma, Norman.

all was not well in the library directors' world, resulting in a vague feeling of uneasiness. Then in one year, 1971–72, the seriousness of the situation became dramatically evident: seven of the directors of the Big Ten university libraries (plus the University of Chicago) left their posts, only one a normal retirement for age. These are major universities on the national scene whose directorships had been stable in the past.

To discover how widespread this condition might be, an investigation has been undertaken among the seventy-eight largest university libraries—members of the Association of Research Libraries. Exactly one-half of the directors were found to have changed within the past three years, four of them twice. This is an extraordinarily high rate of change. If such a rate were to continue, the average span of service for directors would be five to six years. Next, to find out if the development was related to size of the library, those university libraries holding more than 2,000,000 volumes were compared with the twenty

smallest libraries in the association. Size apparently has some bearing, but does not appear to be a major factor: while 60 percent of the larger libraries had changed directors, 45 percent of the smaller ones did, too. The authors are well aware that the directors of libraries in many small universities—as well as those in intermediate and large institutions—are in severe difficulty or under intense pressure. Oddly, the chief librarians of colleges and junior colleges do not appear to be affected. The problem seems to be limited to university librarians only.

Several explanations of the phenomenon have been offered. Edward G. Holley observed the trend during visits to a number of urban university libraries in 1971: "At the end of the sixties it has not been uncommon for chief librarians, who by any objective standards served their institutions well, to retire early from their directorships, some with sorrow, some with relief, and a few with bitterness. Very few have retired with the glory and honor that used to accompany extraordinary accomplishments in building resources and expanding services."[1] Holley attributed the condition partly to changing attitudes of the library staffs. On the other hand, Raynard C. Swank questioned whether many directors really had retired in great favor in the past. He also suggested that the present high rate of change might be due partly to a large number of directors who were appointed some thirty years ago all nearing retirement age about the same time.[2] Others believe that the problem reflects a highly critical attitude towards the university library itself rather than just criticism of the directors. Still others conclude that an era is ending and old ways are having to give way to new: those who will not or cannot adapt are finished. The suggestion also was made that a few of the changes might be attributable to weaknesses among the directors. Though each

of these explanations may have some validity, the full story is far more complicated.

Directors who have recently quit their jobs should be authoritative spokesmen on the subject. The authors corresponded or discussed the subject, therefore, with twenty-two directors or former directors whom they knew well personally.[3] Each was asked for his opinions about the causes of the extraordinary turnover in directorships and to suggest possible remedies. Every one replied, and many gave keen analyses of the causes as well as suggesting steps that should be taken.

BACKGROUND FACTORS

The numerous changes in directorships indicate that some fundamental dissatisfactions have arisen within university libraries or their environment in recent years. The underlying causes may be deep-seated and varied. Thus the director might be under fire, as he unquestionably is, because he is the most visible representative of an agency that is under attack, the university library itself. Therefore, recent trends in society and the university were examined, as well as movements in university administration, the world of scholarship and research, and the publishing and information world, as well as the university library itself.

Growth of enrollment. The extraordinary growth in enrollments in higher education during the decade of the sixties forced the university itself to make many changes to attempt to cope with the flood of students. Total enrollments grew from almost four million to approximately eight million. The number of graduate students tripled, from 314,000 to more than 900,000. The tremendous increase produced changes in the university far beyond merely making it larger. It became a far more complicated institution.[4]

University expansion began long be-

fore the sixties, of course. Probable effects upon the university library were noted in 1958 by Donald Coney, and the title of his article is prophetic: "Where Did You Go? To the Library. What Did You Get? Nothing."[5] Except for the creation of undergraduate libraries in some of the larger universities beginning at Harvard in 1948, few changes were made to cope with the rising flood. Most universities remained oriented basically to the single-copy research concept.

Changes in the presidency. Growth in size of the institution placed great pressure upon the president, and other factors added to his problems: rising expectations, growing militancy of students and faculty, disillusionment and a newly critical attitude towards higher education on the part of the general public that developed as a result of student activism, political pressure from hostile legislators or governors, growing powers exerted by state boards of control, and, to cap it all, financial support that began to decline or at least levelled out. Harried from all sides, forced to act often on bases of emergency or expediency, and with little time left for academic affairs, the position of the president has become almost untenable.

It is not surprising that the average tenure of university presidents in the United States is now a short five years. Chancellor Murphy of UCLA stated that the office of president or chancellor has become impossible, and suggested a maximum term of ten years. He observed that "The chief executive of an institution makes his greatest creative impacts in the first five to eight years. He may need a few more years to follow through in the implementation of these creative impacts. Beyond that, however, the housekeeping function inevitably becomes larger, and much of the vitality, drive, and creativity declines."[6] President Lyman of Stanford noted that directors of libraries appeared to be in the same situation as presidents. Herman H.

Fussler added that the tenure of all senior university administrators—not only presidents but also vice-presidents and deans—had declined considerably in recent years. He asked, why should librarians expect to be different?[7] Booz, Allen & Hamilton predicted that term appointments for presidents might become common, and that even peer election could come in the late seventies.[8]

Proliferation in university management. To cope with the greatly intensified pressures on the president, and in the belief that universities were undermanaged, nearly every university in the country has added substantially to its central management staff. The most striking increase has been in the number of vice-presidents.

The proliferation of vice-presidents was noted and commented on by several directors: Lewis C. Branscomb, Thomas R. Buckman, Richard N. Logsdon, Robert Miller, and Edward B. Stanford. All observed that this movement has had the effect of interposing a layer of administrative officers between the chief librarian and the president. The director no longer has direct access to the president; thus the role of the library in the university and the power of the library to present its case has been reduced. Logsdon commented that unfortunately the presidents rarely have utilized existing administrators, such as directors of libraries, who have a broad overview of the university, to help with the growing burden of general administrative affairs.[9]

Changes in the world of learning and research. Several factors beyond the obvious one of expansion of existing graduate programs and establishment of new programs have affected the university and its library. A major instance is the continued fragmentation of traditional academic disciplines. New specializations continue to break off from older fields; each, of course, smaller than the original. One authority has

referred to the trend as "the Balkanization" of learning.[10] Another movement of the sixties which is having a major impact on libraries is the emergence of interdisciplinary programs, including area studies. New social concerns and the demands for relevance also foster the growth of interdisciplinary institutes and other irregular patterns outside of established fields. Even engineering is moving towards a juncture with the sciences. To help cope with the flood of students, teaching methods have turned increasingly to larger classes, increased use of teaching assistants for regular classes, and, to a lesser degree, the newer media, such as closed-circuit TV.

These changes in the world of learning may presage a fundamental reorientation, according to Peter F. Drucker. "The emergence of knowledge as central to our society and the foundation of economy and social action drastically changes the position, the meaning, and the structure of knowledge. . . . Knowledge areas are in a state of flux. The existing faculties, departments, and disciplines will not be appropriate for long. Few are ancient to begin with, of course. . . . The most probable assumption is that every single one of the old demarcations, disciplines and faculties is going to become obsolete and a barrier to learning as well as to understanding. The fact that we are shifting rapidly from a Cartesian view of the universe, in which the accent has been on parts and elements, to a configuration view, with the emphasis on wholes and patterns, challenges every single dividing line between areas of study and knowledge."[11]

All the foregoing movements have implications for the libraries. As was remarked by Warren J. Haas, the rise of small new specializations tends to drive up the price of books and journals because the clienteles are small. Interdisciplinary studies tend to weaken the old system of departmental libraries.

Spread-out departmental libraries do not serve the new needs well, and no university can afford to create the many new branch libraries presently being demanded. The multitudes of teaching assistants are not adept at utilizing the library in their teaching. Furthermore, the large numbers of students in single courses demand more copies of any title than the library is able to provide. Few libraries are equipped or staffed or budgeted to add the newer media to their services, and most are not oriented in that direction. The effects of all these patterns of scholarship upon library resources have been ably summarized by Douglas W. Bryant.[12]

The information explosion. The constantly accelerating production of knowledge has been so widely publicized that it hardly calls for comment. When the knowledge produced by the world up to 1900 is doubled by 1950, and doubles again by 1965, as has been estimated, the term "explosion" seems applicable. As early as 1945, Vannevar Bush wrote that "Professionally our methods of transmitting and reviewing the results of research are generations old and by now totally inadequate for their purpose. . . ."[13] No significant changes have occurred since Bush's statement. By 1970, a national Committee on Research in the Life Sciences concluded that "Investigators in the life sciences have not been able to cope with the waves of information since 15 years ago."[14] The rate of growth in science and technology seems fairly constant at 10 percent a year, which means a doubling every eight years.

University libraries quite obviously were going to be overwhelmed by this flood sooner or later; the velocity of change produces a faster expansion of knowledge than can be appraised, codified, or organized. Fremont Rider first called attention to the problem in 1944, pointing out that research libraries were doubling in size every sixteen years.[15]

The annual studies at Purdue since 1965 indicate that the rates of growth discovered by Rider have continued unabated through 1971.[16]

So long as financial support of the university and its library grew steadily year after year, university libraries could hope at least to keep their heads above water. They clearly were in a very precarious position at best, however, and anyone could foresee that when hard times came, as they inevitably would, sooner or later, there would be serious difficulties. Those times have now arrived.

Hard times and inflation. The current financial problems of universities hardly need documentation. Earl F. Cheit in a study for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the Ford Foundation calls it "the new depression."[17] Budgets have actually been cut, or the rate of increase slowed drastically.

Planning and budgeting. A static budget when coupled with inflation spells real trouble for universities. All have begun to reassess goals and functions, and to try to improve their planning and budgeting processes. State boards of control appear strongly interested in program planning and budgeting systems, even though these devices have doubtful validity for colleges and universities. Clearly, long and short range planning and analytical budgeting are going to be a way of life in universities henceforth.

One of the budgets likely to be looked at hard with an eye to cutting is that of the university library, partly because it looms large. Certainly libraries can no longer count on steady increases to help them in their efforts to keep abreast of continuing increases in rate of publication. In addition, libraries are harder hit than most parts of the university, especially in regard to acquisitions, because the rate of inflation (or increases, if we accept the subject-fragmentation factor as one cause for increases in the price of materials) is higher than it is in other aspects of our economy. The declining status of the director of libraries in the administrative family also tends to reduce his effectiveness in presenting library needs.

Technology. Ever since Vannevar Bush proposed the Memex in 1945—the storage of all the information a research scholar needs in microform within the space of a desk, recallable at will —technology has been seen as a promising means of coping with the ever-growing flood of knowledge. Microtext has been adopted readily by university libraries, though it should be noted that government agencies do not allow the counting of materials in microtext in basic reports on resources. There have been many experiments with the computer, especially in computerized bibliography, the best examples being the National Library of Medicine's MEDLARS (now succeeded by MEDLINE), and *Chemical Abstracts.* Many experiments have been undertaken, numerous books have appeared on the subject, and the federal government has established a special agency on scientific information. One director declared in 1971 that "Computerization of information, long hoped by some to be the solution to library costs, is for that purpose substantially bankrupt."[18] This judgment may seem harsh, but it reflects general disappointment. Perhaps everyone, including librarians, had over-optimistic expectations. Time may change the situation, but it is now thirty-seven years since Vannevar Bush's proposal was first advanced.

Changing theories of management. Certain new theories of management emerged beginning in the early 1960s. Based on psychology and the study of human relations in an organization, the new ideas appeared first in business and industry and subsequently spread to governmental agencies. The new theories are characterized by the growing involve-

ment of people in organizational decision-making, loosening of the traditional hierarchial structure, what might be called creative tensions, growing complexity, constant change, and open-endedness. Leadership is with a soft voice at a low key. Motivation and morale are stressed. Several excellent books on the new system have appeared.[19] One of the cycle theories, an aspect of the open-end concept, is that management is in constant change and that a successful organization evolves through five stages, the last of which is collaboration.[20]

The new theories seem especially suitable to an academic organization, because it is made up of intellectual and rational men, it is bureaucratic, and hardly compatible with the principles of hierarchy and obedience. One of the particular virtues of the new management plans for a university is that it tends to provide a defense in depth for the institution, when it comes under attack. It marshals all resources (administration, faculty, students, staff, and regents) against any onslaught. Predictions are that universities generally will adopt the new methods.[21] Ideas about participatory management in university administration are documented well by Henry L. Mason in a study promoted by AAUP.[22] Mason, in turn, reflects the ideas of Demerth, Millet, Carson, Kerr, and other authorities in academic management.

Unionization. Social conditions are changing, and therefore management needs to change. Factors promoting acceptance of the new theories of management include the growing educational level of workers, social disillusionment, activism including a demand for a share in the government of the enterprise, the need for more effective use of employee knowledge and spirit, the protection which they provide against outside attacks, and unionization. The unionization even of faculties, long regarded as unlikely, appears to be on the

increase.[23] Participatory management may be an acceptable alternative. However, tight money and the over-supply of Ph.D.'s may speed the trend of college and university faculties to unionize "at a revolutionary pace."[24] Even the AAUP is moving away from its former cooperative attitude towards a position of being spokesman for the faculty as a defender of all faculty interests, including salaries, class size, and similar concerns. Unionization is one form of participation in management.

Increasing control by state boards. State boards of regents for higher education are becoming increasingly powerful and exerting more and more control over state-supported institutions. In part, this movement is a result of public disillusionment about higher education, especially universities where the student activist movement has been most evident, and partly it is a product of legislative wishes. Such boards, in some instances, are adding highly qualified specialists to their staffs, developing long-term master-plans to which the universities must conform, and emphasizing the budgeting process. Many already budget by formulas, and nearly all are strongly interested in program planning and budgeting systems. In a number of states they are creating new community and junior colleges which are less subject to public disfavor, and also are politically popular. The junior institutions draw heavily on both state building and state operating funds for higher education. Typical of the movement towards stronger control is the recent reorganization of the State Board of Governors in 1971 by the North Carolina Legislature, giving the board complete authority to determine functions, educational activities, academic programs, and degrees. Previous assignments of functions or responsibilities to designated institutions were cancelled.[25] The state boards appear to be using for overall research and planning the National

Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, at Boulder, Colorado. The center's studies and recommendations therefore are of basic importance.

University libraries are becoming more and more subject to the state boards, especially in the budgeting process and in their demands for more effective cooperation among all state academic libraries. The coming pattern of state budgetary controls for university libraries was predicted ten years ago. McAnally found in a survey in 1962 that a majority of state boards were not yet using formulas for university library budgets (even though some already had formulas for college libraries), because of the complexity of the problem, but that many were interested in the subject.[26] Now there is a definite trend towards formulas for budgeting for university libraries, and many state boards also are considering PPBS.[27] The Washington "Evergreen" formula, developed by business officers, in cooperation with the state's college and university libraries, is typical of the newer, complex formulas. It has certain disadvantages for university libraries.[28] McAnally and Ellsworth had referred to the dangers of equalitarianism in formula budgeting for university libraries. If graduate programs and quality are not given adequate weight, this could be an end result. It remains to be seen what the effect of PPBS will be on university libraries, if this budgeting system is adopted widely.

No national system for information. The last of the background problems for libraries is the failure to achieve an effective national system for the sharing of information. The present uncoordinated system was reasonably satisfactory around the turn of the century when advances in knowledge were slow and leisurely. The information explosion is now producing an enormous wealth of knowledge, published and distributed

according to the techniques of 1900, which is beyond control and a source of frustration, dismay, and continual irritation to scholars. Steps such as interlibrary loan, cooperative acquisitions plans, union lists and catalogs, and the Center for Research Libraries have been useful, but too little and ineffective, and hardly acknowledged by the community of scholars. Control is not necessarily a library problem, though librarians seem to catch the brunt of the blame. Instead, many agencies ought to be helping to solve the problem: the various professional associations in different subjects, publishers of books and journals, computer and information specialists, foundations, and last, but not least, the federal government. Information is a resource of national importance; certainly the center of an effective system will be enormous in size and complexity. The federal government has made some useful efforts toward the control of scientific information, but only in medicine has the work been supported adequately.

In any event, university libraries receive the principal blame for failure to solve the problem of access, with the result that the director of the library has lost stature and prestige within his institution. Buckman believes that some substantial progress must be made towards the solution of major national problems, such as this one, before the director of libraries can hope to regain his proper status within the university.[29]

INTERNAL PROBLEMS

Many of the newer problems facing directors of university libraries have their origins in changing social conditions or within the institution as it attempts to adjust to these social trends. Some of his problems, however, have developed within the university library itself. Few of the internal problems are new; mainly, they are expansions of existing or latent difficulties.

Greatly intensified pressures. The most

obvious change in the director's job is the extraordinary increase in the pressures exerted upon him. Many of the directors with whom the authors corresponded wrote quite feelingly upon this point. A few key phrases describe the situation succinctly. Herman Fussler observed that "the pressures on the library and director have changed by one or two orders of magnitude in the past twenty years . . . the librarian sits between the anvil of resources and the hammer of demands. . . . The strain is greater, just as it is for presidents of universities."

Louis Kaplan wrote, "Administration is never easy, and there were problems galore even when money was plentiful. . . . I had lived through the 'glory' years. . . ." Louis Branscomb noted that "It has become a matter of running faster on the treadmill every year in order to stay where you were the year before." One director said that at his first interview the new president informed him that he did not believe in buying books, and later elaborated this statement. Another reported that the president had refused to see him for ten years. David Otis Kelley suggested that the university should have "a younger man to sit on this hot seat." Edward B. Stanford referred to the "present climate of creeping discontent that pervades the faculty, students and staff on so many large campuses." Ralph Parker observed that "I have found the life of a Dean on this campus to be much cosier than the life of a librarian." And the title of a talk by Warren B. Kuhn describes the situation vividly: "in the Director's office, it's 'High Noon' every day!"

Writers on management agree that to a certain degree stress stimulates executives to better performance. But they also agree that excessive stress is harmful. As the pressures on the director increase, he has a tendency to become more and more decisive in attempting to cope with the growing multitude of problems alone, until he ultimately offends too many people or else concludes that the rewards are no longer worth the cost.

Pressure sources. The growing pressures on the director are exerted by five different groups. They are, in probable order of magnitude, the president's office, the library staff, the faculty, students, and, in publicly supported universities, state boards of control. It may seem odd to list the library faculty as high as second, but in those cases in which the principal cause for the director quitting his position can be identified, the library staff ranks second.

Unquestionably, the president's office, including not only the president but also the academic vice-president and particularly the financial vice-president, bring the strongest pressures to bear on the director. In part, this is because the president is the most powerful man in the university, in part because he reflects institutional opinion. The president's office is a source of many of the director's frustrations. Numerous directors commented on this problem, and on the deterioration of these relationships. As already pointed out, the proliferation of top-level administrators has severed the director from direct contact with the president, interposed a layer of officers between the two, and reduced the ability of the library to present its case. Directors also have realized, as Thomas R. Buckman remarked, that they have no power base on which to operate, and others noted that the director could not even get to the point of a showdown, much less win one. All presidents are harried, some are inexperienced, and others may come from nonlibrary oriented fields such as the sciences.

One of the major frustrations of the director may be with the financial vice-president. Robert Vosper calls attention to a prediction by a social scientist as early as 1961, of coming conflicts between the library and budgetary authorities.[30] The rate of growth of libraries observed by Rider and others obviously

had to end eventually. The director sees clearly the financial needs produced by the ever-growing flood of publications, increased enrollment, expanding graduate programs, rising expectations and demands, and inflation, but may not be able to convince the budget officer of the acuteness of library needs. Besides, the financial vice-president may have no new money, is reluctant to make cuts elsewhere for the library, which he may regard as a "bottomless pit," or may have less money than previously. Financial demands pressed hard are likely to see the director relieved of his post. A noteworthy example of this fact occurred in one of the great Ivy League schools—when the director wrote bluntly and bitterly about financial support, on the first page of his annual report (his only or last recourse?), he was immediately relieved and transferred to the School of Religion. The financial problems of the university library are not likely to decrease for the indefinite future.

Staff pressures. It may seem strange that the director should be under attack from his own staff, or fail to receive badly needed support in relations with the administration and faculty, but it is so in many cases. Robert Miller wrote: "In recent years there has been pressure exerted upon the library administrator by the library staff, the overt features including a strengthened organization, unionization, requests for participation in administrative decision-making, faculty status, etc. To me and to other benevolent and beloved administrators, this is an attack on the father image which I have long fancied. I know one man who felt this so keenly that he resigned."

Nowadays the library staff, both the academic or professional and the nonprofessional, are far better educated than in the past. Most librarians hold at least a master's degree, and many higher degrees. They also are more socially conscious, action-oriented, and impatient—in common with the rest of our society.

They want and expect a share in policy decisions affecting themselves and the library.[31] The rise of library specialists in university libraries also is producing severe strains on the library's administrative structure, and represents a force for change in administrative practices, according to Eldred Smith.[32]

A particular problem that has not yet surfaced fully is that the director has two staffs, one academic or professional and one clerical or nonacademic. The latter is the larger of the two. Different administrative styles are needed for each. There is some danger that the two groups might end up in opposition to each other, especially if the nonacademic group unionizes and the academic group does not.

The old methods of organization may no longer be acceptable, but good alternatives are difficult to find. Booz, Allen & Hamilton identify the problem in their Columbia study.[33] In any event, new administrative styles are being called for, and those directors who will not or cannot adapt to the newer ways may be lost.

Faculty sources. The latent conflict of interests between librarians and the faculty were commented upon recently by Robert H. Blackburn and Richard H. Logsdon. Blackburn stated that librarians have the books, professors have the students.[34] Logsdon pointed out that the typical faculty member wants complete coverage in his subject and centralized service; the professor sees the size of the library budget and regards the library as an empire with all kinds of staff help when the professor cannot even have a secretary. As one director wrote, these and other frustrations lead to "a gradual building up of small things into big, lose a friend here and there every year, and there's bound to be a critic in almost every department."[35] A simple but cynical explanation of the growing problem in faculty relations may be financial—when there is not even money enough

for any raises for the faculty, faculty support for other university functions inevitably declines. The growing militancy in society generally also may be a factor in bringing existing problems to the fore.

Student pressure. Students do not yet have the power in the university for which they are agitating, but their power is growing. They, too, are action oriented, and are demanding improvements in library service. "Under pressure from students and faculty there has been a forced change in academic library priorities," Robert A. Miller finds. "Service is more important, or holds more immediacy than collection building. More service is wanted and in more depth . . . reference to limitations of funds, space, personnel is not accepted as a sound reply, but only as an alibi for non-performance."[36] When there is no new money, improved service must come at the cost of collections. A special problem is that most university libraries have over-emphasized services to research, so that except in those institutions where there is an undergraduate library, the collections tend to be single-copy collections. Professors, when they select books, prefer to cover as much of the new literature in their fields as possible, and are reluctant to spend money on extra copies, even of important titles. Approval plans also produce only single copies. To cap the problem, changing emphases of human rights over property rights lead to losses—not nearly as great as faculty and students think, but certainly causing a very serious problem in public relations.

Declining ability of library to meet needs. Apparently the university library is becoming increasingly less able to meet the legitimate needs of its university community. The causes have already been outlined in background factors: the information explosion, inflation, more students, and continued fragmentation of the traditional disciplines,

coupled with hard times. A recent study at Harvard concluded that with 8,000,000 volumes the library was less able to cope with the demands of scholars than it was when it had only 4,000,000 volumes. Ralph Ellsworth, in his 1971–72 annual report at Colorado, came to the same conclusion. David Kaser states plaintively: "The lugubrious fact is that our ability to supply the books and journals needed by Cornell teaching and research programs is rapidly diminishing, and no one seems to know what to do about it. Computerization of information, cooperation, and microminiaturization have not provided solutions. . . . The somber conclusion fast being arrived at by the library staff is that the only solutions likely to be effective are (1) more money, or (2) a substantially reduced academic program for the library to serve, neither of which appears imminent. The library needs, and would welcome, advice in this matter."[37] Another director observed that "when the library is unable to perform at the level of satisfaction to the faculty, the head of the library is held personally responsible and it is assumed that he is incapable of being Director."

Lack of goals and planning. Like the university itself, the library has rarely done a good job of planning, either long-range or short-range. One director remarked: "Many university librarians have rigid, pre-conceived notions about the proper objectives of their libraries. The traditional library objectives summarized cynically in such phrases as 'more of the same' and 'bottomless pit' are probably unrealistic, and yet little is offered in their place."[38] Now that higher education and all its parts are under critical review, the lack of realistic, practicable, and accepted goals, and of long-range planning, is a major handicap. There are some noteworthy exceptions, such as UCLA, Columbia, and Illinois. Several writers have discussed this problem.[39]

Inability to accommodate to educational changes quickly. The university library, like the university itself, is a bureaucracy which is difficult to change, even though the need may be recognized by nearly everyone concerned. In addition, the university library may have large collections, sometimes built up over centuries, research collections which cannot be changed quickly; the library is housed in a great building or buildings which would cost millions to replace; and its staff of specialists has been developed over a period of years. The two groups most impatient for new philosophies and new types of services are the students and the president's office. Inability to make changes rapidly, even though he tried, cost at least one director his job.

Decline in status of the director. This subject has been dealt with previously, but is so important to the welfare of the library, as well as to the director personally, that it should be noted again in a consideration of internal problems. The director no longer is in the upper level of university management and cannot participate in institutional policy decisions, including planning and budgeting. Partly the decline is due to lack of basic support. The director seldom has an opportunity to defend the library, or if he does, no one wishes to listen to him. And on him now falls the chief burden of asking for institutional book funds as well as staff money. Many directors commented on this aspect and asserted that it made real achievements impossible and reduced the attractiveness of the position.

Declining financial support. When financial support for the universities slows down, stands still, or decreases, the library must suffer too. A static or declining budget causes especially acute problems in the library, because of the continuing proliferation of publications and increases in the prices of print well above the national average. A number of directors, in discussing this problem, referred to "housekeeping" or "caretaker-level" funding. Booz, Allen & Hamilton warns that the president is inclined to look at the library budget as a place to economize. There is widespread evidence that the percentage of the total educational and general budget allotted to the university library has declined in recent years, including some of our most distinguished universities. The national situation cannot be determined readily; however, *Statistics of Southern College and University Libraries,* which reports percentages spent on the library, reveals that decreases slightly outnumber increases over the past five years, but decreases outnumber increases two to one over a ten-year period.

Renewed questioning of centralization. Every director is probably aware of the declining efficiency of the general library and the old departmental library system in meeting new needs and rising expectations. Interdisciplinary studies and fragmenting disciplines are not served well by the system, and libraries have no funds to expand. Peter Drucker expects the entire university curriculum to be reorganized;[40] if so, this problem may well increase. Every director also is aware of the rise of many office collections, unofficial institute libraries funded from grants, and departmental reading rooms supplied personally by the faculty. All these developments indicate growing dissatisfaction with centralized controls. "Institutionalizing library resources inevitably denies individual faculty members the degree of control they would prefer. . . . Add to this the even stronger desire on the part of professional schools to be autonomous within the university and you have another set of frictions."[41]

No effective sharing of resources, computerization, microminiaturization. Failure to make substantial progress on these national problems is blamed on the library and its director, and some believe

it an important factor in the decline of prestige of the director.

Old-style management. As noted above, the traditional hierarchical and authoritative style of management is increasingly unacceptable. As one director observed, it "no longer has any purchase in the market place." Many directors are unwilling or unable to adapt. In addition, the director's office now operates in a condition of constant change, intense pressures, and great complexity. These factors are of crucial importance to the director personally, demanding the highest administrative abilities as well as durability, flexibility, and determination.

SOLUTIONS AND CHANGES

It is far easier to identify the multitude of problems facing the university library and its director than it is to find solutions to these troubles. Nevertheless, there are answers to some problems and partial solutions to others. Perhaps the most important fact for the director to recognize is that the old ways are being questioned and that changes are evolving; he should be receptive to continuing change, both for his library and for himself personally, and try to see that the best possible choices are made among various alternatives. The university library obviously will survive, for it is a fundamental part of the university, but its nature will continue to be transformed. What happens to the individual director may not be important, heartless though this may seem. Either he adapts to new ways, or another person will be brought in who has the qualities needed in the new era. But what happens to the leadership of the library embodied in the position of director of libraries is exceedingly important.

Solutions to national problems. To restore the confidence of the university in the library and its director, there has to be "general acceptance and implementa-

tion of some significant national programs that really come to grips with fundamental problems of providing information and knowledge for people working in the universities. . . . They probably won't get it fully until he and his colleagues attack the national problems in such a way that the local university library becomes a manageable operation."[42]

Unfortunately, the problems are so vast that there seems to be little that the individual director can do. Instead, the solutions must come at the national level. No *deus ex machina* is likely to appear any time soon from the computer-information world, microminiaturization or other technologies; it is therefore the responsibility of librarians to develop answers, even though they may be only partial and prove temporary. However, the librarian can make his views known and speak out vigorously about the urgent need to national agencies which are in a stronger position to attack the problems. These include the Association of Research Libraries, agencies of the federal government, and the American Library Association. Efforts of the Association of Research Libraries to promote a national acquisitions program and to develop plans for more effective sharing of resources for research are constructive, but the organization is dependent upon the federal government and foundations for research funds, and is not funded to operate any continuing program. Nonetheless, its leadership is vitally important in the overall situation. Only the federal government can provide the sizeable funds needed for a proper national plan. There are four comprehensive federal agencies in the field—the National Commission on Libraries, the Library of Congress, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—none of which is funded properly for the task, nor has national responsibility for information been

fully accepted by the government. The American Library Association can be helpful but has many diverse interests and at present has internal management problems.

Current developments of promise are the recently completed ARL interlibrary loan cost study, the same organization's current study of the feasibility of a computerized national referral center, and ongoing studies of national-regional periodicals resources centers or lending libraries by the National Commission on Libraries, ARL, and the Center for Research Libraries. Both the Association of Research Libraries and the Center for Research Libraries have broadened their membership considerably in recent years, thereby increasing their strength. ARL has adopted automatic membership criteria based on 50 percent of the ARL averages on certain factors. Some librarians see networks as an answer, but existing examples are uncoordinated and vary widely in scope and in value. It should be noted again that political pressures are strong for more and more effective cooperation, especially from state boards of higher education and from HEW.

Better planning. Failure to plan for the future has been one of the major weaknesses of university libraries in general, a condition which many authorities agree must be corrected in the seventies. "Planning is the orderly means used by an organization to establish effective control over its own future . . . to be effective any plan . . . must be logical, comprehensive, flexible, action-oriented, and formal. Furthermore, it must extend into the future and involve human resources."[43] In an era of change in the university and of static financial support, the allocation of resources becomes especially important. The components of comprehensive library planning include (1) university requirements and expectations for library services; (2) the library's own objectives and plans in sup-

port of academic programs and general learning needs; and (3) library resources (financial, personnel, collections, facilities, and equipment) needed to implement agreed-upon plans. There are four ways to accommodate change. (1) Appoint a new chief librarian. (2) Call in an outside consultant. So far as the director is concerned, results are the same as (1) four times out of five, especially if the university calls for the consultant. (3) Establish a committee within the library organizational structure as a research and planning group.[44] (4) Appoint a staff officer in the director's office for planning and research, to do some of the work and to assist the staff committee. Kaser points out that in the university "academic decision making . . . is not accomplished through the organizational tree that we have come to associate with large organizations. Such a structure does exist in universities, but it exists for nonacademic decisions; academic decisions . . . are rather initiated and made by faculty members as individuals and with practically no centralized control over them."[45] Implications for the library are obvious.

Improved budgeting. During this period of hard times for the university, the university library must improve its budgeting and control practices greatly if it is to receive its fair share of limited resources. The old add-on type budget is gone, at least for a while and perhaps forever. Librarians need to prove their value to the classroom faculty as well as to the university administration—libraries are indispensable, but how indispensable? Libraries now have to demonstrate their importance to the educational program of the institution. There also must be more accountability—directors must provide better justifications for budget increases. Some steps that the director should take include adding a business-trained budget manager to the library staff for budget preparation; enlisting the support of instructional de-

partments in preparing budgets; seeking faculty and administrative recognition of the fact that any new academic program requires money and that special financial aid should be given to the library for it; making productivity and cost benefit analyses regularly; participation in computerized networks and information-sharing systems; and having the director sit on the highest university policy board.[46] A discovery of considerable significance was made by Kenneth S. Allen, who found among thirteen sampled institutions that "the percentage of educational and general expense funds allocated to the library appears to be favorably influenced by having faculty status."[47] Further study is needed to see if this is true nationally.

State boards of higher education clearly are going to affect budgeting practices of state-supported university libraries, as previously observed, for their financial control is growing rapidly. The methods they adopt will govern library methods. Six types of budgets currently are in use: the traditional budget by objects of expenditure, program budget, performance budget, Planning, Programming and Budgetary Systems, formula budgeting, and combinations.[48]

New organizational patterns. If present trends in the academic programs of the university continue—breakoff of new subjects from old disciplines, growth of interdisciplinary studies and area studies, rise of programs oriented towards current social problems, more independent study programs, and more adult education work, or if indeed there will be entirely different curricula by 1980 as suggested by some—then the university library may have to make considerable change in its organizational structure to accommodate to university needs. Some modifications are needed already, for internal as well as external reasons; our present patterns are over seventy-five years old.

At present, no one knows with any certainty exactly what changes in organization may be needed. The most interesting suggestions to date, the Booz, Allen & Hamilton proposals (limited to staff and service only) for Columbia University libraries, appear unwieldy and cumbersome. The experiment should be watched with interest. The company reflects a business-industrial management firm's approach. In any event, the director needs to be aware that organizational changes may be needed, and to remain open-minded and flexible on the subject.

Services vs. collection-building. The director must recognize that the emphasis in university libraries is shifting from collection-building to services, under growing pressures from students and faculty, and that the library must conform. Library staffs also seem to be becoming more service conscious and program oriented. When financial support is static, there is no place to obtain the money for improved services other than book and journal funds. Therefore, the percentage of the library budget allotted to acquisitions will decline, unfortunate as this is for the world of scholarship in general and the university in particular. In its most affluent days, no library was able to acquire more than a portion of the world's published output.

Every director has been made increasingly aware of the growing dissatisfactions with library service. Formerly faculty members and students were reluctant to voice criticism and make suggestions; nowadays, neither seems to hesitate to make attacks. Failing to receive satisfaction, they may go to the president or to the campus newspaper. Courteous hearings and boxes for complaints and suggestions are useful. Another evidence that every director must be aware of is the rapid growth in recent years of alternatives to standard library service—office collections, unofficial institute libraries, faculty-supplied departmental reading rooms, and the like. Dougherty suggests that a new attitude and new

types of service may be needed for the latter group.[49]

Undergraduate libraries (or learning resources centers as some state boards prefer to call them) seem successful and desirable, and are popular with students. They are possible, however, only in large university libraries. They help improve service, but there seems to be little or no correlation between the presence of such a unit and the tenure of the director.

Collecting policies. Several changes in collecting policies may be desirable. The first and most obvious change is that, with stable or declining funds, the library needs to be more selective in choosing from the world's output. Unless the library receives a book and journal budget that increases steadily at least 12 percent a year, the recent rate of inflation in the price of print, library intake will decline. There is a trend towards selection by library specialists. Blanket order and approval plans are becoming widespread. Both movements seem to be satisfactory and acceptable to the faculty. When book funds decline, many libraries tend to protect their periodical subscriptions first.

Institutional pride and rules of agencies for counting library statistics emphasize the codex book and the journal. Microprint is well used by libraries but is not acceptable for the basic count. Libraries need to widen their collecting net to include information in other forms, including the so-called newer media and information on computer tapes or discs. Douglas Bryant has pointed out the growing variety of forms that must be collected.[50]

Rare books. Some presidents, legislators, and state boards have long looked askance at the use of budgetary funds for the purchase of rare books *per se.* Now the attitude appears to be spreading to the faculty and to students. A little checking with faculty members in almost any department except history,

English, and classics or other humanities is likely to prove startling. Neither scientists nor social scientists are likely to appreciate the need. Perhaps the attitude is a product of severe financial problems, or McLuhanism, or strong emphasis on the current problems of our society. The director may be well advised to use only gift funds for such purposes, and to publicize this policy among the faculty. "Friends of the Library" organizations can be quite helpful in providing funds for "frosting on the cake."

More copies of important books or current titles in heavy demand ought to be purchased. Most university libraries, with the exception of those with undergraduate units, are basically single-copy libraries. The most severe criticism of every university library in the country probably is the inability of students or faculty to secure a copy of a high-demand title when needed. Changes in acquisitions policies clearly are required.

Institutionalization of resources. Some loosening of centralized control over resources and services may be in order. This will seem downright heresy to some, and an encouragement of inefficiency and wastefulness by others. But the fact is that this is already occurring. Professional associations in medicine and law in concerted campaigns have gained a great deal of independence for their schools, including their libraries. Other professional associations are beginning to work on similar programs. The rise of many unofficial office collections, institute libraries, and departmental reading rooms has already been noted. The library itself cannot establish the needed new branches to serve interdisciplinary and similar new programs, due to the financial pinch. Actually, at least two great university libraries have always been federations of libraries—Harvard and Cornell. The financial and supportive aspects of allowing some degree of freedom were suggested by Donald Coney in the 1950s.

When asked why he allowed so many independent branch libraries at Berkeley, he replied, "We get more money that way." Cooperation and a new kind of personalized service to meet new needs are suggested by Dougherty.[51] Holley suggests that coordinated decentralization as at Harvard should be looked at, as well as the view that after a certain size has been reached, some form of decentralization may be both necessary and desirable.[52]

Directors undoubtedly need all the help they can find nowadays, and by cooperation they can maintain some degree of coordination which might otherwise be lost. As the rate of acquisitions declines, libraries may have excess staff in their acquisitions and cataloging departments which could be utilized. Policies on these matters need to be reviewed, and either re-affirmed or modified.

Status of the director. Most directors commented on the decline in status of the office of director, reflected in the interposition of layers of vice-presidents between the president and the director. Some decline in general approval of the library itself also seems to be evident. This is unfortunate for the director, but very serious indeed for the university library itself. The library's representative usually no longer participates in institutional policy decision making processes, and cannot present the library's case at the top level.

Buckman believes that the four requirements to restoring confidence and credibility in the director, and by implication the library, are: (1) some effective attack on major national problems; (2) establishing an effective working relationship with the administrative officers of the university; (3) providing a framework in which the director can operate effectively within the university's power structure and (4) setting reasonable and widely understood goals for the library.[53] Branscomb suggests that this may be a problem to be worked out individually on each campus, rather than by a considered attack from research libraries as a group.[54] Booz, Allen & Hamilton propose that the director be made a vice-president.[55] The vice-president needs to adopt a university-wide viewpoint when this is done. The idea is attractive, and has been implemented at Columbia, Texas, and Utah, the two latter perhaps for different reasons. An important factor, for directors considering such a move, may be that the office should be a vice-president for information services for the entire campus, assuming responsibilities for the newer media, even closed-circuit TV and certain aspects of computerized information services. Separate budgeting for the latter units seems fundamental.

The status of the director is sometimes a negotiable matter which should be dealt with as one of the conditions of appointment. The rank of dean may be negotiable; the status of vice-president possibly not. The welfare of the library itself as well as the opportunity for achievement by the director of course are involved.

Term appointments. One of the solutions proposed by several directors is appointment for a fixed term, perhaps for ten years, perhaps for five years, with one renewal possible.[56] If Chancellor Murphy is correct, and if the post of director is comparable to that of a president, then his observation that an individual's major creative contributions are made within the first three to five years, with ten years the maximum time needed to complete programs, the idea should be considered carefully by the profession. Both the library and the individual are certain to suffer when the director remains in the position past his period of optimum contribution.

Several universities presently have term appointments for deans and other such administrators—with extensions possible—Cornell, Texas, and Illinois. The de facto tenure period for directors of ARL libraries over the past three

years has averaged between five and six years. Vosper does note, however, that very short terms inhibit planning and focused concentration, such as the three year elective term in Japanese academic libraries.

If term appointments are adopted, some orderly plans or structure to facilitate wise change in administration must be formulated. So far there is none, though at West Virginia a president acquires retirement privileges after five years, and at Kentucky deans who return to teaching retain their salaries at the expense of the general administration. A majority of directors who have quit their posts have gone into teaching, but there are limitations to this concept—many universities have no library school, and the ability of schools to absorb a succession of directors may be limited. Others have become curators of special collections, taken early retirement, or moved to another university. If peer appointment should come for presidents, as has been suggested, it might also apply to directors. In such circumstances, moving to a lesser position in the library would become more practicable. In any event, the profession needs to give some thought to the problem of how to make such changes feasible rather than traumatic.

Increase the percentage of nonprofessional staff. Some twenty-five years ago university libraries in the United States generally had a 1:1 ratio between professional librarians and supporting staff. Then following a series of articles by Archie McNeal and others in the middle 1950s, pointing out that perhaps two-thirds of the work in an academic library could be done successfully and more economically by nonprofessional people, libraries generally moved to a staff composition of two nonprofessionals to one professional. With few exceptions, this distribution is common among university libraries today.

Among Canadian university libraries the ratios are different: from three-

to-one up to five-to-one. The movement began in the catalog department at the University of British Columbia; when catalogers complained about the amount of routine and clerical work they were doing, the library increased the size of the supporting staff to what they deemed proper. Canadian university libraries have close working relations, and the movement spread rapidly. The new ratios are reported to be acceptable and satisfactory.

This subject requires further examination on the part of directors and their staffs. The education of the entire population has improved greatly in the last fifteen to twenty years, from which it follows that nonprofessional personnel ought to be able to carry more and higher level duties. A careful survey of student opinion about the central library at the University of Oklahoma revealed that the four areas of greatest dissatisfaction fell within the province of the nonprofessional staff. Obviously the library needs more assistants.[57] Eldred Smith also had speculated that the university library may not need many more academic or professional staff, but better qualified and more specialized individuals.[58] Harold F. Wells suggests that the ratio of clerical to professional ought to be five-to-one; adding that all staff are better educated, one year is a short period of graduate education, the Army is very dependent on sergeants, and libraries ought to upgrade clericals and assign more duties to them.[59] A tentative inquiry about a research grant to establish the proper ratio was unsuccessful.

In relation to nonacademic staff members, there are three special problems for the director: they may fit a somewhat different administrative pattern, no one knows what are the proper relationships between the academic and the nonacademic staff, and clerical assistants appear to be more likely to join a union.[60] Booz, Allen & Hamilton proposals in the Columbia study attempt to come to

grips with the problem, one of the first efforts to date. Other approaches need to be explored. In one major university library, the two groups have already come into conflict. The problems will grow in proportion to increases in size of the assistant group.

CHANGING PATTERNS OF MANAGEMENT

New management styles rapidly are replacing the old traditional techniques in the university library world. The trend has been observed and commented on by several librarians who have made surveys of university library management around the country during the last two years: Edward G. Holley, Maurice P. Marchant, Eldred Smith, and Jane G. Flener.[61] Involving increased staff participation in the management of the library to one degree or another, they are called participatory management, collegial management, or democratic administration. The theory and principles have been drawn from two different sources, business and industry, and academia itself. The new styles are being adopted rapidly because the arguments in their favor are persuasive. They draw in to the solution of problems a diverse group of good minds with varied viewpoints, thereby improving the quality as well as the effectiveness of decision making. They are the answer to growing staff pressures, particularly from the academic or professional staff, for participation in planning and policy decisions, as well as administrative affairs affecting themselves. They tend to improve the morale and dedication of the staff. They marshall the entire staff in defense of the library against attacks from outside, thus relieving and supporting the director, a defense in depth, as it were. The director has to surrender some of his old authority, and becomes more of a leader. His influence may not be diminished, but it must be exerted in different ways.

There are three principal styles, two based on business and industry, the other on university academic practices. The three might be called the business management plan, the unionization method, and collegial management or academic plan. A director may not be free to choose among them. If his university has not, and probably will not, grant academic status to librarians, such as the Ivy League universities, he must choose one of the first two. If the professional staff already has faculty status, then he would be wise to accept that style. A show of hands recently in the Association of Research Libraries indicated that three-fourths of the directors already had academic status or were interested in seeking it for their staffs. If a staff is unionized already, a new director has no choice. All of the new styles are so new, comparatively speaking, that there are still wide variations in practice in all three groups. Each may be successful. The director who enters upon any one of the paths grudgingly and because he is forced to, and drags his heels all the way, however, is likely to find himself in trouble after a short time.

Business management plan. Examples of libraries experimenting with the professional but not academic approach (i.e., their staffs do not have faculty status nor are they unionized) are Cornell, Columbia, UCLA, and recently Harvard. The method may give more options to the director, and allow him to make more decisions concerning the degree of staff participation. There are no firm outside models; therefore, the director and his staff have to make many basic and difficult decisions. A director who goes into this system determined to cede only what he has to treads a very difficult and possibly dangerous path. There is likely to be a latent restlessness in the staff which will burst forth if there is even slight provocation. Given hard work, good judgment, and cooperation from both sides the method should be successful.

It is interesting to note that Booz, Al-

len & Hamilton, Inc., in their original report of 1970 on *Problems in University Library Management,* make no mention of staff participation matters. Subsequent papers by Seashore and Bolton of the firm's staff, however, stressed the desirability of extensively involving the staff in management, and their recommendations in the Columbia study also emphasize this feature. A representative of the firm declined to commit himself about faculty status for librarians.

Unionization. Management by collective bargaining probably produces the most drastic changes in management of all the three methods. In some respects it is the newest and least-known of all. Chicago, California (Berkeley) to a certain extent, and the City University of New York are examples. A guide exists on the subject of unionization of library staff.[62] De Gennaro believes that unionism and participatory management are incompatible; which will emerge as the trend of the future is still uncertain.[63] One university library union, it should be noted, includes both professional and nonprofessional staff members.

Factors that might tend to lead to unionization are large size and unsatisfactory business management types of participative management. The larger the staff, the more difficult it is to develop participatory management plans that will effectively involve all of the staff. Academic, faculty, or collegial management seems less likely to lead to unionization of the professional staff, but if the classroom faculty is unionized, the library faculty undoubtedly will be included.

Academic management. The model for the third or academic style lies in the university itself—administration of a college. The director should be comparable to the dean of a college or perhaps a vice-president, and the professional staff to a college faculty. Like the first method, however, it has both advantages and disadvantages. First, despite many libraries working in this direction for a number of years—Illinois, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Ohio State, Oregon, Penn State, Miami, and Kentucky, for example—there are still about as many variations as there are in the first method. Excellent statements of principles under this system are those produced by Miami, Houston, Oregon, Minnesota, and Oklahoma. Numerous problems exist; the transition is neither simple nor easy. The director has less choice about the degree of participation in management which is to exist; he has more than many think, but the example of faculty-dean is close at hand, and there the respective roles are well-established and clear. To find out what the role of a director may be in such a plan, he has only to examine the role of the dean. A guide to the effects of academic status upon organization and management is that by McAnally.[64] It should be noted that a dean of a nondepartmentalized college tends to have considerably more power and influence than a dean of a college with many departments. The role of a dean of libraries in a large university library which has to be subdivided into both academic and administrative departments is quite different. Middle management tends to be much stronger in this case. Both types of colleges flourish in American universities. Another disadvantage of the system is that numerous time-consuming committees are required. The excesses to which committee operation could be carried were illustrated at the Library of Congress by a pioneer in participative management, Luther Evans.[65] Committees of classroom faculty members produce certain problems and this is an area the director needs to watch.

The advantages of academic management or operation as a college are substantial. It provides recognition of the library as an academic unit. The methods of management fit the standard uni-

versity pattern, hence are accepted readily by administration, classroom faculty, and the library staff. It draws in to planning, solution of problems, and management generally a wide variety of backgrounds and knowledge, so that decision-making tends to be better and the decisions accepted more readily. It promotes continuing education and professional growth, and increased professionalization. Morale is higher. One study indicates that it tends to improve financial support of the library.[66] Another indicates that the classroom faculty tends to be better satisfied with the library when the library operates as a faculty-academic unit.[67]

Productivity. Productivity under participatory management has been questioned by Lynch.[68] Her comments would seem to apply to business-style participatory management, academic management, and the unionization method alike. Marchant, however, points out that "While group decision-making alone appears to be neither adequate nor necessary to assure high productivity, it has been found to be generally characteristic of high-production organizations."[69] In a highly professionalized staff, his observation would seem particularly applicable. Any director who is convinced that the traditional hierarchical and authoritarian approach should be retained because it is best for the university would be well-advised to start looking for a new job, or a series of them, in view of current management trends.

Uncertain place of the supporting staff. Currently in university libraries in the United States, as previously observed, the supporting staff outnumbers the professional or academic staff two to one. The proportion is likely to rise during the next five years to the three to one up to five to one common in Canadian university libraries. The place of the nonprofessional staff in the management system, however, is still generally uncertain. Only in unionism is its role clear. Obviously, there must be solutions found for the proper involvement of the supporting staff in the government and management of the university library. Its members are better educated and better qualified than they were twenty years ago, and they will perform two-thirds to four-fifths of all work done in libraries. Various plans should be tried to find the best. Currently most nonacademic staff members operate under rules set by the university personnel office.

QUALITIES OF A MODEL DIRECTOR

The qualities required of a director of libraries are the same as they have always been. Certain aspects, however, receive more emphasis nowadays than they did in the past. First, the director must be more flexible and adaptable; the old certainties are being questioned or are gone, and the university library will continue to undergo changes. He must be willing to accept change as a way of life, and be open-minded about alternatives. Any man (or woman) unwilling to operate in such a milieu, or unable to accept uncertainty as a way of life should not undertake the management of a university library for the years immediately ahead. Second, he must possess a stable and equable temperament, and the ability to keep his emotional balance under the constant tensions that come at him from all directions. The tensions are unlikely to decrease. The apothegm of a former president seems appropriate: "If you can't stand the heat, stay out of the kitchen!" Third, he must have endurance. Luther Evans, who once described the qualities of a good library administrator, chose the term "endurance" instead of the term "vigor," which business and industry favored.[70] His choice seemed odd in the 1940s, but more apt now.

Finally, the director must be exceptionally persuasive. Ability to present li-

brary interests and needs effectively to the administration, classroom faculty, students, and state boards is essential. He must have facts derived from continuous planning and from continuing cost studies, including cost-benefit, but he also needs to have a personality that commands attention and respect. The new type of leadership within the library requires that he be a leader and not merely an authority. Sometimes it seems that a worker of miracles is wanted—a search committee for a new director of one of the major university libraries specified a mature and experienced man having at least ten years of professional career yet to go who would be able to persuade the university to increase financial support of the university library in an era of declining institutional income!

REFERENCES

1. Edward G. Holley, "Organization and Administration of Urban University Libraries," *CRL* 33:175–89 (May 1972).
2. Raynard C. Swank, Discussion with Arthur McAnally, Chicago, January 1972.
3. Lewis C. Branscomb, Thomas R. Buckman, Robert Carmack, Herman H. Fussler, John A. Heussman, Edward G. Holley, Robert K. Johnson, Louis Kaplan, David Otis Kelley, Roy L. Kidman, Warren B. Kuhn, Frank A. Lundy, John P. McDonald, Stanley McElderry, Robert A. Miller, Ralph H. Parker, Benjamin B. Richards, Eldred R. Smith, Edward B. Stanford, Lewis F. Steig, Raynard C. Swank, and Robert Vosper.
4. For a brief survey of some of these changes, not only in size but in other areas, and their probable effects on the university library, see President Richard Lyman (Stanford), "New Trends in Higher Education: The Impact on the University Library," Association of Research Libraries, *Minutes of the Twenty-Eighth meeting, May 14-15, 1971.* (Washington: A.R.L., 1971) p. 3–7. Also Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. "Trends in Higher Education and Their Implications for University Libraries and University Library Management," p. 11–20 of their *Problems in University Library Management* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1970).
5. Donald Coney, "Where Did You Go? To The Library. What Did You Get? Nothing," *CRL* 19:179–84 (May 1958).
6. Franklin D. Murphy, "Some Reflections on Structure," in John Coffrey, ed. *The Future Academic Community: Continuity and Change.* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1969), p. 88–94.
7. Herman H. Fussler, Letter to Arthur McAnally, March 8, 1972, p. 2.
8. Earl C. Bolton, "Response of University Library Management to Changing Modes of University Governance and Control," *CRL* 33:308 (July 1972).

9. Richard N. Logsdon, Letter to Arthur McAnally, August 10, 1972.
10. Jean Mayer, "The College and University: A Program for Academic Renewal," *Harvard Bulletin* (Nov. 16, 1970), p. 21–27.
11. Peter F. Drucker, *The Age of Discontinuity, Guidelines to Our Changing Society* (N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 389–90.
12. Douglas W. Bryant, "Problem of Research Libraries: Development of Resources," *A.C.L.S. Newsletter* v. 22, no. 1 (Jan. 1971) p. 3–8.
13. Vannevar Bush, "As We May Think," *Atlantic Monthly* v. 176, no. 1 (July 1945), p. 101–08.
14. National Research Council. Committee on Research in the Life Sciences. *The Life Sciences: Recent Progress and Application to Human Affairs, the World of Biological Research, Requirements for the Future.* (Washington: The National Academy of Sciences, 1970), p. 406.
15. Fremont Rider, *The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library, a Problem and Its Solution* (New York: Hadham Press, 1944).
16. O. C. Dunn, et al. *The Past and Likely Future of 58 Research Libraries, 1951–1980: A Statistical Study of Growth and Change* (Lafayette, Ind.: University Libraries and Audio-visual Center, 1965–   ).
17. Earl F. Cheit, *The New Depression in Higher Education, A Study of Financial Conditions at 41 Colleges and Universities; A General Report for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education and the Ford Foundation* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971).
18. Cornell University Libraries. *Report of the Director of University Libraries, 1970/71* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Libraries, 1971), p. 7.
19. Representative leaders include Chris Argyris, *Understanding Organizational Behavior* (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1960)

and his *Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness* (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1962); Rensis Likert, *New Patterns of Management* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961); Peter F. Drucker, *The Effective Executive* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967); Robert A. Sutermeister, *People and Productivity;* 2d ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969); Alfred J. Marrow, et al., *Management by Participation; Creating a Climate for Personal and Organizational Development* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967); and Harlon Cleveland, *The Future Executive* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972). A good summary of the early movement is Timothy Hallimen, *New Directions in Organization Theory* (Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND Corp., Sept. 1968. P-3936).

20. Larry E. Greiner, "Evolution and Revolution as Organizations Grow," *Harvard Business Review* v. 50, no. 4 (July-Aug. 1972), p. 37–46.

21. See for example Earl C. Bolton, *Response of University Management*, p. 308.

22. Henry L. Mason, *College and University Government, A Handbook of Principle and Practice* (New Orleans: Tulane University, 1972).

23. See for example Myron Lieberman, "Professors, Unite!" *Harper's Magazine* v. 243, no. 1457 (Oct. 1971), p. 61–70; and Terence N. Tice, ed. *Faculty Power: Collective Bargaining on Campus* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute of Continuing Legal Education, 1972).

24. "Unionization of Faculty Expected to Pick up Speed Because of Tight Money and Ph.D.s," *College Management* 6:38 (Sept. 1971).

25. "Analysis of an Act to Consolidate the Institutions of Higher Education in North Carolina, Session Laws of 1971, Proceedings, Chapter 1244, Ratified 30 October 1971."

26. Arthur M. McAnally, "Budgets by Formula," *Library Quarterly* 33:159-171 (April 1963).

27. Kenneth S. Allen, *Current and Emerging Budgeting Techniques in Academic Libraries, Including a Critique of the Model Budget Analysis Program of the State of Washington* (Seattle: April, 1972).

28. Washington (State), Office of Interinstitutional Business Studies, *A Model Budget Analysis System for Program 05 Libraries* (Olympia, Wash.: 1970).

29. Thomas R. Buckman, Letter to Arthur McAnally, June 8, 1972, p. 2.

30. Second U.S.-Japan Conference of University Library Directors, Oct. 17–20, 1972. Robert Vosper, "The Role of the University Library Director: Principal Issues of the Seventies," p. 7. The social scientist is Richard L. Meier. See "Information Input Overload: Features of Growth in the Communications-Oriented Institutions" *LIBRI* 13:11, 1963.

31. See L. Carroll De Weese, "Status Concerns of Library Professionalism," *CRL* 33:31–38 (Jan. 1972). Also Edward G. Holley, "Organization and Management." Also Maurice P. Marchant, "Participative Management as Related to Personnel Development," *Library Trends* 20:48–59 (July 1971). Directors who have commented on this point, besides Robert Miller, included Edward B. Stanford, Lewis C. Branscomb, David Kaser, and Richard H. Logsdon.

32. Eldred R. Smith, *The Specialist in the Academic Research Library, a Report to the Council on Library Resources.* [Berkeley, Calif.] May 1971.

33. Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. *Organization and Staffing of the Libraries of Columbia University: A Summary of a Case Study.* (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1972). (The full study will be published in two volumes.)

34. Robert T. Blackburn, "College Libraries: Paradoxical Failures; Some Reasons and a Possible Remedy," *CRL* 29:171–77 (May 1968).

35. Richard H. Logsdon, "Librarian and the Scholar: Eternal Enemies," *Library Journal* 95:2871–74 (Sept. 15, 1970).

36. Robert A. Miller, Letter to Arthur McAnally dated March 17, 1972. Also, see Hendrik Edelman, "Motherhood, the Growth of Library Collections, Freedom of Access and Other Issues," *Cornell University Libraries Bulletin,* no. 176 (April 1972), p. 5–6. See also Eldred R. Smith, "The Specialist in the Academic Research," p. 34.

37. Cornell University Libraries. *Annual Report of the Director, 1970/71* (Ithaca, N.Y.: The Libraries, 1971), p. 7.

38. Thomas R. Buckman, Letter to Arthur McAnally, dated June 8, 1972.

39. See Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. *Problems in University Library Management.* Also David Kaser, "Planning in University Libraries; Context and Processes," *Southeastern Librarian* 21:207–13 (Winter 1971). For a pioneering effort in long range planning, see Marion Milczewski, "Cloak and Dagger in University Library Administration," *CRL* 13:117–21 (April 1952).

40. Peter F. Drucker, *The Age of Discontinuity, Guidelines to Our Changing Society* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969).

41. Richard H. Logsdon, Letter to Arthur McAnally, August 8, 1972.

42. Thomas R. Buckman, Letter.

43. Earl C. Bolton, *Response of University Management,* p. 309. See also Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. *Problems in University Library Management,* p. 5–6 *et passim.*
44. Robert P. Haro, "Change in Academic Libraries," *CRL* 33:97–103 (March 1972).
45. David Kaser, "Planning in University Libraries," p. 288.
46. These and other excellent suggestions are made by Kenneth S. Allen, *Current and Emerging Budgeting,* p. 37–46. See also Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. *Problems in University Library Management.*
47. Kenneth S. Allen, *Current and Emerging Budgeting,* p. 40.
48. Ibid., p. 18.
49. Richard M. Dougherty, "The Unserved— Academic Library Style," *American Libraries* 2:1055–58 (Nov. 1971).
50. Douglas Bryant, "Problems of University Libraries: Development of Resources," *ACLS Newsletter,* v. 22, no. 1 (Jan. 1971), p. 3–8.
51. Richard M. Dougherty, "The Unserved."
52. Edward G. Holley, "Organization and Administration," p. 186–87.
53. Thomas R. Buckman, Letter.
54. Lewis C. Branscomb, Letter to Arthur McAnally, April 3, 1972.
55. Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc. *Organization and Staffing of the Columbia University Library: A Summary of the Case Study.* Also their *Problems in University Library Management,* cited previously.
56. Herman H. Fussler and Robert Vosper, op. cit., Larry Powell made a similar observation to Vosper.
57. University of Oklahoma Library Ad Hoc Committee on Library Service. *Final Report of a User Survey of the Bizzell Memorial Library with Special Reference to Problems.* (Norman, Okla.: July 1972).
58. Eldred Smith, "Academic Status for College and University Librarians—Problems and Prospects," *CRL* 31:7–13 (Jan. 1970), p. 11.
59. Harold F. Wells, Telephone conversation with Arthur McAnally, July 8, 1972.
60. Edward G. Holley, "Organization and Administration," p. 182.
61. All have been cited already except Jane G. Flener: "Staff Participation in Management in Large University Libraries," *Indiana University Library News Letter,* v. 8, no. 1 (Oct. 1972) p. 1–3.
62. Melvin S. Goldstein, *Collective Bargaining in the Field of Librarianship* (Brooklyn, N.Y.: 1968).
63. Richard De Gennaro, "Participative Management or Unionization," *CRL* 33:173–74 (May 1972).
64. Arthur M. McAnally, "Status of the University Librarian in the Academic Community," in *Research Librarianship, Essays in Honor of Robert B. Downs,* ed. by Jerrold Orne (New York: Bowker, 1971), p. 19– 50. Administrative operation is p. 31–46.
65. Luther H. Evans, "The Administration of a Federal Government Agency," *L.C. Information Bulletin,* Sept. 20–26, 1949, Appendix, p. 1–9, See also his annual reports of the period.
66. Kenneth S. Allen, *Current and Emerging Budgeting.* Thirteen institutions.
67. Maurice P. Marchant, *Participative Management,* p. 54. Also Lewis C. Branscomb, letter to Arthur McAnally, April 3, 1972.
68. Beverly Lynch, "Participatory Management in Relation to Library Productivity," *CRL* 33:382–90 (Sept. 1972).
69. Maurice P. Marchant, *Participative Management,* p. 48.
70. Luther H. Evans, "The Administration of a Federal."