

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

TO: Cecil K. Byrd

FROM: Dominique-Béné de Lerma

TELEPHONE. 7-6157

DEPT. University Librarian

DEPT. Music Library, Mu 100

SUBJ. Space in Music Library

DATE. September 28, 1967

PRELIMINARY COMMENTS

Earlier registrations of concern for additional space were apprehensive, anxiously expressing hope that a solution might be found before it was a critical or emergency situation.

The present statement, submitted on your request, is in spirit totally subjective; we have reached problems which I can neither solve nor face much longer, and these problems grow more serious each month with each new acquisition.

This situation was anticipated in a memo to Dean Charles H. Webb on October 25, 1966: "We have had no real emotional outbursts, but our nerves are often taxed. No one has accused us of poor organization, but we cannot locate letters, annual reports or other items quickly...There is always a series of obstacles in the way...I feel we have passed the point that this is a crisis."

In subsequent qualification: There has since been a personality problem within the staff which would have been avoided had we the room to work and be organized satisfactorily. This in itself is not of such great seriousness but it seems awkward to blame the event on space, after it has arisen, and there is meanwhile damage to our staff relations and to those we must maintain with the administration. In short, there is doubtless less confidence in our work because of a situation that developed for want of room to accomplish this.

39 seats

We have also experienced some trying moments in office organization, failing to provide prompt answers on questions from other university departments (e.g., Purchasing, Personnel) and individuals. Had we satisfactory space arrangements in the office, this report, for example, would have been easier to prepare. These inconveniences have disturbed our staff and patrons, and some of the difficulties have been more than mild.

We have no room to shelve any more acquisitions, regardless of the call number; all shelving is exhausted. Although obligated to encourage use of the library, we cannot provide more than one-third the amount of patron space which is barest minimum.

I feel I must have a private office for almost every aspect of my personal tasks. An immediate example: During the past week I had to have a conference with a member of the staff, a conference of a distinctly personal nature. I could not accomplish this in the office area, where six full-time persons are engaged and within ear-shot of most of our readers. This instance, by the way, is far from unique and could also be illustrated with respect to telephone conversations with Dr. Flener or Dean Bain. At any rate, it has been traditional to have personal conferences out in the hall, among passing students and faculty. At this time, the hall was much too busy and provided

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

TO: CKB **FROM:** DSL **TELEPHONE.**

DEPT. **DEPT.**

SUBJ. **DATE.** 9-28-67

- 2 -

far less privacy than normal. We tried several foyers by the elevator in the Music Addition, eventually finding one not filled with students. Our talk, which could not be postponed, lasted one hour. During this time, as we perched informally on the window ledge for our serious discussion, numerous students came up to engage in conversation or to wait for the elevators. What we had to say to each other was overheard, and several students reacted. This situation has been going on since I assumed this job in 1963, and I have had to rely on memos (without a secretary or any typing skill) which have less value often than direct communication and exchange of ideas.

I have tried to reduce the clutter and congestion that is destined to result in a small administrative-cataloging center, but even minimum Zigeunerie is far from satisfactory in my mind. I find it often impossible to think clearly and reasonably around such confusion -- I do not live this way at home, despite any informalities, and I object to having working conditions like this. I am embarrassed to receive visitors in my office, and I have been told by several faculty members that they would prefer to meet with me elsewhere for our discussions. Just as the packed stacks and inadequate reading space inhibit scholarship in the Music Library, so does the inevitable state of my office discourage conference with the faculty and students.

At the time this report is being prepared, there is some thought about moving the technical staff to a wing of Laurel Hall. This might provide an emergency and make-shift solution to staff and storage congestion. A subsequent report to Dean Webb will consider the value of this from the viewpoint of the Music Library.

Before advancing further, I feel it important to make the following statement in an effort to avoid the possibility of any misinterpretation:

May I state foremost that the unequivocal loyalty and devotion I have for I.U. and its administration completely prevents me from actions or comments which should be interpreted in any other light. I have accepted the responsibility of building I.U.'s Music Library within the philosophy and goals of the University Libraries and the School of Music; no matter what future developments might come about, I am emotionally incapable of violating this belief. It is precisely this great ambition which has forced me to create the space problem which exists and I feel there is some merit in having strained our resources through valid operations to this extent, although I regret such extreme limits seem finally to have been reached. I hope it has not been naïve for me to gather that this philosophy has been practiced both by the School of Music and the University Libraries in their broader fields of activities, but I know that the resulting problems cannot help but tax the administrations' patience at times like this, and it was not my intent to assume my superiors could do more than they have for us. I have

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

TO: CKB **FROM:** DSL **TELEPHONE**

DEPT. **DEPT.**

SUBJ. **DATE.** 9-28-67

- 3 -

stated that I feared the Music Library has reached a critical stage in its expansion, and that I am at a loss to know what possible solution can be reached within my own jurisdiction. Simultaneously, but I hope not in selfish vanity, I recognize a need to exercise my own potentials just as I have sought to exercise those of the library resources which have been provided me. Because of that fact, I have had to admit the possibility of remaining devoted to I.U. even though these drives might force me to consider employment elsewhere. It is this loyalty which had me indicate this early in the school year that, if it is now indeed impossible for the library to continue its expansion, I owe it to myself to consider another position. I have always very carefully tried to avoid the slightest suggestion that any one of those for whom I work has not been co-operative, supporting or encouraging, and I certainly do not wish to indicate now that my feelings have changed; I am sure that support has been maximal, and I hope that the sincerity of these sentiments is beyond doubt.

The remainder of this report will attempt to justify the intolerant attitude I have toward the Music Library facilities, with the hope that either significant relief - in any suitable form - may be found possible, and with the knowledge that this relief is totally essential for further operation of the Music Library.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

TO: CKB **FROM:** DSL **TELEPHONE**

DEPT. **DEPT.**

SUBJ. **DATE.** 9-28-67

- 4 -

GROWTH AND JUSTIFICATION

Circulation from the Second Floor Music Library is symptomatic of patron demands, not only on materials, but on space. The circulation totals for the calendar years since 1963 are:

1963 - 22,183
 1964 - 34,630
 1965 - 47,924
 1966 - 52,623

This represents an increase of substantially over 100 percent during these four years. During this time, the service and storage areas of this library division have remained unchanged.

The staff size has also changed. In presenting figures on this, we should ignore those persons involved with Record Library circulation. The mere act of circulation does not seem to require more room under present conditions. Those in the Music Library Annex whose duties include circulation are included, however, as circulation there also involves pre-circulation preparation of folders and other multiple-copy materials. No full-time person is engaged for circulation at the Second Floor desk.

1963 - 5
1964 - 5
1965 - 6
1966 - 9

These figures represent full-time staff only. Because library operations have become much more complex, our hourly budget has also had to increase. The students have not all been engaged in circulation, but have assisted in processing, typing, filing and even cataloging. This budget has changed as indicated below (year indicates start of fiscal period under consideration and includes additional allocations):

1963 - \$	4,903.43
1964 -	6,254.11
1965 -	8,231.00
1966 -	9,009.13

Ignoring room required by the student assistants (although this has been a very major problem in scheduling time and equipment), between 1964 and 1966 we should have added 400 square feet of office space to the library. In fact, we have added 380 square feet, yet it will be shown that this is not satisfactory; ALA standards call for each full-time person to have 100 square feet for his use - in the office (Mul100) each person of the full-time staff has 1/3d that space and must then share it with eight hourly workers. The following statement regarding this was submitted on request from the Associate Music Librarian:

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

To: CKB

From: DSL

TELEPHONE.

DEPT.

DEPT.

SUBJ.

DATE. 9-28-67

- 5 -

"In your office, which you share with five other full-time workers, where all cataloging is done, the relative extent of congestion around the shelf list, official catalog, subject heading catalog, and the various bibliographic tools is surely comparable to the similar problem of the Catalog Dept. in the Main Library, if not more serious. The problems in the Music Library office are compounded each week by the presence of eight hourly workers, most of whom work fifteen hours a week. Their duties include filing, cataloging, assisting in cataloging, assisting in phonodisc acquisition, assisting in bibliographic projects, and acting as a courier. Most of them also must have access to the same files around which the full-time staff are working. Our main problem with the hourly workers in the office, however, is that we have no place for them to work, not to mention the absence of a single typewriter for them to use. They can only hope to sit in a chair and use a corner of the desk of the full-time person they are assisting, or occasionally they may occupy the desk of a full-time person who is absent."

Mr. Elrod's last two sentences accurately point to the heart of our most frustrating daily irritation. He goes on:

"The office is further crowded daily by patrons wishing to speak with you or to use some of our bibliographic sources. And this is virtually our only reference service!"

By ALA minimal standards, the Music Library office is only about half as large as it should be to accomplish basic tasks, if reference service and consultation may be excepted as a primary library duty.

A relationship of the budget allocation to acquisition totals will indicate the growth of our holdings and the need to have space for storage and use, and the space and equipment needs to care for the acquisitions. The figures cited below represent the total expenditure for the fiscal year starting with the date given.

1963	\$8,000.00
1964	9,000.00
1965	10,644.85
1966	13,062.16

Acquisition of new titles for this period totals:

1963	1,315
1964	1,855
1965	1,145
1966	3,341

Our book budget has risen over 2/3ds. During this period the average cost of music has risen 35 percent, or to just over \$8 per copy. This means that our increased book budget has been greater than the rise in the costs of purchase. Were these figures equitable, we should have had a budget of \$26,728 for 1966, or only 1,632 titles should have been added that year.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

TO: CKB

FROM: DSL

TELEPHONE.

DEPT.

DEPT.

SUBJ.

DATE. 9-28-67

- 6 -

A question naturally arises: Where have new acquisitions been placed? We are currently using half (the top half [sic]) of MA 151 for "temporary" storage of cataloged items that have been withdrawn from the Second Floor shelves. These items are not arranged in any order for want of proper space. This room is now fully occupied and has not provided the space relief needed by the huge number of acquisitions. In 1963 (December 13) a measurement of linear shelf footage was made of those shelves housing materials ready for circulation from the Second Floor and the Music Library Annex. In 1967 (September 27) the same area was measured again:

1963 3,331 linear feet

1967 3,696 linear feet

This indicates an increase of 365 more feet within a four year period for shelving 7,656 new titles (this figure does not include either added copies or added volumes!). Standard measurement asks that ten volumes occupy one foot. The increase of 365 feet should then be an increase of 766 feet, or twice as much room as we have been able to use. Yet that in itself is not accurate, as the stacks were over-packed in 1963. Now the volumes are placed on stack tops, sometimes seven or eight feet from the floor. The shelves themselves have virtually no room for any more additions at all.

What, then, of space for the student patrons? One year ago we had chairs for 47 readers in the Reading Room, a total which was 93 below ALA standards. The total now is 39, and we are 111 seats short in this area alone. Any comment regarding the arrangement of these chairs would be superfluous if the area were viewed while in use. The crowded condition most certainly discourages any scholarship which is not essential; there is a large, unexpressed demand for facilities because they are so sub-standard. In the same room, just beyond metal and glass partitioning, is the Music Library office. From 9:30 a.m. to 14 p.m. on September 28, 1967, the door to the Music Library office was used 164 times - such traffic cannot help but distract the patrons. There is also an overflow of typing and normal office sounds into the Reading Room.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

TO: CKB **FROM:** DSL **TELEPHONE.**
DEPT. **DEPT.**
SUBJ. **DATE.** 9-28-67

- 7 -

STATISTICS

The following figures will represent present space and facility conditions of the Music Library, measured against ALA standards and those which have been suggested by Dr. Miller to me in planning for the new music library.

	<u>Present</u>	<u>ALA</u>	<u>Dr. Miller</u>
<u>Patron</u>			
Seats			
MulOO	39	150	
2d floor	22		
MLA	1		
RL	97	150	
Linear inches per reader at table			
MulOO	24.5	30	
Service area in square feet			
2d floor	796	10,500	7,500
RL	792	10,500	7,500
MLA	42	10,500	7,500
<u>Collection</u>			
Storage room in square feet			
2d floor	1,332		5,263
MLA	507		10,856
RL	544		973
ARM	0		973
<u>Staff space in</u>			
Office space in square feet (shared = with patrons or storage)			
MulOO	380	600	
2d floor	shared	100	
MLA	shared	200	
RL	shared	200	
<u>Additional</u>			
Conference rooms	0 sq. ft.	240 sq. ft.	
Process & technical	697 sq. ft.	1,200 sq. ft.	
Private offices	0	200 sq. ft.	
Total space	6,296 sq. ft.		33,964 sq. ft.

These figures indicate the extent by which the Music Library space falls short in every category with the minimal standards established by the American Library Association.

In relief and for further comparison, I should point out that the University of California Music Library (Berkeley) has 119 square feet for each enrolled music major, while Indiana University has 4.19 square feet for each of these potential patrons. This same library has 450 volumes for each student, while I.U. has 350. I suspect that any other measurement from other major university music libraries would illustrate our extraordinary shortcomings with equal drama.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMUNICATION

TO: CKB **FROM:** DSL **TELEPHONE**

DEPT. **DEPT.**

SUBJ. **DATE.** 9-28-67

- 8 -

SPACE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Music Library very badly needs a substantial change in its space allocation for the current semester. It would be of great benefit if the new arrangements could care for our growth over a ten-year period as this may well prove to be the length of time before properly designed quarters are available.

The following recommendations are offered with that idea in mind, yet only seek to bring us closer to minimal standards for the operation as it currently exists. To that extent, I trust this recommendation can be considered modest. If such changes are possible, it would be most important that the various areas of operation are kept together as units; further departmentalization of the Music Library will prove to be more expensive than our budgets will permit, and more cumbersome than our operation can allow.

Patron

Seating -- increase of 111 seats to total 150 for general reading;
Space -- increase of 4,000 square feet to total 4,646;

Spa Collection

Space for 2d floor holdings -- increase of 3,931 square feet to total 5,263 square feet for book, score and journal storage; Space for performance materials -- increase of 500 square feet to total 1,007 square feet which is one-tenth below standards; Space for phonorecord storage -- increase of 400 square feet to total 944 square feet;

Office

Increase of 220 square feet to total 600 square feet, plus two offices for the professional librarians, and one conference room.

These recommendations, with an increase of 6,174 square feet, would bring the library space to 12,460 square feet - which is still 21,504 square feet below standards for conditions as they exist at the time this memo is prepared, yet are proposed in the hope this will provide reasonable relief for a ten-year period of growth.

cc: Dean C. H. Webb