

LIBRARY

SES BY

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 600

JC 660 323

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE LIBRARY PROGRAM AT  
FULLERTON JUNIOR COLLEGE AND ASSOCIATED CAMPUSES.

BY- TOY, ERNEST W., JR.

PUB DATE FEB 65

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.60 40P.

DESCRIPTORS- \*JUNIOR COLLEGES, \*COLLEGE LIBRARIES, \*LIBRARY  
FACILITIES, LIBRARY MATERIALS, STUDY FACILITIES, FULLERTON

AN ANNUAL INCREMENT OF FIVE TO SIX THOUSAND VOLUMES AND  
AN ANNUAL RATE OF DISCARD NOT TO EXCEED 2.5 PERCENT ARE  
RECOMMENDED TO KEEP THE LIBRARY CURRENT IN THE APPROXIMATELY  
50 FIELDS TAUGHT AT FULLERTON JUNIOR COLLEGE. MAINTAINING THE  
LIBRARY IN ONE BUILDING AND ADOPTING THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS  
CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM IS RECOMMENDED. THE SPACE ALLOTMENTS  
FOR VARIOUS LIBRARY MATERIALS AND SEATING, AND THE EXPECTED  
STAFF REQUIREMENTS ARE CONSIDERED. TABULATED DATA RELEVANT TO  
PROBABLE LIBRARY GROWTH ARE PRESENTED. (AD)

ED012600

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE  
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
POSITION OR POLICY.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE  
LIBRARY PROGRAM AT FULLERTON JUNIOR COLLEGE  
AND ASSOCIATED CAMPUSES

By

Ernest W. Toy, Jr.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.  
LOS ANGELES

DEC 01 1966

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR  
JUNIOR COLLEGE  
INFORMATION

February, 1965

## CONTENTS

	Page
I. Introduction . . . . .	1
II. Summary of Major Recommendations . . . . .	3
III. Book Collection . . . . .	6
IV. Seating. . . . .	11
V. Staffing . . . . .	16
VI. Additional Special Areas . . . . .	20
VII. Summary of Space Recommendations . . . . .	22
VIII. Amplifying and Miscellaneous Recommendations and suggestions . . . . .	24

## APPENDIX A

Some additional considerations influencing the annual rate of book acquisition . . . . .	26
---	----

## TABLES

### Table

1. Collection growth of colleges founded before 1946 with 1962/63 enrollments over 4,000 ADA . . . . .	30
2. Collection growth of colleges founded before 1946 with 1962/63 enrollments under 4,000 ADA . . . . .	30
3. Collection growth of colleges founded between 1945 and 1954 with 1962/63 enrollments over 4,000 ADA . . . . .	30
4. Collection growth of colleges founded between 1945 and 1954 with 1962/63 enrollments of 1,000 - 4,000 ADA . . . . .	31
5. Collection growth of colleges founded since 1954 with 1962/63 enrollments of over 1,000 ADA . . . . .	31
6. Changes in average growth rates of colleges comparable with Fullerton . . . . .	31

TABLES (CONTINUED)

Table	Page
7. Volumes added by colleges in Tables 1, 3, and 5 in 1962/63 and 1963/64 . . . . .	32
8. Staffing practices in comparable colleges, 1963/64 . . . . .	32
9. Physical plant of comparable colleges, 1963/64 . . . . .	33
10. Theoretical maximum collection sizes . . . . .	34
11. Theoretical collection growth over 15 years of Fullerton Junior College . . . . .	34
12. Day enrollments by division, Fullerton Junior College, 1964/65, with scaled estimate of library need . . . . .	35
13. Percentage of enrollment at library support levels, Fullerton Junior College . . . . .	35

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE  
LIBRARY PROGRAM AT FULLERTON JUNIOR COLLEGE  
AND ASSOCIATED CAMPUSES

1

I. INTRODUCTION

The test of the success of a modern college and of its library is the part the library plays in the academic life of the members of the college community. If it is the center of that life, the college and the library are successful. If it is not, the library program is inadequate and the college has very little academic life.

This was not always true. The history of the college library in America can be summarized as a slow movement, covering two centuries, from the fringe to the center of the academic world. Two hundred years ago a student, with the written permission of his professor, was allowed to read a library book. Just over a hundred years ago several thousands of books picked up in European book stores by a young biologist made a satisfactory library for what is now one of our greatest universities. After World War II the extent of recorded knowledge, its rapid change and expansion, a marked change in college teaching methods, and a remarkable broadening of the college curricula have combined to make the library the heart of the college.

This change has been so rapid and so recent that many colleges have not completely adjusted themselves to it. As one librarian has remarked, if the library is the heart of the college, then many colleges suffer from a coronary thrombosis.

One might object that the junior college, with its large terminal and vocational training programs, needs much less library support than the liberal arts college with its academic program. As indicated by Tables 12 and 13, actual course enrollments do not support this argument. Only 5.85% of the enrollment in 1964-65 at Fullerton Junior College would fall in this category. At the outside, excluding physical education, which has relatively small book requirements, but is common to all colleges, only 19.85% of the 1964-65 enrollment could be said to be in low book courses. Even in these courses, technological developments, such as those in data processing, are forcing an ever higher book use. In general, it is true, of the approximately 75% of the entering junior college students who plan to continue through upper division, only about a third do so. However, all of them, as well as students studying in terminal vocational areas, take a general education program which, to be effective, must rely heavily on library collections.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that 80% of the enrollment in Fullerton Junior College is in high book use programs comparable to those in a four-year college. To partially offset the effect of the 20% differential, the junior college teaches in far more subject areas than does the liberal arts college. Fullerton, for example, teaches in about fifty areas. California State College at Fullerton teaches in about thirty areas. This difference in breadth also partially offsets the differences in depth of subject collections as far as total book input and total collection is concerned.



## II. SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The following major recommendations are developed in greater detail in the body of this report, together with related suggestions and data.

It is recommended that, in calculating the space needed for books and related materials, the following considerations be applied:

1. That between 5,000 and 6,000 volumes should be added to the collection each year.
2. That the rate of discard should probably not exceed about 2.5%, and that, during the next decade and a half, it should probably be about 1%.
3. That space for books be provided at the rate of one square foot for each ten volumes.
4. That space for related materials be provided at the rate of 25% of that allowed for books.
5. That the library collections be centralized in a single building.

It is recommended that, in calculating the amount of seating needed, at least 20% of the full-time equivalent student body be seated, but that space eventually to be used for housing library materials be used on an interim basis to determine experimentally the optimum number of seats to be provided. In developing a seating plan, the following should be considered:

1. That the recommended seating should be located only in the library.



2. That certain specialized kinds of seating, such as listening stations, programmed learning stations, group study areas, microform reading stations, and student typing stations, should be provided, but should be counted as part of the recommended total seating.
3. That as much individualized seating as possible be provided.
4. That twenty-five square feet be allowed for each station.

It is recommended that approximately 10,000 square feet be allowed for audio-visual services, but that a district-wide study of such services and needs be made before determining finally the space to be provided on each campus.

It is recommended that about 4,600 square feet be allowed for office, work and service space.

It is recommended that the building be modular in design to provide maximum flexibility.

It is recommended that plans be made to provide library space in two successive phases, and that needs be resurveyed before proceeding to the second phase. It is estimated that expansion for phase II would occur in approximately twenty years.

The result of the adoption of the above recommendations would be a building of approximately 56,000 square feet for phase one and of about 74,750 square feet for phase two. Phase one would provide storage space for about 120,000 volumes and seats for about 1,000 persons.

It is further recommended that:

1. The college convert to the Library of Congress classification system because of its greater suitability for college libraries and because of the savings which would be realized in the long run by such a change.
2. The building of the basic collection of about 20,000 volumes for the new college now projected be begun as soon as possible.
3. Processing of library materials not be centralized unless a completely centralized library service for the district, based upon an on-line computer system and communications network, is to be provided.

It would be difficult and probably prohibitively expensive to alter the present library building to provide the facilities needed for the phase one program as outlined above. It will be necessary to employ an architect to make final recommendations relative to the utilization of the existing building.

### III. BOOK COLLECTION

Although California junior colleges have, for many reasons, not reacted quickly to recent trends in the relationship of the library to instruction, the information available for this study indicates that they are now responding slowly to a strong and persistent demand for more books and other library materials. This response, which began in most junior colleges only a few years ago, is increasing. Its size seems to be related to the financial support of the college rather than to curricular offerings, present collections, enrollment, or book production, which indicates that it lags behind demand. Geographically, collections and collection growth are largest in the urban areas of Southern California and smallest in rural and semi-rural areas. The greatest pressure for the rapid expansion of library collections will probably come in those areas, like Orange County, which are becoming urbanized very rapidly.

The data in Tables 1, 3, 5, and 6 illustrate these trends but can not indicate a proper size for book and related collections at Fullerton Junior College.

In developing the recommendations listed below concerning collection size, the factors described in Appendix A were weighed carefully, the figures in Tables 6 and 7 considered, the recommendations of the library staff weighed, particularly in connection with reference service, the supporting statements of the two reports on state college library development reviewed insofar as they would apply to the junior college library

the charge of the Master Plan for Higher Education to junior colleges examined and, finally, the various statements of need of various Fullerton Junior College groups considered. The result is necessarily subjective to a degree, but it does approximate the practice of a growing number of progressive junior colleges with adequate financial support. Even a large allowance for subjective error would not alter the main conclusion in regard to library building facilities.

About 22,000 titles are published in this country annually. The number is increasing. About the same number of United States government documents are published. Great Britain and the Commonwealth Countries publish annually a few more titles than we do. Selected foreign language materials are also needed. In all, the library must select from about 70,000 publications each year. Of course, many of these are inappropriate for the junior college library. But if a tenth are worthy of consideration, the selection job is formidable. In addition, retrospective selections of standard items must be made. Continuing publications, such as the World Almanac, must be provided. Indexing and abstracting services are necessary. Business information services are needed. Certain California documents must be acquired. Pamphlets and ephemera of all kinds are urgently needed in a rapidly changing and opinionated world where books are a year out of date when they are published. Periodical backfiles are needed in many areas. A small amount of recreational material should be provided. Any many other needs arising from an increasing burden of disseminating knowledge could be mentioned.

In view of all of the above, the following recommendations are made concerning the book collection and related materials. In determining space requirements, as in other calculations of a mechanical sort, standards accepted by the State Department of Finance have been used.

1. An optimum collection should be planned.
2. Collection development should be reviewed regularly and plans changed as conditions change.
3. The regular annual increment of books should be between 5,000 and 6,000 volumes if the college is to remain current in the approximately fifty fields covered by its instructional program, fill small retrospective gaps, and take care of other important needs. (For current practices of other institutions, see Table 7.)
4. Accessions in addition to the above should be provided to fill large retrospective gaps or to cover new programs needing significant numbers of books to form a basic collection.
5. Weeding should be done carefully, with the rate probably not exceeding 1% for at least 15 years, and the ultimate rate probably not exceeding 2.5% of the collection. In weeding it should be remembered that, in addition to the difficulty caused to faculty and students by premature discard of important items, the investment of the college in a book is lost if it is discarded before its useful life has ended. It should also be remembered that, because of the careful selection needed, the cost of weeding

an item is nearly as great as the cost of adding it, and that, because the difficulty of weeding decreases with the age of the book, savings made in weeding cost by reducing the weeding rate will tend to offset the additional cost of the space needed to house the extra volumes resulting from this policy.

6. Space for the book collection should be planned at the rate of one square foot for each ten volumes.
7. Space for related materials, such as unbound periodicals, pamphlets, pictures, tapes and phonodiscs, microforms, etc. should equal at least 25% of that provided for books.

Table 10 shows the results of applying the above recommendations together with data resulting from different combinations of accession and discard rates. Table 11 indicates the probable result of 15 years of accessions at 5,000 and 6,000 volumes per year with a 1% discard rate.

8. It is recommended that space for 120,000 volumes be provided, together with appropriate space for related materials, in the first increment of an improved library building. This would require a total of 15,000 square feet.
9. It is recommended that the first increment of the building be constructed so that a second increment can be added inexpensively and without destroying the functional layout of the building if and when it is needed to bring book storage capacity to 220,000 volumes plus space for related materials. This would require 27,500 square feet.



10. It is recommended that a modular building with as few inner bearing walls as possible be seriously considered to give the needed flexibility for changes in functions and space assignments over the growth period. Seating and shelving areas in particular should be interchangeable. A module of 22'-6" on centers is recommended as a highly satisfactory spacing for library equipment and activities.
11. It is recommended that the collection not be decentralized in order to reduce space requirements in the library building because of the high cost of supervising and providing reference service for decentralized materials, the need for many costly duplicates in a decentralized system, the need for duplication of parts of the card catalog for branch collections, and the difficulty which such organization provides for the general student who makes up the large majority of the junior college student body. Decentralization is useful only with large graduate programs in very specialized areas in schools wealthy enough to support the great cost of such a system, and possibly not even there.



## IV. SEATING

If the collections of the junior college library are to have the use necessary to make them a worthwhile investment, sufficient numbers of working spaces for all the kinds of persons who have to use the library should be provided. Widely accepted standards, including those of the California State Department of Finance, call for seating 25% of the regular full-time equivalent enrollment (that is, the number of credit hours of enrollment between 8:00 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. divided by 15) for institutions of higher education. Such authorities as Dr. Keyes Metcalf and Dr. Ralph Ellsworth point out that this standard is too low for a college with large numbers of graduate students and resident students. They suggest figures between 35% and 50%. Dr. Ellsworth has also questioned the usual standard of 25 square feet per station, pointing out that 30 or 35 feet would be far more satisfactory.

Use of a library will increase as seating is improved. The heavy use of the present inadequate and inefficient seating facilities at Fullerton Junior College, combined with the smallness of the present collection, indicate that library use could be easily increased.

Seating should be provided for peak and not average periods. If it is provided for average periods, they will become the peak periods and a lower level of use will result. It should be varied according to the kind of work the student is doing. It should provide a certain amount of privacy and freedom from distraction in order to improve the students' work efficiency and to reduce the library noise level and

disciplinary problem. Lighting at each seat should be even and adequate.

The heavy concentration of work at Fullerton Junior College in subjects requiring large amounts of library support, as noted above and in Table 10, indicates that many library seats are needed. The temporary excess in enrollment over planned figures would indicate that extra seating on a temporary basis could be useful.

I would question the importance of living accommodations on campus in increasing library seating requirements. The scheduling of classes would, for example, have a greater effect on library use. The student who has time between classes would, with proper encouragement, spend his free time in the library. The student who travels some distance to campus would also tend to make use of the library during the blocks of time he is on campus because he would have no other place to study, whereas the student with convenient on-campus housing could study in his own quarters.

The key factors in library use, in order of importance, are the degree to which the faculty demands that students study library materials rather than textbooks and lecture notes, the quality of the collection, and the number of seats of the right sort available in the library. Given sound and creative cooperation between library staff and the rest of the faculty, and adequate support, library use will, within broad limits, expand to fill the seating available. If sufficient seating is not available, library use will continue to be unsatisfactory no matter how hard the faculty works at improving it and no matter how good the collection is.

There is some doubt about the applicability of the 25% seating standard to junior college libraries. Because of the lack of standards in reporting (and it would be highly desirable for junior colleges to change their support basis from A.D.A. to F.T.E. to eliminate this problem), the data in Table 9 on practices of other colleges is inconclusive, but it indicates that two junior colleges with good library programs have approached 25% seating. Several others are not far behind. The rest are quite inadequate in this respect, probably because it is more difficult to increase seating space than to remove other inadequacies of library buildings.

Seating for study in areas outside the library is not a substitute for library seating. Its building cost is the same as that of library seating, its supervision cost is extremely high, library materials for the improvement of study are far removed from it, and its atmosphere is not such as to provide a proper mental set for studying. Seating in the student lounge area would be more profitable and efficient because there, at least, the highly improving academic "bull sessions" can go on unhindered by the repressive and arid atmosphere of a study hall.

In view of the above considerations, the following recommendations are made concerning library seating:

12. That study seating outside the library, because of its great inefficiency, be used only in an emergency and for a limited time.
13. That, if possible, seating for 1,000 persons (20% of 50,000 F.T.E.) be provided. Seating for at least 750 persons (15% of 5,000 F.T.E.) should be provided.

14. That, in view of probable rate of collection growth, the space allowed for this growth be used to provide additional seats on a temporary and experimental basis to determine how much how much seating is needed in the library, and that the results of this experiment be applied in designing the second increment of the library building.
15. That to validate the above experiment, intensive efforts be made cooperatively by faculty, administration, and library staff to optimize library use.
16. That limited listening facilities be provided in the library which would, besides supplementing the primary music and language facilities elsewhere on campus, provide for the use of other audio-library materials such as recorded speeches, plays, and readings, and sample or review lectures made locally. These stations, as well as the special purpose seating listed below, should be counted as part of the 1,000 seats.
17. That programmed learning facilities be provided in the library. If possible, the devices used should be capable of integrating with a campus or district computer system.
18. That group study rooms, each seating about six persons, be provided. At least eight such rooms would be needed.
19. That suitable facilities for viewing microforms be provided. If the microfilming of periodicals is to be extensive, places for at least 15 film readers will be needed. If other microforms

are to be collected, additional reading devices will be needed. A coin-operated reader-printer would be very desirable, and, in this connection, it might be added that Xeroxing facilities for students and faculty should be given serious consideration. The microform reading facility should include variable lighting

20. That, if necessary, a very limited amount of isolated faculty seating be provided.
21. That a small amount of the seating be in an uncontrolled area of the library.
22. That about six typing stations be provided in a single room. If more should be needed later, a conference room could be used.
23. That the bulk of the seating be provided on the infusion principle, that is, distributed through the shelving areas, probably on the checkerboard plan.
24. That a relatively small amount of seating be provided in the reference areas.
25. That a very large proportion of the general seating be in individual stations rather than at tables.
26. That, for planning, 25 square feet per station be allowed.



## V. STAFFING

Table 8 indicates the staffing practices of some comparable colleges. Because of a lack of reporting standards, the figures are not completely comparable. The Los Angeles colleges, for example, use centralized processing. Mt. San Antonio has a subject division organization and reflects this in its large staff. The newest colleges seem to lack space (see Table 9) and therefore cannot staff adequately.

Only very general recommendations can be made about staff size. They must be interpreted in light of special situations and operations and in relation to the quality of the program desired. Because many other factors than direct service to students influence staffing, they are included in the following recommendations.

It is recommended:

27. That, in general, not less than 30% of the staff be professional, not less than 40% be subprofessional or clerical, and not over 30% nor less than 20% be student assistants. These figures must be considered as guides and not as absolute rules.
28. That at least one professional librarian devote the bulk of his time to cataloging, one professional spend the majority of his time on acquisitions, and that at least one clerk be available full time for each activity, together with student assistant time as needed. Suitable internal arrangements should, of course, be made for the continuance of these functions in emergencies and during vacations. One man year in all functions is assumed to be eleven months, and added help should be provided to adjust shorter work years to this figure.

29. That, in order to provide the best classification system available for an academic library, to prepare students for transfer to institutions which use this system, and to reduce classification costs, the library convert to the Library of Congress Classification System. Five other junior colleges, Chabot, Contra Costa, Diablo Valley, Fresno, and Lassen have already done so. The cost of reclassification, based upon experience at San Diego State College, should be about \$15,000.00 for the present collection. The saving in classification costs in the future should be at least 306 per title. Well-developed routines for reclassifying could be obtained from San Diego State College.
30. That, unless total unification of library services for the district be undertaken through the use of a computerized communications network, centralized processing not be adopted. In any case, contract cataloging for a college of this size would be uneconomical.
31. That sufficient professional reference staff be provided to have at least one person on duty at all times when the library is open, two or more persons on duty during peak periods, enough persons in addition to allow reasonably short desk duty periods, to give orientation talks and individual instruction, to select books, to weed books, and to provide faculty liaison.



32. That staff time, professional and clerical, be provided to care for periodical functions such as ordering, receiving, claiming, listing, binding, filming, and up-dating.
33. For the teaching of classes in library service, professional librarians should be provided on the same basis as other teaching staff.
34. That if the majority of seats are moved into the controlled area, additional check points be established on the grocery store model and that sufficient clerical and student assistant staff be provided to man appropriate numbers of these stations at various times of the day.
35. That sufficient staff be provided to handle circulation records and the recovery of books and money from borrowers. Circulation should decrease slightly if proper seating is provided and reduce this work load somewhat.
36. That sufficient staff be provided to handle the reserve-book operation of the library with promptness.
37. That appropriate staffing be provided for special operations and functions, such as programmed learning, automation of functions, etc.
38. That sufficient administrative staff be provided to insure the coordination of library functions, planning for the future, and the integration of library services with the instructional program.

39. That if the audio-visual function is added to the library, at least one professional person, one clerical person, and one technician be added to the staff together with enough student assistant time to provide for delivery and pick-up of materials.
40. That staff for weeding be added proportionally to the increase in collection size and to the weeding rate. This staff would equal about three-fourths of the processing staff at collection maturity.
41. That longer service hours be provided, particularly on Saturdays, and that sufficient additional staffing be provided to cover these hours.

## VI. ADDITIONAL SPECIAL AREAS

42. Besides the areas discussed above, the following special library areas should be provided. The areas listed are suggestions and approximations only.

<u>Area</u>	<u>Approx. Square Feet</u>
Librarian's Office	160
Secretary's Office	125
Conference Room	200
Cataloger	160
Acquisition's Librarian	160
Clerk, Cataloging	125
Clerk, Acquisitions	125
Files, Acquisitions	25
Files, Cataloging	75
Bibliographical Tools, Acquisitions	30
Bibliographical Tools, Cataloging	30
Storage of Materials in Process (3,000 v.)	300
Marking	70
Supplies Storage	110
Office Workroom, Reference	200
Reserve Book Shelving (3,000 v.)	300
Receiving Area	<u>100</u>
<u>Total</u>	2,295

The above are approximate only and should be considered as guides.

43. In addition to the above, sufficient laboratory and lecture space should be provided in order to accommodate the projected enrollments in the library service program. The amount of space to be provided should be based upon the standard classroom formula. If possible, this space should be adjacent to the technical services area of the library.

In addition, areas for service points and related spaces will be required. These will include the reference desk, the circulation desk and workroom, reserve-book desk, lobbies, display areas, etc. They would probably about equal in total area the spaces detailed above, but will vary somewhat with the layout of the building.

All past library experience would indicate that the above recommendations are likely to be totally inadequate. Because savings made in staff work areas are very costly and very common, great care should be taken in planning such spaces, and the above recommendations should be taken as absolute minima.

A detailed study of audio-visual services has not been made, but it would seem that at least 10,000 square feet should be provided for this function. See section VII for amplifying remarks on this subject.

## VII. SUMMARY OF SPACE RECOMMENDATIONS

## Phase I, Fifteen-Year Plan

## A. Optimum scheme:

Section II, Shelving (120,000 vols.)	15,000 square feet
Section III, Public Seating (1,000 stations)	25,000 square feet
Section V, Work Areas, etc.	<u>6,000 square feet</u>
Sub-total	46,000 square feet
Section V, Audio-Visual	<u>10,000 square feet</u>
Total	56,000 Square feet

## B. Minimum scheme:

Shelving	15,000 square feet
Public Seating (750 stations)	18,750 square feet
Section V, Work Areas, etc.	<u>6,000 square feet</u>
Sub-total	39,750 square feet
Audio-Visual	<u>10,000 square feet</u>
Total	49,750 square feet

Table of excess seating from unused book storage area (approximation):

Year	Seats	Year	Seats
1	374	8	208
2	352	9	186
3	326	10	164
4	304	11	142
5	278	12	120
6	256	13	98
7	234	14	76

## Phase II, Possible Final Program

	<u>25% seating (1250 seats)</u>	<u>20% seating (1000 seats)</u>	<u>15% seating (750 seats)</u>
Shelving (220,000 vols.)	27,500	---	---
Work Areas, etc.	6,000	---	---
Sub-total	33,500	---	---
Audio-Visual	<u>10,000</u>	<u>---</u>	<u>---</u>
Sub-total	43,500	43,500	43,500
Seating	<u>31,250</u>	<u>25,000</u>	<u>18,750</u>
Total	74,750	68,500	62,250

The areas above are net. Rest rooms, janitorial facilities, duct spaces, etc. are not included. The figures in Table 9 indicate that the experience of other junior colleges which are trying to provide effective library service has produced similar estimates of space requirements.

The present building, including all of the second floor and basement area and with a maximum possible addition, would provide at most about 40,000 square feet. Because of the inflexibility of this building, the layout would not be efficient. No further expansion would be possible.

Unless the total area of the present building plus the maximum possible expansion area to the east can be made available on three floors, it would seem that adequate space for library services alone could not be provided in the present location. Under these circumstances, probably as little money as possible should be put into remodeling the present building. It is recommended that a new building be built in a more suitable location.

### VIII. AMPLIFYING AND MISCELLANEOUS RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Audio-visual services should be provided, if possible, in the library, but if any library function has to be separated physically, this one should be selected first. District-wide services on expensive materials and on maintenance and repair should be considered. Local services will be needed for the preparation of aids and for the distribution and storage of equipment which needs to be kept at each campus. It is recommended that detailed study be given to the demarcation of local and central functions, to the space needs of a central service area, and to the space needs of a branch service area.

The library should be able to provide any student with audio-visual service upon request.

The library should probably continue to have a functional rather than a subject divisional public services organization because of the lower cost of the former. By centralizing reference services, by providing librarians with varied academic backgrounds, and by a vigorous in-service training program, specialized reference service can be provided in a functional organization.

Periodicals should be made as accessible to students as possible. Probably, to reduce cost, they should not be classified or fully cataloged. They should be housed near the reference service area and near the indexes and microforms.

Modern data processing applications for the library should be studied and used whenever possible. If an on-line computer with a simple communications network is to be provided for the district, unified library service



for all colleges in the district should be considered. Such service would involve machine-readable records of all sorts, an enlarged centralized collection (which, for geographical reasons, should be on the Fullerton Junior College campus) and smaller working collections on other campuses, centralized processing, cooperative selection and weeding, centralized periodicals backfiles, etc. It would be by far the most efficient and cheapest system for the district if it could be made to work, but the administrative problems in making it work would be very difficult to solve. From the technical point of view this is the only rational solution to the district library service problem.

For a new campus a basic collection should be built and ready before the opening day. Two years would be needed for the building of such a basic collection. For a campus with a prospective initial enrollment of 5,000 F.T.E., this collection should be about 20,000 volumes. Most of these materials could be cataloged commercially, but the difficult items should be handled by library staff. With the new University of California campuses opening with over 100,000 volumes and the new State College campuses opening with over 50,000 volumes, the figure suggested above does not seem excessive.

## APPENDIX A

SOME ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS INFLUENCING THE ANNUAL RATE  
OF BOOK ACQUISITION.

1. There is a trend away from the textbook-lecture method of gang teaching in higher education and toward individualized instruction which develops greater meaning for each student by allowing him to discuss and work with a variety of materials as he studies a subject and to follow his own interest patterns as much as possible. This variety of material to meet his needs can come only from the college library.
2. Junior colleges, rightly priding themselves on their ability to give individualized instruction to their students, should be leading this movement and should be providing the library resources needed to make it work.
3. The needs of remedial students are varied and can be met only through equally varied instruction and matching library materials.
4. The joint pressures of large numbers of students and of expanding curricula have put a strain on the book stock of Southern California. Public libraries, with a general clientele to serve, cannot provide all the materials, in numbers or in kind, needed by college students. Colleges, struggling to meet the needs of their own students, deny their services and materials to outsiders. The terrifying numbers of junior college students have assured their exclusion from all college libraries.

5. The junior colleges will expand their academic programs as they take their places in the Master Plan for Higher Education in California and become responsible for the largest part of lower division college education in California.
6. Vocational training is becoming more and more sophisticated and making greater and greater demands upon the library. This trend has hardly begun. The data processing curriculum is the best example at present of this new type of vocational curriculum. Automation is likely to affect all fields very strongly in this way.
7. The rapid changes in teaching and in general knowledge force libraries to increase their intake of books and other materials in order to keep up-to-date. In non-research libraries, this rapid dating of materials makes judicious weeding in certain subject areas almost as important as buying.
8. Automation and technological change will increase enrollments in vocational programs for retraining and refresher training. Timely materials for these programs will be especially important.
9. Persons suffering from the increased leisure which is supposed to result from the present technological revolution will need the cultural or academic offerings of the community college if they are to survive. They will also need the library books which make these courses meaningful.
10. The increasing seriousness of the problems faced by our society makes each citizen's knowledge of public affairs vital to our survival. Action

groups whose policies are based upon extensive ignorance threaten our liberties at home at a time when the outside world is undergoing a profound change. The junior college, through its instruction and its library, can help to disseminate the knowledge which will contribute to dispelling domestic idiocies and to understanding and perhaps solving foreign difficulties.

11. The formal instruction of a college cannot give the student all he needs. Only a well-stocked library can round out formal offerings and make a sound student. A wise professor has said that one requirement for an academic degree should be proof that the student has worn out at least one pair of shoes in the library stacks.
12. In this age of mass media and, unfortunately, of mass intellect, the library offers a refuge and a hope for individuality. Here a human being can follow the inclinations of his own mind as far as he wishes, at his own pace, in his own way, taking the paths he feels are most profitable, and receiving only the help he needs when he wants it, assuming that the collection of books is adequate.
13. Three-fourths of all junior college students do not continue their formal education. Since it is well known that a four-year collegiate program only prepares a person of superior intellect to educate himself, the plight of the person who does not continue beyond two years is serious. He can educate himself only by reading. If the habit of doing this in the only institution which can furnish him the range of reading materials he needs, an adequate library, is not established

by the time he leaves the junior college, he will remain partly educated, and perhaps dangerous to himself and to society, for the rest of his life.

14. Technological change is not likely to reduce the need for books and related materials in junior colleges in the near future. Microreproduction can be used to some extent by them, especially for periodicals backfiles, but it is of far greater importance to the research library. Teaching machines (which should become integral parts of libraries) will, if properly used, get more people past the awkward beginning stages of many subjects and thereby increase the demand for that more advanced type of programmed instruction, the book.

TABLE 1

Collection growth of colleges founded before 1946, with 1962/63 enrollments of over 4,000 ADA. (In order of ADA)

College	Average collection growth/year.	Index of average growth. (Average growth per 1962/63 ADA)	Index of 1962/63 growth. (1962/63 growth per 1962/63 ADA)	Index of growth rate increase. (Col.3 $\div$ Col.2)
L.A.C.C.	2,988.4	0.261	0.648	2.48
Pasadena	1,706.7	0.170	0.334	1.96
Long Beach	2,058.0	0.221	0.425	1.97
C.C. of San Fran.	1,858.7	0.268	0.240	0.90
Fullerton	636.8	0.098	0.628	6.41
C. of San Mateo	836.2	0.149	0.365	2.45
Sacramento	1,208.3	0.271	0.695	2.56
Modesto	1,023.2	0.240	0.472	1.97
Average	1,540.0			

TABLE 2

Collection growth of colleges founded before 1946, with 1962/63 enrollments under 4,000 ADA.

College	Av. growth/yr.	College	Av. growth/yr.	College	Av. growth/yr.
Antelope Valley	408.5	Fresno	314.8	Santa Ana	586.4
Bakersfield	579.5	Glendale	540.5	Santa Monica	1,013.7
Chaffey	493.9	Hartnell	663.0	Sierra	934.0
Citrus	367.3	Napa	608.0	Ventura	692.3
C. of the Sequoias	547.4	Reedley	256.1	Yuba	376.0
Compton	784.0	Riverside	658.7	Average	577.9

TABLE 3

Collection growth of colleges founded between 1945 and 1954 with 1962/63 enrollments of over 4,000 ADA.

College	Average collection growth/year
East L.A.	2,255.0
El Camino	2,182.0
L. A. Pierce	2,345.8
L. A. Trade Tech.	1,958.3
L. A. Valley	3,131.0
Mt. San Antonio	2,335.2
Orange Coast	1,200.2
Average	2,201.



TABLE 4

Collection growth of colleges founded between 1945 and 1954, with 1962/63 enrollments of 1,000 - 4,000 ADA.

<u>College</u>	<u>Average collection growth/year</u>
Contra Costa	1,784.0
Diablo	1,857.1
L. A. Harbor	1,938.0
Monterey Peninsula	1,191.3
Palomar	1,707.3
Santa Barbara	722.2
Shasta	1,202.
Vallejo	490.5
<u>Average</u>	<u>1,361.6</u>

TABLE 5

Collection growth of colleges founded since 1954 with 1962/63 enrollments of over 1,000 ADA.

<u>College</u>	<u>Average collection growth/year</u>
Cabrillo	1,863.4
• Cerritos	2,678.0
Chabot	3,108.3
Foothill	3,691.7
Grossmont	2,679.0
Southwestern	2,797.3
<u>Average</u>	<u>2,803.0</u>

TABLE 6

Changes in average growth rates of colleges comparable with Fullerton. (Tables 1, 3, 5.)

<u>Class of college</u>	<u>Average rate of growth</u>	<u>Change in growth rate</u>
8 colleges, pre-World War II	1,540	661
7 colleges, 1945-1954	2,201	
6 colleges, 1955--	2,803	602



TABLE 7

Volumes added by colleges in Tables 1, 3, and 5 - 1962/63 and 1963/64.

	<u>College</u>	<u>Volumes added, 1962/63</u>	<u>Volumes added, 1963/64</u>
(Table 1)	L. A. City College	7,418	5,703
	Pasadena	3,343	4,501
	Long Beach	3,952	No figure available.
	C.C. of San Francisco	1,666	No figure available.
	Fullerton	4,069	5,094
	Col. of San Mateo	2,054	4,702
	Sacramento	3,100	2,710
	Modesto	2,007	1,679
(Table 3)	East Los Angeles	3,822	5,036
	El Camino	3,189	2,891
	L. A. Pierce	4,400	6,188
	L. A. Trade Tech.	1,695	No figure available
	L. A. Valley	7,801	8,164
	Mt. San Antonio	3,481	3,778
	Orange Coast	2,829	4,132
	Cabrillo	5,332	4,006
(Table 5)	Cerritos	5,073	4,942
	Chabot	5,903	4,019
	Foothill	4,833	6,048
	Grossmont	3,798	3,893
	Southwestern	1,726	4,330

TABLE 8

Staffing practices in comparable colleges, 1963/64.

	<u>College</u>	<u>Prof.</u>	<u>Cler.</u>	<u>Student Asst. FTE(2000 hrs.)</u>	<u>Total FTE</u>
(Table 1)	L. A. City College	6.0	7.0	5.0	18.0
	Pasadena	7.0	4.5	4.6	16.1
	Long Beach	No figures available.			
	C.C. of San Francisco	No figures available.			
	Fullerton	5.0	6.9	3.6	15.5
	C. of San Mateo	6.0	7.0	5.9	18.9
	Sacramento	3.0	2.0	2.2	7.2
	Modesto	5.0	7.6	1.7	14.3
(Table 3)	East L. A.	3.5	6.0	1.0	10.5
	El Camino	4.0	9.5	0.8	14.3
	L. A. Pierce	3.5	4.0	1.6	9.1
	L. A. Trade Tech.	No figures available			
	L. A. Valley	5.8	6.0	2.4	14.2
	Mt. San Antonio	8.0	16.5	0.5	25.0
Orange Coast	3.3	3.0	2.3	8.6	

TABLE 8 (Continued)

College	Prof.	Cler.	Student Asst. FTE(2000 hrs.)	Total FTE
Cabrillo	2.0	5.0	0.2	7.2
Cerritos	3.0	3.0	1.9	7.9
Chabot	2.0	2.0	1.4	5.4
Foothill	6.5	9.0	3.9	19.4
Grossmont	2.0	2.0	1.7	5.7
Southwestern	1.0	2.0	0.5	3.5

(Table 5)

TABLE 9

Physical plant of comparable colleges, 1963/64

College	Total Area	Stack Area	Stack Copy.	Collect. Size	Seat. Area	Seat. Copy.	Staff Work Area	Staff FTE	Area per FTE Staff	Other Areas
U.C.C.	No figures available.									
Pasadena	23,000	6,100	61,000	71,109	9,700	388	2,320	16.1	144	4,880
Long Beach	No figures available.									
C.C.San Fran.	No figures available.									
Fullerton	20,400	4,640	46,400	37,402	9,700	388	1,450	15.5	94	4,610
C. of San Mat.	39,960	8,070	80,700	41,750	12,988	520	4,961	18.9		13,941
Sacramento	13,060	655	6,550	55,860	11,135	445	1,010	7.2		260
Modesto	36,237	Not given		45,675	24,604	984	5,800	14.3		5,833
East L.A.	15,914	4,368	43,680	47,881	7,672	307	2,272	10.5		1,602
El Camino	46,732	4,800	48,000	33,976	35,682	1,425	1,250	14.3		5,000
U.C. Pierce	20,000	5,000	50,000	41,191	8,850	354	2,650	9.1		3,500
U.C. TR. Tech.	No figures available.									
U.C. Valley	21,845	4,090	40,900	46,962	8,219	369	1,121	14.2		8,415
Mt. San Ant.	83,960	25,786	257,860	45,812	None given		11,898	25.0		48,276
Orange Coast	13,179	1,817	18,170	22,231	7,117	285	679	8.6		3,566
Cabrillo	27,402	6,000	60,000	13,038	14,750	590	1,356	7.2		5,296
Cerritos	27,233	3,360	33,600	26,374	9,856	394	1,344	7.9		12,673
Chabot	3,000	224	2,240	13,344	2,100	84	540	5.4	100	136
Foothill	37,706	4,028	40,280	28,198	13,768	551	6,340	19.4		13,570
Grossmont	5,300	2,000	20,000	11,730	2,100	84	1,200	5.7		
Southwestern	1,782	461	4,610	10,656	861	34	400	3.5		

\*Colleges apparently attempting to reach American Library Association minimum seating standards.

TABLE 10

Theoretical maximum collection sizes.

<u>Input (Volumes)</u>	<u>Discard Rate</u>			
	<u>1%</u>	<u>2%</u>	<u>2.5%</u>	<u>3%</u>
3,000	300,000	150,000	120,000	100,000
3,500	350,000	175,000	140,000	116,667
4,000	400,000	200,000	160,000	133,333
4,500	450,000	225,000	180,000	150,000
5,000	500,000	250,000	200,000	166,667
5,500	550,000	275,000	220,000	183,333
6,000	600,000	300,000	240,000	200,000

Areas in heavy boxes represent recommended range of possibilities for consideration, with input ranging from 4,000 volumes per year to 6,000 volumes per year and maximum discard rate 2.5%. The double-lined box indicates the recommended target figure.

TABLE 11

Theoretical collection growth over 15 years of Fullerton Junior College, base collection 40,000 volumes.

Year	1% Discard Rate					
	5,000 volumes per year			6,000 volumes per year		
	<u>Discard</u>	<u>Net add.</u>	<u>Collection at end year</u>	<u>Discard</u>	<u>Net add.</u>	<u>Collection at end year</u>
0			40,000			40,000
1	400	4,600	44,600	400	5,600	45,600
2	400	4,600	49,200	500	5,500	51,100
3	500	4,500	53,700	500	5,500	56,600
4	500	4,500	58,200	600	5,400	62,000
5	600	4,400	62,600	600	5,400	67,400
6	600	4,400	67,000	700	5,300	72,700
7	700	4,300	71,300	700	5,300	78,000
8	700	4,300	75,600	800	5,200	83,200
9	800	4,200	79,800	800	5,200	88,400
10	800	4,200	84,000	900	5,100	93,500
11	800	4,200	88,200	900	5,100	98,600
12	900	4,100	92,300	1,000	5,000	103,600
13	900	4,100	96,400	1,000	5,000	108,600
14	1,000	4,000	100,400	1,100	4,900	113,500
15	1,000	4,000	104,400	1,100	4,900	118,400

TABLE 12

Day enrollments by Division, Fullerton Junior College, 1964/65, with scaled estimate of library need (on a 1-4 scale).

<u>Division</u>	<u>Credit hours</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Level of library need</u>
Business Educ.	5,097	12.67	3
Fine Arts	2,167	5.33	3
Home Economics	536	1.33	2
Humanities	5,479	13.62	4
Library	28	0.07	4
Life Science	4,326	10.75	4
Nursing Educ.	140	0.35	4
Physical Educ.	5,824	14.47	1
Phys. Sci. & Math.	4,756	11.82	4
Soc. Sci.	6,485	16.12	4
Tech. Educ.	2,354	5.85	2
Orientations	3,046	7.54	3

TABLE 13

Percentage of enrollment at library support levels, Fullerton Junior College.

<u>Level</u>	<u>%</u>
1	14.47
2	7.18
3	25.63
4	52.73

Over 78% of the Fall 1964 enrollment is in the highest half of library support need; just over 21% is in the lowest half.