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1. Introductory Remarks

In the nineteen sixties the University of British Columbia Library attained maturity.

To recall the nineteen fifties is to remember a library largely confined to a single unfinished structure, containing fewer than half a million volumes.

At the beginning of this new decade, the Library is no single entity, but a network of dispersed and specialized units, containing a million and a quarter volumes and a wide variety of other materials essential to learning and research.

Increase in size, however, is not the only measure of progress. As evidence of its growing importance and utility, the Library could point to a 320% increase in borrowing, compared with an increase of 79% in student members in the same period. In 1960/61, 38 loans per student were recorded; in 1969/70, 90. As an indication of the University's own concern for its Library, comparative budget figures can be cited: they show an increase of 471%, representing a larger share of the University's operating budget, 7.6% compared with 4.2% ten years ago.

Unfortunately, the satisfaction that these developments bring must be tempered by other less attractive realities. Impressive though the Library's achievements might be, they continue to be outstripped by the requirements of students and faculty members, and the collections and the staff of the Library have outgrown the physical capacities of many parts of the library system. It is a plain fact that great numbers of users in the nineteen seventies will find themselves increasingly inconvenienced by the Library's inability to meet
demands which assume the existence of accommodations which are simply not there, and which may not be there in the future. There are few difficulties which in one way or the other do not relate to a shortage of space: this is the Library's major problem, one that only large capital expenditures can solve.

Nevertheless, given the determination of students, faculty and library staff to realize for the University a uniformly high standard of service, the next decade should not be one of successive disappointments and failures, but of further achievement.
11. The Physical Library

In 1960 the Walter Koerner wing of the Main Library was completed; within its walls were taking place changes in the organization of services which pointed the way to the future. What had been a single reference division was being divided into a number of new divisions, each adapted to the requirements of a particular group of users. Divisions for the humanities, social sciences and sciences were created, joining already existing divisions for the fine arts and biomedical sciences. The numerous accumulations of rare books and collections were gathered together in a new Special Collections Division, while an Asian Studies Division was formed around recently acquired oriental collections. For growing numbers of undergraduates, a College Library opened its doors. And the Curriculum Laboratory, then located in the Main Library, initiated a trend toward decentralization by moving into the old Faculty Club, adjacent to the new Education Building.

Specialization and decentralization of library collections and services, under a centralized administration, was the story of the sixties. Within the Main Library, over a period of a decade, new divisions for maps, government documents, microforms, recordings, collection development, orientation and systems were set up. Around the campus, branch libraries were organized for mathematics, ecology, social work, forestry and agriculture. In 1963 the Law Library and the Biomedical Library became part of the developing network, and in 1969 this system was extended to include over thirty departmental reading rooms, operated jointly with the departments concerned through a Reading Rooms Division.

These developments were not accidental, but the result of considered policy
and careful planning. As early as 1962, the University Librarian called for a 1970 capacity for 1,200,000 volumes and 6,000 users in "substantial branches of the University Library in locations convenient to those departments that would use them, and in reading rooms and study halls in academic buildings being newly erected." To provide the framework of policy necessary for growth in this direction, the Senate Library Committee worked for two years on the document Policies Governing the Establishment and Growth of Branch Libraries and Reading Rooms Outside the Main Library Building, approved by Senate in 1965. In keeping with this policy, a Plan for Future Services was produced in 1966, and in a second revised edition in 1969.

The realization of the Plan is a continuing objective for the Library. The addition to the Woodward Biomedical Library, formally opened on June 10, 1970, marked the completion of the University's first and only major branch library; with seating for 800 users and shelving for 180,000 volumes, it serves as a model for future large branches for the sciences and education. During the past year, work on plans for the new Sedgwick Undergraduate Library proceeded quickly. In October, the Board of Governors approved the proposals of the architects for a two-story structure located under the Main Mall, and in April they approved the preliminary drawings. Contractors for the project were appointed in June, to work with the architects during the final stages of planning and estimating. Construction was scheduled to begin in the fall of 1970 and to finish in the spring of 1972.

Nevertheless, the rate at which physical facilities have been expanded has not been swift enough. This should come as no surprise to Senate. In the Librarian's Annual Report, the warning has been sounded often enough: in 1963/64, one reads "Further decentralization ... must proceed apace or the
Main Library will become an obstacle to the use of books."; in 1964/65, "...the increased rate of acquisitions will cause the book collections to overflow existing stack areas in ... the Main Library"; in 1965/66, "a critical shortage of space exists now, and in the absence of early and radical solutions, the situation will be unmanageable inside of two years"; and just last year, "...thousands of books will have to go into storage."

For the next year and a half, until the new Sedgewick Library is completed, students will be subject to seating shortages more acute than those experienced by their predecessors. But for them, at least, relief is in sight. The outlook for the library's collections is less hopeful. Having assembled in the Main Library during the nineteen sixties a research collection worthy of the name, the University must now watch a first installment of 50,000 volumes go into storage in 1970; further installments will follow regularly, in response to acquisition rates. Obviously, a deterioration of standards of service must accompany every withdrawal from the collections for storage. While an attempt will be made to remove only those items which are infrequently used, it is inevitable that the potential of the Library as an instrument of research, particularly in the humanities and social sciences, will be weakened. The steps which the University must take in the nineteen seventies if it is to retrieve itself from this serious situation are described in the final section of this report.

It should not be forgotten by Senate, or by present and future generations of students and faculty members, that while the present and future leaves much to be desired, conditions could have been extremely grave, were it not for Dr. Walter Koerner and the late Dr. P.A. Woodward, whose generosity made possible the construction of the south wing of the Main Library, and the
Woodward Biomedical Library. It is doubtful that the University could have maintained its present programme and standards in the absence of their capital gifts.
III. Public Services

1. Branches, Divisions, Subject Collections

Knowledge itself is continually expanding, and with it the interests of the University. Like any organism, the University responds by becoming more detailed and complex in its parts as it grows larger. As part of the University, the Library responds by subdividing into specialized units, in the fashion described in the previous section of this Report. These units are interdependent, as departments and faculties are interdependent, and the degree of interdependence is increasing as the boundaries between traditional disciplines, along the lines of which most university structures are patterned, break down. Language adapts to these changing approaches to knowledge through the invention of new vocabularies; the University sets up institutes and centres for scholars at home in no traditional department. These phenomena create difficulties for libraries: it is seldom possible now to satisfy all of the requirements of any single user in a single library or reading room, unless the body of literature relevant to his interest is both small and exclusive. Thus in the nineteen sixties the Library has followed a policy of developing comprehensive branches and divisions, such as the Woodward Biomedical Library and the Social Sciences Division, which can serve a wide range of users; the interstices are filled, insofar as budget limitations and common sense permit, by the duplication of selected materials of common interest.

The Annual Report for 1959/60 listed five divisions in the public service, only one of which, the Biomedical Branch Library at the Vancouver General Hospital, was a branch outside of the Main Library building. In 1969/70
there were thirteen reference divisions and subject collections in the Main Library, and nine branch libraries. Whereas a decade ago there were forty employees serving users directly, there were a hundred and ninety-seven last year. There are now about two hundred students per public service employee, compared with two hundred and fifty in 1960.

Loan statistics reflect the shift away from dependence on the Main Library. For the third successive year, loans from branch libraries exceeded loans from the Main Stack collection, this year by 271,596 items, compared with differences of 229,529 items and 181,399 items in previous years. Loans from branches totalled 994,104 items, more than double the number of all loans in 1960/61. However, these and other statistics can only serve as partial evidence of an improvement in service, for many aspects of library use can not be quantified.

As an example, much of the effect of the creation of the Information and Orientation Division in 1968 can not be measured statistically. The purpose of this division is to make the Library more accessible to the student. As part of their work last year, the Division's staff answered thousands of questions at the information desk in the Main Concourse, published with the financial assistance of the Alumni Association a library handbook for students, set up, again with Alumni help, a plexiglass model of the complicated Main Library building, printed, posted and distributed scores of signs, directories and guide sheets, and regularly issued a publication for faculty members, U.B.C. Library News. In the weeks following registration in September 1969, more than two thousand students, over half of the freshman class, took a short course in the use of the library, comprised of a slide-tape lecture and walking tour. Certainly the effect of this activity must be to optimize
use of the library's resources, but to what exact degree is unknown.

A similar account could be given on behalf of the other twenty branches, reference divisions and subject collections. Among many improvements introduced in the last year alone, here are a few:

- The Curriculum Laboratory in the Education Building, although acutely short of space, transferred from the Main Library a hundred and seventy journal titles, thus making them more accessible to users; began to develop a collection of film strips for instructional purposes; and increased hours of opening in response to growing demand.

- The Sedgewick Library, using funds provided by the Alumni Association, set up a collection of about fifteen hundred paperbacks, from which 11,322 items were borrowed in the first year.

- The Crane Library in Brock Hall organized a textbook recording programme for blind students, of whom there are now thirty-one, and also began to participate in another programme for the supply of light reading-through-listening.

- The appointment of two qualified archivists in the Special Collections Division permitted programmes to be expanded in two areas: historical and literary manuscripts and U.B.C. records, manuscripts and publications. Work in these areas has been carried on in a limited way by the Special Collections staff, but trained archivists
were needed to acquire and catalogue manuscripts and to provide expert assistance in their use.

- Subject specialist librarians in the Social Sciences Division delivered 52 bibliographic lectures to approximately 900 students, for the most part at the graduate and upper year level. Comprehensive bibliographies were compiled to assist students in identifying key material in each subject area.

- A union list of all newspapers held in the libraries of U. B. C., University of Victoria, Simon Fraser University and the Center for Research Libraries at Chicago. The listing was prepared by staff in the Social Sciences and Information and Orientation Divisions.

- Expansion of the Mathematics Library into an adjoining study room improved accommodation for readers and allowed additional space for collections, within the confines of the former Arts building.

In the foregoing account of the development of the public service divisions, a shift from a passive to an active mode can be detected. The Library is less and less a static, dormant, self-contained organization, and more and more a vital participant in instruction and research and an essential ingredient in the process of self-education.
2. Reading Rooms

In its first year of work, the Reading Rooms Division, in assuming responsibility with academic departments for the operation of thirty-eight reading rooms, concentrated on determining the needs of the various reading rooms, improving those which most conspicuously needed assistance, arranging for the transfer of periodical subscription records to the Library, processing book orders, and preparing collections for cataloguing.

A preliminary survey revealed that the reading rooms contained some 40,000 volumes, about 26,000 of which had not been catalogued. A crash programme reduced that backlog to about 5,000 volumes; most reading room collections are now listed in the Main catalogue, and have their individual catalogues. It is hoped that all volumes will be catalogued by the end of 1970.

The Library also assumed financial and clerical responsibility for about 900 journal subscriptions, previously paid for by departments and individuals. Over the years, the Library had been supplying journals to most of the reading rooms, so the effect of the transfer was to consolidate records. The new titles added $14,212 to annual subscription costs, bringing the total for reading rooms to about $34,500 for 1459 journals and continuation services.

A budget of $35,525 was made available for the purchase of books for the reading rooms. This budget was supplemented by some faculties and depart-

ments, so that expenditures by the end of the fiscal year amounted to $44,288, the cost of filling 2582 orders. The high average cost is accounted for by the fact that reading rooms are developing collections of relatively expensive reference books, manuals and bibliographies.

Sixteen of the reading rooms have full time assistants, and eleven are closely supervised by departmental secretaries or other personnel. The Division has assisted in the routine administration of the reading rooms, and is preparing an information and procedures manual for the guidance of those responsible for daily operations and custody of collections.

The objective of a campus-wide system of reading rooms was set in 1964 by the President's Committee on Academic Goals; in its report, *Guideposts to Innovation*, it stated that "Departmental reading rooms contribute to the intellectual life of the department and improve the conditions for student discussion and study." That desired situation is now being achieved.

3. Services

*Hours of Opening*

Ten years ago, during the winter and spring terms, libraries were open for seventy-nine hours per week. In 1969/70 this had been increased to a hundred hours a week for major branches; all branches combined offered service for a total of nine hundred and forty-seven hours, in a single week.

Moreover, longer hours were maintained throughout the year. For the first time libraries were open at night in May and June, for the greater convenience of graduate students and increasing numbers of extra-sessional students. In 1970, however, use during this period was slight. Although access to the Library is probably crucial for the limited numbers of students who seem to
require it, for those few users the University pays a relatively high price in additional salaries, $12,228 in 1969/70, in order to keep the Library operating during the period when the majority of staff members take their vacations.

**Copying Service**

It is now difficult to conceive of the Library without the modern copying machine. Yet a decade ago, the best the Library had to offer was a single unit which produced an imperfect and impermanent copy at a cost of thirty-five cents. Little wonder that only two hundred and five such copies were produced in 1960/61.

In 1969/70, nineteen machines, mostly coin-operated, produced 1,588,805 copies in libraries around the campus, an increase of 20.5% over the previous year.

To what uses are these machines being put? To arrive at a realistic assessment of current copying practices, students in the School of Librarianship conducted a survey between February and April, 1970.

Of the sample of 4548 exposures, 52.5% were made of library materials for the purpose of serving user interest. Just under half of the exposures were of non-library materials: notes, user-owned books, diagrams, drawings. Of the Library materials, 63.2% of the exposures were taken from journals, 31.2% from monographs and 5.6% from a variety of other library materials, such as company reports, maps and pamphlets. The average number of exposures
taken of any item was 6.9, representing an average of 9.8 pages.

The users of the copy machines were asked what they would do if no machines were available. The results were revealing: 80.5% said they would hand copy the material, 12.2% said they would drop the matter, 4.3% said they would attempt to purchase the material, 2% said they would steal the item and 1% said they would tear out the pages they needed. Clearly, copy machines are saving the students much time, and the Library a measure of loss and inconvenience.

**Interlibrary Loans**

A more fashionable term for the old-fashioned practice of interlibrary lending is information transmission. As the world's output of recorded knowledge increases, it is becoming more evident that the self-sufficiency of individual libraries must decline. Although interlibrary loans presently constitute only 1.3% of the Library's circulation of materials, an examination of the statistics reveals a trend toward interdependency.

It has been pointed out that in a decade, loans have increased by about 321%. Interlibrary loans have increased by 866%. In the past year, interlibrary loans increased by 25% over the previous year, yet the overall increase in loans was 15%.

Further analysis points to the increased importance of the Library as a part of the interlibrary network. Whereas in 1960/61, U.B.C. Library filled about three requests for every one it made, it now fills five. Of the over 20,000 requests filled in 1969/70, over 12,000 were received from four provincial institutions: Simon Fraser University, the University of Victoria, the B.C. Institute of Technology, and the B.C. Medical Library Service.
The importance of the copy machine in interlibrary sharing is made clear by the fact that almost twice as many requests are now filled with copies, rather than original materials. The benefits of this are obvious: the user receives material he can retain; routines are simplified, no returns being required; postage costs are reduced; and the Library and its users are not inconvenienced by the absence of materials from its own shelves.

The university and college librarians of British Columbia are now taking steps to accelerate the rate of interlibrary sharing steps which will in the long run benefit all participating institutions. One need only consider that the other two public universities will by 1980 hold collections approximately the size of U.B.C.'s present collection, to realize that traffic among these institutions must inevitably increase in all directions.
IV. Collections

1. Funds

In 1969/70, the Library was spending almost a million dollars more on books and magazines than it was in 1959/60; over ten years, the budget for the purchase of library materials has increased by 390.3%, not taking into account the depreciation of the dollar in respect to rising costs of books and journal subscriptions, estimated at 6 or 7% per year. But this was not the whole story of the nineteen sixties, as the accompanying graph shows:

Between 1964/65 and 1965/66, expenditures shot up from $516,153 to $1,613,087. This was the result of the unprecedented and as yet unequalled gift of H. R. MacMillan, who donated three million dollars to the Library for the purpose of developing as quickly as possible a collection to support graduate instruction and research.
This has in fact been accomplished. The Library grew to maturity almost overnight. In a decade, a total investment of $7,938,390 was made on library materials; the size of the collection, measured in physical volumes alone, increased by nearly 150%.

However, following the depletion of the MacMillan funds, some painful adjustments took place. The resources essential to the continuing development of a retrospective research collection were not available, with the result that many purchasing opportunities had to be passed over, to the frustration of the departments and individuals concerned. The present budget is just sufficient, at 1970 prices, to keep abreast of the current literature in all fields of interest to the University, and to acquire duplicate and replacement copies of heavily used or missing titles. By comparison, other comparable Canadian institutions were progressing more rapidly. In 1969/70, the University of Toronto, already the largest research library in Canada, spent $1,688,586 on acquisitions and binding, and the University of Alberta spent $1,889,199, compared with U.B.C.'s $1,240,000.

A higher rate of spending is necessary if the collection is to continue to meet the requirements of a constantly expanding programme of graduate studies and of more intensive undergraduate training. Yet, ironically, an increased rate of acquisition will only accentuate the difficulties arising out of a shortage of stack space. An impasse has been reached, from which the only escape is increased funds for both operating and building purposes.
2. Collections

On October 23, 1963, Dr. James Ranz, University Librarian, addressed Senate on the subject of library goals. Citing a brief prepared by the Faculty of Arts, he said:

"If we are sincere about wishing to become a first-class graduate institution, our immediate goal is, I think, quite clear - a collection of a million volumes, and the sooner the better."

Early in 1969, without fanfare, the millionth volume was catalogued. By the end of August 1970, the million and a quarter mark had been passed. Only a decade ago, the Library had contained fewer than half a million volumes. This, of course, is only part of the story, for physical volumes are but a single measure of the Library's strength. Account must be taken of the over one million microforms, the superb collections of government documents, maps and records.

Library collections do not develop themselves. They are the product of a multitude of decisions made by hundreds of individuals. These decisions must be made within the context of a system of budgeting, and it is the function of the Senate Library Committee to allocate financial resources in ways that will result in developing the collection in accordance with academic needs.

Once budget limits are defined, the task of selecting appropriate materials must be shared by librarians and faculty members. During the nineteen sixties there was a change in the proportion of this responsibility handled by the two groups, as a number of innovations in practice were introduced.
At the beginning of the decade, faculty members undertook to select current books for purchase. However, the results of this approach became progressively less satisfactory as the number of available titles increased, and as other duties claimed more of the time of faculty members. Since collection development demands continuity, the concept of the blanket approval order was introduced, whereby dealers were placed under contract to deliver new books in specified subject areas, from which selections could be made. This method of acquiring new books also made possible a number of time and money saving practices in the Library's processing divisions.

In 1964, the increasing responsibility for the selection of materials made necessary the formal creation of a Bibliography Division, staffed by senior librarians, whose whole assignment is to develop the collection. By 1970, five bibliographers were at work on various areas of the collection, policing the blanket approval orders, producing desiderata lists, building back files and entering new subscriptions.

In areas where the collection was particularly deficient, another technique was employed: the acquisition of entire collections. In the nineteen fifties, the Library had obtained through the generosity of Dr. Walter Koerner such collections as the Thomas Murray Collection of Canadiana and the P'u Pan Collection of Chinese History and Literature; it had thus been demonstrated that giant steps could be taken by this method. In the nineteen sixties, benefactors again enabled the Library rapidly to attain levels of comprehensiveness in a number of areas: the acquisition of the Leake and Sinclair collections, with the help of Dr. P. A. Woodward and Dr. H. R. MacMillan respectively, created a valuable resource for the study of the history of science and medicine, second in Canada only to the Osler Collection at McGill;
Mr. Norman Colbeck's personal gift of his own collection of nineteenth century English literature provided a base for advanced scholarship; and many other individuals and groups, through the presentation of collections, helped the Library to grow by leaps and bounds.

Another form of assistance in collection development was given by a new partner in librarianship: the computer. For half of the past decade, precise records of use have been collected in machine-readable form, and conveniently organized and stored on magnetic tape. Analysis of these five million records of loans has yielded information on rates of use which can be employed in developing collections, principally through the purchase of additional copies to meet high levels of demand. One of the most difficult problems faced by librarians in this era of mass education is that of relating supply and demand.

At U.B.C., thanks to the assistance of the Donner Canadian Foundation, the computer is now assisting in the solution to that problem.

The objective of the Library in the nineteen sixties has been to develop a collection which is current, in the sense that it keeps abreast of an ever-developing universe of knowledge; which is comprehensive, representing all topics of interest to the University's students and faculty; and which is accessible, in that desired individual items are available when required by individual users. The attainment of that objective, given the dynamic nature of the human mind, may be a continuing challenge. Nevertheless, it can be confidently stated that the collection of 1970 meets the needs of users more closely than did the collection of 1960. Ultimately, it is at the personal level that the worth of the collection receives its severest test.
3. **Processing**

The swift development of the Library's collection and its dispersal throughout branches and divisions, changes in selection methods, and the emergence of the computer and other complex machinery as useful tools for performing library procedures have combined to revolutionize the Processing Divisions. Ten years ago adding machines, typewriters and electric erasers alone acknowledged the fact of technology. They have been joined by cameras, keypunches, flexowriters, card sorters, while manual files have given way to thick volumes of computer printout, and the punched card has become as familiar as the standard catalogue card. New working patterns have emerged through the application of techniques of systems analysis, and work performance is measured by computer-based monthly cost-benefit studies. Such adjustments have been necessary, because the Library must now receive, record and store over a thousand new and different items every working day. At any time, as many as 22,000 items may be in various stages of the acquisitions-cataloguing-physical preparation process. Although constant attempts are made to maintain a smooth flow of work, the process is subject to changing conditions, and no more so than in the last decade. The tripling of the book budget in 1965 and the resulting increase in purchases and binding, the addition of twenty-four thousand uncatalogued volumes in the reading rooms, the need for entire new catalogues for branch libraries, the overflowing of old catalogues, and within the divisions events ranging from flu epidemics to the failure of vendors to supply according to promised schedules, all conspired to make regular and efficient performance more difficult. The symptoms of difficulty are backlogs and overworked staff, neither easy to remedy when budget and staff adjustments may take months or years to accomplish.
Nevertheless, the ten-year record of the Processing Divisions borders on the miraculous. As many volumes have been added to the collection in the last five years alone as were added in the first fifty. During the middle of the decade, a stored backlog of over fifty thousand volumes developed; it has now been reduced to about ten thousand volumes, and will have been eliminated by this time next year. All new branches and some divisions have full catalogues of their own; two, the Mathematics Library and the Recordings Collection, have computer-produced catalogues, pilot projects for future more comprehensive systems of handling catalogue information. In the Main Library, the union catalogue has exploded to occupy all of the main concourse, and has split into three sections, for author-title, subject and location, the latter file made necessary by the widespread library system. Joining the catalogue are printouts for periodical holdings, materials on order and volumes on loan. The Processing Divisions have succeeded in bringing together in this one area nearly complete information about the total holdings of the Library.

At the beginning of a new decade, some problems remain to be solved. A lag in time between the shelving of newly processed books and the filing of catalogue cards has developed, traceable to inability of the present preparation staff to keep up with production rates; and they are limited in number both by budgetary and space restraints. Ways must be found to shorten the time it takes to bind and rebind materials. For those within the Library who have to collect and collate journals, write to publishers for missing issues, contents pages and indexes, prepare complex instructions for the binder, inspect the bindery's product, and change records, it is not difficult to account for the passage of time; nevertheless, the customer finds it harder to comprehend. Other problems like these two, of a practical and procedural nature,
are amenable to solution, through the addition of staff and the further refine-
ment of routine.

Regrettably, even if funds were available for additional staff, space is not. 
The Processing Divisions are located on the uppermost stack level of the Main 
Library. There, under a seven foot ceiling, more than a hundred people work 
in confined and uncomfortable conditions. It would be much better for the 
individuals concerned, for the work processes, and for the expanding collection 
itself, if the Processing Divisions could be moved into other space, better 
adapted to their work. According to established standards, the minimum require-
ment for the present level of staffing would be 22,000 square feet. They are 
now occupying less than 14,000 square feet.

4. Use

Methods for measuring library use are not yet very sophisticated. Most libraries 
are satisfied to count those volumes which are borrowed; but they do not count 
the items which have been consulted rather than borrowed, or the maps or micro-
forms which have been viewed. But even if loan statistics are only a partial 
indication of activity in libraries, U.B.C. Library's record is impressive enough.

In ten years, loans increased by 320.9%, from 443,888 items in 1960/61 to 
1,868,466 items last year. This was no mere reflection of an increase in 
student numbers; enrollment has grown by 78.7%. The explanation for the 
discrepancy lies in the fact that students now use the Library more intensively, 
borrowing an average of 89.7 items per year, compared with 38.2 items a decade 
ago.
The following graph illustrates these developments:

It can be seen that the rate of increase of loans is greater than the increase in the size of the collection, indicating heavier use. In 1966, the rate of increase of loans took an upward turn, and seems to be proceeding steadily at an annual increase of about 15%, which would point toward the attainment of two million loans a year within the next two years, a figure exceeded by few academic libraries in North America. A number of factors must account for this: the increase in information itself; the heavier requirements placed upon students by faculty members; an increasing trend toward self-education; the development of branch libraries; orientation programmes; and certainly the ease of borrowing made possible by automated systems.

The detailed record of use is set down in Appendix C. Although most branches and divisions experienced impressive increases, one decrease in use deserves particular attention.

In 1967/68, 76,830 items were loaned from the Reserve Book Room. Last year, the figure had dropped to 41,763, and in the present year a further decline is
predicted. This reflects the Library's determination to reject wherever possible the rationing philosophy of access to materials. As part of a major study of the use of academic libraries financed by a grant from the Donner Canadian Foundation, the computer analyzed records of reserve loans, and those items which had not been borrowed a sufficient number of times to warrant a special loan category were returned to normal loan periods and replaced in the stacks; in other cases, numbers of copies have been increased to meet demand. The object is to make available to the individual student the item he needs, when he needs it, and hopefully for as long as he needs it.
V. Administration

1. Budget

University operating expenditures stood at $16,225,972 in 1960/61 and $51,397,650 in 1969/70, a 216.7% increase. Library operating expenditures, by comparison, increased by 470.9%, from $677,369 to $3,873,988, and from 4.2% of the total university budget to 7.6%. In a list of budgets of North American research libraries, U.B.C. stood in thirty-third place at the beginning of the decade; at the end, it ranked nineteenth. U.B.C. today spends as much on its Library as Harvard spent on its Library a decade ago. These facts and figures reflect the radically changed nature of the Library, and of the University: from a centralized to a decentralized system and from a largely undergraduate to a graduate institution. Expressed in terms of student support, whereas the University spent $53.28 per student on over 11,000 students for library service ten years ago, it spends $186.49 on over 20,000 students today.

Yet surprisingly, this last figure is one of the lowest in Canada. Simon Fraser University spends $426.54; the University of Victoria, $311.73; the University of Alberta, $244.76; the University of Toronto, $216.60; the University of Montreal, $220.62; McGill University, $222.48; Laval University, $207.80; Dalhousie University, $281.50; and Memorial University, $190.21. In fact, only Sir George Williams University, the University of Saskatchewan and the University of Manitoba spent less than U.B.C. in 1969/70.

This situation can be viewed in two ways: the University is getting a high level of service at bargain rates; and, the University would not be setting new records unless it increased its support of the Library substantially. It is hoped that the University will see, and appreciate, both points of view.
2. Organization and Relationships

Four Presidents served the University of British Columbia in the nineteen sixties. Similarly, four librarians made their unique but interdependent contributions to the Library's development. Neal Harlow resigned in June 1961, after a decade of service during which the Library was doubled in all of its aspects. Samuel Rothstein served from July 1961 to May 1962, while at the same time guiding the School of Librarianship through its first year. Between June 1962 and December 1963, Jim Ranz made a case for the rapid development of a research library, and set the Library firmly on the path which he had indicated. The writer succeeded him in 1964.

During the course of the decade, the Senate Library Committee went through a number of transformations. It began as a large body, representative of faculties, then changed into a small but powerful committee made up for the most part of Deans, and finally grew larger again under the impact of changes which were taking place within the Senate itself, ending the decade again as a broadly based group, including both students and faculty members.

The Committee was chaired until the spring of 1969 by Dean Ian McTaggart Cowan, who gave strong support in that capacity for almost a quarter of a century. He was succeeded by Professor Malcolm McGregor, a long-time friend of the Library, and frequently a member of earlier committees.

During 1969/70, the Committee met five times, to attend to its usual tasks of reviewing the annual report, allocating book funds, preparing planning briefs for new buildings, approving new reading rooms, framing and revising policies regarding the use and development of collections, and responding to inquiries, requests and complaints.
Over ten years the pattern of higher education has changed in British Columbia, with the creation of a series of colleges and two new universities: the University of Victoria and Simon Fraser University. A new set of relationships among university and college libraries grew out of these developments. From the outset, the librarians of the three public universities worked together in a spirit of cooperation and amity. On their initiative, and under the aegis of the Academic Advisory Board for Higher Education, the librarians of the colleges were brought together for the first time in October 1969, and an informal Council of B.C. College and University Libraries was formed. This body concerns itself with the collection of statistics and other information, the establishment of standards, the sharing of resources, and with collaboration in such areas as collection development and processing.

U.B.C. Library has since 1966 been a member of the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago, an organization which has been described as a Library's library. The Center concentrates on the purchase of materials which are too infrequently used or too expensive for individual libraries to acquire; it has massive holdings of newspapers, documents and manuscripts, available to U.B.C. through the media of collect long-distance telephone and air freight.

To a greater and greater extent, individual libraries are participating in so-called networks, realizing that although the world's information resources can be held by no single library, any group of users can represent a vast range of needs. In the interests of utility and economy, U.B.C. Library and other libraries must move closer together in the next decade.

3. Personnel

The 103 staff members of 1960 had become 394 by 1970; of that number, only
eighteen could be counted as veterans, having joined the staff before the beginning of the decade. There has been a threefold increase in the number of professional librarians, from 33 to 100, and over a fourfold increase in supporting staff, from 70 to 294. After Toronto, McGill and Alberta, U.B.C.'s library staff is the fourth largest in Canada today.

The improvements in service described earlier in this report were reflected in the ratio between students and library staff: 113 to 1 in 1960, 53 to 1 ten years later. Nevertheless, the figure was still higher than Alberta's and Toronto's 48 to 1.

The increase in staff numbers ushered in new problems of management. The almost familial atmosphere of the fifties was gradually being replaced by the formal atmosphere of any large and complex organization. In its attempts to alleviate this undesirable condition, the Library's administration has wherever possible decentralized authority, and delegated it to points in the organization where decisions can be made by those who best understand their effects. As a result, branches and divisions have a high degree of autonomy. At the same time, coordination and communication have been emphasized as the means of binding the Library together.

In order to bridge gaps between library staff levels, particularly in matters which affect working conditions and personal relationships among employees, a system of staff participation in intramural policy-making has been set up. The two key units of this system are an elected four-person Ombudsman Committee, to hear complaints and to make recommendations for change, and an elected eight-person Administrative Resources Committee, to deal with all staff suggestions for policy change and involvement in policy-making; acting as a Committee on
Committees, it further involves staff members by organizing them to deal with such things as salary scales, personnel classifications and conference travel.

In the course of ten years, changes have been introduced which have made working conditions in the Library more satisfactory. The method of appointing librarians and determining their rates of pay were changed. Other staff members were grouped together in an additional classification for Library Assistants; job descriptions for five classifications were prepared, criteria for promotion established, and the possibility of a career within the Library for supporting staff was thus created.

Salaries have been raised, and are competitive at all levels. As a result, a wastefully high rate of turnover dropped from a peak of 68.3% in 1965/66 to 49% in the past year, a more acceptable rate, considering that many staff members are student wives, and that the staff for the most part is composed of people under thirty years of age.

The decade witnessed the departure of a number of persons who had made outstanding contributions to the evolution of the Library. Neal Harlow, Samuel Rothstein and Jim Ranz, all University Librarians, have been mentioned. Miss Anne M. Smith, Associate Librarian, retired in 1964, having guided the development of reference services and collections for thirty-four years. It could be said that the Lanning family retired during the sixties, having rendered an astonishing total of a hundred years of service to the University. Mabel Lanning, the Head of the Circulation Division from 1926 to 1961, was for generations of students the very Library itself. Roland Lanning, her brother, developed through both lean and fat years a magnificent collection of periodical literature; he retired in 1968 after 42 years service as the Head of the Serials Division and the Bibliographer for periodical literature.
Walter Lanning, Head of the Curriculum Laboratory since its establishment in 1955, and Professor in the Faculty of Education, retired this year. The principle of public service was a common cause for all of these librarians, who spared nothing of themselves in its pursuit.

4. Systems

During the sixties, libraries, in company with many other kinds of organizations, began to use increasingly sophisticated machinery for the performance of routine tasks. Today the computer occupies a dominant position among the working tools of the Library. To realize how rapidly this development has taken place, one need only recall that the first commercially available computer entered the marketplace in 1950, and U.B.C. acquired its first computer, ALWAC, in 1957.

Among academic libraries, U.B.C. made an early beginning in applying techniques of systems analysis to its daily routines, and in developing practical computer applications to carry out these routines. A system for the circulation of books was inaugurated in the fall of 1965, and in smooth succession over the years, systems for acquisitions, accounting, serials, backlog books, book catalogs and document indexing were put into operation. These systems do more than simplify tasks and multiply records: they make the Library easier to use, and accumulate and analyze information which can be used to guide the future growth of the Library. Some of these applications have been touched upon in earlier sections of the report. The emphasis has been, and will be in the future, on systems for people, not systems for systems.
VI. Concluding Remarks and Forecast.

Through its functions of teaching, research and publication, the University is at one time the creator, user, recorder and transmitter of knowledge. Nothing short of a global disaster seems likely to slow the rapidly increasing growth of knowledge, and its consumption by greater and greater numbers of people. A comparison of the University's Calendars for 1960/61 and 1969/70 should be enough to convince anyone that this University is responding well to the universal process of intellectual development, and that this process will result by 1980 in a curriculum even more comprehensive and diverse.

The Library acquires, organizes, preserves and disseminates knowledge, and is thus deeply involved in this process. The implications of present trends are clear enough: there will be higher levels of demand from more people for an even more massive body of information. The Library will be expected to guarantee access to this recorded knowledge, and as knowledge becomes more complex and abundant, to provide more simple methods of access. This formidable assignment may be further complicated by a diminution of financial support. If the next decade followed the pattern of the last, the University's operating budget would be about $163,000,000 by 1980, and the Library's about $22,000,000, which would represent nearly a doubling of support in terms of University budget over 1970; this is probably too much for either the University or its library to hope for.

If it can be assumed that the University and the Library will be expected to do more with less, ways must be found either to limit demands, or to increase benefits while lowering costs. In the past year, the University took steps to control at least one aspect of its future: it set a limitation on
enrollment of 27,500 students during its two major terms. In setting this figure, it established a higher than present ratio of graduate students to undergraduate students, 5,500 to 22,000. By defining its ultimate student body, the University greatly simplified the task of planning its future.

Accommodating student users has been one of the most difficult of the Library's problems in the past decade, and it is a problem that is not yet solved. However, the enrollment limitation facilitates Library planning in this its most expensive aspect, for library patrons are the greatest consumers of space in library buildings. Using the accepted standard of 35% seating for undergraduate students and 50% seating for graduate students, a requirement of 10,450 places is indicated when the enrollment limit is reached. Presently, in all libraries, reading rooms and study areas, there are almost 5,000 seats. A new Sedgewick Library is under construction; a new Law Library is in the planning stages; these, together with the libraries for the sciences, fine arts and education, already proposed to the Senate Committee on Academic Building Needs; together with increased seating in the Main Library following upon the removal of the Processing Divisions; and together with a few anticipated reading rooms, will come acceptably close to the University's hopefully permanent requirement for seating.

By comparison, planning is complicated by the continuous increase in recorded knowledge. No end to this process is in sight. The demand for access to the Library's store is similarly increasing, with no hint of diminishing. Thus it is extremely difficult to discern the ultimate nature and dimensions of the Library's collections, and to determine how these may be arranged and controlled. However, some trends can be examined as possible indicators.
During the nineteen sixties, it was frequently speculated that the physical volume, the book, was destined to disappear. At the beginning of a new decade, this seems far from likely. It is now commonly recognized that the centuries-old format has many advantages in convenience of use, portability and economy. Book production rates are escalating the world over, and confidence in the future of the book is evidenced by the enthusiasm of investors, from conglomerates down to individuals, for the stock of publishers; it has recently come to public attention that foreign capital regards even Canadian publishing as a reasonable investment. The appetite of consumers for books and magazines is not waning, despite early warnings that television would compete for public time. At the University, faculty members provide longer and longer lists of readings for their students, who have established new rates of use which, if they continue to rise, will attain 6,000,000 loans per year by 1980. It would be reasonable for the Library to assume that the conventional printed volume will play a major role in its future, as it has in its past.

On that assumption, the Library will hold two and a half million volumes by 1980, even if its purchasing power is not increased over 1969/70. If the collection grows at the rate established in the past decade, it will contain 3,000,000 volumes, and yet this figure would represent a proportionately smaller share of the world's information resources. In fact, a three million volume collection is not remarkable in 1970, and will be much less remarkable in 1980. Among North American university libraries, nine have collections of over three million volumes, including the University of Toronto; eleven more have collections of over two million volumes; and thirty-eight have collections of over a million. In the Association of
Research Libraries list of fifty-eight libraries, U.B.C. Library stands fiftieth. It is highly probable that the Library will grow past the two and a half million mark and approach the three million mark in the next decade.

While the physical book rests secure in its future, it is also unquestioned that it will be joined by a variety of other media or knowledge-carrying formats in the Library, or in close association with it. Some of these formats, such as sound recordings, microforms and computer tapes, are already familiar, some are unfamiliar, and doubtless there are others yet undiscovered and unknown. Again, some trends may be detected: developments in microphotography, sound recording and computers share a trend toward miniaturization, with its corollary of portability; and with this new compactness, costs are declining. Both the machines necessary for using recorded materials and the recorded materials themselves are becoming smaller and less expensive to reproduce. The eventual integration of the technologies of electronics and photography could result in cassettes carrying libraries of fundamental readings, playable on devices as convenient and cheap as a transistor radio. The linking of libraries to computers with the capability of swiftly accessing massive memory banks will further revolutionize the use of information. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that the Library itself will play a major role in developing the necessary new products to support these systems, or, as some people have thought, in hindering their development. As with the Library, the final test will be at the level of the user, and in an attempt to satisfy him, manufacturers will invest, and are now investing, vast amounts of capital. The Library's role, as in the past, will be to remain alert to the possibilities of all new means of storing and using information, and to incorporate them into the existing collections.
Despite the vagueness of the future, planning for the collections must proceed. The accommodation required for physical volumes can be easily estimated; space for a collection of two and a half million volumes has been requested in the submission to the Senate Committee on Academic Building Needs. The approximate capacities of present and future libraries are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Library</td>
<td>1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodward Library</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedgewick Library</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law Library</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Library</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences L.</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Library</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts Centre L.</td>
<td>75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Branch Libraries</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Rooms</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,525,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Under construction or in planning stage.
3. Proposed to Senate Committee on Academic Building Needs.

The implications of future developments in information handling point toward buildings of great flexibility, capable of constant readaptation of space, and equipped for the installation of a variety of equipment.

If the University is to accommodate library users and collections in the nineteen seventies, it must commit itself to a continuous programme of library construction. It should be noted, however, that the proposed
buildings, while they will provide for the projected numbers of users, will not hold physical volumes in excess of two and a half million; any increase in purchasing power above the present level will thus mean that additional space for collections must be provided. This raises the question of the eventual size of the collection, and where it might be housed when it reaches three million volumes, then four, then five.

There is a growing realization that libraries can no longer follow a course of exclusively independent development. The creation of centres of bibliographic information linked with efficient means of transmission can maximize the use of regional and national resources and provide opportunities for multi-institutional acquisitions policies, with attendant financial economies. The librarians of British Columbia's three public universities are now exploring ways and means of achieving these objectives, by means of which some of the outcomes of unhindered and unregulated collection growth can be avoided.

From the point of view of the user, what has been called the information explosion is imposing heavier burdens in terms of the use of personal time. Responses to this situation can be seen in many quarters. Witness the development and growing popularity of speed-reading courses; the increasing sales of outlines and digests of individual books and whole subject areas; learning aids, ranging from flash cards and recordings through to teaching machines; and at the extreme, experiments in learning even during sleep. The Library must respond by going farther in helping the user to locate as swiftly as possible only the material which is relevant to his purposes; the whole Library apparatus, from subject catalogues to physical arrangements, must be made more efficient and more comprehensible. At the same
time, the Library will have a larger role to play in equipping students to
deal with information, for the ability to keep abreast of developments in
one's specialty will become critical to one's survival in this age of
technology. No less important, if the age of technology is to be humane,
will be the Library's function of providing access to and encouraging famil-
liarity with the world's cultural inheritance, in such forms as literature,
art and music.

While it is not possible to foresee all of the changes which will take place
in the Library in the nineteen seventies, enough can be predicted that it
becomes possible to sketch a rough portrait. Certainly the Library will be
larger in terms of its own collections, but these may have reached a practical
limit in terms of size and format, with older and infrequently used materials
being relegated to various kinds of storage. The Library, despite the
limitations of its own immediate resources, will have access to vast repos-
itories of material through cooperative regional bibliographic centres,
joined to national and international systems of information gathering,
indexing, and preservation. Great distances may be involved, but the time
required to locate and transmit desired materials will be diminished. The
requirements of users will be heavier, more pressing and more refined, and
these will be met by higher levels of reference and public service, involving
greater numbers of more specialized library staff members, with access to
more sophisticated systems of information retrieval. Users will have the
benefit of a variety of media, from books to videotape, greatly enriching
the quality of education.

Some have questioned the ability of the conventional library to survive. In
nature, the failure to adapt leads to extinction. U.B.C. Library will have
no such fate, given the willing support of the University, because it is today a flexible and responsive organization, staffed by inventive and industrious people, for whom the future presents a stimulating challenge. But in meeting this challenge, the Library must have the support of Senate and of the University, particularly in respect to its physical requirements; for if these requirements are not met, the Library is destined to become an inefficient and unmanageable barrier to education. The University will be the loser, and will have thrown away the investment of fifty-five years of effort and expense.
## UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA LIBRARY

### Selected Statistics

#### 1960/70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960/61</th>
<th>1969/70</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Operating Expenditures</td>
<td>$16,225,972.00</td>
<td>$51,397,650.00</td>
<td>216.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Cost per Student</td>
<td>$1,396.26</td>
<td>$2,474.96</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment (Winter-Spring)</td>
<td>11,621.00</td>
<td>20,767.00</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Library Operating Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960/61</th>
<th>1969/70</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>$384,152.00</td>
<td>$2,204,115.00</td>
<td>413.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books &amp; Periodicals</td>
<td>$229,884.00</td>
<td>$1,127,291.00</td>
<td>390.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>$33,751.00</td>
<td>$112,709.00</td>
<td>233.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies, Other Expenses</td>
<td>$29,582.00</td>
<td>$428,873.00</td>
<td>1336.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Library Expenditure per Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960/61</th>
<th>1969/70</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Expenditure per Student</td>
<td>$58.28</td>
<td>$186.49</td>
<td>219.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library % of University Expenditures</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Staff Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960/61</th>
<th>1969/70</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>394.5</td>
<td>283.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>204.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>294.0</td>
<td>320.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Students per Staff Member

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960/61</th>
<th>1969/70</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students per Staff Member</td>
<td>112.8</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>-53.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Collection - Volumes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960/61</th>
<th>1969/70</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volumes added</td>
<td>37,556</td>
<td>129,283</td>
<td>244.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes per student</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Loans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1960/61</th>
<th>1969/70</th>
<th>% Increase/Decrease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>443,888</td>
<td>1,868,466</td>
<td>320.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans per student</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>135.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B

### LIBRARY EXPENDITURES

**1960-1970**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Wages</td>
<td>384,152</td>
<td>439,387</td>
<td>491,290</td>
<td>594,177</td>
<td>685,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books and Periodicals</td>
<td>229,884</td>
<td>240,931</td>
<td>292,247</td>
<td>393,838</td>
<td>516,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>33,751</td>
<td>33,067</td>
<td>37,820</td>
<td>50,307</td>
<td>55,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies, Equipment, etc.</td>
<td>29,582</td>
<td>29,575</td>
<td>63,350</td>
<td>78,237</td>
<td>94,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>677,369</td>
<td>742,960</td>
<td>884,707</td>
<td>1,116,559</td>
<td>1,350,627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Wages</td>
<td>873,300</td>
<td>1,327,320</td>
<td>1,674,536</td>
<td>1,949,238</td>
<td>2,204,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books and Periodicals</td>
<td>1,613,087</td>
<td>1,515,364</td>
<td>1,011,181</td>
<td>998,414</td>
<td>1,127,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>50,684</td>
<td>105,654</td>
<td>88,052</td>
<td>111,506</td>
<td>112,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies, Equipment, etc.</td>
<td>179,731</td>
<td>264,162</td>
<td>325,093</td>
<td>359,000</td>
<td>428,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>2,716,802</td>
<td>3,212,500</td>
<td>3,098,862</td>
<td>3,418,158</td>
<td>3,872,988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX C

## SIZE AND GROWTH OF COLLECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volumes - Catalogued</strong></td>
<td>1,063,559</td>
<td>129,283</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>1,192,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volumes - Controlled Storage</strong></td>
<td>29,735</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,820</td>
<td>17,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documents</strong></td>
<td>544,470</td>
<td>58,944</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>603,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Films</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microfilm (reels)</strong></td>
<td>24,528</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microcard (cards)</strong></td>
<td>101,280</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>107,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microprint (sheets)</strong></td>
<td>527,500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>618,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Microfiche (cards)</strong></td>
<td>285,820</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>337,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maps</strong></td>
<td>63,220</td>
<td>7,666</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>70,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manuscripts</strong></td>
<td>562 ft.*</td>
<td>540 ft.*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1102 ft.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phonograph Records</strong></td>
<td>14,359</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>15,213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Thickness of files
# Recorded Use of Library Resources

**September 1969 - August 1970**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Library</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Stack Collection</td>
<td>308,765</td>
<td>386,765</td>
<td>470,404</td>
<td>551,450</td>
<td>+ 17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Circulation</td>
<td>62,360</td>
<td>76,830</td>
<td>51,910</td>
<td>41,763</td>
<td>- 19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Studies Division</td>
<td>3,632</td>
<td>5,243</td>
<td>5,957</td>
<td>8,354</td>
<td>+ 40.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts Division</td>
<td>27,271</td>
<td>28,103</td>
<td>30,130</td>
<td>42,360</td>
<td>+ 40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Publications</td>
<td>31,524</td>
<td>48,571</td>
<td>58,324</td>
<td>61,397</td>
<td>+ 5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities Division</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map Collection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,249</td>
<td>6,375</td>
<td>+ 50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Division</td>
<td>3,808</td>
<td>3,334</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences Division</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Collections</td>
<td>5,842</td>
<td>9,028</td>
<td>7,844</td>
<td>10,809</td>
<td>+ 37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>446,937</td>
<td>557,462</td>
<td>630,618</td>
<td>722,508</td>
<td>+ 14.57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Branch Libraries</strong>    |         |         |         |         |                               |
| Curriculum Laboratory   | 133,562 | 146,884 | 143,890 | 164,935 | + 14.6%                       |
| Law                     | 51,772  | 67,164  | 84,497  | 103,231 | + 22.2%                       |
| MacMillan Library       | -       | 15,306  | 21,165  | 24,473  | + 15.6%                       |
| Marjorie Smith Library  | 10,908  | 18,178  | 20,705  | 20,824  | + .57%                        |
| Mathematics             | 10,366  | 16,980  | 18,543  | 21,982  | + 18.5%                       |
| Medical Branch, V.G.H.  | 20,805  | 23,418  | 26,315  | 27,811  | + 5.7%                        |
| Music                   | -       | 9,810   | 13,696  | 16,379  | + 19.6%                       |
| Sedgewick               | 316,253 | 351,004 | 434,890 | 502,444 | + 15.5%                       |
| Woodward Biomedical     | 72,046  | 88,117  | 97,279  | 112,025 | + 15.2%                       |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></th>
<th>615,712</th>
<th>738,861</th>
<th>860,980</th>
<th>994,104</th>
<th>+ 15.46%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RECORDINGS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Collection</td>
<td>53,494</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>82,321</td>
<td>95,203</td>
<td>+ 15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Library Record Collection</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12,399</td>
<td>24,335</td>
<td>26,340</td>
<td>+ 8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>53,494</td>
<td>72,399</td>
<td>106,656</td>
<td>121,543</td>
<td>+ 13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTENSION LIBRARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volumes for Extension Courses</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>2,887</td>
<td>4,382</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>+ 12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Collection</td>
<td>1,021</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>- 31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>2,823</td>
<td>3,744</td>
<td>5,185</td>
<td>5,490</td>
<td>+ 5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERLIBRARY LOANS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Simon Fraser Univ.</td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Univ. of Victoria</td>
<td>- *</td>
<td>- *</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>291</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To B.C. Inst. of Tech.</td>
<td>- *</td>
<td>- *</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To B.C. Med. Lib. Service</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Other Libraries</td>
<td>2,053</td>
<td>2,593</td>
<td>3,077</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From B.C. Med. Lib. Service</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Other Libraries</td>
<td>1,836</td>
<td>2,308</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>6,271</td>
<td>6,752</td>
<td>6,744</td>
<td>8,401</td>
<td>+ 24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopy Requests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Simon Fraser Univ.</td>
<td>2,895**</td>
<td>4,018**</td>
<td>5,545</td>
<td>8,402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Univ. of Victoria</td>
<td>- *</td>
<td>- *</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To B.C. Inst. of Tech.</td>
<td>- *</td>
<td>- *</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>246</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Other Libraries</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>4,273</td>
<td>4,518</td>
<td>4,961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Other Libraries</td>
<td>1,855</td>
<td>2,407</td>
<td>2,309</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB-TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>7,810</td>
<td>10,698</td>
<td>13,103</td>
<td>16,420</td>
<td>+ 25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,133,047</td>
<td>1,389,916</td>
<td>1,623,286</td>
<td>1,868,466</td>
<td>(+ 245,180)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not Recorded Separately  
** Estimated from number of exposures + 15.1%
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LIBRARY ORGANIZATION

ADMINISTRATION
Stuart-Stubbs, Basil
Bell, Inglis F.
Hamilton, Robert M.
McInnes, Douglas N.
McDonald, Robin
de Bruijn, Erik

University Librarian
Associate Librarian
Assistant Librarian - Collections
Assistant Librarian - Public Services
Coordinator of Technical Processes and Systems
Administrative Services Librarian

ACQUISITIONS
Omelusik, Nicholas

Head Librarian

ASIAN STUDIES
Ng, Tung King

Head Librarian

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Colbeck, Norman
Keate, Heather
Elliston, Graham
Mercer, Eleanor
Shields, Dorothy

Bibliographical Consultant
Bibliographer - Science
Bibliographer - Serials
Bibliographer - English language
Bibliographer - European languages

BINDERY
Fryer, Percy

Foreman

CATALOGUE DIVISION
Elrod, J. McRee
Little, Margaret
Bailey, Freda
Gray, John
Price, Margaret

Head Librarian
Catalogue Specialist
Catalogue Specialist
Catalogue Specialist
Catalogue Specialist

CIRCULATION
Butterfield, Rita

Head Librarian

CRANE LIBRARY
Thiele, Paul

Head

CURRICULUM LABORATORY
Hurt, Howard

Head Librarian

FINE ARTS DIVISION
Dwyer, Melva

Head Librarian
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ANIMAL RESOURCE ECOLOGY LIBRARY

Litz, Carol
Head Librarian

MacMILLAN LIBRARY

Macaree, Mary
Head Librarian

GIFTS & EXCHANGE

Joe, Linda
Head Librarian

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS

Dodson, Suzanne
Head Librarian

HUMANITIES DIVISION

Selby, Joan
Head Librarian

INFORMATION & ORIENTATION

Chew, Luther
Head Librarian

LAW LIBRARY

Shorthouse, Thomas
Head Librarian

MAP DIVISION

Wilson, Maureen
Head Librarian

MARJORIE SMITH LIBRARY

Freeman, George
Head Librarian

MATHEMATICS LIBRARY

McIntosh, Jack
Head Librarian

MUSIC LIBRARY

Burndorfer, Hans
Head Librarian

READING ROOMS

Harrington, Walter
Head Librarian

RECORD COLLECTION

Kaye, Douglas
Head

SCIENCE DIVISION

Brongers, Rein
Head Librarian
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SEDGEWICK LIBRARY

Erickson, Ture

SERIALS DIVISION

Johnson, Stephen

SOCIAL SCIENCES DIVISION

Carrier, Lois

SPECIAL COLLECTIONS DIVISION

Yandle, Anne

SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT

Dennis, Donald
Dobbin, Geraldine

WOODWARD LIBRARY

Leith, Anna

BIOMEDICAL BRANCH LIBRARY

Cummings, John

COLBECK ROOM

Colbeck, Norman

Head Librarian

Systems Analyst

Head Librarian

Head Librarian

Systems & Information Science Librarian

Head Librarian

Head Librarian

Curator
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**LIBRARY SUPPORTED**

**READING ROOMS**

**AS OF AUGUST 1970**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Planning</th>
<th>Main Mall North Administration Bldg.</th>
<th>Geology</th>
<th>Geog. &amp; Geol. Bldg. Room 114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Science</td>
<td>Civil Engr. Bldg. Room 305</td>
<td>Geophysics</td>
<td>Geophysics Bldg. Main Mall 2nd. Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>F. Lasserre Bldg. Room 7B (Basement)</td>
<td>Hispanic-Italian</td>
<td>Buchanan Bldg. Room 2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Studies</td>
<td>Buchanan Bldg. Room 2250</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Buchanan Bldg. Room 1220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Chemistry Bldg. Room 261</td>
<td>Inst. of Industrial Relations</td>
<td>Henry Angus Bldg. Room 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>Buchanan Bldg. Room 2208</td>
<td>Librarianship</td>
<td>Library North Wing 8th Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
<td>Henry Angus Bldg. Room 9 (Basement)</td>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>Buchanan Bldg. Room 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>Buchanan Bldg. Room 1262</td>
<td>Mechanical</td>
<td>Mech. Engr. Bldg. Room 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing Centre</td>
<td>Civil Engr. Bldg. Room 238</td>
<td>Metallurgy</td>
<td>Metallurgy Bldg. Room 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>Brock Hall South Wing Room 204</td>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>Wesbrook Bldg. Room 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Brock Annex (Former Billiard Room)</td>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
<td>Wesbrook Bldg. Block C Room 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Buchanan Bldg. Room 2208</td>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>Cunningham Bldg. Room 160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Geography
Geog. & Geol. Bldg.
Room 216

Physics
Hennings Bldg.
Room 311

Psychiatry
Health Sc. Centre
Wesbrook Road
Campus

Rehabilitation Medicine
Hut M S 1
Room 20

Social Sciences
Henry Angus Bldg.
Room 305

Philosophy
West Mall Block
Room A 112

Physiology
Wesbrook Bldg.
Block A
Room 203

Psychology
Henry Angus Bldg.
Room 203

Slavonic Studies
Buchanan Bldg.
Room 2251

Theatre
Frederick Wood Theatre
Room 211
(Apply at Room 207)
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Senate Library Committee

1969/70

Dr. M. F. McGregor (Chairman)
Mrs. A. Brearley
Dr. S. Rothstein
Dr. D. G. Brown
Mr. F. J. Cairnie
Dr. D. H. Chitty
Dr. J. M. Kennedy
Dr. A. J. McClean
Mr. K. R. Martin
Miss D. Allen
Mr. J. J. Campbell
Mr. W. Armstrong
Chancellor A. McGavin
President W. Gage (ex officio)
Mr. J. E. A. Parnall (ex officio)
Mr. B. Stuart-Stubbs (ex officio)

Terms of Reference:

(a) To advise and assist the Librarian in:

(i) formulating a policy for the development of resources for instruction and research;

(ii) advising on the allocation of book funds to the fields of instruction and research;

(iii) developing a general program of library service for all the interests of the University; and

(iv) keeping himself informed about the library needs of instructional and research staffs, and keeping the academic community informed about the library;

(b) To report to Senate on matters of policy under discussion by the Committee