REPORT FROM THE CHAIR

Jacquelyn Morris
College Librarian
Occidental College
Los Angeles, California

As usual there is a lot going on with the section. At the Midwinter meeting two new committees were formed. There was also much discussion of the possibility of the initiation of new discussion groups. Collection Development in College Libraries and Automation of College Libraries were the subjects proposed for these groups. If anyone is interested in pursuing the development of these groups, please contact me prior to the Annual meeting in June.

The new committees formed include The College Library Leadership Committee chaired by Larry Hardesty. The idea for this committee came out of a panel discussion held during the ACRL conference in Cincinnati, 1989. The panel explored such issues as mentoring, training, internships and the general encouragement of junior librarians to choose college librarianship as a career path. The committee will develop strategies for dealing with these issues.

The second committee approved by the CLS Executive Board is to work with OMS, on the implementation of the Small College Library Planning Program. This committee (continued on next page)

Historical Commission Recommends Planning

Susan McCarthy Campbell
Library Director
York College of Pennsylvania
York, Pennsylvania

The Newsletter Committee asked me, as chair of the ad hoc Historical Commission from 1985 through 1989, to write an article on the College Libraries Section history for the Newsletter. Michael Haeusser and I outlined what little history the Historical Commission found in a College and Research Libraries News article written to coincide with the ACRL conference in Cincinnati a year ago. Therefore, this piece will focus on the Historical Commission's work, and subsequently on the ad hoc Planning Committee's efforts, to strengthen the Section in the future.

In addition to preparing a Section history, the Historical Commission was charged with "collecting and suggesting procedures, and assembling these procedures into a Section manual." The Manual of the College Libraries Section of ACRL was presented to the Executive Committee at the 1989 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Washington. It was compiled to provide the Section's leadership with a sound basis not only for procedural continuity, but also for historical context.

(continued on next page)
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is being chaired by Mignon Adams and will work closely with Joan Segal, Executive Director of ACRL.

During the midwinter meeting, the CLS Planning Committee agenda focused on many planning issues. Chaired by Susan Campbell, this committee will help CLS comply with the ACRL Strategic Plan.

The CLS has a wonderful program planned for the annual meeting. Co-sponsored with the University Libraries Section and Community and Junior College Libraries Section, the topic is "Performance Measures in Academic Libraries." The CLS part of this program will be held Sunday, June 24th from 9:30-12:00 p.m.

FREE COPY OF CLS COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT PAPERS OFFERED TO SECTION MEMBERS

Thanks to cooperation between the Haworth Press and the ACRL Office, the College Libraries Section is offering its members a great bargain. The first 100 CLS members who simply write and request it will receive a free copy of "Collection Development Issues in Medium-Sized and Smaller Academic Libraries: Papers from the College Libraries Section's Program in New Orleans, 1988," edited with an introduction by Richard Hume Waring. The papers were recently published as a special section in Collection Management, Vol. 12, Nos. 1/2 (1990). Authors of the papers are Craig S. Likness, Trinity University; Thomas W. Leonhardt, University of the Pacific; Arthur H. Miller, Lake Forest College; Rebecca T. Lenzini, CARL Systems, Inc.; William Hannaford, Albright College; and Katina Strauch, College of Charleston.

To obtain your complimentary copy, address your request to: Collection Development Papers, ACRL/ALA, 50 E. Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611, or call 1-800-545-2433, ext. 2520. After the first 100 are gone, additional copies may be ordered directly from Haworth Press for $5.50.

(Historical Commission, cont.)

The Manual is organized in 14 sections. It begins with a preface describing the Historical Commission's work, which is followed by a very brief CLS history. The next section seeks to define the operation of the CLS within the context of ACRL, i.e., as a type of library section.

Next, the Manual outlines the structure of CLS. It describes the way in which officers are elected and committees are appointed. Further, it describes Section liaison relationships with the ACRL Board, ACRL Headquarters, and ACRL Legislation Committee.

The duties of the CLS officers are listed. Gleaned primarily from the bylaws, the duties are delineated to more accurately reflect each officer's responsibilities.

The standing committees, CLIP Notes, Newsletter, and Standards, as well as current ad hoc committees (Conference Program Planning, Library Directors Selection Guidelines Review, National Advisory Council Steering, and Nominating) are described. The Section's College Library Directors Discussion Group is also included.

The Bylaws of the College Libraries Section, as approved by the ACRL Board at the Midwinter Meeting in 1988, constitute the next section. This is followed by descriptions of CLS publications, CLIP Notes and the CLS Newsletter. Information on archival material in the ALA Archives at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign is also included.

"Getting involved in the College Libraries Section," is a brief document included in the Manual. It is designed for use in the CLS Newsletter or other publicity to encourage membership and participation in the Section.

The next three sections of the Manual outline what documented history the
Historical Commission was able to gather, i.e., officers, membership data, and program information. The Manual concludes with further information on CLIP Notes published to date and an organizational chart for the Section.

Broadly interpreting its charge to suggest procedures, the Historical Commission concluded its three year assignment by making seventeen recommendations to the Executive Committee. Five of these were procedural and were directly related to the Manual. The remaining twelve went beyond the scope of procedure. They were sent to the Committee with the intention of insuring a strong future for the Section. Those twelve recommendations follow:

1. Develop an inclusive definition for college libraries.
2. Identify issues of concern to college librarians.
3. Find forums to address the issues.
4. Institute organizational planning for CLS.
5. Insure continuity by establishing strong goals.
6. Continue to encourage broader participation.
7. Promote college librarianship as a fulfilling career alternative.
8. Assist college librarians with recruitment efforts.
9. Make programming available to those who cannot regularly attend national meetings.
10. Maintain and build on the strength of CLS publications.
11. Increase CLS visibility by encouraging good programs, good publications, and strong leadership.
12. Accomplish the above goals within the existing structure of CLS.

The Executive Committee identified these recommendations as strategic planning concerns. In Dallas, they appointed and charged an ad hoc Planning Committee to develop a planning process for Executive Committee to review at Chicago annual conference. The proposed process must be consistent with the strategic planning process of ACRL.

At the Midwinter Meeting in Chicago and in the months since, the ad hoc Planning Committee has worked to develop the process. They will present this process along with recommendations and a sample plan, consistent with ACRL's Strategic Plan, at the annual conference.

A CLS standing Planning Committee will undertake the strategic planning role following the Chicago annual conference. In addition to the concerns raised by the Historical Commission, the Executive Committee has asked the new standing committee to look at the roles of the vice chair and the past chair with respect to planning for the Section. They have also been asked to examine the committee structure within the Section, particularly with respect to the use of interns.

While the Section lacks a well documented history, it is moving into its second century with strong dedication to organized long range planning. This commitment to a strategic plan should insure growth for the Section, and more importantly for its members.

Notes

1. Original members of the Historical Commission were Michael Haeuser, Michael La Croix, David Norden, Robert Schirmer, and Susan Campbell, Chair. Claudette Hague and Clarence Toomer joined the Commission in 1987.


3. Members are Larry Hardesty, David Norden, Eleanor Pinkham, Mary Sellen, John Sheridan, Jacqueline Morris (ex officio), and Susan Campbell, Chair.
PUTTING PERFORMANCE MEASURES TO WORK

ACRL'S COLLEGE LIBRARIES SECTION
PROGRAM
Sunday, June 24, 1990
9:30 a.m. until noon

Sponsors
College Libraries Section
Community & Junior College
Libraries Section
Universities Libraries Section

Academic libraries are increasingly
being asked to measure their perform-
ance, rather than use traditional
measures such as number of volumes.
ACRL's new publication, Measuring
Academic Library Performance, can
show librarians how to do this. The
authors of the manual will explain
it; presentations by librarians who
have used performance measures in
their libraries will describe their
experiences and demonstrate how
they've used the information.

Speakers

The Performance Measures Manual:
Why'd We Do It
Virginia Tiefel, Director
Library User Education
Ohio State University

Nancy Van House, Associate Professor
School of Library & Information Studies
Beth T. Weil, Biosciences Librarian
University of California at Berkeley

Automated System Output Measures
for Library Management Decisions
Virginia Steel, Head
Access Services Department
University of California
San Diego

In Anticipation: A User's Look at
Performance Measures
Diane Parker, Library Director
Western Washington University

READINGS IN ACADEMIA

Mary Lee Sweat
Library Director
Loyola University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Baylis, Thomas A. Governing by Committee:
Collegiate Leadership in Advanced
Societies. Albany: State University of

Is this title an oxymoron? Not at all,
says Thomas Baylis, who sets out to prove
that effective governance in today's
institutions requires collegial
leadership. Baylis states that collegial
leadership occurs when "a number of more
or less equal individuals share authority
in common," and defines collegial
leadership as "leadership which is
exercised overtly by and through the
group." His conclusions, based on the
study of political executives in
Switzerland, Germany, and other countries,
posit that all leadership is collective,
and in fact collegial leadership is a
correlate and consequence of modern
bureaucracy. It is the complexity,
specialization, and peer group pressure we
find in modern society which demand
collegial leadership.

Chamberlain, Marian K., ed. Women in
Academe: Progress and Prospects. New

Editted by Marian Chamberlain, project
director and chair of the Task Force on
Women in Higher Education, this book
reflects on the changes which have taken
place in the past fifteen years in the
status of women in higher eduction, as
well as prospects for the future. A four
year study, begun in 1982 and sponsored by
the Ford Foundation, the Carnegie
Endowment, and the Russell Sage
Foundation, forms the basis for the papers
presented in this book.

The book looks at all aspects of women in
higher education: as students, as faculty
members and scholars, and as
administrators. Of special interest to
librarians may be the chapter on
"Transitional and Traditional Fields for
(continued on next page)
Women" which includes a discussion of librarianship. However, some may argue with the book's assertion that librarianship "is a field of declining employment owing in part to the rise of computer and information sciences during the last two decades and also to budgetary cutbacks on the part of educational institutions and public agencies." Also, those interested in women's studies may find the chapter on research centers enlightening.


Michael Oakeshott is a Hobbes scholar, professor emeritus of the London School of Economics, and a fellow of the British Academy. This excellent collection of Oakeshott's writings on education should be of real interest to those who seek a greater understanding of the essential nature of a liberal education. Many of these papers were published locally, went out of print, and only now have been gathered together for a wider audience.

In this age when so many of our activities are driven by extrinsic values and goals, Oakeshott urges us to reconsider the basic purpose of teaching and learning. Oakeshott envisions liberal learning as a conversation in which the teacher and learner, possessing both self-confidence and self-understanding, strive toward intellectual and emotional maturity. In this process the teacher is not the expert lecturing to the ignorant, but instead is a guide, a fellow-traveller.


This book deals with the role of federal government in supporting educational research in colleges and universities. The well qualified authors cover everything from the contributions of professional associations, such as the American Federation of Teachers, to federally funded research, to the dangers of the censorship of educational research. The authors emphasize the importance of this research in improving our public school system.


I suppose it is not uncommon for academic administrators, whether they be vice-presidents, deans, or library directors, to sometimes lose perspective and feel frustrated by the many dilemmas and problems inherent in the academic environment. To Rise Above Principle is the perfect anecdote to such frustration.

Josef Martin is the pseudonym for a dean in a large research university who writes lovingly but with tongue-in-cheek about his experiences. His appreciation for the academic enterprise is apparent, but he also understands that it is imperative that one be able to laugh at the enterprise if one is to succeed within it. The book is not only enjoyable to read, since anyone who has spent a few years in academe will find himself nodding in recognition at some of the characters and situations, but it is also full of profoundly good advice. As Martin succinctly states, "...I write of things that I learned through being dean, some of them things that I hadn't even known existed to be learned. I express views other than the common platitudes: sacred cows, I believe, should not be left to roam without hindrance; and even some modern and up-to-date emperors turn out also to be wearing no clothes rather than new ones."

Perhaps I am not the only one who felt that reading this book was like having a conversation with an old friend. If you have not had an old friend like Josef Martin, all the more reason to read the book and savor its humor and wisdom.
THE STANDING OF ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS:
CURRENT ACTIVITIES OF THE
ACRL ACADEMIC STATUS COMMITTEE

Larry R. Oberg
Director of Libraries
Albion College
Albion, Michigan

The Academic Status Committee (ASC) is
charged with the review and revision of
all ACRL standards, guidelines, and
related documents pertaining to faculty
status and academic governance. At the
1989 Dallas Conference, Committee members
set a rigorous agenda that includes a
national survey of academic librarians;
review and revision of several Committee
documents, including the seminal Standards
for Faculty Status for College and
University Librarians; a new edition of
the popular Committee-produced booklet,
Academic Status: Statements and
Resources; and a number of publications,
hearings, and conference programs.

The Standards document, produced by the
Committee and adopted by ACRL in 1972, has
not been revised despite the many changes
in the ensuing years that have affected
the status, role, and working conditions
of academic librarians. In order for it
to reflect current realities and the
position of today's membership, Committee
members agreed to its review and revision.

The chair appointed and charged a Task
Force composed of Irene Hoadley, Texas A&M
University; Charles B. Lowry, University
of Texas, Arlington; Rush G. Miller,
Bowling Green State University; and Larry
R. Oberg, Albion College; with assessing
the "status of status" nationally. Survey
results are expected to inform the
Committee's work and national discussion
of these issues. Task Force members will
publish a report of the results of the
survey this year. A longer analytical
review of the data and other aspects of
faculty status will appear later as a
monograph. The ASC is also sponsoring a
program on faculty status at the 1991

Atlanta Conference where survey results
and their implications for the profession
will be discussed.

THE SURVEY: The Task Force at first
thought to replicate Tom English's 1983
study of faculty status within the
Association of Research Libraries (College
& Research Libraries 44:199-211, May,
1983). English's approach of presenting
institutionspecific data, it was felt,
would allow us to track changes and trends
over time. College librarians on the
Committee, however, argued that smaller
libraries should be included. Members
finally decided to survey a stratified,
random sample of all categories of
institutions, including two and four-year
colleges, drawn from the Carnegie
Foundation's A Classification of
Institutions of Higher Education, and
present their data in the aggregate.
Although some comparability has been lost,
the study establishes a new baseline for
future surveys and offers the profession a
vivid snapshot of the standing of today's
academic librarians. The ACRL staff and
the ALA Office for Research agreed to
review, support, and coordinate our survey
at the national level.

The survey instrument is based upon, but
does not duplicate, English's
questionnaire. Mailed in September, 1989,
to 594 potential respondents in the United
States and Canada, 445 usable
questionnaires were received for a return
rate of 75%. This high rate argues for
the reliability of the data and
demonstrates the importance librarians
attach to the topic. A few preliminary
results of interest to college librarians
are summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF LIBRARY</th>
<th>FACULTY STATUS</th>
<th>ACADEMIC STATUS</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL STATUS</th>
<th>CIVIL SERVICE</th>
<th>NUMBER OF RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N=195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>N=84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N=83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Year College</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>N=171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Canada</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>N=80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of all Responding Libraries</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>N=100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although a high level of faculty status currently exists throughout the country—there has even been a slight trend toward faculty status during the last twenty years—the survey nonetheless reveals an erosion of faculty status in the liberal arts colleges. Of all liberal arts colleges reporting a change in the status of academic librarians since 1970 \( (N=18) \), only 33.3% adopted faculty status, while 66.7% rejected it for either academic or professional status.

- Of all responding liberal arts college libraries with faculty status, 43% offer their librarians tenure eligibility and 52% continuing appointment; of those reporting academic status, 73% offer continuing appointment; of those reporting professional status, only 4% offer tenure eligibility and 38% continuing appointment.

- Of all responding liberal arts college libraries with faculty status, 44% report that their librarians are evaluated for tenure or continuing appointment by the same criteria as teaching faculty; 41% report using a modified version of teaching faculty criteria; and 15% report evaluating their librarians against a set of professional criteria.

- Of all responding liberal arts college libraries with faculty status, 54% offer their librarians sabbatical eligibility, while only 23% of those reporting professional status offer the same eligibility.

- Of the librarians in all responding liberal arts college libraries, 83% are female and 17% are male.

THE HEARINGS: At the 1989 Dallas Conference, the ASC decided to hold open hearings on the Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians document, first at Midwinter 1990 and again at the 1990 Chicago Conference. The second of the two hearings will be held on Sunday evening, June 24, 8PM-10PM. College Library Section members are urged to attend.

The Midwinter hearing demonstrated continued support for faculty status, although individual participants expressed concern about various elements of the document. For example, sanctions to be imposed against institutions not meeting or adhering to the Standards was a recurring theme and arguments for and against their inclusion were voiced. While most remarks indicated commitment to faculty status, one participant suggested that the document sets a standard upon which many people may not be agreed. She pointed out that in California, for example, librarians often have academic—not faculty—status and, indeed, may prefer it. Moderator Irene Hoadley replied that it was not the intention of the document's framers to dictate a unilateral model to the country and that faculty status must be considered in terms of changes in local campus climates. She expressed optimism that the present document could be reworked in a way that does not demand a hard set norm.

One participant linked the credibility of the faculty status document to the question of how realistic it is to expect the MLS to be accepted as the equivalent of the Ph.D by teaching faculty and academic administrators. Other issues included the difficulty of being tenured at many institutions with only an MLS, peer review, the relationship between the Standards document and the new Guidelines for Academic Status statement (C&RL News 51:245, March, 1990), variations in the academic tenuring process, the removal of sexist language from the document, and the need to define whether it represents a minimum or an aspirant standard.

ATTENTION

College & Research Libraries is seeking reviewers for material in higher education and academic libraries. Please contact Stephen Lehmann, Reference Dept., Van Pelt Library, Univ. of Penn., Philadelphia, PA 19104. Indicate background and reviewing interests.
Saturday, June 23

9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m. CLS Executive Board

2:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m. CLIP Notes

2:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m. Newsletter Committee

2:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m. Nominating Committee 1991 (closed meeting)

2:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m. Ad hoc CLS Planning Committee

Sunday, June 24

2:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m. College Library Directors Discussion Group

8:00 p.m.-10:00 p.m. Ad hoc CLS Planning Committee

8:00 p.m.-10:00 p.m. Standards Committee

Monday, June 25

8:00 a.m.- 9:00 a.m. Conference Program Planning 1991 Committee

11:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m. Fringe Benefits Committee

2:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m. Small College Library Planning Program Committee

2:00 p.m.- 4:00 p.m. National Advisory Committee

Tuesday, June 26

9:30 a.m.-12:30 p.m. CLS Executive Board

8:00 p.m.- 9:00 p.m. College Library Leadership Committee

College Libraries Section
ACRL/ALA
50 E. Huron Street
Chicago, IL 60611-2795