

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 477

LI 002 096

AUTHOR Kuhn, Warren B.
TITLE Planning the Undergraduate Library.
INSTITUTION California Univ., San Diego. University Library.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology
(DHEW/OE), Washington, D. C.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 35p.; Paper prepared for the Institute on Training
for Service in Undergraduate Libraries..., August
17-21, 1970
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$1.85
DESCRIPTORS College Libraries, *Guidelines, *Library
Collections, *Library Facilities, *Library Planning,
*Library Services
IDENTIFIERS *Undergraduate Libraries

ABSTRACT

Planning any undergraduate library represents an unusual, complex and multi-problemmed process. This working paper, composed of selected quotes or comments from actual planners, attempts to offer an overview of the more pressing concerns. The appended "decision checklist" used on one campus outlines topics important to the thinking of any undergraduate library planner, including: (1) location, (2) collections, (3) administrative organization, (4) housing the collections, (5) circulation, (6) reserves for classes, (7) reference service, (8) provisions for study, (9) special provision for faculty, (10) staff areas, (11) miscellaneous and (12) other aspects and/or overall comment. A bibliography is provided. (NH)

ED0 42477

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

Institute on
TRAINING FOR SERVICE IN UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARIES

sponsored by
The University Library
University of California, San Diego*

August 17-21, 1970

PLANNING THE UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY

by

Warren B. Kuhn
Director of the Library
Iowa State University

*Conducted under a grant
from the U. S. Office of
Education, Title II-B,
Higher Education Act of
1965, P.L. 89-329, as
amended.

42 002096

ED0 42477

Warren B. Kuhn
Director of the Library
Iowa State University
Ames, Iowa

PLANNING THE UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY

Noah and the Ark

Planning an undergraduate library has many disquieting similarities to the problems faced by Noah as he fashioned his Ark. Our "ark" is very special in purpose, our potential passengers many but our total capacity is limited, and seemingly the worse the flood the better the time to launch. Also, as with Noah, large amounts of faith are needed in the ultimate value of what we are doing.

Whether we agree with this slightly facetious analogy or not, the fact remains that planning any undergraduate library represents an unusual, complex and multi-problemmed process. This working paper attempts to offer an overview of the more pressing concerns. Quotes or comments from actual planners have been selected to illustrate various aspects, but no single paper can cover them all. An appendix contains a "decision checklist" used on one campus which to my mind excellently outlines topics important to the thinking of any undergraduate library planner.

Preliminary Conditions

A review of the literature as well as statements by individual planners seems to clearly establish that certain conditions have prevailed at campuses where undergraduate libraries have been or are being built. These include the sheer size of general library

collections on these campuses. the serious need for additional library space and the pressures of mounting enrollment. Equally important with these physical factors is the changed climate of concern for the undergraduate in terms of proper library service.

Lamont, the prototype undergraduate facility, was itself proposed at a time of severe library space shortages at Harvard. Metcalf argued its construction would also relieve pressures on Widener, allowing the latter to concentrate on research services and functions. Better accessibility to collections by undergraduates was a third reason. It was pointed out that in competition for library services with faculty and graduates, undergraduates came off second.

Wagman, in his 1955 program for an undergraduate library at the University of Michigan, said:

"The . . . Michigan library system, like that of most older universities, is adapted to the research requirements of the faculty and graduate students, and of undergraduates when they are engaged in work on advanced projects or term papers. It is not now designed to meet most of the library needs of the students in their undergraduate years. The collections are vast . . . the catalogs complex . . . access to the crowded stacks cannot be granted to large numbers of students who are relegated . . . to uncomfortable study halls and reserve reading rooms where books are relatively inaccessible. The collections are dispersed . . . the needs of the undergraduates and their very number create pressures upon the entire library system which make it difficult to offer the best possible service to the graduate students and faculty."¹

Worden, in 1965, noted that beyond the primary purpose of improving undergraduate education, the proposed new University of

California, Berkeley, undergraduate library would:

" . . . provide 2,000 library stations to meet the needs of 8,000 undergraduates for whom no library space is now available . . . A secondary, but very important, goal . . . is to permit graduate students and faculty to make full use of the Main Library's research resources . . . At present, graduate students and faculty use of the Main Library is seriously hampered because it is so overcrowded. The Main Library, attempting to do two dissimilar jobs with inadequate space, is doing neither adequately."²

At Stanford a capital fund campaign brochure (in which the undergraduate library was given top priority) praised the phenomenal library development which had brought great strength to the University, but commented that a good portion of the specialized growth in branch libraries was of

"limited use to undergraduates. For practical purposes, the undergraduate is virtually dependent on the facilities of the Main Library and the special Western Civilization Library. [The latter was a small building adjacent to the Main Library housing reserves and undergraduate materials.] These two libraries combined provide about 1,000 seats which Stanford's 5,600 undergraduates must share with graduate students and faculty scholars in the humanities and social sciences."³

A recommended doubling of seating capacity was made at that time (1963) for undergraduates alone. However, it was also explained that

"the decision to construct a new library building did not come about [solely] to increase seating capacity. It was based upon the recognition . . . that an entirely different kind of library would better suit the present reading requirements of Stanford's undergraduate population."⁴

In Texas several thousand students in a petition supported an undergraduate library since there was a

"startling need for adequate library facilities for the undergraduate students . . . We call attention to the antiquated, inefficient, unavailable, and completely uninviting nature of our present library facilities for undergraduate reading . . ."5

At Ohio State University two separate projects are involved. The first, the West Campus Learning Resources Center (LCR), is currently under construction on a new campus $1\frac{1}{4}$ miles west of the present campus.

"The second library building for undergraduates was to be a remodeled museum currently occupied by the Ohio Historical Society. It now appears likely [this will not happen. Completion of a second building] . . . may be deferred as many as three years. In any case, the demonstration of our need for such a building appears in memoranda as long ago as 1958. The present university administration understands this need well and has consistently given it a high priority in master plans."6

Noteworthy in some of these statements is the fact that faculty and graduate students are indirect beneficiaries of this new recognition of undergraduate need. Indeed, comments by undergraduate librarians would indicate that not only have faculty and graduates benefitted by less pressure in the main library, but many have become the most ardent users of the undergraduate library. After all, where can extra copies of basic materials in unworn editions be found more easily and enjoyed under pleasanter conditions than in the undergraduate library?

Support

If campus conditions are a prerequisite for a successfully launched undergraduate library project, equally important are the

methods by which this need is articulated and given focus. Initiation of the concept can come from librarians as well as university presidents and can be reinforced, as at Texas, by student opinion. Appointment of faculty/library committees is a fairly common next step. Campus planning studies have also helped direct attention to the need. Needless to say, the librarians must play a large part in not only eliciting and maintaining support, but in providing clear directions on what is to be accomplished.

At the University of Illinois while the need for a more adequate undergraduate library was recognized very early,

"strong impetus was given to this idea when the President's Third Faculty Conference, meeting at Allerton Park in 1960 to consider the topic 'The Undergraduate Climate at the University', approved a resolution which recommended the establishment of a separate undergraduate library building."⁷

At Berkeley, beginning in 1956, the Library Committee had been working on problems relating to undergraduate library service in anticipation of enrollment increases, and a subcommittee recommended construction of a "College Library, designed to attract and to serve the bulk of the undergraduate population."⁸ The Committee outlined the benefits to be derived from such a special library for undergraduates as well as graduate students and faculty, and suggested directions on capacity and siting.

At Stanford, President Sterling appointed an ad hoc Undergraduate Library Committee to advise the Director of Planning, the Director of Libraries (both of whom were members of the Committee),

and the President's Office on the University's undergraduate library needs. In November 1957 this committee issued a report on its conclusions covering the following general areas:

"(1) What the Undergraduate Library should accomplish; (2) What books the Library should provide; (3) Circulation of books and other services; (4) Allocation of space; (5) Architectural recommendations; (6) Cost estimates; (7) Future planning."⁹

At the University of California, San Diego, the undergraduate library concept was uniquely included from the beginning in a master plan for library development. Twelve interrelated colleges in clusters of three or four to be established by 1995 became the future projection with serious consideration beginning in the spring of 1964 as to a final form for the undergraduate library. Two themes emerged: one, a central undergraduate library near the research library with small unsupervised reference libraries in each of the twelve colleges; the other, three undergraduate libraries of 50,000 volumes, each in a "cluster" center and serving four colleges. Several carefully reasoned memoranda written by the University Librarian were prepared for the University Chancellor; included in these were space, staff and collection alternatives. The University Librarian argued determinedly for the "cluster" approach which was finally adopted. The plan was discussed with and distributed to the Campus Architect, Ten-Year Planning Committee, Campus Planning Committee, State Planning Committee, and the Academic Library Committee, as well as with the UCSD Chancellor.¹⁰

At Nebraska, a consulting firm in 1964/65 surveyed the Lincoln campuses. Their overall report demonstrated that the greatest need for expansion and development was in the University Library. The

Central Planning Committee of the University recommended two areas for immediate action: the creation of an undergraduate library in Nebraska Hall, and planning for a new central library addition. When the findings of the consulting report became known, the full support of the administration and the faculty came into being. There was indication that prior to this report support of library needs had been less than warranted; after the report the picture changed drastically for the better.¹¹

Ohio State reports that "the interest of the President in such a facility was reinforced by the Libraries rather than created by us."¹² Orne at North Carolina writes that "the decision to go for an undergraduate library was essentially made within the library" and on the basis of available space as well as projections for undergraduate and graduate area growth.¹³ At Michigan in 1953 the President's interest in a separate undergraduate library for the campus was concurred in by Dr. Wagman, then newly-appointed library director, and a statement by Wagman on the library situation was written in response to a resolution adopted by the faculty of the College of Literature, Science and the Arts. It surveyed library needs, especially as to the expansion of plant, and supported the need for a separate undergraduate library building.¹⁴

The Program

At some point in this early process the matter of a program comes into consideration, but few institutions seem to go about this

in exactly the same manner. In a number of cases there have been no written programs in the formal sense, although on several of these campuses there were committee reports which could be considered to constitute a program insofar as needs and general guidelines are concerned.

Metcalf reports that while he knew programs had been written for buildings before World War II, it was unusual for librarians to write them, and he did not feel especially competent to write one. Since he knew pretty well what he wanted and had worked with the architect before, he felt a program could be evolved between them. Lamont was the result of this informal method. However, several decades and uncounted buildings later Metcalf strongly recommends a written program.¹⁵

Certainly a program necessitates setting down as clearly as possible essential needs - why, what and a basis for how.

The difficulty in recommending a formal program is that apparently quite a number of successful undergraduate library buildings have been built without them. This is not to say that some type of documentation did not exist: descriptive data, summaries of space requirements, reports or memoranda outlining philosophies of purpose as well as more specific needs, reports of subcommittees, etc. In a number of cases these documents were prepared to present the case for the building and to enlist support

for it; in others they served as working guides following approval of the project; in still other cases the program incorporated recommendations of earlier committees and studies. In a very real sense it is hard to pin down any general rule as to which might best come first, or as to what form it should take.

To illustrate some of the wide variation in the approach to programs and their purposes, the following may be helpful:

Texas

"There was no written program to promote the facility beyond the reports of several committees whose members represented components of the University needing space and anxious to be incorporated into the building. It was not possible financially to construct a building to include all of these activities. Neither could all of the ideas expressed concerning the components included be accepted. In selling the idea the role of the Chancellor, of the Regents, and of the students was emphasized. Support from the faculty, the administration, the students, and the public was most enthusiastic."

"Plans for the Undergraduate Library in their broadest aspects were outlined for three floors of the building by the librarian's committee of six. These were sketched in greater detail into the general plans for the building as devised by the campus Building and Planning Office and the architects selected for the project. . . . A member of the music faculty gave considerable help in planning the Audio Library."¹⁶

North Carolina

"We began writing programs . . . with the early appointment of an undergraduate librarian. . . . We went directly to our Administration and to the funding agencies; i.e., the State and the federal Office of Education, with much descriptive data, but not the building program."

North Carolina also used a Library Advisory Administrative Board to help sell the building program, with the selling done fundamentally by the library director and a few associates who developed a statistical presentation.¹⁷

North Carolina's tentative program developed in 1962 served to produce acceptable preliminary plans. A formal program in 1966 was later written to update the tentative program due to an increase in available funds and minor changes in concept. The final program provided "a more reliable basis for the development of working drawings and equipment layout."¹⁸

Nebraska

"When the project was cleared . . . the Director of Libraries . . . brought together three or four librarians, a campus architect and his assistant, and in a series of weekly meetings developed a program and the elements of a physical plan for the space assigned. After a few weeks the on-campus architect was replaced by an architect on contract, and the Central Planning Committee approved the architectural plans for execution."¹⁹

Washington

An original program was produced in 1960. It outlined physical plant requirements, estimated costs for building and furnishings, initial and operating budgets for books and staff, sources and content of the collection, methods of assembling and processing the collection and a priority schedule for hiring staff. A faculty committee was appointed by the President to advise on the development of the program, and the

program was made available to officers in the University Administration and the Deans of the various schools and colleges.²⁰

Michigan State

Several documents represent the development of the undergraduate library at Michigan State University. The first, in mid-1961, was a report to the Board of Trustees by the library director describing general needs and a program of development for the library. It made note of the differences between the "advanced scholar" and the "fledgling undergraduate" and described the demands by both on resources and services.²¹ A second document in 1962, entitled "A Library Program for Present Needs and Future Growth", covered financial requirements for a ten-year period and explained the proposal of a remodeled older building for an undergraduate library joined to a new high-rise research library.²² A third report was one from the President's Ad Hoc Committee on the Library, dated October, 1964. It comprehensively and exhaustively covered the changing character and needs of the University and the Library and made recommendations for future Library development, in essence supporting a dual library building.²³ A fourth document was a building program written by the Library Director in March 1965 with specific library objectives for implementing the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee.²⁴

Illinois

At first a lower priority had been given to the undergraduate

library since main library stack space seemed more urgently needed. However, the decision was made to move on the undergraduate library so as to capitalize on the interest aroused by the Allerton Park conference on the "Undergraduate Climate". Under a new arrangement begun at Illinois in 1964/65, a space utilization office, termed the Central Office on the Use of Space, compiled the program in general consultation with the Main Library administration. Funds were then appropriated based on the program's estimated costs. The undergraduate library program was the first written under this new arrangement. Because of the unusual building departure there were also meetings between the library staff, the campus architect assigned by the chief university architect and representatives of the physical plant.²⁵

The following construction timetable was the one proposed in the program. A delay of approximately two years in construction occurred, however.

"Approve Definitive Design	July 1965
Complete Construction Documents	Jan. 1966
Complete Review and Corrections	Feb. 1966
Receive Bids	Mar. 1966
Award Construction Contracts	Apr. 1966
Complete Construction	Aug. 1967
Occupancy	Sep. 1967" ²⁶

Determining the Form of the Library

The factors that influence the form an undergraduate library will take are diverse. In addition to the ever-present one of financing,

they depend heavily on the local situation and the approach of its planners. Among the most important general factors to be considered are:

- (1) Available site (if a new building) or an available older building (if remodeling is decided upon).
- (2) Question of juxtaposition with the main or central library as a back-up resource.
- (3) Geographic dispersion of the campus and its influence on need.
- (4) Accessibility to student living quarters and classrooms.
- (5) Facilities shared with other campus departments or services.
- (6) Maximum collection capacity.
- (7) Seating capacity.
- (8) Expansion.

The greatest number of undergraduate libraries in separate structures on the central campus are located immediately adjacent to or within reasonable walking distance of the main library. Distances range from a few hundred feet to several blocks. Those at greater distances are admittedly located for maximum student convenience and service. With access by students emphasized, the ideal site for undergraduate libraries is definitely on or at the mainstreams of student pedestrian traffic.²⁷

The following selected comments by library planners on several of these factors should illustrate some of the considerations or serve as take-off points for discussion:

Texas

"Selection of a site was not a problem since it existed along a main foot traffic route, between the Student Union Building and the Main Library, on ground partially occupied by a condemned building and partially open space for a building."

"We erred in planning for reserve books, expecting that books on open shelves would receive preference to closed shelf reserves. This has not proved to be the case because faculty preference, better control, larger classes, etc., have combined to make adequate storage space for closed reserve books a very real problem."

"We refer to (and so far as I know will continue to refer to) three floors of this Academic Center and Undergraduate Library Building as the Undergraduate Library. We knew early in planning that 'Undergraduate Library' was something of a misnomer because physical space requirements as well as economy in operations forced us to locate graduate closed reserve there and that ease of access would make it popular as a place to study."

"More recently, space requirements have found that like Michigan our Education and Psychology Collection has had²⁸ to be located there temporarily, but we hope not beyond 1970."

Nebraska

"The physical structure, arrangement and location of the building (Nebraska Hall), and the academic level of the students which would be served were prime factors considered in determining the final form of the library. Two floors, 30,000 sq. ft. each, in a strong, modular warehouse type building were assigned to us. The floors were enormously strong; the ceilings were relatively low; and everything else was in bare cement. We developed a central book stack on both floors, with an interior stairway; a second floor desk and service center; and surrounded all this with continuous study hall."²⁹

University of California, Berkeley

"Moffitt's role is to meet undergraduate library needs which cannot be met adequately elsewhere. We are building well lighted, well ventilated, attractive space which can be used interchangeably and economically for books or for readers. It is located close to the Main Library. The underground separately entered classroom 'wing' is planned so that it can be economically converted to library space to accommodate either books or readers. Incidentally, the bulk of the building cannot be economically remodeled to offices or classrooms! The basic concept is an open stack with seating close at hand, not a series of seminar collections or gentleman's libraries. We see our clientele as mature and reasonably self-sufficient students who use the library as individuals."³⁰

Illinois

An unusual situation was faced at Illinois. Site studies pointed to the north-south mall directly east of the main library as an ideal location in relation to undergraduate classrooms and residence halls, as well as for access to central library resources. However, to maintain the openness of the mall and to avoid shading of venerable adjacent agricultural research plots, the new undergraduate library was placed underground.

The proposed building was to be twice as large originally. This was based on total library needs of the campus and the undergraduate library was to serve as a partial answer. Departmental libraries, however, wanted to add undergraduate seating space, and as these needs were answered, it was felt no longer necessary to have such a large library.³¹

Washington

"The proposed Undergraduate Library-Food Services Building will bring under the same roof two facilities whose relationship to each other consists largely in the fact that each will serve daily large numbers of students, the majority of whom are undergraduates and commuters. . . . It is hoped that skillful design will permit the addition of approximately 2,184 study stations within the library proper and approximately 960 seats for food service and conversation in a center which will enhance the intellectual and social life of the undergraduate."³²

"Outside of financing, the site had considerable influence. The Undergraduate Library is one building in a two building and parking garage development, thus architectural consideration played a major part in ultimate size and shape of the building."³³

British Columbia

"The design proposed by the architects is an ingenious solution to a seemingly insoluble problem; how to create an attractive new library facility, located where studies show it ought to be - that is, immediately west of the existing library - without destroying the traditional character of the treed Main Mall and adjacent lawns."

"The solution: construct the new library under the mall. This makes it possible to preserve all but one of the 40-year-old pin oaks [by use of concrete caissons] and the vistas they frame along UBC's main street."

"The architects wanted to create a light, open environment for learning, not just an underground knowledge vault . . . by designing the new library [so] that its east and west faces will open out into the landscaped courtyards in front of the Main Library and the mathematics building. Every room in the building will have an attractive view onto one or the other of these garden courts."³⁴

University of California, San Diego

The following comment by John Haak, Undergraduate Librarian, University of California, San Diego, is a good example of a newer approach to questions of size and dispersion:

"The Cluster Library plan overcomes some current patterns of organizing undergraduate libraries which I think questionable; first,

- (1) I am somewhat dubious of the long-range effectiveness of the form of organization which creates one centralized undergraduate library to serve an extremely large student population (20,000 and more) with a collection of two to three hundred thousand volumes and seating space for several thousand students. On fairly compact campuses, like Berkeley, perhaps there is no other choice. It seems to me that just because of the size of the library and the number of students passing through each day that there would be a very strong tendency in these monolithic undergraduate libraries to assume a formal character quite similar to the research library.
- (2) The location of a single undergraduate library is generally a compromise between accessibility to dorms and accessibility to classrooms. There is emerging a pattern of decentralization among undergraduate libraries in which a number of small satellite dormitory libraries are created. Dorm libraries are one means of overcoming the disadvantages of centralized undergraduate libraries near classrooms and also provide a more intimate place for study.

The cluster form of organization has the following advantages:

- (1) It mirrors the campus organizational plan.
- (2) Each cluster library will have a clientele of only ten thousand and will be serving a particular cluster of colleges. Such a library should be able to keep a feeling of intimacy as well as a flexibility in its adaptation of collections and services to the colleges it serves.
- (3) The cluster libraries will be central to both classrooms and dormitories.

- (4) The basic working collections of the cluster libraries will be convenient not only as undergraduate collections but as everyday working collections for faculty and graduate students."³⁵

The Role of the Undergraduate Librarian in Planning

North Carolina

"The Undergraduate Librarian was in fact appointed about four years before we got into the building. Once assigned, he had a great deal of authority for the planning and direction of the work. Now that we are in the building, the present Undergraduate Librarian has present responsibility for all aspects of planning and growth in that Library. He reports to me as a department head and I hold him responsible."³⁶

Illinois

Lucien White, Associate Director for Public Services, had the planning responsibility, but worked with four undergraduate librarians along the way. Illinois had an undergraduate library in the main building for some years previously, thus a training ground for librarians was readily available.³⁷

Texas

The first undergraduate librarian was appointed September 1959, but eventually concentrated primarily on building the book collection.

"With a small staff working at book selection, acquisition, and cataloging, a working collection was ready by the time the building was occupied. . . . The present Undergraduate Librarian is a department head, reporting to the Associate Librarian in Charge of Public Services, who has planning and growth responsibilities to the extent her budget will support."³⁸

Nebraska

"The Undergraduate Librarian we now have has seen the project all the way through. In many respects, it is 'his library'."³⁹

The foregoing remarks cover four situations where undergraduate librarians could and did assume varying responsibility for the project. At other institutions, the first undergraduate librarian of the new building was not hired during the early planning process, but came "on board" a year or two before the completion of construction. In still others, the undergraduate librarian must come in cold to a situation not of his making.

Viewed from personal experience, an undergraduate librarian who arrives early enough in the planning process can be of significant assistance to the central library administration and to a successful operation. Such a person provides concentrated supervision on the building under construction, on activation matters and operating policies. He or she can serve as a focal point for design questions, furnishings and purchasing coordination, interior layout, preparation of guides, handbooks and directories, mechanical problems, etc. Since he or she will be responsible for a smoothly running operation, personnel aspects of the new building are a natural area of concentration.

A welcome planning aid would be preparation of a position appointment schedule to help answer such questions as when the first

staff members for the new operation will be hired and what their pre-activation responsibilities will be.

Planning Checklists

A time schedule can usefully be enlarged beyond personnel appointments to cover other highlight dates. These could include such items as installation of furnishings, partial acceptance of the building for staff working space, dates of occupancy, physical transfers of collections, special tours, actual opening plans and dedication ceremonies. In any case, these should offer guidelines for planning, not oppressive deadlines. "Murphy's Law", unhappily, works well in building planning; if something can be delayed, it will be delayed.

If time schedules are helpful, so also would be a checklist of planning points that should be considered during the total process from start to finish. This could be similar, in effect, to the architect-contractor's "punch-list" normally used at the end of construction to verify that all is in accordance with the contract. A contract "punch-list", however, falls at the tail-end of the planning process. A checklist such as suggested would serve as a starting point and could extend beyond the program to policy matters, operating decisions, etc.

An approach toward such a list was developed by Howard

Rovelstad, Director of Libraries, University of Maryland, for the new undergraduate library at Maryland. It is termed "Topics of Decision" and was circulated to his department heads for comment and opinions early in the planning process. While it has value in involving others in planning details, it also permits active consideration of such major concerns as layout, staffing, building design, traffic patterns, etc.

A copy of this outline is included with the thought that participants in the Institute may wish to pencil in comparative decisions or comments on their own buildings. These could then be used for open discussion. What would be particularly helpful is an opportunity to consider arguments pro or con on the more significant topics.

* * * * *

The author is grateful to the many librarians whose letters, comments and questionnaire answers provided the illustrative data used in compiling this working paper. A special note of thanks is extended to Melvin Voigt and John Haak, University of California, San Diego, for their assistance with the questionnaire, and to Howard Rovelstad for forwarding his "Topics of Decision" list as an aid to the author and the Institute.

A Suggested Personal Checklist for Planners

The following items are suggested as ones requiring varying degrees of consideration in undergraduate library planning. Some do not always receive the attention they deserve; in general, they expand the scope of the Maryland checklist. They do not appear in any order of priority, nor do they pretend to be comprehensive. Discussion in more detail is intended at the Institute.

1. Project continuity: Who will be responsible?
2. Pre-activation staff?
3. Personnel: the Undergraduate Librarian; appointment schedule of staff?
4. Collection particulars?
5. Classification arrangement?
6. Will the building be shared?
7. Expansion?
8. Special cost factors?
9. Furnishings and the bid procedure?
10. Special furnishing design, special equipment?
11. Activation duty staff?
12. Transfer of the collection?

13. Food, beverage service?
14. Smoking?
15. Keying?
16. Fire, safety regulations; effects on planning?
17. Equipment and supplies for staff during immediate pre- and post-opening periods?
18. Handicapped students: access, facilities?
19. The "necessity" of audio?
20. Automation?
21. Hours of opening?
22. Policies of use: circulation, reference, audio?
23. Use of building by others for brief periods?
24. Publications, directories, signing?
25. Consideration of donors?
26. Maintenance?

There are other major factors not covered in the foregoing simply because they are available for comparative purposes in the literature and also because they depend in large part on the local situation. A brief summary appears on the next page.

A Summary of Major Planning Factors (and Selected Building Facts)*

Buildings

- Flexible buildings for a flexible future.
- Popularity of modular design.
- The question of older buildings.
- How large can a central building become?

Size

- Largest two separate buildings: Texas (211,473 gross sq. ft.) and University of Michigan (145,036 gross sq. ft.)
- Net assignable square feet ranges from Texas (100,400 sq. ft.) to South Carolina (40,000 sq. ft.)

Collection

- Present libraries (1968): ranges from Harvard (147,600 volumes) to South Carolina (45,000 volumes).
- Maximum capacity: ranges from UCLA (200,000 volumes) to South Carolina (85,000 volumes).

Seating

- Ranges: Wisconsin (2,700) to South Carolina (600).
- How important is the ratio of seating in the undergraduate library to total campus need?

Dual Occupancy

- Problems and potentials of shared buildings.

Costs

- Project costs vary tremendously throughout the country.
- After completion, what of operating budget? Ranges (1967-68): Michigan (\$370,000), Stanford (\$295,000), Cornell (\$188,534), South Carolina (\$69,876).

* Facts are quoted from: Muller, Robert H. "The Undergraduate Library Trend at Large Universities." Advances in Librarianship, Vol. 1, Academic Press, New York, 1970.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography (General)

- Braden, Irene A. (1970) "The Undergraduate Library." ACRL Monograph No. 31, American Library Association, Chicago.
- Muller, Robert H. (1970) "The Undergraduate Library Trend at Large Universities." Advances in Librarianship, Vol. 1, Academic Press, New York.
[Note especially page 120, section on "New Dimensions".]
- Kuhn, Warren B. (1969) "Undergraduate Libraries in a University." Library Trends, Vol. 18, No. 2, 188-209.

[Each of these includes additional readings which run the gamut from the philosophy of undergraduate libraries to published accounts of specific projects.]

* * * * *

Bibliography (Planning the Undergraduate Library)

1. Wagman, Frederick H. Program for an Undergraduate Library. The University of Michigan, the University Library, February 1, 1955.
2. Worden, Helen M. Moffitt Undergraduate Library. Memorandum dated March 24, 1965.
3. Stanford PACE Program. (A \$100 Million Plan of Action for a Challenging Era.) An Undergraduate Library for Stanford University. [1963]
4. Ibid.
5. Braden, Irene A. "The Undergraduate Library, The University of Texas." The Undergraduate Library, ACRL Monograph No. 31, American Library Association, Chicago, 1970.
6. Branscomb, Lewis C. Letter dated April 23, 1970.
7. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Undergraduate Library. (Brochure). [1969]

8. University of California, Berkeley. Report of the Library Committee for the Academic Year, 1958-59.
9. Stanford University. Report of the Undergraduate Library Committee, November 1957.
10. Haak, John R. University of California, San Diego. (Reply to questionnaire) April 1970.
11. Lundy, Frank A. University of Nebraska, Lincoln. (Reply to questionnaire) April 1970.
12. Ohio State University, Columbus. (Reply to questionnaire) April 1970.
13. Orne, Jerrold. Letter dated May 8, 1970.
14. Wagman, Frederick H. The Library Situation and the Program of Plant Expansion. University of Michigan, General Library, November 3, 1954.
15. Metcalf, Keyes D. Planning Academic and Research Library Buildings. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965.
16. Folmer, Fred. Letter dated April 7, 1970.
17. Orne. Op cit.
18. University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill. Final Program (1966). Robert B. House Undergraduate Library.
19. Lundy. Op cit.
20. Allen, Kenneth S. The Requirements for the Construction, Staffing and Stocking of an Undergraduate Library at the University of Washington. (Original program, January 26, 1960) - and - (Reply to questionnaire) April 1970.
21. Michigan State University Library. A Report to the Board of of Trustees. June 15, 1961.
22. Chapin, Richard E. A Library Program for Present Needs and Future Growth. Summary. Michigar State University, December 17, 1962.

23. Michigan State University. Report from the President's Ad Hoc Committee on the Library. October 1964.
24. Building Program for Michigan State University Library. Addition and Remodeling. March 1965.
25. White, Lucien W. Interview on April 28, 1970.
26. University of Illinois, Urbana, Central Office on the Use of Space. Program Statement: Undergraduate Library, Phase I. March 1965.
27. Kuhn, Warren B. "Undergraduate Libraries in a University." Library Trends, Vol. 18, No. 2. October 1969.
28. Folmer. Op cit.
29. Lundy. Op cit.
30. Worden. Letter to Dr. Robert H. Muller dated February 27, 1968.
31. White. Op cit.
32. Allen, Kenneth S. "Proposed Undergraduate Library-Food Services Building, University of Washington, Seattle." American Library Association, 1967 Library Buildings Institute, Buildings Committee for College and University Libraries. June 5, 1967.
33. University of Washington. (Reply to questionnaire) Op cit.
34. University of British Columbia Reports, Vol. 15, No. 18. October 9, 1969.
35. Haak. Op cit.
36. Orne. Op cit.
37. White. Op cit.
38. Folmer. Op cit.
39. Lundy. Op cit.

APPENDIX A

1

April 4, 1966

To: Heads of Departments and other administrative units
 From: Director of Libraries
 Re: Undergraduate Library

With official approval of the Undergraduate Library project, it is time to begin thinking ahead to the planning of the building. The attached outline covers topics on which decisions will need to be made prior to actual planning. You are asked to comment, in the spaces provided, on any or all of the headings; particularly in readers' service areas it would be desirable to elicit the comments of your subordinates. Please sign below and return to me by May 1.

In the 1965 Report recommending the construction of an undergraduate library a number of decisions were, in effect, made; please bear them in mind while preparing your comments:

1. The Technical Services unit of the McKeldin Library will take care of acquisition and cataloguing to approximately the extent it does now for the Engineering and Physical Sciences Library.
2. The floor area of the building is to be approximately 180,000 sq. ft. (The total floor area of the McKeldin Library, including mezzanine levels, is 191,000 sq. ft.)
3. The total shelving capacity is to 200,000 volumes. (The total shelving capacity of the McKeldin Library is slightly under 1,000,000 volumes.)
4. The building is to seat 4,000 readers. (The McKeldin Library seats about 2,000.)
5. The collections are to support the undergraduate programs in all fields. It is expected that advanced undergraduates will need to make considerable use of other campus libraries and that no student will be excluded from any campus library.

A building such as must be planned differs from what most of us are accustomed to in the way of library buildings because of its relatively large seating capacity and its relatively small book capacity.

Signature: _____
 Department or
 administrative
 unit: _____

THE UNDERGRADUATE LIBRARY
TOPICS FOR DECISION

A. LOCATION

B. COLLECTIONS

1. Periodicals

2. Reference works

3. Microforms

4. Phonorecords

5. Government publications

6. Art materials

7. Audio-visual materials (primarily for instruction)

8. Maps

9. Other materials

C. ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION

1. Division of public service (by form? by subject? by activity? other or combination?)

2. If two departments--Circulation and Reference--what division of duties

3. Reserves for classes--how placed in hierarchy

4. Publicity and exhibits

5. Receiving and shipping

6. Responsibility for maintenance of card catalogs

7. Other aspects

D. HOUSING THE COLLECTIONS

1. The main collection (i.e., circulating books and bound periodicals)
 - a. Separation or integration of books and bound periodicals

 - b. Integrated or adjacent reading and shelf areas

 - c. If clearly defined shelf areas, open or closed or a combination (and should open areas, if any, be capable of being closed--and vice versa)

D. 1 (cont.)

d. Relationship to other areas (loan and/or reference)

e. Shelving

f. Other aspects

2. Browsing Room or other area for recreational reading

3. Other housing problems (e.g., special rooms, "alcoves," etc.)

E. CIRCULATION

1. Centralized or decentralized

2. If centralized, check-out stations or a single long counter (or combination)

3. Provision for book return and financial settlement

4. Offices and work areas

5. Other aspects

F. RESERVES FOR CLASSES

1. A separate service, as at McKeldin, or decentralized
2. If a separate service, provision for preparation, shelving, and service
3. Other aspects

G. REFERENCE SERVICE

1. Division (if any) by subject and/or form
2. Provision of service other than in "reference room"
 - a. At catalog
 - b. In shelf areas
 - c. For persons entering building
 - d. At other points
3. Library instruction, provisions for (including class projects)
4. Secondary responsibilities, if any, e.g., periodicals, phonorecords, etc.

G (cont.)

5. Shelving, seating, etc. (in reference "rooms" as such)

6. Offices and work areas

7. Other aspects

H. PROVISIONS FOR STUDY

1. Relation to consultation and inquiry areas

2. Extent of supervision

3. Seating, tables, etc.

4. Relationship to shelf areas

5. Special provisions

a. For typing

b. For smoking

c. For group study

d. For study when the library as a whole is not open

I. SPECIAL PROVISION, IF ANY, FOR FACULTY

J. STAFF AREAS (OTHER THAN AS ALREADY NOTED)

1. Administrative suite
2. Provision for receiving, sorting, etc., various types of materials
3. Staff restrooms, lounges, kitchen, etc.
4. Student assistants' facilities

K. MISCELLANEOUS

1. Exhibit facilities (preparation and display), signs, and directories
2. Duplication service
3. Public lockers, coat racks, etc.
4. Stairs, elevators, etc.
5. Wall finishes, floor coverings, etc.
6. Lighting and ventilation
7. Exterior of building, grounds, parking facilities

L. OTHER ASPECTS AND/OR OVERALL COMMENT (Over)