

Rockefeller University

Digital Commons @ RU

Historical Documents, Letters, Publications

Library History

1977

The Rockefeller University Library, 1980-2005

Sonya Mirsky

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.rockefeller.edu/historical-documents-letters-publications>

THE ROCKEFELLER UNIVERSITY LIBRARY, 1980-2005.

Prepared by: Sonya Wohl Mirsky
Librarian

December 1, 1977

"Academic libraries do not exist in isolation: they draw their meaning and function from the nature of the parent institution. Although their central goal of supporting teaching and research, with an occasional nod at public service, remains fairly constant, the type of institution, the size, and the ways in which the library carries out its goals have changed decidedly in the past twenty-five years. Very likely most institutions will change even more significantly in the next two decades... A good healthy skepticism toward gazes in one's crystal ball is, therefore, in order... Thus, one should approach carefully predictions about higher education's future and even more carefully predictions about the academic library in that future."

Edward G. Holley, What Lies Ahead for Academic Libraries? In: Herbert Poole, ed., Academic Libraries by the Year 2000, New York: R. R. Bowker, 1977, pp. 7-8.

The Rockefeller University Library, from its inception, has been a service agency in support of the University's research and educational programs. The Library is thus not an end in itself. In this respect it differs from the national libraries and from resource libraries which, in part at least, in their endeavors to preserve knowledge in great collections, are ends in themselves. The Library has the same *raison d'etre* as the University of which it is part, and exists for the sake of furthering, rather than originating, the programs and goals of the University.

Some general obligations or aspects of this task are clearly defined:

1. To provide the books, periodicals and related materials needed in connection with the research and educational programs.
2. To provide conveniently arranged and reasonably comfortable physical facilities, such as reading rooms, carrels, etc.
3. To devise more effective ways of facilitating the use of the materials and services provided.
4. To provide direction, guidance and assistance in locating information required.

In sum, the Library must provide the materials required, must remove as far as possible all barriers in the effective use of these materials, and must facilitate the flow of infor-

mation. Around this central obligation is a fringe of other duties, including the preservation of archival materials, rare books, service to alumni, etc. As useful and important as some of these are, they are not part of the main obligation.

The Library has reached a critical stage in its development. Within the next 3-4 years the collection of books and periodicals will have outgrown the existing physical facilities available in Welch Hall. Every square inch of this building is in active use either as reading room space or as stack space. In 1973-1974 Welch Hall was renovated to provide additional facilities for approximately a five-year period, in anticipation of construction of a new library building. If the present rate of growth continues, and there are no reasons to think that it will change significantly in the next few years, these additional facilities will be filled to full capacity by 1980-1981.

There are five options available to the University for consideration in dealing with this problem:

1. A new library building.
2. Renovation of the interior and/or exterior of Welch Hall.
3. Renovation of the former Animal Facility buildings.
4. Altering the collection, by redefining the content and/or changing the form of the holdings.
5. Decentralization of the collection.

Some of these options are not mutually exclusive.

Before turning to a discussion of these options, some basic library matters should be enumerated and discussed. These will then assist in formulating and evaluating the choice and scope of the changes being described. How large should the Library be? What should the Library buy? How is the Library used? What are the costs of library service?

How large should the Library be?

As of October 1, 1977, the Rockefeller University Library contains approximately 179,000 volumes of books and periodicals.

The usual measurement of any library's effectiveness is how many volumes it contains. The simplicity of this measure has led to an emphasis on the mere size of a collection which is out of all proportion to the significance of the fact. Apart from a tendency to rank libraries according to the number of their volumes and the pressure of accrediting agencies, the feeling that every volume contains something of value and should be preserved has been responsible for policies of gross accumulation. This is a dangerous argument because of the kernel of truth it contains: yesteryear's scientific research is this year's historical data. At the same time, that volumes are not used in one, two, or ten years is no proof that they are not needed. For one reason or another, volumes which readers seem to have passed by come back into circulation.

The question of size ultimately comes down to the question

of this Library's function. Although there may be an upper limit to the proper size of this Library, it would be difficult to determine, and would probably be debatable. Several points which are not debatable are:

1. The desirability of eliminating purely numerical goals in either direction.
2. Continual removal of volumes which have clearly ceased to be of value.
3. Expansion only on the basis of need and actual use.

The Library has had and implemented a policy covering these points since 1968.

1. No volumes have been added or discarded merely for the sake of body-count.
2. The collection is weeded annually to remove duplicates older than 5 years, originally purchased to satisfy immediate needs, and which are not in active use currently.
3. All books and periodicals being considered for purchase are evaluated in terms of the research and educational programs of the University.

The Rockefeller University Library grows in size every year, but at a significantly lower rate than the national average. The average academic library doubles in size every 14 years. Based on the average annual increases in the past

10 years, the Rockefeller University Library doubles in size every 18.5 years. While this would seem to indicate that the need for space for growth is less pressing for this library than for others, this is offset by the immediacy of the need for space.

What should the Library buy?

The acquisitions policy of the Rockefeller University Library is well-defined: the Library seeks to obtain, through purchase, exchange and gift, all books, periodicals and reference services which further and support the research and educational needs of its faculty and students. This policy is implemented by the Librarian in cooperation with members of the faculty.

Since this Library is not a national or resource library, it is easy to frame a policy in general terms. However, such general statements are not very helpful when one comes to particulars. The Librarian has been at the University 28 years and has made a point of following the scope and range of research by reading the publications from the University's laboratories. She is able to select 90% of the titles required, conferring with faculty and/or waiting for faculty recommendations for those titles about which she is undecided. However, this is an anomaly and it is unlikely that future Acquisitions Librarians will be able to fill this position in quite the same way. At that time, in common with most academic libraries, the Acquisitions Librarian will have the responsibility for the purchasing program, allocating

funds in accordance with actual needs of the subject specialties, with a greater reliance on faculty involvement, either individually or as a library committee.

Thus, unless there is a significant change in the range and scope of the University's programs or in the nature of the library itself, it is to be expected that the acquisitions policy will remain substantially the same as the present one.

How is the Library used?

In an effort to determine the extent to which the Library is performing its intended functions, two surveys, to determine who uses the Library and how the Library is used, have been conducted since 1965. After careful analysis, both surveys were found to be of limited value as objective measures. While it was possible to reach some qualitative conclusions, efforts to determine quantitative measures were found to be impossible without seriously disrupting the library user. For example, circulation of books and periodicals were easily counted by saving charge cards as materials were returned. However, since the Library is open-stacked, there was no way of counting the use of volumes in the Library without either closing the stacks or requiring that volumes be returned to a central point, which in turn would have created a backlog of shelving, making volumes unavailable to the next user. In either case, it was decided that the information which would be derived was hardly worth the probable disruption.

The following general conclusions were reached:

1. Analysis of the circulation records showed that most faculty, all students, and some (relatively few) employees borrow books and periodicals. 22-23,000 volumes are borrowed per year.
2. Faculty and students prefer to do their own reference work, turning to library staff only after their own efforts fail.
3. Analysis of interlibrary loan transactions showed that while many make use of this service, a significant number make direct use of libraries in neighboring institutions (Cornell University Medical College and Memorial-Sloan Kettering Cancer Center) instead of the service. Rockefeller University Library has a reciprocity agreement with both libraries for reference use of each other's collections. Approximately 1000 items are borrowed from other libraries per year.
4. In analyzing the interlibrary loan requests, it was found that rarely did we encounter multiple requests for the same book or for articles from the same periodical. This indicates that in general the Library is acquiring the books and periodicals needed by the faculty and students. Multiple requests are reported to the Librarian for evaluation

for purchase.

5. The photocopy service is heavily used by faculty and students. Approximately 300,000 copy-pages are produced per year.
6. Faculty and students use the Library as a study hall, not for the use of any materials but for the quiet and seclusion provided; i.e., to escape interruptions, particularly the telephone, while thinking or writing. The Library is open 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. It is used not only by our own faculty and students but also by those of our neighboring institutions whose libraries close by midnight.

The surveys also revealed some features the Library lacks:

1. Study rooms. While the Library has sufficient carrels, it has no study rooms for persons doing library work over an extended period.
2. Conference room(s). An interest was indicated in having at least 1 room in the Library where a small group could meet to discuss matters requiring referral to library materials.
3. Air-conditioning. Library staff offices and 2 rooms in the Library are air-conditioned during the summer months. All other areas are not. The stacks and the 2 large reading rooms become un-

bearably hot during the summer.

4. Elevator service. The Library has a reliable, but old-fashioned elevator. It is reliable in the sense that it rarely breaks down. However, it has no memory feature and responds to one call at a time, sometimes leaving a person waiting for some time before it responds to a particular call. Also, it is often difficult, especially if one is carrying volumes from floor to floor, to open the elevator gate and the floor-door, to get in or out. Bruised arms and damaged volumes occur with some regularity.

What are the costs of library service?

The firm basis for determining what the Library budget should be is a calculation of the actual costs involved in providing effective library service. This is a more satisfactory method than any arbitrary standard; i.e., a given percentage of total University expenditures, a specified dollar-amount per library user, etc. It is therefore important to know, as precisely as possible, what the costs of library service are. Each year these costs are calculated, based on the previous fiscal year's operation, for the preparation of the next year's budget.

Aside from the prices of books and of subscriptions of periodicals, which, being outside of the control of the librarian, are imponderables in a management sense, the costs of the functions performed and the services rendered during FY-77 are:

Acquisitions (per title)	Labor	\$3.01	
	Supplies	.28	
	Total		\$3.29
Cataloging (per title)	Labor	\$7.02	
	Rental MAG-TYP	.32	
	Supplies	.55	
	Total		\$7.89
Circulation	Labor	\$1.97	
	Supplies	.25	
	Total		\$2.22
Interlibrary Loan (per transaction)	Labor	\$1.70	
	Rental TWX	1.55	
	Supplies	.17	
	MLC Exchange	1.09	
	Total		\$4.51
Photocopy Service (per copy-page)	Labor	\$.03	
	Rental COPIER	.02	
	Copier-use charges	.01	
	Supplies	.01	
	Total		\$.07

It is to be noted that these figures do not include the costs of capital investments in equipment (typewriters, calculators, etc.) and furniture (desks, chairs, files, etc.) or the cost of university support functions (energy, purchasing service, etc.). They represent the operational costs of performing library functions and services within a given year only.

As can be seen, library service is labor intensive. This is less so than it was even ten years ago. Mechanization of various procedures has ameliorated the situation. As an example, prior to 1966, when the Library rented its first IBM Magnetic-Selectric-Tape typewriter, the Cataloging Section had 4 typist-clerks producing catalog cards at a cost of approximately \$24,000 per year,

with a backlog of 2 months in cataloging a new title. In 1977 the salaries of 4 typist-clerks would come to \$30,000. At present, this section has 1 typist-clerk and an IBM Magnetic-Selectric-Card typewriter at a total cost of \$11,112 per year, with a backlog of 36 hours in cataloging a new title. Admittedly, this is an extreme example. However, it shows dramatically what can be accomplished not only in terms of costs but in terms of service as well.

In general, it can be stated that the Rockefeller University Library has been and is at present providing the appropriate books, periodicals and services needed by the faculty and students on a cost-effective basis.

The major problem facing the Library is one of upgrading its physical facilities in order to continue to house its books and periodicals and to provide necessary services. Owning books and periodicals, housed in a disorderly manner or stored in inaccessible locations, is almost as bad as not owning them at all. It affects every aspect of library services rendered to the faculty and students by the library staff. Often it makes it impossible for faculty and students to use the Library effectively when the library staff is not on duty. This is not a hypothetical description of the state of affairs under these conditions. For a number of years, prior to the renovation of 1973-1974, the Library functioned under just such conditions. Of course, at present the Library is not in this state. However, it is not

too soon to consider the University's options to avoid a crisis in the offing in 1980-1981.

As indicated earlier, the University has five basic options available for consideration: (1) a new library building, (2) renovation of Welch Hall, (3) renovation of the former Animal Facility buildings, (4) alteration of the content and/or form of the collection, and (5) decentralization of the collection.

Since some of these options are not mutually exclusive, additional possibilities are available by combination of two or even three of them.

It is a basic canon of library architecture that it is not economically feasible to build a new building or renovate an existing building unless it thereby be functional for at least 25 years. What are the probable characteristics of and requirements for the Library by the year 2005?

1. Since the Library collection doubles in size every 18.5 years, it will contain approximately 500,000 volumes.
2. If the population using the Library remains fairly stable, presently about 1500, seating capacity will be required for about 300.
3. Work and service areas will be required for a library staff of 20-25.
4. Conference rooms, study rooms, microform facilities, and space for library facilities and technologies

developed during the intervening 25 years will be required.

In terms of the five basic options, these characteristics and requirements translate into:

New library building.

A careful study has been made during the past few months of the library architecture literature, and of a number of recently constructed libraries, similar in size and scope to the Rockefeller University Library. Particular attention was paid to their characteristics and the economics of their construction and equipment. Since the Rockefeller University Library is both an academic and a research library, both types of libraries were studied. While no library was found that closely approximated our own configuration of needs and use, by carefully extracting from each salient features which did correspond, the composite picture indicates that a new library building will cost about \$10,000,000.

Aside from the cost of a new library building, its site on campus looms as a large question. Two possibilities are: (1) building over the FDR Drive, east of Welch Hall, and (2) the area to the south of Welch Hall, presently occupied by the Nurses Residence building. Indeed, this is an example of a possible combination of options: building a new library building contiguous with Welch Hall, and renovating and integrating Welch Hall with the new building, would result in a smaller and less costly new building. However, the cost of renovating Welch Hall,

and, if the second possible site were chosen, the cost of demolishing the Nurses Residence building would, in turn, be additional costs.

Renovation of Welch Hall.

It must be stated at the outset that renovation of Welch Hall, in and of itself, cannot solve the problems facing the Library. This option is only feasible in combination with one or two of the other options. We have already indicated one possibility: (1) renovation of Welch Hall + building a new library building. Others are: (2) renovation of Welch Hall + renovation of the former Animal Facility buildings; (3) renovation of Welch Hall + altering the form of the collection; i.e., converting all periodicals older than 25 years to microform; (4) a combination of (1) and (3); and, (5) a combination of (2) and (3).

The idea behind possibility (2) is to house books and periodicals published during the past 25 years in Welch Hall and house all others in an annex. The two buildings are not contiguous, but they are not very far apart, the equivalent of 1.5 city blocks, and are connected by a tunnel. This is not an overpowering disadvantage because of the difference between the way recent scientific literature is used in comparison with the older literature: studies have shown that, except for mathematics and organic chemistry, the use of scientific periodicals after five years approaches zero asymptotically. Therefore,

if, as proposed, five times the five-year-heavy-use period is made available in Welch Hall, the burden to the library user in having the older literature in an annex should be minimal.

Possibility (3) involves the miniaturization of the periodical collection older than 25 years. This would require, of course, the necessary equipment, reader-printers, to provide the library user with easy and comfortable access and hard-copy should it be required. Manufacturers of microforms quote a saving in space of 95%. However, we would qualify this statement with the observation that while it saves 95% in shelf space, it does not take into account the space needed for reader-printers, study space, storage cabinets, furniture, etc. If one includes these items, the saving in space comes closer to 75%, still a significant saving.

Renovation of the former Animal Facility buildings.

This option presents two possibilities: (1) renovation as an annex to Welch Hall, and (2) renovation to house the entire collection. The first possibility has been described above. The second possibility is excluded from consideration because the amount of space available in the buildings is too small:

North Animal House:	Floor A = 1915 sq. ft.
	Floor B = 4100 sq. ft.
	Floor C = 3712 sq. ft.
	Floor D = 983 sq. ft.

67th Street House:	Floor A = 4260 sq. ft.
	Floor B = 6184 sq. ft.
	Floor C = 2026 sq. ft.
	Floor D = 2363 sq. ft.

Total area available = 25,543 sq. ft.

This corresponds almost exactly with the area available at present in Welch Hall, 25,430 sq. ft.

The cost of renovation is approximately \$25 per square foot. Therefore, to renovate these buildings for library use would come to about \$650,000.

Alteration of content and/or form of the collection.

As has been indicated earlier in this report, the Rockefeller University Library weeds its collection annually to remove duplicates older than 5 years, originally purchased to satisfy immediate needs, and which are not in active use currently. As a result, the Library contains virtually no titles which are not needed, at least occasionally, by its faculty and students. Therefore, any decision to alter the content of the collection would involve a drastic revision of the policy to provide on site the materials needed for research or education by the faculty and students. That is, conceivably, it could be decided to house only actively-used titles, depending on interlibrary loan access to resource libraries in the area for the older and little-used titles. Such a policy would be extremely difficult to implement on an objective basis since, as stated earlier, we have no objective measures of need or use. In addition, this policy would not result in any savings, in a monetary sense, since interlibrary loans are relatively expensive on a systematic basis.

On the other hand, alteration of the form of the collection

presents a number of avenues of approach. The vast proliferation of publication in the sciences has resulted in changes in the manner of current publication: a significant number of publishers are now publishing periodicals both in the conventional way and in microform, either microfilm or microfiche. Libraries have turned to microform holdings to alleviate crowding on shelves and to avoid the cost of binding. This is one possibility for this Library. Another is miniaturization of the older periodicals, rather than the current volumes. Since the older volumes are relatively little used, the space they occupy consumes a disproportionate share of the available space as storage-space as opposed to use-space. In other words, it is proposed that periodicals older than 25 years be stored in microform and be made available by means of reader-printers. This would release primary shelf space to periodicals in active use.

Even if the Rockefeller University Library does not do this as an integral part of the options available, it will have to put a number of titles in microform in order to preserve them. Fully one-fifth of the periodicals currently housed in the basement core stacks of Welch Hall have deteriorated over the years to the point of having a fictional existence: to open them is to break the binding and to turn the pages is to reduce the volume to a mass of loose leaves.

Many scientific periodicals in microform are available commercially at a cost of approximately \$6 per volume on microfilm

and approximately \$9 per volume on microfiche. If all the volumes older than 25 years were put in microform, it would cost about \$650,000. To provide for the "fictional" volumes only would cost about \$135,000.

Decentralization of the collection.

This option is included for the sake of completeness; i.e. to indicate that consideration has been given to it. Implementation of this option would frustrate the library user, render library service inefficient, and would be, in the long run, the most expensive of all the options available.

If 4 or 5 locations for subject-area libraries could be found on campus - none are apparent at present - and if a consensus could be reached on how to divide the collection, the periodicals budget and the library staff budget would have to be increased at least two-fold. Since there are no departments at the University, and laboratories in the same subject-area are located in 2, and in some cases 3, different buildings, any one location of a subject-area library would be arbitrary from the library user's point of view. Also, the division of the collection would create a need for multiple copies of a significant number of titles. Maintaining service for a number of satellite libraries would be expensive. While acquisitions and cataloging would remain centralized, all other functions would be local and would require staffing. Indeed, even though cataloging would be centralized, it would be necessary to produce 4-5 catalogs in addi-

tion to the main catalog.

At present the periodical budget is \$142,500 and the library staff budget is \$200,000. If the Library had been decentralized during 1977, it would have cost approximately an additional \$342,500. Even if costs did not increase - which is highly improbable - this represents \$8,562,500 in 25 years. To this figure must be added the cost of establishing and maintaining satellite libraries, bringing the total cost of decentralization of the collection significantly above the cost of a new library building.

In sum, this is a negative option, representing a step backward in terms of library service and efficiency.

We wish to end this report on a positive note, rather than a negative one, by recommending the direction which seems to us to be a productive and cost-effective way to proceed:

1. Renovation of Welch Hall. \$650,000
2. Renovation of the former Animal Facility buildings as an annex to Welch Hall. \$650,000
3. Miniaturization of the periodicals collection over a period of time.
 - a. Replacing "fictional" titles with microforms. \$135,000
 - b. Replacing periodicals older than 25 years with microforms. \$675,000
 - c. Establish an on-going program of replacing periodicals with microforms at 5-year intervals. \$22,500/yr.

Interpreted in terms of projected years of growth:

$$1 + 2 = 18.5 \text{ years } (\$1,300,000 = \$70,270/\text{yr.})$$

$$1 + 2 + 3a = 25 \text{ years } (\$1,435,000 = \$57,400/\text{yr.})$$

$$1 + 2 + 3a + 3b = 40 \text{ years } (\$1,975,500 = \$49,375/\text{yr.})$$

$$1 + 2 + 3a + 3b + 3c = 60 \text{ years } (\$3,325,000 = \$55,416/\text{yr.})$$

Thus, in terms of cost per year of space provided, a plan incorporating the renovation of Welch Hall, the renovation of the former Animal Facility buildings, and the miniaturization of all periodicals older than 25 years, including the "fictional" titles, seems to be the optimal arrangement. However, is it valid to try to make predictions about the Library for a 40-year span? The longer the span of time the less likely that any plan will fulfill the assumptions about the future of the Library, which are, at best, "educated guesses".

Therefore, we would recommend that, since the "fictional" titles are needed by the faculty and students, the plan combining their miniaturization with the renovation of Welch Hall and the former Animal Facility buildings is the one that would be most adaptable to variations in goals and technologies in the years to come. At some later time, should conditions require it, miniaturization of the entire periodical collection might be considered.