challenge twenty years ago, when the academic community led in a movement for cultural change and opposed the conservative research agenda of government-financed research grantees.

Just as we still await the “paperless office” (p. 140) of the seventies, the “networking collection developer” of the eighties has not arrived. Major academic research collections are usually built by “lone conceptualizers.” For their work, *Varsity Letters*, a good manual on archival practice, and a set of realistic priorities will be useful tools.

Maynard Brichford, *University Archives, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*


The academic research libraries of North America have sought through institutional and collective actions over the course of the twentieth century new and more rigorous approaches to effective management and planning. Stanton Biddle, administrative services librarian at Baruch College, City University of New York, documents and summarizes this history with a particular focus on the strategic and long-range planning efforts of the last ten years. His study, based on a 1988 doctoral dissertation completed at the University of California, Berkeley, investigates the level and nature of planning in Association of Research Libraries (ARL) member libraries, evaluates library planning documents on the basis of a model drawn from the key literature, and proposes guidelines for improving the quality of planning.

The first third of this work provides an overview of the general and library planning literature and a description of the historical development of the research library and early planning studies in libraries through 1970. This is a useful and well-written summary that highlights the expanding recognition of the university research library as a complex academic organization in an unstable environment demanding new frameworks for development and decision making. One of the most interesting and important works cited by Biddle is George Keller’s 1983 book *Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in Higher Education* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983) and its summary of processes other than planning. Biddle concludes that “planning is not a document” but “a dynamic, ongoing, everchanging adapting process” (p. 12).

Biddle’s race from the colonial period to the post–World War II growth years sets the stage for an excellent discussion of the application of management theory and early planning studies in academic libraries. He notes, in particular, the persistent gap between the development of administrative theories—classic bureaucratic, scientific, or human relations management—and their application to academic libraries. Starting with George Works’s 1927 benchmark study *College and University Library Problems: A Study of a Selected Group of Institutions* (Chicago: American Library Association, 1927), Biddle takes the reader through the key planning developments of the next forty years. These include the library sections in the 1930 U.S. Office of Education study of land grant institutions, the expanding number of library surveys by outside experts through the 1940s into the early 1950s, and library self-studies inspired by accreditation reviews. Biddle emphasizes the content, strengths, and weaknesses of these early assess-
ment and problem-solving methodologies and draws links to the expanding application of strategic planning in academic libraries beginning in the late 1960s inspired by the work of Robert Kemper. Kemper's 1967 University of Washington dissertation on Strategic Planning for Library Systems sets the stage for a revolution in thinking about management practices in academic libraries and a new framework for planning, distinct from operational planning and task programming, which are more focused on resource utilization and day-to-day activities. It was during the late 1960s, provoked by social and institutional unrest and economic challenges, that the North American research library community aggressively focused its attention on the need for new approaches to management processes. Biddle describes the June 1968 ARL meeting as the watershed event in this development, from which flowed the Committee on University Library Management, the classic Booz/Allen/Hamilton report Problems in University Library Management (Washington, D.C.: Association of Research Libraries, 1970), the Office of University Library Management Studies, and the expanding interest and support of the American Council on Education and the Council on Library Resources.

The second third of Biddle's book analyzes the content and impact of the Booz/Allen/Hamilton study and uses this work in combination with eight other “key library survey/library planning source documents” (p. 101) and other sources to construct a model of “basic library planning program components” (p. 102). Problems in University Library Management was “the most comprehensive investigation of university library management ever undertaken” (p. 70) and focused on managerial issues and decision processes rather than products. This report spawned the series of key steps taken by ARL to expand library management research and support, the comprehensive studies carried out in the early 1970s at several major university libraries, and the development and implementation of the Management Review and Analysis Program (MRAP) to help “university libraries devise strategies for improving their management and planning systems” (p. 85). Biddle correctly concludes that at the end of the 1970s, the environment and support mechanisms were in place to launch a period of successful strategic plan development and implementation, that is, planning efforts based on mission, goals and objectives, environmental and organizational assessments, alternative approaches, contingency plans, and rigorous and continuing evaluation.

The nine survey/planning documents used by the author to create a model against which to evaluate the plans produced by libraries throughout the 1980s are drawn from the period 1927–71 and include some of the classics on library management and planning. One of the critical shortcomings of this retrospective strategy is that Biddle seems to ignore a great deal of the important work carried out in the two decades since 1971. Furthermore, Biddle's history of library management and planning thought essentially stops in the 1970s. This may be explained by the current work being based on a 1988 dissertation focused on a 1982–83 survey. Nevertheless, the seven elements of the library planning model drawn from the historical literature do constitute a valuable assessment tool. The seven elements are statement of goals and objectives, responsive and functional organizational structures, evaluations of resources and services, use of technology and information management systems, extent of interinstitutional cooperation, examinations of the administrative relationship of the library to the university administration, and library planning systems.

The final third of this volume is an analysis of planning documents and a description of planning activities in ARL libraries obtained through 1982–83 and 1990–91 surveys. The primary objectives of these two surveys were to
document the status of strategic long-range planning in academic libraries, to assess how these efforts conformed to the author's criteria/model, and to refine an instrument for evaluating plans and providing guidance for future planning activities. The results of the two surveys, separated by nearly a dynamic decade, are both interesting and instructive. We learn, for example, that 56 percent or forty-seven of eighty-three responding ARL libraries had either developed or were currently working on plans in 1982–83, while nearly 87 percent or fifty-eight of sixty-seven responding libraries were similarly positioned in 1990–91. In the overwhelming majority of cases in both surveys, the plans were required by the parent institutions or were self-initiated in the libraries. The plans are characterized by extensive coverage of missions, goals and objectives, environmental analysis, alternative courses of action, and implementation plans. And not surprisingly, Biddle's content analysis illustrates expanding coverage in the plans of the university context, declining resources, electronic media, collection preservation, instructional activities, resource sharing, faculty and staff development, facility renovation and expansion, and alternative sources of funding. To a significant extent, these trends—as documented in Biddle's analysis of library planning documents—describe the key issues for academic research libraries in the 1990s. Biddle's focus on planning documents is modestly problematic, in that it relies for evidence on the plans themselves, and not on the dynamic, ongoing process stressed in the planning literature. The author's summary conclusions are that the number of libraries actively involved in planning activities has significantly increased, and that the comprehensiveness and sophistication of the planning documents have improved.

One of the most important sections in the book, albeit covered in five brief paragraphs, is Biddle's recommendations for further research. He points to four primary needs: a study of the success of the implementation of plan recommendations, an examination of the impact of ARL's management development program and the support provided by the Council on Library Resources, an investigation of the role of planning in improving a library's efficiency and effectiveness, and research on evaluation of the planning process and implementation. Several other critical items may be added to this research agenda: for example, the role of library education and professional development in creating a supportive and skilled planning environment in libraries, the impact of reduced budgets and organizational downsizing on planning activities, the influence of university planning expectations and processes on library planning efforts, staff attitudes about planning, and the use of interactive decision-making technologies in planning procedures.

Stanton Biddle has provided the profession with an excellent historical account of the development of planning in academic libraries and valuable insights on the characteristics and direction of planning efforts over the past decade. This work will be an important addition to the required reading list for my graduate seminar on planning for libraries.

James G. Neal, University Libraries, Indiana University


The appearance of a new edition of "the Lyle" can be a bittersweet publishing event for those of us who cut our deciduous academic teeth on one or another