

# North Carolina's Two-Year Learning Resources Programs: A Comparison With The U.S. And The ACRL Standards

Ray L. Carpenter

The quantitative standards for two-year college libraries completed in 1979 by the Junior College Libraries Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) constitute the current guidelines for planning and evaluating learning resource centers or libraries for those higher education institutions known variously as junior colleges, community colleges, and technical institutes.<sup>1</sup> This present study presents a profile of the libraries in North Carolina's 66 institutions and a comparison with 1146 others in the U.S. in terms of those variables included in the Standards for which there are measures available in the 1977 Higher Education General Information Surveys (HEGIS), the most recent data available at the time of this study.<sup>2</sup> In order to report more recent information, data available from the *Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina 1980-81* have been added in parentheses in the tables for periodical subscriptions, book collection size, total library expenditures, expenditures for materials and for salaries and wages. The library data in the abstract is actually for the period 1979-80.<sup>3</sup>

The HEGIS survey of libraries is supplemented by the surveys of enrollment, finance, and staff. Major financial support for computation services and data sets was provided by the Junior College Libraries Section (ACRL) with additional assistance from the Computation Center and the School of Library Science of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. The Junior College Section of the North Carolina Library Association funded the computer services for analyzing the North Carolina HEGIS.

The major limitation of this study lies in the fact that the HEGIS studies did not query institutions about all of the variables specified in the ACRL *Standards*, including the physical plant (space) and equipment distribution. Moreover, as the HEGIS query about recorded materials does not jibe with definitions in the *Standards*, adjustments were made as noted in the following section on that topic.

The *Standards* do not differentiate between public and private-controlled schools, but institutions vary considerably in respect to type of control, as will be apparent in many of the following tables. More importantly, many of the standards are expressed in terms of the size of full-time equivalent student enrollment (FTE). Table 1 shows that private institutions in North Carolina are relatively smaller; nearly all (89%) have fewer than 1000 FTE students, as compared with the 42% of the public institutions of this size. Moreover, while

most private schools in the U.S. are similar in size to those in N.C., the public controlled schools in the U.S. are frequently much larger. Only 7% of North Carolina's public schools have FTE enrollments larger than 3,000 in contrast with one-third of such schools in the U.S. As so few schools in N.C. have enrollments of 3,000 or more, they are summarized collectively in each table by the footnote denoted by an asterisk. The numbers at the heads of each column in the tables identify the number of libraries reporting. These numbers change somewhat from table to table due to the variant response rate.

TABLE 1  
Student Enrollment Size by Type of Control

FTE Students	N. C. Total (66)	N. C. Private (9)	N. C. Public (57)	U. S. Total (1146)
Less than 1000	39%	89%	32%	32%
1000<3000	55	11	61	34
3000<5000	5	0	5	11
5000 or more	2	0	2	22

One of the most salient features of the *Standards* for two-year schools is the specification of "minimal" and "good" levels, usually for each category of FTE, for several variables. These levels are noted in the tables by the letters M (minimal) and G (good) with the numerical value in parentheses called for at these levels by the *Standards*. For example, in the table on professional staff, the "M(2)" for the fewer than 1,000 FTE students category indicates the *minimum* number of professional staff required to meet standards in schools of this size. The table shows that 36% of schools in the U.S. and 65% of schools in N.C. (75% of private and 61% of public) had at least two professional staff members, the "minimum" level, while none of the private and 22% of the public schools in North Carolina had four or more professionals, the "good" level. The reader should refer to the *Standards* statement for full explication of this and other parts of the standards. A more detailed treatment of the schools in the U.S. has been published in *College & Research Libraries* in 1981. Comparing the results reported, these may enhance the reader's understanding of the status of North Carolina's schools.

## Staff

The *Standards* document specifies different numbers for Professional and for Support Staff. The following two tables show the distributions for each of these kinds of staff at the minimal and good levels for each FTE student group.

TABLE 2  
Professional Staff

FTE Student	Levels	N.C. Total (1146)	N.C. Total (66)	U.S. Private (9)	N.C. Public (57)
<1,000	M (2)	36%	65%	75%	61%
	G (4)	3	15	0	22
1,000<3,000	M (2.5)	49	72	100	71
	G (4)	21	42	0	43
3,000 or more		*	*		
Median		2.5	3	2.5	3
Mean		3.4	3.2	2.5	3.3

\*U.S.: 26-56% of libraries are at M, 7-12% are at G level.

N.C.: 2 of 4 libraries are at M, one is at G level.

Almost two-thirds of the schools in N.C. met the professional staff criteria. However, private institutions fare somewhat better than their publicly controlled peers when we recall that nearly all of the private schools are in the less than 1,000 FTE range. Not shown in TABLE 2 is that 13% of the schools in the U.S. have less than one professional (all schools in N.C. have at least one).

TABLE 3  
Support Staff

FTE Students	Levels	U.S. Total (1146)	N.C. Total (66)	N.C. Private (9)	N.C. Public (57)	N.C.<1 Support Staff	N.C. 1<4 Support Staff
<1,000	M (4)	4%	8%	0%	11%	0%	92%
	G (6)	<1	0	0	0		
1,000<3,000	M (5)	15	14	0	14	3	58
	G (10)	1	0	0	0		
3,000 or more		*	*				
Median		3.0	2.6	2.0	3.0		
Mean		4.6	2.9	1.9	3.1		

\*U.S.: 5-29% are at M, 1-4% are at G level.

N.C.: 1 of 4 libraries is at M, none at G level.

The inadequacy of support staff was far greater; neither private nor public institutions came up to mark to any significant degree. In addition, the data from Tables 2 and 3 suggest a serious deficiency in developing professional-support staff ratios. Consider the public-controlled schools with 1,000-3,000 students: 71% had at least 2.5 professionals, but 58% had fewer than four support staff members.

TABLE 4  
Ratio of Professional to Support Staff

Ratio Prof.:Support*	U.S. Total (1111)	N. C. Total (66)	N. C. Private (9)	N.C. Public (57)
<1:0.5	19%	21%	11%	23%
<1:1.0	19	30	67	25
<1:1.5	27	21	11	23
<1:2.0	14	11	11	11
<1:3.0	14	11	0	12
1:3.0 or more	7	6	0	7
Median	1:1.0	1:0.9	1:0.7	1:1.0
Mean	1:1.3	1:1.2	1:0.8	1:1.2
Minimum	1:0.0	1:0.0	1:0.3	1:0.0
Maximum	1:20.0	1:5.0	1:1.5	1:5.0

\*The percentages in each row are for the respective row interval; they are not cumulative except as they total 100%, each column.

Table 4 amplifies the relationships implied in Tables 2 and 3. The minimum level of the *Standards* for staff implies that there should be at least two support staff for each professional. Assuming the minimum ratio of professional to support of 1:2, calculations allow us to conclude that 83% of all North Carolina schools fell short of this "standard" (100% of the private and 81% of the public schools). Although public schools more nearly approximated the "standard" ratio, nearly one-fourth of them had less than *one-half* support staff for each professional.

TABLE 5  
Hours of Student Assistance, Annual

No. of Hours	U.S. Total (1051)	N. C. Total (62)	N. C. Private (9)	N.C. Public (53)
<500	35%	52%	22%	57%
500<2,000	19	24	33	23
2,000<6,000	28	23	44	19
6,000<10,000	10	2	0	2
10,000 or more	8	0	0	0
Median	1,600	250	1,520	180
Mean	3,360	1,250	2,070	1,110

Student assistants constitute a special factor in support of library services. If 500 hours can be considered as a rough equivalent of 12 full-time weeks of work (40 hours per week), over one-half of the schools lack this level of

support. The median number of hours varied greatly by type of control; that for private schools was nearly nine times as large as for public.

## Collections

The *Standards* for collection size refer to written and recorded materials. The HEGIS inquiry and the *Standards* statement do not coincide precisely in terminology and definitions for the various kinds of materials. The distribution of periodical subscription *titles* as reported to HEGIS appears in Table 6. "Other written materials" as called for in the *Standards* are represented in Table 7 as the number of *volumes* held, as reported by HEGIS. HEGIS does not distinguish as do the *Standards* between "motion pictures and videotapes" and "other recorded materials"; Table 8 thus represents as "audiovisual" titles the best approximation of the *Standards*.

TABLE 6  
Periodical Subscriptions

FTE Students	Levels	U.S. Total (1146)	N.C. Total (66)	N.C. Private (9)	N.C. Public (57)	N.C. <100 Titles	N.C. <200 Titles
<1,000	M (200)	37%	42%	63%	33%	4%	54%
	G (300)	12	8	13	6		
1,000<3,000	M (300)	41	11	0	11	3	43
	G (500)	7	0	0	0		
3,000 or more		*	*				
Median		280	210 (217)	220 (221)	200 (213)		
Mean		350	220 (228)	230 (235)	210 (227)		

\*U.S.: 8-36% are at M, 3-17% are at G level.  
N.C.: All 4 are below M level.

Fifty-eight percent of North Carolina schools had fewer than 200 current periodical subscriptions, the minimum standard for enrollments of less than 1,000 FTE students. Nearly two-thirds of private schools met the standard as compared with one-third in the public sector. (Not shown in the table is that 24% of schools in the U.S. had fewer than 100 subscriptions as compared with 4% in N.C.) The numbers in parentheses for 1979-80 show an increase in the number of subscriptions but no change in the standards levels.

The size of the book collection was below standard in most institutions, but private schools, of which 89% had fewer than 1,000 FTE students, do considerably better than the public schools. Nearly two-thirds of them met the "good" level, a point that no public school attained. (North Carolina fell far short of the U.S. in respect to book collections. Nationwide, 39% of public schools were at "minimum" in the less than 1,000 FTE class as were 35% in the 1,000-



TABLE 7  
Book Collection Size (Volumes)

FTE Students	Levels	U.S. Total (1146)	N.C. Total (66)	N.C. Private (9)	N.C. Public (57)	N.C. <10,000 Volumes	N.C. <20,000 Volumes
<1,000	M (20,000)	43%	35%	100%	6%	12%	54%
	G (30,000)	18	19	63	0		
1,000<3,000	M (30,000)	33	25	0	23	0	33
	G (50,000)	6	3	100	0		
3,000 or more		*	*			0	33
<10,000 volumes		12%	5%	0%	5% (1%)		
<20,000 volumes		20	41	0	47 (30%)		
Median		27,300	22,300 (24,400)	41,600 (42,100)	19,300 (22,300)		
Mean		33,900	24,600 (27,600)	43,000 (44,000)	21,700 (25,300)		

\*U.S.: 12-24% are at M, 2-8% at G level.

N.C.: 1 of 4 is at G, the other 3 are below M level.

3,000 class). A comparison of the median figures for public and private schools is instructive. On average, public schools' bookstock is about half of that in the private schools. This is possibly due to the fact that public schools are much younger and have had less time to accumulate holdings, an assumption partly substantiated by the 1979-80 figures in parentheses, showing growth primarily in the public institutions.

TABLE 8  
Audio-Visual Titles

FTE Students	Levels	U.S. Total (1069)	N.C. Total (65)	N.C. Private (9)	N.C. Public (56)	N.C. <100 Titles
<1,000	M (365)	76%	92%	88%	94%	4%
	G (1475)	40	73	63	78	
1,000<3,000	M (1475)	59	77	0	76	0
	G (3550)	26	54	100	53	
3,000 or more		*	*			0
Median no.		2,140	3,750	1,700	4,360	
Mean no.		4,660	5,080	2,980	5,420	

\*U.S.: 38-50% are at M, 17-29% are at G level.

N.C.: 3 of 4 are at M level.

In Table 8 all "recorded materials," the term used in the *Standards*, are represented by the HEGIS count of the number of *audiovisual* titles: "audio recordings, motion pictures, filmstrips, slides, overhead transparencies,

videotapes" and "other recorded materials" as does the *Standards* statement. Consequently, in order to maximize the effect of the *Standards*, the M and G intentions, but its count does not distinguish between "motion pictures and video tapes" and "other recorded materials" as does the *Standards* statement. Consequently, in order to maximize the effect of the *Standards*, the M and G levels in Table 8 constitute some of the "motion pictures and videotapes" and "other recorded materials" values called for in the *Standards*. For instance, schools with enrollments (FTE) of less than 1,000 are expected (in the *Standards*) to have 15 units of "motion pictures and videotapes" and 350 of "other recorded materials". Table 8 has combined these to indicate that 365 audiovisual units are required for the minimum level.

Although the data do not account for the degree of specificity accounted for in the *Standards* — distinguishing counts of motion pictures and videotapes from counts of other types of recorded materials — they do show that most N.C. schools in all classes of student enrollment have holdings that exceed the minimum and the "good" levels and surpass the national figures in this respect. Furthermore, it should be noted that recorded or audiovisual materials are probably undercounted, as they are sometimes controlled entirely or in part by an agency or department in the institution other than the library or learning resources center. Such holdings are in effect unreported if the institution fails to take account of such departments when polled by HEGIS. Despite gains and losses among individual schools, the 1979-80 figures show no meaningful change on average and are not presented.

TABLE 9  
**Materials: Other Than Books, Periodicals,  
and Audio-Visuals**

Volumes	U.S. Total (1078)	N. C. Total (66)	N. C. Private (9)	N.C. Public (57)
Median	1,560	990	670	1,090
Mean	7,090	3,010	3,580	2,920

Because the reporting of other kinds of materials, such as maps and charts, is less consistent in respect both to reliable enumeration and consensus about definition, Table 9 simply reports the median and mean volumes held. As the *Standards* call for as few as fifty units for schools with FTE of less than 1,000 and 350 units for the 1,000-3,000 FTE category, most institutions presumably meet the minimum standards. Note, however, the extraordinary difference between the means and the medians, especially for private schools. That the data about holdings of this kind vary so greatly may largely be due to an unreliable inventory in many schools.

TABLE 10  
**Percent of Bookstock Added**  
 (Standard: 5% of the collection should be added yearly)

Percent Added	U.S. Total (1146)	N. C. Total (66)	N. C. Private (9)	N.C. Public (57)
<4%	23%	18%	56%	12%
4%<5%	14	11	22	9
Cumulative % under 5%	(37)	(29)	(78)	(21)
5%<7%	22	23	11	25
7%<10%	19	14	11	14
10% or more	22	35	0	40
Cumulative 5% or more	(63)	(72)	(22)	(79)
Median	6.1%	6.9%	3.4%	7.7%
Mean	8.8	9.1	4.1	9.9

The *Standards* call for annual acquisition of five percent of the existing collection. The best indicator available for this in the HEGIS data base is the annual acquisition rate for the bookstock part of the collection. Consequently, Table 10 tells us only about bookstock additions, not about the important collections of "recorded materials" (HEGIS does not inquire about this). On average, that is, comparing medians and means, private schools did not meet the standard for collection development. Public schools, in spite of 21% falling below the 5% mark, fare better than their peers in the U.S., while private schools fared worse. Recall that this data is based on reports for one year, 1977, which may not be a sound indicator of a general pattern of acquisitions.

## Budget

The *Standards* state that "... a fully developed Learning Resource Program will usually require from 7 to 12 percent of the educational and general budget of the institution, whether these are separately identified as learning resources or diffused in a multiple number of accounts."<sup>5</sup> Most institutions fell well below this budgetary standard; in North Carolina it was met by only nine schools, all public. Collectively, however, the state fared somewhat better than the U.S. as a whole, as may be seen by examining the medians and means. If we combine the schools with less than 3% and those with 3-4%, we see that in North Carolina 29% and in the U.S. 52% of the schools would have to double their budgets to meet the standard of 7% or more. Tables 12, 13, and 14 provide further insight into the budgetary situation. No change is apparent for 1979-80.



TABLE 11  
**Library Expenditure as a Percent  
of Institutional Expenditure**  
(Standard: 7-12%)

Library's % of Institutional Budget	U.S. Total (1107)	N. C. Total (66)	N. C. Private (9)	N.C. Public (57)
<3%	30%	11%	11%	11%
3%<4%	22	18	33	16
4%<7%	37	57	56	58
Cumulative Less than 7%	(89)	(86)	(100)	(85)
7<13%	9	12	0	14
13% or more	1	2	0	2
Cumulative 7% or more	(10)	(14)	(0)	(16)
Median	3.9%	4.7%	4.2%	5.1%
Mean	4.5	5.1	4.2	5.3

Library budgets are modest, but private schools compared favorably with their peers in the U.S. That is, no North Carolina private school had less than a \$35,000 yearly budget, but in the U.S. 53% of private schools were in this category. The private school median of \$65,000 in N.C. was far larger than the private school U.S. median of \$34,000. The public schools' U.S. median of \$133,000 is a third higher than that for N.C. where FTE enrollments are considerably smaller. Changes in N.C. for 1979-80, in parentheses, showed larger growth on average in operating dollars in public (up 17%) than in private (up 13%) schools.

TABLE 12  
**Total Library Operating Expenditures**

Total Library Budget (\$)	U.S. Total (1146)	N.C. Total (66)	N.C. Private (9)	N.C. Public (57)
<\$35,000	15%	0% (0%)	0% (0%)	5% (0%)
35,000<75,000	22	30 (15)	67 (50)	25 (11)
75,000<150,000	28	52 (54)	33 (38)	54 (56)
150,000<250,000	16	15 (18)	0 (13)	18 (19)
\$250,000 or more	18	3 (12)	0 (0)	4 (14)
Median	\$102,000	\$97,000 (114,000)	\$65,000 (75,000)	\$100,000 (124,000)
Mean	166,000	117,000 (138,000)	70,000 (79,000)	125,000 (146,000)

TABLE 13  
Materials Budgets

Materials (\$)	U.S. Total (1146)	N.C. Total (66)	N.C. Private (9)	N.C. Public (57)
<\$10,000	16%	5% (0%)	0% (0%)	5% (0%)
10,000<20,000	22	24 (18)	44 (50)	21 (14)
20,000<40,000	30	55 (54)	56 (38)	54 (56)
40,000<75,000	22	15 (25)	0 (13)	18 (26)
\$75,000 or more	11	2 (3)	0 (0)	2 (4)
Median	\$27,000	\$23,000 (32,000)	\$20,000 (19,000)	\$25,000 (32,000)
Mean	39,000	29,000 (35,000)	20,000 (21,000)	31,000 (35,000)

TABLE 14  
Salaries and Wages Budgets

Salaries and Wages (\$)	U.S. Total (1146)	N.C. Total (66)	N.C. Private (9)	N.C. Public (57)
<\$20,000	16%	3% (3%)	0% (0%)	4% (0%)
20,000<40,000	23	23 (14)	56 (38)	18 (11)
40,000<75,000	21	42 (47)	44 (63)	42 (45)
75,000<100,000	11	17 (19)	0 (0)	19 (21)
100,000 or more	30	15 (20)	0 (0)	18 (23)
Median	\$55,000	\$53,000 (60,000)	\$40,000 (44,000)	\$57,000 (65,000)
Mean	99,000	71,000 (79,000)	40,000 (43,000)	76,000 (84,000)

Differences between private and public schools are demonstrated again in the findings about materials and personnel expenditures. The much smaller budgets, especially for personnel, in private schools may be attributed to their smaller enrollments. Given the very limited total budgets, it is not surprising to find that over 40% of the private schools and a fourth of public schools spend less than \$20,000 on materials. As the number of staff in these libraries is small, salaries and wages budgets are unsurprising. The 1979-80 data for materials show private schools little changed, public schools up about 13%. Both had a 10% average increase in salary money, less than the increase in the cost of living for that period. An important question is the *quality* of resources provided by such limited funding.

## Public Services

Although the *Standards* provide no guidance about the amount of time the library should be accessible to users, the HEGIS data afford information about this fundamental indicator of service. Table 15 shows that the average hours open per week is about the same in N.C. and the U.S. However, private schools in North Carolina provided more access than public schools in North Carolina and more than the private schools in the U.S. This may account in part for their relatively high rate of loans and reference transactions reported in the following two tables. (Conversely, it may be that higher demand for loans and reference service require more hours of access). If the 92% of schools open between 50 and 75 hours a week are on a seven-day schedule, they presumably are accessible approximately 8-10 hours a day. The extent to which these hours are in the evening or on week-ends, times that employed students may need to use the library, cannot be determined with the available data.

The appendix to the *Standards* consists of nearly 70 users' services for which statistics might be collected. The HEGIS data furnish measures for estimates of two important factors in that list, reference services and circulation.

TABLE 15  
Hours Open Per Week

Number of Hours/Week	U.S. Total (1145)	N.C. Total (66)	N.C. Private (9)	N.C. Public (57)
<50	10%	2%	0%	2%
50<75	80	92	67	96
75 or more	10	6	33	2
Median	64	64	72	64
Mean	64	64	73	63
Minimum	10	45	66	45
Maximum	168	87	87	76

The figures in Table 16 do not provide the kinds of precise distinctions called for in the *Standards*. For instance, they do not tell if the service consists of "extensive assistance" or if the service was to particular user groups such as the physically handicapped. In order to interpret the table accurately, note that the percentage distributions are for the number of reference and directional transactions *per FTE student*. The HEGIS questionnaire does not inquire about the type of user; consequently such other users as faculty and staff are in effect not counted in the tabulation. If the number of the *total* population of users were known and used as the divisor, the number of transactions would be smaller than represented in the table. The means and medians of the public and private schools differ greatly — private schools providing on average about two and a half times as many transactions as the public ones.

TABLE 16  
Reference and Directional Transactions  
Per FTE Student Per Week

Number of Transactions	U.S. Total (991)	N.C. Total (58)	N.C. Private (8)	N.C. Public (50)
<0.1	42%	22%	12.5%	24%
0.1<0.5	44	52	12.5	58
0.5<1.0	9	17	50	12
1.0 or more	5	9	25	6
Median	.13	.19	.66	.18
Mean	.36	.40	.75	.31

As in the previous table, the total figures (in this case, loans) are expressed in terms of the number of FTE students. Users other than students are not included; thus the results are somewhat inflated, higher than actually the case if faculty, staff, and other users were included. The private schools show on average higher usage than those under public control. Considering the total of North Carolina's schools, the table shows that 39% of them lend fewer than 8 items per year per student. In sum, circulation data suggest a low rate of use.

TABLE 17  
Annual Loans per FTE Student

Number of Loans/FTE	U.S. Total (1130)	N.C. Total (66)	N.C. Private (9)	N.C. Public (57)
<4	24%	6%	0%	7%
4<8	31	33	0	39
8<12	20	26	11	28
12<20	14	20	22	19
20 or more	11	15	67	7
Median	7	9	23	8
Mean	14	12	21	10

### Summary

The analysis of the 1977 HEGIS to determine how closely learning resource centers in North Carolina's two year institutions of higher education met the ACRL standards may be briefly summarized as follows:

1. *Staff.* A majority met professional, but not support staff standards. Public

schools had a high proportion (60% of their total) at the "good" level for professional staff. Both types of schools fell far short of support staff levels recommended, like most schools in the U.S.

2. *Collections.* Private institutions came closer than public ones to having the recommended number of periodicals, and, unlike public schools, compare favorably with the U.S. Book collections were up to standard in private schools. Public schools in North Carolina fell short of the standards and of their counterparts in the U.S., presumably because they were established more recently.

The standards for audiovisual titles were more nearly approximated by both private and public schools than for the standards for such other materials as maps and realia. The standard for collection development as measured by percent of *bookstock* added is unevenly met. Fifty-six percent of private schools added less than 4%; 22% added 5% or more, the standard level. Only 12% of public schools added less than 4%, and 79% met the 5% level, with 40% adding 10% or more.

3. *Budget.* The recommendation that institutions allocate from 7-12% to learning resources is rarely satisfied. Only 16% of public and none of the private schools' centers received 7% or more of their institution's budgets, a finding similar to the pattern in the U.S. as a whole.

Assuming that the *Standards* in general are a useful measure for evaluating and developing library resources and services and the HEGIS data provide a reasonable approximation of the status quo, at least for the year studied, 1977, we find that most libraries are below standard for many factors, most notably perhaps in respect to support staff. The limited data analysis for 1979-80 shows some improvement, principally among public school, in respect to collection development and budget. Given the increase in materials costs and for cost-of-living salary increases, gains were small in most schools, and represented a loss in purchasing power for many. Further improvement in data gathering and analysis could afford a full and more precise measure of libraries in terms of the ACRL *Standards*. The most serious shortcoming in a study of this kind is the lack of measures that can ultimately and clearly indicate the *quality* of libraries' services and collections. However, several of the most important factors presently in the *Standards* are measurable, and the status of libraries in North Carolina in those terms is fairly clear. Assuming that management policy and practice would be effective and efficient, the allocation of considerably more funds is probably the key factor for bringing these learning resource centers and libraries more nearly up to the levels specified in the *Standards*.

Ray L. Carpenter is Professor, School of Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.



## References

1. "Draft: Statement on Quantitative Standards for Two-Year Learning Resources Programs," *College and Research Library News* 40, no. 3 (March, 1979): 69-73.
2. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Education Division. "Higher Education General Information Survey and Library General Information Survey, College and University Libraries—Fall, 1977." [Questionnaire] Washington, D.C.: The Department, 1977.
3. University of North Carolina. General Administration. *Statistical Abstract of Higher Education in North Carolina 1980-81*. (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1981). The tables for libraries are for 1979-80.
4. Ray L. Carpenter, "College Libraries: A Comparative Analysis In Terms Of the ACRL Standards," *College and Research Libraries* 42 (1981): 7-18.
5. "Draft: Statement on Quantitative Standards for Two-Year Learning Resources Programs," p. 70.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 73.

## REGIONAL LOCAL HISTORY GENEALOGY

PUBLISHERS and BOOKSELLERS of reprints and originals ... Regional and County History, Genealogical source material, Colonial Americana, Revolutionary and Civil War material ... Primary emphasis on Southeastern states ... Publications of the South Carolina Historical Society. Write for complete catalogue.

Thomas E. Smith  
Publisher



THE REPRINT COMPANY, PUBLISHERS  
Post Office Box 5401  
Spartanburg, S.C. 29304

## Bake a Snake

### How to Survive by your Own Cooking

by Gerald Hunter and Peggy Hoffman

A New Illustrated Book for the  
Outdoorsperson or Anyone Who  
May Someday Find it Necessary  
to Survive in the Wilds or in Camp

Many books will tell the reader how to prepare a camp, but few will give the concise, easily understandable instructions for preparing wild food that can be found in *Bake a Snake*. A partial list of what is included:

Alligators	Eels	Mussels
Berries and Beans	Frogs	Rodents
Cattail Corn	Insects	Snakes
Crayfish	Lizards	Turtles

\$4.25 Softbound In Imitation Snakeskin:  
\$9.00 Hardbound Library Edition.

Plus \$1.00 postage and handling for one copy; 30¢ for each additional copy in same order. We pay postage on prepaid orders. N. C. orders add 3% state sales tax.

## Meridional Publications

Route 2, Box 28A,  
Wake Forest, N.C. 17587