DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 172 LI 002 392

TITLE	Libraries and Library Education at Wisconsin's Public Universities.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Madison.
REPORT NO	CCHE-106-69
PUB DATE	Nov 69
NOTE	83p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.25
DESCRIPTORS	Automation, Information Networks, Information Systems, *Interinstitutional Cooperation, *Interlibrary Loans, *Libraries, Library Collections, *Library Education, Library Programs, School Libraries, State Programs, *Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Library Automation, Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

This report was prepared in response to a need identified in the "Provisional Long-Range Plan" of the Wisconsin Coordinating Council for Higher Education (CCHE). The findings of an advisory committee were used as the basis for recommendations in three areas: (1) technology and interinstitutional cooperation, (2) library resources and (3) library education. Recommendations submitted for Council action include: (1) full participation of the public universities in a state information network, (2) five methods to modernize the inter-library loan system, (3) a cost-benefit analysis of a central purchasing and processing center, (4) employment of a library systems analyst-computer specialist in a statewide planning capacity, (5) recommended minimum holding goals for 1980, (6) recommended timing to reach the holding goals, (7) recommended emphasis for library resources development, (8) three requirements for new associate degree programs for library technical assistants, (9) continued emphasis on school librarianship by undergraduate library science programs (10) establishment of a broad field major in library science programs, (11) five guidelines for undergraduate minor programs and (12) maintenance of a permanent library advisory committee by the CCHE with the specified general responsibilities. (NH)

State of Wisconsin \ COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

132 NORTH MIOVALE BOULEVARD
HILLDALE THEATER BUILDING
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53706

FOR ACTION

APPROVED BY CCHE

CCHE #106, 1969
November 1969

LIBRARIES AND LIBRARY EDUCATION AT WISCONSIN'S PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

CHANGES IN THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND TEXT

(1) Delete Recommendation No. 6 on pages 2 and 23.

(2) Recommendation No. 15 on pages 4 and 38 should read as follows:

A broad field undergraduate major in library science should be established in Wisconsin.

(3) The cost per volume added for University of Wisconsin-Green Bay should be changed from $12.43 to $6.61 on pages 20 and B-5.

(4) On page 19, the high average cost per volume added for a campus should be *$10.22*, not $12.43, and the statewide average should be *$7.46*, not $8.46.

State of Wisconsin \ COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

132 NORTH MIDVALE BOULEVARD
HILLDALE THEATER BUILDING
MADISON, WISCONSIN 53705

For Action

CCHE #106, September 1969

LIBRARIES AND LIBRARY EDUCATION AT WISCONSIN'S PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

SUMMARY: This report was prepared in response to a need identified in the Provisional Long-Range Plan. The findings of an advisory committee were used by the staff as the basis for the recommendations in three areas -- technology and inter-institutional cooperation, library resources, and library education.

The following recommendations are submitted for Council action:

Technology and Inter-institutional Cooperation

(1) The public universities should plan on full participation in a state information network.

(2) The inter-library loan system should be modernized in the following ways:

(a) Provide in book form a photographic or machine-readable copy of the author catalog of the UW-MSN campus libraries.

(b) Exchange machine-readable tapes of current acquisitions of books.

(c) Produce from machine-readable cards a print-out of serial holdings in Madison.

(d) Create on the Madison campus a small team which will provide xerox copies, mail books, handle teletype messages.

(e) Plan a more rapid system of delivery.

(3) A cost-benefit analysis should be made of the feasibility of a central purchasing and processing center for Wisconsin's academic libraries.

(4) A library systems analyst-computer specialist should be employed in a statewide planning capacity with the following tasks:

(a) Facilitate the modernization of the inter-library loan process and analyze the cost of the modernization.

(b) Coordinate the higher education component in a statewide information network.

(c) Plan the development of a central purchasing and processing center if such a center is found to be economically feasible.

(d) Investigate possible sources of outside funds in support of experimentation and development with new technology in libraries.

Library Resources

(5) The following minimum holding goals for 1980 are recommended for public senior institutions in Wisconsin:

Madison	3,250,000
Milwaukee	1,250,000
Green Bay	300,000
Parkside	300,000
Eau Claire	550,000
La Crosse	325,000
Oshkosh	600,000
Platteville	250,000
River Falls	250,000
Stevens Point	350,000
Stout	250,000
Superior	300,000
Whitewater	450,000

(6) ~~It is recommended that the percentage of institutional support allocated to libraries be within a 3.5 to 5.3 percent range for the University of Wisconsin and within a 5.2 to 5.5 percent range for the Wisconsin State Universities, with the percentage for each campus in each system being at the discretion of the system and individual institution.~~

(7) The following timing is recommended for reaching minimum holding goals:

Madison -- a steady growth at the rate of at least 100,000 volumes a year.

Milwaukee -- rapid growth to reach a minimum of 750,000 volumes by 1974 with a steady growth to 1,250,000 by 1980.

Green Bay and Parkside -- steady growth to reach 300,000 volumes each by 1980.

Wisconsin State Universities -- rapid growth to bring each senior campus library to 200,000 volumes by 1972 with steady growth after that to reach a minimum of 3,325,000 volumes in the system by 1980. At that time, the volumes should be distributed according to Recommendation No. 5.

(8) The goals, percentage of support, and timing for improving library resources should be reviewed at least by 1975.

(9) The ~~priorities~~ emphasis for development of library resources should be as follows:

First:	Build Wisconsin State University senior institutions to a minimum of 200,000 each by 1972 and system resources to a total of 3,325,000 by 1980
Second:	Build the collection at University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee to a minimum of 750,000 volumes by 1974 and a minimum of 1,250,000 by 1980.
Third:	Continued development of the Madison, Green Bay and Parkside collections to reach minimum goals for 1980.

Library Education

(10) New associate degree programs for library technical assistants should fulfill three requirements:

(a) A demonstration that there is local support in the development of these programs and that there is a local market ready to absorb the graduates.

(b) A school with a library of adequate size and with the continuing financial support to furnish the necessary educational opportunities.

(c) Instructors who are qualified with the academic background of a graduate degree from an accredited library school plus suitable work experience.

(11) The program of the Kenosha Technical Institute should be viewed as a pilot program for the training of library technical assistants in Wisconsin.

(12) Undergraduate library science programs should continue to emphasize school librarianship.

(13) Undergraduate library science courses should reflect the current changes in school libraries to media centers and sufficient care should be taken so that a student is not given obsolete training.

(14) The strengthening and expansion of undergraduate programs of library education should be articulated with changes in graduate education.

(15) A broad field major in library science should be established in Wisconsin.

(16) The following guidelines for undergraduate minor programs should be established:

(a) Minors should be offered only at colleges that award teaching degrees because certification requirements demand a teaching degree for certification as a teacher librarian.

(b) The courses offered in a minor should meet state certification requirements and should allow articulation with graduate library science programs in Wisconsin.

(c) Undergraduate minor programs should be adequately staffed with special facilities for necessary lab-type instruction. At least the minimum requirements of the A.L.A./N.C.A.T.E. Standards and Guide for Undergraduate Programs in Librarianship (1959) should be observed.

(d) Library science minor programs should generate at least 20 students a year who finish the requirements for the minor.

(e) Institutions whose programs do not meet all of the above guidelines should not continue to offer a library science minor.

(17) No additional graduate library science programs be planned in Wisconsin until at least 1975, with adequate support being allocated for the development of the three existing programs to meet state needs until that time.

(18) A plan for the use of extension in graduate library education be developed among the three graduate library schools and appropriate extension agencies with the dual aims of offering the initial segments in 1970-71 and of offering a full-scale program in the 1971-73 biennium.

(19) By June 1970, the three graduate library schools develop a Statement of Special Emphases that will distinguish the major thrusts of each program and will provide maximum diversity of opportunity with efficient use of resources.

(20) The graduate library schools should award at least the following number of master's degrees annually:

Madison	100
Milwaukee	60
Oshkosh	40

(21) Representatives of the three graduate library education faculties, working together with representatives from some of the undergraduate library education programs constitute a committee to evolve a plan for education for school librarianship that will adequately meet the changing needs of the state; especially in the area of media specialists.

(22) The Coordinating Council for Higher Education maintain a permanent library advisory committee with the following general responsibilities:

(a) Serve as a channel for ideas and information from the campuses to the Council;

(b) make studies of areas of concern to librarians and library educators as these problems pertain to Wisconsin;

(c) advise the CCHE on new library science proposals;

(d) review library and library education needs in 1975;

(e) aid in the implementation of policy pertaining to libraries.

LIBRARIES AND LIBRARY EDUCATION AT WISCONSIN'S PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

1

INTRODUCTION

Over two years ago, the CCHE identified libraries as an area needing attention if the state were to make the most efficient use of its resources in support of higher education. In the Provisional Long-Range Plan the staff made the following comment and recommendation:

> In the field of library services recent innovations in retrieval and communications systems could be utilized to make specialized library holdings of a single institution available on any campus in the state. While there is need for some duplication in each library, individual libraries have acquired unique titles and areas of strength. A coordinated statewide system, linked by a telecommunications network and tied to a central computer center, would handle much of the acquisition, cataloging, and book processing as well as making the library resources of all institutions available to any other library. While such equipment is not now available to Wisconsin higher education, the CCHE staff requests an early review of the application of such methods to future library development.

Recommendation 22 in the Provisional Long-Range Plan read:

> *The CCHE staff requests an early review of the application of recent innovations in retrieval and communications systems to future library development.*

The staff position was expanded in an informational paper of July, 1967 (CCHE #43) where three basic problem areas were identified as (1) the use of technology; (2) need for adequate library resources; (3) library education. In the fall of 1967 the CCHE staff formed a Library Advisory Committee to study library needs. The committee consisted of representatives from all systems, and an effort was made to gather a group with experience related to problems

that might be solved through the use of technology. As the discussions unfolded and the focus of the committee broadened, it was necessary to enlarge the committee to thirteen members from the original nine. Both the original and final groups are listed in Appendix A.

Special recognition is given to the diligence and dedication of the Library Advisory Committee, whose members spent hours of their time compiling data, doing research, writing papers, and securing other sources of advice. Their efforts illustrate the principle that coordination of higher education must be a cooperative venture, using the talent available on our campuses. Special notice and thanks should also be given to the university librarians in the state who responded to the resource questionnaire, thus providing the raw data for a study of library resources.

ii

TECHNOLOGY AND INTER-INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

Four aspects were covered in the study of technology and inter-institutional cooperation -- the use of technology in libraries, the feasibility of a central processing center, the improvement of the inter-library loan system, and the development of a statewide information network for libraries. Each of these elements was covered by a separate study.

TECHNOLOGY

The promises which technology seems to hold for improved library operation and cooperation are not easily realized. Early in the study, it became clear that the glowing reports of automated and centralized operations proved optimistic when measured by standards of continuous, effective, and economical operation. Of major significance is the fact that use of technology does not result in lower cost. Better service can be provided through use of technology but the costs also increase. A summary of the developments and implications in computers and data processing helps assess the situation in Wisconsin.

The new computer technology and concomitant sophistication in data processing has begun to markedly affect the management of libraries, and this has noteworthy implications for the planning of future libraries and library systems as well as the facilities which house them.

The application of electronic data processing equipment, the computer and its peripherals, to automate library procedures began less than a decade ago. Most all of the initial installations of computers in libraries were primarily for local demonstration or experimental projects. Many installations have continued and have even expanded their scope.

The success of these first attempts to automate library procedures is difficult to ascertain. Evaluation of demonstration or experimental projects of this kind at best leaves something to be desired; the parameters to measure their effectiveness were then and today are still largely unknown. Moreover, initial projects established in the early 60's bore little relationship to one another. No basis was provided for making any significant comparisons. The computer manufacturers themselves complicate the matter further. Each has its own way of looking at mechanized library systems consistent with the engineering developments that determine marketing policies.

Even with all of the problems of evaluating the first computerized library procedures, some meaningful conclusions may be drawn. Bookkeeping, circulation control, cataloguing, and information retrieval represent application areas of library administration where computerization has been attempted.

Automated bookkeeping systems have been successfully developed. They are in the main extensions of the automated business procedures that are part of the financial operation of any functional division of a college or university.

The development of automated circulation control also has been somewhat successful. However, the various systems that are in operation

are usually tied to a single manufacturer's product line. Good examples of this would be the IBM's circulation control system at Rice University using the model 357 data collection system or the Friden Collectadata 30 system at Michigan State's University Libraries. The variety of mechanized circulation control systems have been successful not because of their uniformity nor because of any great economic savings, but rather because they have been efficient in the production of statistical reports that library management requires for its operations. For example, library staffs have immediately available information about the circulation of books and serials which is both timely and accurate. Reports that may be computer-generated include hold lists, library notices, a master book listing and many others. The development of circulation control systems however is not uncomplicated. There is a tremendous conversion process involved as each book or periodical must be identified in such a way as to produce a machine-readable record at the time it is checked out to the borrower. The conversion process is a massive undertaking and there still remains to be developed an excellent system for applying a machine-readable identification mark for books that will be permanent and unmodifiable by the borrower. In addition, at the time of check-out, the borrower must also be similarly identified.

The development of a computerized library card catalogue presents the most immediate challenge in the effort to mechanize library procedures. There appear to be two viewpoints in how this challenge should be met. One point of view insists that the current catalogue procedures have been developed over a long period of time and experience has demonstrated their usefulness. The computer should be used to make more efficient the production of the catalogue, and to enhance the immediacy of catalogue information to the library user. The other point of view insists that the new technology demands a complete overhaul of cataloguing concepts and procedures. While some aspects of automatic cataloguing procedures seen from either position are now technologically feasible, the issue of which viewpoint will predominate and guide computerization is still unresolved.

Information retrieval systems are still in the experimental stage. It is economically and operationally senseless to convert whole

collections of books and serials to machine-readable form, just to retrieve them for the user by the use of the computer. There is no single advantage in doing so. Nevertheless some successful information retrieval systems have been developed to store and retrieve highly specialized and frequently used data. The most successful of these systems have been developed for government agencies and have been funded federally. At this time the practical development of information retrieval systems for general use in today's college or university library is many years away. In this connection, it should be pointed out that one of the first cooperative information retrieval systems among universities failed to develop. Early in 1965, Yale, Harvard and Columbia Medical Libraries planned to share the task of cataloguing and producing reprographically more than 12,000 medical titles. It has been reported that computer storage costs and technological problems were responsible for the project's lack of success.

Another conclusion that might be drawn from the reports on initial efforts to mechanize library procedures concerns the development of uniform procedures from library to library. There is a degree of individuality among college and university libraries; each tailors its procedures to meet the academic needs of its parent institution. It follows that the development of automated library systems may be similar among institutions but identities should not be expected.

With respect to evaluating current and future efforts to computerize the library, some working agreement upon the parameters to be used when judging the effectiveness of service to the user and the cost of mechanized procedures must be preceded by the definition of an objective basis for measurement.

Finally, the design of future library facilities must take into account the machinery required for automatic library systems. However, *it is not likely in the foreseeable future that book and serial storage space will be reduced by the electronic or photo-chemical miniaturization of documents. Neither is it foreseeable that libraries will develop large central computing centers to control automatically operations and administation.*

A realistic appraisal of the impact of technology on library facilities is represented in a report from the Educational Facilities Laboratories which states that

> *for the next 20 years or more, the great bulk of publication will be in conventional print form, with a gradual increase in the production of microform texts. Retrospective conversion of texts to machine readable form is not expected to any great degree for a very long time in the future. Therefore, the bulk of a scholar's negotiations in a library will be with books even 30 years from now.*

In summary, the state of the technology is such that some effective computerization of library procedures is possible particularly in the area of bookkeeping and circulation. Cataloguing procedures and information retrieval systems require much more study before the new technology will in these regards markedly affect library administration. It will be some time before effective computerized inter-university cataloguing procedures and information retrieval systems can be developed. The new library technology is at a plateau and new breakthroughs and lower costs are required before library procedures can be fully and effectively mechanized.

For Wisconsin to introduce automated bookkeeping and circulation systems in all academic libraries, a considerable amount of additional funds would be required. It does not seem likely that such conversion has high enough priority among the needs of higher education to justify reallocation of resources. Nor does the availability of an adequate amount of federal support for this purpose seem likely in the immediate future. Federal funds are generally applied to demonstration projects that establish the viability of such an approach. For example, Columbia University is currently automating its libraries with the help of $350,000 of federal funds.

The cautious approach suggested by this report should not be construed to mean that the academic libraries in Wisconsin are doing nothing in the direction of library automation. The University of Wisconsin-Madison library is in the midst of developing an automated reserve book system. The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee currently has a completely computerized serials record and also has a partially computerized circulation system. The State Universities use the computer

to produce an annual system-wide union list of periodicals. The new library at the University of Wisconsin-Green Bay is using a microfiche cataloguing process that saves both time and manpower. All of these developments have been funded from existing resources. In addition, the Madison library has developmental funds to put its serials holdings in machine-readable form. These examples suggest that academic libraries in Wisconsin are using a building-block approach in utilizing new technology. Given the uncertainty and expense involved, the approach seems in the best interest of the institutions and the state as a whole.

Central Processing Center

With 13 public four-year university libraries all buying books, many of them duplicates, it seems logical to at least consider the possibility that a centralized purchasing and processing center for book acquisition might result in considerable savings and greater speed in getting the book to the user. At present, no state has such a system in operation, but New York spent over $500,000 to get Arthur D. Little, Inc. to develop a plan for the state university system, SUNY. The plan, as developed, would take advantage of the proximity to publishers in New York City and nearby areas of New Jersey, would require an annual operating budget of $1,500,000, and would process books at a cost of about $1.60 per book when fully operational. Apparently the plan has not yet been put into operation by SUNY.

A member of the advisory committee traveled to New York to discuss the proposed central processing unit with those involved. Because of Wisconsin's geographical location, some of the basic concepts in the New York plan are not applicable. The committee concluded that, with respect to savings, more can be expected from avoidance of unnecessary duplicate research collections than from any centralized form of purchasing and cataloguing. In addition, the time involved in developing an effective central processing system might hamper the efforts of academic libraries to reach minimum holding goals. In general, the universities are skeptical about the feasibility of a central operation.

Central processing and purchasing facilities have proven successful in some instances, and have been recommended in others. Canada offers two examples. One is Ontario New Universities Library Project, a system of centralized selecting, ordering and cataloging operated by the University of Toronto for five new universities. Savings of over $250,000 have been realized by this system which enabled some institutions to establish a basic collection and provide services earlier than if each had operated independently. In addition, the Commission to Study the Development of Graduate Programs in Ontario Universities recommended the creation of an Ontario Universities Library as research headquarters for all of the Ontario universities. Such a central library will have greater resources than the individual campuses and the resources can be developed for about one-fifth of the cost of building separate graduate research collections.

If a centralized processing system is to be developed in Wisconsin, two things must be done. First, a cost-benefit analysis needs to be made of such a plan in relation to Wisconsin. Second, if centralized purchasing and processing is found to be economically feasible for Wisconsin, a library systems analyst needs to develop a plan specifically related to the needs of Wisconsin's public academic libraries.

Inter-Library Loan System

The improvement of the inter-library loan system is closely related to the development of an information network and the strengthening of basic library resources on all campuses. Inter-library loans should not be viewed as a means of eliminating the need for duplicate undergraduate teaching collections necessary for every campus. Such an aim would be an impossible task and would result in unsound educational practices that are inconsistent with Wisconsin's dedication to excellence. The proper use of an inter-library loan system is to supplement an institution's resources at the graduate research level -- the level where duplication should be avoided. Each campus should develop research strengths appropriate to its mission; and these are the resources that can be most beneficially shared.

It would be possible to begin immediately operating an inter-library loan system in Wisconsin in which the 13 public universities would be linked by teletype. The annual cost of such an operation for each library would range between $5,000 and $7,000 if the costs were distributed evenly. Such a system would provide a level of improved service, but two factors suggest that it would be unwise to implement such a system. First, the system would not include all important libraries in the state, thus limiting the resources available. Second, a teletype system would not speed the process of getting the material to the requesting library.

An improved inter-library loan system should consist of the following interlocking elements:

a machine-readable record of books and serials;

a machine print-out of major book collections;

a machine print-out of serial holdings in major libraries of the state;

a special unit, probably in Madison, to handle requests;

a rapid means of transporting materials in fulfilling requests.

Until a statewide information network can be developed, it appears that universities should modernize and improve the present system of inter-library loans. If the suggested improvements are made, the libraries will be prepared to participate fully in a statewide information network when it is developed.

Statewide Information Network

As discussion of the various aspects of library technology and cooperation proceeded, it became clear that a plan for a statewide information network was needed. The purpose of such a network would

be to provide a higher level of library service at the least possible cost and to make the fullest possible use of the library resources within Wisconsin. Ultimately, when a national network system is established, Wisconsin will be able to participate fully because of its own system. All major library resources of all types, both public and private, should be included. Only in this way can we develop an effective and coordinated plan for the use of sophisticated technology and the sharing of unique resources. Academic libraries cannot plan in a vacuum.

Recognizing the need for the development of a statewide system, the CCHE Library Advisory Committee is currently participating in a planning grant of $25,000 of federal funds administered by the Division for Library Services of the Department of Public Instruction. The funds are being used to pay a consultant to develop a staged plan for the development of a system in Wisconsin. Called *Knowledge Network of Wisconsin (KNOW)*, the plan is expected to be ready for presentation by the fall of 1970. As envisioned by the committee, the network will use computers and other direct forms of communication to place the specialized resources in the state within the reach of all citizens.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Library technology is so complex and untested that it seems unwise to offer specific recommendations about its use at this time. Instead, attention should be focused on what can be accomplished immediately with further study being given to long-range implications. Above all else, it is obvious that increased use of technology, though providing better service, will require increases in funds above the current level. In addition, library technology will not eliminate the need for books or for collections of adequate size on each campus. Given this situation, the following recommendations are offered in order of priority:

(1) The public universities should plan on full participation in a state information network.

(2) The inter-library loan system should be modernized in the following ways:

(a) Provide in book form a photographic or machine-readable copy of the author catalog of the UW-MSN campus libraries.

(b) Exchange machine-readable tapes of current acquisitions of books.

(c) Produce from machine-readable cards a print-out of serial holdings in Madison.

(d) Create on the Madison campus a small team which will provide xerox copies, mail books, handle teletype messages.

(e) Plan a more rapid system of delivery.

(3) A cost-benefit analysis should be made of the feasibility of a central purchasing and processing center for Wisconsin's academic libraries.

(4) A library systems analyst-computer specialist should be employed in a statewide planning capacity with the following tasks:

(a) Facilitate the modernization of the inter-library loan process and analyze the cost of the modernization.

(b) Coordinate the higher education component in a state-wide information network.

(c) Plan the development of a central purchasing and processing center if such a center is found to be economically feasible.

(d) Investigate possible sources of outside funds in support of experimentation and development with new technology in libraries.

---

iii

LIBRARY RESOURCES

As soon as discussions on libraries began, it became clear that comparable information was not available on the resources that exist in the state. The committee moved to fill this need by distributing

a questionnaire to all public and private four-year academic libraries in Wisconsin.

The results of the survey are included in Appendix B. While the figures are for 1967-1968, they do give a uniform view of the situation and it is unlikely that it has changed significantly since that time. Without going into detail, certain facts are evident:

(1) The number of volumes per student is uniformly low for the public universities in Wisconsin. The Madison Campus has the highest (61/1), and all other campuses are under 50/1. Comparison between public and private institutions shows the relative weakness of the public campuses (Table 1).

Table 1

Madison	61/1	Marquette	38/1
Milwaukee	23/1	Alverno	51/1
Eau Claire	25/1	Beloit	134/1
La Crosse	33/1	Cardinal Stritch	91/1
Oshkosh	24/1	Carroll	81/1
Platteville	31/1	Dominican	54/1
River Falls	35/1	Edgewood	52/1
Stevens Point	27/1	Holy Family	72/1
Stout	22/1	Marian	53/1
Superior	42/1	Mount Mary	81/1
Whitewater	21/1	Mt. St. Paul	131/1
		Northland	54/1
		Ripon	86/1
		St. Norbert	39/1

Opinions vary as to what ratio of volumes per student represents sufficient library support for an educational program. Some authorities use a ratio of 100/1 while other sources maintain that a ratio as low as 50/1 can provide adequate support. Whatever ratio is chosen, it is clear that Wisconsin's public universities need to increase the ratio of volumes per student.

(2) Circulation figures reveal that there is a large difference in the use of libraries. The ratio of volumes circulated per student shows two campuses with a low ratio of 18/1 and two with the good ratio of 50/1. Circulation figures for 1967-8 indicate that six campuses had turnovers of 100 percent or more the size of their collections. Looked at another way, circulation growth, although quite large, has not always kept pace with enrollment growth.

Thus, it would appear that the view one has of library use depends upon the method of measurement. Although many variables such as library capacity and accessibility should be considered, it appears that some public university library collections are not to the fullest extent possible at this time. At the same time, the figures show that other libraries are making good use of their resources. The columns below summarize the circulation data (Table 2):

Table 2

	Ratio of circulated volumes per student	Total Circulation expressed as % of total holdings	% 1 yr. circulation growth	% 1 yr. enrollment growth	% 5 yr. circulation growth	% 5 yr. enrollment growth
Madison	32/1	52	6	6	49	52
Milwaukee	18/1	76	52	9	NA	65
Eau Claire	50/1	198	18	18	95	116
La Crosse	24/1	73	6	13	61	137
Oshkosh	25/1	107	9	14	101	184
Platteville	31/1	100	12	10	53	109
River Falls	52/1	125	34	9	23	94
Stevens Point	18/1	67	17	15	89	145
Stout	36/1	160	16	18	23	128
Superior	23/1	54	9	12	49	105
Whitewater	34/1	158	2	22	44	185

(3) The public universities are making progress in building library resources. In almost every case, the percentage increase for acquisitions expenditures has surpassed the rate of enrollment growth. In 1967-68, the operating public universities spent over $3,000,000 on books, an increase of $500,000 from the previous year. These funds purchased 367,778 new volumes. Expenditures and volumes added for new four-year campuses only increase these figures. From 1962-63 to 1967-68, the public campuses added over 1,300,000 volumes. For 1967-68, the average cost per volume acquired ranged from a low of $4.90 to a high of $12.43 with the statewide average being $8.46. There are many reasons for differences in costs of acquisitions, but in the future, variation of costs for institutions with similar missions should be reviewed.

The following summary contains the relevant data on library growth (Table 3):

Table 3

	% 1 yr. enrollment increase	% 1 yr. acquisitions expend. increase	% 1 yr. increase in holdings	% 5 yr. enrollment increase	% 5 yr. acquisitions expend. increase	% 5 yr. increase in holdings	1967-8 cost per volume added
Madison	6	8	7	52	144	39	$ 10.33
Milwaukee	9	11	22	65	140	80	9.54
Eau Claire	18	48	15	116	520	78	7.28
La Crosse	13	16	17	137	421	80	4.90
Oshkosh	14	72	15	184	NA	94	7.58
Platteville	10	73	19	109	320	200	6.31
River Falls	9	6	14	94	231	102	6.38
Stevens Point	15	26	12	145	110	58	6.88
Stout	18	18	12	128	307	50	8.30
Superior	12	68	5	105	325	31	10.02
Whitewater	22	98	17	185	327	153	7.41
UWGB	--	--	--	--	--	--	12.43
UWP	--	--	--	--	--	--	6.64

(4) Presently, individual campus library strengths may not be related to campus mission. Pages10-15 of Appendix B show the relative size and areas of strength in broad academic areas for each campus collection. The charts may not be accurate measures of real strength but they at least give indications of where strengths may lie. Although there were good reasons in the past for building collections in their present form, in the future, campuses should emphasize the development of strength in mission-related areas. A closer relationship between academic mission, number of majors, enrollment in courses, faculty strength and library strengths should result from careful attention to the kind of collection being developed. A basic premise of all the recommendations on library resources is that the overall size of a collection is not as important as the relation of the collection to the educational purpose of the campus.

Consideration of the results of the survey led to recommendations on academic library resources that can be used as guides for the next ten years.

The academic mission of an institution was the major factor considered in determining the kind of library development needed over the next decade. Campuses with major graduate and research missions need larger, wider-ranging collections than those with primarily undergraduate teaching missions. Similarly, the strengths of a collection

should be related to the mission foci of the campus so that a campus with a speciality in agriculture, for example, has a good collection in the agricultural and life sciences. In some instances, it may be as necessary to rebuild a collection as it is to increase the total size. Campuses with limited missions should pay particular attention to sorting out the deadwood that may have accumulated over the years.

There are many approaches that can be used in establishing resource goals for academic libraries. Formulas, state comparisons, ratios of holdings to students and faculty, professional association goals and numerous other approaches have been used. The major weakness of such formulas is that they do not take into account the quality of the existing collection and the academic mission of the institution. For these reasons a dual approach has been taken. Two measures of library support are provided in the recommendations -- number of volumes and the percentage of institutional support allocated to libraries. Neither is a precise measure of library support but taken together, the figures establish guidelines that can be used at all levels of planning and budgeting. A significant aspect of the recommendations is that they present goals that can be attained by the continuation of the existing level of support. Commitment rather than supplemental funding is what is required to implement the recommendations.

The minimum holding goals were developed by considering the academic mission of a campus, the enrollment planning maximum for that campus, and the size of the present collection. It is important to note that the existence of minimum holding goals should not prevent the campuses from increasing their collections beyond the recommended minimum sizes if they assign high priority to the development of a larger collection and are willing to allocate the necessary resources to such development. Minimum holding goals are not designed as restrictions on library growth.

The number of volumes which a campus adds will be affected by several factors. Rising costs of books naturally ranks as a major influence. The extent to which a library chooses to use its funds to buy books is also another consideration. Some may allocate two-thirds

of the budget for staff salaries, thus obviously reducing the number of volumes that can be added. In addition, libraries building collections to support new graduate programs will have to spend more per book because many needed items are in the out-of-print market.

The percentage of institutional support going to libraries is a good measure, over a period of years, of commitment to library strength. Librarians consider such a ratio to be the best guide for planning. Because of several variables, adequate percentages vary according to the types of institutions. In institutions with a large component of research funds in the budget, the library support percentage will not be as large as the percentage at an institution whose budget contains a small amount of research funds. When faculty salaries are increasing rapidly, it is also difficult to allocate the desired amount to library support.

In Wisconsin one thing is clear -- for the next decade it seems unrealistic to expect a greater percentage of state revenue for education. For this reason, when speaking of increased funds for libraries, we are speaking of reallocation of available revenue, not an increase in state effort. It appears realistic to think in terms of reallocation over the next ten years because the rate of enrollment growth may decline and the rate of salary increases may level off as supply matches and exceeds demand. Under these circumstances, if the state maintains its per capita effort, funds should be available for increased library support.

RECOMMENDATIONS

While the recommendations concerning minimum holdings can be developed by campus, it seems best to establish system guidelines for percentage of library support since so many variables are involved. Explanation of the recommendations follows the recommendations.

(5) The following minimum holding goals for 1980 are recommended for public senior institutions in Wisconsin:

Madison	3,250,000
Milwaukee	1,250,000
Green Bay	300,000
Parkside	300,000
Eau Claire	550,000
La Crosse	325,000
Oshkosh	600,000
Platteville	250,000
River Falls	250,000
Stevens Point	350,000
Stout	250,000
Superior	300,000
Whitewater	450,000

(6) It is recommended that the percentage of institutional support allocated to libraries be within a 3.5 to 5.3 percent range for the University of Wisconsin and within a 5.2 to 5.5 percent range for the Wisconsin State Universities, with the percentage for each campus in each system being at the discretion of the system and individual institution.

(7) The following timing is recommended for reaching minimum holding goals:

Madison -- a steady growth at the rate of at least 100,000 volumes a year.

Milwaukee -- rapid growth to reach a minimum of 750,000 volumes by 1974 with a steady growth to 1,250,000 by 1980.

Green Bay and Parkside -- steady growth to reach 300,000 volumes each by 1980.

Wisconsin State Universities -- rapid growth to bring each senior campus library to 200,000 volumes by 1972 with steady growth after that to reach a minimum of 3,325,000 volumes in the system by 1980. At that time the volumes should be distributed according to Recommendation No. 5.

(8) The goals, percentage of support, and timing for improving library resources should be reviewed at least by 1975.

(9) The campus's ~~priorities~~ for development of library resources should be as follows:

First: Build Wisconsin State University senior institutions to a minimum of 200,000 each by 1972 and system resources to a total of 3,325,000 by 1980.

Second: Build the collection at University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee to a minimum of 750,000 volumes by 1974 and a minimum of 1,250,000 by 1980.

Third: Continued development of the Madison, Green Bay and Parkside collections to reach minimum goals for 1980.

Explanation

Goals and Growth Rate

For convenience, discussion of goals and the timing for reaching these goals can be combined and dealt with on a campus or system basis.

Madison -- As one of the top 12 universities in the nation, the Madison campus should be compared with the best universities in the nation as well as the Big Ten. In comparisons of academic quality, Madison rates very high, but in terms of library resources, the situation is not so good. The goal of 3,250,000 volumes by 1980 will not mean substantial improvement in the relative position unless other libraries markedly decrease their rate of growth. Table 4 shows Madison's position compared with other similar universities in terms of total holdings for 1967-1968 and number of volumes added from 1957-8 to 1967-8. The addition of the State Historical Society's collection of

under half a million volumes would not substantially alter Madison's position.

Table 4

	1967-1968 Total Holdings	Rank	1957-8--1967-8 Volumes Added	Rank
Harvard	7,920,387	1	1,570,160	3
Yale	5,318,971	2	1,103,062	9
Illinois	4,059,438	3	933.556	10
Columbia	3,895,937	4	1,621,431	2
Michigan	3,816,394	5	1,191,926	6
Berkeley	3,478,893	6	1,173,772	7
Cornell	3,257,399	7	1,289,800	5
Stanford	3,071,372	8	1,715,657	1
Chicago	2,712,785	9	724,085	14
Minnesota	2,691,202	10	785,524	13
UCLA	2,610,572	11	1,309,497	4
Indiana	2,316,197	12	1,125,631	8
Ohio State	2,103,723	13	850,904	12
Wisconsin	2,012,329	14	859,605	11
Princeton	1,998,491	15	490,251	17
Northwestern	1,936,782	16	597,564	15
Michigan State	1,404,492	17	543,867	16
Iowa	1,389,108	18	429,174	19
Purdue	903,738	19	463,664	18

The table shows that quality is not always related to library size although there is a minimum library size which is necessary for excellence. It appears that Madison's collection will have about doubled in size from 1957-1972. This growth is in keeping with a national trend that shows academic libraries doubling every fifteen years. If Madison only slightly surpasses the minimum holding goal of 3,250,000 volumes by 1980, the collection will have doubled again between 1965 and 1980. The recommended acquisition rate of 100,000 volumes per year is considerably higher than the average of 78,000 volumes per year from the past ten years.

Some evidence on the table suggests that Madison's relative position may improve because other libraries may slow their growth

rate once they reach a certain level. Illinois, Chicago, and Princeton appear to have taken such an approach. Nevertheless, it is not likely that Madison's relative position will improve considerably even if the recommendations are followed. The advisory committee recommended that Madison improve its relative position in the next decade but offered no precise estimate of what such improvement would involve. The staff believes that such a recommendation is not realistic in view of the priorities for academic library development in Wisconsin.

A recently completed study by the Joint Committee on University Library Standards established some "Criteria for Excellence for University Libraries" based upon what are generally regarded as the best current practices in the 50 best university libraries rather than theoretical ideals.* For resources, these criteria suggest holdings of 2,000,000 volumes, a net acquisitions rate of 100,000 volumes a year, and a ratio of 100 volumes per student. Madison meets, or nearly meets, two out of the three criteria; for it has over 2,000,000 volumes and added 130,000 volumes in 1967-1968. It is unlikely that the ratio of 100 volumes per student will be reached. Currently, Madison has 61 volumes per student; and if the minimum goal is reached and the projected enrollment peak of 42,000 students materializes, the ratio in 1980 will be 77 volumes per student.

The recommendations provide the necessary resources for the maintenance of excellence and improvement in holdings consistent with the mission of the campus.

Milwaukee -- The Coordinating Council has adopted a mission for UWM that defines its role as an urban university. In addition, the Council has endorsed UWM's goal of developing graduate quality and strength sufficient to place it among the top 100 universities in the nation, or, in other words, to achieve the status of a major urban university. If UWM is going to fulfill its mission, its library resources must be greatly enlarged. Meeting this need has a high priority. Table 5 demonstrates the reason for the priority by showing the 1967-1968 holdings of 12 urban universities with enrollments from 10,000 to 25,000.

*ARL-ACRL Joint Committee on University Library Standards, Report, June 21, 1969.

Table 5

	1967-8 Holdings	1967-8 Rank in Group
Case Western Reserve	1,087,250	1
Washington University (St. Louis)	1,078,655	2
University of Miami	851,312	3
St. Louis University	833,640	4
Fordham	818,116	5
Boston University	781,658	6
CUNY-Brooklyn	465,734	7
University of Houston	465,272	8
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	440,045	9
University of Akron	316,195	10
CUNY-Queens	299,567	11
American University	243,846	12

The table shows that there is a substantial gap between the first six and the last six with the latter group generally being newer institutions. It can be anticipated that all of these campuses' holdings will grow at a rapid pace.

The major reason for a collection of 1,250,000 volumes by 1980 is the academic mission of UWM. If the library is to provide adequate support for the undergraduate and graduate instructional programs and for the research associated with 20 doctoral programs, a collection of 1,250,000 volumes is necessary. Such size should provide one of the foundations for excellence.

In order to bring holdings to the recommended minimum of 750,000 by 1974 and 1,250,000 by 1980, UWM will have to add volumes at the net rate of 67,500 per year. Since the current rate is nearly 69,000 volumes added per year, the goal and rate of growth appear realistic. By reaching the goal for 1980, UWM will increase its 1967-8 holdings 2.8 times or at a rate in excess of the traditional national trend of doubling a collection every 15 years.

Green Bay and Parkside -- Because these new campuses have a primarily undergraduate mission, their collections should be similar in size to other public institutions with similar missions. For this reason, a minimum goal of 300,000 volumes for each campus is considered adequate, especially in view of the fact that the collections

will be completely new and should be built from the start around the institutional mission.

Wisconsin State Universities -- In order to allow flexibility, a rate of growth for each Wisconsin State University campus is not recommended, even though separate campus minimum holding goals for 1980 are recommended. Instead, a date is recommended by which each campus should have a minimum of 200,000 volumes. Reaching this goal by 1972 must take highest priority if adequate library support for undergraduate instruction in the system is to be consistent with the Wisconsin tradition of excellence. In addition these resources will be even more essential as selected graduate programs are developed on the campuses.

Table 6 shows the actual and recommended growth of Wisconsin State University libraries from 1957-8 to 1980.

Table 6

	1957-58		1967-68		1980	
	Volumes	Rank	Volumes	Rank	Volumes	Rank
Eau Claire	54,545	6	159,912	5	550,000	2
La Crosse	58,533	5	168,180	3	325,000	5
Oshkosh	58,700	4	224,200	1	600,000	1
Platteville	42,484	9	144,471	6	250,000	7
River Falls	43,845	8	129,463	7	250,000	7
Stevens Point	58,772	3	160,899	4	350,000	4
Stout	47,624	7	86,207	9	250,000	7
Superior	63,582	1	126,845	8	300,000	6
Whitewater	59,890	2	181,927	2	450,000	3

The table reveals that between 1957-58 and 1967-68 the library resources in the system grew 2.8 times or well above the national trend for a 15 year period. In the past decade the average annual growth for the system was about 89,000 volumes per year. The recommendations call for an increase in size of 2.4 times between 1968 and 1980. To reach the system's holding goal of 3,325,000 volumes by 1980, 150,000 volumes will have to be added each year, a realistic number since the system added about 172,000 volumes in 1967-68.

Table 7 compares library resources at Oshkosh and Whitewater with those at institutions with similar enrollment in other states.

Table 7

1967-68

	Holdings	Rank
Bowling Green	538,267	1
SUNY-Albany	367,687	2
Illinois Normal	350,542	3
Northern Iowa	279,311	4
Sacramento State	246,700	5
Fresno State	245,000	6
Oshkosh	224,200	7
Mankato State	212,659	8
Whitewater	181,927	9

Obviously, the plateau of 200,000 volumes per campus will do little to enhance the relative position of the State Universities. However, when the relationship of holdings to campus academic mission is considered, the situation is not so bleak. Significant improvement in the positions of Eau Claire, Oshkosh, and Whitewater should occur as they reach their 1980 goals and build collections necessary to support their graduate programs. If the recommendations are followed and each campus at the same time enrolls the maximum number of students established by the Coordinating Council, all State Universities will have at least maintained and most will have considerably improved the ratio of volumes per student. Since several campuses may not reach their enrollment maximums, the library outlook is even more favorable for them. The major consideration, however, remains missions; and the recommendations for the State Universities have been designed to provide adequate library resources for quality programs in support of the missions of the nine senior campuses.

Institutional Support

The percentage of institutional support allocated to libraries properly remains an institutional prerogative. Recognizing this fact, recommendations are provided for systems rather than institutions. Such general guidelines will allow maximum flexibility while insuring adequate support. The recommendation should not be construed to

prevent an institution from fixing the percentage at whatever level it selects. The range for the University of Wisconsin is wider because of the major differences in mission among the campuses in the system.

Ranges for support were developed by considering past experience, actions in other states, and national guidelines. Table 8 shows the 1967-68 percentage of institutional support for some of the universities mentioned above in the discussion of the size of collections.

Table 8

UW-MSN	3.0	Miami	2.8
Illinois	3.0	St. Louis	5.6
Indiana	4.7	Washington U.	4.1
Michigan	2.9		
Ohio State	4.0	Eau Claire	5.6
Minnesota	2.2	La Crosse	4.1
Stanford	4.1	Oshkosh	4.2
UCLA	3.9	Platteville	6.2
		River Falls	6.1
UWM	5.3	Stevens Point	6.2
Case West. Reserve	3.0	Stout	4.1
American	3.4	Superior	3.1
Fordham	6.6	Whitewater	7.2
Houston	5.7		
Albany	7.4		
Mankato	6.4		
Bowling Green	4.7		
Illinois Normal	5.0		
Fresno State	8.3		
Sacramento State	7.1		
Northern Iowa	6.3		

Table 8 illustrates a major fact about support of academic libraries -- institutional commitment to the library is the essential ingredient in building a large, quality collection. For this reason, the recommendations in this report are made with the understanding that they can be reached through reallocation of normal institutional funds. Special additional appropriations are not required.

Historical evidence shows that the recommended system percentages are reasonable and consistent with previous action. In the past, the Wisconsin State University system has spent about five percent

on libraries. In view of the pace recommended for the next decade, more than five percent may be required. Similarly, the recommendation for the University of Wisconsin is consistent with past practice although particular campuses may have to increase the percentage to reach the goals.

In the report of the Joint Committee on University Library Standards, a figure of five percent is used as a criterion for judging excellence although the average for the 50 universities studied was only 3.5 percent. In using the percentage of institutional support allocated to libraries, one should remember that salary is a large part of a library budget. Expenditures for books may consist of little more than a third of a major university library. For this reason, although preferred by librarians, the ratio of library to institutional expenditures is of limited usefulness when concentrating on resources. However, when combined with minimum goals, the ratio proves useful in planning. It is in this sense that the recommendation is made. Because higher priority was given to meeting other library needs, no recommendations have been made on library staff size and salaries. The recommendation on ratio of library to institutional expenditures should not be interpreted as an implicit recommendation on library staff.

Cost of Implementing Recommendations

The minimum library resource goals for 1980 can be reached by adding very little to the amount currently being spent on acquisitions. In the 12 years between 1968 and 1980, 4,600,000 volumes should be added. Using $10 as the cost per volume over the entire period, a simple projection of $46,000,000 can be developed. If the necessary funds were allocated in 12 equal annual installments, $3,830,000 would be required each year. In 1967-68, the public universities spent $3,610,000 on acquisitions. Obviously, many variables have not been included in this computation. It would appear unlikely that funds will actually be allocated in equal installments, nor would this be desirable. Inflation might push the costs of books higher than foreseen at this time. Present sources of funds for acquisitions may vanish and new ones may develop. The cost estimates

are intended only as an illustration that the goals in the report can be attained through consistent effort. Needless to say, not even a general projection can be provided on the cost of implementing system-wide ratios of library support since no one can project the size of future budgets a decade in advance.

iv

LIBRARY EDUCATION

Three basic problems exist in coordinating library education. First, at times there are basic differences between the goals of the library profession and basic needs of society. Librarians naturally want high standards for their profession and as a result view the master's degree as the first professional degree. On the other hand, it appears to some that such a view is unrealistic in light of salaries, job requirements, and manpower needs. For these reasons, there is substantial support for the development of an undergraduate major in library science.

The other two problems are related to graduate library science education. With three campuses offering a master's degree in library science, it is essential that the programs coordinate their emphases so that all facets are covered and unnecessary duplication does not exist. Because manpower estimates provide somewhat contradictory data, it is difficult to determine the extent to which the current high demand for librarians will continue. Thus, it is possible that the future will find Wisconsin with too many graduate programs in library science. If the programs find it difficult to attract, train, and place the minimum number of graduates recommended in this report, serious consideration will have to be given to phasing out at least one program. However, until at least 1975, the state's need for better-trained librarians should create sufficient demand for all graduates of the three programs.

The recommendations in the report, while not solving all problems, do offer the best solutions possible at this time and do establish a framework of coordination for library education in Wisconsin.

Undergraduate Library Science Education

Three levels of library science education are included in undergraduate considerations -- the associate degree, minor, and major. Each level has been considered and appropriate recommendations have been developed.

Two-Year, Associate Degree Programs

Two-year programs are the newest ventures in undergraduate library education. Graduates of such programs are usually termed library technicians or library technical assistants. With the great shortages of library workers with all levels of skills, library technician programs are attempting to help by training people to work at the paraprofessional level. Such programs, usually leading to an associate degree, are offered by junior colleges, community colleges and technical schools. Nationally, programs are being developed very rapidly with as many as 50 being announced in one year. Rapid growth means problems have arisen with various aspects of the programs. Students are often led to believe that opportunities for employment and advancement are greater than they actually are. Graduates of these programs sometimes encounter difficulty being assimilated into an appropriate civil service category for a person with this level of training. The field is so new that standards for training programs are just now being completed by the American Library Association (ALA).

Fortunately, none of these programs had been initiated in in before the formation of the library advisory committee. The c was thus able to review the need for such programs in general d to establish guidelines for new programs. In addition, a spe proposal for an associate degree program at Kenosha Technical e was reviewed and recommended for approval. The Kenosha prop developed in accord with new ALA guidelines as well as those de in Wisconsin. Upon a favorable recommendation from the comm staff, the program was approved by the Coordinating Council fo r Education and will begin in the fall of 1969, thus giving Wis

its first program of this type. It has been determined that the most accurate designation for a person with this type of training in Wisconsin is library technical assistant.

The following recommendations are offered concerning associate degree programs for the training of library technical assistants:

(10) New associate degree programs for library technical assistants should fulfill three requirements:

(a) A demonstration that there is local support in the development of these programs and that there is a local market ready to absorb the graduates.

(b) A school with a library of adequate size and with the continuing financial support to furnish the necessary educational opportunities.

(c) Instructors who are qualified with the academic background of a graduate degree from an accredited library school plus suitable work experience.

(11) The program of the Kenosha Technical Institute should be viewed as a pilot program for the training of library technical assistants in Wisconsin.

Undergraduate Minors and Majors

Nationally, it is clear that an undergraduate program with a minor in library science or for state teacher-librarian certification is an integral part of library education. The situation in Wisconsin is consistent with the current national picture, for Wisconsin has nine schools with undergraduate programs and three with graduate, as well as undergraduate programs. Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh has been offering a major in library science, but in order to expedite accreditation of its graduate program by the ALA, Oshkosh plans to drop the major. A significant proportion of library education carried on in this state is at the undergraduate minor level. For many students, an undergraduate minor in library science proves to be their terminal and only preparation for the profession. Most minor programs emphasize school librarianship. Nationwide, 63 percent of the undergraduate library education programs concentrate on courses slanted toward school librarianship.

There is a market for people with this level of training. It has been estimated that 80% of the librarians in the state do not have a graduate degree. These people are not restricted to any one type of library and can be found working in school libraries as teacher-librarians, in public libraries as library assistants and sub-professionals, and in academic libraries as civil service library assistants.

Because librarians who have only a minor are performing satisfactorily and because graduate library schools are not producing enough graduates to meet the needs of the library profession, it has been suggested that an undergraduate major would produce a better trained librarian than the minor. The library profession itself does not favor a major because it believes that the first professional degree should be the master's. The arguments on both sides can be summarized as follows:

Advantages

An undergraduate major suits the needs of many prospective librarians when offered by a university having a strong teacher education program. Because a majority of the librarians of the state are school librarians, it seems incumbent upon the universities to develop programs attuned to the needs of school librarians.

The recipient of an undergraduate degree with a major in library science would find a wider range of employment opportunities among school systems that want more training than a minor and yet cannot or do not choose to pay the going price for the librarian with a master's degree.

An undergraduate major would enable the student to take more work in library science and thus graduate with better preparation. Since only 20 percent of the librarians in the state have a master's degree, it appears that a large part of the library work in Wisconsin is being performed by people with less than the minimum level of professional training.

A major would attract more students into the library profession. Presently many students can only afford four years of education and are therefore lost to the profession when faced with the necessity of a fifth year of study.

Disadvantages

Though the existing field situation indicates a preponderance of librarians with only a minor, this is not necessarily the best pattern for properly trained library personnel. All schools are up-grading the requirements for preparation of their staff and this appears to be a long term continuing pattern. Certification requirements for Wisconsin in 1970 will demand an additional 10 hours beyond the bachelor's and school librarians can take these hours at the graduate level without necessarily completing the master's degree.

An academic, rather than a professional, major is desirable at the undergraduate level for the student planning for graduate work in library science. A broad general education proves more valuable in the long run than additional technical instruction.

Equally important, the student with a major would find himself hampered in trying to gain a graduate degree. To meet the requirement for a broad liberal background, he would have to substitute undergraduate and often underclass courses for the graduate library science courses.

A major would not automatically produce a better trained librarian. The additional courses added as electives to fill out the program might not add to library science proficiency.

An undergraduate major might not be an asset in employment situations outside Wisconsin.

Table 9 shows the current productivity of undergraduate programs.

Table 9

NUMBER OF STUDENTS COMPLETING UNDERGRADUATE
LIBRARY SCIENCE PROGRAMS IN WISCONSIN, 1966-67 and 1967-68

Institution	Majors	Minors	Total
Eau Claire	.....	26	26
La Crosse	.....	22	22
Madison[1/]	.....	.....	.....
Milwaukee[1/]	.....	.....	.....
Oshkosh	23	57	80
River Falls	.....	60	60
Stevens Point	.....	6	6
Superior	.....	12	12
Whitewater	.....	50	50
Total	23	233	256

[1/] No data available for minor.

Apparently the major at Oshkosh has not been unusually popular, for it has averaged only about 10 or 11 graduates a year for the past four years. This evidence would lend support to those who do not support the development of library science majors. Table 9 also shows that several minors are attracting few students and leads to a suggestion that the existence of a major or minor may not be a significant fact in attracting students into the profession.

It appears that the evidence and arguments support no conclusive decision on the issue. The library advisory committee voted to recommend that no undergraduate majors be established in Wisconsin.

Picking up a suggestion discussed by the committee, the staff believes that the undergraduate major should be given one more chance under certain circumstances. First, the major should be offered in the Wisconsin State University system as a broad field major. Under such a designation the program can be of sufficient breadth to offer the undergraduate a background in the liberal arts and sciences. Second, the program should be offered at an institution that does not offer a master's degree in library science. The major should not be viewed as the first step in the development of a graduate program. Third, the major should reveal reasonable promise of graduating 20 to 25 students a year when it is established. In the event that no campus proposes to offer such a major, the concept should be dropped until 1975 when there will be a review of library education in Wisconsin. If such a program is developed, it will insure diversity of opportunity, and the successful operation of one major may lead to the establishment of others.

The following recommendations are offered concerning undergraduate minor and major library science programs:

(12) Undergraduate library science programs should continue to emphasize school librarianship.

(13) Undergraduate library science courses should reflect the current changes in school libraries to media centers and sufficient care should be taken so that a student is not given obsolete training.

(14) The strengthening and expansion of undergraduate programs of library education should be articulated with changes in graduate education.

(15) A broad field major in library science should be established in Wisconsin.

(16) The following guidelines for undergraduate minor programs should be established:

(a) Minors should be offered only at colleges that award teaching degrees because certification requirements demand a teaching degree for certification as a teacher librarian.

(b) The courses offered in a minor should meet state certification requirements and should allow articulation with graduate library science programs in Wisconsin.

(c) Undergraduate minor programs should be adequately staffed with special facilities for necessary lab type instruction. At least the minimum requirements of the A.L.A./N.C.A.T.E. Standards and Guide for Undergraduate Programs in Librarianship (1959) should be observed.

(d) Library science minor programs should generate at least 20 students a year who finish the requirements for the minor.

(e) Institutions whose programs do not meet all of the above guidelines should not continue to offer a library science minor.

Graduate Library Science Education

The basic aims of the recommendations on graduate library science education are threefold: expand graduate opportunity to help librarians meet new certification requirements, update the curricula to meet modern library technique, and distinguish among the three graduate programs. A review of the growth of library education provides the rationale for the recommendations.

Need for Additional Programs

During the last twenty-five to thirty years, the demand for trained personnel has sharply increased due to the population and

publication explosions, the increased stress on educational accomplishments, research, and the widening impact of automated and computerized information handling systems. In addition, library education programs have to provide for the training of library and information science faculty, the replacement of older employees who leave the profession and of younger ones who are leaving the labor force due to their maternal or marital responsibilities and a variety of other reasons.

Table 10

U. S. Library Programs by Category, 1968

Graduate Accredited	39
Graduate Unaccredited	79
Undergraduate General	182
Undergraduate Technicians	57
Programs planned for 1968-69	27
Total	384

Table 10 shows that the basic problem of library education in the United States is that there are too many schools insufficiently funded to offer meaningful programs. The median annual budget for graduate programs for 1967-68 was $279,744. A breakdown of the income of graduate programs (Table 11) illustrates the financial problems of many of the unaccredited schools.

Table 11

INCOME OF GRADUATE LIBRARY
PROGRAMS BY ACCREDITATION STATUS,
FALL 1967-8

Categories	Accredited (39 reporting)	Non-accredited (35 reporting)
High	$ 870,000	$ 495,876 Mean
Mean	358,299	89,666
Low	112,000	7,500
Total	$13,257,065	$ 2,918,056

As a result of the financial problems of the library schools, their faculties are in many instances too small to offer well-rounded programs since between 65 and 70 percent of the expenditures of library programs are for faculty salaries (Table 12). Faculty size is an indicator of the capacity of a school to offer a well-rounded program.

Table 12

FULL AND PART-TIME FACULTY OF GRADUATE LIBRARY PROGRAMS, 1967-68

	Accredited (37 reporting)		Non-accredited (43 reporting)		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Total
Full-time	333	63	158	58	491
Part-time	192	37	113	42	305
Total	525	100	271	100	796

Wisconsin has three state-supported graduate library education programs, two in full operation in Madison and in Milwaukee, and a third developing in Oshkosh. These programs are supplemented by related undergraduate programs and by the undergraduate programs in six institutions of the Wisconsin State University system. There is no private institution of higher education in Wisconsin offering library education at the graduate level, and the undergraduate programs of library education available in two private institutions have limited capacity. Nine public institutions, with three graduate library education programs and nine undergraduate programs, therefore, are available to serve Wisconsin.

As of 1968 there were only seven states with larger numbers of library education programs, with Wisconsin ranking eighth. With a single exception the population of each of these states is considerably larger than the population of Wisconsin, whose population rank is

sixteen. California's population rank is one, New York two, Pennsylvania three, Illinois four, Ohio six, Michigan seven, and Washington twenty-three. Clearly Wisconsin has for its population of 4.1 million and its annual net population growth of 1.4 percent more programs than most states. Table 13 shows that states of population size similar to Wisconsin's tend to have fewer library education programs.

Table 13

LIBRARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS OF STATES BETWEEN 3.6 and 5.3 MILLION POPULATION

	POPULATION (1966)	TOTAL LIBRARY PROGRAMS (1968)	GRADUATE LIBRARY SCHOOLS (1968)
Massachusetts	5.3 million	8	4
Indiana	4.9	6	4
Iowa	4.5	5	1
Virginia	4.5	6	0
Georgia	4.4	11	3
Wisconsin	4.1	12	3
Maryland	3.6	6	2

Judging solely by comparison to states of similar size, Wisconsin requires no additional library education programs.

There have been a number of estimates of Wisconsin's need for graduates of library education programs, some based on unfilled vacancies, others on the gap between standards and current staffing. The rapid development of library technician and library assistant positions in libraries at this moment make sound surveys based on all relevant factors extremely difficult. The data that are available may be said to be indicative, not definitive, but enough evidence exists on which to base tentative recommendations.

In a 1964 inventory of personnel needs in Wisconsin, the estimated need for additional professionals in public, academic, and special libraries was 578. Based on professional staffing standards, the projection of need to 1974 was 638. Another source estimates that

by 1970 Wisconsin will need 500 additional librarians for secondary schools and 1620 for elementary schools without taking into account the annual growth factor. The Library Services Branch of the U. S. Office of Education estimated current Wisconsin manpower needs of public libraries in Wisconsin up to 1980 (Table 14).

Table 14

PROJECTED PUBLIC LIBRARY MANPOWER NEEDS IN WISCONSIN, 1969-1980

Year	Budgeted[a]	Norm[b]
1969	300	333
1970	310	350
1975	335	375
1980	365	405

[a] Budgeted number is the estimated number of positions that libraries will establish.

[b] Norm means the number obtained by applying the standard of one librarian for every 6000 persons in the area served.

The Wisconsin Division for Library Services also provided an estimate of manpower needs for school libraries. At present 1/3 to 1/2 of the public schools in Wisconsin have librarians. At least 600 school librarians are needed for elementary libraries. Only 23 percent of the present elementary school librarians have a master's degree. During the next decade, the normal number of vacancies due to resignations will be increased by 200 positions which will be vacated by retirement.

Media programs are needed at the master's and advanced levels. The North Central Association encourages master's for librarians especially with curriculum and audio-visual backgrounds, thus about 200 people will need to be raised from education lower than the master's level to master's level proficiency.

Other factors, such as the expansion of vocational and technical school programs, the growth of public library systems in Wisconsin,

the newly raised state requirements for school library certification, and the growth of industrial research institutes as Wisconsin's economy expands, may also influence the demand for library education, but it seems realistic to plan for a sizable and steady demand for graduate work.

The graduate library education programs of Wisconsin are expanding rapidly at the master's level, as Table 15 shows.

Table 15

NUMBER OF MASTERS' DEGREES GRANTED 1956-1969

Institution	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	Estimate 1969-70
University of Wisconsin-Madison	100	112	125	125
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	4	22	40	50
Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh	-	-	-	10
Totals	104	134	165	185

Once the growth in Milwaukee and Oshkosh is stabilized, there is good reason to believe that by 1975 these three programs will be conferring approximately 250 masters' degrees annually with a minimum of 200 expected from the three programs. In addition, if the undergraduate programs held at their present levels (Table 9), by 1975 there would be approximately 2,700 professional or sub-professional librarians educated in Wisconsin, which might roughly approximate the demands projected in the manpower statistics mentioned above.

Is the answer to the personnel shortage more graduate library science programs in Wisconsin? Not unless other currently available alternatives prove ineffectual. None of the already existing graduate programs limits its enrollments, which are increasing. The relatively small numbers graduated from the State Universities offering the undergraduate programs would indicate the possiblility for increased enrollments. Vigorous recruiting for undergraduate and graduate programs on a high school and college level, stimulated by the Wisconsin Library Association

and the Department of Public Instruction might also produce greater enrollments.

Besides adequate financial support, quality graduate education demands doctoral-level faculty or what some designate as the professional specialist, with at least a full year's professional education beyond the master's degree. With at least two new major graduate library schools established yearly in the nation and with enormous expansion in faculties in already established schools, the 36 doctorates conferred in the two-year period 1965-1967 is a measure of the inadequacy of existing doctoral programs. Federal support for doctoral fellowships for library education, begun in the academic year 1966-67, has just begun to bear its needed fruit. Existing programs will grow and additional specialist's and doctoral programs may be needed.

The Library School on the Madison campus has already begun to assist in meeting this general need of the library profession (Table 16). Having begun in 1964 to develop a faculty and curriculum to support advanced studies, the Library School enrolled its first group of doctoral students in a formally established cooperative doctoral program in 1967-68, following an informal arrangement through which one student received a Ph.D. in January of 1968. A proposal for a doctorate in library science at Madison will be reviewed by the library advisory committee in light of state needs and resources.

Table 16

ENROLLMENTS AND DEGREES IN ADVANCED STUDIES AT UW-MADISON

	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69
Specialist students	3	5	5
Certificates granted	3	3	6 (est.)
Doctoral students	1	6	12
Degrees conferred	-	(1)	2 (est.)

In conclusion it should be stated that each of the three graduate library education programs in Wisconsin is now in a phase of rapid

growth. Until the expanded program in Madison and the new programs in Milwaukee and Oshkosh have stabilized this phase of their growth in the next five years, it seems very unwise both academically and financially to project additional programs of graduate library education on other campuses in the state. Making the present programs work to the full is essential, and there are neither limitless students and jobs nor limitless funds for library education.

Extension

Manpower projections, however tenuous, reveal that a major need in graduate library education is for improvement of the level of training of existing librarians. Extension programs seem to offer the best means of meeting this need.

In Wisconsin as in other states there is a group of potential students (exact numbers are unknown at the moment) who are restricted by their geographic location and personal responsibilities from participating easily in available on-campus library education programs. Circumstances influencing their situations usually show that they are presently working in libraries and media centers; they cannot easily leave their jobs and families for extended periods of study; they live in areas of the state where graduate library education is not easily accessible.

In addition to the group who is interested in graduate library education, there are many individuals who wish to begin a program in library education but who also find it difficult to take advantage of the undergraduate programs available on the campuses of the state universities and the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Milwaukee. Providing library education through extension is one way to serve these individuals. The extension approach to the expansion of graduate opportunity is consistent with a basic principle in the long-range academic plan recently adopted by the Coordinating Council. Library Science may well serve as a model for expansion in other disciplines.

Extension as part of graduate library education in Wisconsin has been primarily concerned with continuing, non-credit education

in workshops and institute format. Off-campus instruction of graduate credit courses, common in other states, has not yet been developed. The need is here, and extension could provide - under high standards and sound coordination - an answer to some of the needs for "locally" available study for school and public librarians.

The problems associated with competing library science extension programs in adjacent states have been avoided here; in developing extension programs, a high degree of cooperation and coordination should be guaranteed by whatever plan is found feasible.

Under present cooperative arrangements University Extension, University of Wisconsin, can extend graduate courses for the University of Wisconsin (Madison and Milwaukee) and cooperate with Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh. Such an arrangement makes it possible for the Department of Library Science, University Extension, to extend graduate courses for the Library School, Madison, and the School of Library Science, Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh, in its extension program.

In addition to the offering of classes in off-campus locations, University Extension has available the Educational Telephone Network, another means of reaching students who live some distance from university campuses. Through experimentation, ETN is being developed as a valuable learning and communication resource. If it appeared feasible, ETN could be used in the extension program of graduate library education.

It appears logical at this point in time for the graduate library schools at Madison, Milwaukee and Oshkosh and the related extension agencies to explore carefully the feasibility of developing a cooperative long-range statewide extension program in graduate library education which would make full use of all available resources.

In planning for the incorporation of extension classes in the Wisconsin program of library education, guidelines should be established

that provide for:

(1) appointment of qualified faculty who are available to teach at the locations where classes are needed

(2) provision of adequate materials resources in general and special subject areas

(3) administration of the same standards of admission used in graduate programs on campus

(4) stipulation of the number of graduate credits that must be taken in residence and the number which may be taken through extension

It is clear that this effort must be coordinated through the three graduate schools in such a way as to result in a statewide effort. Of primary importance is the liberalization of the number of extension credits that may be counted toward a graduate degree.

Differentiation of Missions

In the light of the expense of graduate library education and the importance of avoiding unnecessary duplication of effort, the principle of building particular emphases into each of the existing graduate library programs is an essential element of coordination. Because the program at Oshkosh has just begun, it was not possible to develop realistic statements of emphasis for that program at this time. All three institutions, however, have agreed in principle to the development of statements by 1970. The statements describing the special emphases of the graduate programs will then serve as guidelines to the universities, regents, and Coordinating Council on matters of curriculum, staffing, budgeting, and long-range planning. The institutions may agree among themselves to emphasize one or several aspects of library education at each campus. Whatever the final determination the final result will be a broad range of graduate library science offerings without the unnecessary duplication that develops when three programs operate independently. Appendix C contains the first step in this process -- descriptions of each program and outlines of areas of differentiation and cooperation.

The following recommendations on graduate library science education are offered as a means of expanding, improving, and coordinating the opportunities in Wisconsin:

(17) No additional graduate library science programs be planned in Wisconsin until at least 1975, with adequate support being allocated for the development of the three existing programs to meet state needs until that time.

(18) A plan for the use of extension in graduate library education be developed among the three graduate library schools and appropriate extension agencies with the dual aims of offering the initial segments in 1970-71 and of offering a full-scale program in the 1971-73 biennium.

(19) By June 1970, the three graduate library schools develop a Statement of Special Emphases that will distinguish the major thrusts of each program and will provide maximum diversity of opportunity with efficient use of resources.

(20) The graduate library schools should award at least the following number of master's degrees annually:

Madison - 100
Milwaukee - 60
Oshkosh - 40

(21) Representatives of the three graduate library education faculties, working together with representatives from some of the undergraduate library education programs, constitute a committee to evolve a plan for education for school librarianship that will adequately meet the changing needs of the state; especially in the area of media specialists.

(22) The Coordinating Council for Higher Education maintain a permanent library advisory committee with the following general responsibilities:

(a) Serve as a channel for ideas and information from the campuses to the Council;

(b) make studies of areas of concern to librarians and library educators as these problems pertain to Wisconsin;

(c) advise the CCHE on new library science proposals;

(d) review library and library education needs in 1975;

(e) aid in the implementation of policy pertaining to libraries.

Afterword

The implementation of the recommendations in this report will provide stronger libraries and more responsive library education for Wisconsin. At the same time it is obvious that many issues have been left unresolved. For this reason the most appropriate conclusion will point the way to further progress. Several major areas of concern can be enumerated.

Resources of two-year campuses, including technical institutes and colleges, should be surveyed and recommendations concerning appropriate resources need to be formulated. Although Appendix B contains some data on the VTA districts, more information is needed. Because of the newness of many of these institutions and because some changes in administrative structures may be on the horizon, these institutions were omitted from the present study.

At the national as well as the state level, librarians and library educators need to review their success in meeting the needs of the nation and determine what revisions, if any, are necessary. A kind critic might suggest that the profession is moribund. Others would be more harsh. What is urgently needed is a realistic assessment by the librarians themselves of the proper education of librarians and the modern management of libraries. In Wisconsin such a review might begin by considering the effect of the media on library education as recommended in this report. Serious attention and analysis should also be given to the frequently cited claim that each library is different or unique. If this is so now, it does not follow that it is necessary or even beneficial. Surely all libraries and librarians have some goals and aims in common.

More reliable manpower data should be developed so that future planning can be more precisely aimed at unmet needs. Similarly, the staffing of academic libraries . eds thorough review both in terms of additions and reorganizations.

Although not solely within the concern of the Library Advisory Committee, the consideration of library facilities and needs in this area ranks as an important aspect to be reviewed. The space guidelines in particular may need review.

Finally, and perhaps most significant, the funding of extension graduate credit programs must be improved if extension is going to provide a major means of improving the education of librarians. The problem is not unique with library education but is general in all aspects of graduate credit extension work in Wisconsin. Some means must be found to equalize the cost of graduate instruction whether it is residential or extension. Only in this way will Wisconsin's commitment to equality of educational opportunity be realized.

Appendix A

Members of the Library Advisory Committee and Meeting Dates

ORIGINAL COMMITTEE:

Paul Ansfield	State University Board of Regents, 142 E. Gilman St., Madison, Wisconsin
P. M. Burnett	Library, UW-Parkside, Kenosha, Wisconsin
W. Lyle Eberhart	Assistant Superintendent, Library Services, Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin
Mark Gormley	Library, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Araxie Kalvonjian	Vocational, Technical & Adult Education, District 6, Kenosha, Wisconsin
Louis Kaplan	Director, Memorial Library, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin
Mary Jane Ryan	Chairman, Department of Library Science, Wisconsin State University, Eau Claire, Wisconsin
Helen Wahoski	Director of Libraries, Wisconsin State University, Oshkosh, Wisconsin
William E. White	Associate Director, Academic Planning, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Madison, Wisconsin
Clifford H. Zenor	State Board of Vocational, Technical & Adult Education, Madison, Wisconsin

FINAL MEMBERSHIP:

William R. Brandt	Librarian, Ripon College, Ripon, Wisconsin
P. M. Burnett	Library, UW-Parkside, Kenosha, Wisconsin
Richard Cooklock	Director of Libraries, Wisconsin State University, River Falls, Wisconsin
W. Lyle Eberhart	Assistant Superintendent, Library Services, Department of Public Instruction, Madison, Wisconsin

Final Membership Cont.

Mark Gormley	Library, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Clauston Jenkins	Assistant Director, Academic Planning, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Madison, Wisconsin
Araxie Kalvonjian	Vocational, Technical & Adult Education, District 6, Kenosha, Wisconsin
Louis Kaplan	Director, Memorial Library, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin
Margaret E. Monroe	Professor, Library School, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin
Frank L. Schick	Director of Library and Information Science, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Eugenia Schmidt	Chairman, Department of Library Science, Wisconsin State University, Oshkosh, Wisconsin
Helen Wahoski	Director of Libraries, Wisconsin State University, Oshkosh, Wisconsin
Dave Witmer	State University Board of Regents, 142 East Gilman Street, Madison, Wisconsin
Clifford Zenor	Wisconsin Board of Vocational, Technical & Adult Education, Madison, Wisconsin

MEETING DATES

November 15, 1967
January 24, 1968
March 28, 1968
June 17, 1968
September 25, 1968
November 5, 1968
January 15, 1969
February 18, 1969
March 13, 1969
April 17, 1969
May 1, 1969
June 4, 1969

Appendix B

LIBRARY RESOURCES IN THE PUBLIC AND SELECTED PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN WISCONSIN:

A Compilation of Data for 1967-68
A Comparison with Previous Years
And a Statement of Goals

Explanation of abbreviations of names:

MSN - University of Wisconsin-Madison
UWM - University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
UWGB - University of Wisconsin-Green Bay
UWP - University of Wisconsin-Parkside
EC - Wisconsin State University-Eau Claire
LC - Wisconsin State University-La Crosse
O - Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh
P - Wisconsin State University-Platteville
RF - Wisconsin State University-River Falls
SP - Wisconsin State University-Stevens Point
St - Stout State University
Su - Wisconsin State University-Superior
W - Wisconsin State University-Whitewater

Note: Information for private schools includes only those that responded to the survey.

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

HOLDINGS 1967-68

	Total Volumes	Periodicals	Serials	Reference	Microfilm	A - V	Enrollment	Faculty	Volumes Per Student	Volumes Per Faculty
MSN	2,012,329	16,380	14,717	41,474	13,768	532	33,000	2,368	61/1	850/1
UWM	358,987	3,659	8,903	15,000	13,363	5,904	15,419	882	23/1	407/1
UWGB	20,117	780	20	2,000	4,000	0	--	--	--	--
UWP	40,500	50	50	300	4,000	0	--	--	--	--
EC	159,912	1,503	800	5,433	4,560	5,376	6,296	303	25/1	528/1
LC	168,180	2,007	NA	5,422	3,643	NA	5,111	311	33/1	541/1
O	224,200	1,613	474	21,735	2,136	8,449	9,444	625	24/1	359/1
P	144,471	1,286	953	10,501	7,355	2,413	4,609	285	31/1	507/1
RF	129,463	1,238	228	4,900	1,891	4,048	3,696	250	35/1	518/1
SP	160,899	1,488	650	8,814	3,838	2,057	5,907	396	27/1	406/1
St	86,207	1,037	385	5,582	1,481	NA	3,859	304	22/1	284/1
Su	126,845	971	1,784	4,000	1,068	1,653	3,028	204	42/1	622/1
W	181,927	1,484	644	6,618	3,321	3,989	8,581	583	21/1	312/1
	3,814,037									

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

LIBRARY USERS 1967-68

	Holdings	Students	Faculty	Other Users	Courses	Majors	Circulation	Circulation Volumes per Student Ratio	Total Circulation Expressed as Percentage of Total Holdings	Holdings Volumes per Student Ratio	Holdings Volumes per Faculty Ratio
MSN	2,012,329	33,000	2,368	14,000	7,500	188	1,047,332	32/1	52	61/1	850/1
UWM	358,987	15,419	882	10,000	3,000	62	272,053	18/1	76	23/1	407/1
UWGB	20,117	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
UWP	40,500	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
EC	159,912	6,296	303	—		46	317,186	50/1	198	25/1	528/1
LC	168,180	5,112	311	500	346	46	123,017	24/1	73	33/1	541/1
O	224,200	9,444	625	350	NA	65	240,574	25/1	107	24/1	359/1
P	144,471	4,609	285	—	412	42	144,383	31/1	100	31/1	507/1
RF	129,463	3,096	250	—	NA	36	162,052	52/1	125	35/1	518/1
SP	160,899	5,907	396	600	922	45	107,533	18/1	67	27/1	406/1
St	86,207	3,859	304	25	451	30	137,792	36/1	160	22/1	284/1
Su	126,845	3,028	204	300	611	29	68,506	23/1	54	42/1	622/1
W	181,927	8,581	583	10,500	685	64	287,831	34/1	158	21/1	312/1

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

CIRCULATION GROWTH

	1967-68 Circulation	1 Year Circulation Growth	% 1 Year Circulation Growth	5 Year Circulation Growth	% 5 Year Circulation Growth	% 1 Year Enrollment Increase	% 5 Year Enrollment Increase	% 1 Year Faculty Increase	% 5 Year Faculty Increase
MSN	1,047,332	55,285	6	343,185	49	6	52	1	10
UWM	272,053	93,512	52	NA	NA	9	65	16	79
EC	317,186	49,535	18	154,738	95	18	116	NA	NA
LC	123,017	6,482	6	46,738	61	13	137	6	166
O	240,574	19,312	9	120,879	101	14	184	37	195
P	144,383	15,376	12	49,909	53	10	109	4	97
RF	162,052	44,547	34	34,263	23	9	94	NA	NA
SP	107,533	16,001	17	50,705	89	15	145	4	130
St	137,792	19,008	16	25,915	23	18	128	16	92
Su	68,906	5,633	9	22,724	49	12	105	8	108
W	287,831	6,830	2	87,263	44	22	185	16	135

LIBRARY SUPPORT 1967-68

	1967-68 Total Institutional Budget	Library Acquisition and Staff Expenditures	Acquisition and Staff Budget % of University	Acquisitions Budget	$ Per Student for Acquisition	$ Per Faculty for Acquisition	$ Per Major for Acquisitions	# Volumes Added	$ Per Volume Added
MSN	$118,044,290	$3,310,865	2.8	$1,341,449	$41	$566	$7,135	129,783	$10.33
UWM	20,543,561	1,099,320	5.3	615,000	40	697	9,919	64,483	9.54
UWGB	NA	NA	NA	250,000	NA	NA	NA	20,117	12.43
UWP	NA	NA	NA	265,561	NA	NA	NA	40,000	6.64
EC	5,823,000	325,800	5.6	155,000	25	512	3,444	21,285	7.28
LC	5,995,658	248,634	4.1	121,270	24	390	2,636	24,765	4.90
O	9,483,061	396,354	4.2	163,000	17	261	2,508	29,213	7.58
P	5,339,101	331,414	6.2	144,461	31	507	3,438	22,095	6.31
RF	3,588,990	217,902	6.1	100,878	27	404	2,802	15,811	6.38
SP	5,279,081	326,430	6.2	114,662	19	290	2,548	16,667	6.88
St	4,912,804	199,926	4.1	75,865	20	250	2,529	9,141	8.30
Su	5,405,063	168,361	3.1	65,916	22	323	2,272	6,580	10.02
W	7,034,191	506,210	7.2	201,248	23	345	3,144	27,145	7.41
				$3,614,310				427,085	$8.46

CCHE #106/ B-5

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

GROWTH IN LIBRARY EXPENDITURES AND HOLDINGS

	1967-68 Acquisition Expenditures	1 Year Increase Acquisition Expenditures	% 1 Year Increase Acquisition Expenditures	% 5 Year Increase Acquisition Expenditures	Extramural Support	1967-68 Holdings	Volumes Added 1 Year	% 1 Year Gain	Volumes Added 5 Years	% 5 Year Gain
MSN	$1,341,449	$ 93,531	8	144	$281,273	2,012,329	129,783	7	566,808	39
UWM	615,000	60,000	11	140	9,532	358,987	64,483	22	159,648	80
EC	155,000	50,000	48	520	25,790	159,912	21,285	15	70,336	78
LC	121,270	16,448	16	421	125,125	168,180	24,765	17	74,793	80
O	163,000	68,000	72	NA	71,249	224,200	29,213	15	108,427	94
P	144,461	50,000	73	320	37,502	144,471	22,905	19	109,110	200
RF	100,878	5,569	6	231	12,545	129,463	15,811	14	65,597	102
SP	114,662	24,000	26	110	27,000	160,899	16,667	12	59,999	58
St	75,865	11,660	18	307	42,826	86,207	9,141	12	28,885	50
Su	65,916	26,716	68	325	14,611	126,845	6,580	5	30,177	31
W	201,249	99,533	98	327	44,649	181,927	27,145	17	110,112	153
	$3,098,750*	$505,457			$692,102	3,753,420*	367,778*		1,383,892	

*Excludes new campuses at Green Bay and Parkside.

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

GROWTH IN LIBRARY STAFF EXPENDITURES

	1967-68 Staff Budget	% 1 Year Increase Staff Budget	% 5 Year Increase Staff Budget
MSN	$1,969,416	18	129
UWM	484,320	24	185
EC	170,800	3	161
LC	127,364	5	83
O	233,354	9	179
P	175,512	3	61
RF	117,024	7	175
SP	211,768	20	237
St	124,061	65	304
Su	102,445	36	210
W	304,961	31	433
	$4,021,025		

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS FOR HOLDINGS GROWTH AND CCHE RECOMMENDATIONS

	1967-68 Holdings	Institutional 2 Year Goal for Added Volumes	Institutional 5 Year Goal for Added Volumes	Institutional 10 Year Goal for Added Volumes	Institutional Goal for 1980 Total	CCHE Enrollment Maximum	CCHE Minimum Holding Goals 1980	1967-68 Volumes per Student Ratio	1980 Volumes per Student Ratio with Minimum Goals at Enrollment Maximums	1968-1980 Cost of Reaching Minimum Holdings Goal @ $10 a Volume
MSN	2,012,329	325,000	690,000	1,600,000	3,700,000	42,000	3,250,000	61/1	77/1	$12,376,710
UWM	358,987	190,000	425,000	850,000	1,210,000	25,000	1,250,000	23/1	50/1	8,910,130
UWGB	20,117	75,000	220,000	720,000	740,000	11,000	300,000	NA	27/1	2,798,830
UWP	40,500	80,000	200,000	400,000	440,000	11,000	300,000	NA	27/1	2,600,000
EC	159,912	90,000	200,000	400,000	560,000	12,500	550,000	25/1	44/1	3,900,880
LC	168,180	100,000	300,000	700,000	870,000	10,000	325,000	33/1	32/1	1,568,200
O	224,200	65,000	165,000	350,000	575,000	15,000	600,000	24/1	40/1	3,758,000
P	144,471	40,000	90,000	160,000	304,500	8,000	250,000	31/1	31/1	1,055,290
RF	129,463	40,000	125,000	300,000	430,000	6,000	250,000	35/1	42/1	1,205,370
SP	160,899	50,000	150,000	320,000	480,000	11,000	350,000	27/1	32/1	1,891,010
St	86,207	70,000	165,000	315,000	400,000	8,000	250,000	22/1	31/1	1,637,930
Su	126,845	18,000	70,000	125,000	250,000	7,000	300,000	42/1	43/1	1,731,550
W	181,927	55,000	140,000	300,000	480,000	12,500	450,000	21/1	36/1	2,680,730
	3,814,037				10,439,500		8,425,000			$46,114,630

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

STAFF

	1967-68 Staff Budget	Budgeted Current Professional Staff	Professional Staff Positions Unfilled June 1968	# Needed 1968-69	Professional Staff Added 1967-68	Professional Staff Added 1962-68	Goal for Professional Staff 1969-71	5 Year Staff Goal	10 Year Staff Goal
MSN	1,969,416	85	5	1.5	-3	10.5	55	75	95
UWM	484,320	20	0	1	0	13	7	11	11
UWGB	43,416	5	1	8	5	--	9	18	29
UWP	53,414	4	0	6	3	--	14	20	25
EC	170,800	9.5	1	1	1	3	3	3	0
LC	127,364	8	2	12	0	3	7	15	25
O	233,354	14	0	5	2	5	10	14	20
P	175,512	13	0	1	2	7	6	7	10
RF	117,024	6	1	2	0	3	2	5	7
SP	211,768	13	0	3	2	6	3	6	10
St	124,775	6	1	2	0	2	3	7	12
Su	102,445	7	0	1	0	3	2	3	5
W	304,961	18.5	0	5	2	14	6	10	35

PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

COMPARISONS OF SIZES IN BROAD ACADEMIC AREAS

MADISON

	Fine Arts	Humanities and Languages	Social Sciences	Natural Sciences	Education	Applied Science
Holdings	4%	40%	36%	6%	2%	8%
Students	3%	9%	22%	7%	6%	15%
Faculty	3%	12%	21%	11%	10%	44%
Majors Offered	4	30	45	24	32	53

MILWAUKEE

						Other and Technology
Holdings	5%	26%	32%	19%	6%	9%
Students	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Faculty	8%	16%	12%	17%	10%	NA
Majors Offered	7	21	13	14	15	28

EAU CLAIRE

	Fine Arts	Humanities and Languages	Social Sciences	Natural Sciences	Education	Other
Holdings	8%	30%	40%	14%	8%	NA
Students	1.5%	10%	18%	14%	37%	NA
Faculty	12%	31%	13%	23%	11%	NA
Majors Offered	5	9	4	8	9	10

LA CROSSE

Holdings	9%	29%	40%	15%	7%	NA
Students	1%	1%	10%	2%	30%	NA
Faculty	9%	18%	18%	17%	24%	15%
Majors Offered	4	4	9	9	20	NA

OSHKOSH

Holdings	5%	25%	38%	11%	19%	2%
Students	3%	3%	10%	8%	26%	NA
Faculty	11%	15%	17%	16%	16%	24%
Majors Offered	4	7	15	10	29	NA

PLATTEVILLE

	Fine Arts	Humanities and Languages	Social Sciences	Natural Sciences	Education	Other Technology
Holdings	6%	31%	25%	15%	8%	11%
Students	1%	2%	2%	2%	19%	43%
Faculty	6%	16%	16%	25%	16%	16%
Majors Offered	4	6	10	14	3	5

RIVER FALLS

						Agriculture
Holdings	10%	12%	18%	20%	18%	NA
Students	3%	4%	9%	7%	13%	7%
Faculty	16%	13%	14%	12%	18%	8%
Majors Offered	8	4	7	6	4	7

STEVENS POINT

						Applied Science
Holdings	8%	34%	35%	11%	6%	6%
Students	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Faculty	8%	16%	15%	18%	7%	16%
Majors Offered	4	8	9	6	10	8

STOUT

	Fine Arts	Humanities and Languages	Social Sciences	Natural Sciences	Education	Other and Technology
Holdings	7%	22%	27%	6%	13%	18%
Students	1%	NA	NA	NA	24%	15%
Faculty	7%	1%	4%	7%	7%	68%
Majors Offered	1	0	0	0	13	16

SUPERIOR

Holdings	7%	37%	22%	14%	12%	6%
Students	NA	NA	NA	NA	22%	13%
Faculty	14%	12%	10%	12%	25%	34%
Majors Offered	3	4	4	4	10	4

WHITEWATER

						Business
Holdings	7%	29%	28%	18%	10%	7%
Students	1%	3%	4%	4%	20%	9%
Faculty	11%	13%	16%	14%	8%	18%
Majors Offered	7	7	7	7	28	8

PUBLIC UNIVERSITY LIBRARY STRENGTHS 1967-68

	Fine Arts	Humanities and Languages	Social Sciences	Natural Sciences	Education	Other
MSN	Music Prints	Romance Language and Literature German Language and Literature	European Social History Russian Underground British Commonwealth	History/Science Physics Mathematics Chemistry	Higher Education Educational Policy	Engineering Medicine
UWM	Art Architecture	English & American Literature Romance Language	U.S. History Economics Pol. Science Geography	Mathematics Chemistry Physics Botany	Theory Psychology U.S. Education	Engineering Technology
EC	Music Theatre	English	History	Chemistry Biology Physics	Ed. Psychology Special Ed.	Nursing
LC	Art History Music	English French German	History Sociology	Biology Chemistry Physics	Physical Ed.	
O	None	English Literature	Economics	Mathematics	Elementary Ed. Secondary Ed. Higher Ed.	Technology
P	Painting Music	French American Literature	History Economics Pol. Science Psychology	Physics Chemistry Biology Geography	Even Strength	Engineering Teachers Education Agriculture

	Fine Arts	Humanities and Languages	Social Sciences	Natural Sciences	Education	Other
RF	Art Instruction Music Instruction	English & American Literature	History U.S. Pol. Science	Chemistry Physics	Elem. Education Academic	Agriculture
SP	Painting Architecture Music	English German	History Pol. Science Sociology	Biology Natural Resources	Theory History Special Ed.	Home Economics Speech Pattern and Audio
St	Art			Biology Botany Mathematics Zoology	Counseling Home Economics Industrial Ed.	Technology Home Economics Safety
Su	Music Art	English & American Literature	History Sociology	Physics Geology Biology	Administration Guidance	
W	Art Music	English Literature Philosophy	History Sociology Pol. Science	Mathematics Biology Physical Science	Physical Ed. Business Ed. Psychology	Medical Science

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

READER STATIONS 1967-68

	Enrollment	Stations	Ratio
MSN	33,000	4,998	6.6/1
UWM	15,419	2,050	7.5/1
EC	6,296	1,200	5.2/1
LC	5,111	284	18/1
O	9,444	2,041	4.6/1
P	4,609	270	17/1
RF	3,696	657	5.6/1
SP	5,907	415	14.2/1
St	3,859	830	4.6/1
Su	3,029	600	5/1
W	8,581	1,172	7.3/1

	Enrollment	Stations	Ratio
Marquette	11,322	NA	NA
Alverno	1,391	170	8.2/1
Cardinal S.	444	144	3/1
Carroll	1,092	470	2.3/1
Dominican	638	NA	NA
Edgewood	777	150	5.2/1
Holy Family	562	133	4.2/1
Marian	716	233	3.1/1
Mt. Mary	948	140	6.8/1
Mt. St. Paul	195	72	2.7/1
Northland	764	75	10/1
Ripon	975	206	4.7/1
St. Norbert	1,561	282	5.5/1

PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

HOLDINGS 1967-68

	Total Volumes	Periodicals	Serials	Reference	Microfilm	A - V Collection	Enrollment	Faculty	Volumes per Student	Volumes per Faculty
Marquette	435,005	6,028	3,055	21,250	11,485	NA	11,322	1,631	38/1	267/1
Alverno	71,580	760	100	3,500	186	NA	1,391	118	51/1	607/1
Beloit	210,000	650	NA	NA	NA	NA	1,563	NA	134/1	NA
Cardinal S.	40,605	415	530	2,348	69	1,346	444	55	91/1	638/1
Carroll	88,111	485	1,275	3,000	837	NA	1,092	88	81/1	1001/1
Dominican	34,400	409	58	2,687	306	883	638	58	54/1	593/1
Edgewood	40,420	384	485	2,873	172	NA	777	66	52/1	612/1
Holy Family	40,264	234	44	4,977	13	3,304	562	49	72/1	822/1
Marian	37,879	325	375	1,965	411	2,814	716	48	53/1	789/1
Mount Mary	76,487	543	75	3,200	854	3,571	948	86	81/1	889/1
Mt. St. Paul	25,523	362	42	2,000	606	2,300	195	23	131/1	1110/1
Northland	40,918	437	NA	1,200	511	2,163	764	67	54/1	611/1
Ripon	84,104	471	50	3,500	1,099	NA	975	76	86/1	1107/1
St. Norbert	61,491	739	170	NA	8,674	NA	1,561	131	39/1	469/1

PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

GOALS

	1967-68 Holdings	2 Year Goal Volumes	5 Year Goal Volumes	10 Year Goal Volumes	Goal 1980 Total	Goal 2 Year Staff	Goal 5 Year Staff	Goal 10 Year Staff
Marquette	435,005	80,000	200,000	400,000	800,000	4	18	40
Alverno	71,580	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cardinal S.	40,605	5,000	12,500	NA	55,000+	0	NA	NA
Carroll	88,111	12,000	35,000	70,000	150,000	0	2	3
Dominican	34,400	5,000	12,500	25,000	80,000	0	1	2
Edgewood	40,420	8,000	20,000	40,000	80,000	1	3	6
Holy Family	40,264	5,000	10,000	20,000	60,000	1	1	2
Marian	37,879	8,000	20,000	40,000	80,000	2	3	4
Mt. Mary	76,487	7,000	20,000	50,000	125,000	1	2	2
Mt. St. Paul	25,532	8,000	20,000	40,000	65,000	1	2	2
Northland	40,918	6,000	15,000	30,000	70,000	NA	NA	NA
Ripon	84,104	8,000	25,000	60,000	145,000	1	2	5
St. Norbert	61,491	17,000	50,000	100,000	160,000	2	7	10

PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

SUPPORT 1967-68

	Total Volumes	Enrollment	Acquisition Expenditures	Staff Budget	Staff Size	% Acquisition and Staff Budget of Total Budget	Number Volumes Added 1967-68	$ per Volume Added	Circulation	Circulation Volumes per Student Ratio	% Circulation of Total Holdings	$ per Student on Acquisition
Marquette	435,005	11,322	218,300	315,100	29	7	33,995	6.42	140,631	12/1	32	19
Alverno	71,580	1,391	NA	NA	3	NA	4,709	NA	59,735	43/1	83	NA
Cardinal S.	40,605	444	NA	NA	4	NA	3,254	NA	23,618	53/1	58	NA
Carroll	88,111	1,092	NA	NA	4	NA	5,754	NA	31,208	29/1	35	NA
Dominican	34,400	638	NA	NA	3	NA	2,492	NA	21,256	33/1	62	NA
Edgewood	40,420	777	20,560	9,388	3	NA	3,192	6.44	21,778	28/1	54	26
Holy Family	40,264	562	12,369	27,362	2	10	2,807	4.40	35,792	64/1	89	22
Marian	37,879	716	NA	NA	1.5	NA	NA	NA	27,371	38/1	72	NA
Northland	40,918	764	14,225	19,845	1.5	5	2,278	6.24	19,454	25/1	48	19
Mt. Mary	76,487	948	NA	NA	4	NA	4,153	NA	53,983	57/1	71	NA
Mt. St. Paul	25,523	195	NA	NA	1	NA	3,896	NA	11,959	61/1	47	NA
Ripon	84,104	975	26,038	36,283	4	6	3,846	6.77	26,289	27/1	31	27
St. Norbert	61,491	1,561	57,617	NA	3.5	NA	7,674	NA	47,629	31/1	77	NA

VTA LIBRARY RESOURCES AND SUPPORT

	Dist. 4 Madison	Dist. 6 Kenosha	Dist. 7 Racine	Dist. 8 Waukesha	Dist. 10 Fond du Lac	Dist. 10 Beaver Dam	Dist. 11 Manito-woc	Dist. 11 Sheboy-gan	Dist. 12 Appleton	Dist. 12 Oshkosh
Volumes	12,941	5,328	3,007	3,032	5,800	250	1,889	1,569	1,300	2,129
Volumes Added	6,452	—	116	781	1,200	50	117	273	46	429
Volumes Withdrawn	174	—	—	—	100	20	6	8	—	46
A-V Media										
Tapes	38	15	—	—	—	6	35	45	115	—
Films	25	415	—	—	300	16	—	250	231	—
Slides	600	1,200	—	—	50	100	110	—	—	—
Transparencies	1,250	250	—	—	200	5	100	—	70	—
Video Tapes	No	61	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Records	80	45	—	—	—	5	70	—	12	10
Microfilm	470	—	—	—	200	—	—	—	—	—
Serials/Periodicals		254	147	65	130	20	72	163	142	62
Newspapers		17	3	13	30	4	3	12	3	7
Pamphlets		600	1,000	88	500	40	222	200	300	500
Staff										
F.T. Cert. Lib. (Bach)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
F.T. Cert. Lib. (5 Yr)	1	1	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
P.T. Cert. Lib.	1	1	—	1	—	—	1	—	1	—
Student Assist.	10	1	3	2	4	—	—	1	2	1
Library Clerk	3	2	1	—	—	1	—	1	—	—
Budget	25,000	Unknown	18,842	6,000	13,600	9,222	2,100	5,000	3,500	6,500
Books	70%	7,390	5,000	6,000	3,000	2,500	1,300	4,000	—	5,000
Non-Books	30%	2,000	600	—	9,600	2,500	200	1,000	900	2,500
Year Library Opened	1964	1965	1962	1963	1965	1967	1965	1966	1951	1966
Facilities										
Total Sq. Footage	2,570	6,000	2,739	1,630	2,444	240	840	816	936	1,091

VTA LIBRARY RESOURCES AND SUPPORT (Continued)

	Dist. 13 Green Bay	Dist. 15 Wausau	Beloit	Eau Claire	La Crosse	Milwaukee	Rice Lake	Stevens Point	Superior	West Allis
Volumes	3,401	5,100	2,048	5,526	3,110	26,030	1,904	814		
Volumes Added	733	1,295	469	601	1,110	3,340	448	53	—	—
Volumes Withdrawn	20	—	96	3	36	1,558	45	—	—	—
A-V Media										
Tapes	—	50	—	331	—	—	10	82	—	—
Films	—	5	—	12	—	—	6	8	—	—
Slides	—	200	—	1,155	—	—	50	50	—	—
Transparencies	—	500	—	450	—	—	200	130	—	—
Video Tapes	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Records	—	40	—	311	—	84	15	70	—	15
Microfilm	—	—	—	—	—	65	—	—	—	—
Serials/Periodicals	125	232	15	266	125	366	77	24	103	—
Newspapers	5	10	4	10	12	5	5	2	23	—
Pamphlets	384	500	—	348	200	400	500	—	567	—
Staff										
F.T. Cert. Lib. (Bach)	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	1	—
F.T. Cert. Lib. (5 Yr)	—	1	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—
P.T. Cert. Lib.	—	—	1	—	1	—	1	—	—	1
Student Assist.	—	7	—	8	2	2	7	—	2	—
Library Clerk	1	—	—	4	—	6	1	—	—	—
Budget	7,250	10,300	5,000	24,738	7,900	66,722	1,480	—	—	—
Books	350	8,000	1,850	22,992	6,000	25,000	1,000	—	3,000	3,100
Non-Books	1,700	2,000	250	1,746	1,200	—	325	—	—	500
Year Library Opened	1966	—	1927	1966	1966	1918	1965	—	1965	—
Facilities										
Total Sq. Footage	1,200	2,400	1,254	10,000	2,120	9,546	1,890	—	1,012	—

Appendix C

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES OF
WISCONSIN'S GRADUATE PROGRAMS

UW-MADISON LIBRARY SCHOOL

The Library School of the University of Wisconsin-Madison was founded in 1906 under the auspices of the Wisconsin Free Library Commission, although summer classes had been conducted as early as 1895. In 1938 the School came under the direct supervision of the University, and the program shifted from granting a diploma to awarding a bachelor of library science degree, with a college degree as prerequisite for admission. In 1950 the one-year professional study was reorganized, and the University approved the Master of Arts and the Master of Science degrees for this program. The School's graduate program was accredited by the American Library Association following this reorganization, and it has remained continuously an accredited program. In 1965, the Graduate School approved the Specialist in Librarianship program, which culminates in a certificate. Twelve Specialist students have completed this program. In 1965 the plan for a cooperative doctorate was approved to support the education of library school faculty and research personnel. Thirteen doctoral students have enrolled in the last three years. The Library School is preparing its formal request to the Graduate Faculty for approval of the transfer of the doctoral program to the School's own administration. Since 1963 there has been a four-fold increase in number of Masters degrees awarded annually, as well as the development of the advanced studies programs. Maintaining a minimum undergraduate enrollment, the School seeks to stabilize the size of its Master's program at the present level of approximately 125 Masters degrees annually, while it gives increased emphasis to the development of advanced studies in the Specialist and Doctoral programs.

The University of Wisconsin Library School
425 Henry Mall Madison, Wisconsin 53706

SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES, FELLOWSHIPS, AND GRANTS 1967-1969

I. UW FUNDS	1967-68	1968-69
1. Salaries		
(a) Academic	$167,525	$192,766
(b) Classified	41,483	35,042
(c) Student	7,219	7,432
2. Supply and Expense	21,350	17,000
3. Capital Expenditure	24,901	15,000
4. Fellowships and Scholarships	17,670	18,530
TOTAL	$280,148	$285,770

II. OUTSIDE FUNDS			TOTAL FUNDS (UW + OUTSIDE)	
	1967-68	1968-69	1967-68	1968-69
1. Salaries				
(a) Academic	$ 30,114	$ 23,905	$197,639	$216,671
(b) Classified	3,329	5,920	44,812	40,962
(c) Student	- - - -	2,832	7,219	10,264
2. Supply and Expense	2,189	5,991	23,539	22,991
3. Capital Expenditure	- - - -	- - - -	24,901	15,000
4. Fellowships	92,480	124,320	110,150	142,850
5. Institutes	16,472	41,817	16,472	41,817
6. Research Projects	50,000	225,818	50,000	225,818
7. Other	9,741	- - - -	9,741	- - - -
TOTAL	$204,325	$430,603		
GRAND TOTAL	$484,473	$716,373	$484,473	$716,373

The Library School in Madison has a faculty of twelve full-time instructors, eight of whom hold doctoral degrees, and seven part-time instructors who teach regularly one or two courses in their areas of specialty. For the past five years, the faculty has been developing course work and research projects with view to the expanded advanced study program. Doctoral student interests reflect a breadth of concern: six in public libraries, six in university libraries and one in school libraries. The thirteen Specialist students have included: five in public libraries, five in school libraries, and three in university libraries. The curriculum at all levels is designed to prepare professional librarians for the major types of libraries, and to emphasize the specialties related to the unique talents of its faculty and special strengths of the Madison campus. The budget of the School reflects its emphasis on advanced study in the size of its budget items for fellowships, faculty salaries, and research.

UWM SCHOOL OF LIBRARY AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

The School of Library and Information Science was authorized by The University of Wisconsin Board of Regents in February 1966. During the Fall of the same year the first complete graduate library science program was initiated.

Since 1927, however, some undergraduate courses were taught by part-time instructors to permit education majors of the Milwaukee State Teachers College to earn the minimum State requirements for certification as school librarians. In 1956 when this institution became The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, a library science minor was approved by the administration and two years later the first full-time faculty member was employed. By 1960 the number of enrollments passed the one hundred mark. Within the next six years the figure

tripled. The first graduate courses were offered in 1965 when the Department of Library Science was transferred from the School of Education to the College of Letters and Science. The first graduate degrees in Library Science were awarded in June, 1967. By August 1968 nearly 40 graduates had entered into professional library positions.

The Information Science program began with individual course offerings in the Spring of 1967 and will be developed into a subject major.

The primary function of the School of Library and Information Science is to prepare librarians for the school, academic, public and special libraries as well as information centers, thereby contributing to filling the national library manpower gap, and to provide trained information specialists for Wisconsin and other states to help with their industrial expansion programs. The School presents an integrated program leading to a Master of Arts (or Master of Science) degree in Library Science which prepares the graduate for positions in the library and information services.

While stressing its graduate program, the School continues the undergraduate program which permits students in the School of Education to meet the current Wisconsin certification requirements for school librarians with a fifteen-credit hour minor. The School plans to extend within the next three years its offerings to a Master's degree in Information Science.

The School has presently a faculty of nine full-time and four part-time instructors of whom three hold doctoral degrees and three expect such degrees within the next two years. During the last three years the School graduated respectively four, twenty-two and forty candidates, and expects to graduate, during 1969-70, about fifty candidates. Through its late afternoon, evening and Saturday classes, the School serves its large number of part-time and special students, many of whom hold graduate degrees. Full-time students account for about forty percent of the total enrollment.

The School's budget reflects the School's program activities and limitations.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MILWAUKEE
SCHOOL OF LIBRARY & INFORMATION SCIENCE
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES, FELLOWSHIPS & GRANTS, 1967-70

		1967-68	1968-69
I.	UWM FUNDS*		
	Salaries		
	Academic	$149,407	$169,946
	Classified	15,432	22,224
	Student	1,156	2,020
	Supplies & Expense	10,000	10,000
	Capital	8,200	8,200
	Scholarships		
	Total	$184,195	$212,390
II.	OUTSIDE FUNDS		
	Fellowships		24,960
	Institutes		56,034
	Research Projects	7,558	
	Total	$ 7,558	$ 80,994
GRAND TOTAL		$191,753	$293,384

* Includes Summer Sessions

WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY OSHKOSH-DEPARTMENT OF LIBRARY SCIENCE

The undergraduate major in library science was inaugurated in Oshkosh in 1952 with the enrollment of six students. The department was established within the School of Letters and Science. By the mid-1960's the program had flourished and enrollment had increased enough to warrant contemplation of the feasibility of graduate work. In late fall, 1968, a graduate program in library science for WSU-O was approved by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. The target date for implementation of the project is September, 1969.

WSU-O will offer a Master of Arts degree in library science to educate candidates for professional positions in public library systems, media centers in elementary and secondary schools, college and university libraries, and special libraries.

The Library Science Department will continue to offer a strong undergraduate minor of twenty-two hours. The latter will satisfy requirements for certification of school librarians by the State Department of Public Instruction and/or requirements for Grade 2 public library certification.

In 1969-70 the faculty will consist of five full-time and five part-time instructors, of whom three hold earned doctorates. Of the others, one has two Master's degrees, another has two Post-Baccalaureate degrees and another is a doctoral candidate. Since the graduate program has not yet been initiated, statistics on salaries, capital outlay, supplies, etc. for 1968-69 are not really relevant to this report.

AREAS OF DIFFERENTIATION AMONG THE THREE GRADUATE LIBRARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

There are three well-identified areas of differentiation among the three graduate library programs.

1. SCHEDULING in relation to STUDENT BODY

UW-Madison: with a predominantly full-time student body, classes tend to be scheduled between 7:45 a.m. and 5 p.m. Monday through Friday, with most classes meeting twice a week. A few late afternoon courses, some once-a-week courses (primarily on Fridays and Saturdays) enable some students to travel to Madison for study on a part-time basis. About 50 graduate "special" non-degree, part-time students are registered each year, to begin professional study or to follow post-Master work.

UW-Milwaukee: with a predominantly part-time student body typical of a large city university, a substantial portion of the teaching program comes in the late afternoons and evenings as well as in Saturday classes. About 60 graduate "special" non-degree part-time students are registered each year, to begin professional study or to follow post-Master study.

WSU-Oshkosh: with, at present, a predominantly full-time student body, there will be some part-time students in three evening classes in the fall of 1969. At that time there will be approximately 25 graduate students plus undergraduate majors and minors.

2. UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

UW-Madison: a limited undergraduate minor for those entering school librarianship (19), with a growing enrollment (72) of juniors and seniors in Letters and Science carrying the preliminary courses for admission to the Masters program.

UW-Milwaukee: a limited undergraduate minor for those entering school librarianship, which will be phased out when school library emergencies have been met. Enrollment from the College of Letters and Science in prerequisite courses is very limited, and from the School of Education is large.

WSU-OSHKOSH: strong undergraduate major and minor programs with 46 majors from the School of Education, 60 majors from the School of Letters and Science, 91 minors from the School of Education and 13 minors from the School of Letters and Science.

3. DEGREE PROGRAMS

UW-Madison: MA or MS in Library Science, an academic degree;

Specialist Certificate, presented on completion of a specially designed 2nd professional year of study;

Cooperative Ph.D. program, leads to a University doctorate granted under the Graduate School. The Ph.D. administered by the Library School will be requested during the academic year 1970-71.

UW-Milwaukee: MA or MS in Library Science, an academic degree;

MA or MS in Information Science to be developed over the next two to three years;

No plans for an Intermediate Degree or Doctoral Degree will be made until a review of need in 1975.

WSU OSHKOSH: MA in Library Science, an academic degree;

There will probably be no plans for an Intermediate Degree or Doctoral Degree until a review of need in 1975.

4. SPECIAL EMPHASIS OF PROGRAMS

Each of the three graduate programs of library education is a "multipurpose" program, designed to prepare librarians for all types of libraries. There are inevitably, however, some areas of special emphasis in each program, and these will differ from program to program. The exact delineation of these areas of emphasis can be ascertained with a somewhat more extended period of consultation among the three programs.

AREAS OF COORDINATION AND COOPERATION

Cooperation between UW-Madison and UW-Milwaukee graduate library schools has been in existence from the founding of the School at UW-M. Transfer of credit for graduate students, and planning and co-sponsorship of institutes are well-established patterns of cooperation. Expansion of areas of cooperation and coordination among the three programs is envisioned along the lines of the items below:

1. Exchange of faculty and students in certain areas of specialty might be effected among the three graduate programs. Joint annual coordination of schedules for special courses might be a means to this end. Courses of a highly specialized nature that would involve exchange students or professors could be scheduled for blocks of time, for example, on Fridays and Saturdays, to enable the exchange.

2. As a means of widening the opportunities and flexibility of library education in Wisconsin, transferability of beginning courses from one graduate library science program to another, by exemption examination or by acceptance of credit, needs to be studied. Since UW-Madison and UW-Milwaukee are contemplating re-evaluation of their curricula, it will not be practical to arrive at a decision regarding this problem for about a year. The Committee will be interested in hearing developments along this line.

3. A policy on extension courses is of prime importance. There are potential students who cannot take advantage of on-campus library science courses because they are presently employed in libraries, cannot leave their positions and families, or live in areas where graduate library education is not easily accessible. For these, courses are needed to build both their professional knowledge and their motivation for on-campus study. Such students have a variety of goals: school library certification, a master's degree, up-dating of knowledge in a special competence through courses to be taken at a post-master's level.

   In creating a graduate credit extension program, the following factors in planning are fundamental considerations:

   a. Coordination should be achieved among the graduate extension programs by whatever means is most relevant to the goal of increased accessibility of quality graduate library education.

   b. Qualified faculty should be assigned to every class.

   c. Only classes for which supporting library materials are available in local libraries or through inter-library loan should be scheduled.

   d. Admission standards of the individual graduate schools should obtain in extension.

   e. Limits to the total number of extension credits applicable to the master's degree should be established.

4. Joint planning for meeting Wisconsin's needs for school librarians and to the investigation of media specialist preparation in the context of librarianship should have a high priority. Representatives from the three graduate library programs and from some of the undergraduate programs should be on the committee.